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Top of Form

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Ana Navarro, a Republican strategist and commentator, was national Hispanic campaign chairwoman for John McCain in 2008, national Hispanic co-chair for Jon Huntsman's 2012 campaign and was supporting Jeb Bush's candidacy for 2016. Follow her on Twitter @ananavarro. The opinions expressed in this commentary are hers.

(CNN) -- I didn't want to write this. I avoided making a decision as long as I could. I schlepped my absentee ballot all over the country for almost four weeks. I would periodically take it out of the envelope, look at it, shake my head in disgust, and put it back in my suitcase.

I had decided to write-in my mother as a symbolic protest vote against the Democratic and Republican nominees. I didn't want to vote for either of them.

I had hoped that a week before the election, Trump would be losing Florida by a large enough margin that my vote wouldn't matter. But darn it, my home state is too close to call. Florida could be the decisive state (again) as to who ultimately becomes the next president of the United States. I thought back to the 2000 election, which was decided by 537 votes in Florida. I thought about how I would feel if the same thing happened in 2016. I thought and I thought and I thought....

Then I cast my vote for Hillary Clinton. Let me rephrase that. I cast my vote against Donald Trump. I did it without joy or enthusiasm. I did it out of civic duty and love for our country.

I voted against Donald Trump because I am an **immigrant**. Trump has spent this campaign focusing on the very bad things done by a very small group of very bad **immigrants**. He has portrayed **immigrants** as criminals, rapists, and murderers. He does not talk about the contributions **immigrants** have made to America. He does not talk about **immigrants** who have made this a better and stronger country. He does not talk about the thousands and thousands of **immigrant** names that fill the Vietnam Wall in Washington or that are carved on so many headstones in every US military cemetery around the world.

I voted against Donald Trump because I am Hispanic. On June 16, 2015, the first day of his campaign, Trump called Mexicans "rapists." I was not born in Mexico. I am not of Mexican descent. But I knew he was also talking about me.

I voted against Donald Trump for every American who looks and sounds like me. Because we love this country. We are proud of this country. We stand as equals in the United States of America.

I voted against Donald Trump because of 8-year-old Alessia. She is my best friend's daughter. Alessia was born in Miami. Both her U.S.-citizen parents were born in Venezuela. Alessia can't sleep at night. She is afraid that if Trump becomes president, her parents will be forced to leave our country.

I voted against Donald Trump because of Judge Gonzalo Curiel. He was born in the United States to poor Mexican **immigrant** parents. Judge Curiel is the federal judge assigned to the Trump University case. Trump dismissively called Judge Curiel "Mexican" and attacked his ability to perform his job impartially because of his descent. Attacking another American's qualifications solely based on his ethnic background is bigotry. Plain and simple.

In the midst of the Judge Curiel controversy, I rode a taxicab in D.C. The driver was an African **immigrant**. He told me he worked 14 hours a day, six days a week, so his three children could one day be professionals. He teared up telling me he feared that if Trump became president, his children's ability to be professionals would be questioned because their father happened to have been born in Ethiopia. I voted against Trump for that man and his three children.

I voted against Donald Trump because of Senator John McCain. I consider him a national hero. Like generations of McCains before and after him, John McCain wore our nation's uniform. He enlisted at the age of 17. He was a prisoner of war in Vietnam. He spent five years in captivity being savagely tortured. Trump doesn't consider him a hero. Trump likes people "who weren't captured." Yes, the same Trump who avoided the draft at least four times because of a foot spur. He doesn't remember on which foot.

I voted against Donald Trump because of Serge Kovaleski. That's the name of the reporter with a disability who Trump mimicked and mocked. And I voted against Trump because of Daniel Navarro, my severely disabled brother. My entire life, I have been pained and angered seeing young kids stare at him and mimic his disability. I had never seen a grown man mimic a disabled person. Trump did so in front of thousands of people at one of his rallies. In front of millions of people watching on TV. Most of us would punish our children for exhibiting such behavior.

I voted against Donald Trump because of all women in my life who have been sexually harassed or assaulted and remained silent, bearing the embarrassment, even shame, for years. I heard Trump on tape boast and laugh about being a celebrity and getting away with grabbing women and not being able to contain himself from kissing women. He explained it away as "locker room" talk. Trump was not a teen-age athlete when he said those words. He was a 59-year-old businessman. Sexual assault is no laughing matter. It is a crime.

I voted against Donald Trump because of Megyn Kelly, and Rosie O'Donnell and Alicia Machado and Carly Fiorina and Heidi Cruz and so many other women Trump has called, "bimbo" or "fat," or "ugly" or objectified and demeaned.

I voted against Trump because of Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of Capt. Humayun Khan, who lost his life in Iraq in 2004. I voted against Trump because of my friends, Retired General John Kelly and Karen Kelly, who lost their son, 1st Lieutenant Robert M. Kelly in 2010 in Afghanistan. I voted against Donald Trump for all the Gold Star families who have endured the unbearable and incurable pain of losing a child, a spouse, a parent, a sibling fighting for our country. Trump somehow managed to compare the sacrifice of losing a son to the "sacrifice" of erecting a building. I have no words.

I voted against Donald Trump because of Nykea Aldridge. She was Dwyane Wade's cousin. She was shot in the head and killed while pushing her baby's stroller down a Chicago street. Donald Trump sent out a tweet about her death for his political gain. "African-Americans will VOTE TRUMP!," it ended. No, Donald. Actually, every single poll shows they won't.

I voted against Donald Trump because our system is not "rigged." I live in South Florida, a community filled with political exiles from places like Cuba and Venezuela and Nicaragua, countries with corrupt, totalitarian, repressive governments. Our system is not perfect. But for 240 years, our democracy has respected the will of the people and allowed for peaceful succession. To question its legitimacy is irresponsible, reckless and un-American.

I voted against Donald Trump because I believe in freedom of expression and freedom of the press. I voted against Donald Trump because of Wolf Blitzer. Some of his relatives were killed in the Holocaust. Wolf's parents survived and fled to America. Trump has fostered an atmosphere at his political rallies where his followers angrily shout, "Jew-S-A!" and hurl insults and anti-Semitic slurs at members of the media.

I voted against Donald Trump because I am a deeply flawed person of faith. If I went into a confession booth right now, I'd be in there for hours. I believe in the redemptive need to admit mistakes, express regret and ask for forgiveness. I have done it too many times to count. The thought of a powerful leader who lacks the basic humility to admit error and ask for forgiveness -- not even from the God he professes to believe in -- astounds me.

I voted against Donald Trump because I am a Republican. I accept that Trump duly won the Republican nomination. But I do not accept that he represents Republican values -- not the ones I grew-up respecting.

I have been a Republican since before I could vote. My family fled communism. Ronald Reagan fought communism. That sealed the deal for me. I have been an active partisan my entire adult life. This is the first time I vote against the Republican nominee for President.

I did not want to vote for Hilary Clinton. Unlike Senator Bernie Sanders, I do care about her "damn emails." I am disturbed by the blurry lines and for-profit overlap between Clinton's philanthropic, business and political worlds.

Most of us suspected Hillary Clinton was going to run for President again in 2016. She and Bill Clinton knew it too. They knew they would be under scrutiny. If for no other reason, they could have and should have behaved differently.

No, she shouldn't have set up a private server, which could have compromised national security. No, she shouldn't have given paid speeches to Wall Street. No, her closest aide, Huma Abedin, should not have had an ethically questionable arrangement that allowed her to simultaneously work for four different Clinton-related entities, including the Department of State. No, the Clinton Foundation should not have accepted donations from countries which abuse human rights and discriminate against gays and women.

In every single one of those instances, Hillary Clinton and her closest advisers, including Bill, exercised bad judgment.

Like so many other Americans, I am left deciding which of these two candidates is the lesser of two evils, which one is capable of inflicting less damage on our country, our social fabric. The personal decision for me boiled down to choosing between a person who I consider to have very bad character and a person who has exercised bad judgment.

Our founding fathers set up a government of checks and balances. We can and have survived presidents with bad judgment. But I fear the effects on America of a president with bad character.

I worry that Trump brings out the worst in America. Division. Hostility. Racism. Bigotry. Misogyny. Things we used to hide. Feelings we used to try to overcome. Under the guise of not cowing to political correctness, some people are no longer embarrassed or ashamed to show the warts on their souls.

Some tell me, in 2016 we should no longer expect the president of the United States to be a role model. I refuse to accept that.

The president of the United States has to lift us all in moments of national grief. The president of the United States has to hug the children and spouses of fallen soldiers. That person represents us all. That person is recognized as the face and the voice for America in front of the rest of the world, and more importantly, by our children. A person supported by the Klu Klux Klan and its former Grand Wizard David Duke can never represent me. He can never be a role model for me.

We each have a right and a duty to make a personal choice based on those things that are most important to us, that we value most. My conscience compels me to do every little thing I can to make sure a bad person is not our next president. In America, we don't choose our leaders through violence or armed insurrections.

One vote is our right. One vote is our weapon. I am exercising mine against Donald Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW DELHI (CNNMoney) -- It just got easier for top Indian CEOs to visit the U.K.

British Prime Minister Theresa May announced Monday that India's elite business executives will be given access to an exclusive, bespoke visa service known as the "Great Club" that will help them secure travel documents.

Indian travelers are also now eligible for the U.K.'s registered traveler scheme, which will allow frequent U.K. visitors to skip **immigration** lines at airports -- a privilege currently reserved for visa-free countries like the U.S., Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan.

"For Indian nationals who frequently come to the U.K., and who fuel growth in both our countries, the entry process will become significantly easier," May said during an official visit to New Delhi.

The new measures should make travel to the U.K. much easier for a small number of Indians. But they will do little to satisfy campaigners who had called for a broad relaxation of limits on the number of visas granted to citizens of India.

Restrictions on foreign students have resulted in a 50% decrease in Indian applications to British universities in recent years, and new eligibility criteria for overseas workers have placed further barriers in front of Indian companies.

May, who helped bring in the rules for students while Home Secretary, does not appear ready to further alter her country's **immigration** policies, saying that "nine out of 10 visa applications from India are already accepted so I believe we have a good system."

May is trying to ensure that allies like India — the third-largest foreign investor in the U.K. — remain in her corner after Britain voted to leave the European Unionin June.

But her reluctance to relax the visa rules could dampen enthusiasm for a potential trade deal between India and a post-Brexit Britain.

Even if May does let more Indians into the U.K., it'll only be in exchange for individuals who have overstayed their visas.

"The U.K. will consider further improvements to our visa offer if at the same time we can step up the speed and volume of returns of Indians with no right to remain in the U.K.," she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNN) -- Fleeing El Salvador's civil war, Javier Torres, 19 at the time, came to the United States across the Mexican border on January 10, 1986. On Tuesday, 30 years later, Torres will vote for the first time in an American presidential election.

The eldest of three, Torres says he came to the United States to help provide a better life for his family, who wanted to stay at home in El Salvador. "The idea, the hope of someday becoming an American citizen was a faraway dream," he said, and now says having the ability to take part in Tuesday's election is one of the "greatest things" that has ever happened to him.

New voters

Torres was one of a number of newly naturalized American citizens CNN spoke to who will be voting for the first time this week. For some of them, including Torres, it will be their first time voting anywhere, many having left their home countries before they were eligible to vote there.

Almost 7 million people have become naturalized citizens over the past decade, 729,995 in the last fiscal year, according to US Citizenship and **Immigration**Services.

Some of those naturalized, like Torres, came to the United States undocumented and lived in the country illegally until becoming residents. Others, like Gayle Gatchalian, have come on student visas or other forms of temporary visas, have fallen in love and become residents through marriage.

Gatchalian moved here from the Philippines for college in 2005 and now works for a nonprofit organization in Manhattan. She registered to vote as soon as she became eligible. "If I'm going to live here for the rest of my life, I should have my say," she says.

Millions of new Americans

Those eligible for citizenship take the Oath of Allegiance at a naturalization ceremony often held at a courthouse or other public building.

CNN National Politics Reporter MJ Lee was among the 296 **immigrants** from 53 countries who became citizens at a ceremony on Ellis Island in September. Lee was born in South Korea and grew up in Hong Kong before moving to the United States for boarding school in 11th grade.

"Last Friday was one of the most joyous days of my life," Lee wrote for CNN.com a few days after becoming a citizen.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Donald Trump has promised to "make America great again."

Hillary Clinton thinks it's already an "exceptional nation."

How does the US measure up to the rest of the world on key issues that are important to voters? Here's what we found:

ECONOMY

The economy is the top issue for voters, according to a July survey from the Pew Research Center. But if high unemployment rates were an issue during the 2008 and 2012 races (6.1% and 7.8%), that isn't the case this year.

America's jobless rate is hovering around 4.9%. It's the tenth best among countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) -- a group that includes the world's richest nations.

But if the jobless rate is declining, income inequality is on the rise.

The US scores an abysmal 0.39 on the Gini Coefficient, which measures how evenly income is distributed. According to this metric, a score of 0 would mean every person made the same amount of money -- and a score of 1 would mean all the income was made by one person.

In simple terms: America's rich are getting richer and its poor are getting poorer.

HEALTH CARE

Health care is a key issue for many voters, and that's no surprise -- the US spends more on health care per person than any other high-income country in the world.

On average, Americans dish out $1,810 more per head than the next highest spenders in Luxembourg, twice as much as Canadians, and almost nine times more than Mexicans, according to our calculations based on OECD data.

However, the extra money doesn't deliver better health-related outcomes. Studies have shown that Americans have a shorter life expectancy and higher prevalence of chronic illnesses than citizens of most other wealthy nations.

GUN POLICY

An estimated 310 million guns are owned by American civilians, according to the US Department of Justice, while the US Census Bureau estimates the current population of the US at 324 million people.

The US has more guns per capita than any other country in the world -- and one of the highest rates of death by firearm according to the World Health Organization.

Our calculations based on OECD data show that Americans are 51 times more likely to be killed by gunfire than in the United Kingdom.

**IMMIGRATION**

The US is home to the most **immigrants** in the world -- 19% of the world's total.

But when it comes to refugees -- last year 65 million people were displaced worldwide -- countries in the Middle East and Africa take the most.

Of particular concern are the nearly five million Syrians who have fled since the start of the Syrian conflict in 2011.

Many voters are worried about an influx of Syrian refugees, but the US has accepted far fewer refugees than other Western countries.

Germany has vowed to resettle one million Syrians. Canada said it would welcome 25,000. The US admitted just 1,900 Syrian refugees in the first four years of that country's conflict, although the number was expected to increase to more than 10,000 by the end of the fiscal year.

ENVIRONMENT

Last December, 193 countries signed the Paris Agreement, a landmark deal that requires every country to reduce greenhouse emissions.

President Barack Obama called the treaty "a turning point for the world," but his successor will have to take drastic steps to decrease the country's huge carbon footprint.

China overtook the US as the world's biggest emitter of greenhouse gasses nearly a decade ago -- but in the developed world, the US is still the worst carbon polluter per capita, according to the World Bank.

ABORTION

Abortion is another hot-button issue for many voters.

America is one of around 60 countries that provides legal access to safe abortions. Although abortion has been legal since 1973, access to treatment depends on laws determined by each state.

Although it's almost always a big issue in presidential campaigns, the number of abortions in the US has been generally declining since the 1990s, according to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TERRORISM

The terror threat also weighs heavily on the minds of many voters.

So how big of an impact does the threat of terror have on the US when compared to the rest of the world? Not very, according to the Global Terrorism Index.

Terrorism is highly concentrated in a small number of countries -- and although the number of countries that have experienced a major terror attack is on the rise, the US still ranks low in both attacks and fatalities worldwide.

Victims of terror attacks are mostly from the Middle East and Africa.

Countries like India, Afghanistan and Pakistan have experienced terrorism over an extended period of time. Since 2000, the United States has only been featured once (in 2001) in the top ten countries most affected by terrorism.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 7:06 a.m. -- fixes dropped word, graf 21

(CNN) -- Adam Crapser was a toddler in an orphanage the last time he lived in South Korea.

American parents adopted him decades ago and flew him to the United States. Now the 41-year-old could be days away from deportation.

An **immigration** judge in Washington ruled against his request for relief last week, ordering his removal from the US.

To advocates, it's one more troubling sign of a broken system. The case, they say, exposes a flawed US law that unfairly leaves tens of thousands of international adoptees in limbo without citizenship.

But **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officials say the proceedings against Crapser show the agency is following its priorities by cracking down on criminals.

'America failed Adam'

Crapser has been fighting deportation since 2013, when he applied to get a copy of his green card and ended up on the radar of **immigration** authorities. His past run-ins with the law, including burglary and assault charges, caught their eye.

"ICE targeted Mr. Crapser for enforcement based on the severity of his criminal history, which includes multiple prior convictions for serious and violent offenses including assault, being a felon in possession of a weapon, and 3rd degree domestic violence," agency spokeswoman Rose Richeson said in a statement this week.

Crapser's attorney and supporters stress that his criminal record doesn't tell the whole story.

Crapser was physically abused and relinquished by the parents who initially adopted him and brought him here, they say. Then he was adopted again and endured more abuse.

"America failed Adam multiple times. ... It's insane now to deport him. We should help him," says Becky Belcore, a board member of the National Korean American Service & Education Consortium.

US government officials facilitated his adoption, she says, but never stepped in to help him as system after system failed.

Attorney Lori Walls says Crapser was eligible for a second chance, and deserves one. He's admitted he's accountable for his actions, served out sentences for the crimes he committed and has sought psychological treatment for post-traumatic stress, she says.

"If you don't take into account the fact that he was adopted and abandoned and abused and homeless, then maybe this (deporting someone for crimes he committed) would make sense to you. But it doesn't make sense if you back out just a little and look at the context," she says.

Crapser had pleaded with officials to give him a fresh start.

"All I want to do is be the best American I can be," he said last year, according to CNN affiliate KPTV. "I don't want to be this broken, screwed-up guy, so just don't kick me out of the United States. That's all I'm asking, please."

Adoptee: Judge's decision 'scares me'

In court last week, a group of adoptees who've rallied around Crapser's case listened as the judge decided against giving Crapser a reprieve.

"We were shocked, because we just can't believe that people who were adopted by US citizens as children can be deported back to a country we don't even know," Belcore said. "Just the cruelty of that was shocking."

Crapser, Belcore argues, should have been a US citizen all along.

A law passed by Congress in 2000 made international adoptees citizens automatically. But it didn't apply to anyone who was 18 or over when the law went into effect.

So Crapser never became a US citizen, because neither his parents nor state officials completed the paperwork.

Belcore estimates there are about 35,000 others who were left in a similar limbo. And she's part of a group pushing for Congress to change that with a new law that would provide retroactive US citizenship to all internationally adopted individuals, no matter when they were adopted.

"We all should be citizens," she says. "It's illogical that we're not."

Justin Ki Hong wasn't in court with Crapser last week. But he says word of the judge's decision has rattled him. Like Crapser, he says, he was adopted as a child from South Korea but isn't a US citizen.

"If he was a citizen, he would serve his time, he'd be on probation and then be fine. But now on top of that, they're saying that, 'We're going to punish you a second time and send you to a foreign country,'" Ki Hong says. "That scares me. ... I could be in that situation."

As news media around the country cover Crapser's case, Walls says a wave of adoptees and their parents have contacted her.

"They're terrified," she says.

Preparing for a new life

Speaking to reporters after an **immigration** hearing last year, Crapser said he didn't think he'd survive if he got sent to South Korea.

"You're sentencing me to death for crimes I've already done hard time for," Crapser said at the time, according to KPTV. "Listen to my voice. I'm an American. I've been here my whole life. I don't know anything else."

But at last week's hearing, he decided to waive his right to an appeal after spending more than eight months in **immigration** detention.

"He just feels like he can't stay there one day longer than he has to, the conditions are so dehumanizing," Belcore says.

Crapser couldn't be reached for comment for this story. Friends say he's trying to focus on moving forward and building a new life in Korea.

He hopes someday the US law will change and give him a chance to return. He hopes his wife and children will be able to follow him to South Korea eventually. And he hopes to reconnect with his biological mother, who Korean broadcaster MBC tracked down after airing a documentary about his case last year.

In detention, another **immigrant** has helped him learn letters of the Korean alphabet. But he still doesn't speak the language or know how he'll find work.

According to his attorney, there's only one word Crapser still remembers how to say in Korean: airplane.

CNN's Sonya Hamasaki and Amanda Watts contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump is attempting to crack Hillary Clinton's blue wall. And Clinton is hoping for a surge in Latino turnout fueled by opposition to Trump.

The two candidates are making a last-minute dash across swing states like Florida, Pennsylvania and North Carolina as the 2016 presidential race enters its final hours. They've also gone north to Michigan and New Hampshire to states Democrats have won in recent cycles but could flip this year.

Here are the key states and signs to study as the night unfolds:

Trump's must-wins

Most plausible paths to victory for Trump start with holding onto two battlegrounds that Mitt Romney won four years ago -- North Carolina and Arizona -- and flipping three states President Barack Obama carried: Florida, Ohio and Iowa.

A loss in any of the states would severely complicate Trump's already precarious path to 270 electoral votes. Though if Trump clawed back Pennsylvania or Michigan from the Democrats, who have won both electoral-rich states six times in a row, North Carolina would be more expendable. A win in a state like Pennsylvania or Michigan would allow Trump to offset a loss in North Carolina and still have a shot at reaching 270.

If that doesn't happen, holding North Carolina and Arizona, while reclaiming Florida, Ohio and Iowa from the Democrats -- plus Maine's 2nd District -- would only get him to 260.

Trump would need to tack on 10 more electoral votes somehow. New Hampshire's four and Nevada's six would get him there. Colorado, with nine electoral votes, Michigan with 15 and Pennsylvania with 20 are also possibilities.

In his last 48 hours before Election Day, Trump has been pretty much everywhere, including Colorado, Michigan -- even Minnesota -- searching for the extra votes he needs.

Clinton's must-wins

The key question for Clinton is whether her "blue wall" of Democratic-leaning states on the Great Lakes -- Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin -- will hold.

Trump has targeted all three, but Clinton has consistently led polls in all three states. However, most voters in Michigan and Pennsylvania cast their ballots on Election Day -- which means her campaign hasn't built the early voting advantage already in place elsewhere.

If Clinton can do that and pick up just one of North Carolina, Florida or Ohio, she's all but guaranteed to win.

If she can't win one of those three states, she'll need to hold Virginia, vote-by-mail Colorado, New Hampshire and Nevada -- where Democrats have already built a hefty early voting edge.

Does Latino turnout surge?

If Clinton wins, her coalition will consist of women, college-educated voters and a swell of new Latino voters.

In early voting in states like Nevada, and Florida, there's already evidence of burgeoning Latino turnout. This is best witnessed by the over 57,000 people who voted in Nevada Friday, with pictures of long lines and extended hours at a Latino grocery store in Clark County.

Many first-time voters, polls show, are turning out to oppose Trump. And Democrats are bullish that Latinos have been under-polled through the entire 2016 election cycle.

For Reince Priebus, the Republican National Committee chairman, this is a ghost of elections past. After the 2012 race, the RNC warned that the party needed to do more to court Latino voters. A nominee who roundly rejected that advice could be the reason the party loses a third consecutive presidential race.

Just as Trump's attacks on Mexican **immigrants** have **alienated** Latino voters, his attacks on women and allegations of sexual assault have helped Clinton to a large lead among female voters. Clinton's campaign has highlighted Trump's most derogatory remarks in TV ads aimed at moderate, suburban women -- a constituency that has helped Republican nominees in years past. If she succeeds, it would limit Trump's strengths to rural areas.

Does Trump have a "silent majority"?

Trump's biggest strength is his overwhelming support from disaffected white voters -- particularly men, and especially those without college degrees.

His campaign has long argued that those voters -- many of them independent or Democrats who buy into Trump's protectionist stance on trade -- will carry him on Election Day.

For this to happen, Trump will also need core Democratic voters to stay at home, as well.

Already, Trump appears poised to win Iowa, and has polled ahead of Clinton in Ohio. He's hoping to win enough blue-collar Democrats in Pennsylvania or Michigan to win at least one of those states.

Michigan, in particular, emerged as a tempting target in the campaign's closing days -- a state hard-hit by the trade deals Trump bemoans. Clinton's campaign raced to play defense, dispatching the former secretary of state there, as well as President Barack Obama, for last-minute rallies.

Do African-American voters show up?

Among Democrats' biggest concerns has been whether African-American voters -- a reliably left-leaning constituency -- will turn out in numbers anywhere close to their support for Obama in 2008 and 2012.

If the answer is no, it could hobble Clinton in key states -- particularly Florida and North Carolina.

Obama is helping carry Clinton's load with black voters. In a call to Tom Joyner's radio show, he argued that participating in this election is just as much about him as it is about Clinton.

"And I know that there are a lot of people in barbershops and beauty salons, you know, in the neighborhoods who are saying to themselves 'We love Barack, we love -- we especially love Michelle -- and so, you know, it was exciting and now we're not excited as much,'" he said. "You know what? I need everybody to understand that everything we've done is dependent on me being able to pass the baton to somebody who believes in same things I believe in."

The post-Trump GOP starts now

Since Trump clinched the GOP nomination in May, Republican Senate and House candidates have been forced to answer for everything he has said -- from his attacks on a Gold Star family and an Indiana-born judge's heritage to his rejection of conservative orthodoxy.

As soon as the election ends, Capitol Hill Republicans -- especially if they retain control of both the House and Senate -- will regain power.

The party will have to decide just what to do with Trump's rejection of free trade, his calls for a decreased US role overseas and his criticism of GOP congressional leaders -- whether he wins or loses.

But adopting some of Trump's policy planks while rejecting his political style might not help much after an election driven by the candidates' personalities.

How the loser handles losing

For a nation divided by a long, bitter contest, this could be the most important question of all: Will the loser concede -- and how will he or she do it?

Trump and Clinton are both historically unpopular presidential nominees. Half the country thinks Clinton is a crook, and the other half thinks Trump is a racist and misogynist.

And Trump, in particular, has cast the election as rigged -- calling into question whether ballots that are mailed in will be counted, playing up inaccurate reports of voter irregularities and claiming that voter fraud is pervasive.

The loser will play a crucial role in legitimizing the victor -- or delegitimizing the winner from the outset.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Issac Bailey has been a journalist in South Carolina for two decades and was most recently the primary columnist for The Sun News in Myrtle Beach. He was a 2014 Harvard University Nieman fellow. Follow him on Twitter: @ijbailey. The views expressed are his own.

(CNN) -- Before the final votes are counted in races that will determine the presidency and control of the US Senate, let us reflect on the single decision by the former Speaker of the House John Boehner that more than any other may have shaped the contours of this election.

Speaker of the House Paul Ryan is said to be a smart man, but he wasn't smart enough to see that by standing behind the GOP presidential nominee, a man Ryan says he's already voted for, he was doubling down on a colossal mistake made by his predecessor.

This mistake is among the reasons Hispanics may provide the decisive bloc of votes (the Hispanic vote is up by more than 100% in early voting in some states) that will put a Democrat back in the White House and hasten the civil war already brewing within the Republican Party.

Just over two years ago, the US Senate passed what some described as "the most monumental overhaul of US **immigration** law in generations" on a bipartisan 68-32 vote.

It included more money for border security, which would have increased an already unprecedented level of personnel on the US-Mexican border, and an onerous 13-year path to citizenship that would have required the undocumented to jump through all sorts of hoops and pay back taxes. There was nothing like amnesty about it. **Immigration** advocates and experts embraced it the way many on the left greeted health care reform, accepting that it was a good start despite the flaws inherent in every legislative compromise.

It was ushered through by a rising star in the Republican Party, Marco Rubio, who spent a considerable amount of his personal political capital by taking on the hard right of his party -- including advocating for the bill in such **immigration** hostile venues as the Rush Limbaugh show -- and (briefly) looked like the kind of 21st century leader the Republican Party would be eager to show off in the 2016 election cycle.

President Barack Obama, who had spent years beefing up security forces along our much-discussed border with Mexico and keeping up a brisk pace of deportations to help make political space for an **immigration** compromise (similar to the tactics he used to end "don't ask, don't tell"), was eager to sign that bill into law.

But something happened that prevented Obama from completing another historic domestic legislative achievement. Then-Speaker Boehner balked, refusing to bring the bill to the floor in the House, where he knew that a majority of Republicans would vote against it, even though combined with Democratic support it could pass anyway.

Boehner, a sensible politician, knew it was a sensible plan. He also knew that such a reform bill could either end the **immigration** headache that helped sink the GOP's 2012 nominee, Mitt "Self-Deport" Romney, or even broaden the party's base because Republicans could then credibly argue they were serious about the compassionate conservatism of George W. Bush. Not only that, they could go to struggling white and black voters and explain why such reform was good for them also.

Bringing the undocumented out of the shadows would have put upward pressure on wages at the bottom of the economic scale, which would have been good for the undocumented and American-born citizens struggling on the margins.

There was a potentially enormous upside for the GOP, including launching Rubio into the 2016 presidential race as the ideal standard bearer for a party desperate to find a way to confront a demographic shift that threatens to turn it into a regional, no longer national force.

Republican Party leaders were well aware of this and laid it out in painstaking detail in its 2012 autopsy. All they had to do was pull the trigger on a no-brainer piece of legislation. The Republican senators in now hotly contested races that they might lose saw the writing on the wall and advocated for the bill.

Instead of following their lead, or even his own conscience, Boehner sided with the most unreasonable factions of the GOP, the politicians who convinced their supporters it was possible, for instance, to repeal Obamacare while a guy named Obama was still in the White House.

That decision, maybe like no other, helped usher in a 2016 GOP presidential nominee -- by legitimizing irrationality and bigotry and nativism -- who spent the primaries talking about building walls and a deportation force and thinking fondly of the "Operation Wetback" era but flipped to (sort of) embracing the bipartisan **immigration** reform bill Boehner unwisely passed on.

Instead of the nomination of Rubio -- a candidate uniquely suited to help the Republican Party compete in a browning America: a young, talented, Hispanic with a compelling back story -- the party has the worst of all worlds.

It has a nominee who uses bigotry as a negotiation tactic, a base exposed as having no moral compass or set of principles it wouldn't sacrifice for him, and yet another speaker of the House who is saddled by an unmitigated political mess he might not be able to clean up after Tuesday because he chose to be led instead of leading.

It will be fitting that the group of voters Boehner and Ryan decided was less important than party loyalty could be what finally forces a long overdue Republican reckoning.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton wrote dueling op-eds in USA Today to make their cases to voters nationwide the day before Election Day.

The op-eds, which were published online Sunday night -- and set for print publication Monday -- largely draw upon their respective stump speeches, including outlining some key policy planks and hammering each other.

Trump, using terminology he has favored in recent weeks on the campaign trail, calls for "draining the swamp of corruption in Washington" and fixing a "rigged system in which political insiders can break the law without consequence."

He goes on to mention Clinton as having "been the subject of an FBI criminal investigation." Trump conspicuously leaves out the Sunday afternoon decision from FBI Director James Comey to announce that Clinton was again cleared of wrongdoing.

A message left with the Trump campaign asking if it considered updating the op-ed based on Comey's announcement was not immediately returned.

Trump also reiterates his oft-mentioned plans to scrap Obamacare, renegotiate the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade deals and secure the border to bar undocumented **immigrants** and terrorists from entering the US.

Clinton's op-ed features the former secretary of state laying out four goals for her first 100 days in office, including greater government spending on infrastructure to boost employment, introducing "comprehensive **immigration** reform legislation," overturning Citizens United and starting "end-to-end criminal justice reform."

She makes one mention of Trump toward the end of her piece, writing, "My opponent has run his campaign on divisiveness, fear and insults, and spent months pitting Americans against each other. I've said many times that Donald Trump has shown us who he is. Now we have to decide who we are."

CNN's Jeremy Diamond contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**RENO, Nevada (CNN ) -- Donald Trump is straining to stay on message as he delivers his closing pitch to voters in the final days before the election.

But even as he hews closely to the script his aides have urged him to follow, the Republican nominee isn't abandoning the lies, misrepresentations and hyperbole that he has turned to time and again to bolster the arguments driving his presidential campaign. And this time, many of them are built into the teleprompter.

As his narrow path to victory has begun to widen, Trump in his final week on the campaign trail has leaned heavily on the FBI 's review of new emails that may be linked to Hillary Clinton 's private email server, highlighted the stark contrast between his policies and those of his Democratic rivals, and criticized the strategy underpinning the US's fight against ISIS.

While those arguments might be enough, Trump has also mixed in doses of innuendo, fear-mongering and outright inaccuracies to create a potent cocktail he hopes will drive his supporters to the polls and convince late-breaking independents to side with him.

The real estate mogul quickly pounced on the FBI 's announcement late last week that it had discovered new emails that might be tied to its investigation into Clinton's email server, which ended last summer with the FBI recommending against filing any charges. But Trump has both exaggerated the scope of the FBI 's review and suggested Clinton is facing a separate investigation altogether.

Trump has repeatedly called the FBI 's review of new emails -- found on a device belonging to Anthony Weiner that he shared with his estranged wife, Clinton aide Huma Abedin -- a "criminal investigation," going beyond the FBI 's characterization of the review. He has also argued that emails with classified information were discovered on Weiner's computer, even before the FBI had secured a warrant to begin reviewing the newly discovered emails -- meaning there way of knowing if any emails contain any classified information.

And then Trump dropped what appeared to be a bombshell based on a false Fox News report.

"They're also conducting a second criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton 's pay for play corruption at the State Department," he said Friday night in Hershey, Pennsylvania, even though law enforcement officials have told CNN the Clinton Foundation probe hasn't advanced in months.

Even after that report was debunked and Fox News anchor Bret Baier retracted the report, Trump continued to tell his supporters that Clinton was "likely" to be indicted in the case.

"The FBI agents say their investigation is likely to yield an indictment," Trump incorrectly told his supporters Friday in New Hampshire.

A 'rigged system'

Trump has blended those mischaracterizations with his charges that there is a "rigged system" at work, stating his theories that the Justice Department is "protecting" Clinton as though they were fact -- theories that took on added meaning as reports surfaced in the last week of disagreements between the FBI and Justice Department over whether to publicly announce the review of new emails.

Though the Republican nominee has frequently jumped ahead of law enforcement's conclusions about investigations and terrorist attacks, his words have gained new weight as the election draws nearer.

Trump has also inserted his penchant for misleading and flat-out false statements into his efforts to pitch his hardline **immigration** and terrorism policies, as well as his efforts to paint current US government leadership as inept and in dire need of the change agent he purports to be.

Embarking on his final campaign swing, Trump has sought to play to voters' fears of terrorism and illegal **immigration**, wildly mischaracterizing Clinton's policies to suggest that she would erase the US' borders, allow hundreds of millions of people to flow in and falsely blamed her for undocumented **immigrant**criminals being released from US prisons.

"You could have 650 million people pour in and we'd do nothing about it. Think of it. That's what could happen. You triple the size of our country in one week. Once you lose control of your borders, you just have no country folks, you have no country," Trump said last Sunday during a rally in the border state of New Mexico.

There is no basis for the number.

He has also repeatedly suggested in the last week that the US government is the highest-taxed country in the world -- it isn't -- and warned that Clinton would burden the middle class with "massive" tax increases even though Clinton's plan only calls for tax hikes on the wealthiest Americans.

Through it all, Trump has continued to decry a "rigged system" and argued the media is colluding with the Clinton campaign as he's stressed his campaign offers voters a change from the status quo.

Questioning Mosul offensive

His criticism of the political status quo has also extended to denouncing the US-backed military offensive to retake the Iraqi city of Mosul from ISIS.

Once again, his arguments here have been rife with inaccuracies and baseless statements as he's suggested the offensive has been "disastrous" even though US and Iraq military officials -- as well as impartial observers on the ground -- have said forces are making significant gains.

And while the offensive is aimed at unclenching ISIS' grip of a key Iraqi city, Trump has questioned the merits of the offensive -- which, if successful, would undoubtedly serve to further US strategic goals -- from arguing the US is "not going to benefit" from successfully ousting ISIS from the city on Friday to arguing the offensive was conducted for "political reasons" on Saturday.

Trump has also spun misleading tales about Obamacare, his position in the polls and even the pace of Clinton's campaign schedule.

Early on in his improbable run for the Republican nomination, Trump leaned on his penchant for hyperbole -- from his wealth to the size of his crowds -- and unapologetically misled voters about his own past positions on certain issues as well as his opponents', all while painting a gloomy picture of a country headed for doom unless voters elected him to set the country on the right track.

His wild disregard for the truth quickly surpassed that of any presidential candidate in modern history, prompting news outlets to begin calling Trump's statements out very simply as "lies."

Since the dawn of his campaign, Trump has become more polished, and in the final months of his bid, has used a teleprompter at each of his rallies -- an attempt by his new guard of campaign advisers to erect bumpers that would keep him on message -- although Trump often gets sidetracked by off-script tangents.

Sensing the critical importance of this last week to convince voters he should be the next president, the Republican nominee has fastidiously followed the remarks his aides prepared for him to read at nearly every rally.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**RENO, Nevada (CNN ) -- Donald Trump is straining to stay on message as he delivers his closing pitch to voters in the final days before the election.

But even as he hews closely to the script his aides have urged him to follow, the Republican nominee isn't abandoning the lies, misrepresentations and hyperbole that he has turned to time and again to bolster the arguments driving his presidential campaign. And this time, many of them are built into the teleprompter.

As his narrow path to victory has begun to widen, Trump in his final week on the campaign trail has leaned heavily on the FBI 's review of new emails that may be linked to Hillary Clinton 's private email server, highlighted the stark contrast between his policies and those of his Democratic rivals, and criticized the strategy underpinning the US's fight against ISIS.

While those arguments might be enough, Trump has also mixed in doses of innuendo, fear-mongering and outright inaccuracies to create a potent cocktail he hopes will drive his supporters to the polls and convince late-breaking independents to side with him.

The real estate mogul quickly pounced on the FBI 's announcement late last week that it had discovered new emails that might be tied to its investigation into Clinton's email server, which ended last summer with the FBI recommending against filing any charges. But Trump has both exaggerated the scope of the FBI 's review and suggested Clinton is facing a separate investigation altogether.

Trump has repeatedly called the FBI 's review of new emails -- found on a device belonging to Anthony Weiner that he shared with his estranged wife, Clinton aide Huma Abedin -- a "criminal investigation," going beyond the FBI 's characterization of the review. He has also argued that emails with classified information were discovered on Weiner's computer, even before the FBI had secured a warrant to begin reviewing the newly discovered emails -- meaning there's no way of knowing if any emails contain any classified information.

And then Trump dropped what appeared to be a bombshell based on a false Fox News report.

"They're also conducting a second criminal investigation into Hillary Clinton 's pay for play corruption at the State Department," he said Friday night in Hershey, Pennsylvania, even though law enforcement officials have told CNN the Clinton Foundation probe hasn't advanced in months.

Even after that report was debunked and Fox News anchor Bret Baier retracted the report, Trump continued to tell his supporters that Clinton was "likely" to be indicted in the case.

"The FBI agents say their investigation is likely to yield an indictment," Trump incorrectly told his supporters Friday in New Hampshire.
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He has also repeatedly suggested in the last week that the US government is the highest-taxed country in the world -- it isn't -- and warned that Clinton would burden the middle class with "massive" tax increases even though Clinton's plan only calls for tax hikes on the wealthiest Americans.
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And while the offensive is aimed at unclenching ISIS' grip of a key Iraqi city, Trump has questioned the merits of the offensive -- which, if successful, would undoubtedly serve to further US strategic goals -- from arguing the US is "not going to benefit" from successfully ousting ISIS from the city on Friday to arguing the offensive was conducted for "political reasons" on Saturday.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Stephen Flynn is a professor and co-director of the George J. Kostas Research Institute for Homeland Security at Northeastern University. He is author of "America the Vulnerable" and "The Edge of Disaster: Rebuilding a Resilient Nation." A retired Coast Guard officer, he has advised both the Bush and Obama administrations, including as the homeland security policy adviser for President Obama's 2008 transition team. The views expressed in this commentary are his own.

(CNN) -- There are three cardinal rules for homeland security, and Donald Trump has been breaking each one with abandon.

First, don't overstate the threat. Doing so only indiscriminately elevates public anxiety. It also creates the toxic conditions within our body politic that lead to costly and harmful overreactions, which end up rewarding our adversaries for engaging in acts of terror.

Generating widespread fear about a real, but limited danger serves no useful end. Remember the color-coded warning system that was trotted out after 9/11? It was widely criticized, and for good reason. What were people supposed to do when the US Department of Homeland Security declared condition orange or condition red? The Obama administration quite rightly abandoned it.

Playing up a sense of pervasive and indiscriminate threat that leaves Americans feeling helpless and has two dangerous outcomes. For the already anxious, it fuels paranoia. For the skeptics, it provides fodder for their apathy and denial.

Second, don't overstate what can be done about the threat. After 9/11, elected leaders and national security and homeland security officials would often say: "Terrorists have to be right only once, while we have to be right 100% of the time." The intent was to convey commitment toward doing whatever it takes to prevent the next act of terrorism. But the outcome was to create overinflated public expectations about what can and was being done to make the homeland safe. In what human endeavor has government ever been 100% successful? When the inevitable happens, and the nation feels as though it has been misled, public trust ends up strewn among the casualties.

Preventing terrorism is hard, particularly when dealing with homegrown lone-wolf attacks. This risk is being well-managed by law enforcement at all levels, supported by recent homeland security programs to combat violent extremism by providing resources to communities to put in place local prevention efforts. To President Barack Obama's credit, he has resisted the temptation to overpromise and has been willing to take the political heat for doing so. Over the past eight years, he has soberly declared that acts of terror cannot always be prevented, while reminding Americans that we are a strong and resilient people who no adversary can defeat.

Third, don't **alienate** the people whose assistance is needed to deal with the threat. Law enforcement and security professionals are rarely successful on their own. The most effective policing is community policing supported by neighborhood watches. Policing that devolves into "us vs. them" ends up being dangerous for everyone involved.

Dealing with the risk of jihadist extremism requires close collaboration with American Muslim communities and the cooperation of intelligence and security services in majority-Muslim countries. Confronting the risk that terrorist groups may try to evade our border controls requires that homeland security officials have good relations with our Canadian and Mexican neighbors and with foreign officials at airports and seaports overseas.

Beginning with the Bush administration and accelerated under the Obama administration, a number of cooperative programs have been put in place to provide strategic depth by pushing our borders outward. These include the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Container Security Initiative programs, in which US Customs agents work with their foreign counterparts to inspect US-bound cargo before its heads our way. These efforts depend on good global relations centered around shared goals and common interests.

Trump wildly exaggerates the threat posed to the United States by terrorism. He matches his hyperbole with sophistry, promising to build "impenetrable" border walls and to "defeat the ideology of radical Islamic terrorism" that "I alone" can deliver. By demonizing Muslims generally and **immigrants** specifically, Trump has been poisoning the well in ways that compromise decadelong counterterrorism efforts to engage with these communities.

Smart security is always nuanced and, at times, counterintuitive, which is why it trips up capable bad guys. Alternatively, tough security is always simple, which makes it politically attractive, but always ineffective for the adversaries we really need to worry about. And security is never an end onto itself. When the Founding Fathers outlined their intent "to form a more perfect Union," the only place they used the word "secure" in the Constitution, is in the preamble: "to secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

The measure of a security solution is not whether it sounds good but whether it works. In the face of the terrorist threat, Trump is only serving up sugar pills that undermine the best homeland security efforts of two Republican and Democratic administrations while also eroding the very constitutional principles that presidents solemnly take an oath to protect and defend. As such, he poses a clear and present danger to the safety of the very homeland, whose protection he has placed at the core of his presidential candidacy.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The late campaign roles of President Obama and King James, the fight for the military vote and the role a surge in Latino voting plays in a key Senate race: It's all a part of our Inside Politics forecast.

1) Back To Cleveland -- and some help from The King

Can LeBron James help trigger a Clinton comeback in battleground Ohio?

The Cleveland Cavaliers star is appearing with Hillary Clinton at a Sunday rally as the Democrats try to generate a surge in African-American turnout.

The state has been frustrating for Democrats this cycle, and while it's close, late polls favor Donald Trump.

A Clinton win in Ohio would be devastating to Trump's chances. CNN's Jeff Zeleny shared reporting on how Team Clinton hopes some superstar help brings a late campaign boost.

"There's perhaps no other big city in America that speaks more to the final strategy of the Clinton campaign than Cleveland. ... Obviously, a huge share of the vote in Ohio is in Cleveland and around the surrounding area. But by this point, the Clinton campaign had hoped to be expanding into sort of more Republican areas. The old adage of Ohio is when Democrats are going to Cleveland at the end, that is to get out their base, and they aren't doing the independents and the persuasion."

2) The Obama factor: Clinton hardly the only beneficiary

President Obama speaking Spanish on the radio?

Jonathan Martin of The New York Times heard it with his own ears in the Miami area Saturday as the president tried to help Democrat Patrick Murphy in his race against incumbent Republican Marco Rubio.

Proof, Martin reports, that the unprecedented Obama effort in campaign 2016 is aimed at trying to do something he was unable to do in 2010 and 2014.

"He's finally an asset after being a liability for much of the last eight years for his own party. I was with him in Chapel Hill last week. He was as impassioned going after Richard Burr, the senator there, as he was Donald Trump. Almost ridiculing Burr for supporting Trump," explains Martin. "Given his popularity he might pull some Democrats over the lines."

3) Military families are key targets in swing states

There are battlegrounds within battlegrounds that can sway the states that matter most -- including the effort to win the votes of military families.

Think Florida. And Virginia. Add in North Carolina. Plus Colorado. Four states where the votes of current and retired military members and their families are abundant -- and getting a lot of attention in these final days of the campaign.

CNN's Nia-Malika Henderson noted the importance of this vote in the Obama presidential wins as she discussed this campaign's final appeals.

"In terms of ads, there are two more debuting during Sunday Night Football, i guess it's the Broncos and Raiders game. These are Hillary Clinton ads, 30-second ads featuring Republican, white men who served in the military. Talking about Donald Trump, talking about why they don't want to vote for Donald Trump, talking about his words about women," reports Henderson. "Interesting to look at it within the context of the military vote. Of 20 million veterans in this country, particularly in states like North Carolina, Virginia, Florida, Colorado. And we've seen both campaigns really go after this voting bloc."

4) Election will shape prospects for **immigration** legislation

This could well be the "Year of the Latino" when we break down the biggest factors in the election results -- and the impact could go well beyond who wins the White House.

CNN's Maeve Reston shared conversations with Republican lawmakers who want to advance **immigration** legislation through Congress. That's a tough sell with the conservatives who dominate the House.

But Reston reports that if Latinos punish Republican candidates, those GOPers looking to change the **immigration** debate hope their colleagues see a need to do something.

"There's still a group of Republicans in Congress that is deeply committed to getting an **immigration** reform bill through Congress. And they are hoping that if there is a huge kind of anti-Trump Latino turnout, on Tuesday night, that will provide some momentum to actually finally get a bill through Congress," explains Reston.

5) GOP hopes of winning Reid's seat fading

Senate Democratic Leader Harry Reid is retiring -- and Republicans had hoped to send him off with a thumping at home.

But those hopes -- of turning Reid's Nevada Senate seat from blue to red -- are fading because of a late surge in Latino early voting.

And if the GOP can't get that seat -- its one big hope for a pickup this year -- it complicates the Republican math for keeping its Senate majority.

The GOP math begins with the current 54 seats. There are three expected losses: Illinois, Wisconsin and Pennsylvania. So, if it plays out that way, Republicans would need to win all four of these: Indiana, Missouri, New Hampshire and North Carolina.

Bullish Republicans think that is possible but it is scenario that leaves zero room for error.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Voters aren't just choosing the next president on Tuesday. They're mercifully putting the most emotionally draining and overwrought campaign in decades out of its misery.

A White House battle fought not over the direction of the nation but through blistering character attacks is triggering extreme emotions in the final days of the race.

The 2016 campaign has been dominated by explicit sexual content and racially charged rhetoric. Fuming crowds at Donald Trump's rallies harness their hatred of Hillary Clinton with the chant, "Lock her up." Clinton, meanwhile, depicts a Trump victory as an apocalyptic event.

No wonder the country is at the end of its rope.

"At this point we are all boiled frogs. We are wondering why our skin is falling off," said Tommy Vietor, who worked for Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign and in the White House and now co-hosts the "Keeping it 1600" podcast. "I think when this election ends and people stop for a minute and people actually reflect, they will realize how insane and horrible and unprecedented it really was."

Election obsession syndrome is taking hold of the country. Its main symptoms are soaring ratings for cable news shows and frequent refreshing of polling and election forecasting websites. With Clinton's lead over Trump in battleground states shrinking in the final stretch, the next two days promise to be even more nerve-wracking as both sides angle for victory.

The cover of next week's New Yorker sums up the brittle national mood -- especially among fretful liberals -- picturing a man on a train reading a newspaper with the headlines "Oh Sweet Jesus, Please God No," and "Anything But That."

Even "Saturday Night Live" has had enough. During the opening sketch Saturday, Alec Baldwin broke out of his Trump impression and turned to Kate McKinnon, who plays Clinton, and said: "I'm sorry, Kate. I just hate yelling this stuff at you like this."

"Yes, I know, right?" she answered. "This whole election has been so mean."

"I just feel gross all the time. Don't you guys feel gross all the time about this?" Baldwin asked the audience.

The pair then ran outside the studio. Baldwin hugged an African-American man and McKinnon embraced a man with a "Make America Great Again" hat who gave her a piggy-back ride while she ate cotton candy. It was a cathartic moment meant to celebrate the diversity of American life.

Anxiety among Democrats

Among Democrats, there is a palpable sense of intense anxiety about Clinton's prospects. Her campaign was rocked when FBI Director James Comey revived her email controversy, triggering growing concern that Trump could win.

"Every Democrat I know right now is checking the validity of their passports," CNN commentator Van Jones said Friday on "Erin Burnett OutFront."

For his part, Trump has shown remarkable discipline over the past week, further unnerving Democrats who are used to baiting him into a meltdown.

Conservative talk radio icon Rush Limbaugh crowed this week that "we have panic starting to set in in the Democrat Party and in the Drive-By Media."

On Friday, CNN modified its projected electoral map, for the first time putting Clinton's current total of electoral votes below the magic number of 270.

The Twitter account of David Plouffe, the former Obama election guru, has become a source of free therapy for nervous Democrats.

"Clinton path to 300+ rock solid. Structure of race not affected by Comey's reckless irresponsibility. Vote and volunteer, don't fret or wet," Plouffe tweeted on October 30.

One Democrat who is not panicking is Clinton herself.

"Here she is, the biggest event in the history of this country potentially and she's calm and collected. She's focused," billionaire and Clinton supporter Mark Cuban told reporters Friday. "I've been around situations when people are anxious. You see people choke. Look, she's confident. She's good."

Despite the tightening race, Clinton's campaign remains convinced that her advantage on the electoral map will hold and she will prevail on Tuesday. But that's unlikely to calm everybody down.

"Both Democrats and Republicans are really worked up," said Sam Wang, who runs the Princeton Election Consortium and questions whether the emotions whipped up by the race are justified by the facts of the election.

'Separate the drama from the data'

"In my own mind, I try to separate the drama from the data. Early this season, I noticed that no matter what happened, opinion didn't move that much," Wang said in an e-chat on CNN.com this week. "The race has shown less variation than ever in the history of presidential polling. It made me realize that the race probably wasn't going anywhere. But when was the last time a presidential race was this emotional?"

Vietor agrees that the level of emotional involvement is out of whack with what has been an unusually stable race that has not been permanently shaken by even stunning events like Clinton's fainting spell in September or the release of an "Access Hollywood" tape in which Trump is heard making sexually aggressive remarks.

"It does feel like every day something is said or done that in another election would be a blockbuster or game changing story," Vietor said. But in this race, "it feels like the half life of any major story is five days."

The election was always going to be an emotional roller coaster, given the candidates.

In Clinton and Trump, their parties nominated the two candidates most guaranteed to cause the maximum amount of **alienation** on the other side.

Trump is so far outside the normal parameters of what is accepted behavior for a potential president, firing off conspiracy theories and outright falsehoods in his stump speeches, it is not surprising he rouses fierce emotions. The Republican nominee has deliberately stoked anger, grievances and grass roots fury, using demagogic techniques to power his anti-establishment campaign.

His presidency would in many ways be a leap into the unknown for America and the world -- so heightened concern is inevitable.

But Trump is not the only candidate who evokes strong feelings.

Polarizing personalities

For more than a quarter of a century, Clinton has been one of the most polarizing personalities in American politics. While Trump has gone further than most of her other critics in openly branding her a crook, the intensity of feeling towards her among conservatives is visceral.

The candidates are doing nothing to calm things down -- seeing raging emotions as a tool to get their base voters to the polls.

"I think this will be the last election if I don't win. I think this will be the last election that the Republicans have a chance of winning," Trump told David Brody of the Christian Broadcasting Network in September, warning Democrats would naturalize millions of illegal **immigrants** to swamp the voting rolls.

Clinton warns Trump could incite Armageddon.

"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," she said in Pittsburgh on Friday. "Imagine how easily it could be that Donald Trump would feel insulted and start a real war -- not just a Twitter war -- at three in the morning."

Obama went even further this week warning during a campaign trip, "the fate of the world is teetering and you, North Carolina, are going to have to make sure that we push it in the right direction."

Given the intensity of the feelings, it's unlikely that the fury stoked by this election will quickly dissipate after Tuesday. It will likely be a powerful force in shaping the presidency of whoever wins.

But one longtime Washington sage, Charlie Cook, has a message for a divided nation in his latest National Journal column: Take a breath.

"My advice is for folks to ease off the caffeine, maybe watch less television news, take in a movie, play a round of golf, or do whatever lowers their blood pressure and preserves their sanity," Cook wrote. "This country has survived a lot, and it will still stand tall whatever happens on Tuesday."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- As the 2016 Presidential election winds down, we look back fondly (?) on the biggest whoppers of the general campaign.

There have been some big ones, some utterances so absurd that they invite laughter rather than scorn.

Our journey begins from the dates the two major party candidates amassed enough delegates to secure their nominations. At that point, we consider the general election campaign to have begun.

Here are our highlights -- or is it lowlights?

Clinton and her email server

Hillary Clinton on whether the FBI backed up her story regarding her use of a private email server for State Department business: "As the FBI said, everything that I've said publicly has been consistent and truthful with what I've told them," she said in an August interview just days after her original claim had been shown by a number of fact-checkers to be false.

Trump and the Iraq War

Donald Trump is convinced he was against the Iraq War from the beginning. No one else seems to be. No matter how many times it was pointed out that this statement, "I was against the Iraq War from the beginning," wasn't true, he kept repeating it.

Trump and the unemployment rate

Trump says the unemployment rate is 42%.

That's higher than it was at the height of the Great Depression, when it hit nearly 24%.

"Our real unemployment rate -- in fact, I saw a chart the other day, our real unemployment -- because you have 90 million people that aren't working," he said in an August interview with Time magazine.

"Ninety-three million to be exact. If you start adding it up, our real unemployment rate is 42%," he said.

Trump 'stalking' Clinton

Clinton said Trump stalked her all over the debate stage last month, a claim she repeated several times after the second debate. It wasn't true any time she said it.

Trump: 650 million **immigrants** may move to US

Sure, if everyone in the Western Hemisphere decides to move here.

Pence: The Clinton Foundation gives 'less than 10 cents on the dollar' to 'charitable causes'

He made this claim during the vice presidential debate. It's wrong.

Pence: 'Well, he never said that'

When Pence's rival, Tim Kaine brought up things that Trump had said, Pence repeatedly denied that he did. Well, he did.

Trump: Clinton's **immigration** plans will bankrupt Social Security

Fact is they might save Social Security.

Trump: 'Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio'

"They're all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore," Trump said during the first debate.

Trouble is those states are gaining jobs.

Trump on the state of black America

At a rally in North Carolina in September, Trump said: "Our African-American communities are absolutely in the worse shape they've ever been in before. Ever, ever, ever."

Worse than slavery? Jim Crow? Worse than the 50-year period when at least one black person was lynched every week?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Donald Trump expressed support for "amnesty" for some undocumented **immigrants** during a 2011 interview on Fox News.

In an appearance in November of 2011 on "Fox and Friends," Trump defended former House Speaker Newt Gingrich, then a candidate for the Republican nomination, who was being criticized by his opponent Michele Bachmann for saying at a debate that he wanted "a humane" approach to the subject of illegal **immigration** which would avoid deporting families rooted in American communities. Trump signaled he liked Gingrich's approach, agreeing with a Fox host's description that it could be called amnesty.

"Well first of all he's really talking about something where somebody has been in the country for 25 years, they've been educated here, they're really tremendously performing people, and citizens, or not citizens depending --- I guess he's talking about if they become, or should they become, citizens," Trump said. "The fact is he's showing a lot of compassion. Now I know both of them, and they're both very, very, good people. I like what Newt is saying to a certain extent. It's a very limited thing, but he's talking about people that have really been terrific people for this country for a long, long, period of time. He's saying it's very, very, tough to throw them out.

"I tell you, I know Michele," said Trump. "And if you told Michele, 'Go across the street. You see that family? They've been here, they've been really producers for this country for 25 years. They're great people, their children are educated, their children are producers, you go tell that family to get out of here and get into their own country,' I don't think she could do it, because she's a good person."

"This isn't conservative, I'm the world's most conservative person, this isn't conservative. This is compassion," added Trump.

"Is it amnesty?" asked "Fox and Friends" host Steve Doocy.

"I guess to a certain extent, for a very limited number of people, it would be considered amnesty, but how do you tell a family that's been here for 25 years to get out?" responded Trump.

The 2011 exchange is significantly different from the central theme of Trump's 2016 campaign, which has been a hardline position on **immigration** that emphasized the deportation of undocumented **immigrants**. In an August speech on **immigration**, Trump laid out his plan to deport undocumented **immigrants** with criminal backgrounds, and made clear that the only path to becoming a legal resident would be for **immigrants** to return to their home country first.

"For those here today illegally who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined above," Trump in his **immigration** speech. "Those who have left to seek entry under this new system will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to enter under the **immigration** caps or limits that will be established.

"We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. There will be no amnesty."

A Trump spokesperson did not respond to a request for comment.

CNN's KFile first reported earlier in October that Trump had in 2012 said in an interview that he did not support deporting many undocumented **immigrants**. The extent to which Trump supported so-called amnesty for undocumented **immigrants** in 2011 and 2012 was mostly unscrutinized throughout the 2016 campaign.

In the 2011 Fox News interview, Trump added that Gingrich's comments would help him with voters in the general election, even if it hurt him with conservatives.

"With a very strong conservative group of people he did himself harm, with the overall electorate he did himself a lot of good," said Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**() -- As we slouch toward election day, all eyes are on the battleground states -- the ones that flash blue and red and back again, potentially changing the course of our country's future with every passing notion.

Of all of these states, Florida is the most crucial. And in this historic election, no group is more important than Florida's female voters.

We traveled from Miami to the cane fields of the state's center to the sunny space coast; under the dusky live oaks in Gainesville, to the party-hearty streets of Tampa and Orlando with one goal in mind: To learn more about the women whose convictions and concerns may very well define this election.

The common thread we found, regardless of politics or ideologies, was a sense of foreboding, of inner conflict and frustration. And yet, in all of these women, there was also a strong faith in, and obligation to, our American democracy.

Shannon DeFana, Miami

DeFana, 31, was born and raised in South Florida, the daughter of a Cuban **immigrant** father and a mother with Irish **immigrant** origins. She calls this the "I can't even" election, a nationwide joke that somehow went too far. While she's no big Clinton fan, Trump's positions on **immigration** leave her incredulous and his attitudes toward women, she says, are downright scary. "Everything he stands for is pretty much against everything I am as a person," DeFana says. To her, preserving social progress is critical. "It's not even about me," she says. "It's about people who I am friends with, and their identities, who are way further marginalized than myself. We have to protect those people."

Marsha Craig, Tampa

"I fear for our country, for our constitution, and for our way of life," says Marsha Craig. The 71-year-old grandmother is an unabashed patriot whose ancestors came over on the Mayflower. Now, she says, the country is straying too far from its roots. "I became a Trump supporter the day he came down that escalator," she says. They agree on a great many issues: More vetting for **immigrants**, the end of career politicians, and the preservation of a conservative Supreme Court. Craig says the America she loves is in danger of being suffocated by corruption and progressive agendas. That course, she says, needs to change before it's too late. "It's really important we don't lose our identity as a nation."

Rae Roberts, Orlando

Rae is 21 and, like many her age, she's just trying to get a job and go back to school. She is also currently homeless. "In this city there are a lot of homeless youth, a lot of gay youth, and there aren't a lot of resources for us," she says. Rae entered foster care when she was 14, after her mother got out of prison and couldn't take care of her. She aged out when she was 18, and is staying at the Zebra Coalition in Orlando, an organization for disadvantaged LGBT youth. What she's looking for in a leader is more advocacy like this -- but it can be hard to find. "I'm voting for Hillary," she says, though she's not enthusiastic. "Trump is a pompous ass, and egocentric, and I feel like Hillary Clinton can identify a little more with the common person." She smirks. "Just a little, though."

Rachel Gossett Mateu, Miami

Rachel Gossett Mateu is struggling with her choice. As a 38-year-old Christian who wants to start a family, she has traditional views on things like abortion and marriage. But she's disheartened that the candidates' appeals to religious voters haven't matched up with their actions -- or conduct. "It's difficult for me to listen to the banter related to topics I feel are working against the family unit." she says. This year, she was deliberate in educating herself about the candidates, but as she watched the debates, the acrimony and personal attacks left her frustrated and wanting answers. She is undecided, but she says her faith will support her through Election Day and beyond. "I believe we are called to support our leaders," she says. "I will still be praying for either one of them."

Shannon, Tampa

Shannon is a 39-year-old registered Republican with a particular interest in taxes, the military and the national economy. As the owner of a photography business, she was initially drawn to Trump. "I thought it would be a great change, and something really refreshing, for a non-politician to jump in and maybe do something a little different." But Shannon is also an exotic dancer at 2001 Odyssey in Tampa, and the way Trump responded when a porn star accused him of assault floored her. It revealed his character, she says. "I don't always put so much merit in what people say against a politician. But I do put a lot of thought into how they react to it."

Lauren Wolfe, Merritt Island

Lauren Wolfe was firmly in the Bernie Sanders camp, right up until the painful moment he conceded. The mother-of-four is passionate about environmental issues, government corruption and campaign finance reform. Since the top of the ballot doesn't represent her interests, she's going for Jill Stein. Wolfe's husband and father and plenty of her friends are voting Trump, and Lauren can see the appeal. "I think people are so mad at the established political system," she says. She's voting against the system too, just in a different way. "I definitely believe in a multiple party system," she says. "It keeps the parties in check."

Paulina Praphanchith, Gainesville

Praphanchith, 23, is majoring in communications with a minor in leadership at the University of Florida. When it comes to choosing her own leader, she says she's mostly concerned with social and human rights issues. "I think that's especially important, given the violence and hate that's been going on in our country." She says she'll probably vote for Clinton, even though her parents support Trump. She chalks it up to a generational divide. "I used to think the same way my parents did, but now I feel I've experienced different things," she says.

Crystal Bruce, Pahokee

Bruce has been a Democrat all her life, and she's voting for Clinton. "I have granddaughters. I am a woman," she says. "So [my vote] is making a statement. What will it mean to my granddaughters, to see a woman president and know the sky's the limit?" Bruce has worked at polling places for more than 20 years, and she's seen it all. She says she'd never fault someone for thinking differently than her. "Are they wrong for being a Republican? No. Am I wrong for being a Democrat? No," she says. In some instances, say, for a governor or local seat, Bruce might even prefer a conservative. "I just don't want one as my President."

Mary Kate Bryant, Tampa

Mary Kate Bryant, 55, is a proud third generation Tampan who's tired of the campaign ads, the twisted political rhetoric, the whole BS. She wants to see change, and that change for her is Trump. Bryant is a broker at a family business, where she says she has worked hard for 30 years. "Our country seems to be going in the opposite direction of hard-working Americans," she says. "And personally, I see Trump as a successful businessman who can get our country going in a different direction. Because obviously, things just aren't happening right now." She's not bothered by some of the things he's said about women. "I don't care what you said. I'm more interested in what you are going to do to bring back jobs and turn the country around."

Suzan McDowell, Miami

Suzan McDowell is an enthusiastic ambassador for #BlackGirlMagic. She built her own marketing business, Circle of One, from the ground up, and has worked with major political campaigns for both parties. The fact that Donald Trump is a candidate in this election, she says, is a little embarrassing. As a businesswoman, she respects his "business clown" hustle, but she finds his politics -- and the effect he's had on the country -- frightening. "Americans are inherently winners," she says. "So, whoever loses, what's going to happen to their side?" She believes our future President has a duty to try and heal the divides -- racial, ideological and otherwise -- that this election has wrought. "I don't believe in a system where only I get what I want," she says. "We are all in this boat together. We're all rowing, and if millions of people don't row, we're screwed."

Makayla Norlin, Tampa

Norlin is on the fence. This is the 20-year-old's first election, and she has found she holds a lot of Republican views. That doesn't mean she likes Donald Trump, though. "I think foreign policy is really important, and I don't really feel like he has a foreign policy plan," she says. But Clinton's scandals -- the emails, Benghazi -- don't make her an attractive alternative either. The University of South Florida student has strong beliefs on medical marijuana and right-to-die laws, which complicate her decision. "It gives me chest pain," she says. "It sucks. I'm stuck between a rock and a hard place and I can't really figure out which way is the better way."

Mieke Fox, Boca Raton

Just because Mieke Fox would rather not talk politics doesn't mean she doesn't care. As a mother of two, a cancer survivor and a South African **immigrant**, issues like healthcare and **immigration** really touch a nerve. It's the candidates themselves that leave her unenthused. "I don't like either candidate. I cannot vote for Donald Trump, because I am a mother of two daughters, I'm a woman myself, and I can't imagine living in a Donald Trump world," she says. Still, she has serious reservations about Hillary's trustworthiness: "She has been on the scene for a long time, and that's not necessarily what I want to continue." Fox is sure about one thing: She will definitely vote. "There are a lot of men and women who have died for this freedom, and there are a lot of people in this world who are fighting for the right to vote. I feel like I need to do it for them."

Julie Reda, Cocoa Beach

Florida's Space Coast has been ravaged by job loss since NASA's space shuttle program was shuttered in 2011. Reda, 46, kept that in mind when she cast her vote for Donald Trump. "We need somebody who is business-minded to bring those jobs back," she says. Reda considers herself a "liberal Republican" and, while she says it's exciting to have a female candidate on the ballot, she also thinks Trump better aligns with her views. "I have nothing against Hillary Clinton, I just don't trust her," she says. "Whoever is going to get elected is going to get elected, and we all need to stay friends the day after."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Adam Crapser was a toddler in an orphanage the last time he lived in South Korea.

American parents adopted him decades ago and flew him to the United States. Now the 41-year-old could be days away from deportation.

An **immigration** judge in Washington ruled against his request for relief last week, ordering his removal from the US.

To advocates, it's one more troubling sign of a broken system. The case, they say, exposes a flawed US law that unfairly leaves tens of thousands of international adoptees in limbo without citizenship.

But **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officials say the proceedings against Crapser show the agency is following its priorities by cracking down on criminals.

'America failed Adam'

Crapser has been fighting deportation since 2013, when he applied to get a copy of his green card and ended up on the radar of **immigration** authorities. His past run-ins with the law, including burglary and assault charges, caught their eye.

"ICE targeted Mr. Crapser for enforcement based on the severity of his criminal history, which includes multiple prior convictions for serious and violent offenses including assault, being a felon in possession of a weapon, and 3rd degree domestic violence," agency spokeswoman Rose Richeson said in a statement this week.

Crapser's attorney and supporters stress that his criminal record doesn't tell the whole story.

Crapser was physically abused and relinquished by the parents who initially adopted him and brought him here, they say. Then he was adopted again and endured more abuse.

"America failed Adam multiple times. ... It's insane now to deport him. We should help him," says Becky Belcore, a board member of the National Korean American Service & Education Consortium.

US government officials facilitated his adoption, she says, but never stepped in to help him as system after system failed.

Attorney Lori Walls says Crapser was eligible for a second chance, and deserves one. He's admitted he's accountable for his actions, served out sentences for the crimes he committed and has sought psychological treatment for post-traumatic stress, she says.

"If you don't take into account the fact that he was adopted and abandoned and abused and homeless, then maybe this (deporting someone for crimes he committed) would make sense to you. But it doesn't make sense if you back out just a little and look at the context," she says.

Crapser had pleaded with officials to give him a fresh start.

"All I want to do is be the best American I can be," he said last year, according to CNN affiliate KPTV. "I don't want to be this broken, screwed-up guy, so just don't kick me out of the United States. That's all I'm asking, please."

Adoptee: Judge's decision 'scares me'

In court last week, a group of adoptees who've rallied around Crapser's case listened as the judge decided against giving Crapser a reprieve.

"We were shocked, because we just can't believe that people who were adopted by US citizens as children can be deported back to a country we don't even know," Belcore said. "Just the cruelty of that was shocking."

Crapser, Belcore argues, should have been a US citizen all along.

A law passed by Congress in 2000 made international adoptees citizens automatically. But it didn't apply to anyone who was 18 or over when the law went into effect.

So Crapser never became a US citizen, because neither his parents nor state officials completed the paperwork.

Belcore estimates there are about 35,000 others were left in a similar limbo. And she's part of a group pushing for Congress to change that with a new law that would provide retroactive US citizenship to all internationally adopted individuals, no matter when they were adopted.

"We all should be citizens," she says. "It's illogical that we're not."

Justin Ki Hong wasn't in court with Crapser last week. But he says word of the judge's decision has rattled him. Like Crapser, he says, he was adopted as a child from South Korea but isn't a US citizen.

"If he was a citizen, he would serve his time, he'd be on probation and then be fine. But now on top of that, they're saying that, 'We're going to punish you a second time and send you to a foreign country,'" Ki Hong says. "That scares me. ... I could be in that situation."

As news media around the country cover Crapser's case, Walls says a wave of adoptees and their parents have contacted her.

"They're terrified," she says.

Preparing for a new life

Speaking to reporters after an **immigration** hearing last year, Crapser said he didn't think he'd survive if he got sent to South Korea.

"You're sentencing me to death for crimes I've already done hard time for," Crapser said at the time, according to KPTV. "Listen to my voice. I'm an American. I've been here my whole life. I don't know anything else."

But at last week's hearing, he decided to waive his right to an appeal after spending more than eight months in **immigration** detention.

"He just feels like he can't stay there one day longer than he has to, the conditions are so dehumanizing," Belcore says.

Crapser couldn't be reached for comment for this story. Friends say he's trying to focus on moving forward and building a new life in Korea.

He hopes someday the US law will change and give him a chance to return. He hopes his wife and children will be able to follow him to South Korea eventually. And he hopes to reconnect with his biological mother, who Korean broadcaster MBC tracked down after airing a documentary about his case last year.

In detention, another **immigrant** has helped him learn letters of the Korean alphabet. But he still doesn't speak the language or know how he'll find work.

According to his attorney, there's only one word Crapser still remembers how to say in Korean: airplane.

CNN's Sonya Hamasaki and Amanda Watts contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- It's a recent Tuesday morning at Fiesta Jalisco Mexican Restaurant in Columbus, Ohio, and Victor Sandoval is preparing the daily food specials.

As you walk into the kitchen, your eyes may sting from the aroma of the freshly-chopped onions but instantly feel refreshed as you walk by a man chopping cilantro. They are key ingredients in the house salsa, a recipe Sandoval has used for decades.

Sandoval, who spoke to CNN after the final presidential debate had taken place, came to the US as an **immigrant** from Mexico in 1986, when he was 18 years old. He became a citizen in 1993 and lived in a few places around the country, but eventually moved to Ohio.

"Columbus is a good market for restaurants," he said. "It's growing like crazy. We have Latinos everywhere."

Sandoval now owns two restaurants and says that's why on November 8 he'll vote for the presidential candidate that will make life better for him as a businessman.

He's registered as a Republican, but adds that "doesn't mean I have to vote for that one because I always go with the party that offers more benefits for me and my family."

Sandoval says he never votes a straight-party ticket. When Barack Obama won in 2008 and 2012, Sandoval was one of the Latino voters who helped the first black president capture the Buckeye State. He believed Obama was going to change **immigration** policy, something Sandoval says remains a high priority for him.

For the last two decades, attention has been focused on Ohio during presidential election years. In a City University of New York study commissioned by CNNen Español, 1.8% of total voters who cast their ballots in Ohio in 2012 were Latino. Obama won the state by 1.9%.

Four years later and the state's population increase indicates about 2.2% of votes around Ohio will come from Latinos. Despite the fact that the Hispanic population is so small in the Ohio, the study shows Latinos could very well be the decisive factor in the election.

"The Latino vote is important not because it's a big number, but because it represents a big impact when it comes to the elections," says German Trejo, a political consultant with experience running campaigns on both sides of the aisle. He says Ohio's electorate is, for the most part, set -- with the exception of about 100,000 voters, most of whom are undecided Latino voters.

"Out of those 100,000, Latinos have a big chunk of that population and if they go and cast their ballot, they'll account for between 20% and 80% of that margin of victory," Trejo said. "These are voters that traditionally stay at home, but in this election, because of the nature of the political candidates and rhetoric that is going on between the two parties, I think the Latino community is motivated and will go and vote in their best interest, whatever that interest is."

Ohio also outpaces the rest of the country in one aspect when it comes to Latino voters. According to the CUNY study, Ohio registration rates for Latinos in 2012 were at 69%, well above the national average of 58.7%. For 2016, that rate is expected to increase.

"Elections are won and lost by the slimmest of margins and we provide that margin of victory to most of the electorate," says Juan Molina Crespo. Crespo heads up the Hispanic Alliance of Cleveland, a grassroots, non-profit group that works to increase voter registration. He knows the importance of the Latino vote in the northeastern part of the state.

"When you look at the state of Ohio, we have three counties out of the 88 counties that typically vote Democrat, and in those three counties we also have the highest number of Latinos in the state," he said.

Crespo looks at Cleveland, in Cuyahoga County, with the highest density of Latinos in the entire state.

"President Obama won Ohio in the previous two elections in large part by very, very slim margins," he says, "and that slim margin was predicated upon the Latino vote."

But Crespo points to problems in political camps with their last-minute push for the Latino vote here. "It's critical," he says. "Unfortunately, I think both parties do a dismal job of courting the Latino vote until the 11th hour."

Now, with just a few days until the election, some voters in Ohio are already casting their ballots, forcing local Latinos to decide now which candidate has their best interests at heart.

"I just want to encourage all the Latinos to be more united," says Yasin Cuevas, a Puerto Rican transplant to Ohio and entrepreneur. "To vote for those who can't, to understand that we are a community of unity, family-oriented and to see the candidates and watch which one more embraces our values and morals."

Cuevas moved to Northern Ohio a decade ago and teaches modeling techniques as the director of Miss Ohio Latina. She says politics comes into conversation with her clients a lot.

"I remind them they have the right vote. Before we didn't, and this is something really important that can affect who we are as women and what rights we have in the society," she says.

Cuevas says she's learned that most Latino families have similar priorities in what they want from a commander-in-chief, regardless of how small the number may be.

"We are a powerful community and (we've grown) so (much) in the last years and it's really important," she says.

Experts like Trejo point to Obama's narrow victory in Ohio four years ago as an example of why all candidates know the importance of winning the state and why they spend so much time and money here.

"The state of Ohio has 18 electoral votes out of the 270 needed to win the White House," he said. "The state of Ohio is one of the top two important states to win the White House, and that's why presidential campaigns pay so much attention to this state in particular."

But with only a 2% voting base, it's a wonder Latinos in Ohio can make such a major difference on Election Day.

"Here in Ohio that 2% could be decisive," Trejo said, "And as we know: as Ohio goes, so goes the nation."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:31 pm: Tweaks headline

SELMA, North Carolina (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Thursday sought to shore up votes in the critical battleground state of North Carolina, touting his plans to boost support for military veterans, build out the military and combat ISIS.

The Republican nominee also attacked his rival Hillary Clinton, who held a dueling evening rally just 30 miles away in nearby Raleigh, as unfit to serve as commander in chief, arguing the former secretary of state "can't be trusted" to protect the United States.

"We know Hillary can't be trusted -- we know that -- with America's security. You take a look at her email situation, can we trust her with our security?" Trump said of his rival, who has repeatedly argued that Trump is too erratic to be trusted with the nation's security.

Trump delivered his military-focused remarks days away from the election that could be decided by voters in this state, where more than 100,000 active duty military personnel are based and where the military supports nearly 600,000 jobs, according to the North Carolina Department of Commerce. Additionally, 775,000 veterans live in the state.

That's why Trump, flanked by a dozen veterans, including retired military officers and Medal of Honor recipients, touted the strong support he enjoys among military veterans and even sought out a moment of humility as he touted the Medal of Honor recipients supporting his candidacy, calling them "so much more brave" than him.

"I wouldn't do what they did. I'm brave in other ways. I'm financially brave. Big deal," said Trump, who sought multiple deferments to avoid military service in Vietnam, his voice trailing off.

Trump later pivoted back to the group of veterans who served as the backdrop to his speech alongside a massive American flag, suggesting they would recoil at the thought of serving under Clinton as commander in chief.

"You know, when I look at these great admirals and these great generals and these great Medal of Honor recipients behind me, to think of her being their boss?" Trump said skeptically after a pause. "I don't think so ... They're incredible patriots, they would never say a thing, but I know what they think."

Trump rehashed his plans to build out the military by increasing the number of troops, ships and fighter jets and, stoking fears of ISIS attacks reaching American shores, Trump also pledged to defeat the terror group and "defeat it quickly." And he tied that plan to his hardline **immigration** policies, arguing that Clinton "wants to fling our borders wide open" and allow terrorists "to infiltrate our country," mischaracterizing his opponent's **immigration** plans.

But Trump didn't offer just bravado and fear-mongering. He also sought to speak directly to military families in North Carolina whose votes will be crucial to securing victory in this pivotal swing state.

"The military families of North Carolina have shed their blood and poured out their hearts for our country," Trump said, before pledging to fully equip military forces in combat, end the defense sequester and deploy troops only if military action is "vital" to US national security interests.

Trump also vowed to improve medical care military veterans receive as he lamented problems at the Veterans Administration and the high rate of suicide among veterans.

"You're our great people. You are our great people. It's not gonna happen," he said to cheers from the crowd of thousands who gathered outdoors to see and hear the Republican nominee.

Trump, who repeatedly criticized the foreign policy actions of President Barack Obama, also argued for a break with past foreign policies of the United States, vowing a Trump administration "will stop trying to build foreign democracies ... and race recklessly to intervene in situations that we have no right to be there, folks."

"America needs new leadership, quickly," Trump said.

Trump will return to the state several times before voters head to the polls on Tuesday, with rallies already scheduled in the state on Saturday and Monday.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine made his case to Latino voters Thursday, asking them to vote for his presidential ticket with Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton -- in Spanish.

While speaking at a rally in Phoenix, Arizona, Kaine said Republican nominee Donald Trump is "someone who thinks 'Latino outreach' means tweeting out a picture of a taco bowl."

Kaine slammed the real estate mogul for saying Mexicans are criminals and rapists, calling Alicia Machado "Miss Housekeeping" when she won the 1996 Miss Universe pageant and for suggesting Indiana-born US District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel was biased in overseeing a lawsuit against Trump University because he is "Mexican."

"In the first weeks of his campaign, Donald Trump said that **immigrants** from Mexico are drug dealers, rapists, murderers," Kaine said in Spanish. "In the last debate, Trump referred to them as 'bad hombres.' ... He insists that 'This is a country where we speak English, not Spanish.' He doesn't understand that multilingual and bilingual families contribute to the diversity that makes our nation strong."

Kaine's speech is in part a sign of Clinton's campaign efforts to turn traditionally red Arizona in her electoral favor. According to a CNN/ORC poll released Wednesday, Trump tops Clinton by 5 percentage points with voters in Arizona, 49% to 44% respectively. But the campaign is targeting Latino and millennial voters -- where 30.7% of the Arizona population identified as Latino and/or Hispanic.

Kaine, who grew up in the Kansas City area, became fluent in Spanish during volunteer service in Honduras during the early 1980s. The former Virginia governor -- whose state includes a growing Latino population -- in 2013 became the first senator to deliver a floor speech entirely in Spanish.

On Thursday the Virginia senator was introduced by Clarissa Felix, a student at Arizona State University, who said her mother recently became a US citizen, and they both plan to vote for Clinton and Kaine in the election.

Kaine also slammed local Arizona politicians -- former Gov. Jan Brewer and Sheriff Joe Arpaio -- who are both supporters of Trump for president.

"One of Trump's biggest supporters, Sheriff Joe Arpaio, who's facing criminal charges for profiling Latinos and has persecuted undocumented **immigrants**. He says he thinks Trump will get 'a lot of Hispanic votes,'" Kaine said in Spanish. "Just the other day, your former governor, Jan Brewer, who signed into law the discriminatory SB1070 that promoted racial profiling, said that she wasn't worried about her candidate, Donald Trump, winning this state, because, as she said, Latinos 'don't get out and vote.'"

He continued in Spanish, "So I hate to break it to the Trump campaign, but Latinos are going to have a really big voice in this election ... and the choice is really clear."

He ended his speech by pleading that Latinos vote because they could help swing the state blue for Clinton.

"For the first time in a while, the state of Arizona is competitive -- and every single vote counts," he said.

CNN's Betsy Klein contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated at 4:41 p.m. Fixed number of undocumented workers in 2009.

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- In the years that followed the Great Recession, the number of undocumented workers joining America's workforce came to a standstill.

According to a report released Thursday from Pew Research Center, an estimated 8 million undocumented **immigrants** were either working or looking for work in the U.S. in 2014, from the 8.1 million that were in the U.S. workforce in 2009.

Overall, this group made up about 5% of the U.S. workforce in 2014, Pew reported.

The flagging growth in the number of undocumented workers is a sharp contrast to the decade prior to the recession. Between 1995 and 2005, the number of undocumented **immigrants** in the U.S. workforce more than doubled from 3.6 million to 7.3 million, Pew reported.

Mexico is a big part of the recent slowdown, said Mark Hugo Lopez, Pew's director of Hispanic research. "Not only is it harder to cross the border into the United States from Mexico, it's harder to cross into Mexico from Central America," he said.

Mexico's stable economy has also helped stem the flow of undocumented **immigrants** coming into the U.S.

"Mexico hasn't experienced an economic crisis recently," Lopez said. "And now there's a growing number of Mexicans who feel like life in the U.S. isn't that much better than life in Mexico."

Even though undocumented workers represent just fraction of the overall U.S. workforce, there are industries where they figure prominently. In the agricultural and construction industries, for example, undocumented workers represent 17% and 13% of the labor force respectively, Pew reported.

As fewer migrant workers come into the country, specialty fruit and vegetable producers say they're experiencing a worker shortage that has forced them to pay higher wages. With a national average wage of roughly $12 an hour, most American workers don't want to do the work for that pay, industry sources said.

Pew also found that seven U.S. states saw their undocumented worker population increase significantly since 2009, while eight other states saw substantial declines.

The state with the highest proportion of undocumented workers is Nevada, where the leisure/hospitality and construction industries employ many undocumented workers. There, 10% of workers were undocumented in 2014. California and Texas follow, with 9% and 8.5%, respectively.

The undocumented worker population trend reflects that of the overall undocumented population, which has also held steady at 11 million since 2009, according to Pew.

Lopez noted that documented new-**immigrant** arrivals from Asia, mainly from China and India, outpaced undocumented and documented arrivals from Latin America. The increase in the number of foreign born people could be from an increase in refugees, family reunifications and H-1B visa holders, he said.

Some undocumented **immigrants** start out as documented but become undocumented when they overstay their visas, he added.

Using data primarily from the U.S. Census Bureau's American Community Survey for 2005 to 2014, Pew derived estimates for the undocumented **immigrant**population by subtracting the foreign-born population that are "documented" from the total foreign-born population. It then adjusted its figures to consider people that were omitted from the survey. Pew defined the labor force as those who are 16 or older and are currently working or who are looking for work.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Melania Trump says she'd work to improve a social media culture that has gotten "too mean and too tough" -- riddled with insults based on "looks and intelligence" -- if she becomes first lady.

But she didn't make any mention of the Twitter activities of her husband, Donald Trump, who has relentlessly attacked his political foes, journalists, critics and other entertainers for years with demeaning comments based on their appearances and intelligence.

In a rare appearance on the campaign trail -- and her first solo speech since the convention this summer -- the wife of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump discussed her vision for her role in the White House for the first time Thursday in suburban Philadelphia.

"It is never OK when a 12-year-old girl or boy is mocked, bullied or attacked. It is terrible when it happens on the playground, and it is absolutely unacceptable when it is done by someone with no name hiding on the internet. We have to find a better way to talk to each other," Melania Trump said.

"We must find better ways to honor and support the basic goodness of our children, especially in social media," she said. "It will be one of the main focuses of my work, if I am privileged enough to become your first lady."

Not mentioned: Her own husband's long history of cyberbullying.

In September, after Clinton cited Trump's reference to 1996 Miss Universe Alicia Machado as "Miss Piggy" and "Miss Housekeeper" during their first presidential debate, Trump said in a 3 a.m. Twitter rant that Machado is "disgusting" and a "con" and directed followers to check out a non-existent Machado sex tape.

Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway said Melania Trump's speech will not serve to highlight her husband's most controversial and inflammatory tweets.

"It won't for responsible journalists who wish to cover her entire speech/life journey," Conway said, adding a shot at the Democratic nominee and the FBIinvestigation into her private email server. "And under that premise, would President Hillary Clinton never be able to talk law enforcement or corruption investigations again? Would she just abolish the DOJ and FBI?"

It was Melania Trump's first speech since her appearance at the Republican National Convention, where her remarks triggered controversy because one section plagiarized Michelle Obama's 2008 Democratic National Committee speech. A speechwriter later apologized.

She cast her husband as someone who's in touch with America's working class.

"Every time my husband learned of a factory closing in Ohio or North Carolina or Pennsylvania, I could see him get very upset," she said as she made the case that the Republican nominee can fix the nation's economic woes.

Trump opened the speech by discussing her youth in Slovenia before **immigrating** to the United States, saying that "America meant if you could dream it, you could become it."

She said she went through a 10-year process of becoming a United States citizen, which she called "the greatest privilege in the world."

"I'm an **immigrant**, and no one values the freedoms and opportunities of America more than me," she said.

Melania Trump hasn't had a very public role on the campaign trail and has made it clear, publicly and privately, that her first priority is raising their 10-year-old son, Barron.

But her speech Thursday was the first of what Donald Trump said in an interview with ABC would be two or three major speeches before the November 8 election.

The speech took place in Berwyn, Pennsylvania -- in the suburbs of Philadelphia -- and was designed to help Trump win over the middle-class women in the region who could tip the balance of Pennsylvania's 20 electoral votes for Trump or Clinton.

Conway worked with Melania Trump on the speech and was in attendance Thursday. Conway, Trump advisers said, has built a positive relationship with Melania over the course of the campaign. And Melania has privately been very supportive of Conway's role as the head of her husband's campaign.

Melania Trump was introduced by Karen Pence, the wife of the Republican nominee's running mate Mike Pence.

"I know that America will fall in love with her just as much as she loves the American people," Karen Pence said.

CNN's Ashley Killough and Sara Murray contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Melania Trump cast her husband as someone who's in touch with America's working class as she made a rare appearance on the campaign trail.

"Every time my husband learned of a factory closing in Ohio or North Carolina or Pennsylvania, I could see him get very upset," she said as she made the case that the Republican nominee can fix the nation's economic woes.

Trump opened the speech by discussing her youth in Slovenia before **immigrating** to the United States, saying that "America meant if you could dream it, you could become it."

She said she went through a 10-year process of becoming a United States citizen, which she called "the greatest privilege in the world."

"I'm an **immigrant**, and no one values the freedoms and opportunities of America more than me," she said.

Melania Trump hasn't had a very public role on the campaign trail and has made it clear, publicly and privately, that her first priority is raising their 10-year-old son, Barron.

But her speech Thursday was the first of what Donald Trump said in an interview with ABC would be two or three major speeches before the November 8 election.

The speech took place in Berwyn, Pennsylvania -- in the suburbs of Philadelphia -- and was designed to help Trump win over the middle-class women in the region who could tip the balance of Pennsylvania's 20 electoral votes for Trump or Clinton.

Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway worked with Melania Trump on the speech and was in attendance Thursday. Conway, Trump advisers said, has built a positive relationship with Melania over the course of the campaign. And Melania has privately been very supportive of Conway's role as the head of her husband's campaign.

Melania Trump was introduced by Karen Pence, the wife of the Republican nominee's running mate Mike Pence.

"I know that America will fall in love with her just as much as she loves the American people," Karen Pence said.

CNN's Ashley Killough and Sara Murray contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Britain's divorce from the European Union got a whole lot messier on Thursday, when the High Court ruled members of parliament must vote on the process.

The ruling means Prime Minister Theresa May's government will now need MPs' approval before triggering Article 50 -- the mechanism for Britain leaving the EU.

The ruling could give the 48% of British voters who wanted to remain in the EU a greater voice in Brexit plans. But what do the 52% who voted Leave think about it?

CNN spoke to Brexiteers in Havering, a London borough where 70% of people voted to exit the EU, making it one of the places with the highest percentage of Leave voters across the UK.

Here's what they said.

Disillusioned: The small business owner

Graeme Gibbons, 50, owner of Penny's household goods stall in Romford Market for 25 years.

"People voted for Brexit in good faith and now they're being told that it may not go ahead -- so I think they'll be feeling pretty disillusioned and cheated," said Graeme Gibbons, who voted for "Leave."

"What's the point in having a referendum if they're just going to overrule it anyway?"

Gibbons warned that the sense of injustice among Leave voters could also play into the hands of right-wing parties such as UKIP, which campaigned heavily for tighter **immigration** controls.

"If we vote in a certain way and it's taken away from us, parties such as UKIP could really capitalize on that sense of dissatisfaction," he said.

"The majority of people voted to leave, it cost a lot of money to hold the referendum, and now they'll be asking, 'What's the point?'"

Disappointed and angry: The clothes vendor

Tony Geary, 49, chairman of the Romford Market Traders Association.

"I voted to get out of the EU," said clothing store owner Tony Geary. "And there was no suggestion that we'd need to go through parliament to get all the necessary boxes ticked before that happened."

"As a small business owner I believed Brexit would be best for my country, and I want the government to fulfill what I've asked them to do."

Geary added that it wasn't just Leave voters in Havering who would be feeling disappointed by the court ruling -- but the majority of the country.

"The referendum was: 'Do we stay or do we go?'" he said.

"Not: 'Let's decide and then we'll get the courts to rule on it and put it another way.'"

Confident Brexit will go ahead: The fishmonger

Dave Crosbie, 58, owner of "The Better Plaice" seafood stall in Romford Market.

"We voted to come out of the EU, so they can't really go against that, can they?" said Dave Crosbie, who believes parliament will keep to Prime Minster Theresa May's deadline for triggering Article 50.

"As long as they stick to the March 2017 date, and don't try and do a backdoor turnaround, I don't think it'll make a huge difference."

Crosbie says he voted to Leave the EU partly because of high levels of **immigration** -- and hopes any Brexit deal would honor those concerns.

"Tighter **immigration** control and control over our armed forces -- those things are not negotiable," he said.

"At the end of the day it's the people that voted on it -- so I would hope parliament is fair and gives us voters what we want."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Raul A. Reyes, an attorney and member of USA Today's board of contributors, writes frequently for CNN Opinion. Follow him on Twitter@RaulAReyes. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- They are a voting block that is the object of curiosity and disbelief. They have been covered extensively by an incredulous media. They generate fascination as well as scorn.

They are Latinos for Trump -- and their existence cannot be denied.

Although polls show Hillary Clinton with as much as a 50-point lead among Latino voters, Donald Trump still manages to get the support of almost 20% of Latinos. That's nearly one in five of America's largest ethnic minority group. So why would any Latino support the presidential candidate who has run the most anti-Mexican, anti-**immigrant** campaign in modern history?

Latinos actually support Trump for the same reasons that some other Americans do. Although their motivation may seem misguided, their support for Trump speaks to the overall diversity of the Latino electorate. Latinos for Trump are a product of factors both prosaic and complex.

US Latinos currently number around 55 million. The Pew Center estimates that 27 million of them are eligible to vote in the presidential election. These huge numbers encompass recent arrivals and people whose ancestors have been on American soil since it was part of Mexico. It encompasses bodega workers and CEOs. U.S. Latinos can be natural-born citizens or **immigrants** from more than 20 countries across Central and South America.

US Latinos can be black, Asian, Jewish, Mormon, evangelical Christian, LGBT, and everything in between. It is unrealistic to expect such an enormous group of potential voters to fall into ideological lockstep. Assuming that Latinos will not support Trump is a simplistic way of looking at our communities.

It is also a mistake to expect Latino voters to mirror African-American voters. An October CBS News poll found Trump with just 4% support from likely African-American voters (in a four-way race including Gary Johnson and Jill Stein). But Latino voters are far less monolithic than African Americans due to differences in our collective experiences.

The defining moments in African-American history include slavery, the southern civil rights movement and the election of our first black president. For Latinos these moments are **immigration**, relations with Cuba and the civil rights movement in the southwest. So while the interests of Latinos and African Americans may overlap on many issues, each electorate is informed by a unique and different history.

What's more, the ugliness of Trump's **immigration** rhetoric does not necessarily resonate as an issue with all Latinos. Cuban-Americans and Puerto Ricans, for example, do not share the same **immigration** concerns as Mexican Americans. In fact, new research from Latino Decisions breaks down the top concerns of Latino voters by region. While **immigration** was the top concern of Latinos in California, in Texas Latinos were most concerned with lowering the cost of health care. New York Latinos were most concerned with improving wages, while terrorism was the top concern of Latinos in Florida.

Like other voters, some Latinos are attracted to Trump's promises of change, his message on jobs, and his outsized public image. His ability to channel a populist sense of outrage has won over some Latinos, too. Trump could have probably earned more Latino support had he stayed on an aspirational message and not derailed himself by launching attacks on everyone from a Latina former Miss Universe to a distinguished Mexican-American judge.

Many prominent Latino conservatives such as Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen (R-Fla.), former Bush Commerce Secretary Carlos Gutierrez and syndicated columnist Linda Chavez have refused to endorse Trump. Yet Latinos can be just as partisan as anyone else. Among the roughly one-quarter of Latino voters who identify with or lean towards the GOP, there are no doubt those who simply cannot bring themselves to vote for a Democrat. No matter how they might feel towards Trump, they still prefer him to Clinton.

There are likely deeper forces in play here as well. Historically, Latinos have been portrayed negatively by the media. It is not far-fetched to think that some Latinos have unconsciously absorbed these messages and then acted upon them. Such "internalized oppression," as sociologists call it, is not unlike homophobes who have been revealed to have issues with their own sexuality.

Thus we have Latina Trump supporter A.J. Delgado insisting that Trump did not insult Latinos when he called **immigrants** "rapists" and criminals. Or the head of Latinos for Trump, Marco Gutierrez, on MSNBC warning of "taco trucks on every corner." Their positions make more sense when we see them as a result of years of ingesting inaccurate stereotypes and fear-mongering.

In a perfect world, no one would vote for Trump, given his bigotry, misogyny, Islamophobia and xenophobia. He is unqualified in virtually every relevant way for the presidency. Still, those who choose to support him have the right to do so, regardless of their ethnicity or background.

Our democracy is a multicultural, messy jumble of ideas and opinions. Like it or not, Latino Trump supporters fit right in.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Your pocketbook may sway how you feel about the next president.

With election day less than a week away, here is how Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump stack up on key money matters: jobs, taxes, stocks and the economy.

1. Jobs: Clinton boosts job growth, Trump policy plagues it

Analysts are calling Clinton the winner on job creation.

Under a Clinton presidency, the economy would add 4.7 million new jobs by 2020, according to an analysis by Oxford Economics. Other estimates are higher. Moody's forecasts that Clinton would add 10.4 million jobs.

The difference in the two forecasts stems from the assumptions about the impact of Clinton's **immigration** proposal to provide a pathway to citizenship. It is expected to boost employment and growth -- but experts differ over the extent and the time period of the benefits.

Under Trump's policies, Oxford says America would add a mere 700,000 jobs by 2020, while Moody's expects a net loss of 500,000 jobs by the end of his first term. The forecasts for Trump assume his **immigration** and trade policies would be major headwinds for job growth.

Trump says he will add 25 million jobs over a decade -- a claim that independent analysis hasn't been able to corroborate.

2. Taxes: Clinton (pay now) or Trump (pay later)

It depends what you want -- pain now followed by gain later, or more money now followed by tough times down the road.

Trump's tax plan would have a positive impact...until 2024. UPenn and the Tax Policy Center found that Trump's tax-cutting policies could boost growth in the short term. But lower tax revenue would lead to higher federal debt, which would hurt future generations even more than current projections.

The same analysis of Clinton's plan came up with the opposite result: a headwind in the short term from higher taxes. But then there is the potential of positive effect in the long-term, when the tax revenue could be used to build new roads, bridges and highways.

3. Stocks: Clinton is clear winner, but day after election could be bad for either

Wall Street wants Clinton to win.

According to Macroeconomic Advisers, a Clinton win would boost the S&P 500 by 2%. That may not sound like much but it's better than the expected market nosedive if Trump wins.

A Trump win would surprise markets, sending U.S. stocks down 8%, Macroeconomic Advisers forecasts. Trump is also extremely unpredictable, a trait that markets abhor. The Brookings Institution predicts a 10% to 15% stock market dive if Trump wins.

Investors prefer Clinton because she is a known commodity. Plus if the Republicans maintain control of Congress, as expected, it would lead to more gridlock in Washington. Gridlock means a lower chance of new regulations -- and less headaches for big banks.

However, no matter who wins, the day after the election usually tends to be rough. Bespoke Investments found that the average selloff the next day is about 1%.

4. Economy: Trump promises major growth. But experts say Clinton is better for economy

Trump promises big growth: as much as 4% a year. But experts doubt it's possible.

Trump's policies would cost the economy to lose $1 trillion by the end of his first term, according to Oxford Economics (Trump's team calls Oxford's analysis "narrow and myopic").

Growth isn't expected to be spectacular under Clinton either, though the economy is expected to stay on track, they say.

Clinton's **immigration** policy, which would theoretically expand the job market, would grow the economy, but only marginally more than if none of the current policies are changed, according to Oxford and UPenn data.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SAN ANTONIO, Texas (CNN) -- Yanira Lopez thought she and her three children had finally left the worst behind: the fear and uncertainty of a perilous journey from their native Guatemala to the United States border; the harrowing day she lost her children for five hours somewhere in an unknown land.

But when the family reached the US border in Matamoros, Mexico, in February 2015, a sense of hope replaced the confusion and apprehension. The seemingly endless line of people waiting to cross over into Brownsville, Texas, was unlike anything they had seen. When the Lopez family's turn came, Yanira Lopez simply told a US **immigration** officer: "We came here for your help, to get asylum."

The officer wrote down their information. Lopez said she relaxed for the first time in the long journey. Finally, they had arrived, escaping the crime and violence that made Guatemala one of the dangerous countries in the world.

They were given hamburgers and Hershey chocolates. Lopez imagined a joyous reunion with relatives in the US. A short time later, they boarded a bus.

"We couldn't even imagine where they were taking us," Lopez said.

The family reunion was not to be. Not yet, at least. After a night locked in a temporary holding facility, the Lopez family was transported to another unknown detention center where they would languish for two months.

Despite aggressive US government efforts to stem the flow of Central American migrants crossing the border, more and more families are following the footsteps of Lopez and her children.

Lopez arrived one year after the unprecedented 2014 wave of unaccompanied minors and families that crossed the border in what activist called a humanitarian crisis.

The Obama Administration responded to the 2014 crisis by opening two large family detention centers in Texas: The Karnes County and the South Texas Family Residential Center.

The initial goal was to deter new families from coming. Instead, the stream of incoming families is growing. Two years ago, 68,445 family units (people who come in groups of two or more family members) were apprehended at the border. In fiscal year 2016 that total swelled to 77,674, according to the US Border Patrol.

The surge of migrants across the border has been one of the hottest topics in the presidential election.

Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump went so far as to conflate families apprehended at the border with criminals. "They are being released by the tens of thousands into our communities with no regard for the impact on public safety or resources," Trump said at one debate. "But we have some bad hombres here and we're going to get them out."

While the number of apprehensions of families on the southwest border spiked in 2016, Department of Homeland Security figures give no indication that families are being released into the population en masse.

"The government's detention policies here in the United States are not going to stop families from coming if they fear for their safety and their lives because of violence in their home countries," said Denise Gilman, an **immigration** attorney who represents families who are detained.

Like other advocates, she believes the government should treat the surge of women and children coming from Central America as a refugee crisis, not a national security threat.

"Under US asylum law, the way you seek refugee status is to come to the US," Gilman said. "That is provided for in the law. That is not law breaking."

Before 2014, women and children claiming asylum were rarely placed in detention.

Families were processed and given a court order where they could pursue their claim. Then they were released at the border to go live with relatives in the country.

US **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) maintains that family detention centers are a key part of its strategy to prevent illegal **immigration**.

"The centers allow for prompt removal of individuals arriving as families who have not stated a claim for relief under our laws," said an ICE spokesman who asked not to be identified by name.

In response to growing concerns about detaining women and children, Homeland Security appointed a committee of independent experts to advise them on family detention and help reform its practices. In late September, the committee said in a draft report that "detention is generally neither appropriate nor necessary for families... DHS should discontinue the general use of family detention."

The official report is to be published this month. ICE's spokesman did not comment on the upcoming report but said DHS has limited the amount of time women and children are detained. He said the majority of families seeking asylum are detained for 20 days or less.

To win asylum, a person has to prove persecution because of race, religion, national origin, political opinion or membership in a particular social group. Passing the "credible fear interview" means you'll have a chance to convince a judge. Failing it means your days in the United States are likely numbered.

For those families who can't immediately travel to join relatives or don't have a place to live, Gilman says there are other solutions beyond detention like voluntary refugee shelter.

After Yanira Lopez and her three children -- two sons ages 14 and 17, and a 6-year-old daughter -- passed their interview, she was released from Karnes Family Residential Center in Texas. She went to live at Casa de Raices, a San Antonio refugee shelter for families released from detention.

She was only supposed to stay in the house a few days, but she decided to stay there and help after seeing all the other mothers released from detention.

"The idea is for them to feel relaxed and to forget for a moment what they endured during their journey," Lopez says.

She described her own experience in detention centers as traumatic. She felt trapped, like a prisoner. She wanted be free and simply go to the park with her children or take a walk to the store. Lopez said she was verbally abused by detention center workers and health services were inadequate.

"We come here for help," she says, "and they treat you worse than an animal, worse than a criminal."

Lopez believes the stay in detention will have a lasting psychological effect on her children.

The American Academy of Pediatrics agrees, saying in a September report that detention centers "do not meet appropriate standards for the safety and well-being of children."

ICE contends the detention centers are safe. On its website, the agency includes a list of safety and health standards for family residential centers.

Today, there are three family detention centers in the US: The two facilities in Texas and the Berks County Detention Facility in Pennsylvania, which opened before the 2014 spike in family border crossings. ICE says it pays an average of $342.73 per day for each individual detained.

So far in 2016 there have been a total of 44,558 recorded bookings in family detention.

Yanira Lopez's case is still pending. She now has a work permit and a Social Security number. Her three children are doing well in school. And this summer they moved into an apartment in San Antonio, their first in the United States.

"It's a dream come true," she says. "To be able to show the government that we are going to pay our bills and that we are good people, not delinquents."

CNN's Ray Sanchez contributed to this story.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**updated 6:53 pm ET: Navarro, who initially confirmed quote, now says he was misquoted.

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- America's economists on college campuses have no love for Donald Trump.

A letter signed by 370 economists, some whom have won the Nobel Prize in economics, urged voters not to vote for Trump.

"His statements reveal a deep ignorance of economics and an inability to listen to credible experts," the letter reads. The Wall Street Journal first reported on the letter, which was signed almost entirely by college professors.

The economists did not endorse Hillary Clinton, but recommended that would-be Trump voters "choose a different candidate."

They argue that Trump has deeply misled Americans on trade, manufacturing, **immigration** and public institutions critical to the credibility of the economy, such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which keeps track of how many jobs the economy creates and publishes a widely-watched monthly report.

One of Trump's economic advisers, Peter Navarro, told the Journal the letter "is a headline, whatever."

Navarro, an economics professor at the University of California, Irvine, also told the Journal: "You shouldn't believe economists or Nobel Prize winners on trade." He confirmed that comment to CNNMoney, but later said that the quote was incorrect.

Navarro added in a statement: "You don't need a Ph.D in economics to know Trump's plan to cut taxes, reduce regulation, increase oil, gas and clean coal production, and eliminate our trade deficit by increasing exports and reducing imports will significantly increase growth."

Trump has been heavily criticized for his threats to slap tariffs on Mexico and China, as well his comments about tearing up free-trade deals like NAFTA. His **immigration** policy to deport millions of undocumented workers has been widely lambasted by economists who say that would shrink the job market and hurt growth.

Clinton isn't unanimously loved by economists either. In September, over 300 economists signed a letter arguing that her economic policies would be bad for the country. They claim that Clinton's energy policy against fossil fuels, her tax plan and proposal to raise the federal minimum wage would slow down the economy.

"Her outdated policy prescriptions won't return our economy to the faster growth rates it once enjoyed," the economists' letter against Clinton reads.

Those economists also did not endorse Trump.

However, economic analysis of both candidates economic plans -- from taxes to jobs to economic growth -- leans towards Clinton, according to Oxford Economics, Moody's Analytics and UPenn's Wharton School Budget Model.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A GOP group funded by heavyweight Republican donors is attacking Hillary Clinton from the left, attempting to open a rift between Latinos and the Democratic nominee via television ads aimed at Spanish-language voters.

Future 45, a pro-Donald Trump super PAC funded by some of the biggest names in Republican politics, is spending $1.5 million in the final week of the campaign amplifying comments made when she stylized herself as more of a hardliner on **immigration**. The ads were crafted months ago during the Democratic primary -- though they did not run -- and the group now sees an opportunity to repurpose them for a general election audience.

Brian Baker, the group's president and a political aide to one of its lead donors, the Ricketts family, said the PAC would try to paint her as a "political chameleon."

"Hillary Clinton says she's a friend of ours. Is it because she needs our votes? A friend would not say this," one ad says, before featuring old clips of Clinton comments, with Spanish subtitles, stressing her opposition to illegal **immigration**.

Another spot features similar comments of hers at a 2008 debate: "Listening to the Hillary of yesterday, we can't trust the Hillary of today," the narrator says.

Trump himself has not yet aired a single Spanish-language ad in the campaign, which has surprised some GOP hands eager to make inroads in the Hispanic community. The spots will air on Univision and Telemundo nationally, with a particularly heavy rotation in Colorado, Nevada and Florida, and also online.

Future 45 and its affiliated nonprofit 45Committee earlier this fall looked poised to help Trump achieve parity in television advertising, but fundraising and spending appears to have slowed in recent weeks.

Sheldon Adelson and his wife Miriam have given $10 million to the super PAC, and CNN has reported that the Las Vegas couple has committed $25 million total to the two groups, though the nonprofit is not required to disclose its donors.

CNN's Daniella Diaz contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**5:17 pm: Adds McMullin response

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump's campaign on Monday quickly condemned a white nationalist supporter who is pushing a small automated call in Utah slandering a third-party threat in the state, Evan McMullin.

A California man named William Johnson has placed a robocall in the state identifying himself as a "farmer and a white nationalist" and alleging that McMullin "has two mommies." McMullin grew up with both a father and a mother, but his parents have since divorced and his mother is now in a lesbian relationship.

Johnson also alleges -- without evidence -- that McMullin is gay because he is currently single.

"Don't vote for Evan McMullin. Vote for Donald Trump. He will respect all women and be a president we can all be proud of," the call concludes.

The Trump campaign quickly rebuked Johnson.

"We strongly condemn this rhetoric and these activities of which we have no knowledge," Trump spokesman Hope Hicks said Monday.

The campaign distanced itself far more quickly than it has some other white nationalists in the past, including when Trump repeatedly demurred to CNN's Jake Tapper about David Duke's support, before finally condemning him.

In an interview with Tapper on "The Lead" Tuesday, McMullin said he wasn't surprised by the robocall, saying it "is exactly the narrative and the approach the Donald Trump campaign has had."

"Trump supporters have attacked me because of my faith, they've attacked my service, we've even received some death threats from these white supremacists, even recently, overnight," McMullin continued. "They've attacked my family, but, you know, they've attacked so many other Americans, too. Donald Trump himself has bragged about sexually assaulting women and attacked people for the color of their skin and their faith. I mean, this is the Republican nominee and none of this should surprise any of us."

White supremacists have found unusual comfort in Trump, who has stoked nationalist sentiment among supporters and launched some racially based attacks during the campaign, from proposing a ban on Muslim **immigration** and accusing Mexican **immigrants** of being criminals and "rapists."

The call has barely any money behind it -- just $2,000, Johnson said, and will go to 193,000 homes between Monday and Wednesday evening. But it is a reflection of the growing threat posed by McMullin, who has lead Trump in some polls in the ruby-red state.

UPDATE: This story has been updated to include McMullin's response.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here's a look at the life of 2016 GOP presidential candidate and businessman, Donald Trump.

Personal: Birth date: June 14, 1946

Birth place: New York, New York

Birth name: Donald John Trump

Father: Fred Trump, real estate developer

Mother: Mary (Macleod) Trump

Marriages: Melania (Knauss) Trump (January 22, 2005-present); Marla (Maples) Trump (December 1993-June 1999, divorced); Ivana (Zelnicek) Trump (1977-1990, divorced)

Children: with Melania (Knauss) Trump: Barron, March 20, 2006; with Marla (Maples) Trump: Tiffany, October 13, 1993; with Ivana (Zelnicek) Trump: Eric, 1984; Ivanka, October 30, 1981; Donald Jr., December 31, 1977

Education: University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Finance, 1968

Other Facts: Famous American entrepreneur and real estate developer.

Chairman and President of The Trump Organization.

Nicknamed "The Donald."

Timeline: 1970s - After college, works with his father on developments in Queens and Brooklyn.

1980s - Purchases/builds multiple properties in New York City, including Trump Tower (1983), Trump Plaza, and multiple casinos in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

1983 - Buys the New Jersey Generals football team which goes under a few years later when the United States Football League folds.

1990 - One of his casinos is forced into temporary bankruptcy as Trump faces huge debts.

1992 - Two of Trump's casinos file for bankruptcy in order to restructure debts.

1996 - Buys out and becomes executive producer of the Miss Universe, Miss USA and Miss Teen USA pageants.

January 2004 - "The Apprentice," with Trump acting as host, premieres on NBC.

August 18, 2004 - Relaunches a board game called "Trump, the Game," an updated version of a 1989 game with the same name.

November 21, 2004 - Trump Hotels & Casino Resorts Inc. files for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.

January 16, 2007 - Trump receives a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame.

January 2008 - "The Apprentice" returns, re-branded as "Celebrity Apprentice."

February 13, 2009 - Announces he is resigning from his position as chairman of Trump Entertainment Resorts.

February 17, 2009 - Trump Entertainment Resorts files for bankruptcy. The Trump Organization owns 28% of Trump Entertainment Resorts.

May 16, 2011 - Announces he will not run for president.

May 29, 2012 - On CNN's The Situation Room, maintains that President Barack Obama's birthplace is a matter of opinion and with regards to the president's Hawaiian birth certificate, "a lot of people do not think it was an authentic certificate."

March 15, 2013 - Makes a speech at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), calling the country a "a total and complete mess."

June 1, 2015 - Says he will make a "major announcement [on] June 16" at Trump Tower, according to a GIF posted on his official Instagram account.

June 16, 2015 - Trump announces that he is running for president during a speech from Trump Tower in New York.

June 28, 2015 - Trump says he's giving up the TV show "The Apprentice" to run for president.

June 29, 2015 - NBC says it is cutting its business ties to Trump and won't air the Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants because of "derogatory statements by Donald Trump regarding **immigrants**." This comes two weeks after comments Trump made about Mexican **immigrants** during his presidential campaign announcement.

July 8, 2015 - In an interview with CNN's Anderson Cooper, Trump says he "can't guarantee" all of the workers he employs have legal status in the United States. This is a response to questions about a recent Washington Post report that said there are undocumented **immigrants** working at the Old Post Office Pavilion construction site in Washington, which Trump is converting into a luxury hotel.

July 15, 2015 - Trump's campaign reports that the Republican presidential candidate's net worth is "in excess of ten billion dollars" and his personal finance disclosure has been submitted to the Federal Election Commission.

July 22, 2015 - Donald Trump's financial disclosure report is made public by the Federal Election Commission.

August 6, 2015 - During the first 2016 Republican debate, Trump is questioned about a third party candidacy, his attitude towards women and his history of donating money to Democratic politicians. He tells moderator Megyn Kelly of Fox News that he feels he is being mistreated, declaring "I've been very nice to you, although I could probably maybe not be, based on the way you have treated me. But I wouldn't do that." After the debate, a series of late-night Tweets are posted on Trump's Twitter page, criticizing Kelly and Fox News.

August 7, 2015 - The controversy continues, as Trump tells CNN's Don Lemon that Kelly was singling him out for attack. He says, "You could see there was blood coming out of her eyes, blood coming out of her wherever." The statement is interpreted by some as a reference to hormonal imbalance.

September 11, 2015 - Trump announces on social media he has purchased NBC's half of the Miss Universe Organization, which organizes the annual Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants.

December 7, 2015 - Trump's campaign puts out a press release calling for a "complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on."

March 2016 - Along with thirteen others, is ranked number 324 on Forbes' list of the the world's billionaires with a net worth of $4.5 billion.

March 29, 2016 - Trump's campaign manager Corey Lewandowski is arrested and charged in Jupiter, Florida, with simple battery of former Breitbart reporter Michelle Fields. Two weeks later, State Attorney David Aronberg announces he will not prosecute Lewandowski.

May 26, 2016 - Secures enough delegates to clinch the Republican Party nomination. A CNN count estimates Trump has crossed the 1,237 threshold required to be elected the nominee. However, Trump is still the presumptive Republican nominee until the delegates formally cast their votes on the convention floor in Cleveland in July.

July 16, 2016 - Trump formally unveils Indiana Governor Mike Pence as his running mate.

October 1, 2016 - A New York Times report about Donald Trump's 1995 tax records shows he declared a $916 million loss that could have allowed him to legally skip paying federal income taxes for years. The report, which contains some of the most detail of Trump's financial empire that has been publicly reported, shows Trump declared a $916 million loss for 1995 and lists tax benefits he used after a turbulent financial period for him in the early 1990s. The Times says it obtained the three pages of documents when they were mailed to a reporter last month.

October 7, 2016 - Previously unaired footage from 2005 surfaces of Donald Trump talking about trying to have sex with a married woman and being able to grope women. In footage obtained by The Washington Post, Trump is heard off-camera discussing women in vulgar terms during the taping of a segment for "Access Hollywood." In a taped response, Trump apologizes early Saturday, "I said it, I was wrong and I apologize." Over the weekend, several House and Senate members rescind their endorsements of Trump, and key GOP figures call for Trump to step aside.

October 9, 2016 - During the second presidential debate, CNN's Anderson Cooper asks Trump about his descriptions of groping and kissing women without their consent in the "Access Hollywood" footage. Trump denies that he has ever engaged in such behavior and declares the comments were "locker room talk." After the debate, nine women step forward to claim that they were sexually harassed or sexually assaulted by the real estate developer. Trump says the stories aren't true.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Julian Zelizer is a professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University and a New America fellow. He is the author of "Jimmy Carter" and "The Fierce Urgency of Now: Lyndon Johnson, Congress, and the Battle for the Great Society." He is the co-host of the podcast, "Politics & Polls." The opinions expressed in this commentary are his own.

(CNN) -- As part of her closing argument, Hillary Clinton has released an ad that will bring back memories for baby boomers who lived through the tumultuous 1960s. The television spot begins with the actress Monique Luiz, who played the girl in Lyndon Johnson's famous "Daisy" ad in 1964.

Luiz says, "This was me in 1964. The fear of nuclear war that we had as children, I never thought our children would ever have to deal with that again. And to see that coming forward in this election is really scary." The rest of the ad features Trump making provocative statements about possibly using nuclear weapons, as well as national security officials like former National Security Agency and CIA Director Michael Hayden warning about the dangers of having Trump in office. "Bomb the s---t out of them," we hear Trump saying at the end of the ad.

For those who don't remember, the "Daisy" ad was considered to be one of the most powerful television spots ever made.

President Lyndon Johnson was running for re-election against Republican Sen. Barry Goldwater. A major theme of the Johnson campaign was that Goldwater was too much of an extremist to be president.

Johnson also cited statements that Goldwater made about his willingness to use low-level nuclear weapons in Vietnam to warn voters that he would bring the country into a nuclear war. Johnson and the Democrats depicted Goldwater as unstable and unpredictable.

With Democrats worried that there would be a backlash against Johnson's support for the Civil Rights Act of 1964 in the South, Johnson focused on stirring a "frontlash" that would persuade Republicans to switch parties because of the erratic nature of their candidate.

To make this point, the Daisy ad featured a little girl counting the petals off a flower, counting from 1 to 10 until her voice is interrupted by an official government voice, counting down from 10 to 1 until viewers see a mushroom cloud from a nuclear explosion in her eyeball.

"These are the stakes --- to make a world in which all of God's children can live, or to go into the dark. We must either love each other, or we must die," viewers heard Johnson say in a voice-over. Another male voice then says, "Vote for President Johnson on November 3. The stakes are too high for you to stay home."

Republicans complained the ad hit below the belt. It was dirty politics. The ad, said Arizona Sen. John Rhodes, showed Democrats were "callously playing on the fears of the American people by deliberately trying to picture Sen. Barry Goldwater as a man who would get this country into nuclear war." Democrats pulled the ad, but just playing it once did the trick. The media covered the ad, discussed the ad, and the message that Goldwater was dangerous got through. The ad "hung the nuclear noose around Goldwater and finished him off," noted presidential speechwriter and adviser Bill Moyers.

Johnson enjoyed a landslide victory in 1964 in one of the most consequential elections in American history. With over 61% of the popular vote, Johnson won 486 Electoral College votes to Goldwater's 52, while Democrats came out of the election with 295 seats in the House and 68 seats in the Senate. The conservative coalition of Southern Democrats and Midwestern Republicans that had held up civil rights, Medicare and every other progressive bill diminished in power as a result of the election as liberal Democrats flourished.

Birth of the 'Great Society'

After the election, Johnson was able to work with a Congress that was willing to pass a massive legislative agenda that included Medicare and Medicaid, federal assistance to higher, secondary and elementary education, voting rights, **immigration** reform and much more. The election allowed for the passage of the Great Society.

Yet it is unlikely this election will have the same effect as 1964. Although there were a few days when some experts were talking about the possibility of a landslide victory for the Democrats, the polls suggest the race remains pretty tight. Some statisticians expect that even if he loses, Trump's floor could be about 40% and Republicans are very likely to keep at least one chamber of Congress. Given today's partisan environment, the result will be a mess. It is already clear that if Clinton is in the White House and Republicans control at least one chamber of Congress, there will be a blitz of investigations that could make Bill Clinton's experience seem like kids play.

With the new Daisy ad in the air, it's worth considering what makes these campaigns so different. Why is it so much more difficult to achieve the kind of landslide that we saw in 1964? The most important factor is that the electorate is just much more polarized today than it was in 1964.

Over the past couple of decades, as Princeton's Sam Wang (who is my co-host for "Politics & Polls") pointed out in The New York Times, there are fewer voters who are willing to switch parties. Voters are unwilling to vote for the opposition regardless of how much they dislike the person at the top of their own ticket. There are a number of reasons this has happened, from the demographic sorting of voters to the impact of our campaign finance system, but the results are clear. More and more Americans live in distinct partisan worlds and are unwilling to venture into new territory.

Johnson and Democratic congressional candidates were able to cut significantly into Republican support in states like Illinois. In Kansas, Johnson won with 54.1% of the vote, the first time the state had not gone to a Republican since 1936. Goldwater was able to win support in what was then the heavily Democratic Deep South, but we are unlikely to see those kinds of shifts today.

Trump is no Goldwater

The fact that the electorate is so polarized has created space for a candidate like Donald Trump, despite his outlandish behavior and often extreme rhetoric on issues like **immigration**, to survive, indeed to thrive. Republicans are so loyal to their party that there is greater willingness to tolerate someone who seems like such an outlier. The recent email controversy with FBI Director James Comey's letter is likely to cement Republican antipathy toward the Democratic candidate and energize conservative voters to stay firm in their opposition to her.

While Goldwater was actually too far to the right for his party in 1964, the Republican Party has changed dramatically since. Trump's views on **immigration**, for instance, are rooted in forces that have pushed the party toward more hard-line positions since the 1990s.

Nor is Hillary Clinton like Lyndon Johnson. In early 1964, Johnson was an extremely popular president (with approval ratings reaching nearly 79%) who had taken over after the tragic assassination of John F. Kennedy. Johnson made clear his unabashed commitment to many signature liberal causes, such as health care for the elderly, voting rights, federal assistance to education, a war on poverty and much more.

Johnson also ran his campaign at a moment when liberal grassroots activism, led by the civil rights movement and organized labor, generated enthusiasm and support for the Democratic ticket. They also quelled doubts that existed about the Texas-born president's true commitment to civil rights.

Today, Clinton does not enjoy that kind of standing even with her own supporters. She has suffered from very low approval ratings. Clinton has been reluctant to move out front on many key issues and has a record of trying to find the perfect center on key questions like trade and race relations, leading to doubts among many liberal activists. Centrist voters tend to have a weaker understanding of Clinton's stance on the issues. Many will vote for her, but much of that support is based on her experience rather than vision, and much of it is based on the fact that she is not Trump.

Moreover, Clinton has been the victim of sexism that Johnson never faced. There is ample evidence of how she has had to undergo all sorts of treatment in the campaign, mostly raised by Trump, about her "stamina" and her physical looks that Johnson never had to deal with.

What's Trump stand for?

Finally, there is Trump's own political brand. After the 1964 election, Johnson was able to characterize the vote as a defeat for right-wing conservatism. Goldwater was part of a growing body of conservative Republicans who believed their party had to stand for principles and that political risks were worth taking to move forward with the conservative agenda.

When the election ended, many observers naturally believed liberalism had defeated conservatism. Many Republicans bolted from Goldwater's legacy and were willing to work with Democrats to appear more centrist.

But does Trump really stand for anything? The campaign has been so eclectic and devoid of specific positions, and there are so many doubts that he really believes what he is saying, that Clinton would have more trouble defining his defeat as a vote against conservatism -- or indeed any kind of political vision. A Trump defeat would be seen as a defeat of Trump rather than of any set of principles (other, of course, than his hard-line views on **immigration** and Muslims).

So for all these reasons the new Daisy ad is playing in a very different political environment than the one in which Johnson defeated Goldwater. When the dust settles from this contentious and bitter election, we are much more likely to find the nation in a period of even greater gridlock and discord than we've seen in the past eight years.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ALBUQUERQUE, New Mexico (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Sunday warned his supporters in this border state that Hillary Clinton "wants to let people just pour in," saying without evidence that hundreds of millions of people could enter the US under a Clinton presidency.

And speaking just nine days before Election Day, the Republican nominee also bemoaned criticism of waterboarding and appeared to once again call for bringing back the since-banned technique for use in the fight against ISIS.

"These savages are chopping off heads, drowning people. This is medieval times and then we can't do waterboarding? 'It's far too tough,'" Trump said, mocking critics of the technique used by the CIA in interrogations of terror suspects under President George W. Bush's post-9/11 administration.

Trump has previously called for reinstating waterboarding and "much worse" methods of torture if he becomes president.

"We have to be tough and we have to be smart. And we have to be in some cases pretty vicious I have to tell you," he added.

The Republican nominee also issued a dire -- and baseless -- warning to Americans that a Clinton administration could usher a flood of hundreds of millions of people crossing into the US.

"You could have 650 million people pour in and we'd do nothing about it. Think of it. That's what could happen. You triple the size of our country in one week. Once you lose control of your borders you just have no country folks, you have no country," Trump said, speaking in this Democrat-leaning border state.

Trump also stoked fears about undocumented **immigrant** crime, warning that continued illegal **immigration** would result "in the loss of American lives," even though undocumented **immigrants** do not commit crimes at a higher rate than legal US residents.

Trump's stop here came a day before Trump stumps in Michigan, also a state likely to swing in Clinton's favor, as the Republican nominee and his campaign are hoping to make late gains to help secure the 270 electoral votes Trump needs to secure the presidency. Trump's stops in these blue-leaning states also helps bolster the campaign's message that Trump's candidacy is on the rise and that the campaign is going on the offensive the final slog to Election Day.

EDITOR'S NOTE: The headline in this story has been updated.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SAN ANTONIO (CNN) -- One of the clearest indications of the weakness of Donald Trump's candidacy is how far he has lagged behind past Republican nominees in red states. There is Arizona, where Hillary Clinton is currently making a real play, as well as Utah -- where Mormons have reacted with revulsion to his campaign.

Perhaps most striking is the close race in reliably red Texas, where no Democrat has won the presidential race since 1976.

Democrats have long eyed the staunchly conservative state with swiftly changing demographics as a future battleground. The fact that Clinton is only behind Trump by single digits here is stoking excitement that Texas could shift from a solid red state to a purple one much earlier than anyone thought. A University of Houston poll recently showed Trump with 41%, to Clinton's 38% in a four-way race.

But close observers of Texas politics say they are all but certain that Trump will ultimately win the state's 38 electoral votes on November 8. And they question whether the race is close because voters are tilting leftward, or simply reacting to Trump.

Many voters here point out that they live among **immigrants**, and embrace that aspect of America's culture, while understanding the complexity of **immigration** policy. Trump's rhetoric has turned off voters of many different races and nationalities. That is a major reason why he is trailing so far behind Clinton in states like Colorado; why states like Arizona look competitive; and why Trump's path to 270 electoral votes has narrowed so dramatically.

But there has been no real push by the Clinton campaign to capture Texas, and no major mobilization of Democratic voters on the ground.

"I think this is the year Texas could have gone blue," said Matt Angle, director of the Lone Star Project, a political action committee aligned with Democrats. "But you don't win a state like Texas unless there's a real, aggressive and engaged campaign to win it."

Still, many here believe Clinton could draw a greater share of the vote than even Obama did in 2008, when he won nearly 44% of the vote to Republican nominee John McCain's 55.5%.

Looking to appear on offense, the Clinton campaign placed a six-figure ad buy in Texas this month highlighting the endorsement of her campaign by the Dallas Morning News -- the first time the paper backed a Democrat since 1940. But the low-dollar investment in an exorbitantly expensive state was largely a symbolic gesture.

A strong Clinton showing on Nov. 8 "could reinforce the argument that Texas doesn't have to wait for demographics," Angle said. "One of the biggest myths about Texas is that Democrats always get stomped on here." The reality, he said, "is just that we seldom have the resources to compete statewide."

Democrats who want to see the national party invest more heavily in this state are eager to see what the Trump effect will be in the 23rd Congressional District, a swing district stretching from the San Antonio suburbs to El Paso that is more than 70% Hispanic.

Freshman Rep. Will Hurd is in a fierce race to defend his seat against former congressman Pete Gallego. Democrats believe that reclaiming that district would show that if they put resources behind a strong Democratic candidate, they can win.

James Henson, director of the Texas Politics Project at the University of Texas at Austin, is wary of reading too much into this year's statewide poll numbers as signs of a seismic shift in Texas. In interviews here, many Republican voters said they simply loathed both Trump and Clinton -- and were particularly offended by Trump's rhetoric on **immigrants**.

"I would have voted Republican... Normally this is a Republican state, but Trump has pretty much said a lot of things to piss everybody off," said Jerry Carrasco, a 45-year-old independent from San Antonio, who voted for both George W. Bush and Barack Obama.

"He sounds racist to everybody. He has to realize that we're all **immigrants** -- I mean if you're not Native American -- you're not a true American. He forgot that," said Carrasco, whose family **immigrated** to Texas from Mexico in the 1800s. "If he's going to run for president, he needs to be more respectful. He sounds like an idiot at times."

Carrasco said he and his colleagues laugh about the sheer impossibility of Trump's proposal to build a wall: "I've worked out there in South Texas and it's difficult. It's very harsh terrain and the way the Rio Grande always floods, the soily roads. It's not going to happen."

"The border -- they're never going to stop that," Carrasco added. "They're going to be crossing no matter what. If you put a fence up they're just going to find a way to get around it."

The Trump effect could make the closeness in Texas a one-time phenomenon. Past efforts to increase the share of the Latino vote from 17% of the electorate have largely been unsuccessful, particularly those by the group known as Battleground Texas and the Wendy Davis gubernatorial campaign in 2014.

"As long as I have been following politics, Democrats have been saying 'We're going to go out, we're going to mobilize Hispanics this time, and we're going to take back the state,'" said Henson. "In fact it's gotten worse from the Democrats' perspective," he said, pointing out that there are currently no statewide Democratic officeholders. "So it's hard not to look at (this year's poll numbers) without a certain degree of skepticism."

Latinos backing Republicans

Latinos in Texas tend to be less liberal than in other parts of the country, and have comfortably voted for Republican candidates, including former Texas Gov. George W. Bush and current Gov. Greg Abbott. (In the 2014 midterm election, GOP Sen. John Cornyn won 48% of the Latino vote; while Abbott won 44% of the Latino vote, according to some exit polls).

There are fewer **immigrants** and more natural born citizens within the Texas Latino population than nationally. And there's a much higher rate of home ownership among Latinos in Texas than nationally, said Henson.

Those factors together make Texas Latinos more conservative than most people would assume based on voting trends in other parts of the country. "We know from survey research now over a few decades that the farther you get from the **immigrant** experience, the more your views shift in a more conservative direction," said Henson.

Census data shows that Latinos now make up 38.8% of the Texas population---which is the same percentage as Latinos in deep-blue California -- while African Americans make up 12.5% of the population.

Angle sees signs of hope for Democrats in those figures. He notes that Texas' Latino population has grown at 10 times the rate of the Anglo population, and the African American population is growing at five times as fast.

Hispanic non-voters in Texas tend to be younger and more liberal -- a potential trove of Democratic votes. But whether they turn out in force to oppose Trump remains to be seen, particularly when the most likely scenario is that Texas will stay in the Republican column.

John Kelly, a 68-year-old retired civil engineer who lives in the outskirts of San Antonio, said with Clinton and Trump at the top of the ticket, he is horrified by his choices.

He said he probably will reluctantly vote for Trump -- as well as Hurd in the congressional race. Kelly appreciates that Hurd is a "reasonable, rational Republican" who has kept the presidential nominee "at arms-length."

Trump's "brash comments have generally been pretty appalling," Kelly said. "He seems not well-informed on a lot of topics that a presidential candidate should be informed about --- too numerous to mention. There are a lot of issues that he has tended to shoot from the hip, rather than think through and understand the details."

Kelly said his best hope is that Trump will be willing to listen to his advisers.

"I've voted in every election since I was old enough to vote, and these are absolutely the worst choices we've ever had, for sure."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Starts new series

CALAIS, France (CNN) -- Aid groups raised serious concerns Thursday over the plight of unaccompanied children left without shelter overnight at a migrant camp in Calais that French authorities have declared closed.

Officials had processed and bussed at least 4,400 migrants out of Calais to other parts of the country as of Wednesday. They had vowed to resettle all of the migrants from the camp, known as "The Jungle," before nightfall so that bulldozers could raze the settlement.

But about 1,200 migrant children remained at the site, where fires blazed Wednesday, as they awaited processing.

"This really is the end of the Jungle ... Our mission is accomplished and it is now time for the migrants to start a new chapter as they begin a new life," Calais prefect Fabienne Buccio said Wednesday.

She had earlier vowed that the camp would shut down that night "no matter what."

But aid groups say many children were left with nowhere to go overnight.

Muhammad, a 16-year-old Egyptian migrant, told CNN he had slept rough because he wasn't registered by the authorities, a process that would have allowed him to sleep inside shipping containers at the site.

He said he had slept on the ground just in front of the containers, with some 20 to 30 other minors.

'Very worrying'

"The problem we have is the only people left here now are the unaccompanied children," said Clare Moseley, founder of the NGO Care4Calais, on Wednesday.

"Some of them have been processed and put back in the containers. Some of them did not get processed today and actually just got sent back to the camp, which is very worrying because we don't know where they're going to sleep tonight."

The minors are being interviewed by French and British authorities to determine if they should be rehomed in the UK, under an agreement offering refuge to children and vulnerable young people.

Dorothy Sang, a Save the Children representative at the Calais camp, said it was still not clear Thursday morning where those unaccompanied children who had not been registered were supposed to go.

Diggers are moving in, Sang said on Twitter, with nowhere safe for the children to take shelter.

A CNN team at The Jungle on Thursday morning also said serious demolition was underway, with three diggers visible alongside a dozen men in hard hats and orange jumpsuits.

However, police had secured the perimeter of the site, preventing the team from getting access to see who remained there.

Fires blaze through Calais camp

Migrants have long refused to leave the camp, which sits some 30 miles across the English Channel from Britain, one of the more desirable destinations for refugees in the region.

The UK government has committed to take unaccompanied children from The Jungle who have family ties in Britain, as well as considering the cases of other unaccompanied minors without family connections.

French officials said up to 7,000 people were living at the camp on Monday before evacuations began. However, NGOs told CNN the figure was closer to 10,000.

In a statement Wednesday, Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve said that 5,596 migrants in total had been taken elsewhere since the operation to dismantle the camp began, including 234 unaccompanied children sent to the United Kingdom.

On Wednesday, he said, 1,215 adults had left the camp on board 32 buses, bound for centers across 11 regions, while 133 children had been directed to provisional shelters.

Bouchart said her town had for too long been the victim of policy failures over **immigration** in Britain.

"The British government says it refuses to welcome migrants but we know they keep crossing the border and when they arrive, the British government lets them integrate into Britain, and it's hypocritical," she told CNN.

The UK Home Office denied this was the case, saying in a statement: "It is categorically wrong to suggest the UK does not remove illegal **immigrants** -- we have removed more than 41,000 in the last year alone and introduced measures to make it harder than ever for illegal **immigrants** to live and work in Britain."

CNN's Camille Verdier, Sebastian Shukla, Simon Cullen and Max Blau contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CHARLOTTE, North Carolina (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Wednesday pitched African-American voters on a "new deal for black America," painting an excessively bleak and broad-brushed picture of the lives of African-Americans before ticking down a list of policy proposals.

The Republican presidential nominee, once again drawing no distinction between African-Americans living in poverty and the majority of African-Americans who do not, listed a series of largely economic proposals that he claimed would bring economic opportunity to inner cities. After meeting with a group of African-American community leaders, Trump delivered his speech in a church before a mostly white audience.

Trump's plans for what he called "urban renewal" include expanding opportunities for cities and states to seek a federal disaster designation -- typically reserved for natural disasters -- to provide for an injection of federal funds "to initiate the rebuilding of vital infrastructure, the demolition of abandoned properties and increased presence of law enforcement."

He also proposed "tax holidays" to spur inner city investment and a tax break for foreign companies that relocate to "blighted neighborhoods." And he called for a "21st century Glass Steagall," though he did not specify what that would look like beyond a reform to the banking law that would prioritize helping African-American owned businesses get loans.

The real estate mogul, speaking in this key battleground state whose residents are 22% black, also proposed allowing those on welfare to convert that government assistance into microloans, a form of financing typically reserve for impoverished entrepreneurs.

Trump also touted his goal of making African-American communities "safe again" -- with no details on how to do so -- and described black communities as riddled with crime, falsely claiming that murders are at their highest rate in 45 years. This year has seen the biggest one-year increase in murders in that period, but the murder rate still remains dramatically lower than in previous decades.

"I mean you walk to the store to buy a loaf of bread, maybe with your child, and you get shot, your child gets shot," Trump said.

He also touted his hardline stance on **immigration** and argued that illegal **immigration** "violates the civil rights of African-Americans."

"No group has been more economically harmed by decades of illegal **immigration** than low income African-American workers," he said.

Trump also spent some of his time mocking Hillary Clinton, his Democratic rival who enjoys more than 90% support among black voters.

As one man in the audience shouted that Clinton was "useless," Trump laughed, saying: "I'm not allowed to say it, but I'll accept it."

He also quipped that Clinton "has less energy than Jeb Bush" as he knocked her less aggressive campaign travel schedule.

Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway, who sat in the audience for most of Trump's speech, turned toward this reporter and mouthed "I like that," with a smile.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update12:28 p.m. ET. Writes through, tweaks highlight

(CNN) -- A federal judge on Tuesday ordered Arizona Sheriff Joe Arpaio to be tried on a criminal contempt charge, accusing him of disobeying a court order in a racial profiling case.

U.S. District Judge Susan Bolton's order comes after US District Judge G. Murray Snow asked the U.S. Attorney's Office to file the criminal contempt charges against Arpaio, who bills himself as "America's Toughest Sheriff," and several subordinates.

Snow in May found Arpaio and three members of his office to be in civil contempt because they allegedly violated court orders intended to keep the Maricopa County Sheriff's Office from racially profiling Latinos. Snow wrote in August that continued failure to follow the court's directions, along with false statements and attempts to obstruct further inquiry, now justified filing criminal contempt charges.

Bolton ordered Arpaio's trial for December 6 in Phoenix, court papers said. Arpaio could face fines and even jail time, if convicted.

His attorney didn't immediately return a telephone call or email seeking comment Tuesday night.

The criminal contempt charge stems from a 2007 lawsuit brought by Hispanics, who claim Arpaio had discriminated against them.

Among the plaintiffs was Manuel Ortega Melendres, a visitor to Arizona who possessed a valid visa. In 2007, he was arrested after the car he was riding in was pulled over by Maricopa County deputies. The lawsuit alleged that the sheriff's office "unlawfully instituted a pattern and practice of targeting Latino's drivers and passengers in Maricopa county during traffic stops," the ACLU said in a statement.

A federal investigation of the sheriff's office later found that it engaged in discriminatory policing and jail practices. The sheriff's office was notified of the formal federal investigation in March 2009 and for 18 months "consistently refused to cooperate" with it, the Justice Department said.

As a result, in September 2010, the federal government sued Maricopa County under Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

During the investigation, the Justice Department found that deputies "engaged in a widespread pattern or practice of law enforcement and jail activities that discriminated against Latinos," according to a December 2011 letter of finding by the department.

In May of 2013, Snow ruled that Maricopa County's handling of people of Latino descent was not thorough enforcement of **immigration** laws -- but instead amounted to racial and ethnic profiling.

On Wednesday, Bolton wrote that Snow in 2011 had prohibited Arpaio and sheriff's office "from enforcing federal civil **immigration** law or from detaining persons they believed to be in the country without authorization but against whom they had no state charges."

But the sheriff's office "continued to stop and detain persons based on factors including their race, and frequently delivered such persons to (U.S. **Immigration**and Customs Enforcement) when there were no state charges to bring against them," Bolton wrote.

Arpaio's hard stance on **immigration** and his aggressive roundup of undocumented **immigrants** has garnered him national attention, and a conservative following. In 1993, he established an outdoor prison consisting of tents, saying it saved the taxpayers money despite criticism that the conditions were inhumane.

A staunch supporter of GOP presidential nominee Donald Trump, Arpaio has insisted that President Barack Obama is not a US citizen and that his birth certificate is fraudulent. Arpaio said last month he wasn't abandoning his 'birther' investigation even though Trump said he now believed the President Obama was born in the United States.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**COCONUT CREEK, Florida (CNN) -- Hillary Clinton accused Donald Trump on Tuesday of seeking to dismantle American democracy, casting her opponent as a threat to the political system in a dire closing message for the 2016 presidential campaign.

Speaking at a campaign rally here, Clinton kicked off the final two weeks of the election with a plea to voters to help her stop Trump from reaching the White House. Stringing together the Republican nominee's many offensive and controversial remarks from this campaign, Clinton warned that the outcome of November 8 would determine whether the democratic values this country is founded upon can continue to flourish.

"There is a reason why America is the greatest and longest-lasting democracy the world has ever known -- because we believe that no matter what you look like, where your parents were born and who you love, you have the right to be treated equally and fairly," Clinton said. "And Donald Trump is attacking everything that has set our country apart for 240 years."

She added: "After spending his entire campaign attacking one group of Americans after another -- **immigrants**, African-Americans, Latinos, women, POWs, Muslims, people with disabilities -- now his final target is democracy itself."

Clinton's Exhibit A in casting Trump as an obstacle to the founding principles of this country was the businessman's refusal to say he would accept the outcome of the election. As his poll numbers have fallen, Trump has increasingly doubled down on his assessment that the election is "rigged." In the final debate of the general election, Trump -- pressed on whether he will concede if he loses on November 8 -- responded: "I will keep you in suspense."

Clinton on Tuesday once again slammed those remarks as "horrifying."

"We have free and fair elections and the peaceful transfer of power -- that is one thing that makes America great," Clinton said.

Clinton's urgent message once again highlighted a challenge Clinton has confronted throughout the general election -- her struggle to deliver an affirmative message in her own terms, separate from her attacks on her opponent.

In the final weeks of the election, the Clinton campaign has been focused on get-out-the-vote and early voting efforts aimed at capitalizing on Trump's recent struggles.

Clinton's spokeswoman, Jennifer Palmieri, said Tuesday that a part of the reason they will spend the next two days in Florida is because their internal numbers show higher than normal amount of early voting in the state.

"A big priority for us this week is states where people are voting in big numbers right now," she said. "You'll see us spending a lot of time in North Carolina and Florida this week that is because people are voting in big numbers."

In a memo, Clinton's campaign said over 133,000 Latino voters have already cast ballots -- a 99% increase from the same point in 2012, and that Florida women are participating in this election at a higher rate than men, with 56% of ballots returned came from women and just 44% from men.

As Trump has struggled to regain his footing after fighting back a swirl of controversies for weeks, Clinton has also been more forceful in speaking on behalf of down ballot candidates, heralding Democratic Senate candidates in North Carolina, Ohio and Pennsylvania during her trips to each state.

Clinton did the same on Tuesday in Florida, touting Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy, who is looking to unseat Sen. Marco Rubio, as "exactly that kind of senator Florida needs and deserves."

Clinton did not mention Rubio by name, but repeatedly slammed the senator -- particularly for his support for Trump. (Rubio ran against Trump in the primaries and in recent weeks refused to disavow Trump after a tape surfaced in which Trump described making unwanted advanced on women.)

"Unlike his opponent, Patrick Murphy has never been afraid to stand up to Donald Trump," Clinton said, arguing that Florida deserves a senator who will support **immigration** reform and education spending and fight to end climate change.

"You deserve a senator who would never say that Social Security and Medicare have, and this is a quote, 'weakened us as a people,'" Clinton said, quoting Rubio.

When the audience booed, Clinton cribbed a line from President Barack Obama and said: "That is exactly the right response. But don't boo, vote, right?"

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: John D. Sutter is a columnist for CNN Opinion who focuses on climate change and social justice. Follow him on Snapchat, Facebook and email. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

COPENHAGEN, Denmark (CNN) -- Denmark is obsessed with an American reality TV star.

And no, it's not Donald Trump.

It's Rufus Gifford -- or "Rufus," as everyone here seems to know him.

Gifford is the US ambassador to this little near-utopic nation, which is consistently ranked as one of happiest, best-educated and greenest places on Earth. The 40-something diplomat has found himself the unlikely star of a Danish reality TV show called "I Am the Ambassador."

Gifford's dog, Argos, and husband, Stephen, are fixtures of the six-episode program, which entirely lacks the drama of "Keeping Up With the Kardashians" or the wine-glass-throwing of "The Real Housewives" series. For proof, look no further than the first episode's description, which says, "The embassy hosts a barbecue for the ambassador's birthday, and Rufus and Stephen throw a party. Rufus and the Danish defense minister talk terrorism." You might think that last sentence -- and "terrorism" -- means there's going to be some tension in the episode, some looming threat. You'd be wrong. There's basically no drama here, no plot twist, no ex-boyfriend coming to sabotage the couple's marriage, no slurry, vendetta-carrying party crashers.

And that's exactly what Danes like about it.

"He walks in the gay pride parade. He runs the Copenhagen half-marathon. He's very open," said Lykke Leonardsen, who works on climate issues for the city of Copenhagen.

"He's very American in the most positive way."

At a time when another reality show veteran, Donald Trump, is clawing for the US presidency, Gifford, a former Obama fund-raiser, represents the America that Europeans want to believe still exists. There are no fiery, cantankerous speeches on the show, much less "rigged election" conspiracies or allegations of sexual assault. There's no gotta-see-what-happens-next aspect to Gifford's persona. Gifford is the inoffensive, big-smiling, gay, golden-retriever-walking anti-Trump.

Sadly, he's exactly the kind of public figure who wouldn't interest Americans much these days.

Assuming the GOP nominee doesn't get elected, the Year of Trump is still sure to leave scars on America. Among them likely will be an insatiable appetite for scandal and drama in our politics.

Theater, not substance, has the spotlight this campaign season. Headlines focus on Hillary Clinton's emails and Trump's bragging about grabbing women's genitals -- on Paul Ryan's fidgeting and Clinton's smile. Debates are long on personal attacks and short on substance. Facts? They're starting to seem irrelevant to many.

It's almost trite to say: This is great for TV and bad for democracy.

Yet it wouldn't be great TV unless we didn't crave it on some level.

At the risk of sounding quaint and outdated, I think we Americans could learn a thing or two from Denmark's taste in public figures. Yes, there are wackos in Scandinavia, too, those who want to ban Muslims from entering the country and whose nationalism should scare anyone with more than 70 years' knowledge of world history. But, largely, they expect more civility from their politicians than we've come to. And their society -- which has far less income inequality and much higher levels of trust -- still functions as a cohesive unit. America is tearing at the seams. It's not all Trump's fault, surely, but the vitriol he encourages has made it difficult for Americans on the left and right -- urban and rural, Muslim and Christian, gay and straight, black and white, recent **immigrant** and multigenerational **immigrant** -- to see each other as equally human, to understand where the other is coming from even when there's real disagreement. Without that, what makes us a nation besides a pledge and a flag?

That Danes appreciate a candid, no-frills look into the life of an innocuous US ambassador is telling. They're capable of showing interest in people who aren't screaming for attention and trying to engineer their own plot twists. I hope that after the 2016 election has settled we Americans can say the same.

But like me, you may not finish the entire series. (It's on Netflix and iTunes.)

There's simply not enough tension to keep it moving.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**2:11 - removes reference to "she" for Blair Stapp

DENVER, Colorado (CNN) -- These days, Colorado is less of a battleground and more of a settling ground.

Strike up a conversation with one of the young people teeming around Denver and its suburbs and it's easy to find a story to back up the numbers: young and educated Americans following jobs or family members or in search of a progressive environment and quality of life have migrated to Colorado. They're here to stay and to vote.

Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has, for the most part, maintained a steady lead in the polls. Her campaign hasn't aired TV ads in Colorado markets since July, and instead diverted its funds to more competitive states.

The state's turn from red to purple and eventually, maybe blue, has been sudden by political and demographic standards. Colorado was squarely in the Republican column for decades, only awarding its electoral votes to Democrats twice between 1952 and 2004. The state was transformed into a hotly contested battleground when Barack Obama campaigned, and won, in 2008 and 2012.

But Clinton's strong performance here in polls has relegated Colorado to second-tier battleground status. If she wins here, it would mark the first time in a century that Democrats carried the state in three consecutive presidential years. Woodrow Wilson was president the last time it happened.

Analysts agree It's too early to talk of permanent political realignment. But Democrats hope Colorado is becoming the next "blue state," thanks in larger part to an influx of new residents.

"Population on the front range is exploding -- that's where you have more of a concentration of Democrats," said Lynn Bartels, a spokeswoman for the Colorado Secretary of State who covered state politics as a reporter for decades. "We have San Francisco-style rents here, almost. I walk by parts of the cities that used to be ghost towns and now there's lines of young people ready to party and go out."

Colorado has seen steady population growth this decade, and it was the second-fastest growing state last year, according to the US Census Bureau. Millennials, Latinos and people with college degrees are moving here in droves, and these are all Democratic-leaning groups. Their influence shows in the numbers: For the first time in 32 years, there are more registered Democrats than Republicans in the Centennial State.

Millennials moving in

Whether it's because of the mountains, the microbreweries or the legal marijuana, Colorado is an attractive place to live. Denver was ranked the best place to live earlier this year by US News and World Report. Colorado Springs wasn't far behind on the list.

Millennials, born in the 1980s and 1990s, are increasingly turning to Colorado to begin their professional careers. And these young Coloradans, many of them progressives, are engaged in the political process.

Turnout among Colorado residents ages 18 to 29 was about 14% higher than the national average for young voters in 2012, and about 13% higher in the 2014 midterms, according to information from CIRCLE, a non-partisan organization that researches youth engagement in politics.

This year, Sofia Mazo, 18, will be one of those young voters. She moved from Florida to Colorado earlier this year with her boyfriend so she could attend the University of Colorado Denver and he could pursue a career in health care. She says she's listening to Bernie Sanders' advice and voting for Clinton.

"I definitely feel like this is a place I could stay after graduation, mostly because I'm in love with Denver," Mazo said. "My favorite thing about Denver is not only the diversity of the people and the cultures, but also the geography. It can take me 30 minutes to get to the mountains, 20 minutes to get downtown."

Beyond the economic opportunities, other Millennials see Colorado as a welcoming environment.

Blair Stapp, 28, grew up in Huntsville, Alabama, but moved to Colorado four years ago to work in the sustainability industry. Stapp now works for New Era Colorado, a non-partisan group that promotes political engagement among young Americans. The group has registered 50,000 new voters this year.

"My job initially brought me out, and I then realized that Colorado is a much safer place for me to be LGBTQ," Stapp said, outside of a liquor store were organizers were registering new voters. "You have a lot of different perspectives, but everybody, or a lot of people, are focused on moving things forward really."

Colorado legalized civil unions for same-sex couples earlier than the rest of the country, Stapp added.

Driving up diversity

Colorado has the 8th largest Latino population in the United States, and it's growing too.

Hispanic voters comprised 13% of the Colorado electorate in the 2008 presidential election, and 14% of the electorate in the 2014 midterms, according to exit polls. The Pew Research Center recently estimated that about 15% of all eligible voters in Colorado are Latino.

For many Latino in the Centennial State, this election is important both up and down the ballot. Democrats have razor-thin majorities in the Colorado legislature, and they've passed **immigrant**-friendly legislation, like drivers' licenses for undocumented **immigrants**. But those chambers could always flip.

Angel Sanchez, 33, was born and raised in Arizona. But he moved to Longmont, Colorado, in 2010 amid the national uproar over SB 1070, what he called Arizona's "show me your papers" law.

"I got to see the climate get a little intense in terms of the treatment of **immigrants**," Sanchez said. "It wasn't a comfortable space for me to raise my daughter... she was five when I brought her here."

Sanchez spent his weekend canvassing voters in the Denver suburbs, but not everyone is as enthusiastic about this election. In a food market downtown, Hector Torres, 23, manned the register at a butcher shop. His parents were born in Mexico, he was born in the US and he wants Clinton to win, but says he's turned off by politics these days.

"It's like two children fighting with each other," Torres said. "It's the lesser of two evils kind of a thing."

Can Republicans turn it around?

The demographics favoring Democrats are strong, but not inevitable.

There is a winning formula, said veteran GOP strategist Dick Wadhams. He's managed many prominent races, including the 1998 campaign of Bill Owens, the first GOP governor elected in almost 30 years.

But after Owens' re-election in 2002, Republicans went on a 12-year drought without a statewide win. It wasn't until Cory Gardner unseated incumbent Sen. Mark Udall in the GOP midterm wave of 2014.

Gardner won the college-educated vote that year. Colorado has the highest percentage of white, college-educated voters in the country, according to the US Census Bureau. While they are generally supporting Clinton over Trump, this group has historically supported Republicans for president.

"I do think Colorado is still a swing state," said Wadhams, who is supporting Trump. "It matters who we nominate. Frankly, if we had nominated one of the other Republican candidates for president, I think they would be leading Hillary Clinton by five points or more right now in Colorado."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Teachers and students say the anti-**immigrant**, anti-Muslim rhetoric on display during this year's election campaign appears to have seeped into the classrooms, creating a new level of fear and anxiety among students of color.

At a middle school in Tukwila, Washington, one of the most diverse schools in America, students say they've seen a different kind of bullying arise this year.

A Muslim eighth-grader says other kids, including some who were her friends, have called her a terrorist. That's not something she's heard until this year.

An Hispanic student who was born in the U.S. says he's been told to "go back to the border" and "it's not right for you to be here."

"These are things that we hadn't been hearing before. Our population hasn't changed. So what seems to have changed, to me, is the political rhetoric," said Debbie Aldous, a teacher at the school.

There's always been bullying, but this new tone is something teachers across the country are seeing more recently.

More than two-thirds said they've seen an increase in anti-Muslim or anti-**immigrant** sentiment since the beginning of the presidential campaign, according to a survey conducted in March by the Southern Poverty Law Center.

The survey didn't ask about the rhetoric of specific candidates, but 1,000 comments received from respondents mentioned Trump. Fewer than 200 mentioned Hillary Clinton by name.

To be sure, these ideas and feelings pre-date Trump's campaign, during which he's spoken of deporting millions of **immigrants**, building a wall along Mexico's border, and banning Muslims from entering the country.

His candidacy has "made lots of people and their kids feel more free to express certain bigoted ideas," said Jonathan Zimmerman, a professor of the history of education at the University of Pennsylvania.

"But at the same time, I think it's dangerous to attribute this solely to Trump or to blame it only on his supporters," he said.

Even if teachers don't bring up the specifics of the campaign, kids are talking about these issues.

A majority of teachers who responded to the survey said their students have expressed concerns or fears about what might happen to them or their families after the election.

"I just feel weird inside. Scared with a mix of frustration and anger," said Jose Rios, whose parents are from Mexico.

He said he believes Trump will build a wall and move Mexicans away from America because every time he watches the news, there are a lot of people cheering Trump on.

"The people who agree with Trump, they don't know the feeling to hear 'go back where you came from,'" he said.

Shukri Diriye's parents are **immigrants** from Somalia who fled the civil war. She was born here in the U.S., but when she hears other students call her a terrorist, it sometimes makes her question whether she does deserve to live in this country.

"If Somalia never had a civil war, I wish I could have just stayed there with people that look like me, so I wouldn't be the different person," she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton leads Donald Trump by 5 points as the presidential campaign heads into its final two weeks, with the Democratic nominee's support just shy of the 50% mark, according to a new CNN/ORC poll.

Among likely voters, Clinton tops Trump 49% to 44%, with just 3% backing Libertarian Gary Johnson and 2% behind Green Party nominee Jill Stein.

With all three presidential debates now in the rear view mirror, both candidates appear to have consolidated some support among their core supporters. Clinton has expanded her edge among younger voters and non-whites, while Trump has boosted his support among the whites without college degrees who make up the majority of his supporters.

Clinton now stands at 53% among voters under age 45, compared with 47% in the previous CNN/ORC poll. In fact, the only age group where Clinton currently trails Trump is among those age 50-64, who back Trump by 4 points in this poll.

Clinton's support has also ticked up a few points among non-whites (72% back her now vs. 69% in a poll conducted just after the first debate, not a large enough change to be significant, but edges her margin over Trump among this group above 50 points).

Trump has gained a bit among white voters, edging up to 54% in the new poll from 49% support in the last poll. That gain is centered largely among white non-college voters, who break for Trump by a 62% to 32% margin, while white college grads continue to lean in Clinton's direction, favoring the former secretary of state by 11 points.

The gender gap remains large, with Clinton holding a wide 12-point lead among women, topping Trump 53% to 41% among that group, while Trump edges Clinton by a narrow 3-points among men, 48% to 45%.

Another notable shift since the last CNN/ORC poll is the steep drop in support for Johnson, who falls from 7% to 3% overall. Support at that level is more in line with the numbers generated by typical third-party candidates who don't make much of a mark on Election Day itself, well off his flirtation with double-digit support through the summer and early fall.

Taking the third-party candidates out of the mix, Clinton's margin widens by a point in two-way matchup between the Democrat and the Republican, to 51% to 45%.

Clinton's supporters are increasingly apt to say that their votes for her are to express support for Clinton rather than opposition to Trump (69% say so now vs. 60% in the last CNN/ORC poll), while Trump's supporters are holding steady on this metric (59% say their votes are about expressing support for Trump now, exactly the same as in the last CNN/ORC poll).

The most promising finding in the poll for Trump is his continued edge as more trusted to handle the economy. Overall, 51% favor Trump on that vs. 47% who prefer Clinton, a shift in Trump's favor compared with a 2-point edge for Trump in the last poll.

Clinton tops Trump on every other issue tested this way in the poll, including terrorism (Clinton +2), **immigration** (Clinton +3), nominating justices to the Supreme Court (+5) and foreign policy (+21). But the economy continues to be voters' top issue, 91% call it extremely or very important.

Despite Trump's edge on the economy, the businessman trails Clinton on a related issue of empathy, with 49% saying they feel Clinton would "stand up for people like you" compared with 44% who think Trump would be better on that score.

While majorities of both candidates' supporters agree that the economy is a critical issue in determining their vote for president, there are wide gaps between Trump backers and Clinton supporters on whether several other issues are important.

Trump backers are almost twice as likely as Clinton backers to consider illegal **immigration** a critical issue to their vote (52% among Trump supporters vs. 23% among Clinton backers), and are more apt to see terrorism (66% to 49%), Supreme Court nominations (58% to 46%), taxes (46% to 34%) and trade with other countries (40% to 29%) as extremely important than are Clinton supporters. Those voters backing Clinton are nearly four times as likely as Trump supporters to consider climate change a key issue (46% to 12%), and they are also more apt to prioritize health care (53% to 48%) and education (55% to 42%).

More broadly, Clinton is more often seen as having a clear vision for the country's future (49% to 42%), perhaps connected to a perception that she did a better job in the debates (61% to 29%).

Clinton also holds wide leads on having the better temperament to serve effectively as president (61% to 32%), being better able to handle the responsibilities of commander in chief (55% to 40%), and as a person you admire (42% Clinton to 29% Trump, though nearly 3-in-10, 28%, say they feel neither is a person they admire). The two are almost even on who is the stronger and more decisive leader, 48% say Clinton, 46% Trump.

The poll also shows Clinton narrowing the gap on honesty and trustworthiness, an issue where she trailed Trump by nearly 20 points among likely voters in early September. Now, 43% see Trump as more honest and trustworthy, 42% Clinton, a statistically insignificant gap. Still, 14% of likely voters say they see neither candidate as honest, a share that has held steady over that time.

Both continue to hold favorability ratings that tilt negative, with 52% holding an unfavorable view of Clinton and 57% a negative impression of Trump. About 6-in-10 likely voters say that recent controversies around each candidate raise questions about their character and ability to serve as president, with 62% saying that the way Clinton handled her email while serving as secretary of state raises those issues, while 59% say the same about the way Trump treats women.

The CNN/ORC Poll was conducted by telephone October 20-23 among a random national sample of 1,017 adults, including 779 who were determined to be likely voters. The margin of sampling error for results among the sample of likely voters is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Just four years ago, Donald Trump took a drastically different position on what is now his central issue: deporting undocumented **immigrants** in the United States.

Since he announced his candidacy last June, Trump has promised to build a wall on the US border with Mexico and at various times said he would, as president, deport all or many of the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the country. However, in an June 2012 interview with CNBC's Squawk Box reviewed by CNN's KFile, Trump said he didn't believe in deporting undocumented **immigrants** who, he said, "had done a great job."

Asked about his views on **immigrant** labor, Trump said, "You know my views on it and I'm not necessarily, I think I'm probably down the middle on that also. Because 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, Michelle, and you understand that. I don't believe in a lot things that are being said."

Trump comments came in the context of a discussion of the Supreme Court's decision a day before on the state of Arizona's tough **immigration** law. Trump said "both sides lost" in the ruling, which struck down key parts of the law but upheld a part of the law allowing law enforcement to check the **immigration**status of a person when enforcing other laws.

A Trump campaign spokesperson did not return a request for comment.

Trump kicked off his campaign in June 2015 by calling some of the undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico "rapists."

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best," Trump 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."

In a speech in September laying out his **immigration** plan, Trump reaffirmed his commitment to building a wall on the US southern border and deporting undocumented **immigrants** with a criminal background. Trump did not specify in his speech what he would do with those that remain in the country, but did say undocumented **immigrants** seeking legal status would have to first leave the country.

"For those here today illegally who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system," Trump said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**3:48 pm: Adds Reynolds 2:20 pm: Writes thru 1:46 pm: New dateline 1:27 pm: Adds hiring freeze 1:16 pm: Adds details on policies 1:05 pm: Updates with speech

GETTYSBURG, Pennsylvania (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Saturday offered what his senior campaign aides billed as his "closing argument" in the presidential race just 17 days from its conclusion, rehashing his campaign's key policy planks to give voters a sense of his top priorities as president.

Trump began his remarks here near the site of President Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" by urging the country to follow Lincoln's example to "heal the divisions" the US now faces. But he quickly slipped into his combative rhetoric, slamming a "totally rigged" system and raging against establishment politicians and the media for seeking to sink his campaign.

He slammed Hillary Clinton as an insider politician and accused her of "running against change" and "all of the American people.

"Hillary Clinton is not running against me, she's running against change. And she's running against all of the American people and all of the American voters," Trump said.

And before getting to what he would seek to accomplish in the first 100 days of his presidency -- which campaign aides said Friday evening would be the focus of his speech -- Trump went on to again attack women who have accused him of sexual assault or misconduct, saying, "every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign" and vowing to sue them after the election is over.

Finally, 15 minutes later, Trump pivoted to his plan for the first 100 days of his presidency should he be elected in terms of "measures," "actions" and legislative bills -- terms that gave his policies a more concrete and realistic flair.

"I am asking the American people to dream big once again. What follows is my 100-day action plan to make America great again," he finally said, calling it "a contract between Donald J. Trump and the American people."

Trump offered no new major policy announcements, instead mostly reiterating key plans of his presidential campaign and offering sparse new details.

He promised to propose a constitutional amendment to impose congressional term limits, vowed again to begin renegotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement of the 90s and announce his intention to withdraw from the Trans-Pacific Partnership and promised to take a tough approach to countries like China that he believes are abusing free trade laws.

He promised to cancel out every "unconstitutional executive action" enacted by President Barack Obama, cut federal funding to "sanctuary cities," begin deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the US and "suspend **immigration** from terror-prone regions where vetting cannot safely occur."

And that litany of proposals -- and several more -- is only what Trump vowed to accomplish on his first day in office, raising questions about the number of executive orders he would need to sign in order to uphold his promises.

Trump said his priorities would be to tackle corruption in Washington, protect American workers through protectionist trade measures and prevent illegal **immigration** and terrorism. He proposed up to 10 bills addressing those issues that he said he would work to pass in this first 100 days in office.

As he laid out a bill to "end illegal **immigration**," Trump offered up new details on how he would look to disincentive undocumented **immigrants** from crossing into the US, calling for a two-year mandatory minimum federal prison sentence for those who illegally re-enter the US and a five-year minimum sentence for those with prior felony convictions, multiple misdemeanors or two or more previous deportations.

Currently, there is no mandatory minimum sentence, but undocumented **immigrants** who seek to re-enter the US can face up to two years in prison and those with felonies can face up to 10 years in prison.

Trump also called for a hiring freeze on all federal employees -- except military and public health and safety officials -- as part of his "six measures to clean up the corruption and special interest collusion in Washington," though he did not say how long the freeze would last. The Republican nominee has also previously called for a freeze on new federal regulations and repeated Saturday that he would require federal agencies eliminate two federal regulations for every new one.

'A time of division'

While Trump opened his remarks by recognizing a former Republican president Lincoln's leadership "at a time of division like we've never seen before," Trump quickly abandoned that hopeful tone in favor of blistering attacks on the media and establishment politicians in Washington, and once again cast doubt on the US democratic system by arguing that there could be rampant voter fraud on Election Day, despite evidence to the contrary.

Trump accused the FBI and Department of Justice of having "covered up" Clinton's "crimes" given the Justice Department's decision not to pursue criminal charges after investigating Clinton's use of a private email server during her time as secretary of state.

Christina Reynolds, a Clinton campaign spokeswoman, said Trump's speech presented a "troubling view."

"Today, in what was billed as a major closing argument speech, Trump's major new policy was to promise political and legal retribution against the women who have accused him of groping them," Reynolds said in a statement. "Like Trump's campaign, this speech gave us a troubling view as to what a Trump State of the Union would sound like---rambling, unfocused, full of conspiracy theories and attacks on the media, and lacking in any real answers for American families."

Trump also accused the "dishonest mainstream media" of being "a major part of this corruption," accusing the press of fabricating stories to make him look "as bad and even as dangerous as possible," before complaining about the media's insufficient coverage of the crowd sizes at his rallies.

Trump took his complaints further, promising action to prevent AT&T from buying Time Warner, the parent company of CNN, which he argued would concentrate too much power in one company. And he also slammed Comcast's purchase of NBC.

"We'll look at breaking that deal up and other deals like it," he vowed. "They're trying to poison the mind of the American voter."

As he sought to draw a heavy contrast with Clinton, who is leading Trump in most recent national and battleground state polls just over two weeks from the election, the Republican nominee urge voters to "dream big once again" and take a chance on his unconventional -- and controversial -- candidacy.

"I'm asking the American people to rise above the noise and the clutter of our broken politics and to embrace that great faith and optimism that has always been that central ingredient in the American character," he said.

CNN's Daniella Diaz contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**1:46 pm: New dateline 1:27 pm: Adds hiring freeze 1:16 pm: Adds details on policies 1:05 pm: Updates with speech

GETTYSBURG, Pennsylvania (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Saturday offered what his senior campaign aides billed as his "closing argument" in the presidential race, rehashing his campaign's key policy planks to give voters a sense of his top priorities as president.

Trump began his remarks here near the site of President Abraham Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address" by urging the country to follow Lincoln's example to "heal the divisions" the US now faces. But he quickly slipped into his combative rhetoric, slamming a "totally rigged" system and raging against establishment politicians and the media for seeking to sink his campaign.

And before getting to what he would seek to accomplish in the first 100 days of his presidency -- which campaign aides said Friday evening would be the focus of his speech -- Trump went on to again attack women who have accused him of sexual assault or misconduct, saying, "every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign" and vowing to sue them after the election is over.

Finally, 15 minutes later, Trump pivoted to his plan for the first 100 days of his presidency should he be elected in terms of "measures," "actions" and legislative bills.

"I am asking the American people to dream big once again. What follows is my 100-day action plan to make America great again," he finally said.

Trump offered no new major policy announcements, instead mostly reiterating key plans of his presidential campaign and offering sparse new details.

Trump said his priorities would be to tackle corruption in Washington, protect American workers through protectionist trade measures and prevent illegal **immigration** and terrorism. He proposed up to 10 bills addressing those issues that he said he would work to pass in this first 100 days in office.

As he laid out a bill to "end illegal **immigration**," Trump offered up new details on how he would look to disincentive undocumented **immigrants** from crossing into the US, calling for a two-year mandatory minimum federal prison sentence for those who illegally re-enter the US and a five-year minimum sentence for those with prior felony convictions, multiple misdemeanors or two or more previous deportations.

Currently, there is no mandatory minimum sentence, but undocumented **immigrants** who seek to re-enter the US can face up to two years in prison and those with felonies can face up to 10 years in prison.

Trump also called for a hiring freeze on all federal employees -- except military and public health and safety officials -- as part of his "six measures to clean up the corruption and special interest collusion in Washington," though he did not say how long the freeze would last. The Republican nominee has also previously called for a freeze on new federal regulations and repeated Saturday that he would require federal agencies eliminate two federal regulations for every new one.

Trump also slammed his Democratic rival Hillary Clinton and sought to contrast his outsider candidacy with hers.

"Hillary Clinton is not running against me, she's running against change," Trump said.

CNN's Daniella Diaz contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Amr Arafa can't help but feel nervous.

He'd been working on this project for months, with one simple goal in mind: to change how we treat the world's most vulnerable people.

He truly believes it can impact thousands of lives.

And it officially launched today.

It's called EmergencyBNB, a website designed to help domestic violence victims and refugees find temporary shelter. Think of it as an Airbnb with a noble purpose.

It works the same way.

Users can use their phone or computer, enter a zip code and find a host who's willing to house them in their apartment or home. The difference is, no money changes hands.

It's meant for those who are in the midst of, say, an asylum hearing or want to get away from an abusive relationship.

"Helping others is a human instinct and when you see something that really affects you, you want to do something about it," Arafa told CNN.

A germ of an idea

Arafa is a 34-year-old Egyptian **immigrant** who lives in Washington DC, and runs a consulting company.

He was inspired to create EmergencyBNB after watching a video of Syrian refugees running for the Hungarian border only to find police had formed a human barricade to stop them.

It bothered him, and it gave rise to a germ of an idea.

"Let's build a site that makes us a more solid society," he wrote in a LinkedIn post shortly afterward. "A site that changes how others see us, and how we see others. Let's call it: http://www.emergencybnb.com [http://www.emergencybnb.com]."

He started by offering up his Foggy Bottom apartment on AirBnB. A Syrian couple from Texas who needed to be in DC for a week for an asylum hearing took him up on it. So did a woman who was escaping an abusive situation.

He then decided to create a site for just such situations.

EmergencyBnB had a soft launch in August. Even as he worked out the kinks and tweaked it, he was overwhelmed by the response.

A safeguard in place

Already, 700 people in the US and abroad have listed their homes.

In order to prove you're a refugee or a domestic violence victim, you have to show some kind of documentation to the host: a refugee passport, a police report or a recent restraining order.

This safeguard's in place to make sure hosts aren't taken advantage of. During the early stages, Arafa says he had to deny more than a dozen users because it appeared they were lying.

A stable of hosts

Natalie Perdue, a host in Springfield, Virginia, admits she was apprehensive at the thought of letting a stranger sleep in her basement, while her husband and three kids slept on the second floor.

But her 14-year-old daughter helped change her mind. She'd come across articles about the refugee plight and wanted the family to help.

"At first it is uncomfortable signing up on the site," Perdue said ."But I'd rather not live my life playing it safe knowing that I could have done something to help - but chose not to."

Perdue encourages more people to list their homes and she believes hosts can benefit as much from the experience as the person they are hosting.

Maria Luque, another host, lives in an apartment in Washington DC with her husband. The couple are **immigrants**, who left Colombia for a better life.

"We have been blessed to find peace and stability in this country. We would be grateful to help others achieve the same," she said.

A small, consequential act

Like many others who have enlisted their homes on EmergencyBNB, Luque hopes this small act of opening up her home will help others do the same.

"I have to confess that it can be a little scary to host a stranger without any guarantees, but I'd rather feel a little afraid than completely powerless," she wrote.

That, in the end, is the idea of EmergencyBnB: An army of people who keep their homes and hearts open in case another person needs to walk through.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Life for thousands of migrants at the sprawling "Jungle" migrant camp is set to be thrown into disarray -- again -- as French authorities renew efforts to dismantle the site on Monday.

The camp in Northern France has long been used as a gateway for migrants attempting reach the United Kingdom.

This time, French authorities say it will no longer be an option.

Here's how we got here.

The 'Jungle'

Known as the "Jungle" the camp is a sprawling migrant settlement situated in the port town of Calais.

The controversial camp serves as base for migrants hoping to cross into England through the 50 kilometer (31 miles) undersea Channel Tunnel that connects the two countries.

A strong French police presence, reinforced by UK border officers and heavily manned wired fences, attempt to thwart migrants' journeys to Dover. Clashes with local authorities are a regular occurrence.

In September, the British government announced construction on a four meter (13 foot) high wall along the camp's approach. The £17 million ($23 million) deal was struck between the UK and France to stop the flow of illegal **immigration**.

A risky passage

Many migrants risk their lives either by stowing away on a truck or a Channel Tunnel train.

In 2015, Channel Tunnel operator Eurotunnel intercepted 37,000 migrants attempting to travel to the UK illegally.

Thirty-one people died while trying to reach British soil last year, many of them teenagers and young adults, according to the International Organization for Migration.

Harrowing reports of fatal journeys also made headlines, including the death of an African teenager who was struck by an oncoming train.

So far this year, 15 migrants attempting a similar journey have died.

The population is constantly changing

It is hard to pinpoint exactly how many people live there as the camp does not qualify for refugee camp status under international law.

As a result, the "Jungle" exists in a legal gray area, lacking the infrastructure and authority to provide an accurate census.

Migrants are constantly coming and going, making it hard for charities and local authorities on the ground to provide up-to-date figures.

However, earlier this week the French government said there were between 5,684 and 6,486 migrants living in the camp. Aid organizations on the ground say the population is closer to 10,000.

War, famine, and violence drive migrants to Calais

The majority of the migrants living in the "Jungle" come from Afghanistan, Eritrea and Sudan.

Migrants from war torn countries such as Iraq and Syria are also there, along with Somalians and other Africans seeking political asylum, as well as displaced Kurds and Palestinians.

Men make up the majority of Calais' inhabitants. Women only make up about 10% to 15% of the total population, and often live in separate areas.

A center has been created by French authorities to facilitate the migrant and refugees departure on Monday.

There will be four separate lines at the center to separate different groups: adults, minors, families and vulnerable people (pregnant women, the sick and the disabled).

Unaccompanied children are of serious concern

There are 1,291 isolated minors currently in the camp, according to French aid organization Terre D'Asile. Some have fallen victim to human traffickers, with many exposed to sexual abuse. Malnutrition and disease are commonplace.

The UK has started to accept a small number of "qualified" children under EU and UK law. French authorities said Friday that special provisions are to be made for unaccompanied minors.

In March, the British government said it would allow 3,000 unaccompanied child refugees into the country. But so far this year, only 80 have been accepted from France; the first arrived earlier this month.

This is not the first time the "Jungle" has been cleared

Although the population of the camp has swelled to its highest number in the past year, Calais has attracted thousands of refugees and asylum seekers for at least 17 years.

It was first closed in 2001, prompting a cycle of destruction and rebuilding between migrants and the authorities that have defined the camp ever since.

This March, the southern half of the camp was demolished. But by August, French authorities reported a 53% rise in the camp's population over the course of two months -- the biggest influx of migrants the "Jungle" has ever seen.

Why is it this new clearing happening?

Earlier this month, French President Francois Hollande announced the "full and final" dismantlement of the camp.

As it's an unofficial camp, the "Jungle" does not qualify for international assistance. There are not enough funds or manpower to keep sanitation and security under control.

Migrants' basic needs are often addressed by charities and NGOS working on the ground. And although these organizations provide vital, daily assistance, their work is not a permanent solution.

The closure comes at a time that Europe's growing **immigration** crisis, fear of terrorism and the spread of anti-migration movements have soared.

The plan is to have the camp completely torn down by December, according to the French Ministry of the Interior.

Could another "Jungle" grow?

French authorities have said the migrants and refugees will be given two options: to seek asylum in France and be relocated within the country or to return to their country of origin.

If relocated within France, they will be moved to temporary accommodation in a shelter while their claim is processed.

In the past year alone, up to 6,000 Calais residents have been moved to other locations in France, where 80% have applied for asylum.

Some charities working inside the camps say that although the proposed living arrangements are a suitable alternative for those seeking asylum in France, the solution is not viable for many who wish to settle in the UK.

"Many refugees in Calais have strong reasons for wanting to get to the UK and will simply return to Calais," charity Care4Calais said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Ben Emmerson is the UN special rapporteur on counterterrorism and human rights and an international lawyer, and he specializes in European human rights law and international criminal law. Jessica Jones is a human rights barrister specializing in international and criminal justice work and legal adviser to the UN special rapporteur. The opinions expressed in this commentary are theirs.

(CNN) -- We live in a world at a crossroads. The conflicts in Syria rage on, seemingly impervious to the various attempts to resolve them -- a horrifying staging ground for broader US-Russian tensions, and the front line of terror groups' battles for territory.

A tragic consequence of this and other global conflicts and inequalities are the 65 million displaced people around the world. Last year, 1 million people a month fled their homes, in many cases to escape regions where terrorist groups are active and to seek sanctuary in Western democracies.

As they have made their often perilous journeys, the rhetoric that has greeted them has become increasingly inflammatory. In the final presidential debate Wednesday night, Donald Trump described Syrian refugees as "definitely, in many cases, ISIS-aligned," continuing a trend of incendiary comments around migration he began last year with his call for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," and built on this year by calling for **immigration** to be stopped from "any country that has been compromised by terrorism," a policy that would effectively condemn ordinary Syrians to exile in a deathtrap.

He later clarified that such measures would be "temporary" until "vetting systems" were in place. But even his later comments display intolerance, irresponsibility and a blinding ignorance of the way in which a safe world order -- a world order that keeps us, in the United States, in the UK, in Germany, safe -- is created.

There is a reason that our countries are destinations for migrants fleeing persecution. No one can value life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness more than those who have endured and understand the terror of endless bombardments, the oppression of life under ISIS, the despair of once-vibrant cities crumbling around them. What we claim to offer is a set of values that speak to people of all nationalities: freedom, tolerance, opportunity.

But those values are seriously threatened. Trump's extreme rhetoric (and he is not alone -- the Czech President has made similarly inflammatory remarks, as have politicians in the UK, Slovakia and elsewhere) reflects and contributes to a widespread misperception that the movement of people is a threat to national security.

It has become an all too common assumption that those fleeing regions in which terror groups are active present a heightened threat or embody a greater risk of radicalization that might lead them to commit acts of terror in the countries to which they flee.

But there is no evidence that that is the case. Indeed, as our report to the UN General Assembly sets out, the assumption that refugees present any terrorist risk to the countries receiving them is statistically and analytically unfounded, and must be challenged.

Refugees are, in many cases, victims of terrorism. They must not be marginalized as potential terrorists. They must be protected.

Right now, the world is failing in that duty. Our report shows that states are building fences, engaging in pushback operations and criminalizing irregular migration to clamp down on the entry of people to their territories -- but such steps are often counterproductive.

While the intention might be to protect those already within our borders, the truth is that restricting access to safe territory for those outside it encourages covert movements of people, including by traffickers, which makes borders more, not less, porous.

The establishment of clandestine routes across international borders and the criminalization of individuals legitimately seeking access to safe countries may ultimately assist terrorists who exploit chaos and vulnerability in equal measure.

For those who make it to our borders, the fear-mongering engaged in by Trump and others leads to discrimination, social exclusion and the marginalization of communities, which have been recognized by international bodies as conditions conducive to terrorism.

Respect for the humanitarian needs and human rights of migrants is not distinct from counterterrorism objectives; it is central to them. The hard-line approach will backfire.

It is time to be clear: It is not in our interest to flout international law and restrict refugees' routes of escape or the assistance we provide them. To protect ourselves, we must face up to and fulfill our obligations to the millions of displaced people struggling to re-establish their lives.

Every citizen must recognize their own responsibility for upholding and promoting the values that form the fabric of our society. A series of clear choices must be made over the next weeks and months, and the very future of our democracies may depend on them. The baton is in our hands.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- As cities like Detroit and Baltimore struggle to find ways to revitalize their abandoned buildings, a new study has found that **immigrants** might hold the key to bring new life to blighted neighborhoods.

However, entities that manage distressed properties -- called landbanks -- have ignored them.

Most Rust Belt cities have more **immigrants** who could qualify as home buyers, per-capita, than all other demographic groups, according to research unveiled this week by the Fiscal Policy Institute and the Welcoming Economies Global Network, an **immigrant**-focused economic development group.

"There are thousands of **immigrants** in the nation's Rust Belt cities that are potential homeowners and we believe that the folks that deal with distressed real estate have overlooked the opportunity that they represent in their backyard," said Steve Tobocman, an author of the report.

Tobocman is also director of Global Detroit, an economic development group focused on empowering **immigrant** communities in that city.

In Detroit, there are about 80,000 properties -- or a quarter of the city -- held by the city's landbank, Tobocman said.

Researchers discovered that 209 out of 1,000 **immigrant** households could be eligible to buy a $50,000 home. That's better than the 152 out of 1,000 U.S.-born white households and the 162 per 1,000 U.S.-born black households that could qualify to buy a home at that price.

The research was used to create an online interactive tool to measure how many potential households currently living in each city could qualify for distressed home ownership.

The annual income needed to purchase a $50,000 distressed property in Detroit is $25,000, according to the tool, which also shows some of the annual costs of owning the distressed property, including mortgage, insurance, water and fuel.

For the past year, Global Detroit has been facilitating the distressed home buying process for **immigrants**.

"We've now completed a dozen vacant home purchases in Detroit and those have all been for less than $5,000 and a lot of these people have been fixing them up through their own sweat equity," Tobocman said.

According to the Fiscal Policy Institute, between 1960 and 1980, 29 of the 30 largest American cities had population declines. Since then, the population in more than half these cities has rebounded.

"There isn't a single great American city that has rebounded in population growth without **immigrants**," Tobocman said. **Immigrants** who become homeowners bring in tax revenue, fix up abandoned homes and encourage economic growth.

Sergio Martinez, 28, who is originally from Mexico, bought an abandoned house four years ago in Detroit's Mexican Town neighborhood. Martinez works as a restaurant manager near his home and loves being part of Detroit's revitalization.

"There's so much diversity in the city. Close to me we have a huge Bengali, Mexican and Arab community," he said. "I grew up in the city. Back then things weren't as bad for **immigrants**."

He says the house he bought has four bedrooms and a full basement and cost less than $10,000. Since he purchased it he's bought a new kitchen, redone the floors and is in the process of remodeling the bathroom.

Martinez was lucky. A friend helped him organize the paperwork he needed and he had some help from his dad with the down payment.

For low-income households, having a down payment is a significant challenge. Plus, getting a mortgage for a distressed property is difficult and newcomers often have problems with a lack of credit history or identification.

"The average resident in Detroit doesn't have access to the information needed to buy a home," he said.

Martinez, who arrived as a 5-year-old without documents and is currently protected by Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), ran into a wall recently when he tried to purchase a second home in Detroit.

Because of Michigan's "Real ID" law, which requires a Social Security number or proof of citizenship, he has been unable to renew his expired state identification -- and was denied a mortgage because of it.

Detroit's city council recently approved the creation of a municipal ID card. It will help **immigrants** and others open bank accounts, gain entry to museums and access other social services. People can begin enrolling for the cards in November.

"Once I get that, I'm going to try again," Martinez said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON (CNNMoney) -- London's financial district is proposing a special new visa to ensure international workers aren't shut out of the U.K. after the country leaves the European Union.

The new visa proposal, produced by PwC for the City of London, argues that U.K. work visas should be granted based on regional business needs.

"International businesses will still require access to the brightest and the best candidates in order to remain competitive globally," said Julia Onslow-Cole, head of global **immigration** at PwC. "The regional visa system is a mechanism to specifically address skill shortages."

London -- which boasts the biggest financial center in Europe -- has strong ties to Europe and the continental banking system. It's also home to the largest proportion of foreign-born residents in the U.K.

The city's economy is expected to suffer as the U.K. pushes ahead with Brexit plans. It has a lot to lose if the separation curtails European trade and **immigration** to the U.K.

The pain will be particularly acute in the financial district -- which is called the City of London. Nearly a third of workers in the district come from abroad, and about 12% come from Europe.

PwC estimates that about three-quarters of European workers in the U.K. would not be allowed to stay after Brexit, based on the current visa system. Its proposal is designed to help sectors that depend on European workers, including banks, healthcare, agriculture and construction.

If the new regional visa system is put in place, businesses would be expected to demonstrate to the government that they originally tried to recruit British workers before hiring international employees.

The U.K. voted in late June to leave the European Union. But the exit process will take years.

The vote resulted in a sharp drop in the value of the pound. It's now trading at $1.22, down 18% since the vote.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Peniel Joseph is the Barbara Jordan Chair in Political Values and Ethics and the founding director of the Center for the Study of Race and Democracy at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, where he is also a professor of history. He is the author of several books, most recently "Stokely: A Life." The views expressed here are his own.

(CNN) -- Wednesday night's third and final presidential debate took place against an unprecedented backdrop of controversy over the Republican nominee's history of alleged sexual assault and harassment of women, his more recent unsubstantiated allegation of widespread voter fraud and his suggestion the election is being rigged in favor of his opponent.

The debate, moderated by Chris Wallace of Fox News, started with a substantive question about the Supreme Court, with Hillary Clinton suggesting as president she would choose justices who protect marriage equality and the rights of the poor.

Trump attacked Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg for criticizing his candidacy and presented the election as a referendum on the protection of the Second Amendment. He promised to appoint "pro-life," Second Amendment justices, equating the wishes of the Founding Fathers with the ideological positions of right-wing conservatives.

Throughout the night Trump often presented himself as a caricature of the right, vowing to appoint Supreme Court judges who would reverse Roe v. Wade and accusing Clinton of supporting ripping babies "out of the womb in the ninth month on the final day" in rhetoric designed to arouse red-meat conservatives everywhere.

Trump: 'We have some bad hombres'

Trump also doubled down on his absurd promise to build a wall to stem the tide of illegal **immigration**, noting that "we have some bad hombres" who need to be deported from America.

Clinton countered this rhetoric with a robust support for a woman's right to choose and for a pathway to citizenship for 11 million undocumented **immigrants**residing in the country. "We are both a nation of **immigrants** and a nation of law, and we can act accordingly," Clinton said, promising to introduce comprehensive **immigration** reform as president. She also reminded the audience of Trump's blatant racism in characterizing Mexican-Americans as rapists and drug dealers.

In a zesty discussion over **immigration**, the only time race was mentioned in this last debate, Clinton accused Trump of using undocumented workers to build Trump Tower and then threatening those he underpaid with deportation when they complained.

Perhaps the bitterest exchange of the evening came when Clinton accused Trump of being a potential puppet of Russian leader Vladimir Putin. "You're the puppet!" Trump shot back in an exchange never before witnessed in modern presidential debate history. As the night wore on Trump grew angrier, at one point calling Clinton a "liar" on national television.

Clinton shined during moments that allowed her to articulate a detailed economic vision for America. Her laundry list of economic programs such as free community college, a living wage for low-income workers, and higher taxes for wealthy individuals and corporations read like a progressive agenda echoing Lyndon Johnson's Great Society.

At one point, Trump asked Clinton "Why the hell" she did not negotiate great trade deals when she had the opportunity. The exchange illustrated the bizarre and truly embarrassing spectacle the American people have been subjected to during this historically mean presidential election season.

Asked about his reported history of sexual harassment, Trump pivoted and accused the Clinton campaign of orchestrating the allegations as well as inciting violence at his rallies.

Beyond policy differences, this final debate showcased Trump's extraordinary unfitness to be president. The lies, racial intolerance, sexism, bullying and schoolboy antics were on display for all to see. Perhaps Trump's most troubling aspect is how blithely unaware he seems of his own shortcomings. That such a person could be entrusted with the safety and security of the world is exceedingly dangerous.

Clinton's best moment came when she pointed this "pattern of divisiveness" as not being the true identity of America or its citizens.

Trump declined to say he would accept the results of the election should he lose, accusing the entire process of being rigged, since "she should have never been allowed to run" due to Clinton's presumed guilt for crimes against the American people.

The war talk coming from Trump amplifies the coalition of racial extremists, conspiracy theorists and disgruntled white Americans who form the core of his supporters and who have been directed to serve as unofficial poll watchers in a naked effort to intimidate and suppress voter turnout on November 8.

With less than three weeks until the presidential election, the final debate made it plain that no matter what the outcome the wounds inflicted on our democracy during this campaign season will take a long time to heal.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 6:31a: adds second hashtag that emerged

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The headlines Thursday morning will be about how Donald Trump declined to say he will accept the result of the election.

But turn to Twitter -- that barometer of immediate public opinion -- and the topic that was trending higher than the Supreme Court, Chris Wallace and Putin was ... #badhombres.

Yes, it was another debate, spawning another meme, thanks to what we can only surmise was an off-the-cuff remark.

During a discussion about his stance on **immigration** reform, the Republican presidential nominee reiterated his stance on deporting undocumented **immigrants** and used a Spanish word to make his point.

"We'll get them out, 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."

Searches for "hombre" spiked 120,000% over the hourly average, Merriam-Webster said.

This prompted the dictionary to tweet: "Somehow, this night ends with us writing an hombre/ombre/ombré explainer. Of course it does."

If you sense a tone of resignation in that tweet, you're not alone.

"Bad hombres? Bigly? Merriam-Webster weeps...." said one tweet.

This, ladies and gentlemen, is what our presidential showdowns have devolved into -- not an after-debate discussion of substantive issues, but a parsing of all the incredulous, ridiculous utterances.

Bad hombres. Bigly. Nasty woman.

There was no shortage.

"Sometimes I forget this is a presidential debate and not an SNL skit," tweeted Ian Mayberry.

Not that it requires defining, but an hombre, in case you didn't know, is "man" in Spanish.

But Trump pronounced it "ombre," which is an altogether different thing: colors or tones that gradually blend into each other.

Of course, that yielded a whole new round of memes and tweets.

"So now we know what #trump's **immigration** plan is focused on... ridding the #USA of these monsters," tweeted Joseph Azam with a picture of a bad hair job.

The irony of Trump's use of "hombre" was not lost on CNN analyst Van Jones.

"The only time Donald Trump used Spanish in this campaign ... is to smear and denigrate **immigrants**."

CNN's Amanda Jackson contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- CNN commentators and guest analysts offer their take on Wednesday night's final presidential debate. The opinions expressed in these commentaries are solely theirs.

Julian Zelizer: A stunning moment in the debate

The most troubling part of the debate for many observers came when Donald Trump would not say that he will accept the results of the election.

"I'll tell you at the time---I'll keep you in suspense, OK?" he said, words that will provoke great concern among those who feel he is raising dangerous questions about the legitimacy of this election and the results---assuming he does not win.

Still, in many ways the debate was more conventional than anyone expected. Hillary Clinton was at her best when she found the opportunities to be aggressive on domestic policy issues.

During the discussions over the second amendment, women's rights and **immigration**, she displayed a level of confidence and knowledge that allowed her to take Donald Trump on with gusto. She also hit him very hard when Chris Wallace turned the discussion to his comments about women and the accusations of sexual harassment that have emerged. Even as he blamed her campaign for spreading the allegations, Clinton remained focused on the women's stories.

With the exception of his "suspense" remark, Trump did not implode. He was generally able to contain his outbursts---with some exceptions and Alec Baldwin type "wrong"s in the microphone while Wallace's questions prompted Clinton to stumble about her position on open borders.

Clinton moved the conversation deep into allegations about Putin, taking them away from the differences on **immigration** that could energize the Obama coalition. Trump was able to get in some points, such as his promise to appoint a conservative Supreme Court judge who could bring back some conservatives who have been deserting the GOP candidate. He was still able to repeat some of his familiar quips like calling the Clinton Foundation "a criminal enterprise."

But then the election comes down to the reality of the numbers. The data show that Trump and the GOP are in serious trouble. He is not winning in battleground states, he is struggling in some conservative states, and he is certainly not expanding the number of red states. Just looking at the math, it's hard to see how he wins the Electoral College. If Trump scored any points, this debate alone won't be enough to transform the basic picture of the electoral battle. And if it was a tie, the benefit goes to Clinton given her increasing lead.

Julian Zelizer is a professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University and a New America fellow. He is the author of "Jimmy Carter" and "The Fierce Urgency of Now: Lyndon Johnson, Congress, and the Battle for the Great Society."

David Gergen: Trump missed this last chance

Years ago, among the casinos of Atlantic City, Donald Trump raised the curtain on a new part of his career in business. Last night, among the casinos of Las Vegas, he very likely lowered the curtain on his career in politics.

That he has come as far as he has in politics remains one of the most improbable stories of our time. He created an army of followers that will continue to shake the American landscape. Still, one always sensed there would be a moment of personal reckoning. It came last night.

Trump emerged from the GOP primaries with a reputation for putting away his opponents, knowing just where their jugular was and ripping into them. His swagger and refusal to prepare seriously for the presidential debates suggested a confidence that he could do the same to Hillary Clinton.

But in their first debate together, she clobbered him, ending his upward surge. Over the next 23 days leading up to Las Vegas, he not only lost a second time to her but drove his campaign into a ditch. He ran the worst fall campaign of any candidate in memory.

Thus, he came into last night's debate desperate for victory. For the first 40 minutes, it looked like he might actually pull it off. But just as he did in the other encounters, he began to lose steam and, importantly, lose control of his ego. Wild charges, interruptions, defensiveness all resurfaced -- some would say his persecution complex kicked in. She kept her cool and sure enough, CNN's poll found that viewers thought she won: 52% to 39% A YouGov poll found a 10 point spread in her favor.

More importantly, many in the press, as well as others (I am among them) were horrified that Trump refused to say he would accept the verdict of voters on November 8. No other candidate has ever taken the outrageous position that "if I win, that's legitimate but if I lose, the system must be rigged." It is bad enough that Trump puts himself before party; now he is putting self before country.

Meanwhile, Hillary Clinton came in rested and prepared last night and, over time, took control of the stage. While Trump supporters still think she is a witch, my hunch is that many others are growing more comfortable with the notion that she will likely be our next President.

There are sure to be more surprising twists and turns in this campaign, but one thing now seems certain: after losing three straight debates, Trump has now exhausted his last big chance to reverse the momentum in his favor. Defeat seems near -- and it is not because the system is rigged against him.

David Gergen is a senior political analyst for CNN and has been a White House adviser to four presidents. A graduate of Harvard Law School, he is a professor of public service and co-director of the Center for Public Leadership at the Harvard Kennedy School. Follow him on Twitter: @david\_gergen.

S.E. Cupp: Trump did better... but bar was low

To increase an engine's power, you "take the governor off," as we NASCAR fans say. Donald Trump has thus far run his campaign without a governor, much to the chagrin of the Republican Party and even his own surrogates and campaign staff. His outbursts in previous debates telegraphed to many he was not interested in being "shackled" by any traditional campaign conventions. As the election has progressed, that's led to a narrowing of his appeal and his inability to crack a majority in national polls.

To continue the NASCAR theme, this final debate was the Talladega of debates, where Trump was racing with a restrictor plate and the governor back on.

Sure, there were moments where he was loose, barking back retorts to Hillary Clinton like, "wrong" and "not true." But he was also loaded with ready comebacks, stats and the obvious attacks he often missed in previous debates in favor of tangential, off-topic ad hominem nonsense. Instead of going to the gutter, he repeatedly steered back to issues.

It was a performance that was, yes, riddled with inaccurate statements that fact-checkers will point out. He once again showed an alarming lack of facility with foreign policy, insisting Aleppo, the Syrian city that is under siege by Bashar al-Assad and Russian airstrikes, had fallen, and mixing up Sunni and Shiite loyalties in Mosul. He also insisted he never said he'd allow nation states like Saudi Arabia to nuclear arm, which is a lie. And he once again failed to repudiate the idea that the election has been "rigged," setting an incredibly dangerous precedent that he might not accept the outcome of this election.

But it's also a performance that many in Republican leadership may have wanted to see much earlier. The bar was low for Trump, so this only looked controlled in comparison to his previously maniacal performances, and with Clinton gaining insurmountable ground nationally and in battleground states, it's too little, too late. But this was without question his best debate performance of the election.

S.E. Cupp is the author of "Losing Our Religion: The Liberal Media's Attack on Christianity," co-author of "Why You're Wrong About the Right" and a columnist at the New York Daily News

Errol Louis: With 'nasty woman' comment, Trump shows Clinton got under his skin

Hillary Clinton came into the final debate in a stronger political position than Donald Trump -- and wisely chose not to play it safe. Instead, she jabbed at Trump continually, and predictably drew out the billionaire's angry, caustic side.

Trump handled early questions well, sounding familiar notes on why he would nominate conservative judges to the Supreme Court. But Clinton kept needling him, pointing out that Trump projects were built with Chinese steel and undocumented **immigrant** labor.

And she more or less called Trump a "puppet" of Russian leader Vladimir Putin, leading her irritated opponent with little more to reply than, "No, you're the puppet."

Trump was at his best, as usual, on the economy, but was cornered on the issue of how his proposed plan would affect Medicare, Social Security and the national debt (the debate's moderator, Chris Wallace of Fox News, did an excellent job of showing how Clinton and Trump would both leave entitlements at risk and do little to slow growth of the debt).

"Such a nasty woman!" Trump complained toward the end of the debate, a marker of Clinton's skill at getting under Trump's skin -- much in the way she did in the first debate.

The point was well taken. Clinton has averaged a 6.5-point lead over Trump in polls over the past week. That's after a 5-point lead following the first debate. With fewer than three weeks to go, Trump is running out of time to catch up, and may have missed his last, best chance in the final debate.

Errol Louis is the host of "Inside City Hall," a nightly political show on NY1, a New York all-news channel.

Brett Talley: Trump, a vote for the forgotten people

After two debates that could have been held in a mudhole, tonight was mostly about the issues. And boy, did we see some differences between these two candidates.

During this debate, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump told you exactly what they would do as President. If you support activist justices on the Supreme Court, if you support late-term abortion on demand, if you support open borders and amnesty, if you want a continuation of a foreign policy that has helped plunge the Middle East into war-torn chaos, if you want four more years of the past eight years, Hillary Clinton is your candidate.

If you want something different, if you want justices who adhere to the Constitution, laws that respect unborn life, a reformed **immigration** system and secure border, a military that puts American interests first, and a government that cares about the people in this country who have been forgotten for too long, then Donald Trump deserves your vote.

These two candidates are horribly flawed. Donald Trump has said some awful things. Hillary Clinton has committed acts that would have resulted in the prosecution of ordinary citizens. But this election isn't just about the people on the stage; it's about the future of the country and which direction we will go.

Brett J. Talley is a lawyer, author, one-time writer for Mitt Romney's 2012 presidential campaign and former speechwriter for Sen. Rob Portman. He is deputy solicitor general at the office of Alabama's attorney general.

Roxanne Jones: Clinton the only fit candidate on stage

We knew from the start when Donald Trump said he wanted to "make America great again," it wasn't completely true. He wasn't talking to everyone --- not women, not Muslims, or Mexicans, or the LGBTQ community, certainly not blacks or Latinos, or **immigrants**, or even poor folks.

Last night, Trump doubled down on his strategy to divide America and try to conquer the White House. He told us that if he loses he's not sure he'll accept the results, even for the good of the country. In his closing statement, a perfect opportunity to go out classy, he bashed Hillary Clinton, said---essentially-- we should fear one another and that we should get rid of **immigrants**; he told blacks he was the only person who could save us and called for more law and order. Not one positive word about how he could move our country forward or improve the lives of every American.

Just for a minute in the beginning, Trump looked good. He had finally studied his notes. He showed more discipline than in the past --stayed focused on the questions. But then, he unraveled. He deflected questions about his lewd comments on groping women, told moderator Chris Wallace he wanted to talk about something else. I bet he did.

Trump stayed silent when Clinton told America that Trump and his company have not only used undocumented workers to build his projects but also shipped jobs out of the country at every turn. Trump's response: change the laws so I won't be able to do that. Say what? So now, it's Clinton's fault that Trump decided to send jobs overseas? Horrible.

Trump entered this race a brash political outsider. He had a chance to do something really powerful: re-create the Republican party, broaden the base to appeal to more Americans. And inspire us to cross party lines to work together and show the world America's heart. But he blew it in one long winded, hate-filled campaign in which boasting, bashing women and just about everyone else took the place of informed policy discussions and common decency.

Hillary Clinton is not perfect --- I've yet to see a politician who is --- and she faces legitimate issues with trust among voters. But she was the only person on that stage fit to be President of the United States, the only candidate who can move America forward. The win goes to her.

Roxanne Jones, a founding editor of ESPN Magazine and former vice president at ESPN, has worked as a producer and as a reporter at the New York Daily News and The Philadelphia Inquirer. She was named a 2010 Woman of the Year by Women in Sports and Events, is a co-author of "Say It Loud: An Illustrated History of the Black Athlete," and CEO of the Push Marketing Group.

Tim Stanley: Trump a sad, sore loser

Hillary Clinton won this most substantive debate, which was excellently moderated by Chris Wallace.

In theory, the focus on issues should've given Donald Trump a chance to shine. It did allow him to make some standard conservative points -- and rather well. His pro-life position was uncompromising; his stance on gun control a clear contrast to Hillary Clinton. But he was also rambling, repetitive, failed to complete thoughts and -- worst of all -- allowed himself to get side-tracked by personal vendettas. If he is too thin skinned, however, it is because layers have been torn off by this process. The allegations of sex abuse, of fraud, or reliance on his father's wealth are easily exploited by Clinton.

The biggest moment of the night was Trump's refusal to accept his forthcoming defeat, casting doubt on the validity of the election. He referred, I suspect, to Pew's 2012 research, which found that up to 1 in 8 voter registrations in the United States "are no longer valid or are significantly inaccurate." But that doesn't actually mean those registrations translate into votes, while Pew also said that nearly a quarter who should be able to vote currently cannot -- so turnout may actually be depressed. Either way, Trump came off as a sore loser conceding the inevitable. A sad, pre-emptive end to a remarkable, charismatic candidacy.

Timothy Stanley is a historian and columnist for Britain's Daily Telegraph. He is the author of "Citizen Hollywood: How the Collaboration Between L.A. and D.C. Revolutionized American Politics."

Nayyera Haq: He can't help himself

Candidates don't change their personalities in the final debate. The goal is to use the third debate as an opportunity to add new voters to the team.

By sticking with the conservative Republican line on SCOTUS, 2nd amendment, abortion, and repealing Obamacare, Trump should have helped shore up his numbers in red states and make down-ballot Republican candidates feel more comfortable. For a broader set of voters, seeing a serious Trump able to have a policy based discussion for 45 minutes was a truly novel experience.

But Trump couldn't hack it for the full debate. As we saw in the first debate, it is very easy to get under Trump's skin. All it takes is questioning his business practices or ties to Russia and Trump simply cannot stay on the substantive side of the topic.

Trump derails his own gains by interrupting Hillary and making catty comments, and more tellingly, is not able to return to the more sober, statesmanlike demeanor people hope to see from a presidential candidate.

Instead, he doubles down on the personality traits that turn off voters generally and makes comments that disgust women and minorities in particular. Telling African-Americans he will make their lives better by instituting more law and order is the exact wrong message. And why take the final few minutes of the debate, the part that viewers are most likely to remember, to call the first female presidential candidate a "nasty woman"?

With 20 days left in the election, we all know who Trump is. He can fake being serious about the presidency for only a few minutes before resorting to the snarky comments that made him a reality star. It works for ratings, but it's a losing strategy for getting votes.

Nayyera Haq is CEO of Avicenna Strategy, a cross-cultural communications firm. Previously a White House senior director and a State Department spokesperson during the Obama administration, she regularly comments on politics and current affairs for CNN. She is a Hillary Clinton supporter.

Raul Reyes: Trump, a wounded bear, flails in debate

Coming into the debate tonight from Las Vegas, Donald Trump was like a wounded bear, swinging and flailing in a last-chance effort to keep his candidacy alive. His dwindling poll numbers have set him on an increasingly erratic course; since the last debate, he has warned of a "rigged election," suggested that a Mexican billionaire was behind the New York Times' unflattering coverage of him, claimed that undocumented **immigrants** were committing voting fraud on a massive scale, and lashed out at the women who have accused him of unwanted sexual advances. He has even gone so far as to insinuate that Hillary Clinton was on drugs at the last debate.

If all this sounds like the strategy of an increasingly desperate candidate, that's about right. Trump is going down, and he knows it. What this meant for Hillary Clinton is that for once, she had a low bar to clear in the debate: as long as she could stay cool and articulate her vision for the country, she would likely be judged the winner of Wednesday's faceoff.

So did she manage to accomplish this goal? Yep. And the person that Clinton can thank for this, in part, is Trump himself.

Trump managed to maintain his composure for about 25 minutes into this debate. Then the gloves came off, in the worst ways. He interrupted Clinton, in a manner reminiscent of Alec Baldwin impersonating him on Saturday Night Live ("Wrong!").

Raul A. Reyes is an attorney and member of the USA Today board of contributors. Follow him @RaulAReyes.

Buck Sexton: We're trapped in crass reality show

The final presidential debate was as expected: nasty, brutish and not short enough. Trump won, though it was likely too close a call to affect the polls. While the policy substance was probably the strongest of all three candidate face offs, it was overshadowed by the plentiful personal attacks. Nothing new was learned about either candidate. It was a debate that was more instructive as a microcosm of a generally dispiriting election race than as a moment to change the minds of undecided American voters.

Perhaps the melee on stage was inevitable. We have reached the saturation point for mudslinging in this election. A public contest for who should be the next commander-in-chief shouldn't feel like the most crass, ungallant reality TV show imaginable, yet here we are. No matter what the final outcome on November 8th, both major parties' top-of-ticket candidates have largely deprived this country of a substantive public debate on policies that matter.

Instead, we have been privy to an all-out partisan media war, with unrepentant Hillary Clinton enablers on one side, and Donald-Trump-at-all-costs defenders on the others (though a vast majority of the chattering class clings to Madam Secretary's side). This battle of propaganda machines will churn on, unmercifully, until election day, and whichever candidate ends up winning the White House, he or she will have been ethically sullied and politically hobbled along the way. The debate was merely reflective of these unfortunate realities.

Buck Sexton is a political commentator for CNN and host of "The Buck Sexton Show" on TheBlaze. He was previously a CIA counterterrorism analyst.

Frida Ghitis: Donald Trump is a frightening man

If you're not frightened for America, you have not been paying attention. That was clear even in this final debate, in which Donald Trump managed to keep his cool for about the first 30 to 45 minutes, appearing to maintain control over his baser instincts. The effort to restrain himself proved too strenuous, and he finally dropped all pretense of discipline. We saw the real Trump, and it was a most unpleasant sight.

Nothing Trump does or says comes as a surprise any more. But we should not lose our ability to be shocked. The Republican candidate for the presidency refused to say he would accept the outcome of the election. America's foes, the enemies of democracy around the world, must have rubbed their hands in glee.

One of the great achievements of humanity is the democratic tradition of peaceful transfer of power, the knowledge that after a hard-fought campaign the loser concedes. Trump may or may not accept that. Forget November 8th. What is he planning for November 9th?

How scary is Trump? Imagine he wins the election. The dark scenarios are endless. But fast-forward to four years later. Imagine that he wins the election. Imagine he runs for re-election and loses, and then refuses to give up power. Trump has the instincts of a dictator.

Some dictators are charming. Trump is not. He lied so many times it was amazing to watch. He claimed the accusations of women against him have been debunked. They have not. He rejected the judgment of US security agencies about Russian hacking in the US.

And then, near the end, in a most revolting moment, he interrupted Clinton to say, "She's a nasty woman."

Trump solidified his standing with his hardcore supporters, promoting what sounds more and more like a seditious movement, a movement to incite rebellion against the lawful government of the United States.

If Trump had maintained discipline, he might have scored some points. Instead, he reminded us what a frightening election this is, what a frightening man he is.

At the same time, he helped showcase the poise of his rival. Hillary Clinton looked, sounded, behaved, like the soon-to-be President of a great country.

Frida Ghitis is a world affairs columnist for The Miami Herald and World Politics Review, and a former CNN producer and correspondent. Follow her @FridaGhitis.

Sally Kohn: One candidate was presidential

The third and final debate was a microcosm of this entire election: Hillary Clinton was presidential and Donald Trump was petulant.

Hillary Clinton's experience and expertise literally made Donald Trump sweat. She talked inspiringly about her vision for growing America's economy from the middle-out and the bottom-up, as opposed to Trump's top-down trickled down economics. And Clinton addressed complex foreign policy questions with the nuance and sophistication that they demand and that Trump plainly lacks.

Anyone who claims that Trump won is really just admitting that the bar is so terribly low for him at this point that as long as he only vomited incoherent word salads and not actual salad on the stage, he came out ahead.

And yet Trump, who has managed to lower all of our expectations in this election, went one step lower in refusing to say that he will honor the results of the presidential election if he is not the winner. This is dark, dangerous anti-democratic stuff. The sort of stuff that takes us down a road that history has proven to be ugly.

Then Trump called Clinton a "nasty woman." Ugly in a different way, but still ugly.

I have got to hope that it is plain to anyone who stops to deeply think about it that Hillary Clinton is a knowledgeable and serious candidate and Donald Trump is throwing a national temper tantrum and is dangerously close to our nuclear codes.

Hillary Clinton was the only candidate on that stage with the skill and strength to be President of the United States of America. She has ideas. He has innuendo. She has solutions. He has the sniffles.

She won. He lost.

Hopefully this debate was also a preview of what to expect on November 8th.

Sally Kohn, a CNN political commentator, is an activist and columnist. Follow her on Twitter: @sallykohn. She supports Hillary Clinton for the presidency.

Haroon Moghul: America's sacred values reduced to strategy

This third and final contest was Hillary Clinton's best. Addressing Donald Trump's record of misogyny, she spoke with a passion we do not hear from her often enough. Trump had his ultimate chance to show our country that he's not who he appears to be. Unfortunately, what you see and what you hear is what you get.

Notably, American Muslims lost last night. Secretary Clinton called on our country to "work with American Muslims communities who are on the front lines." This is the wrong response to Donald Trump's discrimination. White Americans don't deserve rights because, or whether, they speak out against white supremacism. And neither does anyone else.

American democracy lost, too.

Asked about the peaceful transition of power, Trump said he could not absolutely guarantee he'd accept the outcome of the vote on November 8th. He said, instead, he'd "keep [us] in suspense." Later, Clinton compared Trump's attacks on the democratic process to his conviction that the Emmys were rigged.

Our most sacred values reduced to a crass, tacky negotiating strategy. What was Trump trying to say, anyway? Was he telegraphing an intention of insurrection? That's one bad hombre.

The planet lost, too. In three debates, we haven't had a single question on climate change. ISIS is a bigger national security threat than the warming of the entire planet? To quote Donald Trump, who did a great Alec Baldwin impression tonight: "wrong."

Haroon Moghul is a senior fellow at the Center for Global Policy. His next book, "How to be a Muslim," will be out in 2017.

Ruth Ben-Ghiat: Is democracy really up for debate?

In this final debate, Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump graduated from the school he's been attending: it's the same school attended by Benito Mussolini, Adolf Hitler, and other strongmen up through Vladimir Putin. When asked point blank if he'd accept the results of the presidential election, he refused to commit, saying he'd look at the issue when the time came -- as though he were talking about changing the plumbing in a building he wants to buy, and not the most fundamental moment of our democratic process.

Tonight Trump went further in this direction than ever before, declaring that this election is not only rigged but invalid in its origins, since his Democratic opponent Hillary Clinton should never have been allowed to run. Everything else Trump said tonight pales beside this assertion.

We've all been waiting for this election to be over, but tonight made clear that November 8th may just be the start of our problems.

Ruth Ben-Ghiat is a professor of history and Italian studies at New York University. Her latest book is "Italian Fascism's Empire Cinema."

Lanhee Chen: The biggest losers

We, the people, were the big losers in tonight's debate. Both candidates had the opportunity to address serious problems with real solutions, but all we heard were platitudes and unrealistic plans.

Hillary Clinton reminded us that she believes government is the only answer to lagging economic growth. Donald Trump went back to his familiar anti-trade, anti-entitlement reform rhetoric. And neither candidate presented a truly realistic approach to creating jobs, fixing broken entitlement programs, or addressing the national debt.

It's remarkable that we're at this very late stage of the 2016 presidential campaign -- just under three weeks from Election Day -- and there remain so many question marks about the policy proposals of both major-party candidates for the presidency.

Tonight's debate, while substantive in parts, did little to provide comfort to an independent voter looking for a president who is willing to cross party lines to get things done or pursue commonsense reforms across a broad range of domestic policy areas.

For Hillary Clinton, it was a missed opportunity to "seal the deal" with these voters. And for Donald Trump, it was even worse -- it was a failed attempt to speak to those voters whose support he needs to have any pathway to the presidency. Indeed, both candidates spoke directly to their bases of support and had little rhetoric or policy that would be more broadly appealing.

But, then again, none of this may matter at all since Donald Trump refused to say that he would accept the results of the election in three weeks. That's sure to be the headline coming out of this debate, and for good reason.

Tim Naftali: Trump's disrespect for America

His eyes were full of hate tonight. This, the third debate in the presidential series, was the most frightening. Whereas Donald Trump had generally limited his contempt to Hillary Clinton in the previous encounters, tonight he sprayed it at all of us.

Unwilling to bow to any of the small civilities that have made US politics since the Civil War contentious without being violent, Trump showed himself to have the authoritarian core predicted by his fiercest critics. When asked if he would accept the verdict of the voters on November 8, he didn't answer; instead he taunted Chris Wallace and the country by giving the impression that he hadn't yet decided. "L'Etat, C'est Moi."

We saw glimpses of this in Cleveland when he vowed in his acceptance speech to be the man who could fix any problem. At least in Cleveland he gave facts and figures to give us the sense that he believed he needed to earn the presidency. Tonight there were no facts, just assertion after weird assertion. Apparently there are millions of fraudulent voters; apparently many people in the inner circles get shot going for groceries or that NAFTA is the worst trade deal in human history.

In its most idealized form, political speech is an effort at persuasion-- and even in its mundane form, it respects the fact that our democracy is founded on the principle of Consent of the Governed. Instead Trump just proclaimed. And tonight much of what he said was nonsense. Trump may know where Aleppo is but he doesn't know what it means, nor who or what is responsible for that human catastrophe.

He doesn't understand the reason for attacking Mosul or for letting civilians and even some ISIS fighters leave that city before the violence starts. When Trump saw something in the outside world that he agreed with---the claim that apparently some US allies are making noises about bearing more of the burden of their defense-- he naturally and absurdly took credit. The picture was no prettier on the home front, where he rhetorically slashed and burned his way through the last 30 years of bipartisan administrations. Trump's virtual Mount Rushmore clearly has only one bust, his own.

Hillary Clinton was also at this debate. She jousted and drew blood when Trump incautiously opened the door to comparisons between the candidates' family foundations or when he praised Bernie Sanders, a man who publicly despises him. But at her most effective tonight, she merely stood up to Trump and allowed Americans to see--and draw their own comparisons. It was those eyes of his. He must know he is losing.

Tim Naftali, a CNN presidential historian and clinical associate professor of history and public service at New York University, is writing a new biography of President John F. Kennedy.

Tara Setmayer: Two steps forward, 10 steps back

Donald Trump simply cannot help himself. He continues to take two steps forward and 10 steps back. Trump was initially more measured and somewhat better prepared for the final debate. His attacks against Hillary Clinton's policies on **immigration**, the economy and the shady dealings of the Clinton Foundation were his best moments.

However, Hillary Clinton was able to dodge many of the toughest criticisms and use the opportunities to train her fire on Trump's long list of shortcomings. Clinton articulated her counter arguments more effectively than Trump, running circles around him on more than one occasion. For example, when Trump questioned Clinton about what has she done in her 30 years of public service, Hillary fired off her list of accomplishments and concluded with a zinger: "when I was in the Situation Room monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting the Celebrity Apprentice."

Tara Setmayer is former communications director for Rep. Dana Rohrabacher, R-California, and a CNN political commentator. Follow her on Twitter@tarasetmayer.
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(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump met Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team spent the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN listened throughout the debate and selected key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Reality Check: Clinton says undocumented workers pay more income tax than Trump

By Amy Gallagher, CNN

Talking about taxes, Clinton again maligned Trump for not paying income tax and went on to say "half of all **immigrants**, undocumented **immigrants** in our country actually pay federal income tax. We have undocumented **immigrants** in America who are paying more federal income tax than a billionaire."

Is this true?

According to CNN's own reporting based on government statistics, undocumented **immigrants** do pay taxes, both payroll taxes, such as social security tax and income tax. In fact, the government itself found that "50% to 75% of the about 11 million unauthorized US **immigrants** file and pay income taxes each year."

So the first part of her claim is true, and might even be an understatement.

From the little we've seen of Trump's tax returns, it appears possible that he has paid no income taxes since 1995. He hasn't denied the specific accusation, though he made it clear that he pays other kinds of taxes.

Given what we know, we'll rate Clinton's claim true.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

Guns

Reality Check: Trump and Clinton on Second Amendment

By Lisa Rose, CNN

During a discussion about gun rights and the Supreme Court, Trump said Clinton intends to nominate justices who would "dismantle" the Second Amendment. To illustrate his point, he referenced comments Clinton and her advisers have made about a landmark case that overturned a handgun ban in Washington, DC.

Trump claimed Clinton was "upset" by the D.C. v. Heller decision, which reinforced the right for individuals to own firearms but included the caveat that gun rights aren't absolute. Clinton responded that she was upset about one portion of the 5-4 ruling, which overturned Washington's handgun ban and its safe storage law, requiring firearms to be kept in safes or locked boxes to prevent accidents.

"I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case," said Clinton. "Because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from getting guns. They wanted people with guns to safely store them and the court did not accept that reasonable regulation."

Although Clinton said she objected to one narrow sliver of the D.C. v. Heller decision during the debate, she expressed broader opposition to the ruling in a Bloomberg Politics article published last spring.

"Clinton believes Heller was wrongly decided in that cities and states should have the power to craft common sense laws to keep their residents safe, like safe storage laws to prevent toddlers from accessing guns," said Maya Harris, a policy adviser to Clinton, in a statement emailed to Bloomberg. "In overturning Washington DC's safe storage law, Clinton worries that Heller may open the door to overturning thoughtful, common sense safety measures in the future."

In a recording leaked from a private fundraiser last year, Clinton said, more broadly, "The Supreme Court is wrong on the Second Amendment" while talking about the case.

Because Clinton has said that she thought the high court erred in D.C. v. Heller, we rate Trump's claim true.

We rate Clinton's claim as true, but misleading. During the debate, she said she opposed one part of the ruling but her past comments suggest she feels the whole case was wrongly decided.

Reality Check: Trump on Chicago's gun laws

By Sonam Vashi, CNN

When moderator Chris Wallace asked Trump why he opposed any limits on assault weapons or high-capacity magazines, Trump said: "Well, let me 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."

Trump and other Republicans have often cited Chicago as having some of the strictest gun laws in the country.

But while Chicago was once tough on guns, courts and gun rights advocates have overturned much of the legislation. The Supreme Court reversed Chicago's handgun ban in 2010, a federal appeals court toppled the Illinois concealed carry ban in 2012 and Chicago began allowing gun stores in the city in 2014 for the first time in years after gun rights proponents pressured the city, according to the Chicago Tribune.

So while Chicago does have tough gun regulations, they are not necessarily the toughest in the nation anymore.

Chicago does see extreme raw numbers of gun violence, more than the rest of the country, although that's affected by the city having a larger population than many other cities.

Additionally, the Chicago Police Department says it recovers more guns than any other city in the nation. That situation is affected by other states around Chicago; 60% of recovered guns in Chicago from 2009 to 2013 were first sold outside of Illinois, in states with softer gun laws, according to a 2014 report from the Chicago's mayor's office.

CPD authorities say violence in the city is often fueled by repeat offenders. And even when people who commit gun crimes are convicted, Chicago-area judges do not often give harsh sentences. In 2014, the Chicago Sun-Times analyzed Cook County convictions for illegal gun possession and found that most defendants received the minimum sentence -- one year. That time didn't even count early releases of prisoners under good behavior laws.

Trump is arguing that regulations like bans on assault rifles won't necessarily reduce gun violence, because Chicago's tough laws haven't stopped its gun violence. But using Chicago as an example doesn't work: its regulations have been scaled back, its gun violence is affected by more lenient laws in other states and its punishments are not always tough on gun crime, potentially enabling repeat offenders.

Trump's correlation between gun regulation effectiveness and Chicago's gun violence is egregiously misleading, making his claim false.

Reality Check: Clinton on 33,000 gun deaths annually

By Ali Foreman, CNN

"We have 33,000 people a year who die from guns," Clinton claimed.

Her claim is in line with not only statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which reported 33,599 people killed by firearms in 2014) but also the rhetoric of her primary campaigning. In a February debate against Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, Clinton said, "On average, 90 people a day are killed by gun violence in our country."

While Clinton's figures are correct -- the CDC's reported number rounds to about 92 firearm-related deaths a day -- the context provided in Wednesday night's debate misses the mark.

She expanded upon the statistic, saying, "I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole ... I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment."

Clinton's use of this figure in support of gun control gives the impression that 33,000 Americans are violently killed by firearms each year. As we pointed out in February, the CDC's statistic encompasses many types of gun-related deaths -- not only violent, intentional encounters.

In addition to the 11,409 individuals killed as a result of gun violence (homicide and legal intervention), that 33,599 also includes suicides, unintentional deaths, and incidents with undetermined intent.

For this reason, we will rate Clinton's claim for a second time true, but misleading.

Nuclear proliferation

Reality Check: Trump claims he doesn't support nuclear proliferation

By Kevin Liptak, CNN

Clinton and Trump sparred over the Republican candidate's statements about nuclear weapons.

Clinton claimed Trump had been "very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons," an assertion Trump interjected to claim was "wrong." The Democratic candidate continued: "He's advocated more countries getting them. Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia."

Trump disputed the characterization of his stance: "There's no quote. You'll not find a quote from me," he said, saying he advocated countries taking steps to defend themselves, but "didn't say nuclear."

Over the course of his campaign, Trump has taken different and convoluted stances on nuclear proliferation. He suggested to The New York Times on March 27 that because North Korea has nuclear capabilities, Japan should develop a comparable defense.

"If Japan had that nuclear threat, I'm not sure that would be a bad thing for us," he said then.

Pressed in various CNN interviews since then, Trump expressed a similar stance. He told Anderson Cooper on March 29: "Wouldn't you rather in a certain sense have Japan have nuclear weapons when North Korea has nuclear weapons?"

And when Wolf Blitzer asked in May whether Trump was "ready to let Japan and South Korea become nuclear powers," Trump answered affirmatively.

"I am prepared to, if they're not going to take care of us properly, we cannot afford to be the military and police for the world," he said.

But he's also expressed a general opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons, telling CNN in March, "I hate nuclear more than any" and "I don't want more nuclear weapons."

Ultimately, Trump is on the record expressing support, at least in the hypothetical, for countries that currently don't have nuclear weapons eventually obtaining them.

Verdict: False.

Abortion

Reality Check: Trump on Clinton allowing abortions 'two or three or four days prior to birth'

By Ben Tinker, CNN

When asked by moderator Chris Wallace about late-term abortion, Trump responded, "If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take a 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 is saying, and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take a baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month, on the final day and that's not acceptable."

While Clinton has said she believes a fetus lacks constitutional rights, she did vote against a ban on late-term abortions in 2003 while serving as a senator from New York.

"The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make," Clinton said in the debate Wednesday night.

"I have met with women who have, toward the end of their pregnancy, get the worst news one can 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."

Roe v. Wade, decided by the Supreme Court in 1973, made abortions legal during the entire term of a pregnancy, but put restrictions on the procedure during the second and third trimesters.

Clinton does believe mothers should be allowed to terminate a pregnancy at any point -- up until birth -- if her life is in danger, but abortions as late in a pregnancy as Trump suggests are almost unheard of.

We therefore rate Trump's claim as true, but misleading.

Clinton's State Department

Reality Check: Trump says $6 billion went missing from the State Department

By Laura Koran, CNN

Attacking Clinton's leadership credentials, Trump claimed that $6 billion went missing from the State Department during her tenure as secretary of state, possibly stolen.

"How do you miss $6 billion?" he asked incredulously.

Trump has made this allegation at several recent rallies, but its origins are murky.

The conservative news website the Daily Caller reported on this apparent missing cash in August, having obtained a copy of a Freedom of Information Act request from the conservative government watchdog group Cause of Action Group.

The Cause of Action request, submitted to the State Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), asserts that the State Department lost contract files worth over $6 billion.

A footnote to the request shows they arrived at that figure by reading a management alert written by the State Department OIG in March 2014, which noted, "significant vulnerabilities in the management of contract file documentation that could expose the Department to substantial financial losses."

"Specifically, over the past six years, OIG has identified Department of State (Department) contracts with a total value of more than $6 billion in which contract files were incomplete or could not be located at all," that management alert noted.

But does that mean $6 billion went missing?

In short, no.

In fact, after The Washington Post reported on the management alert in 2014, the State Department IG wrote a letter to the editor seeking to dispel this notion.

"Some have concluded based on this (alert) that $6 billion is missing," Steve Linick wrote. "The alert, however, did not draw that conclusion."

"Instead," he continued, "it found that the failure to adequately maintain contract files - documents necessary to ensure the full accounting of US tax dollars -- 'creates significant financial risk and demonstrates a lack of internal control over the Department's contract actions.'"

Verdict: False. The man in charge of the same office that issued the management alert said the conclusion that $6 billion was lost is false. Rather, the State Department misplaced important documents related to valuable contracts.

Russian hacking

Reality Check: Clinton on Trump encouraging Russia to hack US

By Jamie Crawford, CNN

"It is pretty clear you won't admit the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people," Clinton said to Trump about assertions that Russia orchestrated the hack of emails from Clinton's campaign manager.

While there is no evidence that Trump has personally been involved in directing Russian agents to do the hacking, Clinton is correct that Trump has encouraged Russia of doing similar action.

During comments at a news conference earlier this year, Trump said the following in relation to the controversy over Clinton's use of a private email server during her tenure as secretary of state:

"Russia, if you're listening, I hope you're able to find the 30,000 emails that are missing. I think you will probably be rewarded mightily by our press," Trump said in Florida.

"They probably have them. I'd like to have them released," he continued. "Now, if Russia or China or any other country has those emails, I mean, to be honest with you, I'd love to see them."

Soon after those comments, Trump was asked by Fox News if he was being sarcastic, to which he replied, "Of course I'm being sarcastic."

Based on Trump's comments calling on Russia to take the action he did, we rate Clinton's assertion as true.

Clinton also said the following regarding Russia's alleged role in supplying WikiLeaks with the hacked emails being published from Podesta's account: "We have 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin."

Earlier this month, US intelligence officials confirmed that emails hacked from the Democratic National Committee were the work of Russian intelligence, with the approval of Russia's senior-most leaders. That included the Director of National Intelligence -- representing all US intelligence agencies which include civilian and military agencies -- and the Department of Homeland Security.

"The kinds of disclosures that we've seen, including at WikiLeaks, of stolen emails from people who play an important role in our political process is consistent with Russian-directed efforts," White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said at the time.

Based on this, we also rate Clinton's comments as true.

Jobs

Reality Check: Trump calls the most recent jobs report 'anemic'

By Patrick Gillespie, CNNMoney

Trump slammed the US job market's progress in September.

"They came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report," Trump said.

The US economy added 156,000 jobs in September, and though the unemployment ticked up slightly, it is at a relatively low 5% -- down from 10% in October 2009.

Roughly 90,000 new jobs per month are needed to keep up with the growth of the job market, according to many economists.

Economists didn't call it a great jobs report, but didn't say it was terrible, either. Many used the Goldilocks metaphor that job growth was not too hot nor too cold -- it was steady.

"Most of the indicators in the September jobs report were modestly below expectations, but overall they suggest that labor market conditions continue to improve," Kevin Logan, a US economist at HSBC, said when the report came out.

UBS economist Drew Matus called September's job gains "healthy."

It was the 72nd consecutive month that the economy gained jobs, marking six straight years of monthly gains in jobs.

Since Obama took office in January 2009, the economy has added 10.8 million jobs overall.

Verdict: False.

Reality Check: Trump on jobs being 'sucked out'

By Tami Luhby, CNNMoney

Trump repeated his familiar refrain that America's economy and manufacturing base has collapsed.

"Our jobs are being sucked out of the economy," Trump said. "You look at all of the places I just left. You go to Pennsylvania. You go to Ohio. You go to Florida. You go to any of them. You go to upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places."

And a few minutes later: "We've lost our jobs. We've lost our business. We're not making things anymore, relatively speaking."

We've previously examined the claim of jobs leaving the US for Mexico, when Trump made the claim back in September. We found it to be mostly true.

But let's examine the jobs situation Trump outlined.

Trump didn't specify a time period so we will look what's happened over the George W. Bush and Barack Obama administrations.

There are now 144.7 million workers in America, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. That's up from 134.1 million at the start of Obama's administration in January 2009 and from 132.7 million when Bush took office in January 2001.

And looking at the states that Trump mentioned:

Pennsylvania has added 193,000 positions since Obama took office and by 247,000 jobs since Bush's inauguration.

In Ohio, employment has risen by 297,000 during Obama's tenure, but is down 102,000 jobs from when Bush took office.

Florida's employment is up by 975,000 jobs under Obama's presidency and by 1.5 million since Bush took office.

As for whether we make things in this country, it may not seem like it when Americans shop for clothing, toys or some other consumer products. But the nation's factories are humming -- America still manufactures products from cars to chemicals.

The nation's industrial production has not quite returned to its pre-recession high, but is up from 2000 and far up from the 1970s and 1980s, according to Federal Reserve Bank statistics.

We rate Trump's claim on America losing jobs false.

Trump's accusers

Reality Check: Trump says accusers' claims against him 'debunked'

By Eve Bower and Kay Guerrero, CNN

Within the last week, nine different women have spoken with various media outlets accusing Trump of non-consensual, invasive acts ranging from unwelcome advances to physical and sexual assault.

At the debate, Trump said, "those stories have been largely debunked."

Sexual assault accusations are difficult to prove definitively beyond the assertions of the parties involved. Trump has vehemently denied the accusations against him. The nine women maintain that their stories are true.

In reporting these allegations, CNN has spoken with six of Trump's accusers, and has worked to verify details contained in their accounts. CNN has also spoken with friends and colleagues of three accusers, and in each of those cases, the women's stories were corroborated.

Last Friday morning, Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence said that "evidence" would come out that day that would show the assault allegations against him to be false. As of Wednesday's debate, that evidence has still not emerged.

Trump's claim that the accusations against him have been "debunked" is false.

Reality Check: Trump and women's accusations

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Clinton claimed that Trump had swatted away the women who have accused him of sexual assault by disparaging their looks.

"He had a number of big rallies," Clinton said, "where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for --"

"I did not say that," Trump interrupted.

"...them to be assaulted," Clinton continued.

"I did not say that," Trump repeated.

Clinton then rattled off a series of comments made by Trump, including him saying, "Look at her. I don't think so"; "that wouldn't be my first choice"; and deemed a third woman who wrote a story about the assaults to be "disgusting."

CNN has not independently verified any of the women's claims, and Trump has vociferously denied each of their allegations.

But Trump has indeed made comments suggesting that he couldn't have done what was alleged because of how the accusers looked.

"You take a look, look at her, look at her words," Trump said in West Palm Beach, Florida, of Natasha Stoynoff, a People magazine writer who alleged misconduct. "And you tell me what you think. I don't think so."

"Believe me, she would not be my first choice," he said in Greensboro, North Carolina, of Jessica Leeds, who claimed Trump groped her on an airplane. "That would not be my first choice."

Though not explicitly, Trump certainly left the impression the women's looks were evidence he did not do what was alleged. We rate that claim by Clinton true.

But Clinton went too far, including the description of The New York Times reporter which, based on the reporter's own account, was his reaction to her writing a negative article, not her looks. We rate this claim false.

Taxes

Reality Check: Will Clinton really double your taxes?

By Jeanne Sahadi, CNNMoney

Trump asserted that Clinton's "tax plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes."

Clinton's plan calls for a range of tax increases on wages and investments, but they target the highest-income households, according to the latest analysis from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center. The top 1%, for instance, would absorb 93% of her proposed tax hikes.

Among her proposed tax increases, Clinton wants to implement the so-called Buffett Rule. It's named after billionaire Warren Buffett and would require anyone making $2 million or more to pay at least 30% of that in federal income taxes. So to the extent someone making that much pays 15% or less today, their tax bill would double.

But on average, the Tax Policy Center estimates that those in the top 0.1% would see their tax bills rise by 20%.

Low- and middle-income households, meanwhile, would see a small tax cut on average.

Broadly speaking, it's true that Clinton's tax plan would raise taxes, but they would be raised only on the highest earners. And even among that group, most would not see a doubling of their tax bill.

"I think you could find those edge cases where people would see a doubling of their tax bill. But more generally her plan is relatively modest," said Kyle Pomerleau, director of federal projects at the Tax Foundation, which advocates for lower taxes and a simpler code.

Verdict: False.

Trump Foundation

Reality Check: Trump on the flag and his foundation

By Kevin Liptak, CNN

Seeking to defend his charitable foundation, Trump sought to explain why he used funds from the group to settle a penalty imposed by a municipal government in Florida.

"The money goes, 100%, to a lot of charities, including a lot of military," Trump said of his namesake foundation. "I don't buy boats. I don't buy planes."

Pressed by Wallace about reports that some of the money had gone to settle lawsuits, Trump said: "No, 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 in the American flag."

"The money," Trump said, "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 veterans."

The roundabout explanation stems from a 2007 complaint brought by the city of Palm Beach, Florida, against Trump for raising a flagpole at his Mar-a-Lago club whose height exceeded regulations. As first reported in The Washington Post, Trump and the city settled the dispute over unpaid fines by agreeing Trump would donate $100,000 to a veterans' charity.

As the Post reported, the money did come from the Trump Foundation -- which is funded primarily with other people's money.

Trump's campaign didn't dispute the scenario. His campaign manager Kellyanne Conway told CNN in September that the "donations went to veterans groups" and questioned "how did the Mar-a-Lago benefit from him giving $100,000 to veterans?"

We rate this true, but misleading. Trump's claim that his foundation donated the money to the Fisher House veterans charity is accurate, though it only happened after he reached a legal settlement to do so.

NATO

Reality Check: Trump claims he got NATO countries to pay their dues

By Jamie Crawford, CNN

Trump said the following about spending of countries in the NATO alliance: "I questioned NATO. Why aren't they paying? Since I did this all of a sudden, they're paying. I've been giving a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden they're starting to pay up. I'm a big fan of NATO, but they have to pay up."

Trump is correct in saying there is a deficiency by the majority of countries of the 28 nation alliance that do not meet the NATO recommendation that each country spend 2% of its GDP on defense. In fact, only five members -- the United States, Estonia, Greece, Poland and the United Kingdom -- meet that benchmark, so Trump is correct in asserting that a majority of NATO countries are not paying their fair share.

Throughout his campaign, NATO has been a popular punching bag for the Republican nominee, who has threatened not to honor the commitment to self defense outlined in the NATO treaty unless other countries increase their spending.

In testimony before Congress last month, US Assistant Secretary of State for European Affairs Hoyt Brian Yee told the Senate that "all 28 allies are moving toward spending at least 2% of GDP on defense, with 70% already on track to meet that goal by 2024."

But is that the result of Trump's comments this campaign?

NATO allies have become alarmed by Russia's incursion into eastern Ukraine and annexation of Crimea over the past two years. Over the past year, several NATO countries have rotated forces throughout countries near the Russian border as a show of support. Europe is also under heavy stress from a refugee crisis stemming from the turmoil in the Middle East.

The goal of having more countries meet the NATO spending standards has long been an issue. There is nothing to indicate from the comments from officials of any NATO countries that the increase in spending has been spurred by the rhetoric from Trump or the US campaign trail.

Due to the fact that there is nothing to concretely quantify Trump's claim, we rate his comment as false.

Debt

Reality Check: Will Trump add $20 trillion to the debt and Clinton not a penny?

By Jeanne Sahadi, CNNMoney

Clinton said that she "will not add a penny to the debt. I have costed out what I'm going to do. (Trump) will, through his massive tax cuts, add $20 trillion to the debt."

Both candidates' tax plans have been analyzed by outside tax and budget groups. The latest -- from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center -- estimates that Trump's tax cuts would increase the federal debt by $22.1 trillion over the next 20 years.

By contrast, it estimates that Clinton's tax plan, which raises taxes on the wealthy and some businesses, would reduce the federal debt by at least $5.4 trillion over the same time period. So Clinton would be correct to say that her tax plan wouldn't add a penny to the debt and that Trump's would add $20 trillion.

But those numbers don't include the candidates' spending proposals.

Once Clinton's tax and spending plans are considered together, her not-a-penny claim isn't quite as airtight. Clinton's proposals as a whole would add an estimated $200 billion to the debt in the first decade, according to the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Though that $200 billion may end up being paid for once Clinton offers more specifics on what she means by "business tax reform," said Marc Goldwein, CRFB's senior policy director.

Still, that's a lot more than a penny, though $200 billion is a rounding error in the $18 trillion US economy.

Verdict: False.

Editor's note: The verdict on this Reality Check has been updated.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**12:14 am: Trump's accusers, taxes 11:54 pm: Jobs 11:36 pm: Russian hacking 11:18 pm: Clinton's State Department 10:56 pm: Abortion 10:44 pm: Nuclear proliferation 10:27 pm: Gun deaths 10:15 pm: Adds Syrian refugees 10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump met Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team spent the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN listened throughout the debate and selected key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

Gun deaths

Reality Check: Clinton on 33,000 gun deaths annually

By Ali Foreman, CNN

"We have 33,000 people a year who die from guns," Clinton claimed.

Her claim is in line with not only statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which reported 33,599 people killed by firearms in 2014) but also the rhetoric of her primary campaigning. In a February debate against Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, Clinton said, "On average, 90 people a day are killed by gun violence in our country."

While Clinton's figures are correct -- the CDC's reported number rounds to about 92 firearm-related deaths a day -- the context provided in Wednesday night's debate misses the mark.

She expanded upon the statistic, saying, "I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole ... I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment."

Clinton's use of this figure in support of gun control gives the impression that 33,000 Americans are violently killed by firearms each year. As we pointed out in February, the CDC's statistic encompasses many types of gun-related deaths -- not only violent, intentional encounters.

In addition to the 11,409 individuals killed as a result of gun violence (homicide and legal intervention), that 33,599 also includes suicides, unintentional deaths, and incidents with undetermined intent.

For this reason, we will rate Clinton's claim for a second time true, but misleading.

Nuclear proliferation

Reality Check: Trump claims he doesn't support nuclear proliferation

By Kevin Liptak, CNN

Clinton and Trump sparred over the Republican candidate's statements about nuclear weapons.

Clinton claimed Trump had been "very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons," an assertion Trump interjected to claim was "wrong." The Democratic candidate continued: "He's advocated more countries getting them. Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia."

Trump disputed the characterization of his stance: "There's no quote. You'll not find a quote from me," he said, saying he advocated countries taking steps to defend themselves, but "didn't say nuclear."

Over the course of his campaign, Trump has taken different and convoluted stances on nuclear proliferation. He suggested to The New York Times on March 27 that because North Korea has nuclear capabilities, Japan should develop a comparable defense.

"If Japan had that nuclear threat, I'm not sure that would be a bad thing for us," he said then.

Pressed in various CNN interviews since then, Trump expressed a similar stance. He told Anderson Cooper on March 29: "Wouldn't you rather in a certain sense have Japan have nuclear weapons when North Korea has nuclear weapons?"

And when Wolf Blitzer asked in May whether Trump was "ready to let Japan and South Korea become nuclear powers," Trump answered affirmatively.

"I am prepared to, if they're not going to take care of us properly, we cannot afford to be the military and police for the world," he said.

But he's also expressed a general opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons, telling CNN in March, "I hate nuclear more than any" and "I don't want more nuclear weapons."

Ultimately, Trump is on the record expressing support, at least in the hypothetical, for countries that currently don't have nuclear weapons eventually obtaining them.

Verdict: False.

Abortion

Reality Check: Trump on Clinton allowing abortions 'two or three or four days prior to birth'

By Ben Tinker, CNN

When asked by moderator Chris Wallace about late-term abortion, Trump responded, "If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take a 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 is saying, and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take a baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month, on the final day and that's not acceptable."

While Clinton has said she believes a fetus lacks constitutional rights, she did vote against a ban on late-term abortions in 2003 while serving as a senator from New York.

"The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make," Clinton said in the debate Wednesday night.

"I have met with women who have, toward the end of their pregnancy, get the worst news one can 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."

Roe v. Wade, decided by the Supreme Court in 1973, made abortions legal during the entire term of a pregnancy, but put restrictions on the procedure during the second and third trimesters.

Clinton does believe mothers should be allowed to terminate a pregnancy at any point -- up until birth -- if her life is in danger, but abortions as late in a pregnancy as Trump suggests are almost unheard of.

We therefore rate Trump's claim as true, but misleading.

Clinton's State Department

Reality Check: Trump says $6 billion went missing from the State Department

By Laura Koran, CNN

Attacking Clinton's leadership credentials, Trump claimed that $6 billion went missing from the State Department during her tenure as secretary of state, possibly stolen.

"How do you miss $6 billion?" he asked incredulously.

Trump has made this allegation at several recent rallies, but its origins are murky.

The conservative news website the Daily Caller reported on this apparent missing cash in August, having obtained a copy of a Freedom of Information Act request from the conservative government watchdog group Cause of Action Group.

The Cause of Action request, submitted to the State Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), asserts that the State Department lost contract files worth over $6 billion.

A footnote to the request shows they arrived at that figure by reading a management alert written by the State Department OIG in March 2014, which noted, "significant vulnerabilities in the management of contract file documentation that could expose the Department to substantial financial losses."

"Specifically, over the past six years, OIG has identified Department of State (Department) contracts with a total value of more than $6 billion in which contract files were incomplete or could not be located at all," that management alert noted.

But does that mean $6 billion went missing?

In short, no.

In fact, after The Washington Post reported on the management alert in 2014, the State Department IG wrote a letter to the editor seeking to dispell this notion.

"Some have concluded based on this (alert) that $6 billion is missing," Steve Linick wrote. "The alert, however, did not draw that conclusion."

"Instead," he continued, "it found that the failure to adequately maintain contract files - documents necessary to ensure the full accounting of US tax dollars -- 'creates significant financial risk and demonstrates a lack of internal control over the Department's contract actions.'"

Verdict: False. The man in charge of the same office that issued the management alert said the conclusion that $6 billion was lost is false. Rather, the State Department misplaced important documents related to valuable contracts.

Russian hacking

Reality Check: Clinton on Trump encouraging Russia to hack US

By Jamie Crawford, CNN

"It is pretty clear you won't admit the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people," Clinton said to Trump about assertions that Russia orchestrated the hack of emails from Clinton's campaign manager.

While there is no evidence that Trump has personally been involved in directing Russian agents to do the hacking, Clinton is correct that Trump has encouraged Russia of doing similar action.

During comments at a news conference earlier this year, Trump said the following in relation to the controversy over Clinton's use of a private email server during her tenure as secretary of state:

"Russia, if you're listening, I hope you're able to find the 30,000 emails that are missing. I think you will probably be rewarded mightily by our press," Trump said in Florida.

"They probably have them. I'd like to have them released," he continued. "Now, if Russia or China or any other country has those emails, I mean, to be honest with you, I'd love to see them."

Soon after those comments, Trump was asked by Fox News if he was being sarcastic, to which he replied, "Of course I'm being sarcastic."

Based on Trump's comments calling on Russia to take the action he did, we rate Clinton's assertion as true.

Clinton also said the following regarding Russia's alleged role in supplying WikiLeaks with the hacked emails being published from Podesta's account: "We have 17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin."

Earlier this month, US intelligence officials confirmed that emails hacked from the Democratic National Committee were the work of Russian intelligence, with the approval of Russia's senior-most leaders. That included the Director of National Intelligence -- representing all US intelligence agencies which include civilian and military agencies -- and the Department of Homeland Security.

"The kinds of disclosures that we've seen, including at WikiLeaks, of stolen emails from people who play an important role in our political process is consistent with Russian-directed efforts," White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest said at the time.

Based on this, we also rate Clinton's comments as true.

Jobs

Reality Check: Trump calls the most recent jobs report 'anemic'

By Patrick Gillespie, CNNMoney

Trump slammed the US job market's progress in September.

"They came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report," Trump said.

The US economy added 156,000 jobs in September, and though the unemployment ticked up slightly, it is at a relatively low 5% -- down from 10% in October 2009.

Roughly 90,000 new jobs per month are needed to keep up with the growth of the job market, according to many economists.

Economists didn't call it a great jobs report, but didn't say it was terrible, either. Many used the Goldilocks metaphor that job growth was not too hot nor too cold -- it was steady.

"Most of the indicators in the September jobs report were modestly below expectations, but overall they suggest that labor market conditions continue to improve," Kevin Logan, a US economist at HSBC, said when the report came out.

UBS economist Drew Matus called September's job gains "healthy."

It was the 72nd consecutive month that the economy gained jobs, marking six straight years of monthly gains in jobs.

Since Obama took office in January 2009, the economy has added 10.8 million jobs overall.

Verdict: False.

Trump's accusers

Reality Check: Trump and women's accusations

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Clinton claimed that Trump had swatted away the women who have accused him of sexual assault by disparaging their looks.

"He had a number of big rallies," Clinton said, "where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for --"

"I did not say that," Trump interrupted.

"...them to be assaulted," Clinton continued.

"I did not say that," Trump repeated.

Clinton then rattled off a series of comments made by Trump, including him saying, "Look at her. I don't think so"; "that wouldn't be my first choice"; and deemed a third woman who wrote a story about the assaults to be "disgusting."

CNN has not independently verified any of the women's claims, and Trump has vociferously denied each of their allegations.

But Trump has indeed made comments suggesting that he couldn't have done what was alleged because of how the accusers looked.

"You take a look, look at her, look at her words," Trump said in West Palm Beach, Florida, of Natasha Stoynoff, a People magazine writer who alleged misconduct. "And you tell me what you think. I don't think so."

"Believe me, she would not be my first choice," he said in Greensboro, North Carolina, of Jessica Leeds, who claimed Trump groped her on an airplane. "That would not be my first choice."

Though not explicitly, Trump certainly left the impression the women's looks were evidence he did not do what was alleged. We rate that claim by Clinton true.

But Clinton went too far, including the description of The New York Times reporter which, based on the reporter's own account, was his reaction to her writing a negative article, not her looks. We rate this claim false.

Taxes

Reality Check: Will Clinton really double your taxes?

By Jeanne Sahadi, CNNMoney

Trump asserted that Clinton's "tax plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes."

Clinton's plan calls for a range of tax increases on wages and investments, but they target the highest-income households, according to the latest analysis from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center. The top 1%, for instance, would absorb 93% of her proposed tax hikes.

Among her proposed tax increases, Clinton wants to implement the so-called Buffett Rule. It's named after billionaire Warren Buffett and would require anyone making $2 million or more to pay at least 30% of that in federal income taxes. So to the extent someone making that much pays 15% or less today, their tax bill would double.

But on average, the Tax Policy Center estimates that those in the top 0.1% would see their tax bills rise by 20%.

Low- and middle-income households, meanwhile, would see a small tax cut on average.

Broadly speaking, it's true that Clinton's tax plan would raise taxes, but they would be raised only on the highest earners. And even among that group, most would not see a doubling of their tax bill.

"I think you could find those edge cases where people would see a doubling of their tax bill. But more generally her plan is relatively modest," said Kyle Pomerleau, director of federal projects at the Tax Foundation, which advocates for lower taxes and a simpler code.

Verdict: False.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**11:18 pm: Clinton's State Department 10:56 pm: Abortion 10:44 pm: Nuclear proliferation 10:27 pm: Gun deaths 10:15 pm: Adds Syrian refugees 10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump met Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team spent the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN listened throughout the debate and selected key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

Gun deaths

Reality Check: Clinton on 33,000 gun deaths annually

By Ali Foreman, CNN

"We have 33,000 people a year who die from guns," Clinton claimed.

Her claim is in line with not only statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which reported 33,599 people killed by firearms in 2014) but also the rhetoric of her primary campaigning. In a February debate against Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, Clinton said, "On average, 90 people a day are killed by gun violence in our country."

While Clinton's figures are correct -- the CDC's reported number rounds to about 92 firearm-related deaths a day -- the context provided in Wednesday night's debate misses the mark.

She expanded upon the statistic, saying, "I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole ... I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment."

Clinton's use of this figure in support of gun control gives the impression that 33,000 Americans are violently killed by firearms each year. As we pointed out in February, the CDC's statistic encompasses many types of gun-related deaths -- not only violent, intentional encounters.

In addition to the 11,409 individuals killed as a result of gun violence (homicide and legal intervention), that 33,599 also includes suicides, unintentional deaths, and incidents with undetermined intent.

For this reason, we will rate Clinton's claim for a second time true, but misleading.

Nuclear proliferation

Reality Check: Trump claims he doesn't support nuclear proliferation

By Kevin Liptak, CNN

Clinton and Trump sparred over the Republican candidate's statements about nuclear weapons.

Clinton claimed Trump had been "very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons," an assertion Trump interjected to claim was "wrong." The Democratic candidate continued: "He's advocated more countries getting them. Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia."

Trump disputed the characterization of his stance: "There's no quote. You'll not find a quote from me," he said, saying he advocated countries taking steps to defend themselves, but "didn't say nuclear."

Over the course of his campaign, Trump has taken different and convoluted stances on nuclear proliferation. He suggested to The New York Times on March 27 that because North Korea has nuclear capabilities, Japan should develop a comparable defense.

"If Japan had that nuclear threat, I'm not sure that would be a bad thing for us," he said then.

Pressed in various CNN interviews since then, Trump expressed a similar stance. He told Anderson Cooper on March 29: "Wouldn't you rather in a certain sense have Japan have nuclear weapons when North Korea has nuclear weapons?"

And when Wolf Blitzer asked in May whether Trump was "ready to let Japan and South Korea become nuclear powers," Trump answered affirmatively.

"I am prepared to, if they're not going to take care of us properly, we cannot afford to be the military and police for the world," he said.

But he's also expressed a general opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons, telling CNN in March, "I hate nuclear more than any" and "I don't want more nuclear weapons."

Ultimately, Trump is on the record expressing support, at least in the hypothetical, for countries that currently don't have nuclear weapons eventually obtaining them.

Verdict: False.

Abortion

Reality Check: Trump on Clinton allowing abortions 'two or three or four days prior to birth'

By Ben Tinker, CNN

When asked by moderator Chris Wallace about late-term abortion, Trump responded, "If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month you can take a 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 is saying, and based on where she's going and where she's been, you can take a baby and rip the baby out of the womb. In the ninth month, on the final day and that's not acceptable."

While Clinton has said she believes a fetus lacks constitutional rights, she did vote against a ban on late-term abortions in 2003 while serving as a senator from New York.

"The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make," Clinton said in the debate Wednesday night.

"I have met with women who have, toward the end of their pregnancy, get the worst news one can 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."

Roe v. Wade, decided by the Supreme Court in 1973, made abortions legal during the entire term of a pregnancy, but put restrictions on the procedure during the second and third trimesters.

Clinton does believe mothers should be allowed to terminate a pregnancy at any point -- up until birth -- if her life is in danger, but abortions as late in a pregnancy as Trump suggests are almost unheard of.

We therefore rate Trump's claim as true, but misleading.

Clinton's State Department

Reality Check: Trump says $6 billion went missing from the State Department

By Laura Koran, CNN

Attacking Clinton's leadership credentials, Trump claimed that $6 billion went missing from the State Department during her tenure as secretary of state, possibly stolen.

"How do you miss $6 billion?" he asked incredulously.

Trump has made this allegation at several recent rallies, but its origins are murky.

The conservative news website the Daily Caller reported on this apparent missing cash in August, having obtained a copy of a Freedom of Information Act request from the conservative government watchdog group Cause of Action Group.

The Cause of Action request, submitted to the State Department's Office of the Inspector General (OIG), asserts that the State Department lost contract files worth over $6 billion.

A footnote to the request shows they arrived at that figure by reading a management alert written by the State Department OIG in March 2014, which noted, "significant vulnerabilities in the management of contract file documentation that could expose the Department to substantial financial losses."

"Specifically, over the past six years, OIG has identified Department of State (Department) contracts with a total value of more than $6 billion in which contract files were incomplete or could not be located at all," that management alert noted.

But does that mean $6 billion went missing?

In short, no.

In fact, after The Washington Post reported on the management alert in 2014, the State Department IG wrote a letter to the editor seeking to dispell this notion.

"Some have concluded based on this (alert) that $6 billion is missing," Steve Linick wrote. "The alert, however, did not draw that conclusion."

"Instead," he continued, "it found that the failure to adequately maintain contract files - documents necessary to ensure the full accounting of US tax dollars -- 'creates significant financial risk and demonstrates a lack of internal control over the Department's contract actions.'"

Verdict: False. The man in charge of the same office that issued the management alert said the conclusion that $6 billion was lost is false. Rather, the State Department misplaced important documents related to valuable contracts.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:44 pm: Nuclear proliferation 10:27 pm: Gun deaths 10:15 pm: Adds Syrian refugees 10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump met Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team spent the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN listened throughout the debate and selected key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

Gun deaths

Reality Check: Clinton on 33,000 gun deaths annually

By Ali Foreman, CNN

"We have 33,000 people a year who die from guns," Clinton claimed.

Her claim is in line with not only statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which reported 33,599 people killed by firearms in 2014) but also the rhetoric of her primary campaigning. In a February debate against Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, Clinton said, "On average, 90 people a day are killed by gun violence in our country."

While Clinton's figures are correct -- the CDC's reported number rounds to about 92 firearm-related deaths a day -- the context provided in Wednesday night's debate misses the mark.

She expanded upon the statistic, saying, "I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole ... I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment."

Clinton's use of this figure in support of gun control gives the impression that 33,000 Americans are violently killed by firearms each year. As we pointed out in February, the CDC's statistic encompasses many types of gun-related deaths -- not only violent, intentional encounters.

In addition to the 11,409 individuals killed as a result of gun violence (homicide and legal intervention), that 33,599 also includes suicides, unintentional deaths, and incidents with undetermined intent.

For this reason, we will rate Clinton's claim for a second time true, but misleading.

Nuclear proliferation

Reality Check: Trump claims he doesn't support nuclear proliferation

By Kevin Liptak, CNN

Clinton and Trump sparred over the Republican candidate's statements about nuclear weapons.

Clinton claimed Trump had been "very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons," an assertion Trump interjected to claim was "wrong." The Democratic candidate continued: "He's advocated more countries getting them. Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia."

Trump disputed the characterization of his stance: "There's no quote. You'll not find a quote from me," he said, saying he advocated countries taking steps to defend themselves, but "didn't say nuclear."

Over the course of his campaign, Trump has taken different and convoluted stances on nuclear proliferation. He suggested to The New York Times on March 27 that because North Korea has nuclear capabilities, Japan should develop a comparable defense.

"If Japan had that nuclear threat, I'm not sure that would be a bad thing for us," he said then.

Pressed in various CNN interviews since then, Trump expressed a similar stance. He told Anderson Cooper on March 29: "Wouldn't you rather in a certain sense have Japan have nuclear weapons when North Korea has nuclear weapons?"

And when Wolf Blitzer asked in May whether Trump was "ready to let Japan and South Korea become nuclear powers," Trump answered affirmatively.

"I am prepared to, if they're not going to take care of us properly, we cannot afford to be the military and police for the world," he said.

But he's also expressed a general opposition to the spread of nuclear weapons, telling CNN in March, "I hate nuclear more than any" and "I don't want more nuclear weapons."

Ultimately, Trump is on the record expressing support, at least in the hypothetical, for countries that currently don't have nuclear weapons eventually obtaining them.

Verdict: False.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:27 pm: Gun deaths 10:15 pm: Adds Syrian refugees 10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are meeting Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team is spending the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN is listening throughout the debate and selecting key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

Gun deaths

Reality Check: Clinton on 33,000 gun deaths annually

By Ali Foreman, CNN

"We have 33,000 people a year who die from guns," Clinton claimed.

Her claim is in line with not only statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which reported 33,599 people killed by firearms in 2014) but also the rhetoric of her primary campaigning. In a February debate against Vermont Sen. Bernie Sanders, Clinton said, "On average, 90 people a day are killed by gun violence in our country."

While Clinton's figures are correct -- the CDC's reported number rounds to about 92 firearm-related deaths a day -- the context provided in Wednesday night's debate misses the mark.

She expanded upon the statistic, saying, "I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole ... I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment."

Clinton's use of this figure in support of gun control gives the impression that 33,000 Americans are violently killed by firearms each year. As we pointed out in February, the CDC's statistic encompasses many types of gun-related deaths -- not only violent, intentional encounters.

In addition to the 11,409 individuals killed as a result of gun violence (homicide and legal intervention), that 33,599 also includes suicides, unintentional deaths, and incidents with undetermined intent.

For this reason, we will rate Clinton's claim for a second time true, but misleading.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:15 pm: Adds Syrian refugees 10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are meeting Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team is spending the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN is listening throughout the debate and selecting key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence," not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Syrian refugees

Reality Check: Trump says Obama admitted thousands of Syrians

By Laura Koran, CNN

Trump claimed that President Barack Obama has admitted "thousands and thousands" of Syrians, adding, "they have no idea where they come from."

Let's break this claim down.

The Obama administration amended its refugee quotas for the 2016 fiscal year in response to the growing migrant crisis, paving the way for at least 10,000 Syrian refugees into the US. They ended the fiscal year at the end of September having admitted more than 12,500 Syrians as part of this increase.

The administration called for a further increase in the overall refugee admissions quota for the 2017 fiscal year, from 85,000 to 110,000. Officials have not offered a specific goal for Syrians, but plan to admit 40,000 refugees from the geographic region that includes Syria.

There is also an "unallocated reserve" of 14,000 the administration can use to adjust admissions for populations facing the greatest need, which this administration (or more likely the next one) could use to increase the number of Syrians.

The second part of Trump's claim suggests the US does not know the identities of the refugees who are entering the country.

Administration officials have called the vetting process for refugees "the most stringent" applied to any group of people entering the country.

The process includes biometric and biographical checks involving officials from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Defense Department, the National Counterterrorism Center and the FBI.

The process is made more complicated by the fact that the administration doesn't have a diplomatic relationship with the Syrian government and therefore isn't able to verify some details about applicants on the ground.

Obama's own FBI director, James Comey, acknowledged the issue, saying last year, "If someone has never made a ripple in the pond in Syria in a way that would get their identity or their interest reflected in our database, we can query our database until the cows come home, but there will be nothing show up because we have no record of them."

But officials involved in the process insist the vetting process is a holistic one, and the interagency team takes advantage of a host of tools to verify applicants' identities and their suitability to be relocated to the US.

Verdict: The first part of Trump's claim is true. The Obama administration has already admitted well over 10,000 Syrian refugees and has put forward a plan that would allow for the admission of thousands more. The second part of his claim is false. Refugees undergo a vetting process that can take over 12 months to verify their identities.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:10 pm: Adds Trump on the wall 10:05 pm: Adds Roe v. Wade

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are meeting Wednesday for their final debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team is spending the night analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN is listening throughout the debate and selecting key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Supreme Court

Reality Check: Trump on Ruth Bader Ginsburg's remarks

By Kate Grise, CNN

Trump called out the Supreme Court justice for her criticism of his candidacy.

"Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some 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," he said. "And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made."

Ginsburg called Trump a "faker" in a July 11 interview with CNN.

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment," Ginsburg said. "He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns? The press seems to be very gentle with him on that."

"At first I thought it was funny," she said. "To think that there's a possibility that he could be president."

Early that same week, Ginsburg also told The Associated Press that if Trump won the presidency, "I don't want to think about that possibility, but if it should be, then everything is up for grabs."

She also told The New York Times, "I can't imagine what this place would be -- I can't imagine what the country would be -- with Donald Trump as our president. For the country, it could be four years. For the court, it could be -- I don't even want to contemplate that."

Ginsburg later said she regretted the remarks.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in a statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future, I will be more circumspect."

We rate Trump's claim true.

Reality Check: Trump justices would overrule Roe v. Wade 'automatically'

By Steve Vladeck, CNN

Trump's claim that the Supreme Court's decision in Roe v. Wade would be overruled by justices he would appoint to the Supreme Court "automatically" is belied by history.

Although Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H.W. Bush appointed justices who they believed would overrule the 1973 decision recognizing a woman's constitutional right to choose an abortion, three of those appointees -- Justices Sandra Day O'Connor, Anthony Kennedy and David Souter -- famously voted to preserve the Roe decision in 1992.

Even if a President Trump were only to appoint "pro-life" justices, there is simply no way to ensure that any particular decision, including Roe, would be "automatically" overruled.

Verdict: False.

**Immigration**

Reality Check: Clinton 'fought for the wall,' Trump claims

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump thundered that Clinton "fought for the wall in 2006."

Clinton did indeed support a border barrier in 2006 -- she voted for George W. Bush's Secure Fence Act, which paved the way for 700 miles of security along the southern border. But as the name implies, it was a "fence" not a wall.

It's unclear if that is still an official campaign position. Her position on **immigration** reform, as listed on her website, says close to little about how she would secure the border.

Confronted by Latino anchor Jorge Ramos about the difference about her position and Trump's, Clinton said in January.

"We do need to have secure borders, and what that will take is a combination of technology and physical barriers," she told him.

"But you want a wall, then," Ramos replied.

"I voted for border security -- and some of it was a fence, I don't think we ever called it a wall," she replied, before conceding: "Maybe in some cases it was a wall."

The difference is largely semantic -- both are physical barriers that prevent people from crossing. But Trump isn't entirely accurate.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump dished some Spanish Wednesday during the third and final presidential debate.

During a discussion about his stance on **immigration** reform, the Republican presidential nominee reiterated his stance on deporting undocumented **immigrants** from the country and used a Spanish word to make his point.

"We have some bad hombres here and we're going to get them out," he said.

Twitter was quick to react -- many in disbelief that he said something in Spanish.

And #badhombres began trending on Twitter.

CNN's Amanda Jackson contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Donald Trump chooses language that gets his supporters scared about crime.

Hillary Clinton wants the political left to know she "gets it."

To get these message across, the candidates use a linguistic strategy sometimes called a "dog whistle."

Consider the examples below as subtle but effective ways Trump and Clinton have tried to rally, wink, or tug at the emotions of their supporters when they talk about race and ethnicity.

"Inner City"

(Decoded: Blacks and Hispanics live in dangerous, poor, crime ridden cities.)

In the first presidential debate, one of Donald Trump's most memorable comments about communities of color was when he said "African-Americans, Hispanics are living in hell because it's so dangerous."

Hell, it appears, is also synonymous with the "inner city" that Trump invokes when speaking about black and brown Americans, an equivalency that paints a dismal economic and social environment filled with crime and danger.

"It makes no sense to use a phrase such as 'inner city' as a stand in for the complexity and variety of people of color in the United States," said Ian Haney-Lopez, a law professor at the University of California at Berkeley and the author of the book, Dog Whistle Politics: How Coded Racial Appeals Have Reinvented Racism and Wrecked the Middle Class.

Phrases like "inner city" are used in this context "as a proxy for language meant to trigger negative images of people of color."

Ryan Lauth, a communications professor at Northwestern University, said "inner city" invokes images of "white flight" when whites were escaping decaying urban areas in favor of what they considered safer suburbs. The term is used to invoke fear in rural and suburban voters who want to elect someone who will stop crime from spreading, Lauth said.

Heather Mac Donald, a fellow at The Manhattan Institute, says those who criticize Trump for using these phrases are missing the point. "It means that you can't talk about crime without being called a racist?" Mac Donald said. "He's not assuming that all blacks and Hispanics live in inner cities, he's saying in urban areas crime is extremely high."

"Law and order"

(Decoded: People of color -- and liberals -- are lawless.)

Trump has also repeated the phrase "law and order" when describing his campaign's focus - a phrase that harkens back to Richard Nixon who ran part of his 1968 presidential campaign on the same premise in an attempt to sway Southern conservative whites.

To help control what's happening in the "inner cities" (see above), Trump uses this phrase regularly. "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," he said in the first debate.

In that same debate, while Clinton jabbed Trump because "he paints such a dire negative picture of the black community," she too struggled. She framed her answer to the question on healing the racial divide through the lens of gun control, an issue that affects all Americans, not just people of color.

Clinton also called for a plan that would deal with policies like mandatory minimum sentences "which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little."

Many of those policies, however, were implemented and enforced by earlier administrations, including her husband's, and led to the mass incarceration of many black and Latino Americans in the 1980s and 1990s.

"Criminal illegal **aliens**"

(Decoded: Scary and dangerous undocumented brown people.)

During the vice presidential debate, Mike Pence repeatedly used the term "criminal **aliens**" to describe undocumented Mexican **immigrants** who commit crimes.

During the second presidential debate, Trump expanded the term to include the word "illegal."

Said Trump: "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."

For Haney-Lopez, this language represents "the boogey man of 2016" and casts undocumented **immigrants** as "inherently criminal" and as "dark skinned Latinos without documents preying on good decent hardworking white Americans."

The term helps Trump "justify his comments about Mexican **immigrants** being rapists and murderers," said Lauth, by making en emotional appeal to Americans who are frustrated with Mexican **immigrants** "taking our jobs."

"Implicit bias"

(Decoded: "I get it -- racism is real.")

In debates and speeches, Clinton has taken to using terms like "systemic racism" and "implicit bias" that were once favored by academics and are now slowly making their way into the mainstream.

Haney-Lopez said Clinton was employing a more subtle form of dog whistling, a secret handshake if you will, that won't register with everyone.

In addition, using the phrase "implicit bias" helps Clinton talk about racism in a way that may be easier for more conservative voters to accept, said Lauth, since it stems from subconscious prejudices that people are unaware they have.

"The term implicit bias will satisfy a lot of people that are looking for a very explicit answer to the problem of police brutality," Lauth said. "It also helps her in walking that line between Blue Lives Matter and Black Lives Matter."

Some of the evolution of Clinton's language around race can be linked to her bumpy relationship with activists of color who have criticized the candidate for, among other things, calling some young criminals "super predators" when her husband was president.

Many interpreted that phrase as being a code for young black men. (Trump didn't miss the opportunity to dredge up the phrase during the first debate calling it "a terrible thing to say.")

Clinton also fumbled with wide swaths of working class white voters when she called a segment of Trump supporters "a basket of deplorables." That term, Lauth said, "makes people feel irredeemable, people that are so bad they can never come back."

Haney-Lopez agreed. Trump supporters say ''I know in my heart I'm not a racist. That's an attack of me as a white person.'"

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 2:20p: Adds color , details

(CNN) -- This was inevitable. This collision of two notable, and objectionable, moments from the Donald Trump campaign: a wall and taco trucks.

A half dozen taco trucks formed a "wall" outside the Trump International Las Vegas hotel, hours before the presidential debate Wednesday.

"If you don't get out and vote, this clown could be president," a worker told the crowd as he pointed at the building.

The rally was organized by the Culinary Workers Union, which vociferously opposes Trump. The group says Trump has refused to bargain with hotel employees who voted last year to unionize.

The hundred or so gathered chanted "Dump Trump" and "Make America Great Again - start here!"

The trucks then handed out tacos.

The union represents more than 50,000 workers in Nevada, and the Trump hotel is one of the very few on the Las Vegas Strip that does not have union-negotiated contracts for its workers.

Last month, the union launched a campaign calling on supporters to boycott all Trump businesses, a bid to bring hotel management to the negotiating table.

The workers were joined by several other organizations Wednesday.

Until recently, Trump has repeatedly said that, if elected, he would build a "great wall" on the southern border of the US to keep out **immigrants** -- and make Mexico pay for it.

The "taco truck" phrase became the subject of ridicule after Marco Gutierrez, a Latino surrogate for the Trump campaign, warned that without tighter **immigration** policies, "you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS (CNN) -- Celia Vargas fled civil war-torn El Salvador and crossed the Mexican border into the United States in the back of a truck in 1981.

For years she lived in the country illegally, before President Ronald Reagan signed a bill into law in 1986 that gave Vargas and millions more like her amnesty.

Today, she works for Donald Trump at his hotel on the Las Vegas Strip. But she's not voting for him.

Trump's **immigration** proposals and his rhetoric on undocumented people upsets Vargas. Many of the people he derides clean his hotel rooms, she says, gesturing towards herself.

"I will vote for Ms Hillary Clinton, and my family, too," says Vargas, who was 23 when she came to the United States illegally. "She fights for keeping families together, she fights for the younger people, for Dreamers."

Workers want change at Trump Vegas

Vargas, a guest room attendant, is one of more than 200 workers at the Trump International Hotel Las Vegas that voted late last year to unionize. Trump owns the hotel the hotel with Phil Ruffin.

Appeals by the hotel to the National Labor Relations Board contesting the certification of the union failed, but the hotel has yet to meet union representatives to negotiate.

Speaking at the Republican National Convention in July, Ruffin said Trump's "handshake is better than any contract you will ever write."

On Wednesday night, the presidential candidates will be in Las Vegas for their third and final debate.

Jeffrey Wise, who has worked in Vegas for 30 years, is among the workers calling on Trump and Ruffin to come to the negotiating table.

Wise works two jobs, one as a food server at the Trump hotel, and another similar role at a hotel with union negotiated contracts elsewhere on the strip. He says his other job pays $3 more per hour and includes benefits he doesn't receive at the Trump property.

"We hear the phrase often and again and again about let's 'Make America Great Again,' let's make America what it was supposed to be," Wise tells CNN, "if you want to start making America great, start from the bottom with the workers."

Neither the Trump campaign nor the Trump International Hotel Las Vegas were immediately able to comment, but when asked last month by the Las Vegas Sun on unionization at the hotel, Donald Trump Jr., citing his father's history of construction projects in New York said, "I don't think anyone in the history of politics has done more with union labor than Donald Trump."

Trump Jr. said he was not aware of any plans for negotiations to commence but said: "If you look at our history you'd see a history and decades of negotiation. So we'll see what happens. Everything is a case-by-case basis."

Taking on the boss

The Culinary Workers Union represents more than 50,000 workers in Nevada, and the Trump hotel is one of the very few on the Las Vegas Strip that does not have union-negotiated contracts for its workers. Just last month the union launched a campaign calling on supporters to boycott all Trump businesses, a bid to bring hotel management to the negotiating table.

Vargas, Wise, and others are not afraid to take on their boss.

Meeting at the union's headquarters, in a quieter part of town two miles off the Vegas Strip, they're still within view of the 64-story hotel with the trademark Trump name emblazoned across its top.

"That's what the basis of being an American is all about, it's the right to speak up when you see something unjust and not done fairly and do something about it," Wise says of his campaign.

Voting the other way

Carmen Llarul, like Vargas, is another Trump worker who isn't voting for the Republican candidate; instead she says she'll cast her ballot for Clinton.

Llarul came to the US from Argentina in the early 1980s. She proudly shows a text message on her phone from her granddaughter Olivia, 20, who is on her first deployment with the US Air Force in Japan.

Carmen's daughter also served in the armed forces and says Trump doesn't appreciate how much **immigrants** and their families contribute to American society.

"These hands clean the rooms every single day for Mr Trump so he can be rich," she says pointing to her hands. "He should listen to us, the **immigrants**, the workers, because we have a lot to teach him."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated 11:23 p.m., graf 61, edit

(CNN) -- I was lecturing a friend one day about the need to vote when he countered with a question about my civic duty: Why don't you ever stand for the national anthem?

An awkward silence followed his question and then he added: "I never asked why. I thought you had some feelings about America. I figured you had your reasons."

He was right. Long before NFL quarterback Colin Kaepernick refused to stand for the anthem, I started remaining seated when it was played. I didn't do it for attention or to protest. As a person of color, I just couldn't relate to the America that the anthem rhapsodized. How do I love a country that doesn't love my people back? Patriotism, I thought, was the language of white America; it didn't speak to me.

But something has shifted within me during the last eight years, and it goes beyond witnessing the election of the nation's first black president. President Barack Obama and others have redefined what it means to "love America."

I'm seeing the birth of a new brand of patriotism that finally speaks to me and other nonwhite Americans.

I bring up Obama and patriotism now because so many people are reflecting on his legacy. The Obama era is being described as a prelude to the "browning of America" when racial minorities become the majority in the future.

Yet I think it's the prelude to something even more. The definition of what it means to love America will expand. The browning of America won't just change how the country looks in the future; it will change how Americans express patriotism, because racial minorities bring different histories to this notion of America as the "land of the free."

I know I do. I've long felt ambivalent when people tell me I should love America. I wonder what America are they talking about. Should I just be happy, as one white man once told me, that my ancestors were rescued from the jungles of Africa and brought to the greatest country in the world?

That man embodied the "love it or leave" attitude that I associate with flag wavers. It's a pugnacious patriotism that one can hear in country singer Merle Haggard's song, "The Fighting Side of Me." Haggard released the song as anti-war protests surged during the Vietnam War.

I hear people talkin' bad, About the way we have to live here in this country, Harpin' on the wars we fight, An' gripin' 'bout the way things oughta be. An' I don't mind 'em switchin' sides, An' standin' up for things they believe in. When they're runnin' down my country, man, They're walkin' on the fightin' side of me.

That's the type of kick-butt patriotism I believed in when I was growing up. My childhood heroes were soldiers like Audie Murphy, the most decorated American soldier in World War II. I read his biography, "To Hell and Back," three times in junior high school. I almost cried when Davy Crockett died near the end of the movie "The Alamo." I plastered US Marine memorabilia on the walls of my boyhood bedroom.

I didn't think about it at the time, but all my childhood heroes were white men carrying guns, typically with American flags waving in the background. I vaguely knew about people like the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr., but they didn't excite me. Singing "We Shall Overcome" didn't compare to storming the sands of Iwo Jima. I thought there was no greater courage than to go to war for your country.

Then I came across a group of college students who taught me about another type of courage.

When patriotism becomes dangerous

I was channel surfing one day when I stumbled upon a PBS documentary on the Freedom Riders. They were an interracial group of college students who decided to sit next to one another on bus rides through the Deep South in the early 1960s. They were trying to desegregate interstate bus travel.

Sitting next to a person of another race on a bus doesn't sound dangerous. But you risked death if you did that in the segregated South. Many Freedom Riders actually signed last wills and testaments before the trips because they didn't expect to return. Their fears were not unfounded. They were attacked by mobs wielding baseball bats and chains. Several were almost beaten to death. Many would carry physical and psychological scars for the rest of their lives. All were unarmed. Their only weapon: faith that their country could be better.

This was a dangerous type of patriotism, not a polite demonstration or mild civil disobedience. It was the kind that could get you fired from your job, shunned by your community, beaten or killed.

Yet it was the kind of patriotism that made progress possible in America, said Ralph Young, author of "Dissent: The History of an American Idea." He said people often forget the United States was founded by political and religious dissenters fleeing Europe. They put the right to dissent in the Constitution, he said.

"Dissent is the fuel for the engine of progress," said Young, a history professor at Temple University in Philadelphia. "Inertia is built into institutions. Things don't change unless people push for change."

How Obama legitimized another brand of patriotism

Most of us were taught in school that dissent is patriotic. Dissenters are venerated, but usually only after they're dead and neutered by time. During war, economic uncertainty or massive social change, the "love it or leave it" form of patriotism rules.

Yet something different has happened during the Obama era. He has helped legitimize the dangerous type of patriotism. He's done this through words and deeds.

No other president has talked about patriotism the way Obama has. It's a type of patriotism many nonwhite Americans can finally see themselves in.

Consider Obama's speech in Selma, Alabama, last year. Some consider it his own "Gettysburg Address." He gave it at the foot of the Edmund Pettus Bridge, commemorating the epic civil rights campaign that spawned the Voting Rights Act.

In that speech, Obama declared that America is great not just because of what it was, but because of what it is becoming. He said "America is not some fragile thing" that can't tolerate citizens demanding change.

"What greater form of patriotism is there than the belief that America is not yet finished, that we are strong enough to be self-critical?" he asked.

He called members of disparaged groups -- gays and lesbians, Mexican **immigrants** -- American heroes. He praised the "hopeful strivers who cross the Rio Grande" and "the gay Americans whose blood ran on the streets of San Francisco and New York."

He also put women, not white men in powdered wigs, at the center of the America story. He cited a 19th century former slave who became an abolitionist and champion of women's rights, and another civil rights activist from the 1960s whose fiery eloquence forced America to face the brutality of segregation in the Deep South.

"Look at our history," he said. "We are Sojourner Truth and Fannie Lou Hamer, women who could do as much as men and then some."

The Selma speech was Obama's answer to critics who said he didn't believe in American exceptionalism. He just redefined it, and as the country gets browner, I suspect this form of patriotism will become more accepted.

The Selma speech was hailed as a classic. In an Atlantic article entitled, "Finally I Hear a Politician Explain My Country Just the Way I Understand It," the author James Fallows said Obama "expressed the essence of our American creed."

Greg Jaffe, another commentator, compared the speech to Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address." He said it "rewrote American history, putting America's rebels, protest leaders, misfits, artists and **immigrants** at the center of the story."

The speech spoke to America's future -- a time when the nation is expected to become "majority minority," Jaffe wrote in the Washington Post.

"Selma is the first great presidential address to speak to that America and a speech only our first black president could give," he wrote.

Obama expressed the same sentiments at another patriotic milestone: The dedication last month of a new Smithsonian National Museum of African American History and Culture in Washington.

Again, the same concept -- troublemakers past and present -- are true patriots, he said.

"This is the place to understand how protests and love of country don't merely coexist, but inform each other," Obama said. "How men can probably win the gold for their country, but still insist on raising a black-gloved fist. How we can wear an I Can't Breathe T-shirt, and still grieve for fallen police officers."

This form of patriotism isn't new. It's the kind that people of color have had to develop because white America's narrow definition of patriotism didn't fit.

It is the type of patriotism that the black poet Langston Hughes expressed in his 1935 poem "Let America Be America Again." In it, he gives his own variation of the call to make America great again.

O, let America be America again- The land that never has been yet- And yet must be-

Patriotism in unlikely places

Never has this type of patriotism been expressed so forcefully from the highest office in the land. Yet I've watched it spread to ordinary American life in so many different ways.

It is a patriotism that insists on seeing the good, bad and ugly of America's past.

One reason I didn't stand for the anthem is because I didn't feel this country had ever officially acknowledged its original sin, slavery. There was a museum that commemorated the European holocaust but there was none to acknowledge the African-American slave trade.

But the African-American museum in Washington has changed that fact. Slavery is dealt with head-on. On display is an actual slave cabin, a receipt for a teenage girl slave, and an iron neck-ring forged for another slave.

There are other signs that the nation is more willing to recognize its other "original sin," the virtual genocide of Native Americans. There's a burgeoning movement to replace Columbus Day celebrations with "Indigenous Peoples' Day" honoring Native Americans. At least 26 cities are replacing Columbus Day with the new holiday.

And at a White House conference last month hosted by Obama, the federal government agreed to pay $492 million to 17 Native American tribes for mismanaging their funds and natural resources. The Obama administration has now settled at least 100 tribal claims, some over a century old. Cherokee Nation Principal Chief Bill John Baker said Obama "is the best president for Indian Country in the history of the United States."

Beyond Washington, there are signs that Americans are thinking differently about patriotism.

When Muhammad Ali died earlier this year, he was treated like an American hero. Yet he was once one of the country's most hated dissidents because he refused to fight for his country. Most of the tributes that followed his death pinned his greatness not on his boxing ability, but on his willingness to defy the government for his religious beliefs.

Today another black athlete is provoking fury for being "un-American": Colin Kaepernick, with his refusal to stand for the national anthem. But compare the response Kaepernick has received to the scorn and professional exile that Ali endured.

Two weeks after Kaepernick's protest, his jersey became the top seller in NFL sales. Other professional athletes followed his example. So have high school football teams throughout the nation. A professional soccer player, Megan Rapinoe, also took a knee while the anthem was played, later explaining that "being a gay American, I know what it means to look at the flag and not have it protect all of your liberties."

Kaepernick even got an impassioned defense from an unlikely source: a former Navy SEAL.

Former Minnesota Gov. Jesse Ventura posted a video online in which he said he fully and completely supported Kaepernick. He literally saluted Kaepernick for having the courage of his convictions and said "whether I agree with him or not is irrelevant."

Ventura recalled that he vetoed a bill when he was governor that would have required the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance in every Minnesota public school.

"You know why?" he said in the video. "Because governments should not mandate patriotism. ... Who mandated patriotism? The Germans in the 1930s."

Americans are accustomed to public figures taking public stands on controversial issues. But for change to really take root, it has to occur away from the spotlight -- and come from someone you'd never expect to see it in.

Which America do you believe in?

That's what recently happened in Charlotte, North Carolina, a week after a black police officer killed a black man in front of his wife. The shooting sparked protests that turned violent and a man was shot to death during a demonstration.

With the city still on edge, a pastor decided to deliver a sermon. His name is Loran Livingston, and he is a white, conservative evangelical. He grew up during segregation in a rural area of North Carolina that was dominated by the Ku Klux Klan. He believes in the inerrancy of the Bible and is a military buff who collects guns and knives. The police officer who allegedly killed the man, sparking the protest, is a member of his church.

One could have expected Livingston to give a hellfire sermon condemning the protesters in Charlotte, but the pastor said something different.

He condemned the violence and praised the police officers who took an oath to protect citizens. He also defended the officer in his congregation who was at the center of the protests, saying he did his sworn duty and "you will not find a finer young man."

But he also said that many of the protesters had "genuine grievances," and that many Americans don't want to admit that there is a "caste system in the nation."

As several members of his Central Church of God congregation stirred nervously in their seats, Livingston condemned "country club" Christian churches where all the members look alike and send their kids to private schools. He asked his congregation to consider the perspective of poor blacks living in Charlotte who see billion-dollar sports complexes sprout up while they struggle to make ends meet.

"And with all that, they turn on the TV and they watch someone who has no clue say make America great again," Livingston thundered, "and these people are saying, 'When was it ever great for me?'"

But maybe it could be one day. That's the hope that has helped so many Americans in the past who felt like outsiders. How does society accommodate this new form of patriotism that incorporates the good, bad and ugly of America, but still looks forward to something better in the future?

Maybe I'll never stand for the anthem. But for the first time as an adult, I can find the words and examples to explain why I think America is exceptional.

You may prefer the "love it or leave it" America. But I, and I suspect many others, believe in another America -- "the one that never was and yet must be."

Correction: An earlier version of this article incorrectly described an officer-involved shooting. It was a black officer who shot a black man in the Charlotte incident.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- A Somali **immigrant** speaking Swahili while visiting a Minnesota Applebee's last year was left stunned and bleeding when another female customer hit her with a beer mug. This week that customer pleaded guilty to the attack, which police said was racially motivated.

Jodie Marie Burchard-Risch was accused of attacking Asma Jama, a Somali **immigrant**, at the Coon Rapids Applebee's in October 2015.

Asma Jama said as her family was seated at the restaurant, the adults were speaking in Swahili, a language the adults often use when children are around so the kids do not know what the adults are saying. As the group walked past Burchard-Risch's table, she said, "In America, we speak English."

Jama said she initially ignored the comments but the situation escalated quickly, she said, when Burchard-Risch yelled at her to go back to her country.

"She was yelling at me in my face, and I will admit I stood toe to toe with her. I wasn't screaming, I was talking to her calmly," Jama told CNN, recounting the incident.

That is when Burchard-Risch took a beer mug and threw it at Jama's face and then fled the restaurant, according to authorities.

Jama needed several stitches for her face and lip. She said that now, a year later, she has scars she covers with makeup.

Jama said the incident has changed her life.

"I used to a be a carefree person. I was never scared someone was going to attack me. I would go on walks alone. Drive alone. Not anymore. I have to have someone with me at all times. It doesn't matter where I am going, I still have anxiety," she said.

Jama left her house on Monday to go to the court to hear Buchard-Risch's plea of guilty to third-degree assault. As part of the plea agreement, Burchard-Risch had to admit in open court to the bias-motivated attack.

In a statement, Burchard-Risch's lawyer, Rodd Tschida, said his client wants to put the situation behind her.

"There are certainly different narratives that can and have been written on this case. Whether that be bias crimes, or the considerable dangers of our criminal justice system relying solely on eyewitness accounts of brief traumatic incidents, which is often exacerbated where there is high media coverage. Ms. Burchard-Risch prays that everyone can move forward and put this regrettable and avoidable incident behind them," he said.

Jama said she is thankful the case is ending, but wasn't convinced Burchard-Risch was remorseful.

"In my eyes, she didn't conduct herself in the manner of someone who was truly sorry for what she did," Jama said.

Jama said she has forgiven Burchard-Risch for what happened that day. "I forgive her. You have to forgive to move on with life. If you hold onto hatred it is going to destroy me more than it destroys her," she said.

As part of the plea deal, Burchard-Risch admitted to throwing the mug at Jama because she wasn't speaking English.

As a result of the plea deal, Burchard-Risch will serve 180 days in jail and five years of probation. She will have to pay restitution.

Jama said she hopes that something positive can come out of everything that happened. "I pray she learns from this and she can open her heart and realize that at the end of the day, we are all the same. It doesn't matter where you are from."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Critical Counties is a CNN series exploring 11 counties around the country that chief national correspondent John King has identified as key in the 2016 election. These counties could play an outsize role in the election and offer an instructive example of what the political parties have accomplished. Prince William County is the seventh county in the series, which runs through Election Day. Explore the other critical counties.

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The country is changing, so is its electorate.

As its older, whiter population ages and **immigrant** populations settle down, the United States will grow more diverse. Gradually, some Republican strongholds can become competitive. Prince William county, Virginia, is one such place.

A very wealthy suburban county in the traditional swing state of Virginia, Prince William once voted Republican. But over the last 15 or so years, its population has changed. Wealth and diversity have flourished outside of Washington, D.C.

Prince William has become a majority-minority district, voting largely Democratic for the past few cycles.

Signs bode well here for Hillary Clinton. Not only is it lacking the white working class populations on which Donald Trump has built his base, it is also home to a disproportionate number of government workers who are quite familiar with her running mate, Virginia Sen. Tim Kaine. The Democratic vice presidential nominee is a Virginian who speaks Spanish, like a lot of Prince William residents. According to data from Google Trends, Prince William was the top county searching about **immigration** and the phrase "en ingles."

Donald Trump has done a lot to shake up this race, but he can't move demographics. If he loses this state, it will be another reminder for Republicans about the work they have ahead of them in a changing country.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here's a look at the life of 2016 GOP presidential candidate and businessman, Donald Trump.

Personal: Birth date: June 14, 1946

Birth place: New York, New York

Birth name: Donald John Trump

Father: Fred Trump, real estate developer

Mother: Mary (Macleod) Trump

Marriages: Melania (Knauss) Trump (January 22, 2005-present); Marla (Maples) Trump (December 1993-June 1999, divorced); Ivana (Zelnicek) Trump (1977-1990, divorced)

Children: with Melania (Knauss) Trump: Barron, March 20, 2006; with Marla (Maples) Trump: Tiffany, October 13, 1993; with Ivana (Zelnicek) Trump: Eric, 1984; Ivanka, October 30, 1981; Donald Jr., December 31, 1977

Education: University of Pennsylvania, Wharton School of Finance, 1968

Other Facts: Famous American entrepreneur and real estate developer.

Chairman and President of The Trump Organization.

Nicknamed "The Donald."

Timeline: 1970s - After college, works with his father on developments in Queens and Brooklyn.

1980s - Purchases/builds multiple properties in New York City, including Trump Tower (1983), Trump Plaza, and multiple casinos in Atlantic City, New Jersey.

1983 - Buys the New Jersey Generals football team which goes under a few years later when the United States Football League folds.

1990 - One of his casinos is forced into temporary bankruptcy as Trump faces huge debts.

1992 - Two of Trump's casinos file for bankruptcy in order to restructure debts.

1996 - Buys out and becomes executive producer of the Miss Universe, Miss USA and Miss Teen USA pageants.

January 2004 - "The Apprentice," with Trump acting as host, premieres on NBC.

August 18, 2004 - Relaunches a board game called "Trump, the Game," an updated version of a 1989 game with the same name.

November 21, 2004 - Trump Hotels & Casino Resorts Inc. files for Chapter 11 bankruptcy.

January 16, 2007 - Trump receives a star on the Hollywood Walk of Fame.

January 2008 - "The Apprentice" returns, re-branded as "Celebrity Apprentice."

February 13, 2009 - Announces he is resigning from his position as chairman of Trump Entertainment Resorts.

February 17, 2009 - Trump Entertainment Resorts files for bankruptcy. The Trump Organization owns 28% of Trump Entertainment Resorts.

May 16, 2011 - Announces he will not run for president.

May 29, 2012 - On CNN's The Situation Room, maintains that President Barack Obama's birthplace is a matter of opinion and with regards to the president's Hawaiian birth certificate, "a lot of people do not think it was an authentic certificate."

March 15, 2013 - Makes a speech at the Conservative Political Action Conference (CPAC), calling the country a "a total and complete mess."

June 1, 2015 - Says he will make a "major announcement [on] June 16" at Trump Tower, according to a GIF posted on his official Instagram account.

June 16, 2015 - Trump announces that he is running for president during a speech from Trump Tower in New York.

June 28, 2015 - Trump says he's giving up the TV show "The Apprentice" to run for president.

June 29, 2015 - NBC says it is cutting its business ties to Trump and won't air the Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants because of "derogatory statements by Donald Trump regarding **immigrants**." This comes two weeks after comments Trump made about Mexican **immigrants** during his presidential campaign announcement.

July 8, 2015 - In an interview with CNN's Anderson Cooper, Trump says he "can't guarantee" all of the workers he employs have legal status in the United States. This is a response to questions about a recent Washington Post report that said there are undocumented **immigrants** working at the Old Post Office Pavilion construction site in Washington, which Trump is converting into a luxury hotel.

July 15, 2015 - Trump's campaign reports that the Republican presidential candidate's net worth is "in excess of ten billion dollars" and his personal finance disclosure has been submitted to the Federal Election Commission.

July 22, 2015 - Donald Trump's financial disclosure report is made public by the Federal Election Commission.

August 6, 2015 - During the first 2016 Republican debate, Trump is questioned about a third party candidacy, his attitude towards women and his history of donating money to Democratic politicians. He tells moderator Megyn Kelly of Fox News that he feels he is being mistreated, declaring "I've been very nice to you, although I could probably maybe not be, based on the way you have treated me. But I wouldn't do that." After the debate, a series of late-night Tweets are posted on Trump's Twitter page, criticizing Kelly and Fox News.

August 7, 2015 - The controversy continues, as Trump tells CNN's Don Lemon that Kelly was singling him out for attack. He says, "You could see there was blood coming out of her eyes, blood coming out of her wherever." The statement is interpreted by some as a reference to hormonal imbalance.

September 11, 2015 - Trump announces on social media he has purchased NBC's half of the Miss Universe Organization, which organizes the annual Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants.

December 7, 2015 - Trump's campaign puts out a press release calling for a "complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on."

March 2016 - Along with thirteen others, is ranked number 324 on Forbes' list of the the world's billionaires with a net worth of $4.5 billion.

March 29, 2016 - Trump's campaign manager Corey Lewandowski is arrested and charged in Jupiter, Florida, with simple battery of former Breitbart reporter Michelle Fields. Two weeks later, State Attorney David Aronberg announces he will not prosecute Lewandowski.

May 26, 2016 - Secures enough delegates to clinch the Republican Party nomination. A CNN count estimates Trump has crossed the 1,237 threshold required to be elected the nominee. However, Trump is still the presumptive Republican nominee until the delegates formally cast their votes on the convention floor in Cleveland in July.

July 16, 2016 - Trump makes his vice presidential pick official by introducing the Indiana governor at a Manhattan hotel two days before the start of the Republican National Convention.

October 1, 2016 - A New York Times report about Donald Trump's 1995 tax records shows he declared a $916 million loss that could have allowed him to legally skip paying federal income taxes for years. The report, which contains some of the most detail of Trump's financial empire that has been publicly reported, shows Trump declared a $916 million loss for 1995 and lists tax benefits he used after a turbulent financial period for him in the early 1990s. The Times says it obtained the three pages of documents when they were mailed to a reporter last month.

October 7, 2016 - Previously unaired footage from 2005 surfaces of Donald Trump talking about trying to have sex with a married woman and being able to grope women. In footage obtained by The Washington Post, Trump is heard off-camera discussing women in vulgar terms during the taping of a segment for "Access Hollywood." In a taped response, Trump apologizes early Saturday, "I said it, I was wrong and I apologize." Over the weekend, several House and Senate members rescind their endorsements of Trump, and key GOP figures call for Trump to step aside.

October 9, 2016 - During the second presidential debate, CNN's Anderson Cooper asks Trump about his descriptions of groping and kissing women without their consent in the "Access Hollywood" footage. Trump denies that he has ever engaged in such behavior and declares the comments were "locker room talk." After the debate, nine women step forward to claim that they were sexually harassed or sexually assaulted by the real estate developer. Trump says the stories aren't true.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here's a look at controversial police encounters in the news.

1991 - Los Angeles - Rodney King March 3, 1991 - LAPD officers beat motorist Rodney King after he leads police on a high-speed chase through Los Angeles County. George Holliday videotapes the beating from his apartment balcony. The video shows police beating King more than 50 times with their batons. Over 20 officers are present at the scene, mostly from the LAPD. King suffers 11 fractures and other injuries.

March 15, 1991 - A Los Angeles grand jury indicts Sergeant Stacey Koon and Officers Laurence Michael Powell, Timothy Wind, and Theodore Briseno in connection with the beating.

May 10, 1991 - A grand jury refuses to indict 17 officers who stood by at the King beating and did nothing.

April 29, 1992 - The four LAPD officers are acquitted of beating King. Riots break out at the intersection of Florence and Normandie in South Central Los Angeles. Governor Pete Wilson declares a state of emergency and calls in the National Guard. Riots in the next few days leave more than 50 people dead and nearly $1 billion in damages.

May 1, 1992 - Rodney King makes an emotional plea for calm, "People, I just want to say, can we all get along? Can we get along? Can we stop making it horrible for the older people and the kids?"

August 4, 1992 - A federal grand jury returns indictments against Koon, Powell, Wind, and Briseno on the charge of violating Rodney King's civil rights.

April 16, 1993 - The federal jury convicts Koon and Powell on one charge of violating King's civil rights. Wind and Briseno are found not guilty. No disturbances follow the verdict.

August 4, 1993 - US District Court Judge John Davies sentences both Koon and Powell to 30 months in prison. Powell is found guilty of violating King's constitutional right to be free from an arrest made with "unreasonable force." Koon, the ranking officer, is convicted of permitting the civil rights violation to occur.

April 19, 1994 - The court awards King $3.8 million in compensatory damages in a civil lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles. King had demanded $56 million, or $1 million for every blow struck by the officers.

June 1, 1994 - In a civil trial against the police officers a jury awards King $0 in punitive damages. He had asked for $15 million.

1992 - Detroit - Malice Wayne Green November 5, 1992 - Two white police officers approach Malice Wayne Green, a 35-year-old black motorist after he parks outside a suspected drug den. Witnesses say the police strike the unarmed man in the head repeatedly with heavy flashlights. The officers claim they feared Green was trying to reach for one of their weapons. Green dies of his injuries later that night.

November 16, 1992 - Two officers, Larry Nevers and Walter Budzyn, are charged with second-degree murder. Sgt. Freddie Douglas, a supervisor who arrived on the scene after a call for backup, is charged with involuntary manslaughter and willful neglect of duty. Another officer, Robert Lessnau is charged with assault with intent to do great bodily harm.

November 18, 1992 - The Detroit Free Press reports that toxicology tests revealed alcohol and a small amount of cocaine in Green's system. A medical examiner later states that Green's head injuries, combined with the cocaine and alcohol in his system, led to his death.

December 1992 - The Detroit police chief fires the four officers.

August 23, 1993 - Nevers and Budzyn are convicted of murder after a 45-day trial. Lessnau is acquitted. Nevers sentence is 12 to 25 years, while Budzyn's sentence is eight to18 years. The charge against Douglas had been dismissed before the trial.

1997-1998 - The Michigan Supreme Court orders a retrial for Budzyn due to possible jury bias. During the second trial, a jury convicts Budzyn of a less serious charge, involuntary manslaughter and he is released with time served.

2000-2001 - A jury finds Nevers guilty of involuntary manslaughter after a second trial. He is released from prison in 2001.

2006 - Nevers' book about the incident and the trial, "Good Cops, Bad Verdict: How Racial Politics Convicted Us of Murder" is published.

2013 - The city demolishes a structure with a memorial for Green, a mural painted on the building near the street where the fatal confrontation took place.

1997 - New York - Abner Louima August 9, 1997 - Abner Louima, a 33-year-old Haitian **immigrant**, is arrested for interfering with officers trying to break up a fight in front of the Club Rendez-vous nightclub in Brooklyn. Louima alleges, while handcuffed, police officers lead him to the precinct bathroom and sodomized him with a plunger or broomstick.

August 15, 1997 - Police officers Justin Volpe and Charles Schwarz are charged with aggravated sexual abuse and first-degree assault.

August 16, 1997 - Thousands of angry protesters, many waving toilet plungers, gather outside Brooklyn's 70th Precinct to demonstrate against what they say is a long-standing problem of police brutality against minorities. Throughout the day, protesters, many of them Haitian, taunt police, chanting, "No justice, no peace." At some times, protesters stand toe to toe with officers watching the protest from behind a barricade, and call the officers racist and fascist.

February 26, 1998 - Volpe, Bruder, Schwarz, Wiese are indicted on federal civil rights charges in Louima's case. A fifth officer, Michael Bellomo, is accused of helping the others cover up the alleged beating, as well as an alleged assault on another Haitian **immigrant**, Patrick Antoine, the same night.

May 1999 - Volpe pleads guilty to beating and sodomizing Louima. He is later sentenced to 30 years in prison.

June 8, 1999 - Schwarz is convicted of beating Louima, then holding him down while he was being tortured. Wiese, Bruder, and Bellomo are acquitted. Schwarz is later sentenced to 15 and a half years in prison.

March 6, 2000 - Charles Schwarz, Thomas Wiese, and Thomas Bruder are convicted for conspiring to obstruct justice by covering up the attack.

July 12, 2001 - Louima receives $8.75 million in a settlement agreement with the City of New York and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association.

February 28, 2002 - The US Second Court of Appeals overturns the convictions of former officers Schwarz, Wiese, and Bruder on the obstruction of justice charges.

1999 - New York - Amadou Diallo February 4, 1999 - New York Police officers mistake the wallet Amadou Diallo's held in his hand for a handgun. Elite crimes unit officers Sean Carroll, Edward McMellon, Kenneth Boss, and Richard Murphy fire upon him 41 times and hit him 19 times.

March 24, 1999 - More than 200 people are arrested outside New York City's police headquarters, the most in one day in what has become almost daily protests since Diallo's fatal shooting.

March 25, 1999 - A Bronx grand jury votes to indict the four officers for second-degree murder.

February 25, 2000 - The officers are acquitted of state murder charges.

January 2001 - The US Justice Department announces it will not pursue federal civil rights charges against the officers.

January 2004 - Diallo's family settles a wrongful death lawsuit for $3 million dollars.

2005 - New Orleans - The Danziger Bridge shootings September 4, 2005 - Six days after Hurricane Katrina devastates the area, New Orleans police officers receive a radio call that two officers are down under the Danziger vertical-lift bridge. According to the officers, people were shooting at them and they returned fire.

-- Brothers Ronald and Lance Madison, along with four members of the Bartholomew family, are shot by police officers. Ronald Madison, 40, who is mentally disabled, and James Brisette, 17 (some sources say 19), are fatally wounded.

December 28, 2006 - Police Sgts. Kenneth Bowen and Robert Gisevius and officers Robert Faulcon and Anthony Villavaso are charged with first-degree murder. Officers Robert Barrios, Michael Hunter and Ignatius Hills are charged with attempted murder.

August 2008 - State charges against the officers are thrown out.

July 12, 2010 - Four officers are indicted on federal charges of murdering Brissette: Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon and Villavaso. Faulcon is also charged with Madison's murder. Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon and Villavaso, along with Arthur Kaufman and Gerard Dugue are charged with covering up the shooting.

April 8, 2010 - Former officer Michael Hunter pleads guilty in federal court of covering up the police shooting. In December, he is sentenced to eight years in prison.

August 5, 2011 - The jury finds five officers guilty of civil rights and obstruction charges: Kenneth Bowen, Robert Gisevius, Robert Faulcon, Anthony Villavaso and Arthur Kaufman.

October 5, 2011 - Ignatius Hills receives a six and a half year sentence for his role in the shooting.

April 4, 2012 - A federal judge sentences five former police officers to prison terms ranging from six to 65 years for the shootings of unarmed civilians. Faulcon receives 65 years. Bowen and Gisevius both receive 40 years. Villavaso receives 38 years. Kaufman was not involved in the shooting, just the cover up, so he receives a lighter sentence than the others do.

March 2013 - After a January 2012 mistrial, Dugue's trial is delayed indefinitely.

September 17, 2013 - Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon, Villavaso and Kaufman are awarded a new trial.

April 20, 2016 - Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon, Villavaso and Kaufman plead guilty. Their sentences -- from three to 12 years in prison -- are remarkably less severe than the six to 65 years in prison they were originally sentenced to back in 2012.

2006 - New York - Sean Bell November 25, 2006 - Sean Bell, 23, dies in a 50-bullet barrage by police outside a Queen's nightclub -- hours before he is to be married. Two of his companions, Joseph Guzman and Trent Benefield, are wounded in the gunfire.

December 2006 - Rev. Al Sharpton leads a rally in Manhattan, "Shopping for Justice," to protest the shooting.

March 2007 - Three of the five officers involved in the shooting are indicted: Detectives Gescard F. Isnora and Michael Oliver are charged with manslaughter, and Michael Oliver is charged with reckless endangerment.

April 25, 2008 - The three officers are acquitted of all charges.

February 16, 2010 - The Department of Justice announces that it will not pursue federal civil rights charges against the police officers.

July 27, 2010 - New York City settles a lawsuit for more than $7 million filed by Bell's family and two of his friends.

2009 - Oakland, California - Oscar Grant January 1, 2009 - San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit officer Johannes Mehserle shoots Oscar Grant, an unarmed 22-year-old, in the back while he is lying face down on a platform at the Fruitvale BART station in Oakland, California.

January 7, 2009 - Footage from station KTVU shows demonstrators rampaging through the streets of Oakland protesting Grant's death. About 105 people are arrested for charges, which include inciting a riot, vandalism, assault on a police officer and unlawful assembly. Some protesters lie on their stomachs, saying they were showing solidarity with Grant, who was shot in the back.

January 27, 2010 - The Bay Area Rapid Transit train system reaches a $1.5 million settlement over Grant's death, filed by the mother of Grant's young daughter.

July 8, 2010 - A jury finds Mehserle guilty of involuntary manslaughter. At the trial, Mehserle says that he intended to draw and fire his Taser rather than his gun.

November 5, 2010 - Mehserle is sentenced to two years in prison. He will be able to apply his 292 days of credit and can be released in as little as seven months. Outraged by the light sentence, protests that night turn violent.

June 2011 - Mehserle is released from prison.

July 30, 2013 - A federal appeals court rejects Mehserle's claim of immunity. This allows Grant's father to file a civil lawsuit against Mehserle.

July 7, 2014 - The federal jury does not award any damages in the civil lawsuit brought by Grant's father's.

2011 - Fullerton, California - Kelly Thomas July 5, 2011 - Fullerton, California police officers respond to a call about a homeless man looking into car windows and pulling on handles of cars. Surveillance camera footage shows Thomas being beaten, clubbed and stunned with a Taser by police. The video sparks a nationwide outcry. Thomas, who is mentally ill, dies five days later, and his death is ruled a homicide.

May 9, 2012 - Officer Manuel Ramos is charged with second-degree murder and involuntary manslaughter, and Cpl. Jay Patrick Cicinelli is charged with involuntary manslaughter and felony use of excessive force.

May 16, 2012 - The City of Fullerton, California, awards $1 million to Thomas' mother, Cathy Thomas.

January 13, 2014 - A jury acquits former officers Ramos and Cicinelli.

2014 - New York - Eric Garner July 17, 2014 - Eric Garner, 43, dies after Officer Daniel Pantaleo tackles him to the ground in a department-banned chokehold during an arrest for allegedly selling cigarettes illegally. "I can't breathe! I can't breathe!" Garner, who has asthma, says repeatedly while restrained on the ground by several police officers. The incident is videotaped on a cellphone.

August 1, 2014 - The New York City Medical Examiner rules Garner's death a homicide.

December 3, 2014 - A grand jury decides not to indict Pantaleo. Protesters pour onto the streets of New York and other cities, including Washington, D.C., Philadelphia and Oakland, California, chanting in unison some of Eric Garner's last words, "I can't breathe! I can't breathe!"

July 14, 2015 - New York settles with Eric Garner's estate for $5.9 million.

2014 - Ferguson, Missouri - Michael Brown August 9, 2014 - During a struggle, a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, fatally shoots unarmed 18-year-old Michael Brown.

August 9-10, 2014 - Approximately 1,000 demonstrators protest Brown's death. The Ferguson-area protest turns violent and police use tear gas and rubber bullets to disperse the crowd.

August 15, 2014 - Police identify the officer as 28-year-old Darren Wilson. Wilson is put on paid administrative leave after the incident, and he is required to undergo two psychological evaluations before returning to duty. Governor Jay Nixon decides to put the Missouri State Highway Patrol in charge of security.

August 18, 2014 - Governor Jay Nixon calls in the Missouri National Guard to protect the police command center.

November 24, 2014 - A grand jury does not indict Darren Wilson for Brown's shooting. Documents show that Wilson fired his gun 12 times. Protests erupt after the hearing in Ferguson and nationwide.

November 29, 2014 - Darren Wilson resigns from the Ferguson police force.

March 11, 2015 - Ferguson Police Chief Thomas Jackson resigns a week after a scathing Justice Department report slams his department.

April 23, 2015 - The family of Michael Brown files a civil lawsuit against the city of Ferguson.

August 9-10, 2015 - The anniversary observations of Brown's death are largely peaceful during the day Sunday. However, after dark police say, a teen shoots at officers who return fire, businesses are damaged and tense standoffs between officers and protesters occur. On Monday, a state of emergency is declared and fifty-six people are arrested during a demonstration at a St. Louis courthouse.

2015 - North Charleston, South Carolina - Walter Scott April 4, 2015 - Officer Michael Slager fires eight shots at 50-year-old Walter Scott. Scott, who is unarmed, is killed. The officer initially says he used a Taser gun on Scott and that Scott grabbed his Taser. Slager had pulled Scott over for a broken tail light.

April 7, 2015 - Cell phone video of the incident is released to the public. It shows Scott, with his back to Slager, running away. Slager is charged with first-degree murder.

April 8, 2015 - Though it's unknown if race was a factor, protesters at the city hall in North Charleston wear T-shirts that read "Black Lives Matter," and chant the phrase that became popular after several police-involved killings of black men around the country.

September 10, 2015 - Slager's attorneys make the case for him to be released on bond, after court documents reveal new details from the toxicology report, blood analysis, and Taser data.

September 14, 2015 - The judge denies Slager bond.

October 8, 2015 - The North Charleston City Council approves a $6.5 million settlement with the family of Walter Scott.

January 4, 2016 - The judge grants Slager a $500,000 cash bond.

May 11, 2016 - A federal grand jury indicts Michael Slager for misleading investigators and violating the civil rights of Walter Scott.

2015 - Baltimore - Freddie Gray April 12, 2015 - Police arrrest 25-year-old Freddie Gray on a weapons charge after he is found with a knife in his pocket. Witness video of the arrest records him screaming as officers carry him to the prisoner transport van. After arriving at the police station, he is transferred to a trauma clinic with a severe spinal injury. He falls into a coma and dies one week later.

April 21, 2015 - The names of six officers involved in the arrest are released. Lt. Brian Rice, 41, Officer Caesar Goodson, 45, Sgt. Alicia White, 30, Officer William Porter, 25, Officer Garrett Miller, 26, and Officer Edward Nero, 29, are all suspended.

April 24, 2015 - Baltimore police acknowledge Freddie Gray did not get timely medical care after his arrest and was not buckled into a seat belt while being transported in a police van.

April 27, 2015 - Protests turn into riots as looting and fires engulf Baltimore on the day of Gray's funeral. At least 20 officers receive injuries, as police and protesters upset over Gray's death clash on the streets. A video shows police in riot gear take cover behind an armored vehicle, as protesters pelt them with rocks. Gov. Larry Hogan's office declares a state of emergency and activates the National Guard to address the unrest.

May 21, 2015 - A Baltimore grand jury indicts six officers in the death of Freddie Gray. The officers now face a range of charges from involuntary manslaughter to reckless endangerment. The driver of the transport van, Caesar Goodman, will face the most severe charge, of second-degree depraved-heart murder.

September 10, 2015 - Judge Barry Williams denies the defendants' motion to move the Freddie Gray trials out of Baltimore, a day after officials approve a $6.4 million deal to settle all civil claims tied to Gray's death.

November 30, 2015 - Officer William Porter, the first of six city police officers, goes on trial. Porter faces charges of manslaughter, assault and reckless endangerment. The Baltimore jury is comprised of eight women, five black and three white, and four men, three black and one white. The alternates are three white men and one black man.

December 7, 2015 - Due to a medical emergency, the judge dismisses a juror. The jury is now comprised of seven women, four black and three white, and five men, three black and two white. The alternates are two white men and one black man.

December 16, 2015 - The judge declares a mistrial in Porter's case after jurors say they are deadlocked.

May 12, 2016 - The bench trial of Edward Nero, one of the six officers charged in the case of Freddie Gray, begins in Baltimore. Nero faces charges of second-degree intentional assault, reckless endangerment and two counts of misconduct in office.

May 23, 2016 - Edward Nero is found not guilty.

June 9, 2016 - The bench trial of Caesar Goodson, Jr. begins in Baltimore. As the driver of the van that transported Gray, Goodson faces the most severe charges alleging second-degree depraved heart murder, involuntary manslaughter, second-degree assault, reckless endangerment and other lesser charges.

June 23, 2016 - Goodson is acquitted of all charges.

July 18, 2016 - Lt. Brian Rice, the highest-ranking officer to stand trial over Gray's death, is found not guilty on all charges. Rice had been charged with involuntary manslaughter, reckless endangerment and misconduct in office. Judge Barry Williams issued the ruling in a bench trial.

July 27, 2016 - Prosecutors drop charges against the three remaining officers awaiting trial in connection with Freddie Gray's death.

August 10, 2016 - A Justice Department investigation finds that the Baltimore Police Department engages in unconstitutional practices that lead to disproportionate rates of stops, searches and arrests of African-Americans. The report also finds excessive use of force against juveniles and people with mental health disabilities.

2015 - Chicago - Laquan McDonald October 20, 2014 - A Chicago police officer shoots and kills Laquan McDonald, 17. McDonald had a 3-inch knife and, according to toxicology tests, had PCP in his system, but he was not within 10 feet of anyone at the time the shots rang out. Several other officers were at the scene, and none fired any shots. According to a police union spokesperson, a police officer told McDonald to drop the knife but he did not listen, the officer then fires on him out of fear for his life. Later, an autopsy shows McDonald was shot 16 times.

April 13, 2015 - Federal and state authorities announce that they will conduct a joint investigation into McDonald's death spearheaded by the Chicago branch of the FBI.

April 15, 2015 - The city reaches a settlement with McDonald's family, agreeing to pay $5 million, though the family had not filed a lawsuit.

November 19, 2015 - A judge in Chicago orders the city to release the police dashcam video that shows the shooting. For months, the city has fought attempts to have the video released to the public, saying it could jeopardize any ongoing investigation. The decision is the result of a Freedom of Information Act request filed earlier this year by freelance journalist Brandon Smith.

November 24, 2015 - Officer Jason Van Dyke is charged with first-degree murder in connection with the shooting death of McDonald.

December 1, 2015 - Mayor Rahm Emanuel announces he has asked for the resignation of Chicago Police Superintendent Garry McCarthy.

August 30, 2016 - Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson files administrative charges against six officers involved in the fatal shooting of McDonald. Five officers will have their cases heard by the Chicago Police Board, which will rule if the officers will be terminated. The sixth officer charged has resigned.

2016 - Tulsa, Oklahoma - Terence Crutcher September 16, 2016 - Tulsa Police Officer Betty Shelby fatally shoots Terence Crutcher, a 40-year-old unarmed black man, after his car is found abandoned in the middle of the road.

September 19, 2016 - The Tulsa Police Department releases video of the incident captured by a police helicopter, showing Shelby and other officers at the scene. At a news conference, the police chief tells reporters that Crutcher was unarmed. Both the US Department of Justice and state authorities have launched investigations into the officer-involved shooting.

September 22, 2016 - Officer Shelby is charged with felony manslaughter in the first degree. The criminal complaint against Shelby says her "fear resulted in her unreasonable actions which led her to shooting" Crutcher. She is accused of "unlawfully and unnecessarily" shooting Crutcher after he did not comply with her "lawful orders."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- As the campaign lurches into its final three weeks, Donald Trump has turned up the rhetoric, attacking his opponent, Hillary Clinton, the news media covering the campaign and, most controversially, the process used to select the next president.

"Of course there is large scale voter fraud happening on and before election day," Trump tweeted Monday. "Why do Republican leaders deny what is going on? So naive!"

Trump's claim that he is about to be cheated out of a victory at the ballot box is not new. In August he railed against federal court decisions that struck down ballot restrictions, including that voters present specific forms of identification, in several states. "We may have people vote 10 times," he told the Washington Post. "it's inconceivable that you don't have to show identification in order to vote or that the identification doesn't have to be somewhat foolproof."

In recent days Trump's argument has picked up in intensity. When asked for proof of his allegations of potential vote stealing Trump's campaign provided the following data points:

A study by the Pew Center on the States entitled "Inaccurate, Costly and Inefficient: Evidence that American Voter Registration Systems Needs an Upgrade."

The 2012 study presented a number of disquieting findings, including:

About 24 million voter registrations are no longer valid or are significantly inaccurate. More than 1.8 million dead people are listed as voters. Approximately 2.75 million people are registered in more than one state.

The Pew report certainly underscores deficiencies in the voter registration system. But the Trump campaign doesn't say how these deficiencies disadvantage his candidacy. For example, there is no evidence in the Pew report that people who have registrations in two states are voting twice for Democrats or for Republicans. And while Trump surrogate Rudy Giuliani has said, "dead people generally vote for Democrats rather than Republicans," he has not proffered any evidence to back up that statement.

Pennsylvania voting experience

The Trump campaign noted media reports that indicated that, in 2012, more than 700 people might have voted twice in Pennsylvania and that Philadelphia elections officials have indicated they have referred a number of voting irregularity cases for prosecution.

But those reports he cites do not indicate who these individuals voted for -- if they even voted twice at all. (The report only said they "may" have voted twice.) Furthermore, the Pennsylvania Secretary of State told local media that potential voter fraud may have occurred among members of both parties.

In addition, Philadelphia officials say only nine cases have been referred for prosecution. Most of these involve local election boards adding votes to machine tallies to ensure the totals that are recorded on machines match the number of voters on sign-in sheets.

"This indicates that voting fraud does occur," says Al Schmidt, a Republican and one of three City Commissioners who oversee elections in Philadelphia. "But if voter fraud was occurring in a widespread conspiracy to sway a presidential election it would have been the easiest thing to see."

Non-US citizens voting

The Trump campaign claims that "illegal **immigrants**" are voting, citing research conducted by Jesse Richman and David Earnest, two professors at Old Dominion University. Using data from the Cooperative Congressional Election Study, the two men estimate that 6.4% of non-citizens voted in 2008 and 2.2% of them cast ballots in 2010. Studies by the Public Interest Legal Foundation, a conservative voting watchdog group, also estimated more than 1,000 non-citizens registered to vote in eight Virginia counties since 2011 and that 86 non-citizens were registered to vote in Philadelphia in between 2013 and 2015 -- 40 of them voted in at least one election.

Neither the report by the researchers nor the conservative watchdogs say if these non-citizens who voted were, in fact, undocumented **immigrants**, though, no matter their **immigration** status, it is against the law for non-citizens to vote in state and national elections. The Old Dominion researchers stressed that the non-citizen vote tends to favor Democrats with President Barack Obama getting more than 80% of the 339 votes they studied in 2008.

But in some cases, there are too few of these voters to make any difference in a presidential election. For example, the watchdog group tallied what they believe were 40 votes cast by non-citizens in Philadelphia elections in 2013, 2014 and 2015. That's out of a total of more than 1.3 million votes who voted in those years -- hardly enough for a rounding error.

Given the evidence Trump has supplied, we rate his claim that large scale voter fraud exists as FALSE.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- The Australian Prime Minister has rejected renewed accusations the country is mistreating asylum seekers on the Pacific island of Nauru.

In its latest damning report, rights group Amnesty International accused the Australian government of turning the tiny island into an "open-air prison."

"The government of Australia has isolated vulnerable women, men and children in a remote place which they cannot leave, with the specific intention that these people should suffer," said Anna Neistat, Amnesty's senior director for research.

Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull told the Australian Broadcasting Corporation Tuesday the claims were "absolutely false."

"The Australian government's commitment is compassionate and it's strong," he said.

Successive Australian governments have defended the policy of detaining refugees offshore as humanitarian, to deter people smugglers from making the treacherous journey and to stop people drowning at sea.

Repeated claims, denials

According to Amnesty, more than 1,100 asylum seekers and refugees are currently held on Nauru, a tiny island of just 10,000 people some 3,000 kilometers (1,864 miles) off the coast of Australia.

The latest Australian government figures put the total number of detainees at 410, including 49 children.

The center was set up to process asylum claims, but the Australian government has made it clear that even confirmed refugees will never be settled on the mainland.

For the report, Amnesty interviewed more than 100 people in Nauru and Australia, who recounted instances of sexual assault, neglect, poor healthcare and even torture at the detention center.

One detainee told researchers his life on Nauru was like "dying a thousand times."

"In Iraq, you get just one bullet or a bomb, and it's over, and here I'm slowly dying from the pain," he said.

'Racist, false' reporting

The Nauru government operates the detention center with support from Australia and private contractors. It was re-opened in 2012 after a surge in asylum seekers arriving in Australia arriving by boat.

It's not the first time the countries have had to defend the center.

Earlier this month, the UN's Committee on the Rights of the Child said found many cases of "attempted suicide, self-immolation, acts of self-harm and depression" among children who had lived in prolonged "detention-like conditions."

And on Monday night, a report on the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's "Four Corners" program about the conditions on Nauru elicited a stinging rebuke from the Nauru government.

"From start to finish (the report) was denigrating, racist, false and pure political activism," it said in a statement.

'Very disturbing'

In a statement Monday, UNICEF Australia said "the reported decline in children's mental health, well-being and their development status is very disturbing."

The charity urged Canberra to "find a permanent solution for children and families on Nauru."

In January 2016, CNN spoke to former and current child detainees at the Nauru camp, who said it was "the worst place (they'd) ever seen for children."

Australia's **immigration** department said in a statement Monday that it "takes the health and safety of refugees and transferees in Nauru very seriously and welcomes independent scrutiny of Australia's support of regional processing arrangements."

Costly process

According to UNICEF, the Nauru government charges Australia a monthly fee of $2,270 (3,000 AUD) per refugee and $756 (1,000 AUD) per asylum seeker every month.

Amnesty estimates that total costs of deterrence policies "such as turnbacks, offshore processing, and mandatory **immigration** detention" was upwards of $7.3 billion (9.6 billion AUD).

Despite this, and widespread criticism of ongoing human rights abuses on the island, support for the camps remains strong in Canberra.

Last month, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull defended the country's record on **immigration** in a speech to the United Nations General Assembly.

During the general election earlier this year, opposition leader Bill Shorten pledged a "more humane and safer approach to asylum seekers," but his Labor party remains committed to offshore detention.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:55p ET: Adds related links

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Like his father, Donald Trump Jr. has a history of engaging in controversial conversations with radio shock-jocks, a review of his appearances on various programs by CNN's KFile reveals.

On shows like "Opie and Anthony," the now-defunct "The Six Pack," and "Opie with Jim Norton," the younger Trump made a joke about the 2012 Aurora theater shooting, expressed regret he could no longer mock overweight people, invoked Arab stereotypes, and joked about child beauty contestants being abused by their parents.

The Trump son also noted there were hours of footage of the "The Apprentice" left on the cutting room floor that would appeal to those with a "sick sense of humor."

For decades, Donald Trump appeared on radio shock jock Howard Stern's daily program, making controversial comments about current events, women, and sex. Trump Jr. also found his voice on shock jock radio shows — often noting his lack of political correctness when sharing his opinion about politics and culture.

Trump Jr. has been a passionate advocate and defender of his father during the presidential election, dismissing critics who take issues with the GOP nominee's heated rhetoric and highly personal attacks on opponents.

In some exchanges on the radio, Trump Jr. echoed his father's rhetoric, saying in one appearance that a "disproportionate amount" of undocumented **immigrants** were bad for society.

A Trump campaign spokesperson did not respond to a request for comment on this story.

On the Aurora Shooting:

In July 2012, on the same day a gunman killed 12 people at a movie theater in Aurora, Colorado, Trump Jr. joked about still giving the movie "two thumbs up."

Trump Jr. made the comment on "Opie and Anthony" after soundbites were played of witnesses speaking about the tragedy.

"Everything was going good until, uh, we saw gas and sparks, and sounded like really strong fireworks, uh, and then you just hear people yelling and actually just a few, uh, rows away from me a girl gets up holding her jaw. I guess she had got shot," a witness said.

"Overall I give the movie two thumbs up," Trump Jr. exclaimed in reaction.

On not being able to mock overweight people:

Trump Jr., in a January 2012 appearance on "Opie and Anthony," lamented that he couldn't make fun of people who are overweight due to political correctness.

"By the way you can't, you can't even make fat jokes now without, like, there's a whole segment of people that like, that's almost the worst one like, it's easier to, like, do a racial thing, than it is a fat one because everyone knows they're fat and they get really offended that--," he said.

"Well it's a disease," a host said.

"Fat people get — everything's a disease," Trump Jr. responded.

"Yeah they're offended, until they lose weight," said another host.

"Laziness is a disease too," Trump Jr. said.

The comments came during a discussion on a mayor in Connecticut who said he would help Latino citizens of his town by eating tacos.

Trump Jr. said it wasn't possible to say anything as a politician without being criticized.

"That's the problem with, I mean, you can't say anything anymore without them being criticized," he said. "You know, we've gotten to a point where you can't be a politician and actually say what you're thinking because someone's gonna get offended and god forbid, like everyone's so sensitive now, it's ridiculous."

Assuming Arabs are named "Mohammed" or "Ali":

In an early January 2012 appearance on "Opie and Anthony," Trump Jr. discussed the assassination of Mahmoud Al-Mabhouh, who was a founding member of Hamas' military wing, assuming all Arab people were named "Mohammed" or "Ali."

"I love the operation they ran in Dubai," said a host. "Somebody from Hamas."

"Yeah, no, exactly," Trump Jr. said.

"I don't know the guy's name. I wouldn't make up a Middle Eastern name. It was somebody in Dubai," said the host.

"Muhammad something or other," Trump Jr. said.

"He had a beard. He wasn't nice to his wife," a host added.

"Yeah, Ali," Trump Jr. said.

Mocking treatment of children in beauty pageants:

In an other exchange in early January of 2012 on "Opie and Anthony," Trump Jr. joked about potential child abuse at the beauty pageants depicted in the TLC series, "Toddlers and Tiaras."

"How, but how do they know they're not damaging these, I mean how do you not know you're, you're..." said one host.

"It's gotta be damaging," another host said.

"Scarring these children," said a host.

"They're, they're yelling at them," said one host.

"Look at all the empty seats," said a host.

"Forcing them not to eat," Trump Jr. said.

"They yell at the kids like, yeah 'You didn't do good, you forgot to turn! You forgot your turn!' It's like ahh, the kid just goes 'Ahh' ... And then they do these interviews where it's like 'Oh she loves doing pageants it's her whole life," said one host.

"The kids, they're crying," Trump Jr. said.

"The kid's crying going, 'I want to go home,'" added the host.

"I just wanna play with Barbie," Trump Jr. said.

"'She beats me when you're not here,'" said the host.

"She's like limping," added Trump Jr., mocking a child's voice. "'Help me, help me.'"

Trump Jr. added of the moms at beauty pageants "they're all fat. Ugly."

On 'Apprentice' footage:

In an appearance on the defunct Sirius XM show "The Six Pack," Trump Jr. said there was footage on the The Apprentice cutting room that would appeal to those with a "sick sense of humor."

"So walk us through the boardroom," a host asked. "How long does that entire process take?

"You know, and people always ask because it's actually an interesting question, I mean, some are quick," responds Trump Jr. "Some are basically almost what you see and others, you know, there's boardrooms that I've been in for, that go for 4 hours. Because you know again, none of it's really scripted and sometimes these guys go after each other and you know, you can only see a certain amount of time because it's all we're left on television."

"You sort of have to see who ends up getting fired, who buries themselves in there and sort of edit backwards to make everything relevant. You know, I'd love to, eventually, one day, just do like an outtake scene movie from the boardroom because I mean, I've seen so much amazing stuff that was just be- you know, if you have a sick sense of humor like I do," he continued.

"You know, it, it's sort of amazing material, um, it just may not be relevant to the outcome, um, of you know, whatever happens on the episode so you don't get to see it. It ends up on the cutting room floor so it, it's sort of a shame, but you know, those things, they can go on. I mean, they average probably, at least, two hours, maybe two and half-hours average. Some go longer, some go a little bit less but you know, there's a lot of stuff going on. It's pretty intense."

On undocumented **immigrants**:

Trump Jr. defended his father's rhetoric on **immigrants** in a June 2015 appearance on "Opie with Jim Norton." The appearance occurred shortly after his father's announcement speech where he said some Mexican **immigrants** are rapists and criminals.

"He's not talking about people that are just here doing, he's talking about people, again, there's a big element coming across and if you speak to people that are on the Texas border -- and he said it very clearly -- 'listen, I'm sure there's some great people too just trying to do better for themselves. I understand that,'" he said in a 2015 appearance shortly after his father announced his candidacy.

"But, you know there's a disproportionate amount of people that are bad relative to society coming across and doing the same thing and we can't just arbitrarily let everyone in here," he continued. "And honestly, I don't think that anyone with a straight face -- then again, if they're playing politics -- can with a straight face say that that's not a reasonable stance I mean it's ridiculous."

On Dionne Warwick:

In March of 2011, while promoting Celebrity Apprentice, Trump Jr. expressed a desire to call singer Dionne Warwick "a bitch." Trump Jr. began to mouth the word, but hesitated, explaining he wasn't sure if he could say the word on the radio.

"Well that's the interesting thing, you know, people come on the show because, you know, they're often times trying to rebuild some of their image and everything, but if they, you know, if they're acting like a b--, just a bad person, people are like, 'I can't believe they're such a-- ,'" Trump Jr. said.

"You wanted to say bitch," a host interjected.

"I wanted to say it then I realized," Trump Jr. responded.

"You wanted to say bitch," a host said.

"Then I was thinking wait a second, I'm on radio, and I was like wait a second we're on satellite so I can probably say it," Trump Jr. added.

"At least we know you want to say bitch," said the host.

"I did wanna say it," he said. "No listen, she was very nice to us and everything like that, but getting along with the people and trying to do the work, she wanted nothing to do with it and so it actually does her a disservice because if you're going to go on the show and you can't kind of play the game..."

On President Obama:

In another January 2012 appearance, Trump Jr. accused Obama of being racist by labeling others racists.

"I mean, so many people, you know, they're just worried about, you can't say something bad about Obama, not because you actually have a strong stance against his platform, but because that makes you a racist," Trump Jr. said. "Like, that in itself is racism. Like, it's so, you know, it's so ridiculous and that's what we've become, and he's played that card very well. And by the way, if I was in his shoes I'd be playing that card too because you can get away with it in this country and we allow it."

When one of the hosts defended Obama's foreign policy, Trump Jr. said, "I didn't realize that you were a commie! That's, that's nice. I'm just kidding, I'm just kidding."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 9:01p ET Tweaks headline

Editor's note: Richard Javad Heydarian is a political science professor at De La Salle University, Manila, and the author of Asia's New Battlefield: US, China, and the Struggle for Western Pacific (Zed, London). The opinions expressed here are solely his.

(CNN) -- Within a span of a few months, the Philippines has transformed from one of China's most ardent critics into one of its potential allies.

"I'm going to China to make friends with them and also with Russia," Rodrigo Duterte, the Philippines' firebrand leader, claimed recently.

"I am ready to not really break ties [with America] but we will open alliances with China and . . . Medvedev [Russia]."

Since his first day in office, Duterte has consistently touted his commitment to forging a more independent foreign policy, which, to him, means less dependence on America.

Naturally, many are beginning to ask whether Duterte, a self-described 'socialist', will revamp the Philippines' foreign policy by shifting alliances towards China.

First state visit to China

Currently, the Philippines and China are negotiating a 25-year bilateral military agreement which allows Manila to purchase Chinese weapons. And unlike any of his predecessors, Duterte's first state visit will be to China.

Without a doubt, China will be rolling out the red carpet, charming its Filipino guest with maximum hospitality and offering assistance and good will.

During his stay in Beijing, Duterte is expected to discuss various measures to normalize bilateral relations, expand economic cooperation and explore a potential modus vivendi in the South China Sea.

Threats against the West

While Duterte is committed to improving ties with China, it is unlikely that he will risk **alienating** the Philippine security establishment and broader populace by severing security ties with the US altogether.

As he recently clarified, "We need not really... break or abrogate existing treaties [with America] because they say that it could provide us with [security] umbrella."

However, over the past few weeks, Duterte has scrapped joint maritime patrols and military exercises with the United States in the South China Sea, a crucial aspect of growing military resistance against Chinese assertiveness in the area, and threatened to expel US Special Forces from the southern island of Mindanao, where they have been aiding Philippine counter-terror operations.

Duterte's tirades against the West, particularly America, are both a reflection of personal conviction as well as political expediency.

On one hand, Duterte is genuinely critical of what he views as Western imperialism, embodied by American (real and imagined) interference in the domestic affairs of allies and developing countries the world over.

But the timing of his threats against the West could be explained by several factors.

Expletives against Obama

First of all, Duterte has been ticked off by America's increasingly open criticism of his signature "war on drugs" policy. No less than US President Barack Obama has openly confronted the Filipino leader on the issue.

"We're not going to back off on our position that if we're working with a country... it is important from our perspective to make sure that we do it the right way," the US leader warned Duterte.

Duterte has responded with expletives against Obama in one occasion after the other.

When the United Nations and the European Parliament joined the fray, criticizing the Filipino leader's domestic policies, they were also met by Duterte's invective-laced tirades.

Then there is his upcoming trip to China, Duterte's first state visit. By openly threatening a downgrade in military cooperation with the West, the Filipino leader is signaling his independence and good will towards Beijing, which has been irked by growing American military footprint in the South China Sea in recent years.

As part of a grand bargain, the Duterte administration may actually not only suspend joint patrols and military exercises with America in exchange for Chinese concessions in the South China Sea, ranging from a joint fisheries agreement in the bitterly-disputed Scarborough Shoal to a broader non-aggression pact in contested waters.

A step too far?

Since the beginning of his presidential campaign, Duterte has promised radical change in the country's domestic and foreign policy. But far from **alienating** the Filipino electorate, he still remains to be widely popular leader.

In many ways, Duterte, a former political outsider, has amassed significant political capital in a very short span of time.

This gives him tremendous wiggle room to renegotiate the parameters of Philippine politics, including its foreign policy orientation.

Severing military ties with America, however, would be a step too far.

The Philippine military and the broader security establishment is largely entwined with and dependent on American intelligence, financing, logistical support, and training.

And surveys consistently show that America enjoys astronomically high approval ratings (92%) among Filipinos, who are very critical of China due to the disputes in the South China Sea.

No wonder then, luminaries including former President Fidel Ramos, among Duterte's most trusted advisers, has openly criticized the Filipino leader's constant threat to downgrade military ties with America.

More likely, Duterte will simply tinker with certain aspects of Philippine-U.S. military cooperation as part of his efforts to rebuild frayed ties with China.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here is some spooky background information about Halloween, celebrated annually in the United States on October 31. In 2016, Halloween is on a Monday.

Facts: The word Halloween is an abbreviated version of the phrases All Hallows' Eve or All Hallows' Evening.

Halloween comes from an ancient pagan festival celebrated by Celtic people over 2,000 years ago called Samhain (prono: SOW ehn).

The festival took place in the United Kingdom, Ireland, and northwestern France.

Samhain means "summer's end" and marks the beginning of winter. Samhain is also thought to celebrate the beginning of the Celtic year. The Celts believed that Samhain was a time when the dead could walk among the living.

Trick-or-treating began in areas of the United Kingdom and Ireland. People went house-to-house "souling" - asking for small breads called "soul cakes" in exchange for prayer.

Adults also went door-to-door asking for food and drinks in exchange for a song or dance.

Jack-o'-lanterns are the symbol of Halloween. People in Ireland and Scotland originally used beets or turnips as lanterns on Halloween.

An Irish legend says that jack-o'-lanterns are named for a man called Jack who could not go to heaven or hell and was forced to walk the earth forever with only a coal from hell to light his lantern.

The name jack-o'-lantern can also be derived from the night watchman who would light the street lanterns every evening.

**Immigrants** from Ireland and Scotland brought Halloween to the United States in the 1800s. Haitian and African **immigrants** brought voodoo beliefs about black cats, fire, and witchcraft.

Halloween Statistics for 2016: (ALL from the National Retail Federation)

More than 171 million Americans will celebrate Halloween this year, with seven out of ten consumers planning to hand out candy. Total spending in 2016 will reach $8.4 billion, with the average consumer planning to spend $82.93 on decorations, candy, costumes and more.

Top Children's Costumes for 2016 1. Action/Superhero

2. Princess

3. Animal (Cat, Dog, Lion, Monkey, etc.)

4. Batman Character

5.Star Wars Character

Top Adult Costumes for 2016 (18-34) 1. Batman Character (Batman, Harley Quinn, The Joker, etc.)

2. Witch

3. Animal (Cat, Dog, Bunny, etc.)

4. Tie: Marvel Superhero (Deadpool, Spiderman, etc.) and DC Superhero (Wonder Woman, Superman, etc.)

5. Vampire

Top Adult Costumes for 2016 (35 and older) 1. Witch

2. Pirate

3. Political (Trump, Clinton, etc.)

4. Vampire

5. Batman Character (Batman, Catwoman, etc.)

Top Pet Costumes for 2016 1. Pumpkin

2. Hot Dog

3. Bumblebee

4. Tie: Lion and Star Wars Character

5. Devil

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Malise Sundstrom, the chairman of Republicans Overseas, lives in London. The opinions in this article belong to the author.

(CNN) -- American expats in London are generally a well-off bunch who have profited greatly from the global economy, either as owners of capital or the well-paid servants of it.

At the mention of Donald Trump, they usually recoil in horror with remarks about the education, racism and misogyny of the candidate and his supporters. What they do not often do is consider the merits of his nationalist policies on trade and **immigration**. It would benefit them to do so.

Hillary Clinton's position on **immigration** and trade is clear from her dream of "open borders and open trade" that she allegedly disclosed in a secret speech to a Brazilian bank.

Her former opponent Bernie Sanders termed "open borders" a "right-wing proposal" designed to depress wages. Her current opponent Donald Trump proposes **immigration** restrictions as a way to increase wages and bolster American employment.

Clinton's support for lower barriers to outsourcing through the Trans-Pacific Partnership has met with scorn from Sanders and Trump.

Sanders' and Trump's nationalist and populist positions didn't emerge in a vacuum. With stock markets near their inflation-adjusted highs, median wages for American men have declined by four percent since 1973, and American households overall have the same median wages they had 18 years ago.

The labor-force participation rate is at a 38-year low. The same economic discontent that motivated the Brexit vote is both present and justified in the American worker.

But why wouldn't someone who is more often in a position to hire **immigrants** than to compete with them for jobs not cast her lot with Hillary Clinton?

The first argument is that those of us who have benefited so handsomely from the existing American economy should support policies that will help the other 325 million Americans as well.

The second argument is that pursuit of liberalized trade and **immigration** policies has a short-term benefit for capital owners, but long-term costs. Looking to the future, automation will further increase returns to capital and put downward pressure on wages. Consider the effect of the self-driving automobile on the 3.5 million American truck drivers on the roads today, or the effect of automated food ordering and preparation on the restaurant industry.

Erosion of wages for the American worker is not just a problem for the workers themselves. Mass production requires mass consumption. If American workers earn less and less, the sale of goods and services will suffer. Some American companies may be able to sell to global markets to soften the blow, but these markets will also be challenged by automation. And as we are now starting to discover, there is a limit to what can be sold on credit.

Donald Trump will not turn back the tide of technological progress and globalization that has caused American wages to stagnate. But a smaller pool of low-skilled **immigrants** competing with laid-off truck drivers for work and a more limited flow of jobs overseas at least grants the country time - its citizens time to retrain for new jobs, and its leaders time to develop solutions to the problems posed by rapid technological change.

It's possible that you find Donald Trump's personal flaws so great that the price of accepting his leadership is not worth his nationalist policies. In considering this issue, note that major-party nationalist candidates are quite rare, and the prospects of a candidate without a billionaire celebrity's fame and resources repeating his performance are at best uncertain.

In any case, even that question receives a depressingly small amount of coverage on the national stage. One might expect that a recent New York Times article discussing Trump's criticisms of Hillary Clinton meeting in secret with international banks would be an occasion to discuss some issues raised here. Instead, the article's thesis was that these comments could be linked to anti-Semitism. Setting aside the implausibility of a Brazilian bank as a target for anti-Semites, the nationalist case deserves a fairer hearing than that.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON (CNN) -- Fourteen unaccompanied refugee children from the notorious "Jungle" migrant camp in Calais, France, have arrived in Britain.

They are the second group of a planned transfer of up to 200 youngsters stuck in the camp who have been identified by the Red Cross as eligible to go to Britain.

The new arrivals follow an advance party of five children -- four Syrians and one Afghan, who arrived in the UK at the weekend. The children were taken to a government center in south London for registration before being united with their families in various churches.

The Home Office said in a statement it had sent a team to France to help identify those children eligible to come to Britain following a meeting between the UK Home Secretary Amber Rudd and her French counterpart Bernard Cazeneuve.

All the children admitted so far qualify for relocation under European Union common asylum rules.

The UK Home Office said in a statement: "When she met the French Interior Minister this week she made it crystal clear that we intend to transfer as many minors as possible, who qualify for transfer to the UK to claim asylum on the basis of close family in the UK under the Dublin Regulation, before the start of the clearance."

"In addition, children who are eligible to come to the UK under the Dubs Amendment to the **Immigration** Act 2016 must be looked after in safe facilities where their best interests are properly considered. Lord Dubs was himself a child refugee who came to the UK to escape Nazi Germany. Work is continuing on both sides of the Channel to ensure this happens as a matter of urgency."

In March, the UK's upper legislative body, the House of Lords, voted against the government and backed an amendment to the 2016 **Immigration** Act by the Labour peer Lord Dubs to allow 3,000 unaccompanied child refugees into the country.

In total, more than 140 unaccompanied children have been accepted for transfer under Dublin family reunification so far this year (up to October 1), with more than 80 from France.

The squalid and overcrowded camp in Calais is home to 10,000 people who, having entered Europe, are trying to get across the Channel to the UK.

It is due to be demolished by French authorities later this month.

"As the camp's closure looms, I am relieved that the first children are starting to come to the UK under fast track arrangements, and can now start recovering from their ordeals," said Anne Longfied, the Children's Commissioner for England.

"Apart from those with rights to come to the UK there are several hundred other children in the camp, the vast majority on their own."

Some estimates put the number of unaccompanied children in the Calais camp at 900, just a proportion of the tens of thousands believed to be in Europe, alone and vulnerable, as Europe's refugee crisis shows no sign of abating.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Muslim Americans describe the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks as a seminal moment that painfully altered their place in American society.

But when CNN interviewed American Muslims about the presidential election, we heard a startling message: 2016 is worse.

CNN traveled last month to three growing Muslim communities -- in Minneapolis, Northern Virginia and Staten Island -- which represent the diversity and increasing political engagement of Muslims in the United States. The majority of people we spoke to said it is harder to be a Muslim American today than it was even after 9/11.

"I have never thought I would hear my young daughter say, 'Dad, people were asking me about my scarf in the school,' " said Hamse Warfa, a Somali refugee who **immigrated** to the US as a teenager and now lives in the Minneapolis suburbs. "After 9/11, there was no ring-leader, so to speak, who was championing, mainstreaming, hate."

That "ring-leader" Warfa was referring to is Donald Trump, the Republican nominee for president.

Trump has run a hardline, anti-**immigration** campaign built on promises to erect a wall and deport millions of undocumented **immigrants**. Last December, he announced a proposal to ban Muslims from entering the country. And he has suggested that profiling would be an effective strategy to prevent terrorism.

CNN interviewed more than 40 Muslim Americans who expressed raw emotions ranging from disbelief to anger to fear. Perhaps most disturbing about this election, many said, is the perception that Trump has helped to normalize animosity toward and suspicion of Muslims in the US.

These tensions have been exacerbated over the past year by a series of attacks carried out by individuals who claim to be motivated by radical Islam, and in some cases swear allegiance to ISIS.

Trump has repeatedly seized on these moments to question the loyalty of all Muslims. He did so as recently as the second presidential debate, when a Muslim woman asked Trump and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton: "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?"

Trump responded by calling for "extreme vetting" -- and for Muslims to police one another.

"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," he said.

Clinton told the woman: "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."

The two candidates meet again Wednesday in Las Vegas for their final debate.

Hate crimes against Muslims appear to be on the rise -- researchers at California State University found that they were up 78% in 2015.

Hina Ansari, an American-born Muslim woman who lives in Woodbridge, Virginia, told CNN that she found Trump's rhetoric about **immigrants** "terrifying."

"I'm imagining internment camps for all of us if Trump won the election," said Ansari, who supported Bernie Sanders during the primaries and now backs Clinton. "The way that he talks, the hate speech that he uses, that he brings people towards him -- it's scary to know that so many people who seem like perfectly reasonable people that I know support him."

Concern has become a catalyst for action. **Immigration** advocates across the country have launched local and statewide voter registration campaigns, including efforts aimed at bringing into the fold first-time Muslim voters.

Those votes will become increasingly important. Muslims make up a small slice the country -- the Pew Research Center estimates that there were about 3.3 million Muslims in the US last year -- but by 2050, Muslims are expected to make up 2% of the country's total population.

Amin Shehadeh, a 47-year-old Palestinian American who has been a US citizen since 1996, will vote for the first time in his life this November for Clinton.

"Because I don't like Trump," Shehadeh said. "This year, my daughter, she make the registration."

Staten Island: 'I'm American. He can't kick me out.'

Haji Khan brims with pride. As he browses the aisles at a halal grocery store in northern Staten Island, Khan mentions repeatedly that his oldest son is an Army Lieutenant who was deployed for two years in Afghanistan. He wants his youngest child, who is starting high school this year, to join the ROTC.

"I want my children to be soldier to defend this country, to fight for this country," says Khan, a Pakistan-born **immigrant** who came to the US in 1980.

This summer, Khan, 56, watched in dismay as Trump attacked the father of a fallen soldier -- a man who shared Khan's last name.

Khizr Khan, whose Army captain son died in Baghdad in 2004, delivered an impassioned speech at the Democratic National Convention, blasting Trump for his rhetoric about **immigrants**.

"Go look at the graves of the brave patriots who died defending America -- you will see all faiths, genders and ethnicities," Khizr Khan said, with his wife at his side. "You have sacrificed nothing and no one."

Trump went on offense, saying Khizr Khan had "no right" to criticize him and even questioning why Khan's wife did not speak.

For Haji Khan, who calls America "beautiful like the song," Trump's animosity toward this grieving father was deeply unsettling. Trump's remarks struck Khan as counter to the values of a country that he says graciously fed and housed him when he first arrived here.

"This country was never like this," Khan says. "America was beautiful paradise when I came to this land... It was a welcome people. Beautiful people."

A short ferry ride from downtown Manhattan and New York's least populated and most conservative borough, Staten Island has become known this year as Trump Country.

More than 8 out of 10 Staten Islanders who voted in New York's GOP primary in April backed Trump, marking almost double the level of support the Queens native received in Manhattan.

Muslim Americans spread out across this island have confronted an uncomfortable reality during this election: Many of their neighbors support a candidate whose policy ideas have taken direct aim at their community.

Tarek Wazzan, 41, operates a family-owned halal restaurant and grocery store called Shop & Eat on Forest Ave. Wazzan, who was born in Egypt and came to the Untied States in the 1990s, said more alarming than Trump's words is the overwhelming support the candidate enjoys in the borough.

"I think they are more educated. Why would they do that?" Wazzan says of Trump's supporters here. "I don't take what (Trump) says seriously. What bothers me is what people are listening to him are doing now."

As Trump gained popularity, tensions between the candidate's supporters and his foes have escalated this year.

In January, Rose Hamid, a Muslim woman wearing a hijab, was escorted out of a Trump rally in South Carolina after she stood up in silent protest. As she was escorted out, Trump supporters jeered, and one person shouted: "You have a bomb, you have a bomb."

Hamid later told CNN: "The ugliness really came out fast and that's really scary."

Some fear that a recent string of hate crimes -- the killing of an Imam in Queens; an attack against two Muslim women pushing their children in strollers in Brooklyn -- foreshadow more to come as Election Day draws closer.

And even while stories of open clashes are rare, some Muslim residents of Staten Island described to CNN the nagging feeling that they are being targeted because of their ethnicity.

Samaira Kouser, 31, was born in Pakistan and is a housewife and mother of three young daughters. She moved to the US when she was 12, and says she has always found Staten Island to be a friendly community. But recently, she says, some of her neighbors have begun to complain about her children playing outside.

"Somebody is in my block who don't like us," Kouser says. "This about (the fact that) we are Muslim."

Kouser's husband, Muhammad Saqib, is also from Pakistan and in the process of becoming a US citizen. He works the cash register at a convenience store, and with his limited income, the family of five lives in a basement apartment that Kouser describes as just one room and a kitchen.

They are currently dependent on food stamps -- information that Kouser readily volunteers as proof that the US is a great country that helps the needy.

Despite their financial difficulties and concerns about the current political climate, Kouser is optimistic about the future. She says she is confident that her children can achieve anything they want in America -- one of her daughters wants to be a dentist; another, a cop.

"This is my country. I live here," Kouser says. "I'm American. He can't kick me out."

Northern Virginia: Muslims have to 'step up our game'

Hundreds of worshippers have filed into the Dar Alnoor mosque in Manassas, Virginia, for Friday midday prayers. Imam Sulaiman Jalloh speaks with urgency, pleading with his congregation to take action: Come November, he says, everyone must get out and vote.

"Today, some people say, 'You and I have no right to be here.' That although this nation was founded on freedom of religion, your religion and mine is not welcome here,'" Jalloh says. "My dear respected brothers and sisters: This time, I believe none of us has the option to just sit home."

There is little doubt that the Imam is referring to Trump's rhetoric during this campaign.

Many Muslims in Northern Virginia whom CNN interviewed said they are obsessively following the election. In places of worship, community centers and schools -- both in private conversations and in public -- Muslims of all backgrounds worry about the toll the campaign is taking.

Even children are not immune.

At the ADAMS Center's Radiant Hearts Academy in Sterling, Virginia, where preschoolers to second graders are taught a curriculum centered on Islamic values, teachers and parents are grappling with how to explain the election to children.

"You can't really hide it, you know? If it's in the news and your parents are watching the news, it'll come up and the word 'Muslim' will come up," says Hurunnessa Fariad, the school's vice principal.

Originally from Uzbekistan, Fariad moved to the US when she was little and now has four daughters.

"You have to constantly tell your children, 'No, we're not going anywhere. We're here, you know, we haven't done anything wrong,'" she tells CNN. (Fariad doesn't want to share who she will vote for in November, only saying: "It's obvious.")

Sadia Naureen is a 16-year-old resident of Falls Church whose family is from Pakistan. Naureen says she has heard multiple stories about Muslims getting attacked and women choosing to take off their hijabs. She no longer feels safe walking alone.

Naureen blames Trump for making her fear for her safety.

"He should know that the stuff he's saying is really affecting people. It's not just words anymore to get votes -- it's going to change people's lives for the worse," Naureen tells CNN.

Dar Al-Hijrah, where Naureen's family worships, felt shaken in November when a man left a fake explosive device at the mosque. Months later, a sign in the lobby cautions that in light of the shooting of an Imam in New York City, Dar Al-Hijrah's security is monitoring all suspicious activity.

Although she is not old enough to vote, Naureen is an avid Clinton supporter and is working with an **immigrant** rights group to encourage people to register to vote.

The US Council of Muslim Organizations, one of many groups involved in voter registration efforts this year, said as of last month, it had helped an estimated 500,000 Muslim Americans register to vote this cycle.

The influx of new Muslim voters -- many of whom are turned off by Trump's message this year -- along with anecdotal evidence of Republican-voting or independent Muslims turning their backs on the party this year, could haunt the Republican Party far beyond 2016.

David Ramadan, a former member of the Virginia House of Delegates and an Arab-American who comes from a Muslim family, suspended his membership with the Republican Party when Trump became the presumptive nominee.

"I was absolutely distraught and offended that my party, the party of Reagan, the party of Lincoln, the true big tent that aspired for a great America, has today nominated a candidate who is a bigot, racist, demagogue," Ramadan says in an interview at his home in Dulles, Virginia.

Born and raised in Lebanon and a life-long supporter of the GOP, Ramadan doesn't yet know what he will do after the election. He predicts that the political views that take hold among ethnic minorities this year will far outlast the 2016 election.

"They're saying, 'What happened here? We need to be more involved so that we don't see this rhetoric again,'" Ramadan says.

Da'in Johnson, one of the worshippers at Dar Alnoor who works for the Department of Labor, says the silver lining for Muslims in the 2016 election is that the community is being forced to "step up our game." Part of that effort, Johnson says, is making clear to political candidates that no Muslim vote should be taken for granted.

"I think that no reasonable-thinking Muslim likes or agrees with what Donald Trump is saying," Johnson, 55, says. "But it's not a lock step for the Democratic nominee."

Minneapolis: We were 'double victims' of 9/11

Fifteen years ago, Muslim Americans watched the horrific images pouring out of downtown New York, the Pentagon and Shanksville, and tried to make what little sense they could of the incomprehensible massacre and destruction of September 11, 2001.

But even before they could begin to mourn, they felt besieged. Their religion was under attack and calls rang out for their community to apologize for the horrific actions perpetrated by terrorists.

It was a kind of Islamophobia that Muslims in America had never before encountered.

Here in Minneapolis, where the country's biggest concentration of Somalis resides, many share a similar story of being displaced by war, spending years at refugee camps and finally arriving in the United States to start a new chapter of their lives.

And they remember distinctly how their lives were altered after 9/11.

"Things really got very tough for us," says Safiya Mohamud, 33, who came to the US as a Somali refugee in 2000 and works at her sister's clothing and accessories store at Karmel Square mall. "At the airport, people would just assume that you dress different so something will happen or something will go wrong. You always get that extra look."

Abdirahman Kahin, who also came to the US from Somalia, says Muslim Americans were "double victims" of the attacks.

"9/11, because of what these guys did, this affected me as an American," Kahin says. "At the same time, other Americans see us as traitors."

But the community describes a gradual easing of tensions and normalization in the 15 years since the attacks.

Rep. Keith Ellison says after he became the first Muslim American elected to Congress, George W. Bush "extended his hand to me and said, 'Ellison, I'm glad there's a Muslim in the Congress.'"

The congressman supported Sanders during the primaries and now backs Clinton. He hopes to see the Democratic nominee visit a mosque -- the same way that Bush did days after the 9/11 attacks.

Bush "stood with Muslims and he said that Islam's not the problem -- these terrorists, murderers and maniacs are the problem," Ellison says. "George Bush doesn't get enough credit for that."

One nominee who has eagerly credited Bush this year is Clinton.

"The week after 9/11, George W. Bush went to a mosque and declared for everyone to hear that Muslims 'love America just as much as I do,'" Clinton tweeted this summer.

Last month, after a bombing in Manhattan's Chelsea neighborhood, Clinton urged Americans to remember that there are "millions of law-abiding, peaceful Muslim Americans."

"We are going after the bad guys and we are going to get them, but we are not going to go after an entire religion and give ISIS exactly what it is wanting," Clinton said.

Kahin is one of many Somalis who have worked to build a comfortable middle-class life in Minneapolis. His two restaurants in Minneapolis and St. Paul are thriving and he feels at home in Minneapolis' diverse community. Earlier this year, Kahin was even invited to attend President Barack Obama's State of the Union speech as a guest of Sen. Al Franken.

"We've been very welcomed by the community," Kahin says.

Never did he imagine that 15 years after 9/11, things could suddenly take a turn for the worse.

"A lot of people believe what Donald Trump (is) saying about us," he says. "That we are violent. That our religion is not like any other religion."

The election became deeply personal for Somali Americans this summer when Trump singled out the community at a campaign rally. Trump warned that Minnesota was having "tremendous problems" and pointed to the state's Somali refugees as an example of a "rich pool of potential recruiting targets for Islamist terrorist groups."

The remarks set off outrage and alarm.

Amal Aynab, a 27-year-old personal banker who was born in Somalia, says she has never experienced discrimination in Minneapolis. But she fears that outside the confines of an ethnically diverse city, the kind of hostility toward Muslims that became so prevalent after 9/11 could be making a comeback, fueled by Trump's rhetoric.

When she recently went to a mall in the city of Edina, Aynab says she encountered an elderly woman who angrily told her that she didn't belong.

"She was like, 'Oh my God. Since you're Muslim you're not supposed to be in the country. Just get out of our mall,'" Aynab says. "I just walked away."

Warfa, the Somalia-born refugee who came at a young age, recently had a similar experience. He was shopping at a Target store in Savage when he says three men confronted him, making derogatory comments about Somalis and Muslims and telling Warfa to "go back to your country."

"I have never seen the level of fear that I see now among Muslim community since 9/11," says Warfa, a social entrepreneur. "People are very fearful now."

The Muslim Americans CNN interviewed overwhelmingly rejected Trump's rhetoric about their community, but a number of them also expressed ambivalence about Clinton. Many of the interviewees had supported Sanders during the primaries, drawn to the Vermont senator's economic populism and his appeal to the younger generation.

Zamzam Ahmed, 22, **immigrated** to the US when she was 9 from Somalia. She is now a senior in college and won't be a citizen in time to vote in November. But if she could, Ahmed says, she would consider supporting Trump, despite feeling disturbed by Trump's rhetoric about Muslims.

"I wouldn't mind voting for Trump. In all honestly because Trump is, as wrong as some of the things he says are, he's being honest," Ahmed says. "I think that's why he gets most of the votes that he is getting."

In the final stretch of a wild presidential campaign that is growing increasingly nasty, many Muslims told CNN they wished to see bigger gestures from elected officials and political candidates to address the recent rise in Islamophobia.

They say they crave declarations that remind the country Muslim Americans are just as American as anyone else.

"This is our home. We are Americans," says Mohamud, the Somali American who works at Karmel Square mall. "If somebody comes to you and says that they're going to chase you away from your house, where would you go?"

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 4:26 p.m. -- Adds Clinton statement grafs 11, 12. New highlight

(CNN) -- Three men face domestic terrorism charges for allegedly plotting to bomb an apartment complex occupied by Somali **immigrants** in southwest Kansas, the US Department of Justice said Friday.

The men had talked about filling four vehicles with explosives and parking them at the four corners of the apartment complex in Garden City to create a large explosion, the DOJ said in a news release.

About 120 Somali **immigrants** live in the complex, CNN affiliate KWCH reported, and acting US Attorney Tom Beall said one of the apartment units served as a mosque.

The trio, members of a militia group that calls itself The Crusaders, wanted to "wake people up," the DOJ said. They were stockpiling weapons and planned to release a manifesto after the explosion, Beall said at a news conference.

"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 US Attorney Tom Beall said. "Many Kansans may find it as startling as I do that such things could happen here."

Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright, both 49, of Liberal, Kansas, and Patrick Eugene Stein, 47, of Wright, Kansas, were charged with conspiring to use a weapon of mass destruction.

A confidential source attended meetings of The Crusaders and told the FBI about the men's plans, the DOJ said.

Stein met with an undercover FBI employee Oct. 12 and test-fired automatic weapons, the DOJ said. Stein took the source to the apartment building the men allegedly planned to bomb and said he would provide ammonium nitrate for the bomb and contribute $200 to $300 for other materials, the DOJ said.

Stein also mentioned that Allen had been arrested in a domestic violence case, causing Stein to worry Allen's girlfriend would talk to police about their plans, the DOJ said.

'Disturbing terror plot'

If convicted, the men could be sentenced to life in prison, the DOJ said.

Hillary Clinton issued a statement congratulating law enforcement "for detecting and disrupting a highly disturbing terror plot" that she said was an affront to all Americans.

"We all must stand firm in fighting terror and rejecting hateful and divisive rhetoric -- and we must do it together," Clinton said.

The Democratic presidential nominee said if elected she would "work with law enforcement at all levels and within our communities to make sure we have the tools we need to prevent both domestic and international terrorist threats."

Mosque attacks

Garden City, a town of about 27,000 people, and Finney County have attracted **immigrants** for years because they can find work in the meatpacking factories, CNN reported in 2009.

Between 2007 and 2008, Finney County became a majority-minority community, the US Census Bureau said.

Preliminary data from the Council on American-Islamic Relations indicates that 2016 is on track to be the second-worst year on record when it comes to mosque attacks in the United States. This year is barely trailing the record set last year: 78 mosques were attacked in 2015.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- If you take Donald Trump at his word, making America great again is going to be quite a chore.

The Republican nominee is selling an apocalyptic vision -- the US as an impoverished hellscape beset by bloodthirsty urban anarchists, a terrorist fifth column, and the machinations of globalist elites.

Even the most mundane institutions are cast as symbols of existential rot. At every turn, Trump finds another "broken," "rigged" and "disastrous" policy to undo or abolish. Real worries and legitimate concerns share space -- sometimes lines in a single speech -- with Trump's dark fantasies.

And like so many aspiring authoritarians before him, the candidate is also consistent on another point: channeling scapegoats and delivering a promise that "I alone can fix it."

Here are more than a dozen people, places and issues Trump has claimed to be damaged or corrupted beyond repair -- by anyone other than himself:

American cities

"We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African-Americans, Hispanics are living in hell because it's so dangerous," he said during the first presidential debate. "You walk down the street, you get shot."

The **immigration** system

"The truth is our **immigration** system is worse than anybody ever realized," he said at a September rally in Phoenix. "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."

The election, generally

"The whole thing we've been going through, and I hate to say it, but the whole thing we're going through -- Bernie Sanders, it was a rigged deal -- the whole thing is one big fix," he said at a rally in Greensboro, North Carolina, on Friday. "It's one big, ugly lie."

The vote, specifically

"I'm telling you, November 8th, we'd better be careful because that election is going to be rigged," he told Fox News in August. "And I hope the Republicans are watching closely or it's going to be taken away from us."

The media

"If the disgusting and corrupt media covered me honestly and didn't put false meaning into the words I say, I would be beating Hillary by 20%," Trump tweeted in August.

NAFTA and free trade

"Because of NAFTA (the North American Free Trade Agreement), signed by (Hillary Clinton's) husband, is perhaps the greatest disaster trade deal in the history of the world. Not in this country. It stripped us of manufacturing jobs," Trump said at the second presidential debate. "We lost our jobs. We lost our money. We lost our plants. It is a disaster."

US military leadership

"I think under the leadership of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, the generals have been reduced to rubble," Trump said during a September forum. "They have been reduced to a point where it's embarrassing for our country."

The Iran nuclear deal

"That is one of the worst deals ever, ever made by this country. It is a disaster," he said at a GOP debate in March.

Senator Hillary Clinton

"She has been a disaster as a senator," he said at the second presidential debate. "A disaster."

America's been pillaged

"It's a global power structure that is responsible for the economic decisions that have robbed our working class, stripped our country of its wealth, and put that money into the pockets of a handful of large corporations and political entities," Trump said on Thursday.

Muslim Americans and terrorism

"They're protecting each other, but they're really doing very bad damage -- they have to open up to society and report the bad ones," he told ITV's "Good Morning Britain." "When they see trouble, they have to report it. They are absolutely not reporting it, and that's a big problem."

The Benghazi hearings

"I hope @TGowdySC does better for Rubio than he did at the #Benghazi hearings, which were a total disaster for Republicans & America!" Trump tweeted last December.

The Republican primary

"Because of me, everyone now sees that the Republican primary system is totally rigged and broken," Trump said shortly before becoming the GOP's presumptive nominee.

The US's standing in the world

"We have been disrespected, mocked, and ripped off for many, many years by people that were smarter, shrewder, tougher," he said in a March interview with The New York Times.

NATO

"I think NATO is obsolete," he said on ABC's "This Week." "NATO was done at a time you had the Soviet Union, which was obviously larger -- much larger than Russia is today. I'm not saying Russia is not a threat."

Europe and its refugee policy

"It's a total disaster, on top of which you have migration which is destroying Europe," he said at an event in September. "Germany is a disaster now. France is a disaster."

PACs and super PACs

"I mean, PACs -- you know, these super PACs are a disaster, by the way, folks," Trump said at the March debate. "Very corrupt. It's going to lead to lots of disasters."

Airports

"You go over to Qatar, you go over to Saudi Arabia, you go over to some of these countries -- China -- and you see airports the likes of which you've never, ever seen before," he said last year at event in New Hampshire. "Then you come back and you land at LaGuardia -- it's true: potholes, potholes -- you land at LaGuardia or Newark or LAX and you walk into a filthy terminal that's falling apart with broken terrazzo floors and that's what we have."

And Trump tweeted in May, "While our wonderful president was out playing golf all day, the TSA is falling apart, just like our government! Airports a total disaster!"

Obamacare

"Everything is broken about it, everything," he said during the second debate.

The mental health system

"Fix our broken mental health system. All of the tragic mass murders that occurred in the past several years have something in common -- there were red flags that were ignored," he says on his campaign website.

The visa system

"Our VISA system is broken, like so much else in our country. We better get it fixed really fast. MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN!" -December 10, 2014, on Twitter

The schools

"We need to fix our broken education system! #StopCommonCore #MakeAmericaGreatAgain"

The world

"Look where the world is today, a total mess, and ISIS is still running around wild. I can fix it fast, Hillary has no chance!" he tweeted in May.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**9:37 pm: Adds Mattzzie was Obama supporter

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A hacked email published by WikiLeaks this week shows that Democratic strategists -- including top political allies of Hillary Clinton -- were gauging voter attitudes about the Muslim faith of Barack Obama's father during Clinton's unsuccessful fight for the 2008 Democratic presidential nomination.

If this had come out in the midst of the 2008 Democratic primaries it would no doubt prompt angry comments from Obama campaign staffers and condemnations of attempts to other-ize the senator. But Democrats, not surprisingly, were mum Friday.

According to Tom Matzzie and Paul Begala, two Democratic consultants advising the 2008 polling effort by Progressive Media USA, it was simply an effort to test Obama's vulnerabilities in a potential general election against John McCain.

Begala and Matzzie told CNN that the group also tested arguments against Clinton, a claim that is backed up by a separate hacked email available on WikiLeaks as Document ID 2187.

"This is Campaigning 101," said Matzzie, an Obama supporter in 2008 who was the president and executive director of Progressive Media USA. "You test the vulnerabilities of your candidate -- something (Republicans) should have done for Donald Trump."

The emails were published by WikiLeaks, which has now posted roughly 10,000 emails hacked from the account of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta. Clinton's campaign has not confirmed the content or veracity of the emails.

"We're still not confirming whether or not any of the WikiLeaks documents are authentic and are therefore not commenting on their content," Clinton campaign spokesman Josh Schwerin said.

In a January 9, 2008, email to Podesta, Begala, Matzzie and two others, an analyst at Stan Greenberg's Democratic polling firm proposed asking voters for their reaction to 15 potential Obama vulnerabilities.

The list of anti-Obama arguments included this one about the faith of Obama's father: "Obama (owe-BAHM-uh)'s father was a Muslim and Obama grew up among Muslims in the world's most populous Islamic country," an apparent reference to Obama's time in Indonesia.

Twelve percent of the poll respondents in 10 battleground states at the time thought that Obama's father being a Muslim and Obama growing up around Muslims was one of the top two reasons to vote against Obama.

Progressive Media found that the most effective Republican argument against Obama was the notion that Obama favored raising taxes by "$2 trillion." Twenty-one percent of poll respondents said that the tax argument was one of the best reasons to vote against Obama.

Matzzie said that the polling project developed over a two-month period. Originally, it was going to test John Edwards in addition to Clinton and Obama, but he was dropped after he failed to win the Iowa caucuses and his chances at the nomination evaporated.

"It was pretty obvious Obama was going to be the nominee," Matzzie said. "It was more important to understand attacks on him than it was two months earlier."

Begala, who is now a CNN political commentator and an adviser to Priorities USA, a pro- Clinton super PAC, tells CNN that this email was labeled "McCain survey" because "it was designed to test attacks that might come in the general election."

Begala was hired by Progressive Media USA to advise the group.

"We could not coordinate with either campaign, and worked to prepare to defend either candidate in the general election," wrote Begala in an email to CNN. "Our entire focus was the general election. Both Obama and Clinton supporters were, at the time, concerned the eventual nominee would emerge wounded and vulnerable for the general election."

The group disbanded after the nomination fight was settled because Obama publicly urged his supporters to give money directly to his campaign not to independent political committees. Progressive Media USA received funding from George Soros, Steve Bing, the Service Employees International Union and others.

In addition to gauging voter reactions to the Muslim faith of Obama's father, the polling team also proposed testing that Obama had described his former cocaine use as using "a little blow." The group also tested Obama's support for driver's licenses for undocumented **immigrants**, his stance on gay adoption, and his 2007 decision to stop wearing an American flag pin.

The group tested multiple potential Republican arguments against Clinton including that she "flip-flopped" on driver's licenses for undocumented **immigrants**, that she "pandered to anti-war radicals" by cutting off emergency funds for the Iraq War and that she has taken "more money from lobbyists and special interests than any other candidate."

"We were trying to simulate an election against McCain," Matzzie said. "If you don't include negative questions about your own candidates in the polling, the research is worthless because no real election is like that."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**update 8:49 p.m. -- new graf 13 with background

(CNN) -- Three men face domestic terrorism charges for allegedly plotting to bomb an apartment complex occupied by Somali **immigrants** in southwest Kansas, the U.S. Department of Justice said Friday.

The men had talked about filling four vehicles with explosives and parking them at the four corners of the apartment complex in Garden City, Kansas, to create a large explosion, the DOJ said in a news release.

About 120 Somali **immigrants** live in the complex, CNN affiliate KWCH reported, and acting U.S. Attorney Tom Beall said one of the apartment units served as a mosque.

The trio, members of a militia group that called itself The Crusaders, wanted to "wake people up," the DOJ said. They were stockpiling weapons and planned to release a manifesto after the explosion, Beall said at a news conference.

"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. "Many Kansans may find it as startling as I do that such things could happen here."

Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright, both 49, of Liberal, Kansas, and Patrick Eugene Stein, 47, of Wright, Kansas, were charged with conspiring to use a weapon of mass destruction.

A confidential source attended meetings of The Crusaders and told the FBI about the men's plans, the DOJ said.

Stein met with an undercover FBI employee Oct. 12 and test-fired automatic weapons, the DOJ said. Stein took the source to the apartment building the men allegedly planned to bomb and said he would provide ammonium nitrate for the bomb and contribute $200 to $300 for other materials, the DOJ said.

Stein also mentioned that Allen had been arrested in a domestic violence case, causing Stein to worry Allen's girlfriend would talk to police about their plans, the DOJ said.

The men could be sentenced to life in prison, the DOJ said.

Garden City, a town of about 27,000 people, and Finney County have attracted **immigrants** for years because they can find work in the meatpacking factories, CNN reported in 2009.

Between 2007 and 2008, Finney County became majority-minority, the U.S. Census Bureau said.

Preliminary data from the Council on American-Islamic Relations indicates that 2016 is on track to be the second-worst year on record when it comes to mosque attacks in the United States. This year is barely trailing the record set last year: 78 mosques were attacked in 2015.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Three men have been arrested and charged with plotting to bomb a mosque and apartment complex occupied by Somali **immigrants** in southwest Kansas, the U.S. Department of Justice said Friday.

The men had talked about filling four vehicles with explosives and parking them at the four corners of the apartment complex in Garden City, Kansas, to create a large explosion, the DOJ said in a news release.

About 120 Somali **immigrants** live in the complex, CNN affiliate KWCH reported. Garden City, a town of about 27,000 people, and Finney County have attracted **immigrants** for years because the meatpacking factories offer jobs that require little training, CNN reported in 2009.

The three men, members of a militia group that called itself The Crusaders, wanted to "wake people up," the DOJ said. They planned to stockpile weapons, the DOJ said.

"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. "Many Kansans may find it as startling as I do that such things could happen here."

Curtis Allen and Gavin Wright, both 49, of Liberal, Kansas, and Patrick Eugene Stein, 47, of Wright, Kansas, were charged with conspiring to use a weapon of mass destruction.

A confidential source attended meetings of The Crusaders and told the FBI about the men's plans, the DOJ said.

Stein met with an undercover FBI employee Oct. 12 and test-fired automatic weapons, the DOJ said. Stein took the source to the apartment building the men allegedly planned to bomb and said he would provide ammonium nitrate for the bomb and contribute $200 to $300 for other materials, the DOJ said.

Stein also mentioned that Allen had been arrested in a domestic violence case, causing Stein to worry Allen's girlfriend would talk to police about their plans, the DOJ said.

The men could be sentenced to life in prison, the DOJ said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**2:32pm ET: Republished with Pennsylvania video at the top.

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- William Schwoyer sighs deeply as he looks down Corporate Center Drive in Reading, Pennsylvania.

Factory after factory has shut. For 37 years, Schwoyer has been a machine operator at Neenah Paper. But he just got word that his plant is closing. He'll be jobless by Christmas.

"I started there when I was 19," said Schwoyer, now 56. "I've never filled out a resume in my life."

Donald Trump realized quickly that "left behind" workers like Schwoyer were angry -- at Democrats, at Republicans, at the system. He promised to bring their jobs back from Mexico and China. And he vowed not to be another politician.

In a state that has lost a third of its manufacturing jobs since 2000, Trump's message got people's attention. Thousands pack high school gyms to hear Trump speak, especially in "Pennsyltucky," the vast area between Philadelphia and Pittsburgh that is filled with farming and manufacturing towns like Reading.

But the message isn't resonating with Schwoyer. "I just don't trust [Trump] at all. He's reality TV," he said.

Schwoyer had made $22 an hour at Neenah Paper, which makes specialty paper products like the tissue used to package ritzy Tiffany gifts. He thinks he'll get another job, but never anything that pays like the one he's losing.

"$10 an hour jobs, $12 an hour jobs? You can't have a real life doing that. You really can't," he said. He doesn't think Trump -- or anyone else -- can bring the manufacturing jobs back. He's telling his grandkids to study hard.

Trump's advisers call Pennsylvania a "must win" state. As recently as September, that looked like a real possibility as the polls narrowed. Trump even had the support of Hamid Chaudhry, a Muslim-American in the Keystone State.

A Muslim-American who WAS for Trump

Chaudhry is a small business owner who runs Wyomissing Family Restaurant, a popular eatery just outside Reading. He **immigrated** to the U.S. from Pakistan in 1988 and became a citizen.

"I'm voting for Trump. I'm hoping my friends and neighbors will be employed again, and the manufacturing jobs will come back," Chaudhry told CNNMoney in late September.

As a practicing Muslim, Chaudhry took a lot of heat for supporting Trump. But his No. 1 issue was the Reading economy, where nearly 40% live below the poverty line. He viewed his vote for Trump as a vote for jobs.

Then the "Access Hollywood" tape surfaced, showing Trump making vulgar and sexually aggressive comments in 2005.

"I'm not sure how I can explain to my 9-year-old daughter why I'm supporting Mr. Trump," he said this week. He's not sure what he'll do on Election Day now.

He's not alone. CNNMoney spoke with six committed Trump voters in Pennsylvania in late September. Two have now changed their minds because of the tape.

Can Trump still win Pennsylvania?

Trump still says he can win Pennsylvania. In fact, he's gone as far as to say the only way he'll lose Pennsylvania is "if cheating goes on." But it's clear Trump is in trouble in the Keystone State. He has been behind in the polls since the first debate.

Pennsylvania is known as "fool's gold" for Republican presidential hopefuls. It hasn't gone red in a presidential election since George H.W. Bush ran in 1988.

The problem for Republicans? The Philadelphia suburbs. Over 20% of the state's voters live in the four counties that surround Philly. In 2000, registered Republicans outnumbered Democrats in the area by 357,000. Now Democrats have a slight edge.

Adam and Caroline Gamse typify the type of young, liberal couples moving to Montgomery County, a key Philly suburb.

Adam is an emergency room doctor and Caroline is a scientist who recently launched CG Medical Works, a medical writing company. They have three kids -- and a Hillary Clinton sign in their front yard.

"Hillary is a much stronger candidate," said Caroline.

The wealthy suburbs are a problem for Trump

While Trump talks about bringing back steel and coal jobs, they see Clinton as trying to usher in the "jobs of the future." The Gamses are even willing to have their taxes go up to help ensure better infrastructure and educational opportunities for all Americans.

Clinton's plan "would raise our taxes," said Adam. "I'm willing to pay more to support what the plan of the country is. That's fine."

The image of Pennsylvania that has dominated national media this election is struggling, blue-collar towns. But the Philadelphia suburbs couldn't be more different. They are prosperous and highly educated: 46% of people have college degrees in Montgomery County.

Beth Hamilton can feel the politics shifting in Montgomery County. She's voted Republican in recent elections, but more of her friends and even some of her children vote Democratic.

She found Trump's comments on the "Access Hollywood" tape "disgusting and despicable," but she feels it's "a little hypocritical to be so selectively outraged by this type of behavior when Hillary Clinton is and has been for years an enable of a sex abuser."

Like many Americans, she doesn't like any of her options for president in 2016. But when forced to pick, the long-time military wife and event planner is going with Trump. She just doesn't trust Clinton on national security and **immigration**.

Ditching Trump for Pence

But for every Beth Hamilton in southeastern Pennsylvania, there's a Virgil Kahl.

Kahl is a successful financial adviser in Reading who usually votes Republican. She was ready to go for Trump in September because she liked the idea of a businessman in the White House.

"I just think government is too big and too bureaucratic," she said then. She prefer Trump's plans to reduce taxes and government.

Now she's changed her mind.

"If Trump cares about this country, he should step down," she told CNNMoney this week after listening to the tape. She plans to write in Mike Pence.

Trump just couldn't win Sanders supporters

In the end, Pennsylvania may come down to women. In 1996, it was the "soccer moms." In 2016, it will likely be the "working moms."

One of those is Lisa, another worker at the Neenah plant in Reading who is about to lose her job. She didn't give her last name for fear it would impact her job hunt.

"Bernie was my guy. Hillary gets my vote by default," said Lisa, who's 55.

In fact, Bernie Sanders was the preferred candidate of a lot of blue collar workers. Clinton may have won the Pennsylvania primary, but Sanders topped her in Berks County, where Reading is located. Trump had hoped to sway the Sanders supporters to his camp. Lisa does share Trump's view on trade.

"I personally believe that the trade agreements are what's killing manufacturing in this area and others," Lisa said.

But she thinks U.S. manufacturing will never be the same, regardless of what Trump promises, which is why she insisted her daughter go to college and get "an office job." Trump's personality also concerns her.

"I don't like Trump because of his opinion of women. He looks at them as objects," Lisa said in a rocking chair on her back porch overlooking Pennsylvania's rolling hills.

CNN's Poppy Harlow, Jordan Malter and Richa Naik contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SALT LAKE CITY (CNN) -- Utah Republican State Sen. Dan Thatcher sees the 2016 election in dire terms.

"It's like choosing between getting shot or poisoned," he said in a back hall of the Utah State Capitol building. "We know that Hillary Clinton is the worst, most horrifying and certainly lethal poison known to man. If we vote for Hillary Clinton, we will die in excruciating agony."

"With Donald Trump, we know we're going to get shot. We just don't know where."

Less than one month out, Thatcher is undecided.

The struggle to accept Trump as the leader of the Republican Party is no more challenging anywhere in America than it is here, where roughly 60% of Utahns are members of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

For so many, Trump offends their moral compass. Hillary Clinton offends their political compass. They are each, at the same time, the worst person in the world.

"He represents the 1980s ethos of materialism and greed; he is vulgar," said a high-ranking Republican staffer who requested anonymity because he works for many elected officials and didn't want to be seen as speaking for them. "He's filled with self-centered pride, which is modern-day idol worshiping.

"Everything he does is the antithesis of being Mormon."

Institutions line up against Trump

Nowhere in the nation does voters' distaste for both candidates feel as palpable. Voter registration tilts three-to-one in favor of Republicans. Still, the Salt Lake City Tribune endorsed Clinton.

Meanwhile, The Deseret News, a newspaper owned by the LDS church, called for Trump to drop out of the race, adding that it does "not believe Trump holds the ideals and values of this community."

The church strongly denies that the paper's op-ed is the official position of the institution, which remains neutral in political elections, but the message was clear: Mormons might want to think twice about the foul-mouthed real estate mogul.

Utah hasn't voted a Democrat into the White House since 1964, and yet, the Democrat this year is tied for the lead here. Barely half of all voters say they'll vote for either of the major party candidates.

The Kim Jong Un of American politics

A few miles up Route 15 in the quiet hills above the suburb of Bountiful, David Irvine is moving into his condo.

"Donald Trump strikes me as the Kim Jong Un of American politics," the 73-year-old attorney said. "He's volatile, he's temperamental, he is not capable of controlling anger. In that position (president), those seem to me to be vital characteristics."

Irvine looks like a sophomore-year political science professor. His bow tie suits him. He is a lifelong Republican and was once upon a time a county GOP chairman and state lawmaker.

For Irvine, morality trumps politics -- so Clinton trumps Trump.

It's not just Trump's personality that irks the lifelong Utah resident, but the cornerstone position of Trump's campaign -- his hardline stance on **immigration** -- is a belief that offends Irvine's Mormon heritage.

"The history of Mormons in Utah is one of persecution, one of being hunted down," he said. "That's a long, tragic story."

"There are a lot of people in Utah who are members of the Mormon faith, the Mormon Church, who are undocumented **immigrants** from who knows where. When Mr. Trump says, 'Deport them all. Build a wall. Tear up families. Kick them out. They're all criminals. They're all rapists. They're terrible, terrible people,' that's a really broad brush that I think most members of the Mormon Church, and many, many other faiths, find to be terribly, terribly offensive."

Morality vs. politics

Who is to say whether moral judgments should take precedence over political ones, or vice-versa? It's two faiths competing. Neither is remotely unimportant; neither can be dismissed.

"The church's own scripture, and teachings from the church leaders would suggest that one of the things that's paramount to consider when you are choosing a candidate is their morality -- their personal morality -- their level of honesty; that they need to be a good person, a good human being," said Quin Monson, a political science professor at Brigham Young University in Provo.

Monson isn't just a professor -- he's Mormon and has voted for Republicans his entire life, a streak that will end on November 8.

"Every time (Trump) chooses to interact publicly, he almost can't help but interact in a way that I think many Mormons, if not most Mormons, would find troubling and antithetical or opposite of who they are, who they are at least taught to be," he said.

Monson will vote for Clinton or for third-party candidate Evan McMullin, who is surging in the polls here, but who is on the ballot in less than a dozen states.

"I'm more confident than ever before that Donald Trump will lose Utah," Monson said.

'I am not electing an ecclesiastical leader'

Kathleen Anderson lives a bit further up in the Bountiful hills from David Irvine. A lifelong Republican as well, she's the president of the Utah Federation of Republican Women.

Unlike Irvine, she has a Trump yard sign -- a new one because the first was vandalized with spray paint.

Anderson's family converted to the LDS church when she was seven years old, and she calls it "a good fit" for her. She's more forgiving of Trump's style and moral compass than other Mormons.

"Donald Trump probably does not espouse all of my values," she said. "However, I am not electing an ecclesiastical leader at this point. I'm electing a leader for this country who can write policies that have gone astray."

Anderson knows other members of her faith are morally repulsed by Trump.

"Some people might find him vulgar, offensive, greedy. Many other qualities that are reprehensible."

But, she said, "I think to hold everyone to the same standard is incorrect and unfair. I was most likely raised with a different set of values than Donald Trump was."

"When we make a mistake, we very much want other people to grant us mercy, or grace, or forgiveness," Anderson said. "When they do, we are so appreciative of that. Yet, it is so easy, it appears, for people to not extend that same grace or mercy, or forgiveness, to someone else who has made a mistake. Rather, we pass this judgment, and I don't think that judgment is always fair."

The agony

Back at the state capitol, Thatcher sounds like he is already in excruciating agony.

"Voting for Hillary Clinton, to my mind, is morally repugnant," he said. "Voting for Donald Trump, in my mind, is morally repugnant. And I am still not sure which one's worse."

But will Trump hold off Clinton and win?

"50-50," he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**3:54 pm: Breaks out verdict on Assad 1:25 am: Trump on radical Islamic terrorism 1:18 am: Tweaks time elements in lede 1:04 am: Adds Trump insults 12:53 am: Adds Clinton and Russia hacking 12:46 am: Adds trade 12:29 am: Adds jobs 12:22 am: Adds Trump on Muslim-Americans 12:14 am: Adds Clinton's fortune 12:06 am: Adds Trump/Clinton on single-payer health care 11:51 pm: Trump on ISIS 11:38 pm: Clinton on Trump tax plan 11:34 pm: Adds taxes 11:30 pm: Adds African-American incomes under Bill Clinton 11:26 pm: Adds Trump on Iraq 11:21 pm: Adds Bill Clinton 11:04 pm: Adds Clinton emails 10:42 pm: Canadians on health care 10:30 pm: Adds Obamacare insured rate 10:09 pm: Adds birther

(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump met Sunday for their second presidential debate, and CNN's Reality Check Team spent the evening analyzing their claims.

The team of reporters, researchers and editors across CNN listened throughout the debate and selected key statements from both candidates, rating them true; mostly true; true, but misleading; false; or it's complicated.

Obamacare

Reality Check: Trump on Obamacare premiums

By Tami Luhby, CNNMoney

Trump cited Obamacare as one of the top problems he wants to address if he is elected president.

"When I watch the deals being made and watch what's happening with horrible things like Obamacare, where your health insurance and health care are going up by numbers that are astronomical. By 68%, 59% and 71%," Trump said.

It's true that some insurers are raising some of their plans' premiums by that much, but that's not the typical increase.

Insurers have requested a rate hike of 9%, on average, for the benchmark silver plan for 2017, up from 2% for this year, according to the Kaiser Family Foundation.

The vast majority of Obamacare enrollees, however, don't see those massive hikes. Some 85% of them receive federal subsidies that can lower their premium to less than 10% of their income.

Verdict: True, but misleading.

Reality Check: Clinton on 90% insured rate

By Tami Luhby, CNNMoney

Clinton praised Obamacare as providing health insurance for 20 million people who didn't have it before.

"Right now, we are at 90% health insurance coverage. That's the highest we have ever been," she said.

Clinton is right that the largest share of Americans now have health insurance. It's actually even more than 90%. The uninsured rate was 8.6% in the first three months of this year, according to the National Health Interview Survey from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

That means a record 91.4% of Americans were insured.

Verdict: True.

Reality Check: Canadians traveling for health care

By Debra Goldschmidt, CNN

In response to a question on Obamacare, Trump said, "If you ever noticed 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."

According to a 2015 report by the conservative Canadian think tank Frasier Institute, "In 2014, more than 52,000 Canadians received non-emergency medical treatment outside Canada."

The 52,000 is an increase of about 10,000 from the previous year. The report last year said one reason for patients traveling abroad is the long wait times in Canada, which were reported to be nearly 10 weeks for treatments deemed medically necessary.

The report itself says it does not have exact numbers but assumes it underestimates. That said, 52,000 Canadians is a miniscule percentage of the more than 35 million Canadians who receive benefits.

While the report doesn't say how many patients travel to the US for medical treatment, we rate Trump's claim as true, but misleading.

Reality Check: Clinton wants single-payer system?

By Debra Goldschmidt, CNN

Trump said Clinton "wants to go to single-payer, which means the government basically rules everything." He went on to say, "Hillary Clinton has been after this for years. Obamacare was the first step."

In July, Clinton said she supported a public option, which is a government health plan as a choice alongside private health insurance options. This is different than a single-payer system, which is a singular, government-run system without other options to chose from.

The goal of adding a public option would be to stabilize Obamacare, which has seen several large insurers downsize their presence and premiums rise as insurers try to deal with sicker-than-expected enrollees. Obamacare had created non-profit cooperative insurers to give consumers more choice, but most of those carriers have failed.

Last month, in response to a question posed by the New England Journal of Medicine on how she would improve on quality and access to care, Clinton said she wants to build on the progress of Obamacare, also known as the Affordable Care Act, something she has said before.

Clinton wrote, "We must work to expand Medicaid coverage in the 19 states that have left 3 million Americans without health insurance because their states refused to expand Medicaid and enroll people eligible for coverage. We need to improve and strengthen the ACA through enhanced tax credits to make coverage affordable, implementation of strong measures to bring down the cost of prescription drugs, increased competition between insurers, and an aggressive campaign to increase outreach and enrollment. And finally, we need to ensure the availability of a public option choice in every state, and let Americans over 55 buy in to Medicare."

The medical journal asked the same question to Trump but he has yet to respond. He has said Obamacare should be repealed.

We rate Trump's claim that Clinton wants a single-payer system as false.

'Birther' claim

Reality Check: Trump claims 2008 Clinton campaign source of Obama photo in Somali garb

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump told Clinton that "your campaign" was responsible for circulating photos during the 2008 primaries depicting Barack Obama dressed in traditional Somali garb, a famous flare-up during the Democratic primary eight years ago.

Well, sort of.

The photo first appeared on Drudge Report, the conservative aggregator, and was attributed at the time to sources within the Clinton campaign, though no names were offered. The Obama campaign pounced on the report, blasting it as "divisive politics" and "part of a disturbing pattern."

The Clinton campaign at the time did not immediately dispute that it was responsible -- its first statement did not address the substance of the allegation.

"This is nothing more than an obvious and transparent attempt to distract from the serious issues confronting our country today and to attempt to create the very divisions they claim to decry. We will not be distracted," her aides said at the time.

The campaign said later that it had not been sanctioned by the campaign - but was not definitive about where it originated.

"We have over 700 people on this campaign and I'm not in a position to know what each one of them may or may not have done," campaign spokesman Howard Wolfson said at the time.

Previous questions about the Clintons' race-based attacks on Obama have been blamed on volunteers, who might not have been "sanctioned" by the campaign. Clinton's campaign brass pointed the finger at a "volunteer coordinator" in Iowa who shared the photo, which was part of what Trump said was an effort to discredit Obama's heritage and legitimacy. The volunteer was clearly backing Clinton and organizing on her behalf in the first-in-the-nation primary state. But it's not certain whether the volunteer was drawing a paycheck from her campaign and therefore an official Clinton actor.

"I don't recall whether they were an actual paid staffer," former Clinton campaign manager Patti Solis Doyle told CNN earlier this year. "But they did forward an email that promoted the conspiracy."

Verdict: It's complicated.

Clinton's emails

Reality Check: Trump on Clinton emails

By Ryan Browne, CNN National Security Producer

Trump returned to a common theme, slamming Clinton for her use of personal email during her tenure as secretary of state.

"You think it was fine to delete 35,000 emails? I don't think so. She said that 33,000 emails had to do with her daughter's wedding, number one, and a yoga class."

He added, "for you to say that there was nothing wrong with you deleting 39,000 emails, again, you should be ashamed of yourself."

Clinton handed 30,000 emails over to the State Department and said she deleted another 32,000 personal messages.

So the number was actually 32,000, not 39,000, 35,000 or 33,000, as Trump charged.

Of the 32,000 emails the FBI was able to find, more than 17,000 of them and determined that a "substantial number" were duplicates of emails that had already been turned over to the State Department.

The State Department has reviewed about 15,000 of the emails and determined that more than 9,400 were purely personal and will not be released and that another 5,600 are probably work-related and will be made public in the weeks before the election.

But he is partially right about the description Hillary gave for the emails that were deleted, thousands of which have been found to be work related.

Back in March 2015, when the server's existence was first revealed, Clinton downplayed the email as being "about planning Chelsea's wedding or my mother's funeral arrangements, condolence notes to friends as well as yoga routines, family vacations, the other things you typically find in inboxes."

Trump's three numbers are all inaccurate and the State Department confirmed that the majority were personal. Therefore, we rate Trump's claims about the numbers as false. But true that Clinton downplayed emails that turned out to be work-related.

Reality Check: Can Trump appoint a special prosecutor to investigate Clinton?

By Jamie Crawford, CNN National Security Producer

"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," Trump told Clinton. "There has never been anything like it, and we are going to have a special prosecutor. I go out and speak and the people of this country are furious."

But would Trump be constitutionally empowered to take such an action if he were elected the 45th president of the United States?

Under Title 6 of the Code of Federal Regulations, the attorney general does have the authority to appoint a special prosecutor, according to Stephen Vladeck, a law professor with the University of Texas School of Law.

Such action can be taken when the attorney general determines that a criminal investigation is warranted and that an investigation by the Department of Justice would present a conflict of interest or "other extraordinary circumstance" and that "under the circumstances it would be in the public interest to appoint and outside special counsel."

But the prosecutor would need to bring charges and that might a difficult proposition in the current climate, in the face of the comments by FBI Director James Comey earlier this year at the conclusion of the FBI investigation into whether or not Clinton broke the law in her use of a private email server.

In July, Comey said that Clinton had been "extremely careless" in her use of a private email server in which classified material was was sent over in small amounts. But Comey also said "our judgment is that no reasonable prosecutor would bring such a case" when he announced that the FBI would not recommend the Justice Department bring criminal charges against Clinton over the matter.

"I just don't see a scenario where, if the director of the FBI doesn't believe criminal charges can or should be brought, a subsequent Justice Department would bring them anyway," Vladeck said of the political situation after Comey's comments. But in practical terms regarding the legality of Trump's promise, the only constraints are the ones set out in the federal regulations.

And would Trump be able to "instruct" his attorney general to undertake such an investigation?

Vladeck points out that the attorney general is supposed to be at least somewhat independent, but at the end of the day, the President can fire him or her for no reason. So in reality, the President could demand that the AG appoint a special prosecutor or else be fired.

That is essentially what led to the "Saturday Night Massacre" during the Nixon administration when President Richard Nixon dismissed Archibald Cox during the investigation of Watergate. But that incident ended up being a significant factor in turning the public tide against Nixon in the scandal that eventually brought down his presidency.

Verdict: True.

Reality Check: Clinton on Russia and hacking

By Justin Gamble and Kate Grise, CNN

Clinton said Russia was behind the hacking of systems related to the Democratic Party and then releasing thousands of emails in an attempt to influence the presidential election to favor Trump.

"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," she said.

"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," Clinton continued. "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"

Trump was not so convinced that the Russians were behind the hacks.

"Anytime anything wrong happens, they like to say the Russians. She doesn't know if it's the Russians doing the hacking," he said. "Maybe there is no hacking, but they always blame Russia. And the reason they blame Russia is because they think they are trying to tarnish me with Russia."

The intelligence community had been debating whether they should "name and shame" the Russians for the cyberattacks because of some concerns about the strength of the evidence and fears that it would be seen as a political statement to help Clinton's election.

However, on Friday, the Obama administration said it was "confident" Russia was behind recent hackings of the Democratic National Committee emails and the sites of other Democratic Party-linked organizations over the summer.

"We believe, based on the scope and sensitivity of these efforts, that only Russia's senior-most officials could have authorized these activities," the Department of Homeland Security and Office of the Director of National Intelligence said in a joint statement.

The statement went on to say that the hackings and then publishing of these emails are "intended to interfere with the US election process."

Russia has denied all involvement in hacking attacks on US servers and organizations, saying the accusations are "nonsense."

While there has been speculation that the hacking benefits Trump as it has targeted Democrats and Clinton, the intelligence community has not reached that conclusion.

So on Trump's claim that it is not known if there is any hacking, we rate the claim false. On Clinton's opinion that the hack is meant to benefit Trump may be her hunch, but not the conclusion of investigators. We rate that false as well.

Bill Clinton

Reality Check: Bill Clinton's law license, Paula Jones settlement

By Sonam Vashi, CNN

Trump went after Clinton's husband tonight.

"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."

The day before he left the Oval Office in 2001, Bill Clinton agreed to a suspension of his Arkansas license to practice law for five years, after giving misleading testimony during the Monica Lewinsky scandal.

The suspensions, and his payment of a $25,000 fine to the Arkansas bar association, was in exchange for the end of the seven-year Whitewater probe. The suspension of Clinton's license closed the disbarment proceedings in Arkansas. Clinton is still listed as suspended on the Arkansas judiciary government website, although it's been 10 years since the end of his suspension.

That same year, after the suspension of his Arkansas license, the Supreme Court disbarred Clinton from practicing law before it, a routine decision that happens if lawyers have been suspended or disbarred elsewhere. The action was mainly a symbolic one, since Clinton had never argued in a Supreme Court case, and Clinton was given 40 days to fight against the disbarment. Instead, Clinton resigned from the bar of the Supreme Court -- again, a symbolic gesture.

Trump is also correct on the $850,000 figure. Paula Jones is a former Arkansas state employee who accused Clinton of making "persistent and continuous" sexual advances toward her while he was governor. She filed a federal lawsuit in 1994, and Clinton settled the lawsuit in 1998, paying out $850,000 to Jones and her lawyers.

Clinton wasn't disbarred in Arkansas, but he did lose his license for a time. Trump's claims are true.

Reality Check: Clinton on African-Americans' incomes rising under Bill Clinton

By Tami Luhby, CNNMoney

Hillary Clinton praised the prosperity America enjoyed during the administration of her husband, Bill. In addition to saying millions of jobs were created and everyone's income rose, she specifically cited how African-Americans benefited.

"African-American incomes went up 33%," she said.

The typical African-American household's income rose to $40,830 in 2000, up 31.5% from 1992, just before Clinton took office, according to Census Bureau data.

That's an even more robust increase than Americans as a whole. Overall, the typical American household saw its income climb to $57,790, up 13.9% from 1992.

While Clinton was slightly off on the numbers, our verdict: True.

Iraq

Reality Check: Trump would not have had US in Iraq

By Eve Bower, CNN

Trump again claimed that he would not have supported the 2003 US invasion of Iraq. Specifically, he said, had he been president, he "would not have had our people in Iraq," and Captain Humayun Khan would still be alive.

Khan was killed in combat in Iraq in 2004, and was posthumously awarded the Purple Heart and Bronze Star.

Khan's parents, Khizr and Ghazala Khan, gained national prominence after speaking critically of Trump at the 2016 Democratic National Convention.

In reality, Trump was on the record as being supportive of the Iraq War as early as a month before Congress voted to authorize military force in Iraq in 2002, as well as soon after the invasion. He didn't express his outright opposition to the war until more than a year later, in an August 2004 interview.

We rate Trump's continued insistence that he would not have led America into war in Iraq as false.

Taxes

Reality check: Trump says Clinton would raise taxes on everyone

By Jeanne Sahadi, CNNMoney

Trump claimed Clinton would be "raising everybody's taxes massively."

Clinton has proposed raising taxes on the highest-earning Americans, but not anyone making less than $250,000.

Independent analyses of her plan find that her proposed tax hikes would squarely hit the most well off.

The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center noted that "nearly all of the tax increases would fall on the top 1 percent; the bottom 95 percent of taxpayers would see little or no change in their taxes." The Tax Policy Center will soon publish an updated analysis of her tax plan to incorporate new tax proposals she made over the summer.

Verdict: False.

Reality Check: Clinton says Trump would raise taxes on middle-class families

By Jeanne Sahadi, CNNMoney

Clinton said that despite claims that he would cut taxes for everyone, Trump actually "would end up raising taxes on ... millions of middle-class families."

Clinton was referring to a study that estimated his proposals would raise the tax burden on millions of low- and middle-income parents.

A leading Democratic tax policy expert conducted the study, but the conservative Tax Foundation said it replicated many of her numbers and found her conclusions "reasonable."

The study estimated that roughly 20% of households with minor children and more than half of single parents could end up paying more in taxes than they do today. These groups include about 25 million adults and 15 million children.

What explains the tax impact? While Trump would increase the standard deduction and add new child care tax breaks, he would also raise the lowest tax bracket to 12% from 10%, eliminate the head of household status and repeal some personal exemptions.

Many single parents could find that tradeoff leaves them with a higher tax bill, the study found.

Verdict: True.

Terrorism

Reality Check: Trump says Assad, Russia and Iran are 'killing ISIS'

By Jamie Crawford, CNN National Security Producer

Trump said the following about the fight against ISIS.

"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"

But is Trump right that those three countries are "killing" ISIS amid the bloody civil war convulsing the country?

Backed up by Russian military power, the Assad regime has targeted what it commonly refers to as "terrorists" but that has primarily meant various groups who are specifically acting to depose the Assad government. Some of those groups include groups the United States also sees as being capable to assist the primary aim of the US-led coalition which is to dislodge ISIS from its base in Syria and Iraq.

Russia insists it has been targeting ISIS forces since it entered into military action inside Syria in support of the efforts of the Assad regime, but US officials have said the majority of Russian airstrikes have been against US-backed rebels battling Assad's forces, as opposed to ISIS. That was one of the reasons US efforts to establish a mechanism where Russia and the United States might cooperate to increase the pressure on ISIS fell part.

Earlier this year, Secretary of State John Kerry said Iran had been "helpful" in targeting ISIS on their own inside portions of Iraq, but there has been little evidence of Iranian forces targeting ISIS inside Syria in support of the Assad regime. Iranian forces in Iraq did play a key role in some of the critical battles that dislodged ISIS from Tikrit and Baiji, and other portions of northern Anbar province where ISIS had a large presence.

Syrian forces backed up by the Russian military have also been accused of targeting civilians inside Syria and launching attacks that have indiscriminately killed thousands of Syrian civilians throughout the course of Syria's civil war -- most recently in Syria's largest city, Aleppo.

Because there has been no visible effort by Assad regime forces to go after ISIS, and with the Russian military not using overwhelming force to go after ISIS in Syria, but to focus on going after groups that opposes Assad, we rate Trump's claim false.

In Iraq especially, US officials and others have noted Iran's role in targeting ISIS as one of the reasons the group has lost ground there, but the picture of Iran's role against ISIS in Syria is not as clear. We would rate his comment as true, but misleading.

Reality Check: Trump suggests Muslim-Americans don't cooperate with law enforcement

By Amy Gallagher and Emma Lacey-Bordeaux, CNN

A voter asked what the candidates would do to help Muslim-Americans who are being "labeled as a threat" and are targets of Islamophobia.

Trump side-stepped her question by calling on the Muslim community to do more to report terrorism.

"We have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on," said Trump. "As an example in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed and wounded many, many people. ... Muslims have to report the problems when they see them."

We have checked the claim about witnesses to the bombs in the San Bernardino shooters' apartment before and have found that there is no evidence that anyone saw the bombs and did not report them. There is also no evidence that Muslims in the terrorists' community had information and withheld it.

On Trump's larger point,the Muslim community has actually been more effective than law enforcement at uncovering potential terror attacks in America since 9/11.

Charles Kurzman, professor at University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill conducted a study in 2013 to examine the relationship between Muslim-Americans and terrorism on American soil. He found that "Since 9/11, 54 Muslim-American terrorism suspects and perpetrators were brought to the attention of law enforcement by members of the Muslim-American community out of 188 individuals where the initial tip was made public. Another 52 individuals were discovered through US government investigations."

We rate Trump's suggestion that Muslim-Americans don't cooperate with law enforcement false.

Reality Check: Trump on radical Islamic terrorism

By Travis Caldwell, CNN

In a response to rising Islamophobia in America, Trump suggested that the terrorist attacks in Orlando and San Bernardino, as well as the events of 9/11, were a direct result of "radical Islamic terrorism" and stated Clinton and President Barack Obama won't use the phrase.

First, a breakdown of the events Trump mentions.

The attacks on September 11, 2001, were coordinated and carried out by al Qaeda, an Islamic extremist terror network. According to law enforcement officials, the San Bernardino shooters may have been self-radicalized, following a warped and extremist version of Islam. The terror group ISIS claimed credit for the San Bernardino shootings, but it has yet to be determined if the shooters and members of ISIS made contact or received instruction.

The Orlando shooter cited himself as an "Islamic soldier" during his talks with police negotiators, but like the San Bernardino attacks, officials believe the shooter acted as a "lone wolf" and was radicalized by online sources.

At face value, the attackers noted by Trump were indeed beholden to a radicalized ideology.

Verdict: True.

Trump also criticized Clinton and Obama for their failure to use the phrase "radical Islamic terrorism."

Clinton, however, told CNN's "New Day" in June that she did not object to the phrase when used properly, saying, "From my perspective, it matters what we do more than what we say. ... And it mattered we got (Osama) bin Laden, not what name we called him. I have clearly said we -- whether you call it radical jihadism or radical Islamism, I'm happy to say either. I think they mean the same thing."

Obama spoke with CNN's Jake Tapper last month on his particular reluctance to use the phrase, saying, "The truth of the matter is that this is an issue that has been sort of manufactured, because there is no doubt, and I've said repeatedly, that where we see terrorist organizations like al Qaeda or ISIL, they have perverted and distorted and tried to claim the mantle of Islam for an excuse, for basically barbarism and death."

Clinton doesn't object to the phrase so we rate Trump's claim as false. Obama may call the issue a distraction, but he refuses to use the term. That claim is true.

Clinton's fortune

Reality Check: No, Hillary Clinton did not use her office to make $250 million

By Theodore Schleifer, CNN

Trump was curious why Clinton had not devoted any of her personal fortune to his campaign, like he has to his. But his charge included a curious datapoint.

"She made $250 million by being in office. She used the power of her office to make a lot of money," Trump claimed.

The main way the Clintons made money: private speeches. The speaking fees -- and what Clinton said to financial audiences behind closed doors -- emerged as a major campaign issue during the Democratic primary, with her rival Bernie Sanders repeatedly calling for the release of the transcripts. And the money she made was another sign of what critics said was a disconnect between the life of the secretary of state and the life of the average American.

But that number's not right. Clinton delivered 92 paid speeches between April 2013, when she was a private citizen, through March 2015, right before she launched her presidential campaign. But those remarks only yielded $21.6 million -- an average speaking fee of $235,000, according to a CNN analysis of her payments.

Trump may have been misspeaking and meaning to reference a different number: $150 million, which is the amount that both Clintons collected during their time after office. When you include Bill Clinton's 637 paid speaking engagements from February 2001 to May 2015, the total Clinton fees rises to $154 million split over 729 speeches.

And if you throw in other sources of income, the two Clintons' intake does indeed arrive to the $250 million ballpark. Forbes reported that Bill and Hillary Clinton earned $230 million between 2001 and 2014 through advising and consulting gigs, book deals and speaking fees.

But a majority of that money came from Bill Clinton, who has had a much lengthier tenure outside of public office.

As for how much she has contributed to her campaign, Clinton has made $1.2 million in in-kind contributions to her campaign.

So we rate the $250 million total, ascribed purely to Hillary Clinton, to be false.

Jobs

Reality Check: Trump says Clinton 'failed' to bring jobs to upstate N.Y.

By Patrick Gillespie, CNNMoney

Trump criticized Clinton's record as a senator representing New York, saying: "Hillary was going to bring back jobs to upstate New York and she failed."

As a senator, Clinton promised to bring 200,000 jobs to upstate New York. She did not.

Upstate New York consists of 49 counties, according to the New York Federal Reserve. It does not include New York City and its surrounding suburban counties.

Clinton became a senator in January 2001 and her last full month in office was December 2008.

During that time, employment in the metro area of Syracuse increased by 5,029 workers. However, the unemployment rate in Syracuse was 4.8% at the start of 2001 and, like much of the nation, rose in 2008 to 6.7%, Labor Department figures show.

Ithaca also had jobs gains but a rise in the unemployment rate.

In Binghamton's metro area, employment declined by 3,600 workers during Clinton's term. In Rochester, employment declined by 5,600 workers.

In a December 2007 report, the New York Federal Reserve found private sector job growth in upstate New York declined 0.2% on average per year between 2000 and 2005. Job growth did pick up in 2006 and 2007.

The region did lose 85,000 manufacturing jobs between 2000 and 2006. However, that was in line with the national trend. While Clinton was a senator, the US economy lost about 4.2 million manufacturing jobs due to improved technology and trade. The New York Fed noted in its report that the manufacturing job losses in upstate New York "appear unlikely to be reversed."

The manufacturing job losses also weren't entirely offset by job gains in lower-paying industries such as health care, education and hospitality, the report found.

Verdict: Mostly true.

Trade

Reality Check: Trump on $800 billion trade deficit

By Tami Luhby, CNNMoney

Trump once again blasted America's trade deals and once again gave the wrong figure for the nation's trade gap.

"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," Trump said.

The nation had a nearly $763 billion deficit in the trading of goods in 2015, according to Census Bureau figures.

But America is shifting to a service economy and exports $262 billion more in services than we import.

That brings our overall trade deficit down to $500 billion for 2015.

Verdict: False.

Trump's insults

Reality Check: Clinton on the people Trump has insulted

By Kate Grise, CNN

Clinton said Trump has insulted many different groups.

"We have seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to 10. We've seen him embarrass women on TV and Twitter. We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe on the harshest most personal terms. So, yes. This is who Donald Trump is. It's not only women and 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," Clinton said.

Let's break down some of Clinton's points.

"We have seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to 10," Clinton began.

In a 2005 interview with Howard Stern, Trump said, "I view a person who's flat-chested as very hard to be a 10."

He then proceeded to rank a list of celebrity women on a scale from one to 10 as Stern provides him with their names.

Stern suggested Trump should start a "Donald Trump evaluation show" to give weekly ratings on women.

"You know that would be a very good show for Sirius I think," Trump agrees. "You do that for hours and hours. It would get tremendous ratings."

We rate Clinton's claim as true.

"We saw him after the debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe on the harshest most personal terms," Clinton said.

In the days after the first presidential debate last month, Trump repeatedly defended his statements about former Miss Universe Alicia Machado.

"She gained a massive amount of weight and it was a real problem, we had a real problem, not only with that but her attitude, and we had a real problem with her," Trump said on Fox News.

Trump went after Machado on Twitter as well -- "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?"

We rate Clinton's claim as true.

"He has also targeted **immigrants**, African-Americans, Latinos, people with disabilites, POWs, and Muslims and so many others," Clinton said.

Trump on **immigrants**: "But you have people coming in and I'm not just saying Mexicans. I'm talking about people that are from all over that are killers and rapists and they're coming into this country," Trump said on CNN's "State of the Union" last year.

During the first presidential debate, Trump said, "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 on African-Americans: "You're living in poverty, your schools are no good, you have no jobs, 58% of your youth is unemployed -- what the hell do you have to lose?"

Trump on Latinos: "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," Trump said in his presidential announcement speech in June last year.

Trump on people with disabilities: At a rally last November, Trump mocked a disabled reporter by impersonating him.

Trump said that he did not know the reporter, so therefore he could not have been mocking him.

Trump on POWs: "He's not a war hero," Trump said of Sen. John McCain who was a prisoner of war during the Vietman War. "He was a war hero because he was captured. I like people that weren't captured."

Trump on Muslims: Trump has called for surveillance of mosques, religious tests for **immigrants** that would prevent Muslims from entering the country and compiling a national database of Muslims living in the United States.

We rate Clinton's litany of claims as true.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**9:32am ET: Fixes a typo in a caption.

NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- For the first time ever, John Hernandez won't vote on Election Day.

Hernandez, a Puerto Rican in his 50s, lives near Disney World in Florida. He views Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton a lot like Mickey Mouse: an act.

"This election is just a game," Hernandez told CNNMoney while out for lunch in early September with his wife of 33 years. They sometimes held hands across the table. "Honesty, integrity ...I don't see that right now."

Florida went for President Obama in 2012 -- but just barely, with the tightest margin of any state. Since then, two populations have ballooned: retirees and Latinos, especially Puerto Ricans. Retirees lean Republican, while Latinos lean Democratic. The voter bloc that comes out stronger will likely sway the election.

CNNMoney stopped at Puerto Rico's Cafe in Kissimmee, Florida, for lunch. It's in the heart of central Florida, an area known as the "I-4 corridor" that runs from Daytona Beach through Orlando to Tampa. It's the swing region of this battleground state, yet no one we met at the cafe was voting for Trump.

"I think he is a clown," said Elise Agosto, an administrative assistant and grandmother of two.

Problem: Uninspired Puerto Rican voters

Trump has struggled with Latinos ever since he called Mexican **immigrants** "rapists" in the early days of his campaign and championed building a wall between the U.S. and Mexico. Trump attempted to soften his image by traveling to Mexico in August. Hernandez calls it "a stunt."

So are Puerto Ricans a slam dunk for Clinton? Hardly. Of the eight people we spoke with over mofongo dishes, three aren't sure they'll vote. Hernandez and Agosto are among the uninspired.

Hispanics account for 18% of Florida's adult population that's eligible to vote, but they make up under 15% of the state registered voters, according to Pew Research. It's a gap the Clinton campaign is trying to close. After all, the 2000 presidential race in Florida -- the year of the "hanging chad" -- was decided by just 537 votes. (And Obama's 2012 victory was by only 74,000).

Clinton campaign going hard after Puerto Ricans

Clinton has a heavy ground game in the Sunshine State to register -- and motivate -- Latino voters like Noel Miranda. He moved to Florida a few months ago, fleeing the economic disaster in Puerto Rico. The island is deep in debt and has been in recession for nearly a decade.

At age 20, this will be his first presidential election. He liked Bernie Sanders because paying for college is a hardship he faces every time he looks at his bank account. Currently, Miranda makes pizzas at a restaurant in order to save up enough money to continue his computer science degree.

"Bernie's not in the race so the second option that I have is Hilary Clinton because I definitely don't want to see Donald Trump as president," Miranda told CNNMoney.

Puerto Ricans are American citizens. They can't vote for president on the island, but they can sign up easily once they move to the mainland United States. About 1,000 Puerto Rican families have been moving to Florida every week, according to some estimates.

Counties in central Florida like Orange and Osceola have seen their Puerto Rican populations double in the past decade, notes Aubrey Jewett, associate professor of political science at the University of Central Florida. Clinton needs minority voters to come out strongly for her to counterbalance the right-leaning retirees who are steadfast voters, rain or shine.

Trump voters aren't all blue collar

Mike Collier doesn't fit the stereotypes of a Trump supporter: the blue collar workers fearful for their jobs or what Clinton called "deplorables." Collier is a Vietnam veteran who went on to a long career at Xerox. Now retired, he and his wife live in a home in a gated community in sunny Sarasota. Life is good. You can find him on a boat most weekends.

There's just one thing Collier isn't happy about: President Obama.

"I believe the current administration failed us," he told CNNMoney. He thinks Obama has run up the debt, failed to reinvigorate the economy and weakened America's leadership abroad. "When I look at [Trump's] history, he's been a winner. I think he's a patriot."

Many predicted the Republican primary in Florida would be close. Marco Rubio -- Florida's own senator -- was facing off against Donald Trump. Instead, Trump crushed Rubio, winning by over 440,000 votes. Some of Trump's biggest margins of support came from wealthier communities such Siesta Key, where Collier lives.

"It really scares us that we're staring at $20 trillion in debt, not knowing how our grandchildren will repay it," says Bob Kuck, a neighbor of Collier's. While Trump's tax plan is projected to shoot up the debt, Kuck believes Trump will surround himself with good advisers in the White House and enact a better plan. He likes Trump's business acumen.

His wife, Linda Kuck, agrees. She was born in Canada but **immigrated** to the U.S. legally and became an American citizen. She thinks Trump is right to take a hard stance on **immigration**.

"It just seems to me that a law is a law for everyone. That's where I stand," she said.

Still voting for Trump, even after "p-word"

These retirees don't love Trump. They were aghast at some of Trump's statements, even before the "Access Hollywood" video from 2005 surfaced where Trump made lewd and sexually aggressive comments about women.

"I frankly was rather appalled at Trump initially. I think his personality is awful," Alice Stonaker told CNNMoney in September. But she's still voting for him now because she thinks Clinton is worse.

The Kucks feel the same way. They see a vote for Trump as the "anti-Hillary" vote.

"I found that these two revelations about Trump to be just disgusting," Bob Kuck said, but he'll still vote for Trump because, "I also find the revelations about Ms. Clinton to be disgusting."

In the end, it comes down to policies. These retirees think Clinton will balloon the government and stack the Supreme Court with liberal judges. In fact, all 12 Trump supporters in Florida that CNNMoney spoke with in September still plan to vote for him now despite the "p-word" video.

Bob Stonaker, Alice's husband, calls this the "most pivotal election of our lifetime." He thinks it could mark the end of the Republican Party if Clinton gets elected and gives millions of illegal **immigrants** citizenship.

"That will ensure that we will continue to have a liberal culture forever," he said. "They'll feel like they're indebted to the liberal party, to vote Democrat."

Cuban-Americans are no longer 'reliably Republican'

Perhaps nowhere in Florida is the state more divided than Cuban-American families. For years, the Cuban-American community was reliably Republican. Senator Rubio is a poster child of that strong voting bloc. Many of these voters fled Cuba for the U.S. and shunned anything that looked remotely like socialism in America.

But their children and grandchildren are not as tied to the GOP: 44% now lean democratic, twice as many as in 2002, according to Pew Research.

CNNMoney spent the evening with four generations of the Garcia family in their ranch-style home in the Orlando suburbs. A map of Cuba hangs prominently in their TV room above the couch.

Miguel and Maria Garcia -- also known as "grandpa" and "grandma" -- were born in Cuba but fled to the United States in the 1960s. They call themselves independents, but they have traditionally gone Republican.

"I honestly don't trust [Hillary]," Maria Garcia told CNNMoney on a couch surrounded by her children and grandchildren. "My problem is...Cuba is a communist country. Anything that turns a little bit to the left, I have a problem with that."

Maria Garcia's two grown daughters, however, have a very different view of politics and this election. They are enthusiastic supporters of Clinton.

"My mom thinks Democrats are Communists, We're like one step away from being Communist when there's a Democratic administration," Carmen, one of the daughters, jokes.

Is Trump a true Republican?

Carmen and her sister Delia, in their early 40s, see Clinton as the clear choice because of her experience and her vision, especially for affordable college education and pre-school for all children. Both college educated, they want to ensure all children in America have the same opportunities they did.

"Donald Trump, I could have 100% agreement on issues and I don't think I could vote for him just in terms of the things the he has said about people and how he's treated people," says Carmen. It's "just a human decency factor."

Maria and Miguel aren't sure what to do. They are the kind of people who offer you drinks and Cuban pastries as soon as you walk in the door. They think the way Trump talks is "denigrating" and that he isn't even a true Republican. They also laugh at his plans to possibly open a hotel or another business in Cuba.

"Trump is going to lose his hotel in Cuba," Maria says. Trump hasn't managed to open anything there yet, but if he does, Maria predicts the Cuban government will seize it. Despite their dislike of Trump, Maria and Miguel aren't sure they can join the younger generation in a vote for Clinton.

Maria's mother, who is 97 and plans to go to the polls, isn't nearly as conflicted. When asked, she said simply, "Trump es loco!"

Who will woo the undecideds?

In the end, Florida will likely come down to the last-minute decisions of voters like Lizbeth Martell. Almost a quarter of Floridians are registered as "no party." She's one of them.

Her family owns Puerto Rico's Cafe in Kissimmee. She's grown up working there since she could walk. It's open every day of the year except Thanksgiving. Martell is also a successful realtor, often serving central Florida's exploding Puerto Rican population that comes from both the island and New York.

Martell has some views than lean Republican -- she thinks too many people get government handouts -- and some that lean Democratic -- she's a strong supporter of public education and has a daughter who is studying to become a teacher.

"I don't agree with paying a McDonald's employee $15 an hour, personally," she says. "They don't deserve it."

At first, Martell was excited about the possibility of a businessman as president or the first female president, but now she's "very unhappy" with both.

Like many Americans, she feels this year is about voting for the candidate who will "do the least harm." She's considering a vote for a third party candidate for the first time but hasn't made up her mind.

CNN's Poppy Harlow, Jordan Malter and Richa Naik contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Timothy Stanley is a historian and columnist for Britain's Daily Telegraph. He is the author of "Citizen Hollywood: How the Collaboration Between L.A. and D.C. Revolutionized American Politics." The opinions expressed in this commentary are solely those of the author.

(CNN) -- It's all over for Donald Trump. He'll lose on November 8 and probably lose big, going over the cliff edge with his supporters like Thelma and Louise.

The question is, what kind of Republican Party will Trump and his fans leave behind? A divided, demoralized party -- with grim future prospects.

They might lose more than just the presidency. Some Democrats are urging Hillary Clinton to aim at long-shot electoral votes in states such as Arizona and Georgia, and even redirect cash to congressional candidates.

Democrats have the advantage in Senate races; they could overturn the GOP control of the House. So it's not inconceivable that Paul Ryan -- the closest thing the Republicans have to moderate leadership -- loses the speakership.

Trump, meanwhile, won't go away. In the last two weeks we've seen the scale of his ego: Anyone who isn't with him is against him and, boy, does he hold a grudge. So expect him to spend the next four years writing a book, appearing on TV, incessantly injecting himself into Republican affairs.

Worse, he will threaten to run again. His concern for the GOP's survival is zero. During the primaries he initially refused to commit to backing a nominee who wasn't Donald J. Trump. His own demand for loyalty now is comically hypocritical.

Even if the Republicans took advantage of President Barack Obama's space exploration program and bundled Trump into a rocket for Mars, they'd still be stuck with Trumpism as a cultural phenomenon.

Because Trump didn't win the primaries on charisma alone. He exploited deep divisions within the GOP coalition. They're not necessarily about class, as is often suggested but not always backed by polling data, but certainly about attitude.

The GOP base was once defined by quite rigid orthodoxies on cutting government, projecting US power and moral conservatism. Trump has rejected all three and won votes from those who want a conservatism that will reduce **immigration** and uphold law and order.

Cheery, optimistic Reaganism is dead; the Bush administration helped kill it with Iraq, the credit crunch and a series of ethics scandals that prepared the GOP base nicely for compromise with Trump. Cynicism has conquered the right.

Perennially "disgusted" men such as Mitt Romney seem like something out of the Ark. Romney's constituency of sober plutocrats is shrinking, yet still powerful enough to resist Trump and bankroll a civil war.

The rejection of the ticket by so many officeholders in the past few days gives a sense of the scale of the elite's disaffection with their own voters. The only reason why more have not bolted, apparently, is that they've been astonished by the strength of grass-roots support for Trump.

One regard in which the GOP is unchanged is that it is the white people's party. From 1968 to 1988, this was an advantage. Now, as the white percentage of the electorate contracts, it's a disability. The dispute over what to do about it defines the civil war.

Anti-Trump Republicans demand a concession to political correctness: Be careful about language, pursue minority voters sensitively and even adopt policies such as **immigration** or police reform.

Trump sees no need for this. He wants minority votes, but he wants them on his own colorblind terms -- regardless of how those constituencies define their own needs. Hence he could label undocumented **immigrants** murderers and rapists and still expect to get the Latino vote.

He won't. The GOP might not get it for a generation. Its more moderate leaders understand and fear this, just as they see the growing gender gap in voting preferences and predict electoral oblivion.

Elements of the base, however, appear to have concluded that permanent opposition is a price worth paying to remain true to principle. They regard their economic needs and cultural identity as being in opposition to mass migration, so they refuse to budge an inch on policy. For them, it's a rational bid for survival.

We could be witnessing a party cleave in two. It's happened before. The Democrats were torn between liberal and segregationist wings in the 1960s. The current alignment of constituencies within the two parties, generally known as the sixth party system, may be due for a shake-up.

The Democrats will be the party of nonwhites, the college educated and liberals. Republican support will be concentrated among white men. Instinctive hatred of President Hillary Clinton will only strengthen that dynamic.

The GOP base will demand a nominee in 2020 who calls Clinton out as an anti-American socialist. In other words, they may nominate a Trump in name only. Can they be stopped? Not without the emergence of a transformative moderate leader. None is on the horizon. Ryan? Marco Rubio? John Kasich? A key reason for Trump's nomination is that the center is so lifeless and over-programmed.

Parties have been to the edge before and come back. The GOP nominated an extremist in 1964 yet won with a moderate in 1968; the Democrats did the same in 1972 and 1976. But right now it's so hard to conceive of a party being held hostage by a demography in decline and it building a winning coalition.

America in this regard is almost unique. Across the Western world, conservative parties have consciously engaged with modernity and adjusted to a changing electorate. The British Tories introduced same-sex marriage. The German Christian Democrats welcomed refugees.

The problem with Trump, therefore, is not just Trump. It's the social forces he represents, forces that constrain the more moderate leadership from chasing new voters. Perhaps the best thing that could happen for the GOP on November 8 is that Trump loses so badly that it repudiates his politics entirely. Alas, he will probably perpetuate a "stabbed in the back" myth that will suggest that defeat was down to Ryan.

Trump is one of those men who makes sure he wins even as he loses.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- The Supreme Court agreed Tuesday to take up three consolidated cases concerning a civil rights lawsuit filed in 2002 against high-ranking federal officials -- including former Attorney General John Ashcroft -- by non-citizens who were arrested for **immigration** violations after 9/11.

In the wake 9/11 the FBI dedicated more than 4,000 special agents to arrest and detain 762 **aliens** on charges that they had violated federal **immigration**laws.

In Court papers, the government argues that "in light of their **immigration** status, it was undisputedly lawful to arrest and detain them pending their removal."

But the class of about 80 Muslim, South Asian and Arab individuals who were held at the Metropolitan Detention Center in Brooklyn argue that the officials lacked any kind of individualized information that they were dangerous. They claim that it violated their due process rights to hold them in ultra restrictive conditions.

"Respondents do not challenge their detention," Jeffrey A. Lamken argues on their behalf in court papers. Instead, he says they challenge "their highly restrictive confinement conditions" that were inappropriate because they had no genuine terrorism connections.

In the one-page order the Court noted that only six justices would hear the case as Justice Sonia Sotomayor and Justice Elena Kagan are recused.

A federal appeals court held that the claims could proceed against Ashcroft and others.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump is launching a kamikaze mission -- fracturing his own party four weeks before Election Day.

The GOP nominee is lashing out in a stream of tweets boiling with rage and resentment, slamming House Speaker Paul Ryan for effectively cutting him loose and accusing the party leadership of dooming his campaign. It's a meltdown unprecedented by a presidential nominee this late in the year.

"It is so nice that the shackles have been taken off me and I can now fight for America the way I want to," Trump said in a tweet that raised the prospect of a full on civil war in the Republican Party. Such a battle would pit his loyal supporters against the rest of the GOP, including vulnerable lawmakers running for re-election that could threaten the party's hold on Congress.

Trump's outbursts come with his national polls tanking and his route to the 270 electoral votes he needs to win the White House closing fast.

Trump also called Ryan, the Wisconsin Republican, "very weak" and "ineffective" -- an attack that comes the day after after Ryan told House colleagues he'd no longer defend or campaign for the GOP presidential nominee.

"Our very weak and ineffective leader, Paul Ryan, had a bad conference call where his members went wild at his disloyalty," Trump tweeted.

"Despite winning the second debate in a landslide (every poll), it is hard to do well when Paul Ryan and others give zero support," he also tweeted.

Trump also criticized GOP Arizona Sen. John McCain who rescinded his endorsement of the Republican presidential nominee over the weekend.

"The very foul mouthed Sen. John McCain begged for my support during his primary (I gave, he won), then dropped me over locker room remarks!" Trump tweeted.

Trump said Republicans who are "disloyal" are "far more difficult" than Clinton.

"Disloyal R's are far more difficult than Crooked Hillary. They come at you from all sides. They don't know how to win - I will teach them," he tweeted.

Trump's move to go rogue and incite anarchy in the party leaves Republican leaders in a tough position. His behavior risks **alienating** moderate and swing voters vital to maintain GOP control of the Senate. But repudiating Trump entirely would risk a backlash by the record breaking millions of voters who flocked to the Republican nominee in the primary process.

He reiterated his frustration at his first post-debate fundraiser Tuesday in San Antonio, according to two sources. He repeated what he tweeted, saying that he feels "free from the shackles" and appeared generally in a good mood. He also mentioned Ryan, saying it was unfortunate that a small part of the party was not focusing on balanced budgets/**immigration**.

Ryan sought a middle ground Monday when he told House Republicans on a conference call he will no longer defend or campaign for Trump, instead spending the campaign's final four weeks focusing on House and Senate races in an effort to help the GOP maintain control of Congress.

"Paul Ryan is focusing the next month on defeating Democrats, and all Republicans running for office should probably do the same," Ryan spokesperson Brendan Buck said Tuesday, a statement echoing his response on Monday.

"The speaker is going to spend the next month focused entirely on protecting our congressional majorities," Ryan's spokeswoman, AshLee Strong, said in a statement Monday.

Trump even cast the Democratic Party -- which nominated Hillary Clinton -- as a stronger organization than the GOP that nominated him.

"With the exception of cheating Bernie out of the nom the Dems have always proven to be far more loyal to each other than the Republicans!," he tweeted.

The feud follows an outpouring of high-profile Republicans slamming the real estate mogul, after the release Friday of a 2005 recording featuring Trump making lewd and sexually aggressive comments about women.

Republican elected officials and party elders lined up Saturday to denounce Trump's incendiary remarks. Some sitting members of Congress pulled their support entirely, while others blasted the remarks but continued supporting the GOP standard-bearer. Some said they wanted Trump to step aside so that his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, can lead the ticket. Pence said in a CNN interview Monday that he's sticking with Trump.

Even a top ally, New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie, criticized Trump for not going far enough to apologize for his lewd and sexually aggressive comments about women that emerged in a video from 2005.

"I was there when he found out about it and there's no question in my mind he's embarrassed by it," Christie told WFAN radio in New York. "But I think that he should have been much more direct and much more focused on saying, just saying 'I'm sorry' and only 'I'm sorry,' and that's what I would have done.'"

And Trump is not just targeting his own party. At a rally in Pennsylvania on Monday night, he raised the prospect that the election is being rigged to stop him becoming President, a scorched earth narrative that threatens one of the bedrock principles of American democracy -- faith in the electoral system itself.

"I hear these horror shows, and we have to make sure that this election is not stolen from us and is not taken away from us," Trump said in Pennsylvania.

Trump will have his first chance to demonstrate his shackle-free approach at an evening rally in Florida on Tuesday night, that could offer a preview of how he plans to act in the final four weeks of the election, if his campaign tips into a deeper free-fall.

CNN's Theodore Schleifer contributed to this report

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Donald Trump has a big promise for the U.S. economy: 4% growth.

No chance, say 11 economists surveyed by CNNMoney. And a paper published Tuesday by the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco backs them up.

"No, pigs do not fly," says Robert Brusca, senior economist at FAO Economics, a research firm. "Donald Trump is dreaming."

The Republican presidential nominee made the promise in a speech in New York in September. "I believe it's time to establish a national goal of reaching 4% economic growth," he said.

Since the Great Recession, growth has averaged 2%. Brusca and the other economists surveyed say that 4% growth is impossible, or at least highly unlikely. The reasons: Unemployment is already really low, lots of Baby Boomers are retiring, and there are far fewer manufacturing jobs today than in past decades.

Trump's team says it will get to 4% growth with tax cuts, better trade deals and more manufacturing jobs.

So what's realistic? The San Francisco Fed estimates the "new normal" for annual economic growth to be 1.5% to 1.75%. That's far lower than the period from World War II to 2004, when growth typically hovered between 3% and 4%.

One reason for slower growth is lower productivity -- for example, how many widgets an assembly line worker can produce in an hour.

Another problem is that the example of the assembly line worker is increasingly outdated: America has shed about 5.6 million manufacturing jobs since 2000, mostly because of innovation and partly because of trade, studies show.

Manufacturing jobs tend to have higher productivity -- and wages -- than jobs in other service industries like retail, education and health care, which have added lots of low-productivity jobs while manufacturing jobs have disappeared.

Interestingly, American manufacturers are producing more than ever before -- in dollar terms. But as technology replaces jobs on the assembly line, more goods can be produced with fewer workers.

On top of that, the economy is already near what economists consider full employment, meaning the unemployment rate can't go much lower.

The unemployment rate is 5% and was as low as 4.7% earlier this year. It can't go much lower because there will always be people leaving jobs or searching for them.

If the job market is already near capacity, the economy can't expand much more, economists say.

Unemployment did go really low in 2000 -- as low as 3.8% -- and the economy was growing above a 4% pace. But the San Francisco Fed attributes those good times to the late 1990s internet revolution.

There are solutions to boost growth, the Fed notes.

Many economists call for more spending on building new roads, bridges and highways, as do both Trump and Hillary Clinton.

After World War II, the creation of the Interstate Highway System was a major boost to productivity and growth. You could go much faster from point A to point B.

Other solutions are a little more dreamy.

Many experts say comprehensive **immigration** reform -- a path to citizenship -- would create more documented workers. Historically, documented workers tend to have higher productivity than undocumented workers because they generally have higher job skills and can take on jobs that produce more valuable goods. Productivity has nothing to do with work ethic.

Outside of **immigration** reform and infrastructure spending, the Federal Reserve says America needs a game-changing invention, such as the IT innovation in the 1990s. New technology from fast-growing countries like China and India may also help too.

"Another wave of the IT revolution from machine learning and robots could boost productivity growth," says Federal Reserve senior research adviser John Fernald.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**updated 11:00 am ET to drop quote attribution to the Financial Times

LONDON (CNNMoney) -- Big business has warned the British government that it must change its approach to exit negotiations with the European Union or risk serious damage to the economy.

The message from groups representing thousands of companies comes after Prime Minister Theresa May indicated that her government would take a hard line on **immigration** during Brexit talks due to begin in early 2017.

The Confederation of British Industry said that May must enter negotiations with a plan based on "fact and a genuine understanding of the economic implications" and secure continued access to EU markets.

Financial services firms should also be given priority, the CBI said, something the new prime minister has opposed.

"[There] are signs that the door is being closed, to an extent, on the open economy," Carolyn Fairbairn, director general of CBI, told The Times. "It's very clear from conversations we are having that the world is watching. International investors are watching."

European leaders have made clear that if the U.K. does not allow free movement of EU citizens across its borders, it will lose some of its rights to access the vast free trade area.

Despite these warnings, May has committed to curtailing the number of **immigrants** that are allowed into Britain. Officials have also suggested that companies could be forced to reveal the number of foreign workers they employ.

The controversial name-and-shame proposal was rolled back after an outcry. But observers were surprised that it was touted in the first place by May's Conservative Party, traditionally seen as the party of business.

Fairbairn said that CBI members reacted to the policy with "shock."

"They regard it as an indication that it is somehow a shameful thing to be attracting the best talent from around the world, rather than a source of pride," she told The Times.

But the policy is indicative of a larger shift underway within the Conservative Party -- one that saw big financial firms and even the Bank of England come under fire during the party's conference last week.

The rhetoric helped push the pound sharply lower last week. The currency has now shed more than 16% since British voters elected to leave the EU.

JPMorgan CEO Jamie Dimon, who warned previously that Brexit could force his bank to move thousands of workers out of London, painted an even bleaker picture of the consequences of a nasty divorce over the weekend.

Brexit has "made the chance of the eurozone not surviving, call it a decade from now, five times higher," he said during an appearance at the Institute of International Finance.

There are also signs that Britain's economy, which held up well in the aftermath of the June 23 referendum, is now coming under strain. A quarterly survey produced by the British Chambers of Commerce shows growth is slowing.

The survey showed that manufacturers have seen a boost, possibly from the much weaker pound. But the outlook for services, which make up 80% of country's economy, is much bleaker.

"Firms are concerned over investment, hiring and profitability," the group said in its report. "Boosting business must be a key task for government in the months ahead."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**added more voices, 1:22 am

(CNN) -- CNN commentators and guest analysts offer their take on Sunday night's second presidential candidate debate. The opinions expressed in these commentaries are solely those of the authors.

Errol Louis: Trump's shocking threat

Donald Trump, with his campaign on the ropes, came out swinging. He made a few solid points, especially on reforming the tax code, but otherwise seemed irritated and irritable, in a continuation of the meltdown that began after a leaked video on Friday showed him making lewd comments about women.

Trump struggled with the town hall-style format, frequently looming over Clinton as she answered questions, interrupting her frequently and bickering with moderators Martha Raddatz and Anderson Cooper over whether he got enough time to respond to questions.

At other points his assertions were downright shocking, such as his blunt threat to, as president, have a special investigator look into Hillary Clinton's emails and potentially jail her. He also admitted not having paid federal income tax for decades, implying that other wealthy Americans do the same and blaming Clinton for not reforming the tax code during her years in the Senate.

Another startling moment was Trump's admission he and his running mate, Mike Pence, haven't discussed key Syria policies and actually disagree on the key issue of whether to launch military strikes at the forces of Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad, a direct contradiction of what Pence said at the recent vice presidential candidates' debate.

Trump did well enough to keep his campaign alive and give hope to his supporters -- but his debate performance did little to counter Clinton's main angle of attack: that he's simply not qualified or prepared to serve as president.

Errol Louis is the host of "Inside City Hall," a nightly political show on NY1, a New York all-news channel.

Sally Kohn: A depressing spectacle

I'm depressed.

I'm depressed that Donald Trump could be caught on tape bragging about sexually assaulting women and try to laugh it all off in a debate as "locker room talk." But what were the debate moderators supposed to do Sunday night? Spend more than a few minutes conveying America's utter disgust at this latest example of Trump's pattern of misogyny? Nah, a few minutes is enough I guess. So on to policy, right?

No, because almost as depressing was Trump's repeated unwillingness to actually answer the questions that were posed to him. How would Trump ensure that pre-existing conditions are still covered by health insurance without some sort of universal coverage mandate? We don't know, he didn't answer.

What would Trump do about the refugee crisis in Syria? We don't know, he didn't answer --- twice. Question after question, Trump said nothing. I mean, words came out of his mouth but they barely formed sentences and they definitely didn't form thoughts. He basically vomited fragments of nothingness all over Hillary Clinton and America. And like Clinton, we all just had to sit there --- frustrated and annoyed.

What's especially depressing is that our media, let alone our democracy, seems ill-equipped to handle anything like Trump. Martha Raddatz and Anderson Cooper tried, but fact checking Trump doesn't work because Trump doesn't care about facts. In fact, he denies he's lying as he's lying and then, for extra audacity, accuses everyone else of being liars. I keep waiting for the ghost of George Orwell to show up on the debate stage and bite Trump on the ankles.

Donald Trump is a perverse man who is perverting not only our democracy but the very concept of truth. He tried to win the debate just like one wins a limbo contest --- by lowering the bar. That should depress all of us.

Sally Kohn is an activist, columnist and television commentator. Follow her on Twitter: @sallykohn. She supports Hillary Clinton for the presidency.

Tara Setmayer: Trump's strategy -- Attack, attack, attack

Donald Trump's behavior during the first 20 minutes of the debate was cringe worthy. To no one's surprise there was no sign of the "humility" or "contrition" many, including his own supporters, called for in response to the devastating video released on Friday showing Trump bragging about groping women in the most vile terms. Instead, he chose to pivot and go directly on the attack against Hillary Clinton every chance he got.

At times, Trump brought the level of discourse embarrassingly low with all sense of presidential decorum thrown out the window. Gone were the pleasantries and respect with Trump referring to Mrs. Clinton as a pronoun (she, her) throughout the evening. Clearly this was done on purpose to diminish Clinton. She handled it like a seasoned professional, making her look like the adult in the room. Trump once again demonstrated why he's temperamentally unfit for the presidency.

However, once the conversation turned to more substantive topics, Trump was able to focus more on Clinton's failed record, forcing her to play defense for much of the night, particularly on her emails, Obamacare and energy policy.

Trump did falter badly on Syria. He seemingly sided with Putin over his own running mate, emphatically saying he disagreed with Mike Pence on the policy and hadn't even spoken to him about the crisis in Syria.

Heading into this debate, Trump's campaign was possibly mortally wounded. He performed well enough to stop the bleeding, for now. But did he do anything to close the gap with key swing state constituencies he needs to win? Doubtful. Fortunately for Trump, Hillary Clinton is such a flawed candidate, she was unable to land the knockout blow. This one was a draw.

Tim Stanley: Will Trump's good night make a difference?

Donald Trump had a good night. It started poorly because it had to start poorly; discussion of his "locker room" banter was bound to be personally embarrassing. He sounded like he was giving a legal deposition. When Clinton and the moderators demanded greater clarity, he lost his temper and called Bill Clinton an abuser of women. I suspect he didn't intend to do that. The man has skin as thin as gossamer.

But after that the debate turned to Clinton, and Trump's constant attacks were effective. The problem is that while Trump is an eccentric candidate, Clinton is a poor one. She struggled to explain why she was running, overused cliches and gave lawyerly answers that sounded like she was squirming. She even let Trump tell a good gag at her expense about Abraham Lincoln.

But how do we judge victory in this unpredictable climate? For Trump it will be warm words from senior Republicans and an end to GOP withdrawals from his campaign. That does not spell victory in November.

Timothy Stanley is a historian and columnist for Britain's Daily Telegraph. He is the author of "Citizen Hollywood: How the Collaboration Between L.A. and D.C. Revolutionized American Politics."

S.E. Cupp: A night of missed opportunities

After the past 48 hours, it's difficult to determine on what basis either candidate would win Sunday night's debate. Donald Trump was emerging out of the fallout from a blistering, embarrassing, potentially fatal recording of him suggesting he's used his celebrity to sexually assault women. In the hours before the debate, he gathered four women who claim they'd been victims of either Hillary Clinton's husband or her to exploit their pain for his own personal gain. Clinton, on the other hand, suffered a significant, if overshadowed, leak about her previously private speeches.

But it's safe to say, Clinton came in with the advantage, and Trump came in with an almost impossible recovery mission. He did little to recover, but it's also hard to see where she used that advantage effectively.

He was undisciplined and puerile, whining about the moderators treating him unfairly, which is never a winning strategy. He missed obvious openings to attack Clinton, for example, on the revelations she's advocated for open borders in those private speeches. He lurked behind her uncomfortably while she spoke, a visual he was either unaware of or maybe actually totally aware of.

But while Clinton was cool and collected, and seemed far more comfortable than he did, she had a clear strategy to wait for Trump to hang himself, instead of going for the jugular on the easy issue. She had an opportunity tonight to end his campaign for good, either by baiting him into a trap or just throwing a knockout. I'm not sure she did either.

Undecided and independent voters will have to decide if they respect her for taking the high ground, or judge her for failing to more aggressively call him out.

S.E. Cupp is the author of "Losing Our Religion: The Liberal Media's Attack on Christianity," co-author of "Why You're Wrong About the Right" and a columnist at the New York Daily News.

Peniel Joseph: It's officially the 'Hunger Games'

With the revelation of Republican presidential nominee Donald J. Trump's bragging about sexual assault during a 2005 taping of an entertainment television show, the 2016 presidential election has officially turned into a "Hunger Games" styled nightmare for the American people.

Trump's repulsive comments about women cast a shadow over Sunday night's second presidential debate in St. Louis. Over the weekend, scores of high-profile members of the Republican establishment finally reached their breaking point, openly calling for Trump to drop out of the race.

Moderator Anderson Cooper bluntly asked Trump whether he realized his comments about kissing and groping women without permission amounted to a confession of sexual assault.

Trump characterized his comments as "locker room talk" and claimed to have "great respect for women." Democratic presidential candidate Hillary Clinton identified Trump as unfit to lead, by virtue of the latest controversy and the litany of racist, sexist and xenophobic comments the billionaire real estate developer has made throughout the campaign.

Trump, who invited to the debate three women who claimed to be victims of sexual harassment and assault by former President Bill Clinton, responded with a surreal defense of his own words by attacking former President Bill Clinton as a sexual predator enabled by Hillary Clinton.

The most bizarre presidential debate in history featured Trump, a candidate rejected by many of his own party's leaders, threatening to appoint a special prosecutor to reopen the FBI investigation into her emails. Clinton countered that she was grateful a man like Trump was not president. "Because you'd be in jail," Trump shot back, in a line that served as red meat to his core base of supporters.

Faced with insurrection in the ranks of the Republican Party on a historic scale, Trump fought back through his most unvarnished display of anger, petulance and disingenuous concern for the plight of African-Americans and Latinos, two groups he's routinely offended during his campaign.

Clinton found her rhetorical footing answering questions about rising Islamophobia that Trump's calls for bans on Muslims have greatly contributed to. Clinton offered a nuanced vision of American society that included Muslim Americans and differentiated between religious extremists who advocate terror and ordinary Americans who happen to practice the Islamic faith.

Ultimately, this second debate, which featured no opening handshake between two candidates who apparently despise one another, illustrated more than just the polarizing nature of contemporary American politics.

Trump's fitness for the presidency has now been openly questioned by some of the leading figures in his own party, including former secretary of state Condoleezza Rice (who asked him to withdraw) and Arizona Sen. John McCain (who rescinded his endorsement).

Verbal fisticuffs between Trump and Clinton over emails, tax returns, and sexual assault have turned a presidential contest into a brutal spectator sport filled with vulgar exchanges that made the spectacle unfit to be watched by children. A largely substance free example of the worst kind of political theater --- one largely devoid of serious policy discussion --- this debate exemplified how modern day American politics has reached a historic low.

Peniel Joseph is the Barbara Jordan Chair in Political Values and Ethics and the founding director of the Center for the Study of Race and Democracy at the LBJ School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas at Austin, where he is also a professor of history. He is the author of several books, most recently "Stokely: A Life."

Nayyera Haq: Trump failed to bury the 'Access Hollywood' tape

It was impossible to tune into this debate without thinking about the leaked tape of Trump's comments about women. So it's a good thing the moderators brought it up at the get-go, giving Trump a chance to reiterate his apology, let Clinton get a jab in, and move his campaign forward.

Trump failed. He failed to take the opportunity to bury the story and instead doubled-down on the "locker room talk" explanation. Trump failed to show his understanding of modern social norms, instead sticking to a sensibility stuck in the culture of the '70s Playboy mansion. And he failed to assuage his Republican colleagues, who are abandoning his campaign in droves, that he can speak to women voters.

Even scarier, Trump openly admitted to not understanding laws designed to protect women; in response to a direct question from moderators, Trump "wouldn't say that" grabbing women's genitalia is considered sexual assault.

On Friday night, President Obama signed the Sexual Assault Survivors' Rights Act. By contrast Trump spent the next 72 hours defending "locker room talk" and rape culture. Expect the narrative and evidence of Trump being harmful to women to dominate this coming week.

Nayyera Haq is a former White House senior director and State Department spokesperson under the Obama administration, Nayyera is a regular commentator on politics and current affairs. She supports Hillary Clinton.

Julian Zelizer: Clinton missed a knockout punch

Donald Trump attempted to move away from the "Access Hollywood" controversy by returning to the themes that animated his primary campaign. He returned to threats from ISIS, illegal **immigration**, liberal Supreme Court justices and Hillary Clinton's scandals --- from email-gate to paid speeches to her husband's sexual past.

At moments he lashed out against Clinton in Trumpian fashion, going so far as to call her the "devil" and saying that if he was president she would be in jail. He painted her as a liar and professional politician who says one thing and then does something else.

If the goal was to stop, at least temporarily, the incessant discussion of his comments on the bus with Billy Bush and the calls for him to step down, Trump was successful. He probably re-energized some of his base and turned attention back to Clinton's controversies. There were several moments when Clinton found herself on the defense and stumbled in her responses.

The problem is that the debate can't remake the basic character of this candidacy or the problems that he has created. The "Access Hollywood" tapes were the tip of a very big iceberg. He apologized for the comments, yet without much gusto. On top of that, there are very likely more Trump controversies on the way.

The long list of prominent Republicans who have announced they now will not vote for Trump is well known. The deep record of polarizing and controversial positions and statements won't go away. Within this debate itself, there were many occasions when Trump reminded undecided voters about why so many Republicans are not on his side. When he threatened to put his opponent in jail on live television he crossed another boundary in campaign history. He even seems to disagree about policy with his vice presidential running mate.

The reason the tape had such an impact was because of who Trump has been and the kind of campaign that he has run since entering the race. It is hard to see how this debate enables Trump to broaden his electoral base, which is essential if he wants to win.

While Trump was able to use this debate to shift attention away from the recording, he didn't score a "win" in terms of the overall quality of the debate (his answers were filled with misstatements, vague references and scattershot statements on unrelated issues) and he didn't erase the problems that he has created for his party. However, Clinton didn't accomplish the kind of "knockout" punch that her supporters were hoping for.

Julian Zelizer is a professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University and a New America fellow. He is the author of "Jimmy Carter" and "The Fierce Urgency of Now: Lyndon Johnson, Congress, and the Battle for the Great Society."

Frida Ghitis: Trump showed he doesn't get it

The top question on everyone's mind was how Trump would handle the issue of the tape in which he speaks in deeply offensive ways about women. On that topic, he showed he absolutely does not get it. "This was locker room talk," he said several times (then awkwardly pivoted to talk about ISIS.) And even though he added, "I'm not proud of it. I apologize...," the repeated mantra that it was "locker room talk" showed he believes it's only natural, really OK for men to refer to women in those terms, and perhaps even to sexually assault women in the way he described in that tape.

That may satisfy his core supporters. In fact, his entire performance may have played well with his most devoted followers, but it's hard to imagine that many independents watched this debate and decided to vote for Trump. His base feels good now, but he didn't persuade many undecideds, and certainly didn't peel away any Clinton supporters.

He came across as a rude, overbearing and nasty man. "She has tremendous hate in her heart," he said, looming over Hillary Clinton and pacing while she spoke. When he spoke, she sat listening, almost never interrupting him, even when he lied; a painful sacrifice Clinton has decided she must make in order not to be seen as "pushy," or "unlikable," or some other "unfeminine" trait.

In one jaw-dropping moment, Trump threatened to put Hillary Clinton in prison if he becomes president, marking a new low for American democracy in an election season filled with new lows.

Some of his attacks on Clinton landed forcefully, such as on her emails and speeches. Clinton could have defended herself more forcefully and attacked more frequently. But the overwhelming tone of the debate was one of Trump making harsh personal attacks against his rival, pleasing Hillary-haters and turning off voters trying to make up their minds.

On foreign policy, it was also one shocking statement after another. He said he disagreed with his running mate Mike Pence and his roundly praised statements on Syria. Pence said he would consider attacking Russia and the Syrian regime if they don't stop the slaughter in Aleppo. Trump said no, and offered a policy that surely brought cheers in Damascus and Syria. Then he made bizarre statements, such as "Russia is new in terms of nuclear, we are old and tired."

Trump repeated old lies, such as the claim that he opposed the war in Iraq. When Clinton said that claim had been debunked (as it has) he cut in, leaning into the microphone and uttering "Has not been debunked," sounding like Alec Baldwin playing Donald Trump.

On the whole, Trump put on a performance that undoubtedly made his diehard fans feel reassured, but one that confirmed that he does not understand what is wrong with his attitude toward women, toward Muslims and toward Russia, and reminding us that he has a jumbled, dangerous foreign policy, and continues to undercut America's fundamental democratic traditions.

Frida Ghitis is a world affairs columnist for The Miami Herald and World Politics Review, and a former CNN producer and correspondent. Follow her @FridaGhitis.

Haroon Moghul: The real message of the night

We shouldn't have invaded Iraq, Donald Trump now says. But he also says we should've "taken their oil." Guarding immobile, sometimes flammable infrastructure, while plundering and pillaging a sovereign nation is colonialism. Had more Republicans actually paid attention to "take their oil," at least they wouldn't have been surprised by "grab them by the p---y."

Because Islamophobia is misogyny is racism. My God, my race, my wealth, my gender, or what have you, permits me to do unto you as I'd never accept being done unto me. Take their oil. Settle their land. Grope their bodies.

In response to a question about Islamophobia, Trump told an allegedly undecided Muslim voter--- a term that makes about as much sense as "clean coal" -- that we have to keep in mind the problem of terrorism.

If the moderators had been bolder, they'd have asked Donald Trump if the violence by radical white supremacists permits us to infringe on the rights of white Americans generally.

We should not, as Melania Trump pleaded, simply forgive her husband's indiscretions, and move on to "the important issues." The average Trump voter is not motivated by economic anxiety. Stop finding politically correct terms for blatant racists. They'd rather we undo decades of social progress than yield an inch on exploitative structures that keep them powerful.

As we were reminded this Friday, that privilege isn't ever benign. It came about through violence, and maintains itself through violence: over bodies, over land, over culture. I'd hoped Trump would be out of the race by this weekend, but it seems even sexual predation isn't enough to wake our country up. Don't ask if Clinton won or lost. Ask what happened to us.

Haroon Moghul is a senior fellow at the Center for Global Policy. His next book, "How to be a Muslim," will be out in 2017.

Raul Reyes: Trump's sub-par performance

Here is a note to all candidates at presidential debates: If you find yourself engaged in combative behavior with the moderators, you have lost the debate. At the combination town hall/presidential debate that Politico described as "the most consequential forum in history," Donald Trump repeatedly clashed with the moderators and made himself look awfully small over the course of 90 minutes. Overall, Hillary Clinton's steady presence triumphed over Trump's typically uneven performance.

From the start, Trump seemed exhausted and "low energy" as he faced off with Clinton. The first question of the night, about whether each candidate was modeling appropriate behavior for young people, was one that was certainly expected. But Trump blew it. He missed his chance to show genuine contrition for his recently revealed behavior. Instead his explanation for his lewd remarks about the "Access Hollywood" host and a soap opera actress was that it was "locker room talk." This was a weak rationalization that will not improve his standing with women -- or anyone who has ever been in a locker room in their life.

Trump's body language was especially revealing tonight. He fidgeted. He paced the stage. At times he lurked behind Clinton, giving off a creepy stalker vibe. And, just like the last debate, he seemed stricken with a case of the sniffles. These were all distractions on top of his rambling answers. Consider that he answered a question from a Muslim woman about Islamophobia by apparently encouraging racial profiling of Muslim Americans. Or that he may have conceded that he did not pay federal income taxes for years.

Worse, once again Trump could not resist interrupting Clinton, or making coarse comments -- like his statement that if he were president, he would have a special prosecutor investigate her and that she would be jailed. Does he not understand that using the judicial branch to go after your political opponents is against the law? His statement that Clinton has "tremendous hate in her heart" showed a stunning lack of self-awareness from the man who has disparaged Latinos, **immigrants**, a Gold Star family, a former Miss Universe, and people with disabilities -- among others.

For her part, Clinton provided clear answers on her positions on everything from the Affordable Care Act to Syria. She was prepared for the inevitable questions about WikiLeaks and her deleted emails. Her best answer of the evening was likely when she enumerated the qualifications she would look for in a Supreme Court justice.

This was the rare evening where Trump faced a high bar in terms of what he had to accomplish. Not only did he not manage effective damage control of his latest scandal, it seems unlikely that he won over any undecided or independent voters tonight. However, he likely may have **alienated** some with his boorish, petulant behavior on full display.

Toward the end of this town hall debate that featured relatively few questions from the audience, Trump described the American nuclear program as "we're old, we're tired, we're exhausted." He could have been describing his sub-par performance.

Raul A. Reyes is an attorney and member of the USA Today board of contributors. Follow him @RaulAReyes.

Roxanne Jones: A pitch to his base

If I were watching a Vegas lounge act, I may have gotten a few chuckles at some of Donald Trump's quick comebacks during the debate. Too bad, this is a campaign for the highest office in the land, and not a comedy night. It's not one-liners most voters are looking for but substance, strategy and clear vision to move America forward. We deserve so much more from the man who wants to be President.

After coming out of the box sounding more like a playground punk, Trump picked it up a bit when he took Hillary Clinton to task for deleting thousands of emails while she was Secretary of State. She apologized (again), took responsibility (again) and said if she had it to do over again, she would not have used her private server. Clinton was wrong. She was investigated and cleared of any illegal acts. You either believe her, or not. Move on.

Unemployment rates in the U.S. stand at 5.0%, that's 7.9 million out of work Americans. For blacks and Hispanics, the picture is bleaker (Black 8.3%, Hispanics 6.4%). And notice that Trump did not deny sending jobs to China by buying low-grade Chinese metal to build his buildings. Not exactly a winning jobs strategy for Americans.

Voters are worried about sending their children to college, about Social Security, clean air, terrorism. Will the next President send our sons and daughters to war? Trump doesn't seem to be too worried about the Middle East. He shockingly admitted that he "hadn't talked to Pence" about Aleppo, and when pressed by moderator Martha Raddatz, he couldn't come up with one detailed answer about how he would handle the war in Syria. One of the major issues of our time and he has no plan. That's beyond troubling.

But then again, I suspect, talking about foreign policy, a solid jobs plan, college costs are not topics that come up during "locker room banter," where apparently Trump does his best talking, bragging about groping women and encouraging sex assault. So while Trump may have looked more poised than what we saw in his bombastic behavior during the first debate, he did little to appeal to voters outside of his diehard followers, for whom he can do no wrong. And he'll need more than them to win.

I've been in my share of locker rooms covering sports over the past 20 years and while lewd talk is real, I've yet to hear an athlete use the crude, childlike words Trump used describing how he approaches women: "Grab them by the p---y. ... You can do anything."

Clinton was in a tough position, after Trump's "groping" video was released. She did well to avoid wading too deep into Trump's gutter. The win goes to Clinton for staying on course. (And Martha Raddatz, the best moderator thus far.)

Tim Naftali: Bewildering debate didn't move the needle

This debate was bewildering. The town hall forum at its best brings the issues down to the level of the individual citizen. This one did not and for that reason will not move many voters in either direction.

Trump decided to bring his stump style to the national debate stage and Hillary Clinton responded more combatively than in the first debate.

There was little chance of a policy debate, but with the exception of a few moments on health care and on the selection of a Supreme Court justice, most of the night descended into charges and countercharges.

Trump looked better but his arguments on foreign policy, especially, though forceful, still did not meet the reality test. Clinton was clear but not as crisp this time. A draw.

Tim Naftali, a CNN presidential historian and clinical associate professor of history and public service at New York University, is writing a new biography of President John F. Kennedy.

Ruth Ben-Ghiat: Just words, folks? They matter

"It's just words, folks," was Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's refrain during this debate. And yet words served him well in his strategies of denial, obfuscation, and direct attack.

Trump tried to talk his way out of his most recent offenses toward women, claiming his words were "just locker room talk" while in the same sentence bizarrely calling in ISIS as an aid and a distraction: those crotch grabs? Not anything important, like ISIS chopping peoples' heads off. Did I mention I will defeat ISIS? If you had trouble following his logic here or at other moments of the evening, you were not alone.

Clinton had a strong enough performance, but some of her fire was missing. Perhaps she wanted to give Trump the space to damage himself, but his repeated gambit of turning policy answers into personal attacks on her warranted a more energetic response.

The winner of this debate? The gentleman at the end who asked the candidates if there's anything they respect about one another. He reminded us that words do matter. They can incite violence; they prepare action. Yet they can also build bridges, something we'll need an awful lot of after this election.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Tim Kane is the JP Conte Fellow in **Immigration** Studies at the Hoover Institution at Stanford University. His most recent book is "Balance: The Economics of Great Powers from Ancient Rome to Modern America" (Simon and Schuster), co-authored with Glenn Hubbard. The views expressed in this commentary are his own.

(CNN) -- A joke about the politics of **immigration** is that things are going nowhere, faster than ever. Even though the **immigration** debate hasn't changed in years, someone should tell Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton that the **immigration** reality has. Demographics have shifted in Mexico and in Central America because women are having fewer babies.

In fact, a decadeslong wave of Mexican **immigration** to the United States simply stopped when the Great Recession started in 2007. It won't be coming back, regardless of who becomes president or what policies the federal government enacts.

The debate during the past three, maybe four, presidential elections focused on what to do about 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. But notice that George W. Bush, John Kerry, Barack Obama, John McCain, Mitt Romney, and now Trump and Clinton have been talking about the exact same number? It's been oddly steady for eight years, according to a new analysis from the Pew Research Center. The growth of illegal **immigrants** grew 10% annually from 1990 to 2007, and has been zero since. Mexican **immigration** has actually been negative.

The new **immigration** reality was easy to miss last summer, when two other migrant waves surprised the West. In Europe, refugees from Syria's civil war crowded onto boats headed for the beaches of Greece. And for the past three years, an average 100,000 refugees from Central America have been seeking asylum at the southern US border. Were those images, endlessly repeated on cable television, wrong? Were they falsifying a reality that wasn't?

To be sure, there are still millions of "huddled masses yearning to breathe free" on every continent. But the tide of migration overall is ebbing, even accounting for the recent increase in refugees worldwide. The typical **immigrant** is young and motivated by economic disparity -- and always has been. That said, two things have fundamentally shifted in our era: The world is getting richer and the world is getting older.

Inflation-adjusted Mexican incomes have more than doubled since the middle of the 1970s, and quadrupled since 1950. Mexico's GDP per person was $17,500 in 2015, according to the International Monetary Fund. The average Mexican income in 2010 was identical to the average American income in 1970. Similarly, the per capita GDPs in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras have grown rapidly in recent decades and today are equal to Mexico in 1970. Across the hemisphere, literacy rates are increasing, poverty is decreasing and incomes are growing, which taken together reduces **immigration** pressure significantly.

What the numbers miss is the more important demographic shift. Fertility rates have essentially collapsed throughout Latin America. The average woman in every Latin American country gave birth to nearly seven children in the 1950s, 1960s and even into the 1970s. Today, the average is two to three children per woman (only Guatemala is near three). Indeed, fertility is nearing the demographic tipping point of 2.1 children per woman in many developing countries, below which a society shrinks rather than grows. In Japan and some European societies, fertility has been far below the replacement rate for a long time, and their labor shortage has become acute. Demographers now admit that the overpopulation alarmism of yesteryear was misplaced.

That explains why the wave of Mexican **immigration** evaporated. And while migration pressure from Central America in a sense has replaced the Mexican cohort, that entire region has a third of Mexico's population. And it is unlikely to supply a young migrant wave because all those nations are graying, too. In Guatemala, for example, the median age during the 20th century was 17.5 years. It was steady for half a century. Suddenly, in 2000, it jumped to 18.1 years. The median age proceeded to rise by nearly a full year during each five-year census: in 2005 (18.9), in 2010 (19.9), again in 2015 (21.2) and is projected to be 22.6 years in 2020. In the United States, the median age rose by two years between 2000 and 2010. It's no joke to say the growth industry of tomorrow will be elder care.

None of this means that concerns about culture clash, assimilation, terrorism and nativism are misplaced. **Immigration** is complicated. But the fear of "**immigrants** stealing jobs" was always a myth, and it will simply disappear in years to come. Instead, we will worry about a low-skill labor shortage and bemoan inflation in labor-intensive sectors, especially agriculture.

As for policy, let's recognize the debate over whether a wall is or is not necessary (or racist) for what it is: irrelevant political theater. Reform with an eye to America's future will need to focus on a modernized work visa system that will enhance GDP growth and flexibly respond to the labor needs of our own aging society.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Tim Kaine struggled to explain a position Hillary Clinton apparently took in a 2013 paid speech to a Brazilian bank that was uncovered in a new WikiLeaks hack over the weekend.

Clinton's comments -- she apparently told an audience that her "dream is a hemispheric common market, with open trade and open borders" -- are at odds with statements she has made on the campaign trail in which she has called for more restrictive trade policies in order to protect American workers.

In an interview with CNN's Jake Tapper that aired Sunday on "State of the Union," Tapper asked Kaine if his running mate really desires "a hemispheric common market with open borders sometime in the future," as was written in a transcript of a 2013 closed-door speech she apparently gave to Brazilian bankers that was included in one of the hacked emails.

WikiLeaks is alleged to have ties to Russia. The group posted more than 2,000 emails from campaign chairman John Podesta and promises to post more from the over 50,000 the group says it can access.

Clinton's Democratic primary challenger, Bernie Sanders, made the release of Clinton's paid speech transcripts a major point of criticism during his campaign, and Republican National Committee Chairman Reince Priebus said Friday the documents exposed Clinton as a "fraud."

The Clinton campaign has not confirmed the authenticity of the documents but has not disputed the contents.

"I have no way of knowing the accuracy of documents dumped by this hacking organization," Kaine told Tapper. "Anybody who hacks in to get documents is completely capable of manipulating them."

Kaine then explained Clinton's current policy stance on trade, saying it focuses on three criteria: "Do they increase American jobs, do they increase American wages, and are they good for national security?"

But when Tapper pressed Kaine on whether the passage on "open borders and free trade," was what she told Brazilian bankers, Kaine deflected by saying, "I have no way of knowing that."

"Well, you could ask her," Tapper replied.

Kaine said: "Jake, I have no way of knowing the accuracy of documents dumped by this hacking organization."

Tapper said: "That's fair. Is the document, then, is it accurate?"

"I have no way of knowing that," Kaine said.

Tapper concluded by asking Kaine if a Clinton-Kaine administration would push for open borders, to which Kaine responded by saying the ticket supports "comprehensive **immigration** reform," explaining that they favor a pathway to citizenship for some undocumented **immigrants**.

CLARIFICATION: This story has been updated to clarify what Tapper was asking Kaine with regard to Clinton's alleged "open borders" remark

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON () -- The Clinton Foundation gives "less than 10 cents on the dollar" to "charitable causes." ... Gov. Mike Pence, during the vice presidential debate

Wow, this was a big one.

A recent analysis by independent watchdog CharityWatch found that the Clinton Foundation actually spent 88% of its budget on charitable programs in 2014.

Pence was probably counting only grants the Clinton Foundation has awarded to outside charitable groups. According to the foundation's tax forms, the foundation reported total revenue of almost $149 million, and awarded external grants worth a total of nearly $9 million -- or about 6 cents on the dollar. He was not counting the charitable work conducted by the Clinton Foundation's own programs.

Clinton's **immigration** plans will bankrupt Social Security

"Hillary Clinton wants to give Social Security and Medicare to illegal **immigrants** through citizenship. Won't this bankrupt the program?" A question to Donald Trump from "Pete from Nashua" at a New Hampshire town hall last week.

"Well, let me tell you. You've heard that, and most people didn't even believe it. But that's true." -- Trump's answer.

This is an even bigger one.

Under the comprehensive **immigration** reform bill that was passed by the Senate, and which Clinton supports, undocumented **immigrants** are given the opportunity over time to become citizens by first paying a fine, a fee and passing a criminal background check and therefore gaining what is known as "provisional status."

While in this category, these **immigrants** are barred from collecting any "retirement, welfare, health, disability public or assisted housing, postsecondary education, food assistance, unemployment benefit." Having gained provisional status, **immigrants** can apply to become a permanent legal resident which will open up a number of federal program to them -- but not Social Security and Medicare. In order to be eligible for those programs, individuals will have to show that they have worked for 10 years after becoming a permanent legal resident.

During all this time, **immigrants** will have to pay taxes that go into the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

There also are other ways that undocumented **immigrants** contribute to Social Security and Medicare.

The Social Security Administration's chief actuary estimated there were about 3.1 million undocumented **immigrants** using fake or expired Social Security cards to obtain jobs in 2010. As a result, payroll taxes were deducted from their paychecks.

The actuary estimated that in 2010 undocumented **immigrants** contributed $12 billion annually -- and about $100 billion over a 10-year period -- to the Social Security trust fund through these taxes. And, unless they get permanent resident status these **immigrants** cannot get Social Security benefits. A similar phenomenon exists for Medicare.

Meanwhile, the actuary said the US-born children of undocumented **immigrants** will have an even greater positive impact on the Social Security system by becoming workers whose taxes help prop up Social Security as the country's population ages.

There is no question that undocumented **immigrants** would, if they are granted legal status, gain access to federal benefits such as the Earned Income Tax Credit. But when it comes to Social Security and Medicare, these **immigrants** are more makers than takers.

We rate Trump's agreement with the idea that they will bankrupt the system as false.

Mike Pence lied during the vice presidential debate when he repeatedly denied things he and Trump have actually said

"Well, he never said that." -- Pence defending Trump at the vice presidential debate.

During the debate, Tim Kaine repeatedly challenged Pence to defend things he and Trump have said during the campaign.

There is no polite way to say this, but, in response, Pence lied by denying that Trump had uttered the words Kaine was attributing to him. On issues ranging from abortion to nuclear weapons to **immigration** to admiration of Russian President Vladimir Putin, Pence denied that Trump had said things that the businessman had indeed said. News organizations, including CNN, called him out on this.

Kaine exaggerates on the Iranian nuclear deal

"She worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot," Kaine said, describing Clinton's role in the Iranian nuclear deal.

It's an exaggeration to say that the deal negotiated between Iran, the United States and European powers "eliminated" the Iranian nuclear weapons program.

Even the White House, which points to the deal as one of President Barack Obama's signature achievements, says the agreement simply increases the amount of time it would take Iran to build a bomb -- should it decide ignore the deal's provisions -- from two to three months to about a year or more.

Also, the restrictions on Iran's nuclear programs lapse in 15 years. Inspectors monitoring the country's nuclear weapons program would stay in the country beyond that so Tehran, presumably, would not be able to develop a nuclear bomb in secret. But it still could develop one.

Gary Johnson believes there is an equivalency between the hundreds of thousands of Syrian civilians killed by Bashar al-Assad and civilians killed by US forces in other actions in the war on terror

During an interview with The New York Times, Libertarian Party candidate Gary Johnson was asked whether there was a moral equivalency between the US and Syria. Johnson sarcastically replied, "Well no, of course not -- we're so much better than all that. We're so much better when in Afghanistan, we bomb the hospital and 60 people are killed in the hospital."

Now Johnson may sincerely believe this, and so, technically, this may not be considered a deliberate lie. But it is so breathtakingly bizarre it belongs on our list.

The Pentagon's report on the bombing of the Doctors without Borders hospital in Kunduz that killed 42 people last year laid out a series of errors by US military personnel that led to the tragedy. Although officials from the relief agency termed the bombing a "war crime," the Pentagon determined that no military personnel would face criminal charges.

Still, few would compare that attack -- and even others that have inadvertently killed thousands of civilians in Afghanistan -- with the systematic targeting of civilian populations by the Assad regime. Nearly half a million civilians have been killed since 2011, according to one estimate.

One might be tempted to give Johnson a pass since he is a minor candidate who will not be elected president this year. But he is on the ballot and does command some support, albeit it is shrinking, probably because of comments like this one.

We have the smallest Navy since 1916, Pence said at the vice presidential debate

This one again?

It has been a hardy perennial of Republican attacks on the Obama administration for what many GOP critics say is the gutting of the nation's military. Yet putting forth the idea of an impotent navy by comparing it to the fleet of World War I has been debunked many times.

Sure, technically it's true. There are 273 active ships in the US navy today, the lowest number since 1916, when there were 245 ships active. But the ships of today are exponentially so much more powerful as to make the comparison laughable.

Take, for example, the Ohio-class ballistic submarine. These underwater behemoths measure nearly two football fields in length. Each sub carries at least 20 Trident II, D-5 ballistic missiles with a range of more than 4,600 miles. The missiles are each tipped with four or five nuclear warheads that can be individually targeted to different locations hundreds of miles away from each other. The destructive force of these warheads range from seven times more powerful than the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima to 30 times more powerful than that device.

An Ohio-class ballistic submarine could single-handedly obliterate London, Paris, Rome, Madrid, Berlin, Moscow and at least 80 more of Europe's largest cities -- with hours of each other, according to Steven Pifer, an arms control expert at the Brookings Institution.

That's just one ship. The Navy has 14 of them.

Bill Clinton's explanation of the problems with Obamacare doesn't make sense

"But the people getting killed in this deal are the small business people and individuals who make just a little bit too much to get any of these subsidies." -- Bill Clinton on why he thinks Obamacare is a "crazy system."

First of all, companies with 50 employees or less -- that's more than 90% of all small business -- are exempt from the law's requirement that they provide health insurance for their workers. The "Secretary of Explaining Things" doesn't quite explain how companies are getting killed by a law they don't have to comply with.

If they already have cut-rate health insurance plans that do not meet the minimum standards set down by the Affordable Care Act, small businesses can keep them until the end of next year -- unless they make "major changes" to them. This provision has caused headaches for some small business. But if the law is so burdensome, why is it that the rate of small businesses dropping their health insurance plans is about the same as it was before the enactment of Obamacare?

As for people who buy insurance, either from the Obamacare exchanges or on their own, but have too high an income to qualify for federal subsidies, they are, indeed, getting hurt. But, using census data, the Commonwealth Fund calculated that group amounts to about 3.2% of all people under the age of 65 who have health insurance. Is 3.2% of the health insurance market enough to label Obamacare a "crazy system"?

Trump says the US Border Patrol is allowing undocumented **immigrants** to "pour" across the border so they can vote

This just sounds like Trump heard what he wanted to hear.

Here is the exchange that took place Friday morning at a roundtable on border security between Trump and Art Del Cueto, vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, the union representing agents. The subject was why undocumented **immigrants** had been allowed to cross the border.

Del Cueto: "I spoke to several agents in my sector who are in charge of processing. And the problem that we're seeing reflected through us as a voice is that some of these individuals that we've 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."

Trump: "Why?"

Del Cueto: "So they can go ahead and vote before the election."

Trump evidently saw an opening. "They're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote," he said.

Well, not quite.

First of all, what Del Cueto seems to be saying is that manpower from the border patrol was being directed from checking criminal records of undocumented **immigrants** to helping to process the citizenship applications of legal **immigrants** in time to allow them to vote. Secondly, Trump's claim that **immigrants** are pouring across the border "to vote" is just not true.

The Department of Homeland Security has acknowledged that there has been a surge of applications -- as there often is in the months leading up to a presidential election -- from **immigrants** who want to cast their ballots.

However, a spokeswoman for Jeh Johnson, secretary of Homeland Security, noted that **immigrants** have to prove they have lived in the US for five years as permanent legal residents before they are allowed to vote. That would make it kind of hard for undocumented **immigrants** to cross the border in order to cast ballots for -- or against -- Trump.

Kaine overstates the negative things Trump and Pence have said about Mexican **immigrants**

"These guys say all Mexicans are bad," Kaine, criticizing Trump and Pence at the vice presidential debate.

From the proposal to build the wall on America's southern border to the statement that many illegal **immigrants** are rapists, Trump has not been kind to Mexicans.

When he first announced his campaign for the presidency last year, he did say, "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best ... 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." But he did add this, almost as an afterthought, "And some, I assume, are good people."

When Trump visited Mexico in August, he said Mexican-Americans 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."

Kaine's statement is just plain wrong since it is way too all-encompassing.

Researchers Eve Bower and Lisa Rose contributed to this article.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- It sounded just a little too wacky -- and a little too conspiratorial -- to be true.

But here's the exchange that took place Friday morning at a roundtable on border security between Donald Trump and Art Del Cueto, vice president of the National Border Patrol Council, the union representing agents. The subject was why undocumented **immigrants** had been allowed to cross the border.

Del Cueto: "I spoke to several agents in my sector who are in charge of processing. And the problem that we're seeing reflected through us as a voice is that some of these individuals that were 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."

Trump: "Why?"

Del Cueto: "So they can go ahead and vote before the election."

At that point, Trump said, "Big statement, fellas." He later added. "That's huge. But they're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote."

Really? Wrong. Or maybe it's really wrong.

First of all, that's not what Del Cueto said -- or at least that's not what he meant to say. Shawn Moran, a spokesman for the Border Patrol union, said his boss' words "could have been delineated a little better."

What Del Cueto may have been saying is that manpower from the Border Patrol was being directed from checking criminal records of undocumented **immigrants** to helping to process the citizenship applications of legal **immigrants** in time to allow them to vote.

Secondly, Trump's claim that **immigrants** are pouring across the border "to vote" is just not true.

The Department of Homeland Security has acknowledged that there has been a surge of applications -- as there often is in the months leading up to a presidential election -- from **immigrants** who want to cast their ballots.

However, a spokeswoman for Jeh Johnson, Secretary of Homeland Security, noted that **immigrants** have to prove they have lived in the US for five years as permanent legal residents before they are allowed to vote. That would make it kind of hard for undocumented **immigrants** to cross the border in order to cast ballots for -- or against -- Trump.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**() -- WARNING: This story contains graphic language.

(CNN) --- It took an audio recording of Donald Trump bragging about trying to have sex with a married woman and saying he could "do anything" to women -- including grabbing them "by the pussy" -- for Republicans to begin withdrawing their support of their party's nominee.

It was the final straw for the flurry of Republicans who began recanting their endorsements and calling on the Republican nominee to drop out on Saturday, but it was also just the latest in a string of outrageous, controversial and inflammatory comments Trump has made over the course of his nearly 16-month-old campaign.

Here are 17 things Trump has said that didn't cause Republicans to reject their party's nominee or stop them from endorsing Trump in the first place.

1. He called for banning all Muslims

Trump last December called for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," a proposal that would effectively bar about 1.6 billion people from entering the United States on the sole basis of their religion.

The proposal was just one of a slew of Islamophobic comments Trump has made throughout his campaign, including declaring in March that he believes "Islam hates us."

Trump never disavowed his calls for a blanket ban of all Muslims, though he has since said he wants to ban **immigration** from "terror states."

2. He questioned a federal judge's impartiality because he was 'a Mexican'

Trump argued that Judge Gonzalo Curiel, a US-born federal judge overseeing a lawsuit against Trump University, was inherently biased against him because of his Mexican heritage.

"We are building a wall. He's a Mexican," Trump said in a June interview with CNN's Jake Tapper.

While Republican House Speaker Paul Ryan condemned Trump's remarks as "the textbook definition of racism," neither Ryan nor any other Republican withdrew their endorsement at the time.

Only Sen. Mark Kirk of Illinois announced after those comments that he would not support Trump.

3. He feuded with the family of a slain US soldier

Trump lashed out at the Gold Star parents of a slain Muslim US soldier who died in Iraq after they sharply criticized him at the Democratic National Convention.

He said Humayun Khan's mother did not speak during the speech because she was not "allowed" and said the father had "no right" to criticize him.

Trump's escalation of the feud prompted Sen. Susan Collins of Maine to announce that she could not support Trump. No Republicans who had previously endorsed Trump withdrew their support.

4. He didn't deny calling a former Miss Universe "Miss Piggy" after she gained weight

After Hillary Clinton raised former Miss Universe Alicia Machado's allegations that Trump had called her "Miss Piggy" and "Miss Housekeeping" back in the 1990s, Trump didn't deny the allegations.

Instead, he said this: "She gained a massive amount of weight, and it was a real problem."

5. He called undocumented Mexican **immigrants** criminals and "rapists"

Trump kicked off his campaign amid controversy after labeling undocumented Mexican **immigrants** broadly as criminals and "rapists."

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best," Trump 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."

6. He denigrated prisoners of war -- and never apologized

"He's not a war hero," Trump said in July 2015 about Sen. John McCain, who was imprisoned and tortured for more than five years in a North Vietnamese prison.

"He was a war hero because he was captured. I like people that weren't captured," Trump continued.

McCain announced his support for Trump after he clinched the GOP nomination and only un-endorsed him on Saturday amid the uproar over the 2005 audio.

7. He appeared to mock a disabled reporter

Trump pressed forward with his pattern of mocking reporters who displeased him when he went after Serge Kovaleski, a New York Times reporter who has a physical disability.

"Now the poor guy, you've got to see this guy: 'Uhh, I don't know what I said. I don't remember,'" Trump said in November, flailing his arms in a manner similar to how Kovaleski's arms look due to his disability.

Trump was prompted by challenges to his repeated (and debunked) claim that he saw "thousands" of Muslims celebrating in Jersey City, N.J., as the World Trade Center towers burned and fell during the 9/11 terror attack.

8. He called on Russia to hack Hillary Clinton

Trump appeared to urge Russian intelligence agencies to unearth and release the 33,000 emails Clinton deleted from her private email server.

"Russia, if you're listening, I hope you're able to find the 30,000 emails that are missing. I think you will probably be rewarded mightily by our press," Trump said in July.

Trump's statement marked a startling call from a presidential nominee to urge a foreign adversary to interfere in the US elections.

9. He condoned violence against protesters at his rallies

After a Black Lives Matter protester was shoved, tackled, punched and kicked when he disrupted a Trump rally last fall, the GOP nominee offered this response:

"Maybe he should have been roughed up because it was absolutely disgusting what he was doing," Trump said reacting to the incident.

Trump has also said in February of a protester that he would "like to punch him in the face" and fondly recalled the "old days" when protesters would be "carried out on stretchers."

And during another February rally, he urged his supporters: "If you see somebody getting ready to throw a tomato, knock the crap out of them, would you?"

10. He said women should be punished for getting abortions

"There has to be some form of punishment," Trump said in March when asked if women should be punished for getting abortions should the practice be outlawed.

He later walked back his remark, saying only the doctors who perform the service should be punished if abortions were outlawed.

11. He called a GOP primary rival too ugly to be elected president

"Look at that face!" Trump cried out as his primary rival Carly Fiorina appeared on TV as Trump sat for an interview with Rolling Stone magazine last year.

"Would anyone vote for that? Can you imagine that, the face of our next president?" Trump continued.

12. He attacked Ted Cruz's family

Trump repeatedly crossed the line most politicians would not dare to cross by attacking the family of his chief rival, Sen. Ted Cruz, during the GOP primary.

He threatened to "spill the beans" about Cruz's wife -- whom he later retweeted an unflattering picture of alongside a glamor shot of Trump's own wife.

Trump later accused Cruz's father -- with no evidence -- of being involved in President John F. Kennedy's assassination.

Trump also called Cruz a "pussy" on stage at a rally before the New Hampshire primary.

13. He said "Second Amendment people" could deal with Hillary Clinton

"Hillary wants to abolish -- essentially abolish the Second Amendment. By the way, if she gets to pick, if she gets to pick her judges, nothing you can do, folks. Although the Second Amendment people, maybe there is, I don't know," Trump said in August.

The comments were interpreted by many as a threat of violence against Clinton and prompted the Secret Service to issue a statement that they were "aware" of Trump's comments.

Trump also called in September for Clinton's Secret Service detail to "disarm."

"Let's see what happens to her," he said. "It'll be very dangerous."

14. He suggested more countries should get nuclear weapons to defend themselves

"North Korea has nukes. Japan has a problem with that. I mean, they have a big problem with that. Maybe they would in fact be better off if they defend themselves from North Korea," Trump said in an April interview with Fox News' Chris Wallace.

"With nukes?" Wallace asked

"Yes, including with nukes," Trump said.

15. He set conditions for defending NATO allies

Trump cast doubt in a July interview with The New York Times as to whether, as president, he would defend some top US military allies in the event of an attack.

Trump said that he would defend NATO allies that have "fulfilled their obligations to us," but would not answer when asked if he would defend those that he believes have not.

16. He refused to immediately reject the support of David Duke and white supremacists

"I don't know anything about David Duke. OK? I don't know anything about what you're even talking about with white supremacy or white supremacists," Trump told Tapper when asked about the former Ku Klu Klan leader's support.

He would later disavow Duke's support.

17. He repeatedly made denigrating comments about women

Trump's 2005 conversation about groping and trying to have sex with a married woman was not the first time such lewd talk has surfaced since Trump has been a candidate for president.

In his numerous appearances on "The Howard Stern Show," Trump frequently engaged in vulgar and objectifying conversations about women, including ranking women on a scale of 1 to 10 and discussing everything from oral sex to an anal sex and whether he could get an erection for certain famous women.

And during the presidential race, after suggesting Megyn Kelly asked him tough questions because she was on her period, Trump accused Kelly of being a "bimbo."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**updated with late-night Trump video, 12:23 am

Editor's note: Michael D'Antonio is the author of the new book, "The Truth About Trump." The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- He finally used the word "apologize."

Donald Trump didn't apologize for insisting the Central Park Five were guilty, years after their exoneration. He didn't apologize for insisting the President of the United States wasn't an American. He didn't apologize for his hurtful comments about two Gold Star parents or about an Indiana-born judge of Mexican heritage. Or about **immigrants** or women or people with disabilities.

But after The Washington Post revealed Friday a tape that caught Trump bragging about being a sexual predator, the Republican candidate issued a statement in which he said, " I apologize if anyone was offended," and then followed up late at night with a video saying, "I said it, I was wrong and I apologize." He argued that the controversy was a distraction from the real issues.

On the 2005 tape, Trump explained that his magnetism enables him to kiss women at will and "grab" them between their legs because "when you are a star they let you do it."

In the discussion, laced with profanity, one of the milder elements of Trump's remarks was the phrase, "I moved on her like a bitch." He was, at the time, the father of four and just months into his marriage to the former Melania Knauss, a model.

In addition to using the timeworn caveat "if anyone was offended," Trump modified his written apology with the excuse that he had merely indulged in "locker room banter."

He also tried to divert attention to his opponent Hillary Clinton's husband. "Bill Clinton has said far worse to me on the golf course," said Trump in the written statement, adding, "not even close." He also attacked Bill Clinton in his video apology.

Setting aside the weaseling modifiers, the smear of Clinton, and the fact that Trump must have hung out in the locker room with some pretty awful men, his expression of regret was nevertheless a milestone.

His lifelong habit has been to never apologize. "Whatever you do, don't apologize," he explained to Boston radio host Howie Carr during the campaign. He cited the downfall of TV gambling expert Jimmy "The Greek" Snyder who made racist comments as evidence for the never-apologize method.

"He was doing OK," recalled Trump, "'til he said he was sorry."

The Trump "no apologies" record was cited by Clinton running mate Tim Kaine during his debate this week with opponent Mike Pence. Kaine asked if Trump would ever apologize for insults he has lobbed at Mexican **immigrants** or for calling women "slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting."

But most of all, he wanted to know if Trump would ever apologize for his years-long effort to delegitimize President Obama by repeatedly suggesting he was not born in the United States.

Having dragged the country and the President through years of false accusations, Trump had the opportunity to apologize in September, when he summoned the press to an announcement related to this issue. He spent nearly a half hour listening to veterans praise him and then quickly admitted, "Barack Obama was born in the United States, period."

No apology was made. Instead, Trump repeated the false claims that the president's birthplace had been in doubt, and that Hillary Clinton had started the whole controversy.

The worst aspect of the "birther" controversy was the way that it consigned the president to the status of "other" in a way that was inherently racist. No previous presidents -- they were all white -- were subjected to such a concerted effort to suggest they were foreign-born. Similarly, none had heard their Christian faith challenged in the way that Trump challenged Obama's by wondering, aloud, if his records indicated he was Muslim.

More recently, Trump refused to acknowledge a mistake, or apologize for inflaming the public outrage over the shocking rape and assault of woman in Central Park in 1989. At the time, Trump bought full-page advertisements in New York newspapers to declare, "BRING BACK THE DEATH PENALTY. BRING BACK OUR POLICE!"

In the ad, which bore his signature, Trump referenced "roving bands of wild criminals" and said, "I want to hate these muggers and murderers. They should be forced to suffer and when they kill they should be executed for their crimes."

He also told CNN's Larry King that year, "Maybe hate is what we need" in response to the crime in the park.

This week, CNN's Miguel Marquez asked the Trump campaign to comment on the case in light of the fact that the five men originally convicted in the case were exonerated.

Instead of taking responsibility and acknowledging reality, Trump said, "They admitted they were guilty. The police doing the original investigation say they were guilty. The fact that that case was settled with so much evidence against them is outrageous. And the woman, so badly injured, will never be the same."

As he often does, Trump offered Marquez only the most convenient facts to justify a simplistic position on a complex issue and avoid admitting he might have done something wrong. The Central Park Five, as they are known, did confess to various crimes under extended police questioning and implicated each other. However they were subjected to improper interrogation techniques, without access to parents or lawyers, and their so-called confessions were without merit.

In standing by his original position on the Central Park case, Trump exhibited a variation on his no apologies strategy that might be called "doubling down."

Like a gambler who shows his confidence by adding to a bet, Trump has often repeated outrageous comments and impolitic observations in order to show that he is a straight-talking person who won't be politically correct. He has done this with his false claim that he opposed the war in Iraq when he didn't, and when he said that Obama was the founder of the ISIS terrorist group and then repeated the claim.

Why did Trump change course this time, pulling a Jimmy the Greek by admitting he did something wrong? It's likely that among the people he offended are his wife, his children, his running mate and millions of voters. Also, the existence of the audio recording makes his behavior impossible to deny.

Finally, he had no option for doubling down. Not even Trump could hear himself saying such awful things and then tell the world he would say them again, and add something worse.

Should the limited mea culpa change the way we regard Trump? The caviling tells us we should not. By offering excuses, and pointing a finger at Bill Clinton, he has maintained his standing as a dangerous and juvenile 70-year-old man.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**updates 12.10p with home office statement and more detail on migrants

(CNN) -- British police say 15 people suspected of entering the country illegally were discovered in the back of a refrigerated truck Friday.

In a statement, Surrey Police said the group included five children and came from Iraq, Iran and Syria.

Police say the driver called authorities after hearing a loud banging coming from inside the vehicle.

Surrey Police officers closed the main access road into the gas station at Clackett Lane. The driver had parked at the gas station while the people were detained.

According to the British Home Office, 11 males, including "five who claim to be minors", were arrested.

One of the men was taken ill at the scene and transferred to hospital, where the Home Office says he remains.

The five other men have been passed onto **immigration** officials for assessment while the juveniles will be met by social services.

A family of four, including two children, was also encountered at the scene. The Home Office said they will be interviewed by **immigration** officials.

In September, Britain announced it was building a four-meter (13 foot) high wall as part of a £17 million ($23 million) deal struck with France in an effort to block migrants from crossing the English Channel.
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NEW YORK (CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump face off for the first time on the debate stage Monday night, the biggest moment of the already extraordinary 2016 presidential race.

With national polls showing a tight race just six weeks out from Election Day, the Hofstra University fight offers one of the last chances for each to speak directly to the tens millions of voters who are expected to tune in.

For Clinton, a veteran debater, one of her biggest challenges will be both to provoke Trump and avoid being provoked by him, while delivering an earnest and candid performance.

And for Trump, who had uneven and at times explosive debate performances during the Republican primary, his first one-on-one debate presents a serious test of his ability to stay on script and keep his cool.

Here are five things to watch at Monday night's debate:

Which Donald Trump will show up?

During the long Republican primary, there was no telling which Trump would show up to a debate.

Sometimes it was the combative and hostile Trump -- quick to throw punches and go after his opponents with personal attacks. Other times, it was an uncharacteristically subdued Trump, content to disappear from the spotlight for long stretches of time and let his competitors command the stage and attack one another.

"We are preparing for different Trumps that might show up," Clinton spokeswoman Jennifer Palmieri told reporters last week. "He may be aggressive or he may lay back and that's hard to game out."

Being overtly antagonistic toward Clinton would be a risky move for Trump. If he is unable to keep calm and stay focused, it will only feed the narrative that he lacks the temperament to be president and potentially make him look small next Clinton, who is famous for being measured.

Trump also won't have the option of sitting on the sidelines. As one of only two candidates on stage, the Republican nominee must make the most of every minute allotted to him and show a level of agility and rapid-response instincts that was far less critical on a debate stage with numerous candidates.

Monday night will pose a critical test for Trump, who has so far shown a relative lack of depth on policy. With approximately half of the debate's 90 minutes dedicated to the GOP nominee, it will be far more difficult than in past debates for Trump to get by with sweeping statements that he is accustomed to making at rallies and in interviews, particularly given that Clinton's strong suit is policy.

Can Clinton heed Obama advice to 'be yourself?'

No one understands Clinton's debating chops better than President Barack Obama, who faced off against her numerous times in the 2008 election.

Obama's advice to Clinton for Monday? "Be yourself and explain what motivates you," the President told ABC's Robin Roberts last week. "I think there's a reason why we haven't had a woman president before, and so she's having to break down some barriers. There's a level of mistrust and a caricature of her that just doesn't jibe with who I know."

So far in this campaign, Clinton has struggled to do precisely that, and appearing unguarded and likeable -- fairly or not -- has been one of her biggest political challenges.

There's no question that policy is Clinton's forte -- aides to the former senator and secretary of state describe her as a wonk who knows policy inside and out. As she marshals her fluency in policy, she will want to avoid coming off as lecturing or smug, the way critics say Al Gore did in his debates with George W. Bush.

But appearing next to Trump could help make Clinton more likable by comparison: Polls show that a majority of voters question Trump's temperament and view him as appealing to bigotry. The Clinton campaign says it plans to drive home the point that Trump habitually makes factually inaccurate statements.

"Donald Trump has pattern of repeating lies hoping no one will correct him," Palmieri, Clinton's communications director, said on a call with reporters last week. "This warrants particular focus because his level of lying is unprecedented in American politics."

Clinton has acknowledged that she doesn't have the natural charisma of Obama or her husband, Bill Clinton, but she has fleshed out her personal story and offered a sharper positive message in recent weeks, and she will likely attempt to continue that effort on Monday.

Things could get really personal

The 2016 election has already showcased a whole lot of nasty name-calling, but Monday night has the potential to descend into the worst mudfight yet.

Even before the debate had begun, the two campaigns were in full trolling mode.

The Clinton campaign offered Mark Cuban -- the TV celebrity billionaire who recently endorsed the Democratic nominee -- a front row seat at Hofstra. Cuban has been relentless in attacking Trump-- in July, he said Trump "went off the reservation and went bats -- crazy" -- and he has also called out Trump for not releasing his tax returns.

Having Cuban in the front row is the kind of mind game that the Clinton camp hopes will distract and throw Trump off his game.

But in Trumpian fashion, the GOP nominee responded over the weekend by threatening to bring Gennifer Flowers as his guest to the debate. Flowers is a former Arkansas state employee who claimed to have had a multi-year sexual relationship with Bill Clinton. The former president has admitted to having a sexual encounter with her.

The Trump campaign later said it won't invite Flowers to the debate. Still, Trump's comments may foreshadow his willingness to dredge up some of the most painful incidents from the Clintons' past, including Bill Clinton's various indiscretions.

Hillary Clinton, too, could go there if provoked -- Trump has been married three times and has two messy divorces under his belt; has openly boasted in the past about his playboy lifestyle. Moreover his offensive remarks about women and minorities are part of her campaign's argument he is temperamentally unfit to be president.

Asked by CNN on her plane earlier this month whether she believes it is fair game to go after Trump's personal life, Clinton didn't rule out the possibility. Trump, meanwhile, said on Fox News last week: "If she treats me with respect, I will treat her with respect."

The politics of race

There's no shortage of top-tier issues -- terrorism, Syria, ISIS, **immigration**, the economy among them -- but the first general election match-up comes amid national outrage sparked yet again by police killings of African-American men.

The recent deaths of Keith Lamont Scott in North Carolina and Terence Crutcher in Oklahoma have sparked fresh and impassioned calls for justice and protests that have at times turned violent. With the issue of police force -- particularly toward minorities -- dominating headlines, the politics of race is guaranteed to be a discussion topic.

Both Clinton and Trump had planned to visit Charlotte -- where Scott was killed -- around the debate: Clinton on Sunday and Trump on Monday. But both campaigns scrapped those plans after Charlotte mayor Jennifer Roberts told CNN's Erin Burnett that the city was too stretched on resources.

For both Clinton and Trump, the challenge will be to offer detailed proposals on how they would address unnecessary police violence and thoughtfully speak to a grieving community. It also gives both a chance to make arguments to key constituencies -- Clinton to African-Americans who voted with Obama, and Trump to GOP base voters with his "law and order" pitch.

The debate will likely delve into many other policy issues including healthcare, trade, economy and foreign policy. But many of the core disagreements between Trump and Clinton are rooted in the different ways in which they view race and inclusion.

The two nominees have starkly contrasting views on **immigration**, for example, and how to handle people who enter the country illegally. They also clash on the national security front --- particularly on how they want to combat terrorism. Clinton has urged measured responses that ensure that an entire religion is not villanized -- Trump, meanwhile, has suggested using methods of racial profiling and keeping out entire ethnic groups as a safety measure.

All eyes on Lester Holt

No one who will face more pressure Monday night than Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump -- except Lester Holt.

The NBC "Nightly News" anchor and veteran newscaster is about to enter uncharted territory as the moderator of the first Clinton-Trump face-off.

Monday will mark Holt's first time presiding over a general election presidential debate; some 70 to 100 million people are expected to tune in; and there is no telling what dynamics will drive ultimately drive the prime-time event.

Both campaigns have preemptively cranked up the heat, suggesting that Holt and the other moderators might be less than fair to their respective candidates.

Palmieri told reporters last week that her biggest concern heading into the debate is that Trump and Clinton will be graded on different curves.

"You should be held to the same standard on knowledge, what kind of plans you have, your ability to explain your plans," she said. "Our concern is just what kind of standard is he held to."

Trump, meanwhile, has suggested that Holt is a Democrat. "Lester is a Democrat. I mean, they are all Democrats. OK? It's a very unfair system," Trump said. (Holt is actually a registered Republican.)

What Holt wants to avoid at all costs is the fate that recently befell his NBC colleague Matt Lauer. The "Today" show host moderated the network's "Commander-in-Chief Forum" earlier this moth, and the reviews were disastrous.

Lauer was accused of multiple transgressions, including aggressively interrupting Clinton, spending too much time grilling her on the email controversy, asking Trump relatively soft-ball questions and failing to call him out when he falsely stated that he had opposed the Iraq War.

With regard to fact-checking, "Lester is not going to be a potted plant," one NBC staffer close to Holt said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**adds government/NGO quotes on unaccompanied minors, pars 7-9

(CNN) -- French President Francois Hollande says the controversial makeshift migrant camp known as "The Jungle" in Calais will be completely dismantled before the end of the year.

During a visit to the northern city on Monday, Hollande said France will carry out a "full and final" dismantlement of the camp, where thousands of displaced people live in squalid conditions.

"From now on our objectives are clear -- to guarantee the security of the people of Calais, maintain public order and ensure for the migrants and refugees conditions are dignified," Hollande said.

He said he was in Calais to tell the "desperate **immigrants**" that they will not remain in the camp because "their place is not here" but they would "protect them as much as necessary."

Hollande said there are at least 7,000 migrants living in the area, according to the latest figures, which were released in August. According to the Calais spokesperson from the Ministry of the Interior, there were 900 unaccompanied minors living in the camp when aid organization France Terre d'Asile (FTDA) last counted.

Some unaccompanied minors will be "taken in by specific accommodation dedicated to their situation, others which fulfill the preconditions will be joining Britain," the French Ministry of the Interior said.

Laura Griffiths, Senior Field Manager for Safe Passage UK, said it's a disgrace that children who have a legal right to live in the UK are still living in tents.

"They have been through unimaginable hardship on their lone journeys through Europe, and now face losing their makeshift homes as the French authorities threaten to bulldoze the camp," Griffiths said. "The British and French governments must act to end the suffering of these children."

The French President said that the migrants would not be allowed to return to Calais to resettle again, and that security measures would be enforced to ensure there are "no more re-establishments."

However Clare Moseley, founder of the charity Care4Calais, told CNN that despite France's efforts in the past to destroy the camp, refugees continue to come back to Calais.

"In February this year, over 50% of the camp was demolished and yet six months later the camp is bigger than it has ever been before," she said. "This is clear evidence that demolitions do not act as a deterrent and that refugees will not stop coming to Calais."

She says dismantling the camp will "achieve nothing more than making living conditions so much more inhumane."

Moseley instead suggests alternative, long-term sustainable solutions because "the refugee crisis will get worse before it gets better."

"We're not saying a refugee camp is a long term solution to the migrant crisis, but we can't destroy it until we do have a long-term solution," she said.

French authorities have said they are creating up to 12,000 places in small centers across the country to cater to those removed from Calais. The capacity of each center will vary from 100 to 300 people.

Moseley said while the centers provide viable, alternative living arrangements to those wishing to claim asylum in France, "many refugees in Calais have strong reasons for wanting to get to the UK and will simply return to Calais."

From Calais on France's northern coast, refugees can easily reach England.

She also added that if migrants and refugees are scattered across France it'll make it difficult for aid workers to get to them.

"Nobody's made a plan. I think this is a very short term action, they want to be seen as though they're taking strong action," Moseley said.

Calais: Major UK entry point

The camp is notorious for being a major transit point for migrants, who often hop onto the back of UK-bound cargo trucks in the hope of entering the country. Many in "The Jungle" are reluctant to register as refugees in France because their preferred destination is Britain.

Hollande also called on France's neighbor to support the clearance plan. "I also wish to repeat my determination in seeing the British authorities show their participation in what France is doing," he said.

He said that despite the UK taking a "sovereign decision" to free itself "from its obligations with regards to France" he still believed that the country was bound by its commitments to its neighbors and the EU.

However, a Home Office representative from the UK said "the dismantling of the camp in Calais is a matter for the French Government" and that they remain committed to protecting their "shared border in Calais and are working closely with the French to do so."

The representative added, "We will continue to support the French Government as it provides alternative accommodation to migrants in the camps."

Hollande is not expected to visit the camp during his visit to Calais. Instead, he will meet with security forces, lawmakers and business representatives.

Earlier this month the UK announced it would build a "big new wall" in the French port city as a further attempt to prevent refugees and migrants from entering Britain, British **Immigration** Minister Robert Goodwill said.

Care4Calais' Moseley says the wall suggests that authorities do not think the demolition of "The Jungle" will be successful.

"It's almost an admission by the French authorities that it's not going to change anything and refugees will keep coming to Calais," she told CNN.

The 13-foot-high wall was part of a £17 million ($23 million) deal struck between Britain and France earlier this year.

Goodwill said that despite the current security measures -- which also included a fence -- some people were still managing to get through to the UK.

"The security we're putting in at the ports is being stepped up with better equipment. We're going to start building this big new wall very soon as part of the £17 million package that we're doing with the French," he said.

The decision came with controversy as British truck drivers criticized it as a "poor use of taxpayers' money."

Additional reporting by CNN's Milena Veselinovic

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Donald Trump may be the "king of debt," but his economic advisers say he'll balance the budget in the White House.

Trump plans a massive tax cut for individuals and businesses. It's how he would boost America's sluggish growth. But slashing taxes comes at a cost: the government doesn't take in as much money. The non-partisan Tax Foundation estimates his proposal will reduce government revenues by between $2.6 trillion and $3.9 trillion in the next decade.

But Trump's advisers -- economist Peter Navarro of the University of California-Irvine and private equity investor Wilbur Ross -- say it will be easy to balance the budget.

"The Trump economic plan is much more than just about taxes," Navarro and Ross write in a new analysis released late Sunday night. They argue that groups like the Tax Foundation don't look at the full policy picture.

Trump can balance the budget by doing the following, they claim:

1. Cut government regulations by 10% (details aren't given on which regulations)

2. Eliminate America's $500 billion trade deficit (by renegotiating deals)

3. Expand U.S. energy production (by allowing more drilling and more coal burning)

Trump's plan: is it fiscally conservative?

Once Trump gets these three items done, his economic advisers believe tax revenues will increase because more Americans will have jobs and businesses will generate more profits. They call the overall plan "fiscally conservative" and say it "approaches revenue neutrality."

The campaign's estimates may be very optimistic, according to other experts who have looked at Trump's plans.

For example, the Tax Foundation says the tax plan alone could cost as much as $3.9 trillion, if all businesses -- big and small -- get taxed at the lowest 15% rate that Trump has proposed. This estimate includes the plan's effect on U.S. economic growth.

"Even if you go to $3.9 trillion number, you are still only a trillion off, which given the size of the U.S. budget is still fiscally responsible," Navarro told CNNMoney. He pointed to how the debt doubled from about $10 trillion to nearly $20 trillion during the Obama administration.

But many businesses leaders and experts say Trump's plans would be a disaster for the economy, sending the U.S. plunging into a recession and running up the debt.

Critics say Trump's plan would be a disaster

Doug Holtz-Eakin, head of the American Action Forum and a former economic adviser to Republican John McCain, has called Trump's plans "wildly implausible at best."

Oxford Economics says Trump's economic, tax and **immigration** policies would cost 4 million jobs, spark a trade war and tank the American economy.

Moody Analytics says Trump's plans will kill 3.5 million jobs and cause a recession that would last longer than the Great Recession. Moody's is especially critical of Trump's plan to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**, which Moody's says would hurt the economy.

Republican business leaders Mitt Romney and Meg Whitman say Trump is a "phony" who will sink the economy by causing a trade war, increasing the debt and constantly saying things that alarm businesses and foreign governments.

It's all about the details

The latest analysis from Trump's economic team doesn't mention anything about **immigration**. It doesn't address how the country would pay for mass deportations or how the economy would deal with the loss of so many workers in a short time frame.

"We see that as a wash in terms of economic impact," Navarro says.

It also doesn't mention the fact that oil and gas prices are already at very low levels. Lowering them more has actually been a negative for the economy in recent months since energy companies can't make money when the price falls below $40 to $50 a barrel (oil is currently trading in that range).

As for claims that Trump would start a trade war with his plans to put hefty tariffs on goods coming from China, Mexico and elsewhere, his economic advisers argue that America is already in one.

"Those who suggest that Trump trade policies will ignite a trade war ignore the fact that we are already engaged in a trade war. It is a war in which the American government has surrendered before engaging," write Navarro and Wilbur.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**0930 ET -- adds more Hollande quotes in pars 10-11

(CNN) -- French President Francois Hollande says the controversial makeshift migrant camp known as "The Jungle" in Calais will be completely dismantled before the end of the year.

During a visit to the northern city on Monday, Hollande said France will carry out a "full and final" dismantlement of the camp, where thousands of displaced people live in squalid conditions.

"From now on our objectives are clear -- to guarantee the security of the people of Calais, maintain public order and ensure for the migrants and refugees conditions are dignified," Hollande said.

He said he was in Calais to tell the "desperate **immigrants**" that they will not remain in the camp because "their place is not here."

He added that the government would "protect them as much as necessary."

Hollande said there are at least 7,000 migrants living in the area, according to the latest figures, which were released in August. According to the Calais spokesperson from the Ministry of the Interior, there are 900 unaccompanied minors living within the camp when aid organization France Terre d'Asile (FTDA) last counted.

French authorities have said they are creating up to 12,000 places in small centers across the country to cater for those removed from Calais. The capacity of each center will vary from 100 to 300 people.

Hollande said that migrants would not be allowed to return to Calais and resettle again: "We must have an ordered approach. If we wish to dismantle Calais it is to ensure no **immigrants** return."

He said security measures will be enforced to ensure there are "no more re-establishments of migrant camps or any form of refugee camps."

Calais: Major UK entry point

The camp is notorious for being a major transit point for migrants, who often hop onto the back of UK-bound cargo trucks in the hope of entering the country. Many in "The Jungle" are reluctant to register as refugees in France because their preferred destination is Britain.

Hollande also called on France's neighbor to support the clearance plan. "I also wish to repeat my determination in seeing the British authorities show their participation in what France is doing," he said.

He said that despite the UK taking a "sovereign decision" to free itself "from its obligations with regards to France" he still believed that the country was bound by its commitments to its neighbors and the EU.

Hollande is not expected to visit the camp during his visit to Calais. Instead, he will meet with security forces, lawmakers and business representatives.

Earlier this month the UK announced it would build a "big new wall" in the French port city as a further attempt to prevent refugees and migrants from entering Britain, British **Immigration** Minister Robert Goodwill said.

The four-meter (13-foot) high wall was part of a £17 million ($23 million) deal struck between Britain and France earlier this year.

Goodwill said that despite the current security measures -- which also included a fence -- some people were still managing to get through to the UK.

"The security we're putting in at the ports is being stepped up with better equipment. We're going to start building this big new wall very soon as part of the £17 million package that we're doing with the French," he said.

The decision came with controversy as British truck drivers criticized it as a "poor use of taxpayers' money."

Additional reporting by CNN's Milena Veselinovic

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here's a look at rampage killings that have occurred in the United States since the 1940s.

US Timeline (selected only): Includes incidents with four or more killed (not including the perpetrators) on college and university campuses as well as other public places. For incidents in K-12 schools, see US School Violence Fast Facts. See also Deadliest Mass Shootings in US History Fast Facts.

2016 September 23, 2016 - Five people die after a gunman opens fire at a Washington state mall in Burlington, an hour north of Seattle. Shooting suspect Arcan Cetin, 20, is taken into custody on September 24 after a nearly 24-hour manhunt.

July 7-8, 2016 - Five police officers are killed and seven others wounded when a sniper fires ambush-style during a peaceful protest in downtown Dallas. After a lengthy standoff with police in a parking garage, a Dallas police bomb squad robot kills the gunman. The dead attacker is identified as Micah Xavier Johnson, 25, of Mesquite, Texas, a military veteran who'd served in Afghanistan.

June 12, 2016 - Omar Saddiqui Mateen, 29, opens fire inside Pulse, a gay nightclub, in Orlando, killing 49 people and wounding at least 53. After a standoff of about three hours, police crash into the building with an armored vehicle and stun grenades and kill Mateen.

March 8, 2016 - Four people are killed in Kansas City and a fifth is gunned down in Missouri. The shooting suspect, Pablo Antonio Serrano-Vitorino had been deported to Mexico in 2004 but returned to the Unites States illegally. Although **Immigrations** and Customs Enforcement received notice last September that Serrano-Vitorino was back, he did not get taken into custody due to a paperwork error. The four shooting victims in Kansas City were Serrano-Vitorino's neighbors. He was also charged with the murder of a Missouri man after his truck was found at the victim's home.

February 20, 2016 - Six people die and two more are injured during a nearly seven-hour shooting rampage at three different sites in Kalamazoo, Michigan. The shooting suspect is identified as Jason Brian Dalton, 45, an Uber driver who apparently picked up and dropped off passengers between shootings.

2015 December 2, 2015 - Married couple Syed Rizwan Farook and Tashfeen Malik open fire on a holiday party taking place at Inland Regional Center in San Bernardino, killing 14 people.

October 1, 2015 - Gunman Christopher Sean Harper-Mercer shoots and kills nine people, injuring another nine, at Umpqua Community College in Roseburg, Oregon. Six weapons are found at the college, where the shooter dies after a gun battle with police.

July 16, 2015 - Mohammad Abdulazeez, 24, opens fire on a military recruiting center in Chattanooga, Tennessee, then drives to a naval reserve facility seven miles away where he kills four US Marines. Abdulazeez is shot and killed by police. A US sailor, wounded during the rampage, dies two days later.

June 17, 2015 - Dylann Roof, 21, shoots and kills nine people inside the historic Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church, in Charleston, South Carolina. Eight die at the scene; a ninth dies at a hospital. Roof is arrested the following day about 245 miles away in Shelby, North Carolina. He confesses and tells investigators he wanted to start a race war.

2014 December 15, 2014 - Six people are found dead from shootings in several small towns in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania. The shooting suspect is identified as Bradley William Stone, 35, of Pennsburg, and the victims are identified as his ex-wife and five former in-laws. Stone is found dead on December 16 from apparent self-inflicted cutting wounds in the center of his body.

May 23, 2014 - Six people are killed near the University of California, Santa Barbara campus, by student Elliot Rodger. The gunman later dies of an apparent self-inflicted gunshot wound.

2013 September 16, 2013 - Twelve people are killed inside the Navy Yard in Washington. The shooter, identified as Aaron Alexis, 34, is also killed.

June 7, 2013 - As many as six people are killed in a random shooting rampage in Santa Monica, California, that ends in the library of Santa Monica College with the gunman dead. John Zawahri, 23, uses a rifle that the police describe as an AR-15 style gun.

2012 August 5, 2012 - Six people are killed and four wounded when Wade Michael Page, 40, opens fire with a Springfield 9mm semi-automatic handgun at a Sikh temple in Oak Creek, Wisconsin. According to the FBI, Page died from a self-inflicted gunshot wound to the head after he was shot in the stomach by a responding officer.

July 20, 2012 - Twelve people are killed and 70 injured in a shooting at an Aurora, Colorado, movie theater screening of the new Batman film. James E. Holmes, 24, is taken into custody outside of the movie theater. Holmes was dressed head-to-toe in protective tactical gear, set off two devices of some kind before spraying the theater with bullets from an AR-15 rifle, a 12-gauge shotgun and at least one of two .40-caliber handguns police recovered at the scene. Holmes faces 165 counts, including murder and attempted murder charges. He has pleaded not guilty by reason of insanity.

April 2, 2012 - Seven people are killed and three others injured during a shooting at Oikos University in East Oakland. The suspect One Goh, 43, allegedly walks into an Oikos University classroom, lines up students against a wall and using a .45 caliber handgun, shoots them one by one. After the shooting, Goh supposedly leaves the classroom, reloads his semi-automatic weapon, and then returns. The rampage ends with the suspect driving off in a victim's car and surrendering to police a short time later. On April 30, 2012 Goh pleads not guilty to seven counts of murder and three counts of attempted murder.

2011 October 12, 2011 - Eight people are killed during a shooting at the Salon Meritage in Seal Beach, California. The suspect, Scott Evans Dekraai, 41, of Huntington Beach, is arrested without incident as he is trying to leave the scene. The eight dead include Dekraai's ex-wife, Michelle Fournier, 48. He was armed with three guns -- a 9 mm Springfield, a Smith & Wesson .44 Magnum, and a Heckler & Koch .45 -- and was wearing body armor during the shooting rampage.

January 8, 2011 - Jared Lee Loughner, armed with a Glock pistol, kills six people and wounds 13 others at a "Congress on Your Corner" event sponsored by Rep. Gabrielle Giffords (D) at a local grocery store. Giffords is shot in the head, but survives. Loughner is charged with one count of attempting to kill a member of Congress, two counts of first degree murder and two counts of attempted murder. On August 7, 2012 Loughner pleads guilty to 19 charges in exchange for the government not seeking the death penalty.

2010 August 3, 2010 - Manchester, Connecticut - Omar Thornton kills eight co-workers at Hartford Distributors before turning the gun on himself. Thornton had been asked to resign for stealing and selling alcoholic beverages.

January 19, 2010 - Christopher Speight, 39, kills eight people at a house in Appomattox, Virginia. He surrenders to police at the scene the next morning. February 2013 he's sentenced to five life terms plus 18 years.

January 7, 2010 - Eight employees are shot, and three killed at the ABB plant in St. Louis. The gunman, who dies after turning the gun on himself, is identified as Timothy Hendron.

2009 November 5, 2009 - Maj. Nidal Malik Hasan kills 13 people and injures 32 at Fort Hood, Texas, during a shooting rampage. In 2013, a military jury convicts Hassan of 13 counts of murder and 32 counts of attempted murder. He is sentenced to death.

April 3, 2009 - In Binghamton, New York, Jiverly Wong kills 13 people and injures four during a shooting at an **immigrant** community center. He then kills himself.

March 29, 2009 - In Carthage, North Carolina, 45-year-old Robert Stewart kills a nurse and seven elderly patients at a nursing home. In May, the Moore County district attorney announces she will seek the death penalty. On September 3, 2011, a jury finds Stewart guilty of second-degree murder. Stewart is sentenced to 141 to 179 years in prison.

March 10, 2009 - In Alabama, Michael McLendon of Kinston, kills 10 and himself. The dead include his mother, grandparents, aunt and uncle.

2008 September 2, 2008 - In Skagit County, Washington, 28-year-old Isaac Zamora, who has a long criminal history and is out on parole, kills five civilians and a police officer during a two-hour rampage. Zamora is sentenced in November 2008 to a life term at the state mental hospital.

February 14, 2008 - Northern Illinois University, Dekalb, Illinois. 27-year-old Steven Kazmierczak shoots and kills five people in a lecture hall before taking his own life.

February 7, 2008 - In Kirkwood, Missouri, Charles Lee Thornton shoots and kills five people at a city council meeting before being shot dead by police.

2007 December 9, 2007 - In Colorado, 24-year-old Matthew Murray shoots and kills four people in two separate attacks. The first attack, in Arvada, happens late at night, after a Christmas banquet at the Youth with a Mission religious complex. Two people are killed. Hours later, at New Life Church in Colorado Springs, Murray kills two teen girls in a parking lot. A security guard shoots Murray several times, but police rule his death a suicide.

December 5, 2007 - In Omaha, Nebraska, 19-year-old Robert Hawkins goes to an area mall and kills eight shoppers before killing himself.

February 12, 2007 - In Salt Lake City, 18-year-old Sulejmen Talovic goes to a local mall and kills five people and injures four more. He is then killed by police.

April 16, 2007 - Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Virginia. A gunman, 23-year-old student Seung-Hui Cho, apparently acting alone goes on a shooting spree killing 32 people in two locations and wounds an undetermined number of others on campus. The shooter, Seung-Hui Cho then commits suicide.

2006 May 21, 2006 - In Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 25-year-old Anthony Bell goes to a local church, shoots and kills four people, abducts his wife and later kills her. He is convicted of five counts of murder and sentenced to die in 2008.

March 25, 2006 - In Seattle, 28-year-old Kyle Huff, leaves a house party and returns with a shotgun and handgun. He kills six people and wounds two and then kills himself when confronted by police.

January 30-31, 2006 - In Goleta, California, Jennifer San Marco, a former employee at a 24-hour Postal Service sorting facility, opens fire, killing seven people before turning the gun on herself. San Marco's neighbor was found shot to death the next day.

2005 March 12, 2005 - In Brookfield, Wisconsin, 44-year-old Terry Ratzmann kills seven people during a church meeting with the Living Church of God at a Sheraton Hotel in Brookfield. He then kills himself.

March 11, 2005 - In Atlanta, 33-year-old Brian Nichols, on trial for rape, shoots three (a judge, court reporter, and deputy) and wounds one (a deputy) while escaping from the Fulton County Courthouse. He kills another (a federal customs agent) while stealing a car. In December 2008, Nichols is sentenced to life in prison without parole, a day after the jury deadlocks on a death penalty sentence.

2004 December 8, 2004 - In Columbus, Ohio, 25-year-old Nathan Gale storms the stage at a rock concert and kills the band's guitarist and three bystanders. He was then killed by a police officer.

2001 October 3, 2001 - In Manchester, Tennessee, 29-year-old Damir Igric attacks the driver of a Greyhound bus, cutting his throat. Igric and five passengers are killed in the bus crash.

January 10, 2001 - In Nevada City, California, 40-year-old Scott Harlan Thorpe kills three people at a mental health clinic and then a fourth at a restaurant nearby. He is found not guilty by reason of insanity and sent to a mental institution.

2000 April 28, 2000 - In suburban Pittsburgh, 34-year-old lawyer Richard Baumhammers kills five people in racially motivated attacks. In 2001, Baumhammers is convicted and sentenced to death.

1990s September 15, 1999 - In Fort Worth, Texas, 47-year-old Larry Gene Ashbrook bursts into Wedgwood Baptist Church during a youth rally and shoots six teens and adults. He then takes his own life.

July 29, 1999 - In Atlanta, 44-year-old Mark Barton kills his wife and two children at his home. He then opens fire in two different brokerage houses killing nine people and wounding 12. He later kills himself.

June 3, 1999 - In Las Vegas, 23-year-old Zane Michael Floyd kills four people at an Albertson's grocery store. He pleads guilty and is sentenced to death.

December 7, 1993 - In Garden City, New York, 35-year-old Colin Ferguson shoots and kills six people on a commuter train. In March 1995, Ferguson is sentenced to life in prison.

December 2, 1993 - In Oxnard, California, 33-year-old Alan Winterbourne, an unemployed computer engineer, shoots and kills three people at an unemployment office. After a car chase, police kill Winterbourne. A police officer is killed during the chase

July 1, 1993 - In San Francisco, 55-year-old Gian Luigi Ferri kills eight people in a law office and then kills himself.

November 8, 1992 - In Morro Bay, California, 43-year-old Lynwood Drake III kills six people before taking his own life.

October 16, 1991 - In Killeen, Texas, 35-year-old George Hennard crashes his pickup truck through the wall of a Lubys Cafeteria. After exiting the truck, Hennard shoots and kills 23 people. He then commits suicide.

June 18, 1990 - In Jacksonville, Florida, 42-year-old James Pough, angry about his car being repossessed, opens fire at a General Motors Acceptance Corp. office, killing nine people. Pough takes his own life.

1980s September 14, 1989 - In Louisville, Kentucky, 47-year-old Joseph Wesbecker armed with a AK-47 semiautomatic assault rifle, two MAC-11 semiautomatic pistols, a .38 caliber handgun, a 9-millimeter semiautomatic pistol and a bayonet kills eight co-workers at Standard Gravure Corporation and then kills himself. He had been placed on disability leave from his job due to mental problems.

April 23, 1987 - In Palm Bay, Florida, 60-year-old William Cruse with a high-powered .223-caliber rifle kills six people in a shopping center. He is the oldest man on death row in Florida until his death of natural causes in November 2009.

August 20, 1986 - In Edmond, Oklahoma part-time mail carrier, Patrick Henry Sherrill, armed with three handguns kills 14 postal workers in ten minutes and then takes his own life with a bullet to the head.

July 18, 1984 - In San Ysidro, California, 41-year-old James Huberty, armed with a long-barreled Uzi, a pump-action shotgun and a handgun shoots and kills 21 adults and children at a local McDonalds. A police sharpshooter kills Huberty one hour after the rampage begins.

June 30, 1984 - In Dallas, 39-year-old Abdelkrim Belachheb kills six people in a nightclub. He is sentenced to life in prison.

May 17, 1984 - In Manley Hot Springs, Alaska, 25-year-old drifter and Army veteran Michael Silka kills seven people in a three-hour rampage. Two days later, Silka is killed in a shootout with Alaska state troopers after he kills trooper Troy Duncan. Authorities believe that Silka also killed his neighbor Roger Culp in April.

March 1, 1983 - In McCarthy, Alaska, 39-year-old Louis Hastings kills six people waiting for the mail plane in a remote village. He is sentenced to 634 years in prison.

September 25, 1982 - In Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, 40-year-old George Banks, a prison guard, kills 13 people including five of his own children. In September 2011, the Pennsylvania Supreme Court overturns his death sentence stating that Banks is mentally incompetent.

August 20, 1982 - In Miami, 51-year-old history teacher Carl Robert Brown, angry about a repair bill and armed with a shotgun, kills eight people at a machine shop. He flees by bicycle, but is shot on the back by a witness who pursued him. He was on leave from school for psychological treatment.

May 7, 1981 - In Salem, Oregon, 25-year-old mill worker Lawrence Moore opens fire with an automatic pistol in a tavern, killing four people. He is convicted and sentenced to four life terms.

June 22, 1980 - In Daingerfield, Texas, 45-year-old Alvin Lee King, carrying four weapons, bursts into the First Baptist Church and shoots to death five people. In 1982, while awaiting trial, King hangs himself in his cell.

1970s August 26, 1977 - In Hackettstown, New Jersey, 20-year-old ex-marine Emil Benoist lies in wait along a trail and murders six joggers and motorcyclists. His weapon of choice is a .44-caliber rifle. After being approached by police, Benoist kills himself.

July 12, 1976 - In Fullerton, California, 36-year-old janitor, Edward Charles Allaway, using a rifle, kills seven people in the library of California State University, Fullerton. He is found not guilty by reason of insanity and committed to a state mental hospital.

January 7, 1973 - In New Orleans, 23-year-old Mark Robert James Essex, using a .44 magnum carbine, kills seven people and wounds 13 more in a rampage at a Howard Johnson motel. Police snipers later kill him. Police later linked Essex to the shooting of two other people on New Year's Eve 1972.

June 21, 1972 - In Cherry Hill, New Jersey, 33-year-old Edwin Grace kills six people at an employment agency and seriously wounds himself. He carried a sawed-off .22 caliber rifle in each hand. He dies in custody several weeks later from the self-inflicted gunshot wound.

1960s August 1, 1966 - University of Texas. Charles Joseph Whitman, a former US Marine, kills 16 and wounds at least 30 from a university tower. Police officers Ramiro Martinez and Houston McCoy shoot and kill Whitman in the tower. Whitman had also killed his mother and wife earlier in the day.

1940s September 5, 1949 - In Camden, New Jersey, 28-year-old Howard Unruh, a veteran of World War II, shoots and kills 13 people as he walks down Camden's 32nd Street. His weapon of choice is a German-crafted Luger pistol. He is found insane and is committed to a state mental institution. He dies at the age of 88.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Just one point separates Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump in two states that are critical to both candidates' chances of becoming president, according to new CNN/ORC polls in Pennsylvania and Colorado.

In Colorado, likely voters break 42% for Trump, 41% for Clinton, 13% for Libertarian Gary Johnson and 3% for Green Party candidate Jill Stein. Pennsylvania's likely voters split 45% for Clinton, 44% for Trump, 6% for Johnson and 3% for Stein. Those divides are well within each poll's 3.5-point margin of sampling error.

The new results in two battleground states underscore the closeness of the race and come as the candidates prepare to square off Monday night in their high-stakes first debate at Long Island's Hofstra University.

In both states, sharp divisions among whites by education are evident, with white college graduates choosing Clinton over Trump by 11 points in Pennsylvania and 16 points in Colorado, while whites who do not hold four-year degrees break in Trump's favor by 19 points in Pennsylvania and 22 points in Colorado.

In Colorado, that education gap is a bigger divide than gender or age, and is even larger than the racial gap in the state. Pennsylvania's likely voters are more divided than Colorado's along gender and racial lines. Johnson's appeal among younger voters appears to be working to Clinton's detriment in both states. While Trump's numbers are significantly lower among voters under 45 than among older voters, Clinton's are roughly the same across age groups, while Johnson's support multiplies among younger voters.

Clinton fares better in two-way matchups in both states, topping Trump 50% to 47% among likely voters in Pennsylvania and 49% to 47% in Colorado. Though both results are within the polls' margin of sampling error, the finding suggests she could fare better in each state if third party candidate support dipped.

The two polls come alongside tight national polls and neck-and-neck poll results in several other key battleground states including Ohio, Florida, Nevada and North Carolina.

In both Colorado and Pennsylvania, the economy stands out as far and away the top voter concern. About half of registered voters in each state, and a similar share of likely voters, call the economy most important out of a list also including terrorism, illegal **immigration** and foreign policy. And when asked which candidate would better handle the economy, Trump comes out on top in both states, though within each poll's margin of error.

Clinton holds broad advantages for handling foreign policy in both states, and she tops Trump by 8 points on handling **immigration** in Colorado, a state where a Pew Research Center analysis recently estimated that about a quarter of the state's sizable Latino population is foreign born. In Pennsylvania, the two candidates run about even on that issue. And in the wake of terror attacks in New York and New Jersey, voters in both states are about evenly split on who would better handle terrorism.

The poll suggests Clinton has made an effective case that Trump does not have the temperament to be president -- she is viewed as better suited for the presidency by a nearly two-to-one margin in each state on that score -- and she holds smaller advantages as the better candidate to be commander-in-chief. But Clinton continues to lag behind Trump when voters are asked which of the two is more honest and trustworthy.

Trump's contention that Clinton lacks the stamina for the job splits voters in Colorado, 48% see him as having the better stamina, 45% choose Clinton. In Pennsylvania, Trump holds a larger advantage on that, 50% to 45%.

Democrats have a narrow edge in the race for Pennsylvania's U.S. Senate seat, with Katie McGinty topping incumbent Pat Toomey 49% to 46% among likely voters, just inside the poll's margin of error, and a broad lead in Colorado's Senate contest, with incumbent Michael Bennet up 53% to 43% over Republican challenger Darryl Glenn.

The CNN/ORC Polls in Colorado and Pennsylvania were conducted by telephone Sept. 20-25. The Colorado poll included interviews with 1,010 adult residents of the state, including 784 who are likely to vote in November. In Pennsylvania, interviews were conducted with 1,032 adult residents of the state, including 771 likely voters. Results for likely voters have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points in each state.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 2:25 p.m.: Tweaks wording in graph 6

Editor's note: Dean Obeidallah, a former attorney, is the host of SiriusXM's radio's daily program "The Dean Obeidallah Show" and a columnist for The Daily Beast. Follow him @TheDeansreport. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- Samantha Bee really went after Jimmy Fallon this week for his Donald Trump interview. In truth, he treated the GOP presidential nominee like a Kardashian. It was jokes and cuteness to the max, with Fallon even begging for permission to mess up Trump's orangish hair. (After some manufactured coyness, Trump agreed.)

In general, late-night comedy hosts shouldn't be held responsible for vetting our presidential candidates. Just because a candidate appears on "The Tonight Show," it doesn't somehow morph the program into "Meet the Press." And if Fallon, whom I worked with for seven seasons at "Saturday Night Live" and is one of the nicest and most talented people you will ever meet, had been interviewing say a Mitt Romney or a John McCain, he could have given them a foot massage and most people wouldn't have cared.

But Trump is different. And that is the very point Bee and others have raised. Trump, who literally kicked off his campaign spewing hate, has demonized Latino **immigrants**, demeaned an American-born federal judge for his Hispanic heritage, stoked hate against Muslims, despicably mocked a disabled reporter, made sexist remarks, led the racist birther campaign and even defended a black protester being beaten up by his white supporters.

And it's no coincidence that Trump is proudly and publicly supported by a frightening number of white supremacists and anti-Semites such as David Duke. And while Trump will tell us he doesn't want their support, just a few weeks ago leading white supremacist leaders held a press conference to "discuss their affection for Donald Trump and their hopes for a white homeland," which they demand must be free from Jews. (Trump has no problem calling people he doesn't like such as Sen. Elizabeth Warren a "fraud" and a "racist" but has yet to use such blunt and impassioned language to denounce his white supremacist fans.)

If Fallon were a person of color, a woman, a Muslim, disabled or a member of any group that Trump has demonized, you wonder if he would've given the candidate a free pass.

Anyone who opposes racism, bigotry and sexism has an obligation to challenge Trump. And that was Bee's point on her show "Full Frontal" on TBS (like CNN, owned by Time Warner) as she called out both Fallon and NBC for giving Trump a platform without remarking on his past disturbing comments: "I guess because ratings matter more than brown people." She added, "Sure, he's making life palpably dangerous for Muslims and **immigrants**, but, hey, he's good entertainment!"

As Bee quipped about Trump's interview, "Network execs and a lot of their audience can ignore how very dangerous Trump is, because, to them, he isn't."

She is 100% correct. For many communities, such as Latinos and Muslims in America, Trump's words are not just political, they are personal.

Trump has caused a palpable fear in the Latino community with his baseless claims about Mexico sending "rapists" to America and vows of mass deportations of even children. As CNN contributor Maria Cardona explained on my SiriusXM radio show last week, even her own daughter has asked, "If Trump wins, will he deport you Mommy?"

And for Muslims, Trump's horribly irresponsible attacks on our community are the reason -- at least in our view -- for an alarming spike in hate crimes versus Muslims. In the past few weeks, two self-professed Trump supporters reportedly were charged with hate crimes in attacks upon the Muslim community.

Now no one is saying Fallon had to do a fact check of every Trump statement. (That's the job of news reporters, but some are failing horribly and need to be called out more.) But Fallon, only seven weeks from Election Day, let Trump turn his appearance into an infomercial.

"The Tonight Show" host could have easily and even comically pressed Trump more. For example, he asked Trump why he wanted to be president, to which Trump responded, "Because I want to help people." Fallon could have joked exactly how does he define "people" given all the groups he has demonized, causing Trump to address the issue.

In response to the criticism from Bee and others, Fallon remarked, "I'm never too hard on anyone." That's true and Fallon's show is one the most entertaining late-night programs on TV.

But sometimes you can combine entertainment with some education. And I bet given Fallon's amazing level of talent, he could have easily done both, making his audience laugh while also informing them about Trump's despicable history of hate.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**new questions added, 11:35 am, updated title for Jeffrey Sachs, and added Karpinski question at end, 10:16 am

(CNN) -- What would you ask Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump if you were moderating the first presidential debate Monday night? Celebrities, writers and other newsmakers pose their questions on subjects including criminal justice, foreign policy and **immigration**. The views expressed are the writers' own. Share your question ideas in he comments section or @CNNOpinion.

Ava DuVernay, director

What are your thoughts on the fact that America, the land of the free, holds the record for the country with the most citizens currently imprisoned, and your concrete plans, if any, on changing that startling statistic through your presidency?

Ava DuVernay is an award-winning director and screenwriter. She is the director of "Selma" and the upcoming "13TH," a documentary about the U.S. prison system, seen through the lens of race relations.

Alex Trebek, actor and television personality

If elected, how would you specifically deal with the great antipathy that exists between the right and the left at the moment, and bring about a spirit of cooperation and acceptance?

Alex Trebek is an actor and a Canadian-American television personality. He has been the host of the syndicated game show "Jeopardy!" since 1984.

Buzz Aldrin, astronaut

The Apollo landings on the Moon inspired a generation of engineers and scientists to develop an unprecedented array of skills, talents and technologies. Today, however, we find that generation of leaders now moving into retirement. America's human spaceflight program appears mired in a series of expensive programs that really do not seem to be moving the nation in a focused direction or motivating our next generation of scientists and engineers. Do you have a plan to restore inspiration and direction to America's space program? If so, what is that plan?

Buzz Aldrin is a former astronaut and an American engineer. He was one of the first two humans to land and walk on the Moon.

Louie Anderson, actor and comedian

Could each of the candidates spend one minute telling the nation only positive things about their opponent?

Louie Anderson recently won the 2016 Primetime Emmy Award for outstanding supporting actor in a comedy series for his performance as Christine in the FX show "Baskets."

Roxanne Jones, commentator

Beyond body and dashboard cameras, please detail two major law enforcement reforms you will put forth as president to guarantee that police officers who unjustly murder or maim innocent citizens are fired, indicted, prosecuted and sent to prison.

Roxanne Jones, a founding editor of ESPN Magazine and former vice president at ESPN, writes frequently for CNN Opinion.

Mike Love, rock 'n' roll icon

Regardless of who wins this election, the new president will be facing a divided country and Congress. What specific steps will you take to bring people across the aisle and create harmony where there is discord? Understanding, of course, that harmony is never easy.

Mike Love is a member of the Beach Boys and author of "Good Vibrations: My Life as a Beach Boy."

John Walsh, TV host

As the father of a son who was kidnapped and brutally murdered, and as someone who has fought years for more resources to protect our nation's most vulnerable, I have seen first-hand how every taxpayer dollar wasted on an ineffective justice system is one dollar not going to put away those that prey on our communities. There is currently bipartisan support in Congress to reform wasteful and outdated policies in our federal justice system. As president of the United States, what will you do specifically with members of Congress on both sides of the aisle to make our federal justice system smarter and more cost-effective?

John Walsh is co-founder on the National Center for Missing & Exploited Children and host of CNN's "The Hunt".

Mark Hertling, retired lieutenant general

The candidates and the American people have rightfully focused on the terror threat emanating from the Middle East. But there are many more threats to our national security. As you consider the demands of the office, name the top three national security issues that concern you, and the strategies, policies or doctrine you will prioritize if you are elected.

Retired Lt. Gen. Mark Hertling is a national security, intelligence and terrorism analyst for CNN. He served for 37 years in the Army, including three years in combat, and retired as commanding general of U.S. Army Europe and 7th Army.

S.E. Cupp, political commentator

In this era of record distrust -- of you both in particular -- tell voters why they should trust either of you.

S.E. Cupp is the author of "Losing Our Religion: The Liberal Media's Attack on Christianity," co-author of "Why You're Wrong About the Right" and a columnist at the New York Daily News.

Michael Smerconish, host, author, and lawyer

Please tell me something specific you will do to improve the relationship between the White House and Congress?

Michael Smerconish is the host of CNN's Smerconish and a host on SiriusXM's P.O.T.U.S

Vicente Fox, former president of Mexico

Mexican migrants are a strong foundation for the US economy. Are you willing to let that go? They're humans and should be treated as such. What would be your approach to this issue -- working toward a humane **immigration** bill or taking the low road?

Vicente Fox was president of Mexico from 2000-2006.

Chris Smith, member of British House of Lords

Is same-sex marriage now a settled feature of American life, and do you welcome it?

Lord Chris Smith of Finsbury is a member of Britain's House of Lords and a former secretary of state for culture and media under a Labour government.

Haroon Moghul, commentator

Secretary Clinton: You supported military intervention in Libya, and the invasion of Iraq. The first of these has created an ISIS haven and helped to destabilize North Africa. The second of these is widely viewed as one of the greatest foreign policy errors in American history. What lessons have you learned from these decisions and why should American voters trust you to manage our country's affairs in the future?

Mr Trump: You have justified unconstitutional policies, like a ban on Muslims entering the country, on the grounds of national security. Is it not reasonable for Americans to wonder what else national security can justify? If for example it is too risky to allow Muslims into America, why should we permit those Muslims already here to stay? Would it be acceptable for the government to deport, detain or deny entry to any demographic we face any degree of threat from?

Haroon Moghul is a senior Fellow and director of development at the Center for Global Policy. His next book, How to be a Muslim, will be out in 2017.

Jeffrey Sachs, economist

Is global warming real, serious and a priority for you?

Jeffrey Sachs is director of the Center for Sustainable Development and a professor at Columbia University.

Cenk Uygur, political commentator

Donald Trump: What, if anything, will you do to get money out of politics? Hillary Clinton: Given that you are one of the leading recipients of campaign contributions in US history, why should people believe you that you want to get money out of politics?

Cenk Uygur is the founder and host of The Young Turks, an online news and politics show.

Don Most, actor

What specific kinds of initiatives would you employ to improve the conditions of the African-American communities in our country?

Don Most is an actor and director.

Tim Naftali, historian

Mr. Trump, you have prided yourself on taking advantage of a system that helps rich people make even more money, as president would you feel an obligation to fix the system so that it does not favor the wealthy like yourself, and how would you go about it?

Secretary Clinton, what would you say to reassure Americans who see your handling of the private email server matter as evidence of a lack of commitment to transparency and the protection of public records?

Tim Naftali is a CNN presidential historian. He teaches history and public service at New York University and was the former director of the Richard Nixon Presidential Library and Museum.

Erica Jong, writer

Fewer people are killed by terrorists than by their armed neighbors and family members -- as president, how would you respond to that?

Erica Jong is a poet, novelist and nonfiction writer with more than 24 books published. Her latest novel is "Fear of Dying."

Raul Reyes, commentator

What specific policy proposals do you offer that could benefit Millennials, who are entering a competitive job market while burdened with tremendous college debt?

Raul A. Reyes, an attorney and member of the USA Today board of contributors, writes frequently for CNN Opinion. Follow him on Twitter @RaulAReyes.

Danielle Pletka, foreign policy commentator

Over the last eight years, al Qaeda, notwithstanding the death of Osama bin Laden, has spread dramatically. The group and its affiliates is now operating and controlling territory in more than a dozen countries. The Obama administration has focused almost exclusively on ISIS and al Qaeda has flourished. The fact that we have not been attacked by al Qaeda is the group's strategic choice, not a result of US operations. What would you do, specifically, to counter this threat to the American people?

Danielle Pletka is senior vice president for foreign and defense policy studies at the American Enterprise Institute.

Paul Callan, legal analyst

Donald Trump: Over the past year, many African-Americans have complained about repeatedly being subjected to acts of disrespect by members of law enforcement. Do you agree that these complaints are legitimate, and how, as president, would you deal with the situation?

Hillary Clinton: When Harry Truman completed his term as president, he declined to accept any corporate fees for speeches stating: " You don't want me. You want the office of the president, and that doesn't belong to me. It belongs to the American people and it's not for sale." After leaving public office both you and President Clinton have accepted numerous speaking fees reportedly in the range of $153 million since 2001. Why do you disagree with Harry Truman on this principle?

Paul Callan is a CNN legal analyst and a former media law professor.

Ted Braun, director

Do you view the unequal distribution of wealth in this country to be a problem? Is there a connection to unequal access to justice? If so, what would you do to correct this? If not, why not?

Ted Braun is director of this year's docu-thriller Betting On Zero and Darfur Now.

Cecile Richards, advocate

Abortion has been legal in America for over 40 years, yet it has become increasingly inaccessible to women across the country due to deeply unpopular political attacks on women's access to health care. What would you do as president to ensure that abortion remains safe, legal, and accessible?

Cecile Richards is president of Planned Parenthood Action Fund.

Julian Zelizer, author and professor

What will you do to improve our intelligence operations so that the US can do a better job of detecting potential acts of lone wolf terrorism before they occur?

Julian Zelizer is a professor of history and public affairs at Princeton University and a New America fellow. He is a frequent CNN contributor.

Mel Robbins, author and commentator

For Clinton: In a recent CNN/Kaiser Family Foundation poll, 84% of working class white voters say they believe the government does not represent them. You've called half of Donald Trump's supporters 'deplorable.' What would you say to these voters about why they should vote for you?

For Trump: You've called Mexican **immigrants** rapists and criminals and advocated widespread deportation, you've blasted some Muslim **immigrants** and called for a temporary ban and extreme vetting. What do you want to say to **immigrant** Americans about why they should vote for you?

Mel Robbins is a CNN commentator, legal analyst and the CEO of Mel Robbins Enterprises, a management consulting firm.

Laura Coates, legal analyst

Given the Supreme Court's oft insurmountable deferential standard conferred to police officers in determining the appropriate level of force to use, will you ask Congress to legislatively change that deference and alter the way prosecutors investigate and assess police-involved shootings?

Laura Coates is a CNN legal analyst. She is a former assistant U.S. attorney for the District of Columbia and trial attorney in the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. Follow her on Twitter: @thelauracoates.

Doug Brinkley, historian

As president would you promote the idea of a new national holiday -- Cesar Chavez Day -- to honor Latino contributions to American history, culture and identity?

Douglas Brinkley is CNN's Presidential Historian, a professor of history at Rice University and author of many books.

Leroy Chiao, astronaut

Without bold political and financial commitments to a clearly defined international program with milestones and dates, the United States is in real danger of losing the lead position in human space exploration. We don't currently have either commitment. Is this acceptable to you, and if not, would you be willing to make those commitments, if elected President?

Leroy Chiao is an American engineer, motivational speaker, former NASA astronaut and an engineering consultant.

Gene Karpinski, activist

Polls show that millennials -- a critical voting bloc -- are concerned with climate change and are more likely to vote for a candidate who will take action on climate. What is your plan to protect the country from the harmful effects of climate change -- including rising sea levels that threaten to wipe out entire cities, and pollution that makes it more difficult to breathe and is contaminating our water?

Gene Karpinski is the president of the League of Conservation Voters.

Judy Gold, comedian and host

Mr. Trump, it is the tradition that on inauguration day, the president-elect arrives at the White House and proceeds to the inaugural grounds at the United States Capitol with the incumbent president. If you are lucky enough to become POTUS, (and when I say lucky, I mean LUCKY), during the brief trip to The Capitol, what advice would you seek from President Obama regarding your new role as Commander In Chief?

Judy Gold is a comedian and host of the Kill Me Now podcast

Tippi Hedren, actress

What steps would you take to protect and guarantee employees-- male and female-- a workplace free of sexual harassment?

Tippi Hedren starred in the classic Hitchcock films, "The Birds" and "Marnie."

Gilbert Gottfried, comedian and host

I give up. Which one of you is the competent one?

Gilbert Gottfried is a comedian and the host of Gilbert Gottfried's Amazing Colossal Podcast.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Para. 20: Correcting that Progressive Change Campaign Committee has not endorsed Clinton, 10:32 am

Editor's note: Sally Kohn is an activist, columnist and television commentator. Follow her on Twitter @sallykohn. The opinions expressed in this commentary are hers.

(CNN) -- Dr. Jill Stein is without a doubt a bold progressive leader. But let's face reality: A vote for Jill Stein is a vote to elect Donald Trump.

In a September 2016 NBC News/Wall Street Journal/Marist poll, when registered voters were given the choice between Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump, 46% chose Clinton while 41% chose Trump. But when Jill Stein and Gary Johnson were added as options, 9% of registered voters chose Johnson and 3% chose Stein. Meanwhile Trump's support dropped two points to 39%. But Clinton's? Her support dropped 5 points to 41%.

In Arizona, a state in play in this election that the Clinton campaign is making a strong effort to win, early September polling shows Clinton at 41% and Trump at 40% with registered voters. But when Stein and Johnson are options? Arizonans throw 13% of their support behind Johnson and 4% to Stein -- and give 37% each to Clinton and Trump, cutting Clinton's small lead down to a statistical dead heat. It's clear -- at least in these two states -- that support for Johnson and Stein most clearly hurts Clinton and helps Trump.

In a national Quinnipiac poll last week, millennial likely voters supported Clinton over Trump by a 55-34 margin. But when Stein and Johnson were included in the survey, Clinton received just 31% support by likely voters between 18 and 34. Upon further analysis, it's clear that Stein is the one mostly taking votes away from Clinton.

Stein understandably sees herself as taking the baton from the progressive revolutionary campaign of Bernie Sanders. There's only one problem with that: Sanders himself handed the baton to Hillary Clinton.

"This election is about which candidate understands the real problems facing this country and has offered real solutions," Sanders said in his speech at the Democratic National Convention in August. "By these measures, any objective observer will conclude that -- based on her ideas and her leadership -- Hillary Clinton must become the next president of the United States. The choice is not even close."

As I said when I endorsed Senator Sanders during the primary, he and Hillary Clinton agree on 90% of issues. Which is just true -- of them and of most liberals and progressives and left-of-center folks. Including Jill Stein.

For instance, while the website insidegov.com does rank Hillary Clinton as, on average, slightly more conservative than Stein, according to the site, on issues ranging from keeping abortion fully safe and legal to supporting strong environmental regulations to opposing restrictions on voting rights, Clinton and Stein are in lockstep.

Both Clinton and Stein believe in government spending to stimulate economic recovery, agree that taxes on the very rich are far too low, and oppose privatizing Social Security. Clinton and Stein both support a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants** and they both oppose the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal.

And incidentally, Jill Stein believes England's xenophobic Brexit vote was a win for "self-determination." And she also believes that exposing kids to wireless internet access in schools is dangerous for their brains. So there are some things she and Hillary Clinton most definitely do not agree on.

Stein has said, "I will feel horrible if Donald Trump is elected, I will feel horrible if Hillary Clinton is elected, and I feel most horrible about a voting system that says: Here are two deadly choices, now pick your weapon of self-destruction."

But Stein wildly misrepresents Clinton -- and her own proximity to many of Clinton's positions -- by lumping her into such a vivid generalization. I know that Jill Stein supports the legalization of marijuana, but if she thinks that Trump's flagrantly hateful and destructive agenda is remotely akin to anything Clinton stands for and believes, Stein must be high.

Hillary Clinton is not perfect. But she has spent her entire career working for the very principles of equality and inclusion that Donald Trump has vowed to destroy. And for Latino **immigrants** and Muslims and working moms and young black men and women fed up with police violence, the difference between a Hillary Clinton presidency and a Trump presidency is too vast to describe with words.

To those of you considering voting for Jill Stein, I suspect most of you desperately do not want Donald Trump to be president. But for whatever reason you don't like Hillary Clinton.

You should give that some thought -- especially if you enthusiastically supported Barack Obama in 2008 and 2012, who in campaigning and certainly in governing has proven himself pretty much the ideological equal of Clinton in 2016. If you liked him, but don't like her, ask yourself why. And if it boils down to "personality," interrogate that, too.

For the record, while a lot of us loved Bernie Sanders' positions, he wasn't the most likable candidate, either. But none of us seemed to mind that. Why?

Either way, I would love to be able to persuade you to embrace Hillary Clinton -- but even if I can't, please don't help Donald Trump win.

Earlier this month, New Hampshire Sen. Jeanne Shaheen explained what's at stake. "What happened in 2000 is Al Gore lost New Hampshire by about 7,000 votes, and 19,000 people voted for Ralph Nader," she said at an event with Sen. Sanders. "And we got George W. Bush, and we got the war in Iraq."

Meanwhile, the Democratic Party isn't perfect, either, but it still is the best vehicle for advancing progressive policy in America today -- especially if we actively engage with it. Joshua Holland points out how the Working Families Party is a good example of this -- not running symbolic candidates that perpetually lose, but strategically cross-endorsing mainstream Democratic candidates in order to be able to lay claim to a share of their victory and thus influence over their agendas. It has worked -- certainly in shifting New York City Democratic politics to the left and, increasingly, statewide.

By the same token, the Democratic Party needs to change nationally as well. This can't happen if progressives don't engage. Bernie Sanders proved this point by running in the Democratic primary -- and his campaign had an indelible influence on the Democratic Party platform this year as well as several policy shifts on the part of Clinton. And the Progressive Change Campaign Committee has worked closely with the Clinton campaign to elevate progressive issues, including debt-free college, expanding Social Security benefits, and holding Wall Street accountable with tough reforms.

If we want to continue to push the Democratic Party to be a force for progressive change, we need to be part of the conversation -- not marginalize our voices and our votes in some fringe party.

We cannot afford to elect Donald Trump president. The consequences would be unthinkable. Fortunately, we have a great alternative -- a feminist who believes in racial justice and progressive economic policy, who wants to make college debt-free and expand our vital social safety nets. That candidate is Hillary Clinton. Vote for Hillary Clinton on November 8 and ensure that Donald Trump is defeated. Otherwise you risk waking up on November 9 with your conscience very much full of regret.

(Note: A previous version of this article said that the Progressive Change Campaign Committee had endorsed Clinton. In fact, the organization has not, at this point, endorsed Clinton.)

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- With Adele's song "All I Ask" playing in the background, a Maryland teenager opened her computer and wrote an emotional letter to President Barack Obama.

"I am an American, I grew up here. I say the Pledge of Allegiance every day," Aleena Khan told the President. "And yet, I am a Muslim."

Which one, she asked, is she allowed to be?

Aleena is 17, with a bright smile and dark hair that sweeps across her shoulders. Her mother is Indian-American, her father emigrated from Pakistan. Aleena and her two sisters have lived in Maryland their whole lives.

Last year, as part of an honors research project on identity crises among Muslim-American teenagers, Aleena spent hours online combing through public comments on news articles about Muslims. What she read shocked her.

"Kick them all out and put the rest in detainment camps. Enough with the PC feces," said one commenter.

"The only peaceful and moderate Muslims are the dead ones," said another.

The tweet from the man wearing military camouflage was the worst, Aleena said. "Hard to tell what we should build first. A border wall or a gas chamber for Muslims."

Aleena sat on the floor of her room, stunned. These people were talking about her mother, her father, her sisters, her cousins, her friends. They were talking about her. If it were just one comment, she could ignore it. But there were so many.

"This is what people think about me?" she wondered. "If I go out and say I'm Muslim will my friends still be my friends? Will people like me anymore?"

She texted her best friend, Haley, telling her what people were saying about Muslims. People are ignorant, Haley answered.

It's difficult to measure a sentiment such as Islamophobia, the word for hatred and fear of Muslims. But it's also hard to escape the idea that being Muslim in America today is like watching comment sections spring to lurid life. The anti-Muslim rallies, the vicious hate crimes, the racial profiling, the threats and taunts and questions about divided loyalties.

Scholars say Islamophobia seems to surge after attacks by Muslim extremists and during presidential campaigns, when candidates pledge to get tough on terrorists, often by singling out Muslims. Just this week, after a Muslim man was charged with detonating bombs in New York and New Jersey and another was accused of stabbing 10 people in Minnesota, GOP presidential nominee Donald Trump urged local police officers to profile "suspicious" people, "like they do in Israel."

"Do we really have a choice?" Trump said. "We're trying to be so politically correct in our country, and this is only going to get worse."

Even before the recent attacks, American Muslims lived under a dark cloud of suspicion. In 2014, they surpassed atheists as the country's "least accepted" religious group.

An estimated 3.3 million Muslims live in the United States, and between September 11, 2001 and the end of last year, 344 have been involved in violent extremism, according to the Triangle Center on Terrorism and Homeland Security. That number does not include attacks from this year, such as the shooting at an Orlando nightclub by Omar Mateen, who killed 49 people.

Still, violent extremists are outnumbered nearly 10,000 to 1 in the United States, which means that Omar Mateen is not the norm. Aleena Khan is.

Aleena graduated from Northwest High School in Germantown, where she gave tours to guests, was a member of four honor societies and ran the Green Club with her friend Haley, helping the school earn Green Ribbon environmental status -- "a nationally recognized thing," she says with a smidge of satisfaction. One of the few clubs she didn't join is the Muslim Student Association. "I didn't want to separate myself from the rest of my classmates," she said.

In her free time, Aleena has tutored young children, interned at a Christian clothing website and volunteered for a company that helps poor and abused women sell handmade wares. This fall, she began her freshman year at George Washington University in Washington, where she plans to study public policy. She hopes, one day, to improve the foster care system, a goal inspired by a recent documentary.

But being a Muslim in America hasn't been easy, Aleena says, even before the recent rash of Islamophobia.

There's the annual Ramadan challenge, which means skipping lunch with classmates and fasting from water during the dog days of summer. She's doesn't wear shorts, tank tops or bikinis, though many of her friends do. Dating is discouraged, and her parents forbade her from attending the school prom. Friends tried to cheer her up, insisting the dance wasn't that fun, but Aleena saw the pictures, and it sure looked fun.

If Aleena were an Orthodox Jew or conservative Christian, she might yield to similar restrictions and feel like she was swimming against a cultural riptide. But few would question her American identity or allegiance.

Aleena wrote her letter to Obama on February 3, the day of his first visit to an American mosque as President, a date many Muslims believe was too long in coming. She thanked Obama for his faith in Muslim-Americans. It was like an oxygen tank, she told the President, allowing her to breathe a big sigh of relief.

But even with Obama's encouragement, Aleena held some doubts. Will other Americans really accept her, especially when the country seems so anxious and tense?

"Muslims live in fear that they will be attacked," she wrote in her honors project. "Americans live in fear that Muslims will attack them."

After submitting her letter through the White House website, Aleena felt silly, believing no one would read it. She deleted it from her computer and forgot about it.

'So what? They're Muslim'

Most Americans don't actually know any Muslims -- at least, not personally.

More than 6 in 10 have seldom or never had a conversation with a Muslim, according to a study conducted by the Public Religion Research Institute. Most Americans also say they know little (57%) or nothing at all (26%) about Islam.

Those numbers have barely budged in 30 years, even after 9/11, two American-led wars in Muslim-majority countries, dozens of terrorist attacks worldwide, high-profile congressional hearings and copious media coverage of Islam. All of which suggests that Americans are not just widely ignorant about Islam and Muslims, they are also oddly incurious.

Few things are more frightening than ignorance in action, to paraphrase a German poet.

Muslims have been shot and killed, execution-style, in their living rooms and outside of their mosques. They have been fatally stabbed on their way home. They have been beaten in their stores, in their schools and on the streets. They have been kicked off airplanes, egged outside Walmart, scorched with hot coffee in a park, shot in cabs and punched while pushing their children in strollers. Their clothes have been set on fire and their children have been bullied. Men have come to their door and told them that they would burn down their house if they did not move away. They have been fired for wearing hijabs and for praying. They have seen their cemeteries vandalized and their Quran desecrated. A Muslim congressman has received death threats, and business owners have posted signs advertising "Muslim-free zones."

Heavily armed men have protested outside mosques in Texas and Arizona, arguing that it's their patriotic duty to protect the country from Islam.

People have covered the doors of a mosque with feces and torn pages of the Quran, left a severed pig's head outside a mosque, firebombed mosques, urinated on mosques, spray-painted the Star of David and satanic symbols on mosques, carved swastikas and crude drawings of penises into signs at mosques, set fire to mosques, threatened to blow up mosques and kill "you Muslim f\*\*\*\*," fired rounds from high-powered rifles into mosques, wrapped bacon around the door handles of mosques, left hoax bombs and fake grenades at mosques, threatened to decapitate congregants at mosques, sent suspicious substances to mosques, written notes saying, "We hate you," "We will burn all of you" and "Leave our country" to mosques, rammed a tractor-trailer into a mosque, thrown bricks and stones through the windows of mosques, pelted Muslims with rocks as they left mosques and stood outside mosques shouting, "How many of you Muslims are terrorists?"

American Muslims have been told that a mosque, unlike churches and synagogues, cannot serve as an election polling station. Dozens of communities have fought to keep Muslims from building mosques in their neighborhoods, sometimes threatening violence.

From 2001 to 2014, there were 2,288 anti-Islamic incidents targeting 2,745 Muslims, according to the FBI. Statistics for 2015 will not be released until November. A study conducted by the Center for the Study of Hate and Extremism, however, projects that anti-Muslim hate crimes surged nearly 70% last year, reaching a level of violence not seen since the aftermath of the 9/11 attacks. And many Muslim activists believe hate crimes are underreported by victims and not pursued vigorously by police and prosecutors. This year, the FBI has begun counting anti-Arab incidents as well.

Politicians have claimed that 85% of mosques are controlled by Islamic extremists and that Islam is a political system, not a religion, and thus not protected by the First Amendment. They have threatened to "arrest every Muslim that comes across the state line" and pledged to bar Muslim refugees from the country. They have sanctioned spying on mosques without warrants and the racial profiling of Muslim communities. They have accused Muslims of launching a "civilizational jihad" and called Islam a "cancer in our nation that needs to be cut out." They have shut down schools over lessons on Islam and called innocuous school materials dangerous propaganda. More than 30 states have considered bills to "protect" their civil courts from Islamic law, and nine states (Alabama, Arizona, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Dakota and Tennessee) enacted the bans. They have said Muslims cannot be president of the United States. They have said Muslims should not be here at all.

Challenged about Trump's proposed ban on Muslims entering the United States, his spokeswoman, Katrina Pierson, said, "So what? They're Muslim."

A coterie of well-funded pundits and self-proclaimed experts encourage Americans to fear all Muslims and the "creeping" influence of Islamic law in the United States. They cast Muslims as "enemies among us," Trojan horses for an insurgency that will topple the republic and conquer its citizens.

Even many liberal politicians, while insisting most Muslims are peaceful, only mention Islam when speaking about national security and countering violent extremism.

"Islam is not thought of as American religion," said Zareena Grewal, a professor of religious studies at Yale University, "however much Muslim-Americans wish that to be true."

In 2011, more than half of American Muslims under 30 said they had been treated with suspicion, called offensive names, singled out by law enforcement or been physically threatened in the preceding year alone, according to a Pew Center report.

Asad Tarsin, a writer and doctor, lives in California with his wife and three young children.

"I know that they will be integrated in America and fully accept their American identity. My question is whether America will fully accept them."

'The Mohammedan world'

Islamophobia didn't start on September 11. It's intricately entwined with America's oldest idea: that this land is, and should always be, a white Protestant nation.

Well before the Pilgrims landed in "New Jerusalem," Columbus had set sail on a mission to find riches to retake "old" Jerusalem from the Ottoman Empire. Centuries later, when Colonists sought to unite the states, anti-federalists railed against the Constitution. Nothing in the new document, they fumed, would prevent a Muslim (or a Catholic) from becoming president.

The first Muslims to arrive en masse came in chains. Scholars estimate that some 10,000 to 20,000 slaves from West Africa were Muslims. A few were granted preferential treatment because they could read and write Arabic, and looked "whiter" than other slaves. They were paraded across the country like prized pets, until they started advocating for their emancipation.

"Such is the bloodthirsty, tyrannical Mahometan negro, who is now travelling himself and suite, up and down through the free states in pomp, with the President's passport in his pocket," snarled one Southern newspaper about a Muslim slave freed by President John Adams.

Within a few generations, African Islam was extinguished, snuffed out by plantation owners who converted their slaves to Christianity.

In the 1880s, Muslim **immigrants** from the tottering Ottoman Empire began to arrive. Before they were allowed into the county, they were required to sign oaths swearing that they owed no loyalty to the empire's Sultan. Even then, most were not allowed to become citizens.

The United States was committed to the idea that its future depended on its identity as a white Christian nation, said Kambiz GhaneaBassiri, author of "A History of Islam in America."

"The presumption has been that all Muslims are considered suspect until proven otherwise."

The Naturalization Act of 1790 allowed only "free white persons" to become US citizens. After the Civil War, "persons of African descent" were added to the list. By the racial classifications of the era, most Muslim **immigrants** were neither. Laws passed in 1917 and 1924 made it even harder for Asian and Middle Eastern Muslims to **immigrate** and become citizens.

In 1942, a Michigan judge denied a Yemeni man's case for citizenship. Apart from the man's dark skin, he ruled, it was "well-known" that Arabs "are part of the Mohammedan world ... and a wide gulf separates their culture from the predominantly Christian peoples of Europe."

Those Christian peoples, of course, trace their religious roots to the Middle East -- the very region the judge deemed irremediably "Mohammedan." By that logic, Muslim **immigrants** argued, Jesus himself could not be an American citizen. The judge was not persuaded.

Even Muslims born and raised in the United States were considered suspicious, especially if they were not white. As thousands of blacks embraced new, Islam-inspired movements such as the Moorish Science Temple and Nation of Islam in the mid-20th century, the FBI kept a nervous watch.

"Though it did not produce peer-reviewed scholarship," writes scholar Edward Curtis, "the FBI was by far the most prolific student of Muslim groups in the first half of the 20th century."

The FBI's report on the Nation of Islam fretted that black Muslims demonstrate "fearless and outspoken anti-white, anti-Christian attitudes. ... As long as racial inequity continues, the militant and arrogant manner of cult members remains a potential threat of violent action."

In 1965, the United States eased **immigration** restrictions, opening the door to nearly 3 million **immigrants**, many economic refugees from countries with sizable Muslim populations.

Today, no one knows exactly how many Muslims live in the United States. Obama said there are nearly 7 million, then corrected himself and said 5 million. Many scholars estimate between 6 million and 8 million. Most media cite the nonpartisan Pew Research Center's estimate of around 3.3 million.

Pew says that number will climb past 8 million by 2050, when Muslims will become the second-largest religious group in the United States, a surge driven by **immigration**, large families and the relative youth of American Muslims (their median age in 2010 was 23). Even in 2050, though, Muslims will only make up 2% of the US population.

Islam is the only American religion without a majority race or ethnic group. Muslims living in the United States come from 77 different countries, according to Pew. About 30% describe themselves as white, 23% as black and 21% as Asian. Likewise, every strand of religious commitment is represented here, from puritanical Salafis to mystic-minded Sufis to Muslims who rarely pray or visit mosques.

While many Muslims praise the diversity of their American community, in practice it has made it difficult for them to forge a group identity or rally around common causes and national leaders. More than half of men and 42% of women said no national Muslim group in the United States represents their interests, according to a 2011 Gallup poll.

Instead, Muslims have often retreated into ethnic enclaves, hired imams from their homeland and disengaged from the broader culture. Three-fourths of American mosques are dominated by one ethnic group, whether it be Arab, South Asian or African-American, according to a study conducted in 2011. In the last five years, many American Muslims have worked to make their mosques more diverse.

Still, even Muslims born in the United States have idealized Islamic institutions and leaders overseas, particularly in the Middle East, viewing them as more authentically Muslim. In a strange way, it's as if they agreed with those who argue that Islam is a faith foreign to America.

Even top Muslim scholars and spokesmen have felt the lure of that idea.

Sheikh Hamza Yusuf is co-founder of Zaytuna College in California, the country's first accredited Muslim college. Yusuf, who is white, converted to Islam in 1977 and soon thereafter left the United States to study with Islamic scholars in the Middle East and Africa. When he returned after a decade overseas, he felt lost, spiritually and emotionally.

"I had no context for being an American Muslim," he said. "It was almost like abandoning my American-ness."

Living in 'the grayzone'

Before he went on his murderous rampage at the Pulse nightclub, Omar Mateen googled Sheikh Hamza Yusuf. He might have been seeking Yusuf's religious guidance; he might have wanted to kill him.

In its online magazine in April, ISIS listed Yusuf among 21 "obligatory targets" for its followers to "make an example of." It was the second time the terrorist group had threatened Yusuf's life.

Yusuf said he likely angered ISIS by preaching a sermon in 2014 in which he called them "stupid young boys." More than 540,000 people have watched the sermon on YouTube in English, and many more in other languages.

ISIS' antipathy toward Yusuf goes beyond any one sermon. It also knows he is one of the few Muslim leaders with credibility to challenge its message to Western Muslims: You don't belong there. Come to the caliphate where you can live as a true Muslim.

"This revival of the Khilāfah gave each individual Muslim a concrete and tangible entity to satisfy his natural desire for belonging to something greater," ISIS said in a recent edition of Dabiq.

In the same edition, alongside interviews with ISIS fighters, articles praising "martyrs" and gruesome photos of its beheaded and burned victims, ISIS argued that Muslims in the West are living in a "grayzone."

The terrorists' goal is to divide the world into two camps: "the crusaders" and "the caliphate."

No Christians living in Muslim lands; no Muslims living in Christian countries. "Grayzones" are areas where Muslims practice their religion peacefully in non-Muslim countries. ISIS wants to eliminate these zones, in part by turning non-Muslims against their Muslim neighbors. Each terrorist attack chips away a little more grayzone, as Westerners marginalize Muslims, pushing them, ISIS hopes, into the caliphate's open arms.

"Muslims in the crusader countries will find themselves driven to abandon their homes for a place to live in the (caliphate), as the crusaders increase persecution against Muslims living in Western lands. ..."

Most American Muslims reject that message, but a few are inspired by it.

According to a study of 101 Americans charged with ISIS-related crimes, half were born in the country and most were citizens. Most were men under 30, one-third had converted to Islam. The vast majority expressed dissatisfaction with living in the United States, and 90% reportedly said they wanted to join the caliphate, perhaps heeding the call to surrender their lives to a larger cause, no matter how violent or quixotic.

"Overall, there is a sense of identity crises and **alienation** from society across a wide range of cases," the report says. "Anxieties over not fitting in, examples of personal isolation and social anger are frequent."

Those anxieties are often exacerbated, if not incited, by Islamophobia, said Sarah Lyons-Padilla, a social psychologist at Stanford University who has studied radicalization among young American Muslims.

American Muslims who felt hopeless, rejected and insignificant because of anti-Muslim discrimination were more willing to support extremist groups and causes, according to a study Lyons-Padilla led last year.

"ISIS would love to make all Muslims believe that the West is anti-Islam," the psychologist said. "When American politicians and citizens spread anti-Muslim rhetoric, be it through discriminatory policies or online trolling, they send the message that Muslims aren't 'real Americans' and that being Muslim is something to be ashamed of. In other words, they're basically helping ISIS recruit."

Counterterrorism officials agree.

In a recent Washington Post op-ed, retired US Army Gen. and former CIA Director David Petraeus said he has grown increasingly concerned about anti-Muslim rhetoric in the United States.

"As policy, these concepts are totally counterproductive," Petraeus said. "Rather than making our country safer, they will compound the already grave terrorist danger to our citizens. As ideas, they are toxic and, indeed, non-biodegradable -- a kind of poison that, once released into our body politic, is not easily expunged."

The number of American Muslims who radicalize is small, especially when compared with other Western countries, said William McCants, director of the Brookings Institution's Project on US Relations with the Islamic World.

Law enforcement experts estimate that about 250 Americans have tried to join ISIS, far fewer than the thousands who have flocked to Syria and Iraq from countries such as France and Belgium.

"I would argue that American Islam is doing something right in contrast to these other countries," McCants said.

Most American Muslims are integrated and feel content with their lives, in sharp contrast with many Muslims in Western Europe, according to the 2011 Pew Center report. Nearly 90% speak English fluently, and more than 8 in 10 are citizens. Most say they see no conflict between being a devout Muslim and living in a modern society.

Still, 81 Muslim-Americans were associated with violent plots in 2015, the highest annual total since 9/11, according to the Triangle Center.

Omar Suleiman, a popular cleric who lives in Dallas, said he has sparred with young Muslims attracted to ISIS' black-and-white theology. Often, they are first- and second-generation **immigrants** who have grown up with some discrimination and "a whole lot of other-ness and awkwardness," he said. They are angry young men, frustrated with dead-end careers, irked by clerics who refuse to address controversial topics and incensed about the suffering of Muslims overseas in the Palestinian territories and Syria.

"When they find that people aren't addressing their concerns in an authentic way, they fall prey to Internet radicalism," Suleiman said. "They become disconnected from the mosque and disconnected from the American Muslim community."

Aleena's answer

Several months after submitting her letter to the President, Aleena received a call from the White House. Naturally, she thought it was a prank.

On the line was Asra Najam, who works in the White House Office of Presidential Correspondence. She said members of the Obama administration had read Aleena's letter and been touched by her honesty. Najam wanted to know if she could post it on the White House's Tumblr.

But there was another reason Najam was calling.

Najam's family emigrated from Pakistan when she was 4, moving to a Detroit suburb. She was 10 when the 9/11 attacks occurred. She remembers the comments people made about Islam in the aftermath, how she felt guilty just for being Muslim, how that feeling lingered for years.

"I was that 17-year-old-girl, like Aleena. I was lost, confused, unsure of how my identity fit into the broader American picture.

"But I definitely didn't have the courage to write the most powerful man on the planet about it," she said with a laugh.

Najam said she still struggles with her identity as an American Muslim, even though her desk looks out on the White House lawn, the country's most prestigious piece of real estate. She didn't know any Muslim women when she started looking for jobs in Washington, and she was terrified. Now she writes letters on behalf of the President.

Aleena's letter led to an invite to an Eid celebration in July at the White House, where she and Najam met in person. They snapped a picture in the ornate East Room and bonded over Adele, whom Aleena mentioned in her letter to the President.

Obama himself gave a short speech that afternoon, while Aleena, her mother and a family friend stood yards away, straining for a closer look among the 400 guests and the smartphones craned upward to record the moment.

As he had in his visit to the mosque in Baltimore, Obama praised American Muslims, calling them an "essential part of the fabric of our country."

But he also said he gets "heartbreaking" letters from American Muslims who tell him that they are anxious and afraid, especially now. He said he had a special message for the young people in the room: "We see you, we believe in you."

"And despite what you may sometimes hear, you've got to know that you're a valued part of the American family, and there's nothing that you cannot do."

It was an answer to Aleena's question: Which one am I allowed to be?

Both, the President said.

How can she be both? Aleena says that's a question she -- and all American Muslims -- have to answer for themselves.

She offers only one bit of advice: Speak up. You never know who might be listening.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated 3:58 p.m. ET -- Updates death toll to 162; additional edits

CAIRO (CNN) -- At least 162 people drowned when a migrant boat capsized this week off the coast of Egypt, state media Ahram Online reported Friday.

The overloaded boat bound for Italy was believed to have been carrying 450 migrants when it overturned Wednesday. Only 164 have been rescued and many more are feared missing.

A local fisherman told CNN his boat retrieved dozens of bodies Friday morning.

"There aren't enough ambulances or body bags," Mohamed Abassi said.

Naval forces on Friday afternoon pulled 107 bodies from the Mediterranean and they expect more, authorities said.

Some family members blocked a highway, asking authorities to step up efforts to retrieve the bodies.

"If the bodies spent more time in the water, people won't be able to identify them," Abassi said.

Survivors of the shipwreck described awful scenes to CNN of friends and family members drowning in the Mediterranean.

Some relatives of those on the boat asked why it took several hours for coast guard rescue ships to reach the scene, saying local fishermen had come to their aid first.

Four crew members were arrested Thursday over the sinking of the boat, state media reported. The men were detained on possible charges of human trafficking and involuntary manslaughter. One is the owner of the vessel.

The boat had set off from Egypt and was heading for Italy when it was found Wednesday afternoon 12 nautical miles northeast of Rashid -- also known as Rosetta -- in El Beheira governorate.

Many of those on board were from Egypt, Eritrea and Somalia, according to survivors.

The Egyptian military has regularly announced efforts to combat illegal **immigration**. On the same day the boat capsized near Rashid, the coast guard foiled an illegal **immigration** attempt, rescuing 294 on board a boat off the shore of El-Alamein, according to a military statement.

As Libya -- a popular jumping-off point for migrants seeking to reach Europe from North Africa -- becomes increasingly dangerous, more people may attempt to make the journey from Egypt's shores, instead.

Journalist Sarah Sirgany reported from Cairo; CNN's Ian Lee reported from Istanbul, and Laura Smith-Spark wrote in London.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNN) -- I WAS COVERING the 2016 presidential election at CNN for more than a year when I made a confession to my husband: I felt a pang of sadness whenever I heard the national anthem at a Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton rally.

Everyone around me would stand up and put their right hand over their heart. I wanted to do it too -- I love the Star Spangled Banner -- but I didn't think I had the right because I was not an American.

When I shared this with my husband, feeling silly as I got emotional, he told me something wonderful -- that it was absolutely OK for me to do this if I wanted to.

"There's no rule that says you can't. All it means is that you love this country," he said.

MENSAH KODUAH, 54, is from Ghana. He drives a taxi and has lived in the United States for 20 years. Pamela Aquino, 28, was born in the Dominican Republic and **immigrated** here when she was a little girl. Chandra and Amara Nandikolla are from India and live in the Bronx -- he is a software engineer at a bank and she is a physician in training.

Together, we were among the 296 **immigrants** from 53 countries who became American citizens on Ellis Island last Friday.

As I recited the Oath of Allegiance with my right hand raised in the air, the historical significance of where I stood was overwhelming. An estimated 12 million **immigrants** came to America through this gateway -- some of the benches we were sitting on were used by the **immigrants** who came to New York harbor on ships.

I owe my new citizenship to at least several of those people. One of my husband's great-grandmothers, Brana Frimet, sailed to Ellis Island from Antwerp in the 1920s. (Some of his other relatives have been harder to track down because we believe their Yiddish names were at some point Anglicized.)

The process of becoming a citizen can feel complex, time-consuming and expensive for many **immigrants**. For me, it has also coincided with a wild presidential election -- one that I have covered for the last 16 months as a political reporter for CNN.

Despite the arduous process, there has been an uptick this year in people applying for US citizenship, and **immigration** experts say many are motivated by the desire to vote in November. And so I found myself the subject of one of the most hotly debated political issues this cycle: **immigration**.

I vividly remember an exchange I had at a Trump campaign rally in Iowa last fall. I approached a man and asked who he was voting for, and he responded that he was leaning toward Trump because he was tired of the "new Americans" coming into the country.

"The people that are coming in here from China, Indonesia and all of them countries, they're getting pregnant and coming here and having babies," the man told me. "They get everything and the people that were born here can't get everything."

He said he didn't mean to offend me.

THE MAN at that Trump rally was right: I am a "new American." In fact, I am the first person in my family to become an US citizen.

But he was wrong if he assumed that my family had somehow tried to game the system.

Like most Koreans of their generation, my parents grew up poor after the Korean War. My father fiercely believed as a young man that the United States was the greatest country on earth. After my brother and I were born, he became obsessed with finding a way to give us an American education.

When he saw a professional opening in Hong Kong, he jumped on the opportunity, moving my family away from Korea when I was seven. My brother and I enrolled in an American school, where we learned English and adapted to our new surroundings. We had privileged childhoods.

I decided to move to the U.S. to attend boarding school in 11th grade. I never left, and painfully, that means I haven't lived in the same country as my parents in 13 years.

Although most people assume that I am American, I've faced constant reminders that I am not from here.

Sometimes it's trivial things like not knowing certain cultural references or English idioms (my colleagues recently taught me the meaning of "worth dying on a hill," and I fully intend to overuse it.)

At other times, it's feeling left out or lonely. I hate that I am 29 and I've never voted. I envy people who are called for jury duty, and it's gotten harder as I've gotten older to be so far away from my parents.

I've also experienced outright rejection: After graduating from Georgetown, I was offered an entry-level job in journalism, but when the employer found out I was on a visa, they took back the offer. I was devastated.

Covering this election has at times exacerbated this nagging feeling that I don't fully belong. The campaign has taken me to towns and neighborhoods where I felt certain that I was the only non-white person, and where the first question I am most often asked is where I am from.

When a stranger yells at me: "Konichiwa" or "Ni hao," I never know how to respond.

Meeting my husband has made me both more Korean and more American.

He is so interested in my Korean heritage and constantly reminds me that the further away I am from my family, the more important it is for me to embrace my roots. He is delighted to answer my never-ending questions about U.S. history and culture.

Long before the citizenship ceremony, he started to call me his "American girl" -- he said I couldn't be more patriotic.

AS I'VE TRAVELED the country during this election, I've encountered countless voters who are turned off and uninspired. That's not surprising: polls show that either Trump and Clinton would assume the presidency with historically high unpopularity ratings.

But if so much of the national coverage has focused on the negativity, insults and controversies, there is also the less told story of **immigrants** inspired by this election. They include long-time permanent residents who are applying for citizenship so that they can vote in a US election for the first time.

Koduah, the taxi driver from Ghana I met on Ellis Island last week, told me this year's election is what persuaded him to finally apply for citizenship.

"I want to be part of the American fabric," Koduah said. At first, he said he preferred not to share who he was voting for. But as we continued to chat, Koduah smiled widely and blurted out: "By the way -- I'll vote for Hillary."

The Nandikollas, the couple from India, told me they will be casting their first ballots for different nominees.

Chandra said he will vote for Trump because he believes the Republican nominee is a "very strong" leader. His wife, Amara, joked that she didn't want to get into an argument. But on a more serious note, she said she has been taken aback by Trump's rhetoric about **immigrants** and will support Clinton because she feels the Democratic nominee is more capable than Trump.

But Nandikollas said they felt the same way about becoming an American.

"I'm so grateful to this country," Chandra said. "Now I want to give it back to this country."

According to the US Citizenship and **Immigration** Services, more than 38,000 people became naturalized citizens last week. **Immigration** experts say they've seen an increase in citizenship applications this year compared to 2015.

While that is not an unusual phenomenon in an election year, according to USCIS data analyzed by the National **Immigration** Forum, applications are up about 8.4% in 2016 compared to 2012.

Ali Noorani, the group's executive director, said they have found that the overwhelming majority of eligible green card holders decide to apply for citizenship once they are educated about the benefits of becoming a citizen.

"We found that to be a function of two things: they wanted to make sure that their voices were heard at the ballot box this year and second, they understood there are certain privileges and protections that came with U.S. citizenship," Noorani said. "Access to better jobs, being able to travel freely -- those are frankly nuts and bolts opportunities that U.S. citizens take for granted."

LAST FRIDAY was one of the most joyous days of my life.

Inside the main hall on Ellis Island, a woman sang the national anthem and I proudly placed my hand over my heart.

After I recited the Oath of Allegiance, these were the first words I heard as an American citizen from Robert Katzmann, the Chief Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit.

"My fellow citizens. How good it is to say that," Katzmann told us. "Our country, this great country, is even stronger, even greater than it was moments ago, because you are now citizens."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Kix Brooks, one half of the country music duo Brooks and Dunn, is not buying the gloom and doom expressed on the campaign trail about America's declining greatness -- often espoused by Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's campaign slogan, "Make America Great Again."

"We've always been great, as far as I'm concerned," the country music artist, whose classic 2001 hit "Only America" with Ronnie Dunn became an anthem for patriotism following the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks, told CNN.

"There's a lot of stuff that we can do better and there's a lot of stuff that we do better than anybody in the world, but that's life. That's our project as Americans -- we always work to be better," he continued.

But Brooks, who considers himself to be "fairly conservative," is not optimistic that the next commander-in-chief will be able to make good on his or her promises to solve some of the country's most divisive issues if Washington remains gridlocked and the US continues to be as "polarized" as it is today.

Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton has promised to work with Congress to implement comprehensive **immigration** reform and pledged to take on the gun lobby to institute "common sense" gun-control measures.

Meanwhile, Trump has promised to build a wall on the southern border between the US and Mexico.

"I think all the issues that are on the table, from gun control to **immigration**, are so complicated, there is no easy answer," Brooks told CNN. "None of these problems are going to be solved overnight or probably in the next four years no matter what either candidate says."

On gun culture

Lamenting the hostility that has often plagued the gun-control debate on both sides, the "Boot Scootin' Boogie" artist said that the right to bear arms is an American principle that "should be respected."

"We do have a Second Amendment and it's something that should be respected and discussed in a civilized way," Brooks said. "My only concerns are that Second Amendment rights are discussed with so much ferocity that sometimes we don't hear what each other is saying."

Brooks, who is an avid hunter, grew up in Shreveport, Louisiana, along the Red River, and as he toured the country to play music over the last two decades, he witnessed a stark cultural divide between rural and urban America when it comes to guns.

While Americans in rural America "never considered what a gang was," Brooks said, those in urban America also don't understand that "having a shotgun in the back of your pick up truck was also just a way of life" for Americans like him.

Brooks is a strong supporter of states' rights and said that gun-control solutions to address gang violence and gun violence in American cities are not necessarily needed or effective in rural America.

"I don't feel like what's good for California is good for Tennessee, is good for Louisiana, is good for New York City," Brooks said," adding, that local "leaders in our own communities know much better what our problems are and how we should deal with them than Washington, D.C., does."

And as for election 2016, Brooks did not say who he is voting for but said if he hears a candidate speaking along those lines, he tends "to listen more closely."

On 'Only in America'

Many artists have protested when politicians with views they oppose use their songs during campaign events. However, when then-Democratic presidential nominee Barack Obama played Brooks and Dunn's "Only in America" at the 2008 Democratic National Convention, that was not the case.

"Seems ironic that the same song Bush used at the Republican Convention last election would be used by Obama and the Democrats now," Brooks said at the time. "Very flattering to know our song crossed parties and potentially inspires all Americans."

Brooks, who was a supporter of President George W. Bush, said that he co-wrote "Only in America" with his friend and music producer Don Cook -- a Democrat -- after they spent day in the woods, riding four-wheelers near Brooks' farm and talking about how grateful they are to be Americans.

"The song was never meant to be political in any way. It still isn't," Brooks said. "The song is patriotic ... Call it corny or flag-waving or whatever you want to, but I'm really sincere about it. It means a lot to me -- our country does and everything it stands for."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- As Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton prepare to square off Monday night in their first debate, the expectations are clear: Political bloodsport in primetime.

The 2016 race has been notably nasty, with Trump assuming the attack dog role campaigns have traditionally outsourced to running mates and surly surrogates. Clinton too has shown a willingness to blitz Trump -- though in less graphic terms -- during speeches and interviews on the trail.

But does the current election season represent a new low in American politics? History says no -- and a group of historians interviewed by CNN agree.

Exhibit A: "That hideous hermaphroditical character, which has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman."

Exhibit B: "Around him, as the candidate for the highest office in the gift of the people, the most corrupt, the most designing and the most dangerous of the community rally."

Exhibit C: "We are Republicans, and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been rum, Romanism, and rebellion."

Presidential candidates, their campaigns and supporters have been slinging mud since the Founding Fathers were jockeying for power in the aftermath of the revolution. The contests of the 19th century routinely descended into cesspools of public deviance, racism, and religious and personal slander.

"The machinations, the backstabbing, the hideous caricatures and slurs were just devastating," historian Joan Waugh told CNN.

"It was a bloodsport," she said. "I have to laugh, when I'm not weeping, at the utter abysmal ignorance of the way that politics and the history of politics is often reported. As if nothing today has ever happened before."

1800: 'That hideous hermaphroditical character'

The first race of the new century was a rematch of the 1796 contest, pitting President John Adams, a Federalist, against Thomas Jefferson. In American politics in those early days, the parties were less important and the candidates didn't campaign much in person, mostly allowing partisan allies and hired hands to do the dirty work.

And there was none more foul than Jeffersonian hatchet man James T. Callender.

In a pamphlet titled, "The Prospect Before Us," the Scottish **immigrant** described Adams as a "hideous hermaphroditical character, which has neither the force and firmness of a man, nor the gentleness and sensibility of a woman." (For his trouble, Callender would eventually be convicted of violating the Sedition Act and jailed, only to be freed when Jefferson took office.)

Candidates in this era operated under both social and statutory constraints. It was considered unseemly to seek votes or speak ill of the opposition. And the Sedition Act made it illegal to write or print anything "malicious" about the government -- especially its President.

"Famously, when a guy in a bar, half-drunk, said that John Adams had a fat ass -- which is also factually true -- the guy was put in jail," Pulitzer Prize-winning historian Edward J. Larson told CNN. "So you had to watch what you said directly about Adams. You could get away with saying anything you wanted about others in the Federalist party."

While the Jeffersonians feared Adams was fixing to dispense with the American experiment in favor of something like the British monarchy, the Federalists were equally convinced that Jefferson would effectively open the borders to foreign radicals and clamp down on religion.

As one Massachusetts newspaper put it, electing "the infidel Jefferson" would mean "our churches will be prostrated, and some infamous prostitute, under the title of the Goddess of Reason, will preside in the Sanctuaries now devoted to the worship of the Most High."

Of course, none of it was true.

"Jefferson was not an atheist," Larson explained. In fact, the Virginian and Adams "had almost identical religious viewpoints. They were both Unitarians. Adams' religious viewpoints were almost indistinguishable from Jefferson's and they knew that. They had been close friends."

Their relationship would last another quarter century, until they died on the same day -- July 4, 1826.

1828: 'The skunks of party slander'

In the first -- but not final -- American campaign drama widely considered to have sent one of its central characters to an early grave, another incumbent Adams was defeated in an electoral rematch from four years earlier.

Like in 1800, the 1824 contest had gone to the House of Representatives. John Quincy Adams fared better than his father, winning the presidency over Andrew Jackson by obtaining the support of House Speaker Henry Clay in what opponents called the "corrupt bargain" -- Adams would name Clay his secretary of state.

This did not sit well with Jackson, a hard-bitten man who was orphaned as a teen and made his name in combat against the British and then by leading a violent campaign against Native American tribes. He would spend the next four years plotting his revenge.

"The campaign of 1828 was very nasty, a campaign in which supporters of Andrew Jackson called John Quincy Adams a 'pimp' (the rumor, started by Jackson allies, was that Adams during his time as the US minister to Russia had provided female companionship for the czar) and supporters of John Quincy called Jackson and his wife 'polygamists' because they had married before her divorce came through," said CNN presidential historian Tim Naftali.

Kerwin Swint, an author and professor at Kennesaw State University, recalled it being particularly hard on the Jackson family.

"Andrew Jackson's mother was caricatured as a common prostitute that the sailors brought over for the benefit of the English Navy," he said, while Jackson himself "was called a murderer, a traitor, and mentally unstable."

Adams dismissed the vile tone of the campaign, chalking up the slurs to those "skunks of party slander." The President, though, was not so high-minded that his associates didn't accuse Jackson of being illiterate, while mocking his poor spelling skills and keeping up attacks on his wife, Rachel.

The harsh spotlight wore on her and, as many historians agree and Jackson then believed, probably had a hand in killing her.

"I would rather be a doorkeeper in the house of God than live in that palace in Washington," she is said to have told friends as the campaign turned ugly.

Rachel Jackson died on Dec. 22, 1828, likely of a heart attack. She would be buried on Christmas Eve, before her husband's inauguration.

At her funeral, Andrew Jackson is widely reported to have told fellow mourners, "I can and do forgive all my enemies. But those vile wretches who have slandered her must look to God for mercy."

Her tombstone at the Hermitage, Jackson's home in Nashville, read in part: "A being so gentle, and yet so virtuous, slander might wound but could not dishonour."

1860: 'Stephen in search of his mother'

"At political rallies in (Abraham) Lincoln's era, people got drunk, they had fist fights, they threw excrement, they attacked horses, they screamed and shouted and cursed -- did I mention they drank; they drank a lot -- and it was not exactly a festive atmosphere," the historian and Lincoln scholar Harold Holzer told CNN. "It was a scary atmosphere."

In the years before the public flocked to see heavyweights in the ring or on the gridiron, many would bring their booze and off-hours aggressions to campaign rallies -- drunken parades and parties that made little mention of the candidates, who rarely if ever attended.

Lincoln in particular steered clear of the trail, as outright campaigning was still considered unbecoming of a future chief executive. So when one of the four candidates in the 1860 race, the Democrat Stephen A. Douglas, announced he was going to travel from Chicago to New Hampshire, by way of New Orleans, to visit his sick mother, political opponents and the partisan press drew their daggers.

"Douglas made a speech every time the train stopped for water and coal," Holzer said. And for that, "he was mocked brutally as a momma's boy, as 'little Steven in search of his mother,' insulting his independence, his manhood, making him look like a pipsqueak -- which he was -- so he was personally assailed."

The broader sweep of the 1860 campaign was much darker. Conspiracy theories and race hate were the prevailing the themes in a four-way showdown that left the Democratic Party in shambles and cleared the way for the first shots of the Civil War just a few months later.

The table had been set by a Supreme Court decision three years earlier, in 1857's Dred Scott decision, when it declared that African Americans could not be US citizens. The ruling aggravated tensions between the northern and southern states, leading many to believe that, as Holzer put it, "Douglas was in cahoots with President James Buchanan and Chief Justice Taney to make slavery legal, national, and perpetual."

This was not quite true. Douglas despised Buchanan and considered the Scott decision a political misstep. But Honest Abe knew how to throw an elbow and seized on anxieties in the north over a federal government conspiring to expand slavery across the continent.

Douglas tried to turn the tables, as Holzer explained, by saying "that Lincoln wants whites to be able to marry blacks, blacks to serve on juries, blacks to have equal rights, blacks to have the vote, blacks to have white servants and all these things that are supposed to send shivers of horror into the white community."

The political cartoons of the day helped stoke the fiction. Appearing mostly on pamphlets and in saloon windows, they were often crude and deeply racist. In one titled "The political quadrille: Music by Dred Scott" (above), all four candidates danced with their perceived objects of their interest -- Lincoln with a black woman, John C. Breckinridge with President Buchanan (or "Buck" the goat here), Douglas with an Irishman and Constitutional Union party candidate John Bell, with a Native American, suggesting that he is a Nativist, or anti-**immigrant**.

Lincoln would rout all three, winning the presidency with 1.87 million votes, nearly 500,000 better than the runner-up Douglas. But less than two months after the election, South Carolina voted to secede from the union. Six more states would follow before Lincoln was sworn in as the 16th president of a rapidly dissolving United States on March 4, 1861.

1872: 'The Home Stretch'

The second post-Civil War election pitted President Ulysses S. Grant against a challenger from within his own party: the audacious abolitionist and New York Tribune publisher Horace Greeley.

The 1872 campaign turned on the fight over Reconstruction in the South and with the Democratic party still hopelessly divided, the Liberal Republicans -- a breakaway GOP group that favored amnesty for erstwhile Confederates -- formed the base of the electoral opposition.

But as the campaign neared, they faced one minor hurdle: no one wanted their nomination. Enter Greeley, "a very strange and eccentric figure" by historian Waugh's account. "He always wore this long white waistcoat and his hair was a mess."

"He was no one's idea of their standard-bearer," Waugh added, but that he would be -- and with it, the target of relentless attacks by his former friends and the cartoonist Thomas Nast.

Greeley became a figure of fun early on, and unflattering caricatures, in essay or cartoon form, followed him throughout the campaign.

The press behaved like a band of cruel teenagers, wondering aloud -- as in one Evening Post editorial -- "how many men are there of character and reputation who may be counted among his friends? If there be any at all, they are very few -- so few that it is difficult to recall their names."

Rallying around him instead, the piece continued, were "the most corrupt, the most designing and the most dangerous of the community."

"They accused Greeley of all kinds of really whacko things," Swint said. "He was a vegetarian, which was seen as weird. Horace Greeley today would be a New Age guru kind of character. He was also easy to lampoon. He had a large puffy face, and big steel-rimmed glasses."

In a pamphlet titled "Horace Greeley Unmasked," Springfield Republican writer Samuel Bowles is quoted suggesting the candidate's "perversity of temper and openness to flattery" made him an easy mark for treacherous operators.

Greeley also suffered at the nimble hand of Nast, the Harper's Weekly cartoonist, who skewered the candidate savagely for months. In his now infamous illustration, "We Are On the Home Stretch," a waylaid Greeley is seen, belly up, on a stretcher, defeated and being returned home to his home in Chappaqua, New York.

The drawing would prove dramatically prescient.

At the end of October, days before the election and a week after the cartoon was published, Greeley's wife died of consumption. Her husband would follow her to the grave a month later, on November 29, before the electoral college could fully register his votes.

1884: 'Ma, Ma, Where's My Pa?'

The called him "Grover the good." But for all the work Grover Cleveland did in cleaning up corruption during his time as the sheriff of Erie County, mayor of Buffalo and governor of New York, the Democrats' nominee in 1884 led a less tidy personal life.

A brief relationship with the widowed Maria Halpin in the early 1870s had yielded a child, but hardly a father.

"It became the story of the day, glorified through the media. There was no smoking gun or direct testimony, all they had were accusations and circumstances. And of course he did know Halpin, and she named her son, his last name, Cleveland," Swint said. "He did admit to having an affair with her" and paid some child support.

The Republicans took aim, calling Cleveland a deadbeat dad while dragging Halpin and the child into the muck.

"There is a famous cartoon (above) of Cleveland walking down the street and a woman carrying a baby saying, 'Ma, Ma, where's my Pa?,'" Swint said. "So a lot of was visual. In the days before TV advertising, photos and illustrations in newspapers (carried more weight)."

The rhyme took hold and became a rallying cry for supporters of Cleveland's opponent, James G. Blaine, who sang it in the streets and during campaign events.

Unfortunately for Blaine, where Cleveland's issues were mostly the stuff of gossip, the Republican's own misdeeds well-documented -- literally.

During his time as speaker of the House from 1869 to 1875, Blaine had in a series of letters articulated the precise details of his self-dealing, which mostly included pushing laws to benefit the railroad companies who, in turn, dished him stock in their growing operations.

One particular missive was marked with the now familiar request, "Burn this letter!" The recipient failed to meet the request and the nominee was soon being taunted by Cleveland supporters as "Blaine, Blaine, James G. Blaine, the continental liar from the state of Maine!"

As one Cleveland backer rationalized, the candidates' personal and professional failings, respectively, had made the choice an easy one.

"We are told that Mr. Blaine has been delinquent in office but blameless in public life, while Mr. Cleveland has been a model of official integrity but culpable in personal relations," the supporter said. "We should therefore elect Mr. Cleveland to the public office for which he is so well qualified to fill, and remand Mr. Blaine to the private station which he is admirably fitted to adorn."

It would get worse for Blaine, who ran into more recognizable trouble when one of his allies in New York, the Rev. Samuel Burchard, introduced the candidate with an infamous assault on the Irish community -- effectively calling them drunks and, in what many considered an insult then, Catholics.

"We are Republicans," he said, "and don't propose to leave our party and identify ourselves with the party whose antecedents have been rum, Romanism, and rebellion."

Blaine did not utter a word of protest, his silence helping to solidify political antipathies that endure to the present day.

Cleveland would win a narrow popular vote but cruise to victory in the Electoral College. His supporters did not disappoint either, finally returning the "Ma, Ma, where's my Pa?" chant with a sharp answer: "Gone to the White House, ha ha ha!"

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 12:51 a.m.: Adds homeland security response

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Two Republican senators are expressing concern to the head of the Department of Homeland Security over what they said was a "rush" to process new citizens ahead of the presidential election.

In the letter to Jeh Johnson, Sens. Chuck Grassley of Iowa and Ron Johnson of Wisconsin specifically suggest that new voters could provide Democrats with an advantage. They refer to an internal agency email from US Citizenship and **Immigration** Services about processing applications "due to the election year." The memo encourages DHS staff to work overtime to process applications and notes several Saturdays that offices will be open to help process applications.

The senators say a similar effort in 1996 to increase citizenship applications "endangered national security and public safety" because not all the cases were processed following the correct protocol, such as fingerprint checks.

The Department of Homeland Security said it aims to ensure naturalization applications are processed on time.

"USCIS's goal is to process applications for naturalization within five to seven months, regardless of external events such as elections. 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 ... has exceeded expectations," Homeland Security said in a statement.

The prospect of more **immigrants** becoming citizens likely stands to benefit Democrats.

The implications are controversial because Democrats have made a push to get new **immigrants** to register to vote, aiming to build up an anti-Trump demographic particularly among Latinos.

US Citizenship and **Immigration** Services show a 14.5% jump in naturalization applications in June-December of 2015 compared with the same six months in the previous year. Federal data does not break down those applications by race, but grass-roots organizations, like the Florida **Immigrant** Coalition, say their naturalization drives across their swing state are filled primarily by Latinos, who overwhelmingly vote Democrat.

Democrats have been accused by Republicans during the 2016 season of trying to increase turnout by adding voters. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump last month slammed an effort by Democratic Virginia Gov. Terry McAuliffe to restore voting rights to some convicted felons who have completed their sentences.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 10:25 a.m. -- Adds pars 3 and 6

(CNN) -- Four crew members were arrested Thursday after an overloaded boat believed to be carrying 450 migrants capsized off the Egyptian coast, according to state-run Nile TV.

The men were detained on possible charges of "human trafficking and involuntary manslaughter." One of them is the owner of the vessel.

Hundreds of migrants are feared dead after Wednesday's sinking, with just 163 people rescued and 51 bodies recovered, according to the country's military and state media.

The boat had set off from Egypt and was heading for Italy when it was found 12 nautical miles northeast of the town of Rashid -- also known as Rosetta -- in El Beheira Governorate on Wednesday afternoon.

State media said the boat had a maximum capacity of 150 people, but 450 had been crammed aboard. Smugglers were charging 35,000 Egyptian pounds ($3,951) for an Egyptian and $3,000 for foreigners to make the dangerous journey from Egypt to Europe, state media said.

Mahmoud Aly spent Wednesday going between hospitals along the coast. His brother and cousin were on the boat.

He told CNN his cousin was rescued but his 24-year-old brother is missing. "The boat had more people than it could take. It's a wooden boat," he said.

He said his family would spend the night on the beach waiting for boats to resume the search and rescue efforts at daylight. "We saw the last boat after sunset. Seven people were on board."

Hope for survivors dwindling

"Only dead bodies came out of the sea today, no survivors," Mohamed Abu Arab, a Rashid-based fishermen, told CNN.

Meanwhile Mohamed Nasrawy, whose brother was on the boat, spent the night and the early hours of Thursday on the beach looking for his sibling.

At least three families who have been searching for loved ones said so far it had mainly been local fisherman involved in the rescue mission.

'This is a disaster'

Arab told CNN that he and other fisherman are used to finding three, four or five bodies from failed migrant crossing attempts.

"But we haven't seen this before," he said of the number of bodies from the latest incident. "This is a disaster."

Fishermen were the first to spot the capsized boat Wednesday, Arab said, and have been assisting the coast guard in the search for survivors. "Everyone is helping. All security agencies are involved."

Most of the survivors he has seen were Egyptian, he said, but he believes there were also people from Sudan and Somalia.

Week of arrests

The Egyptian military has regularly announced efforts to combat illegal **immigration**. On the same day the boat capsized, the coast guard foiled an illegal **immigration** attempt, rescuing 294 on board a boat off the shore of El-Alamein, according to a military statement.

A day earlier, the Egyptian military arrested 68 people on a boat trying to make its way to Europe. They were captured off the coast of Matrouh.

Last week, the country's navy thwarted two attempts by people trying to cross from Egypt to Europe. More than 400 would-be migrants of various nationalities were arrested in that operation.

A perilous journey

Migrants are leaving African countries in large numbers for Europe, often in overcrowded, rickety boats. The perilous voyages often turn fatal.

Many of the refugees using the central Mediterranean route -- which runs roughly from Libya or other north African countries to Italy -- are from Nigeria, Eritrea and Gambia, according to the International Organization for Migration.

This year, over 300,000 have arrived in Europe by sea, landing mostly in Greece and Italy, according to UN estimates. Almost 30% are children.

Of those attempting the crossing, 3,211 people are believed to have died at sea, added the report.

CNN's Paul Armstrong, Sheena McKenzie, Susanna Capelouto and Madison Park contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**() --

Albertville, Alabama (CNN) -- There's one question Sandra Langlois is sick of hearing in job interviews.

"Do you speak Spanish?"

Langlois doesn't -- and doesn't think she should have to.

At 42, she already speaks two languages. Born in Germany, she moved to Pennsylvania as a child and learned to speak English fluently. She thought that would be enough to get a job in the United States.

Now, as she waits for an interview at the Albertville unemployment office, she's not sure it will be.

Hispanic **immigrants**, she says, have transformed the state she's called home for decades. And the ones who came to the United States illegally, she says, make a tough job market even tougher.

Langlois needs to find work, and fast: Her family is living in a motel after the power company turned out the lights in their trailer. She's sharing a car and cell phone with her father-in-law.

The Spanish question, she says, has abruptly ended more than one interview. She hopes it won't throw her out of the running this time, too.

"It's kind of, really, discrimination," she says. "If you're not here legally, then you need to go ahead and go back home. ... They need to come over here the right way. Don't sneak over. Don't stay here."

It's a sentiment that runs deep through some circles of this largely white, working-class town, which made headlines as the epicenter of Alabama's efforts to crack down on illegal **immigration**. Five years later, people in Albertville are still split over the changes they've seen -- and what they think should happen next.

So is the country.

A CNN/Kaiser Family Foundation poll (PDF) released this week reveals deep divides across the United States on **immigration**.

Working-class whites -- a group some analysts say could play a decisive role in the presidential election -- are far more likely than others to say **immigrants**who arrived illegally should be deported. More than half (55%) say that's something the government should attempt, compared with 27% of white college grads.

Those statistics don't surprise Glenda Barnes. The 70-year-old Albertville resident says she moved out of her neighborhood when **immigrants** started moving in. Her street started to go downhill, she says, as people crammed cars onto lawns and stopped taking care of homes.

"If you lived here, you'd understand," she says. "Our town was so neat, a nice little town. Now it's like we don't care, and everything's falling in."

Rachel Zavaleta isn't surprised by the numbers either. The 29-year-old still remembers what people shouted at her on the playground when she came to Albertville with her family nearly 20 years ago: Go back to Mexico.

A changing landscape

Debates about deporting **immigrants** who came here illegally aren't just political talking points in Albertville; they're personal.

This is a city where officials tried hard to force them out, in a state where lawmakers passed the toughest law in the country aimed at doing the same thing.

Five years later, even people who don't see eye to eye on **immigration** can agree on one thing: It didn't work.

Albertville proudly bills itself as "the Fire Hydrant Capital of the World," for the Mueller factory that's manufactured millions there. But across the state, it's better known for another industry: poultry processing plants, which employ thousands of workers -- many of them **immigrants**.

More than a quarter of the town's roughly 22,000 residents are Hispanic. And Alabama's 2011 **immigration** law scared many people who'd found jobs in the area.

Terrified they'd be rounded up and deported, they abandoned homes, pulled their kids out of school and moved to other states. Neighborhoods were left nearly empty. Shopping districts became ghost towns.

But in 2012, a federal appeals court gutted much of the law, ruling that parts of it were unconstitutional, including a requirement that public schools determine the **immigration** status of students and parents.

Now, Albertville's Latino **immigrant** population is thriving once again. A growing number of Haitian refugees, recruited by chicken plants in recent years, have moved to the city, too.

The large Catholic church where thousands pray in Spanish every Sunday just paid off its new $1.2 million building, thanks to donations from the congregation.

Eateries serving tacos and tamales are easier to find in some parts of the city than restaurants offering grits or fried catfish.

The relationships between residents -- and the approaches local leaders take -- have changed.

But it doesn't take long to see that tensions are still simmering.

Stop by the basketball court where Mexican workers are shooting hoops, and you'll hear how afraid they are that Donald Trump might be president, and what it was like a few years back when people couldn't get water or electricity in their homes unless they could prove they were here legally.

Sit for a moment in the Little League stands nearby, and a woman flipping through a coupon book as she leans back in a lawn chair will tell you how **immigrants** should stop speaking Spanish and sucking benefits from the system.

Step into a shopping mall off the busy four-lane highway through town, and you'll see **immigrants** searching for the right words in an English class as they talk with their teacher about what foods to eat on American holidays and how fast the cashiers speak at Walmart.

Cross the parking lot to visit the unemployment office, and you'll hear some people say the influx of **immigrants** gave the region's economy a boost, while others grumble it cost them their jobs.

'There's plenty of jobs'

Langlois runs her fingers through her hair as she scans the bulletin board at the unemployment office, looking for a lead.

Could she be a dishwasher or a welder? Will she go back to working at a chicken plant? Is there any other choice?

As an **immigrant** herself, Langlois says she's had to follow strict rules and make sure her documents are in order when she applies for jobs. And she resents **immigrants** who came to the United States illegally for finding ways to skirt the system.

"It's just not fair," she says. "It's like they're getting special treatment."

The CNN/KFF poll found that working-class whites were significantly more likely than other groups to say illegal **immigration** had directly affected them.

More than a quarter (27%) say their family has been negatively affected by undocumented **immigrants** taking jobs in their community, and among this group, 8 in 10 want the government to deport all undocumented **immigrants**.

The trend is even stronger in the South.

Working-class whites in this part of the United States are about twice as likely as those in other regions to say they've been affected (40% vs. 18% to 22% in other regions).

One possible explanation: The South is where demographers say they've seen the greatest growth in foreign-born and Hispanic populations in recent years.

But not everyone thinks **immigration** in the area hurts a shot at getting a job.

"There's plenty of jobs. You've just got to want to do it," Ronnie Wise says as he waits for an interview after filling out an application at the unemployment office. "A lot of people don't want to, and they (**immigrants**) will. If it weren't for them, we wouldn't have any chicken plants here."

If he meets **immigrants** who need work, Wise says he knows just what he'll do.

Help them.

'There are so many of us'

Two belt buckles sit side by side in a glass display case at a gift shop on Main Street. One is a Confederate battle flag. The other says "Hecho en Mexico" -- Made in Mexico.

A Mexican family searches for shoes in the back of the store. An American woman circles the store and ends up at the cash register with an ashtray and a bottle of perfume called Love.

As she works the front counter at the Gift on Main/El Regalo, Rachel Zavaleta says it's great to see customers from different backgrounds shopping at the store.

Times have changed, she says, since the city and state tried to push out **immigrants**.

"Sometimes, you still get a dirty look when you go somewhere. But they don't do it as much, probably because they'd have to be giving dirty looks all day, since there are so many of us," she says.

But Trump's campaign is already rekindling friction, she says, in an area where he is heavily favored to win.

"You hear people talk, even your friends or people you know, about getting rid of **immigrants**. They're telling that to us, not realizing that we're Hispanic," she says. "It doesn't click in their heads how it would be affecting us."

A Hispanic mayor?

Fox News anchors rattle off headlines on TV as Joe Lusk gets ready to dig into his breakfast. After a waitress places his plate on the table, he bows his head in prayer.

The 59-year-old fence company owner is a lifelong Albertville resident. And he often stops to eat at this family-run restaurant, where a sign hanging by the front door pays tribute to "Southern living, where the tea is sweet, our words are long, the days are warm and our faith is strong."

Lately, he says, the topic of **immigration** has been coming up more often at the breakfast table.

Lusk sees the growing presence of **immigrants** in Albertville as a clash of cultures that's gradually gotten worse.

"There's no place," he says, "to really be away from them anymore."

There's no doubt that most **immigrants** work hard and mean well, he says.

But Lusk sees **immigrants** as a burden. So do nearly half (47%) of the white, working-class people polled, compared with 20% of white college grads.

He says **immigrants** are draining the school and health care systems, and that some of them have brought crime to the city.

Those who came illegally should be sent back, he says, but they probably never will be -- given how much of a financial interest many companies have in keeping them around.

"If they legalize," he says, "we'll probably have a Hispanic mayor in 10 years."

'Let's move forward'

Just a few blocks from the center of Albertville, a historical marker in front of the city's museum talks about migration. But it's referring to people who moved to this mountain town from Georgia and Tennessee in the 1800s.

It wasn't until about 30 years ago, museum board member Danny Maltbie says, that **immigrants** from other countries started trickling in.

Maltbie spends a lot of time digging up information about Albertville's history. Visit the retired automotive plant electrician while he's volunteering at the museum and he'll tell you about devastating tornadoes that ripped off roofs and forced the city to rebuild -- twice.

He'll tell you that the railroad rumbling through town changed everything, bringing fertilizer for the first time and giving farmers the chance to grow crops in the tough mountain soil. He'll tell you that the arrival of the chicken plants decades ago boosted the economy and eventually brought thousands of **immigrants**here.

And he'll tell you how happy he was to give a recent tour of the town cemetery to a class of high school students learning to speak English.

"I thought that was a very good thing that those kids came to see our museum and learn about our history," he says.

Now, he says, it's their history, too.

"They're here," he says. "Let's accept them. Let's move forward."

Local legend has it that signs near the US-Mexico border once informed **immigrants** that jobs were waiting for them in Albertville. Whether that's how they ended up here, there's no doubt they left their mark on the city once they arrived.

The museum's volunteer board has debated how to deal with the influx. Inside the one-room museum, there are displays about the town's founder, its Main Street and its small African-American population. But **immigration** is a topic that hasn't yet been touched on the museum's walls.

It's a sensitive issue, museum board member Glenda Wooten says, and they're still trying to sort out the right wording.

This month, volunteers added a new entry to the official timeline they hand out to visitors:

"1992: First Hispanics moved to Albertville from Mexico to work in the chicken plants. The children were enrolled in the school system, speaking no English and local administrators and teachers did not speak Spanish. Soon, Albertville City Schools' enrollment for Mexicans/Hispanic students was one of the largest in the state."

'Diversity is a strength'

About 40% of Albertville High School's more than 1,300 students are Hispanic, Principal Deidra Robinson says.

Students from different backgrounds didn't used to mingle much, she says, but now they stand shoulder to shoulder on the football field and sit together in the cafeteria.

"They just grew up together," she says.

And even when tension in the community has boiled over, she says, officials worked hard to keep it out of the schools.

"We don't let **immigration** or the diversity of our school be a barrier to our success," she says. "We see it as part of our success. ... It's helping prepare our students for the real world."

A majority (60%) of working-class whites in the CNN/KFF poll say increasing diversity is enriching American culture. But 33% view diversity as a threat, and 38% say increasing diversity is harmful because "some people feel like they no longer belong."

Robinson says teachers in Albertville make sure everyone has a place.

The school system has programs dedicated to helping newcomers who are still learning English, she says, and most **immigrants** who need the classes are quick learners.

There's one figure Robinson says she frequently mentions to skeptical parents and community members as she fights the misconception that large amounts of school resources are being spent on **immigrants**.

Only about 10% of her students are still learning English, she says.

"When somebody asks a question, they try to make it about color. I just go to turning it around. ... Most of them are actually proficient in both languages," she says. "That's a comfort to some people."

'I believe in the rule of law'

Chuck Ellis thinks of the way his 11-year-old daughter, Marli, wakes up in the morning.

She's full of joy when she gets out of bed, he says, knowing things will turn out OK no matter what happens during her school day. But Ellis knows dangers could be lurking.

That fear takes hold every time he thinks of the man Marli is named for: his brother-in-law, Marlin Strange, who was shot dead 17 years ago. A Mexican **immigrant** charged in the slaying is on the FBI's list of most wanted fugitives.

Illegal **immigration**, Ellis says, brought more drugs, crime and prostitution to Albertville. Houses were overrun, with people cramming into buildings and sleeping in shifts.

"It became crazy how many problems we ran into," says Ellis, a state trooper who was on the Albertville City Council from 2008 to 2012.

"I'm not racist," Ellis says. "I believe in the rule of law."

While in office, Ellis made fighting illegal **immigration** a priority. Public safety, he says, was his aim.

It's a concern for many Americans when they talk about **immigration**. About half (49%) of white working-class Americans think Latin American **immigrants**increase crime in communities, according to the CNN/KFF poll. That's higher than other groups polled; among white college grads the number is 32%.

Along with the city's then-mayor, Ellis supported ordinances that made English the official language, booted taco trucks from operating on Main Street, limited the number of people who could live inside a home and ordered store signs to include English translations.

And he invited someone to Albertville to help the city take more substantive measures: Kris Kobach, a prominent conservative attorney who made a name for himself helping governments across the country craft laws to crack down on illegal **immigration**.

In the end, the city decided not to hire Kobach. But Alabama legislators did; he was one of the primary architects of the state's **immigration** law. And Ellis is proud of inviting him to Albertville. He still has a copy of a newspaper front page that shows him shaking Kobach's hand.

Ellis isn't on the City Council anymore; he lost his bid for re-election in 2012. But he's considering another run for county sheriff (he lost his bid to unseat the incumbent in 2014). Rounding up millions of **immigrants** who entered the United States illegally and deporting them isn't feasible, he says. But more needs to be known about who's already here.

"The big thing is the vetting process, making sure that people have done the right things, that people don't have illnesses, that people aren't bad people," he says, "because we've got enough bad people in the country without letting in more."

'I'm not stealing anyone's job'

Nancy Salazar says she'll never shake how it felt to live in Albertville when city and state leaders took aim at illegal **immigration**. Even though she was born in the United States, Salazar says she felt the glaring heat of racism then. And sometimes, she still does.

Hard-working **immigrants** are the bedrock of Albertville's economy, she says, and it's unfair to blame them for crime in the city or anywhere else.

"We are not what they think," she says. "They are just outraged Hispanics have something."

In English, Salazar speaks with the smooth lilt of a Southern belle. And in Spanish, her words slice through the air with the sharp precision of a native speaker.

The 30-year-old preschool teacher, who was born in Florida to parents who **immigrated** to the United States from Mexico, sees the importance of keeping traditions alive.

On the wall of her living room, her high school senior picture shows her wearing the silver dangly earrings she'd put on for cheerleading practice; she's still embarrassed she forgot to wear pearls that day.

Nearby, she keeps a large Virgin of Guadalupe figure standing next to a big-screen TV.

Her husband, Freddy, who was born in Mexico, says he's worked hard in difficult conditions to become a supervisor at a nearby poultry plant. His fingers are so swollen from his years on the job that he struggled to get a ring on his finger when the couple recently renewed their marriage vows.

"The racists are the ones who don't know the work that we do. They judge without knowing. ... There's never going to be an American doing the work I do. I'm not stealing anyone's job," he says. "There simply is work."

'An invaluable resource'

Monte Weldon walks over to a giant Scrabble board on the ground just a few steps from her stall at the Albertville Farmers Market and spells out T-O-M-A-T-O.

It's one of many crops Americans wouldn't have a chance to enjoy, she says, without **immigrant** labor.

"They get a bad rap, but you know what, a lot of people would go hungry if they weren't there," she says. "They're an invaluable resource."

As she sells tomatoes, okra and black-eyed peas, Weldon says she usually tries to steer clear of arguments over **immigration**. It's one of those issues where people never seem willing to listen or change their minds.

Instead, she focuses on her children.

"I taught my kids to understand about different people, different ways to believe. I raised my children in church," she said. "We're not God. It's not our place to judge."

The color of your skin doesn't matter, she says, and everyone's blood is red.

'We're a community'

"How are we all going to live together here?"

That's the question the exasperated publisher of a local newspaper asked back in 2009 at a town meeting as residents and local leaders sparred over **immigration**.

Back then, it seemed like the fury might never die down.

Now, while national debate over **immigration** rages, many in this city have settled for a reluctant truce. Some hope they'll have another shot at getting their way. And others wonder if they're experiencing the uneasy calm that comes before a storm they won't be able to stop.

Lindsey Lyons led Albertville's efforts to crack down on illegal **immigration** and trumpeted the state's law on national media. As mayor, he kept a US Border Patrol baseball cap on display in his City Hall office.

Lyons, who lost his post in 2012, declined to comment for this story. When he spoke with CNN in 2011, he said he had run for office because he was tired of the DUIs, drug trafficking and gang activity that he saw **immigrants** bringing to Albertville.

"We have a right and moral responsibility," he said, "to protect our citizens and our quality of life."

Tracy Honea, who ousted Lyons and just won re-election, says when it comes to **immigration**, he's doing his best to play the hand he was dealt.

"I truly believe folks need to be legal," he says, "but it's out of our control on a national level."

Honea says he tries to take a positive approach as mayor.

"We've worked really hard at trying to create an atmosphere that we're a community, and it's a growing community," he says.

On his office wall, Honea keeps a framed photo of Ronald Reagan riding a white horse that he was thrilled to win at a silent auction. Beneath the photo is a quote from the former US President's 1985 State of the Union address:

"Freedom is not the sole prerogative of a chosen few; it is the universal right of all God's children."

Earlier this year, a class of high school students learning English visited City Hall.

Honea fielded questions from them inside the City Council's chambers. And in a class photo outside, he stood behind them, smiling.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**7:06 am -- Adds exit poll figure to graf 7 per international request - JR

Editor's note: White, Working-Class and Worried is a CNN partnership with the Kaiser Family Foundation - an extensive survey of white, working-class Americans and voters, who form a backbone of the support for Donald Trump. Watch Anderson Cooper 360 and CNN.com for reports throughout the week.

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The white, working-class Americans who form a backbone of Donald Trump's political support have a split view of Muslim **immigrants**-- strong majorities believe both that **immigrants** from Muslim countries increase the threat of terrorism in the United States, but also that most **immigrants**from those countries are good people.

The data is from a new survey from CNN and the Kaiser Family Foundation and is aimed at unveiling the political motivations of the voting bloc that has propelled the GOP nominee.

Threats of terror, both abroad and at home, have repeatedly rolled the race for the White House and the candidates have sought to improve their standing with voters in their responses to the terror attacks in Paris, Brussels, San Bernardino, Calif., and most recently after the attacks in New York and New Jersey. Polls generally show that voters trust Trump more than Hillary Clinton to handle terrorism.

Trump's tough talk about combating terrorism and threats abroad, including a plan to erect a wall at the US-Mexico border and his repeated suggestion that profiling as a preventative tactic against terrorism has helped fueled his rise.

While a majority (63%) of white, working-class Americans say **immigrants** from Muslim countries are generally good people, the same share say that **immigrants** from Muslim countries increase the risk of terrorist attacks.

Members of this group, which exit polls had at around 44% of the US electorate in 2012 though the exact figure is difficult to quantify, also have a more negative view of **immigration**: nearly half (47%) of whites without a college degree view **immigrants** as a burden on the country.

Even among those white, working-class voters who view **immigrants** as a burden, 50% say **immigrants** from Muslim countries are good people compared with 35% who say they are not.

There is also a partisan divide: White, working-class Democrats are more likely to hold positive views about **immigrants** from Muslim countries than their white, working-class Republican counterparts. 47% of white Democrats without college degrees say Muslim **immigrants** increase the risk of terrorist attacks in the US compared with 83% of white Republicans with no college degree.

Trump has made his hard line against Muslims a key component of his campaign, and his white, working-class supporters have strong views about the impact of **immigrants** from Muslim countries. Fifty-three percent of white voters without college degrees who are considering supporting Trump say **immigrants** from Muslim countries are basically good, but 82% say they increase the risk of terrorist attacks in the US.

'Under attack'

More than 6-in-10 white, working-class Americans also say that Christian values are under attack in the United States. That viewpoint is more widespread among older working-class whites than among younger ones. Seventy-three % of white, working class adults 65 and older said Christian values are under attack, while just 41% of working-class adults under the age of 30 said the same.

Trump backers were more likely to say that Christian values were under attack than those who support Clinton. Eighty-one percent of white, working-class voters who would consider supporting him in November said Christian values were under attack, compared to 31% who support Clinton.

Candidate positioning

In the hours following the bombings in New York and New Jersey, Clinton and Trump tussled over who was better qualified to combat terrorism as well as its cause.

Clinton cast herself as the candidate best prepared to combat terrorism and said that her opponent's positions are "not grounded in fact" and "meant to make some kind of demagogic point."

"I am prepared to, ready to actually take on those challenges," the former secretary of state told reporters on Monday, "not engage in a lot of irresponsible, reckless rhetoric."

Trump blamed Clinton and President Barack Obama for failing to keep the country safe and called for profiling to beef up what he sees as currently lackluster anti-terrorism efforts. Instead of treading lightly, Trump said on Fox News Monday morning, the better approach would be to "knock the hell out of 'em."

"Our local police, they know who a lot of these people are," Trump told Fox. "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."

The CNN/KFF Poll was conducted by telephone August 9 through September 5 among a nationally representative sample of 1,614 adults, including 701 people who were identified as working class whites -- white non-Hispanic adults who do not currently hold a four-year degree and, if under age 25, not currently enrolled in school. Results for the full sample have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3 percentage points, it is 5 points for results among members of the white working class, 6 points for whites with degrees, 10 points for black working class respondents and 9 points for the Hispanic working class.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Margarita Montañez came to the United States from Mexico in 1970 when she was 23 years old. She raised six children but says one of her greatest accomplishments was becoming a United States citizen in 1999.

"I wanted to vote," she said. "I wanted to have a say in my children's future."

The Latino vote has long been the subject of interest for presidential elections, and in 2016 it may be wise to look more specifically at the Latina vote.

A study by the City University of New York commissioned by CNN shows that the growing trend among the nation's estimated 27 million eligible Hispanic voters is the increasing number of Latina women stepping up to the ballot box.

For Montañez that makes perfect sense.

"The women, they work so hard, and I think they put more attention [on voting]," she said, contending that more Latinas are acting as heads of household for family finances and family discussions on politics.

Montañez works from home. Her six children graduated from college with careers in engineering, philosophy and education. Now that they're grown, Montanez says she's using this political season to get more involved.

"I like to get involved for the campaigns so when I go knocking on the doors, more of the women answer the doors," she said, "and they're excited."

The CUNY/CNN study shows Hispanic women have voted in greater proportions that Latino men in every presidential election between 1992 and 2012, and that Latinas accounted for between 53% and 55% of all Hispanics who cast a ballot in presidential elections during that period.

Los Angeles-based **immigration** attorney Jessica Dominguez says she doesn't find that surprising.

"I take the fact that I can vote very seriously," she said. "I take it not only as a right, but to me it's a privilege to go out and vote."

Dominguez was 14 when she **immigrated** to the US in 1981. She became a legal, permanent resident eight years later and shortly after that, a US citizen. She's been voting for more than 20 years now.

"As Latinas, we take a lot of time to talk about the complaints that we have," Dominguez said. "We want better education for our kids. We want to be able to afford a mortgage. We want to afford an education. How are we going to do that if our voices are not heard?"

Latinas are also registering to vote in greater numbers than Hispanic men, accounting for a margin of nearly 10% more from 1992 to 2012, according to the CUNY/CNN study.

Political analyst Hernan Molina explained that a lot of this may lie in Latin culture.

"Numbers-wise, it's a very important voting bloc," Molina said. "But they also take voting very seriously. They want to make sure that they elect the next president, the next candidate, because they want to make sure that that person represents their values."

Growing up as undocumented **immigrant**, Mexican-American author Julissa Arce said she votes now because she wants to speak up for those who can't and give the undocumented community a voice.

Arce came to the US when she was 11 years old in 1994 on a tourist visa to be reunited with her parents, who were already living here. When she became an American citizen in 2014, she says she looked forward to this election year, when she will cast her ballot for president for the first time.

"The thing I was looking most forward to was being able to vote," she said. "And finally be a part of our country's democracy because at the very core of what our country is about is the ability of people, of its citizens, to be able to participate in the political process."

But Arce said the idea that the voice in her vote is more than just her own, isn't something she takes lightly.

"I feel like with my vote, I can give a voice to the millions of undocumented **immigrants** who can't vote who cannot be represented in this country the way that they should be," she said.

Montañez, Dominguez and Arce represent three generations of Latinas from different backgrounds and socio-economic levels but with the same vision of the importance of their vote.

"We really love our families. We want to take care of our families. We want to give them the best," Dominguez said. "And in order to do that, we need better representatives. We need a lot of things to change. And if we want change, we need to go out and vote."

Arce agreed, saying: "It's more than just our right to go out to vote, it's our obligation to go out and vote."

"This election is really about taking back our narrative and taking back who we are as Latinos," she said. "This election is about taking back that narrative and showing the country who we really are as Latinos and what we believe in and what we stand for."

The next couple of months, these women believe, will be crucial, believing the power of what happens next lies in their own hands.

"We'll define this next election by either going out and voting or staying at home and not voting. But regardless, it will be us who define this next election," Arce said. "Those are the facts and those are the numbers. We will decide who the next president is."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated 9:28 p.m. ET -- Adds that CBP notified FBI, other agnces about Rahami's overseas travel with other agencies, grafs 28-30 // Editors, see also: New-York-explosion-investigation and New-York-Chelsea-Explosive-Devices

(CNN) -- The man suspected of planting bombs in New York and New Jersey is a naturalized US citizen -- but has made several trips overseas.

As authorities investigate whether Ahmad Khan Rahami had any help or was inspired by foreign terror groups, those travels have become a focal point of the investigation.

Here's a look at Rahami's travel history, according to law enforcement officials:

1995: Move to the United States

Rahami, who was born in Afghanistan, comes to the United States at about age 7. His father arrived a few years earlier, seeking asylum.

2003: First US passport

Rahami receives his first US passport as a teenager. He gets another one in 2007 after he said he lost his first one.

2011: US citizenship

Rahami becomes a naturalized US citizen at about age 23.

2011: Visit to Kandahar, Afghanistan

It was not immediately clear what Rahani did during his visit to Kandahar, or how long he spent there.

2011: Visit to Quetta, Pakistan

Rahani married a Pakistani woman in July 2011.

2011: Return to the United States

Upon returning from Pakistan in 2011, Rahami had to go through secondary screening because he visited Quetta, an area known for its Taliban presence. At that time, he told **immigration** officials he was visiting family and attending his uncle's wedding and renewing his Pakistani visa.

2013 to 2014: Visit to Pakistan and Afghanistan

In April 2013, Rahami returned to Pakistan and stayed there until March 2014. During that time, he traveled by car to Afghanistan, but it was not immediately clear why.

2014: Return to the United States

When Rahami returned to the United States, he was again taken into secondary questioning. He told officials he was visiting his wife, uncles and aunts. A law enforcement official said each time he was taken to secondary screening, he satisfied whatever concerns **immigration** officials had.

After the interview, U.S. Customs and Border Protection officers entered the information Rahami provided into a shared law enforcement agency database, a US law enforcement official told CNN.

They included the information in a bulletin sent to other agencies about a "batch" of people who traveled to high-risk areas, another "common" practice, the official said.

As a naturalized US citizen, Rahami had certain rights and as a result could not be held longer unless there was good reason. If Rahami had raised red flags during the actual interview, FBI investigators would have been brought him in for further questioning or spoken with him more at the airport, the official said.

CNN's Elise Labott, Shimon Prokupecz, Evan Perez, Jim Sciutto, Samantha Reyes and Nick Paton Walsh contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**852PM - tweaks graf 5

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The biggest story of the 2016 election is undoubtedly the rise of Donald Trump, and behind the Republican nominee is a group in its last throes as the biggest force in politics: The white working class.

A new survey from CNN and the Kaiser Family Foundation delves deeply into this pivotal group, to understand their experience in an America whose changing demographics and economy have arguably impacted this group more than almost any other.

Contrary to many assumptions about this group, the poll finds working class whites generally happy with their lives, and mostly satisfied with their personal financial situation. Just 18% say they are angry about the way things are going in their own lives, and 44% think America's best days lie ahead. They are just as likely as their black and Hispanic working class counterparts to feel optimistic about their lives, 7 in 10 or more say so in each group.

But the white working class harbors deep concerns about the country's economy, the amount the government is doing to help the working class and their own ability to influence politics.

A majority, 53%, say they are very dissatisfied with the country's economic situation and 84% say their views are not well represented by the government in Washington, well above the share of white college graduates or black or Hispanic working class to say the same.

About 6 in 10 white working class people say it's gotten harder for people like them to get ahead financially and two-thirds say it's harder to find good jobs. Many are concerned about what the next generation will face: 50% say they expect their children to have a lower standard of living than they currently have, compared with 35% among whites who have college degrees, 43% among the black working class and 31% among the Hispanic working class.

More than other groups, whites without college degrees blame the government for the economic problems that beset the working class, with 62% saying the federal government deserves all or most of the blame for those problems compared with less than half among whites with degrees and the black and Hispanic working class, and 66% saying it doesn't do enough to help the working class.

Amid these concerns, Trump holds broad appeal among white working class voters. Sixty percent say they would consider Trump this fall, about double the 29% who say they'd consider Hillary Clinton. Among other groups, far fewer even say they would consider Trump. Among whites with college degrees, 39% say they'd consider him -- that's cut in half among Hispanic working class voters, 18% of whom say they'd consider Trump, and just 3% of black working class voters say they'll give Trump a look.

White working class voters are more Republican than Democratic, 56% in the CNN/KFF poll are Republicans or independents who lean that way, compared with 33% who consider themselves Democrats or are independents who lean that way, but the poll reveals that their views on what the government does to help people like them and the changing demographics of the country -- two issues that have been a central focus of Trump's campaign -- are driven by both education and partisanship.

The undeniable trend

For nearly all of American history, whites without college degrees -- the group identified as white working class for the purposes of this survey and in many assessments of the American electorate -- made up a majority of the public and a majority of voters.

That has changed, and rapidly, at the same time the nation's economy has shifted to favor those who hold college degrees. Ronald Reagan was elected in 1980 by an electorate in which 63% of voters were whites who had not completed a four-year college education, according to exit polls. That had dropped 10 points by 1992, when Bill Clinton won the presidency. That election marked the last time exit polls would find whites without college degrees to be a majority of voters. By the time Barack Obama won the presidency in 2008, just 39% of those who cast ballots were whites without degrees.

Census figures for voting and registration suggest that the white working class make up a larger share of the electorate than do the exit polls, roughly 44% in 2012 in that estimate. Both data sources have different and unquantifiable sources of error, and there has been some dispute over their true share of the electorate. Regardless of the data source, however, the trend is the same and undeniable -- the white working class is shrinking, and at the same time, their ability to influence American politics has declined.

Enter Trump.

Working class white voters have been critical to Trump's success. Throughout the Republican primaries, Trump's victories were bolstered by support from whites without degrees. Across 28 states with exit or entrance polls this spring, Trump averaged 50% support among white non-college GOP primary voters or caucus participants, compared with 37% among whites with college degrees.

And across five CNN/ORC polls conducted since the primaries ended in June, Trump's lead among white non-college voters averages 29 points, while white college voters have broken in Clinton's direction by an average of 8 points.

Restated in terms similar to the oft-cited gender gap, that adds up to a 37-point education gap among whites. According to exit polls back to 1980, it has never been larger than 14 points.

The white working class shifts Republican

Democrats used to be the party of the white working class, and Republicans, the party of the college educated. Those roles have flipped.

Ron Brownstein, a CNN senior political analyst and editorial director for strategic partnerships at Atlantic Media who has reported extensively on this group, calls it class inversion.

"In the 50s, 60s, and 70s, Democrats ran better among non-college than college whites," he said. "Starting in the 80s, the two lines converged, and in 2000, (Al) Gore ran better among college than non-college whites, (John) Kerry ran 6 points better, Obama 7 points."

Some of that is due to the shifting economy. Working class whites were largely synonymous with union members, who are traditionally staunchly Democratic. As the service economy has grown and manufacturing declined, the profile of union members has changed. In 1980, 70% of all voters who came from union households were whites without college degrees; in 2012, the white working class made up just were 39% of voters from union households. Non-whites and white college graduates were each about 30% of the union vote in 2012, almost double their share of the 1980 vote, and those two groups are increasingly Democratic.

But some of it is their differing views on government and change in American society. Within the white working class, those who consider themselves Democrats and those who say they are Republican tend to agree in their assessment of how the working class is doing. About 7 in 10 working class white voters in each party say it's gotten harder for people like them to find good jobs, and narrow majorities of both say the government isn't doing enough to help "people like you."

And while they don't see exactly eye-to-eye on **immigration** or the increasing diversity of the United States, both sets of partisans are more apt than their college-educated counterparts to see a negative side to the country's shifting demographics. Both working class white Democrats and Republicans are more likely than white college educated partisans to feel that the country's increasing racial and ethnic diversity is harmful because it leaves some people feeling left behind. The same pattern emerges in perceptions of **immigrants**, with white non-college partisans more apt than white partisans with degrees to say **immigrants** today are a burden on the United States and that the government should attempt to deport all **immigrants** currently living in the US illegally.

And in a party whose second-place finisher for this year's presidential nomination considers himself a socialist, working-class white Democrats are less apt than their college-educated counterparts to consider themselves liberal or to be non-religious, two factors that could be driving them away from the Obama-era Democratic Party.

Among white working class Democrats who are registered to vote, 22% say they would consider voting for Trump, vs. just 2% among white Democrats with college degrees, and nearly a quarter, 23%, say they will definitely not vote for Clinton, a figure that stands at 3% among white Democrats with college degrees.

The effects of this shift are showing in recent swing-state polling. Trump's best chance to win the presidency comes by flipping rust-belt states where Democrats have had natural advantages in recent presidential elections and which have larger than average blocs of white non-college voters -- Pennsylvania, Michigan and Wisconsin among them. In each, Trump has cut into Clinton's advantage with broad support from the white working class.

In the pure battlegrounds, Ohio and Iowa also appear to be shifting Trump's way on the strength of his support among white non-college voters.

"Democrats have run slightly better among blue-collar whites in Midwestern swing states, and that has been a key to them holding those states," said Brownstein.

Will they vote?

Majorities of voters across partisan, education, and racial lines say they are dissatisfied with the influence that people like them have on the political process. But there are broader differences when asked about the likelihood of actually turning out to impact that process.

In the CNN/KFF Poll, 71% of white non-college voters said they always vote in presidential elections, and 79% rated the chances that they would vote a 10 out of 10. But both figures were smaller than among whites who do have college degrees, about 9 in 10 in that group said they always vote and would be very likely to this time around.

But a CNN/ORC poll in early September found almost no difference between whites with degrees and those without in terms of enthusiasm about voting this year. Forty-two percent of white college graduates were extremely or very enthusiastic, as were 43% of white non-college registered voters.

Should turnout levels among whites without degrees, whites with degrees and non-whites continue along their current trajectory, the white working class would likely emerge from 2016 still the largest voting bloc in the country in terms of race and educational attainment, for what may be the last time.

The CNN/KFF Poll was conducted by telephone August 9 through September 5 among a nationally representative sample of 1,614 adults, including 701 people who were identified as working class whites -- white non-Hispanic adults who do not currently hold a four-year degree and, if under age 25, not currently enrolled in school.

Results for the full sample have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3 percentage points, it is 5 points for results among members of the white working class, 6 points for whites with degrees, 10 points for black working class respondents and 9 points for the Hispanic working class. Full methodological details are available here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**811PM - adds graf 8-9

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump's campaign on Tuesday stood by a controversial tweet issued by the candidate's son, Donald Trump Jr., in which he likened Syrian refugees to a bowl of Skittles.

On Monday, Trump Jr. tweeted a graphic that likened Syrian refugees to Skittles, which swiftly triggered a wave of criticism.

"This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016," he tweeted, with a graphic 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."

The graphic had an official Trump logo that the Republican nominee shares with his running mate, Mike Pence.

Despite widespread condemnation, the campaign stood by the tweet and in a statement called Trump Jr. "a tremendous asset to the campaign."

"America has become less safe under Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama, and Clinton's planned 550% increase in Syrian refugees is a dangerous proposal that will put American lives at risk," said senior communication adviser Jason Miller. "Speaking the truth might upset those who would rather be politically correct than safe, but the American people want a change, and only Donald Trump will do what's needed to protect us."

Kellyanne Conway, Trump's campaign manager, also defended the comparison to CNN's Erin Burnett.

"What we do know is that many Americans are concerned with the lack of vetting that's going on. We see what's happening all across Europe ... that has been a disaster," she said Tuesday on "Erin Burnett OutFront."

But Mars Candy, which produces Skittles, said in a statement, "Skittles are candy. Refugees are people. We don't feel it's an appropriate analogy. We respectfully refrain from further commentary as anything we say could be misinterpreted as marketing."

'This is disgusting'

The graphic's language apparently wasn't a Trump Jr. original, but instead that of former Illinois Rep. Joe Walsh, a former tea party congressman from Illinois and now a conservative talk radio host.

Walsh tweeted at Trump Jr.: "Hey @DonaldTrumpJr, that's the point I made last month. Glad you agree."

Walsh's tweet included a screenshot of a tweet he made dated August 13.

Hillary Clinton's campaign spokesman Nick Merrill retweeted Trump Jr. adding: "This is disgusting."

The 2016 campaign has featured heated rhetoric around US policy for accepting refugees. Clinton has called for an increase in the number of Syrian refugees the US should accept and Trump has called for "extreme vetting" of **immigrants**, as well as a ban on **immigrants** from countries that are hotbeds of terrorism, such as Syria.

One of President Barack Obama's former speechwriters responded to Trump Jr. with a link to CNN reporting about a little boy in Aleppo, Syria, who became the face of the humanitarian crises in Syria.

"Hey @DonaldJTrumpJr, this is one of the millions of children you compared to a poisoned Skittle today," Jon Favreau tweeted.

Former Obama campaign staffer, Jason Sparks, tweeted at Trump Jr. photos of the Syrian refugee children in the crises and said: "These aren't Skittles, @DonaldJTrumpJr."

Musician John Legend, who has been an outspoken critic of Trump on Twitter, wrote: "There's a tiny chance that anyone could be a murderer. Get rid of everyone now!!! #trumplogic"

Legend also retweeted a photo of the Aleppo boy, where someone said: "This is not a skittle."

And former CIA director James Woolsey, a senior adviser to the Trump campaign, told CNN's Kate Bolduan and John Berman during "At This Hour" that it was a "clumsy analogy" that "doesn't help" the Trump campaign.

"But he's not the one running for president," Woolsey added.

Last week, Trump Jr. was criticized for making a "gas chamber" reference when complaining about how the treatment his father has received form the media compared to the coverage from Clinton.

"They've let her slide on every discrepancy, on every lie, on every DNC game trying to get Bernie Sanders out of the thing," he said. "I mean, if Republicans were doing that, they'd be warming up the gas chamber right now. It's a very different system -- there's nothing fair about it."

This story has been updated.

CORRECTION: A previous version of this story wrongly identified the state Joe Walsh represented in Congress and misattributed a quote to him. Walsh is a former Illinois congressman. It was Joe Wilson of South Carolina who shouted "you lie" at President Barack Obama.

CNN's Jim Acosta contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**656 - adds grafs 9-11

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The number of individuals who were supposed to have been deported but were instead granted citizenship is far higher than was initially reported by media covering the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General's office report on the matter.

On Monday, the Inspector General reported that 858 individuals from "special interest countries" -- meaning countries that are considered to be "of concern to the national security" of the US -- were supposed to have been deported but were instead granted US citizenship.

But the truth is the report is even worse than reported, with more than 1,800 individuals naturalized who should have been deported from the country.

A reason for the underplaying of the number may have been the report's focus, which was whether the US Citizenship and **Immigration** Services was using digital fingerprints effectively. The Inspector General determined that the agency granted citizenship to 858 individuals who had been ordered deported or removed under another identity but "their digital fingerprint records were not available" during the naturalization process.

But a footnote on page one of the report also states that there were, as of November 2015, an additional 953 individuals about whom the Inspector General couldn't determine if there was a problem with the fingerprint records specifically, but also should have been deported. This other group consisted of members of a slightly broader classification, from countries of concern as well as from neighboring countries where there is a history of fraud.

That amounts to a total of 1,811 individuals granted citizenship who should not have been.

The Department of Homeland Security responded to the report, saying it would review all 1,811 individuals "out of an abundance of caution."

Monday's report drew condemnation from many Republicans in Congress, including Sen. Ben Sasse, R-Nebraska, who said "a bureaucracy that blunders so badly is one that doesn't take our national security seriously."

The White House said Tuesday it's "clear" some systems need improving following a glitch with DHS' fingerprint system that led to hundreds of people inadvertently being granted citizenship.

"It's clear there needs to be an improvement in terms of digitizing some of the fingerprint records," said White House spokesman Josh Earnest. "Additional progress would have been made if additional resources had been appropriated by Congress."

He said the Obama administration "certainly takes seriously the consideration that is made in terms of protecting our national security in terms of our **immigration** system."

CNN's Kevin Liptak contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Rudy Ruiz is the author of "Seven for the Revolution" (Milagros Press), winner of four International Latino Book Awards. He is CEO of Interlex, an advocacy marketing agency. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- This is the worst election ever. One that won't result in the best of us being sent to Washington, but rather the worst of us being revealed.

Dragging on for an excruciating eternity, this election season has demeaned democracy, elevated mediocrity and insulted and embarrassed us all on just about every level imaginable: Intellectually, with regard to the lack of focus on policy and substance; ethically, with a complete disregard for integrity and character; and morally, driven by a disgraceful descent into racist and xenophobic vitriol.

Given that our country has consistently climbed down the educational attainment ladder, and that inane and banal reality TV shows draw more eyeballs than books and opera, it should not surprise us that a growing swath of the electorate is more enthused by a coarse, bullying celebrity than by an awkward policy wonk.

But what's doubly disappointing -- as we head into the crucial presidential debates -- is that this lack of intellectual depth is enabled not only by the candidates, but also by the topics they gravitate to, which the media frenzy then exacerbates.

These are topics that don't matter when it comes to making a difference in the future of our country: the size of a candidate's hands (and therefore other body parts), the now-moot birther issue, the Monica Lewinsky and Marla Maples scandals, the name-calling and finger pointing about who is more racist than whom, who is healthier than whom.

What happened to serious problem-solving? What happened to working toward a better world? To the extent that the candidates have voiced views on relevant policy matters such as child care and college costs, they've been drowned out by spectacle and triviality.

Speaking of a better world, what about ethics? Have we ever witnessed a more compromised pair of candidates?

How could such a great country not produce better options? These are two candidates whose spectacular failures and stark shortcomings are only overshadowed by the fact they have consistently evaded significant personal consequences while growing ever richer through calculated connections and deft manipulation of legal, political and financial systems.

Hillary is hobbled by her evasions and lack of transparency, deleted emails and haunting doubts about her decision-making and role in complex fiascos such as Benghazi and Whitewater. The Donald, never to be outdone, is burdened by bankruptcies, over-the-top flip-flopping, womanizing and allegations of misogyny. All told, they present an ethical embarrassment of global proportions.

And morally, what a shame. I mean, there have been moments over the years that make you wonder how politicians can still proclaim we are the greatest nation on Earth without blinking or flinching. Abu Ghraib comes to mind. Tuskegee Experiment. Operation Wetback. Japanese American internment. Jim Crow. Slavery. Native American genocide. And the list goes on and on.

But debasing the debate about race into senseless finger-pointing and disingenuous pandering further humiliates minority communities without offering concrete solutions to the complicated challenges we face.

Trump has chosen to portray undocumented Latino **immigrants** as rapists and murderers rather than as vital contributors to our economy and refugees from failing nations. He taunts African- Americans to support him, with offensive exhortations like: "What do you have to lose?" He stokes white supremacism and xenophobia, wailing for walls and racial profiling as policy solutions to address **immigration** and terrorism.

Yet his surrogates -- including a handful of inexplicable African-Americans, Latinos and Muslim Americans -- cover up his callousness by dismissing criticism as mere political correctness, ignoring the corrosive effect of his vitriol on race relations and civil discourse on this important subject. On the other hand, it is far too easy for Clinton to assume she will carry the minority vote despite her party's failure to deliver tangible results on critical issues such as **immigration** and judicial reform.

During these troubling times; we can find no solace in having elected an African-American president only to see our country rapidly regress into a state of arrested social development and heightened racial tension. And that's not even delving into the Black Lives Matter/police racism conundrum that the candidates have also fumbled about in their typically polarizing ways, without offering any real and holistic solutions.

Indeed, this election has been ugly. It has consistently raised more questions than answers, provoked more problems than solutions. So much so it makes you wonder if the whole system isn't falling apart. I used to think Congress and Washington were broken, but this electoral season reveals broader and deeper dysfunctions: the intractability of the two-party system, the dubious role of the media, and the polarized, crass, uncivil, uneducated, sensationalist, shallow and self-absorbed national culture.

If I could vote for anything this season, it would be a do-over:

A shorter campaign season. Higher standards for media coverage. Stricter campaign finance rules that keep big money out of politics and level the playing field for a wider range of candidates offering diverse and innovative ideas as well loyalty to the best interests of the entire nation. And a revamping of the system so that more political parties can provide better options while shattering the paradigm of bipartisan gridlock that paralyzes our nation's progress.

Unfortunately, those concepts are not on any ballot. Instead of refreshing visions for a future geared to the needs and aspirations of a young millennium, we are mired in a nightmarish late 80s/early 90s déjà vu. Choosing between Clinton and Trump makes for the worst election ever. The only thing that promises to be ghastlier is the outcome.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 6:34 p.m. ET -- Adds dropped word in headline

(CNN) -- Ahmad Khan Rahami, the suspect in the weekend bombings in New York and New Jersey, traveled for extended periods to Afghanistan and Pakistan in the last few years, officials said.

Rahami, 28, spent several weeks in Kandahar, Afghanistan, and Quetta, Pakistan, in 2011, according to a law enforcement official who reviewed his travel and **immigration** record.

Two years later, in April 2013, he went to Pakistan and remained there until March 2014 before returning to the US, official said.

Investigators are looking into whether he was radicalized overseas before returning to the United States in 2014, according to the official. As of Monday, the law enforcement official said, there is no indication he was on the radar before this weekend, when explosions went off in New York and New Jersey.

Multiple trips to Pakistan

Rahami and his family are from Afghanistan. He first came in January 1995, several years after his father arrived seeking asylum, the official said. He was given a US passport in 2003, while a minor, and again in 2007 after he said he lost his first one. He became a naturalized US citizen in 2011.

Quetta is considered a stronghold of the Taliban. While there in July 2011, Rahami married a Pakistani woman.

Upon returning from Pakistan in 2011 to the United States, he had to go through secondary screening because he visited an area of Pakistan known for its Taliban presence, according to the official.

At that time, he told **immigration** officials he was visiting family and attending his uncle's wedding and renewing his Pakistani visa.

In April 2013, Rahami returned to Pakistan and remained there until March 2014, the official said. Two other law enforcement officials confirmed to CNN that Rahami went to Pakistan for approximately a year.

His brother Mohammad traveled to Pakistan around the same time. Mohammad posted on Facebook at the time that while in Quetta they had heard seven bomb blasts over 24 hours at one point, according to CNN's review of the page. Another post during the trip shows a photo of his brother, Ahmad.

During that time the official said Ahmad traveled by car to Afghanistan. When he returned to the United States he was again taken into secondary questioning. He told officials he was visiting his wife, uncles and aunts. The official said each time he was taken to secondary screening, he satisfied whatever concerns **immigration** officials had.

The official said he was petitioning to bring his wife to the United States. He filed the paperwork in 2011 and it was approved in 2012. But the official said it was unclear if she ever came to the United States.

Trouble in the United States

Rahami is in custody after a shootout Monday morning with police in Linden, New Jersey. He was wanted for questioning in connection with Saturday's explosion near a charity race in Seaside Park, New Jersey, and another blast a few hours later in New York City that injured 29 people.

An unexploded pressure cooker was found four blocks from the site of the New York bombing in Chelsea. Surveillance videos appear to show Rahami dragging a duffel bag on wheels near both locations, according to multiple officials.

Investigators first identified Rahami on Sunday afternoon through a fingerprint, according to a senior law enforcement official. A cell phone connected to the pressure cooker also provided clues, the official said.

His last known address was in Elizabeth, New Jersey, where his family lives.

His family runs First American Fried Chicken in Elizabeth, the city's mayor said. The family has a history of clashes with the community over the restaurant, which used to be open 24 hours a day, Mayor Chris Bollwage said.

In 2011, the family sued the city of Elizabeth, and its police department for discrimination and harassment against Muslims stemming from disputes over the restaurant's hours. Investigators searched the building on Monday, Bollwage said.

Zobyedh Rahami, believed to be Rahami's sister, posted on Facebook asking for privacy on Monday.

"I would like people to respect my family's privacy and let us have our peace after this tragic time," she wrote.

CNN's Emanuella Grinberg contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- When Justin Trudeau swept to power last year amid a wave of positive change and optimism, he promised to bring Canada back to the global stage.

"Withdrawing support from globalization," the Prime Minister told CNN's Christiane Amanpour ahead of his debut speech to the UN General Assembly, "is taking us in the wrong direction."

He added, "And what we're doing in Canada is very much focused on showing inclusive growth, diversity, opportunities for everyone is a path forward, and I'm finding a lot of reflection of the desire for that on the world stage."

Ten months into his tenure, Trudeau is still remarkably popular, with one recent Nanos Research poll showing that 69% of respondents agreed he had the qualities of a good political leader.

Last February his center-left government took in 25,000 Syrian refugees, one of his other campaign promises, at a time of fierce division and when so many other countries seem to be shunning asylum seekers. He personally welcomed the first group to arrive in Toronto.

"The fact is Canadians understand that **immigration**, that people fleeing for their lives, that people wanting to build a better life for themselves and their kids is what created Canada, it's what created North America," he told CNN.

Language learning and assistance with employment, he said, are crucial to best integrate refugees into society and to send a positive message about **immigration** to Canadians.

"You can't just bring them (refugees) over. You have to help them on a path towards being successful, and sometimes it doesn't take a lot."

Does Trudeau feel the weight of high expectations, having had such a whirlwind of positive attention so far?

The Prime Minister told Amanpour he finds it "funny" when he hears people say he's trying to recast his image and put policy back at the forefront of his agenda, because "we've done some really big things from the get go." This includes fixing Canada's pension plan and introducing legislation to legalize physician-assisted dying, he said.

While there's a "very real anxiety about the economy, about our job prospects and about security," Trudeau insisted that telling the story of hope and progress is possible by making inclusive growth work for everyone.

This is being done, he told Amanpour, by increasing taxes on the wealthy, through a new child benefit program, and by taking advantage of record-low interest rates to invest in infrastructure.

"These are the things people have been asking for, that we said now is the time to invest in our future."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated 5:22 p.m. ET: Reorganizes, writesthru, and adds latest details // Editors, see also: New-York-Chelsea-Explosive-Devices and New-York-explosion-investigation

(CNN) -- In just a few days, Ahmad Khan Rahami went from virtually unknown to a suspected serial bomber.

Police captured Rahami after a shootout Monday in New Jersey, ending the hunt for the man wanted for a New Jersey explosion and a bombing in New York that left 29 people injured.

Sources say they believe Rahami is linked to an explosives-laden backpack found in Elizabeth, New Jersey -- a city where Rahami had lived.

While authorities believe they have their main suspect, they're still trying to figure out a motive -- and whether Rahami had help.

Here's what we know about the suspect:

His background and education

-- Rahami was born in Afghanistan in 1988 and first came to the United States in 1995, several years after his father arrived seeking asylum, a law enforcement official said.

-- He became a naturalized citizen in 2011.

-- Rahami majored in criminal justice at Middlesex County College in Edison, New Jersey, school spokesman Tom Peterson said. Rahami attended from 2010-2012 but did not graduate.

His wife

-- Rahami married a Pakistani woman in 2011 while he was visiting the country.

-- In 2014, while he was in Islamabad, Rahami contacted U.S. Rep. Albio Sires' office, saying he was concerned about his wife's passport and visa. It turned out her Pakistani passport had expired. Once it was renewed, Asia Bibi Rahami discovered she was pregnant. She was told she would need a visa for the baby as well. It is unclear what happened to the child.

-- Rahami's wife eventually made it to the US -- and she left before Saturday's attacks, a law enforcement official said.

-- The wife is cooperating with investigators and has spoken with US officials in the United Arab Emirates, a US official said.

His family

-- The FBI interviewed Rahami's father in 2014 after a violent domestic dispute. That interview stemmed from a tip alleging that Rahami's father was calling his son a terrorist, according to two US officials.

Ultimately, federal investigators believed it was a domestic dispute, federal officials told CNN. At the time of that interview, Rahami was in jail following a family dispute in which he stabbed one of his relatives.

The FBI never interviewed Ahmad Rahami, according to officials. He was never placed in an FBI database of potential terrorists, officials said.

-- Rahami's family lives in an apartment above First American Fried Chicken in Elizabeth, New Jersey, Mayor Chris Bollwage said. The family has a history of clashes with the community over the restaurant, which used to be open 24 hours a day,

-- The Rahami family alleged discrimination and harassment in a lawsuit against the city and its police department in 2011, arguing that officials conspired against them with citations for allegedly violating a city ordinance on hours of operation.

-- The suit alleged that police officers and city officials had said "the restaurant presented a danger to the community." It also accused a neighboring business owner of saying, "Muslims make too much trouble in this country" and "Muslims don't belong here." The defendants, including police officers and city officials, denied the allegations.

-- Bollwage said a 2012 ruling on the case favored the city, adding that the family's restaurant was "disruptive in the city for many, many years."

-- In a Facebook post Monday, a family member asked for privacy.

"I would like people to respect my family's privacy and let us have our peace after this tragic time," wrote Zobyedh Rahami, who's believed to be Rahami's sister.

His alleged connection to the bombings

-- Investigators "directly linked" Rahami to devices from New York and from Saturday's explosion in New Jersey, FBI Special Agent William Sweeney Jr. said. He declined to provide details about the evidence, citing the ongoing investigation.

-- Investigators believe Rahami is the man seen on surveillance video dragging a duffel bag near the site of the New York blast and the location where police eventually found a suspicious pressure cooker four blocks away, multiple officials said.

His arrest

-- Investigators first identified Rahami on Sunday afternoon through a fingerprint, according to a senior law enforcement official. A cell phone connected to the pressure cooker also provided some clues, the official said.

-- Harinder Bains, the owner of Merdie's Tavern in Linden, New Jersey, said he spotted Rahami sleeping in the doorway of his bar Monday morning. Bains said he recognized Rahami after seeing pictures of the suspect on CNN and called police.

-- When officers arrived, Rahami pulled out a handgun and fired, Linden police said. A shootout ensued. Rahami and two officers were struck, but all three survived.

His travels to Afghanistan and Pakistan

-- Rahami traveled to Afghanistan multiple times, according to law enforcement sources. He was questioned every time he returned to the United States, as is standard procedure, but was not on the radar as someone who might have been radicalized, one official said.

-- Rahami spent several weeks in Kandahar, Afghanistan, and Quetta, Pakistan, in 2011, according to a law enforcement official who reviewed his travel and **immigration** record. Quetta is considered a stronghold of the Taliban. He married his wife during that trip.

-- Upon his return to the United States, Rahami had to go through secondary screening because he visited an area of Pakistan known for its Taliban presence, according to the official. At that time, he told **immigration** officials he was visiting family and attending his uncle's wedding and renewing his Pakistani visa.

-- Two years later, in April 2013, Rahami went to Pakistan and stayed there until March 2014, the official said. His brother Mohammad traveled to Pakistan about the same time.

-- During that time, the official said, Ahmad Rahami also traveled by car to Afghanistan as well. When he returned to the United States, he was once again taken into secondary questioning and told officials he was visiting his wife, his uncles and his aunts.

The official said each time he was taken to secondary screening, he satisfied whatever concerns **immigration** officials had.

-- Investigators are looking into whether Rahami was radicalized overseas before returning to the United States in 2014, the official said. On Monday, law enforcement said so far there is no indication he was on their radar before the attacks in New York and New Jersey.

CNN's Adam Levine, Pamela Brown, Evan Perez, Shimon Prokupecz, Holly Yan, Drew Griffin, Jean Casarez, Patricia DiCarlo, Curt Devine, Joe Sterling and Kristina Sgueglia contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 3:43 p.m. -- adds details grafs 2-6, 12

(CNN) -- Could Ahmad Khan Rahami's wife provide clues about the bombing suspect and his plans?

Asia Bibi Rahami is cooperating with investigators, according to a US official. Authorities haven't revealed any details about what she's said.

She has not been accused of any wrongdoing in connection with Saturday's bombings in New York and New Jersey. Here's what we've learned so far about her:

She left the United States before the bombings.

Rahami's wife left the United States before Saturday's bombings in New York and New Jersey, a law enforcement official said.

She'd been scheduled to fly back to the United States this week, two US officials said.

She's currently in the United Arab Emirates, where she's spoken with US officials, a US official said.

She married Rahami in Pakistan in 2011.

Rahami, 28, and his wife married in July 2011 in Pakistan while Rahami was spending several weeks in the region, according to a law enforcement official who had reviewed his travel and **immigration** record.

Rahami had asked officials for help with her **immigration** paperwork.

That same year, Rahami filed a petition to bring his wife to the United States. The paperwork was approved in 2012, according to one official, who said it was unclear from the paperwork whether she'd come to the country.

Rahami ran into problems with his wife's **immigration** paperwork in 2014 and contacted a US congressman for help.

US Rep. Albio Sires said Rahami contacted his office about concerns with his wife's passport and visa. Her Pakistani passport had expired, according to Sires, and the US Consulate wouldn't give her an **immigrant** visa until the passport was renewed.

Once the passport was renewed, according to Sires, Rahami's wife learned she was pregnant, and US officials told her they wouldn't issue a visa until the baby was born. Then, according to Sires, officials said they'd have to get an **immigrant** visa for the baby, too.

Sires said he doesn't know what happened next. At the time, he said, the consulate advised Rahami to travel to Karachi, Pakistan, but Rahami said it was too dangerous.

A US lawmaker is looking for more information about her.

In a letter to Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson on Tuesday, Sen. Ron Johnson asked for more information about Asia Bibi Rahami's **immigration**, travel and visa applications.

CNN's Pamela Brown, Jason Hanna, Susannah Cullinane, Emanuella Grinberg and Holly Yan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 3:23 p.m.: Adds details in graf 18

(CNN) -- The man suspected of planting bombs in New York and New Jersey is a naturalized US citizen -- but has made several trips overseas.

And as authorities investigate whether Ahmad Khan Rahami had any help or was inspired by foreign terror groups, those travels have become a focal point of the investigation.

Here's a look at Rahami's travel history, according to law enforcement officials:

1995: Move to the United States

Rahami, who was born in Afghanistan, comes to the United States at about age 7. His father arrived a few years earlier, seeking asylum.

2003: First US passport

Rahami receives his first US passport as a teenager. He gets another one in 2007 after he said he lost his first one.

2011: US citizenship

Rahami becomes a naturalized US citizen at about age 23.

2011: Visit to Kandahar, Afghanistan

It was not immediately clear what Rahani did during his 2011 visit to Kandahar, or how long he spent there.

2011: Visit to Quetta, Pakistan

During his visit to Quetta, Rahani married a Pakistani woman in July 2011.

2011: Return to the United States

Upon returning from Pakistan in 2011, Rahami had to go through secondary screening because he visited Quetta, an area known for its Taliban presence.

At that time, he told **immigration** officials he was visiting family and attending his uncle's wedding and renewing his Pakistani visa.

2013 to 2014: Visit to Pakistan and Afghanistan

In April 2013, Rahami returned to Pakistan and stayed there until March 2014.

During that time, he traveled by car to Afghanistan, but it was not immediately clear why.

2014: Return to the United States

When Rahami returned to the United States, he was again taken into secondary questioning.

He told officials he was visiting his wife, uncles and aunts. A law enforcement official said each time he was taken to secondary screening, he satisfied whatever concerns **immigration** officials had.

CNN's Elise Labott, Shimon Prokupecz, Evan Perez, Jim Sciutto, Samantha Reyes and Nick Paton Walsh contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- The top Republican on the Senate's homeland security committee wants the Department of Homeland Security to hand over its records on the suspects in this weekend's bombings in New York and New Jersey and an unrelated stabbing in Minnesota.

Sen. Ron Johnson of Wisconsin sent a letter Tuesday to DHS Secretary Jeh Johnson asking for information on Dahir Adan, alleged to have stabbed 10 people in a mall in St. Cloud, Minnesota, and Ahmad Khan Rahami, alleged to have planted improvised explosive devices in New York and New Jersey.

Johnson also asked for information about Rahami's wife, Asia Bibi Rahami, a Pakistani national who has not been accused of any wrongdoing.

The Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee chairman asked the secretary for the **alien** files, records of foreign travel, visa applications and citizen applications for the two men and **immigration**, visa and travel records for Rahami's wife.

"It is important for Congress to learn more about these individuals in order to understand and evaluate the department's efforts to counter homegrown radical extremism," Johnson wrote.

The senator told CNN's Wolf Blitzer on Tuesday that the request for information is about putting pieces together.

"I've sent a letter to secretary of DHS Jeh Johnson. I want to see the **alien** file, I want to know everything we can found out about Mr. Rahami as well as Mr. Adan," Johnson said. "And we've just got to try to piece things together. But Wolf, we are not fighting a winning battle here when we're dealing with these inspired lone wolfs."

Rahami is a naturalized citizen who came to the states from Afghanistan. He traveled at length to Afghanistan and Pakistan. Adan was Somali and was killed by an off-duty police officer during the attack.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**added report on father calling fbi to para. 32, 1:53pm; new material added on bomber suspect and potential motivation, 11:46 am, updated throughout, 10:14 am

Editor's note: Peter Bergen is CNN's national security analyst, a vice president at New America and a professor of practice at Arizona State University. He is the author of "United States of Jihad: Investigating America's Homegrown Terrorists."

(CNN) -- Ahmad Khan Rahami, the suspect in this weekend's New York City and New Jersey terrorist attacks, is in many ways quite typical of jihadist terrorists in the United States since 9/11.

He is an American citizen, not a foreigner, a refugee or a recent **immigrant**.

That is overwhelmingly the profile of the approximately 360 jihadist terrorists who have been indicted or convicted in the States since 9/11 of crimes ranging in seriousness from sending small sums of money to an overseas terrorist organization to murder. According to research by New America, 80% of these militants are American citizens or legal permanent residents.

They are also not the young hotheads of popular imagination. Their average age is 28, a third are married and a third have children. Rahami, age 28, is married and has a daughter.

FBI Assistant Director William Sweeney said Monday there is no evidence that Rahami was part of a cell, which also makes him also a typical American terrorist. Every lethal terrorist attack since 9/11 has been carried out by a so-called "lone wolf" or a pair of terrorists who were not part of a larger cell.

Indeed, in many ways Rahami is almost exactly like Omar Mateen, who killed 49 at an Orlando nightclub in June. Mateen was a 29-year-old married father and an American citizen of Afghan descent born in New York who carried out his plot by himself.

The bomb that went off in the Chelsea neighborhood this past weekend, injuring 29, is the first jihadist terrorist attack in Manhattan since 9/11.

Similarities to Boston bombing

The bomb device in Chelsea was almost identical to those used in the Boston Marathon attacks three years ago. Pressure cookers were used to house the devices; shrapnel was added to increase the lethality of the charges, and Christmas lights were used to initiate the explosions, according to law enforcement officials.

Terrorist groups have posted these recipes online.

Just as is often the case in school shootings, jihadist terrorists also study previous attacks and it's interesting to note the close match between the Boston bombs and the device used in Chelsea. Adding to the similarities to the Boston attack, a pipe bomb in Seaside, New Jersey, that Rahami is believed to have planted also targeted a running event, a Marine Corps charity run, but the device didn't injure anyone when it detonated on Saturday. Also, a notebook used by Rahami had jottings about the Boston bombers.

Of course, a major difference with the Boston Marathon bombing is that Rahami did not succeed in killing his victims. Unlike the Boston Marathon bombers, Rahami did not place his bomb directly on the street in Chelsea where it could inflict significant damage, but instead put his inside a dumpster, which largely contained the blast. This was a rookie error.

Rahami also used the peroxide-based bomb ingredient HMTD, which is rarely used by terrorists because it is both unstable and not as powerful as another peroxide-based explosive, TATP.

The US Department of Homeland Security says that one of the few terrorists in the States to have tried to launch an HMTD-bomb attacks is Ahmed Ressam, an Algerian al-Qaeda member living in Canada. Ressam built an HMTD-based bomb in Canada that he planned to detonate at Los Angeles International Airport in December 1999. Ressam was arrested at a U.S. border crossing before he could carry out his plan.

Terrorists have been more successful with the more powerful peroxide-based bomb TATP, which was used in the London transportation bombings in 2005 in which al-Qaeda directed suicide attackers killed 52 commuters.

Najibullah Zazi---like Rahami also a US citizen of Afghan descent---was also trained by al Qaeda in Pakistan in 2009 to build TATP-based bombs and, together with two American friends that he had grown up with in Queens, New York., Zazi planned to detonate these bombs in the Manhattan subway around the eight anniversary of the 9/11 attacks. Luckily, a tip from British intelligence led to the uncovering of Zazi and his two co-conspirators just days before they planned to launch their attacks.

The big question: Why?

The fact that Rahami almost perfectly fits the profile of an American jihadist terrorist doesn't, of course, answer the big question: Why would he attempt to murder complete strangers in the country that he had grown up in?

So far Rahami's precise motivations are still murky, but it's telling that in the notebook that he used he made notations about the American jihadist cleric Anwar al-Awlaki who, until he was killed in a CIA drone strike in 2011, was a key leader of al Qaeda in Yemen.

Lost in the intense coverage of the ISIS-inspired threat in the States is the continuing importance of Awlaki, whose sermons and writings about the importance of jihad have appeared in 99 jihadist terrorism cases since 9/11, according to New America's research. Awlaki was killed in a drone strike in Yemen in 2011, but killing the man turned out to be easier than killing his ideas; since his death al-Awlaki's writings and videos have turned up in 58 terrorism cases in the United States.

For the book "United States of Jihad: Investigating America's Homegrown Terrorists," I reviewed court records in hundreds of terrorism cases and spoke to family members and friends of terrorists, as well as to some of the militants themselves. American jihadists are generally motivated by a mix of factors, including dislike of U.S. foreign policy in the Muslim world. For many, embracing the ideology of Osama bin Laden or ISIS allowed them to become the heroes of their own story as well as actors in a cosmic crusade. For others a "cognitive opening" to militant Islam, was often precipitated by a personal disappointment or loss.

For each individual terrorist the proportion of these motivations varied. Take the Boston Marathon bombers who Rahami seemed to have emulated. Tamerlan Tsarnaev, one of the two brothers who carried out the marathon bombing was a non-practicing Muslim who only became an Islamist militant once his dreams of becoming an Olympic boxer faded. At the time of the attack, he was unemployed. On the other hand, his younger brother Dzhokhar never seemed to embrace militant Islam. He smoked marijuana, drank, and chased girls.

These stories of the two Boston Marathon bombers underline how hard it is to satisfactorily answer the question of why terrorists try to kill complete strangers.

Purely homegrown or trained overseas?

Now that Rahami is in custody, law enforcement will have a number of questions: Is he a purely "homegrown" terrorist, or was he trained overseas in Afghanistan or Pakistan, countries he visited often? Was the attack ISIS-inspired? If so, is there any indication Rahami was in direct touch with members of ISIS using encrypted communications? Or was he inspired or directed by some other jihadist group based in the Afghan-Pakistan region, such as al Qaeda or the Taliban?

Faisal Shahzad, an American citizen who had once worked at the Elizabeth Arden cosmetic company in Connecticut, was trained by the Pakistani Taliban in 2009 to carry out a car bomb attack in Manhattan. Luckily, he received only five days training and the bomb contained in a SUV that Shahzad parked in Times Square on a busy Saturday night on May 1, 2010 didn't detonate properly.

This was the last time that a terrorist who had been trained by a foreign terrorist organization attempted to carry out an attack in the United States, and since then we have seen attacks or attempted attacks in the States carried out only by "homegrown" terrorists.

That was the case this past weekend when Dahir Adan stabbed 10 people in a Minnesota mall. According to an American counterterrorism official, Adan had also grown up in the States.

Adan was quickly adopted by ISIS as a "soldier" of its so-called caliphate, the same nomenclature it used to describe Mateen after his attack in Orlando. Similarly ISIS embraced the perpetrator of the attack in July in Nice, France, that killed 84 people as a "soldier" of the caliphate.

There is no evidence these attacks were tied to ISIS in any way other than that the terrorist group supplied some degree of inspiration for them, and it only claimed responsibility for them after the fact. ISIS may also opportunistically claim Rahami as one of its soldiers.

Political fallout

There is already political fallout from the Chelsea attacks.

On Monday, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump told Fox that such attacks would proliferate "because we're allowing these people to come into our country and destroy our country and make it unsafe for people."

In fact, Rahami is a naturalized American citizen who arrived in the States around age 7. Friends describe him as very Americanized, which is not surprising given the fact he has lived in the States for the past two decades.

And this is precisely the challenge US law enforcement faces. Despite the fact that the FBI says it is conducting 1,000 investigations of suspected Islamist militants in all 50 states, by the law of averages terrorists using low-tech weapons such as pressure bombs or legally acquired semiautomatic weapons will occasionally slip below the radar. (While initially officials said Rahami was not known to law enforcement for his militant views or actions, his father says he called the FBI two years ago when his son acted out violently.)

Going forward there were will be others like Rahami who will carry out low-tech terrorist attacks. Because they are American citizens, barring **immigrants** from Muslim countries or places where terrorism is endemic will do nothing to stem this problem.

These jihadist militants are already here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 1:40 p.m.: Adds officials saying the FBI interviewed Rahami's father about him after Rahami was arrested on suspicion of stabbing a relative, graf 28-31; edits to conform, graf 32.

(CNN) -- The capture of bombings suspect Ahmad Khan Rahami alive gives investigators a rare opportunity to try to establish his motivations and affiliations -- if they can get him to talk.

Law enforcement officials launched a manhunt for Rahami after identifying him through a fingerprint, and he was taken into custody Monday after a shootout with police in Linden, New Jersey.

But questions remain about the events leading up to Saturday's bombings in New York and Seaside Park, New Jersey, and the discovery of pipe bombs Sunday night in Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Did Rahami act alone?

Authorities believe the "main guy" has been caught, but the investigation continues to determine if Rahami had help.

Though FBI Assistant Director William F. Sweeney Jr. said there is "no indication" of an active operating cell in the New York area, evidence suggests Rahami was not acting alone, sources told CNN.

Surveillance video shows a man believed to be Rahami with a duffel bag in the area where an unexploded pressure cooker was found in New York's Chelsea neighborhood.

After he leaves, the video shows two other men removing a white garbage bag believed to contain the pressure cooker from the duffel bag and leaving it on the sidewalk, according to a senior law enforcement official and another source familiar with the video.

Investigators want to talk to the two men but appear to have moved away from the idea that the pair had been involved. New York police Commissioner James O'Neill described the men as "strolling" along the street and seeming "incredulous" when they took the bag.

Lenny DePaul, a US Marshals Service former commander, told CNN that investigators would be asking Rahami whether he had any help.

"The real question is: Is there anyone else out there? Was this him solely on his own? Is this a lone wolf or a known wolf that's slipped through the cracks?"

Investigators will likely look to leverage his personal relationships to get information, DePaul said.

"Is there an ability to say: If you don't work with us, everyone around you who may have been complicit may be hit with a conspiracy charge (that may happen anyway) so there's leverage now that he's here," DePaul said.

If Rahami is not a lone wolf, where's the rest of the pack?

Is Rahami affiliated with a terror group?

A notebook found in Rahami's possession when he was taken into custody contained ramblings, including references to previous terrorists, such as the Boston Marathon bombers, and Yemeni-American cleric Anwar al-Awlaki, who was a spokesman for al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula before a CIA drone strike killed him in 2011.

Rahami was born in Afghanistan and traveled home often -- common for **immigrant** families. He is married to a woman from Pakistan, who was in the United States recently but left just before the bombings.

Investigators will be looking into his travels to both countries -- especially to areas recognized as Taliban and al Qaeda strongholds -- to see if he was radicalized abroad.

ISIS -- which claimed the Minnesota mall stabbings over the weekend -- is less prominent in these countries than terrorist groups such as Pakistan's Tehreek-i Taliban, the Afghan Taliban and al Qaeda.

ISIS first appeared in Afghanistan in 2015 -- after Rahami's last visit -- but has been calling for lone wolf attacks in the West.

The Afghan Taliban denies any involvement in the bombings and any ties with Rahami, said the group's spokesman, Zabiullah Mujahid.

And the reference in the notebook to Awlaki -- a source of inspiration for several terror attacks -- appears to bolster an emerging view among investigators that this weekend's attacks weren't ISIS-inspired, at least not in whole.

Former New York state homeland security adviser Michael Balboni told CNN it appeared Rahami "didn't have a plan B or a plan C."

"This has the flavor of someone who was self-radicalized and perhaps who was inspired but not instructed," he said.

Evan Perez, CNN's justice correspondent, said authorities would be looking at whom Rahami was meeting and associating with when he was abroad and whether they could have taught him to make a bomb.

Rahami didn't immediately cooperate with police, but investigators expect to try to talk to him again on Tuesday, a law enforcement official said.

Why wasn't Rahami on a watch list?

Perez said Rahami had not aroused any kind of suspicion that he might have been radicalizing.

"They have hundreds of young men who are attracted to ISIS or following supporters of different terrorist groups and are speaking out online, doing things on social media -- he was not one of these people."

The FBI did discuss Rahami with his father once, in 2014, after the younger Rahami was arrested on suspicion of stabbing one of his relatives, two US officials said Tuesday.

That interview stemmed from a tip alleging that Rahami's father was calling his son a terrorist, the officials said. However, there were conflicting reports about who initiated the contact. The father told reporters Tuesday that he contacted the FBI to express concerns about his son.

In the FBI interview, the father downplayed his concern, the two US officials said. The FBI ran more checks but never interviewed Ahmad Rahami, according to officials. Ultimately, federal investigators believed it was just a domestic dispute, officials said.

Rahami was never charged in the incident; a grand jury didn't find sufficient evidence to indict him, according to court documents.

At the time, Rahami had just returned from an extended trip to Pakistan and Afghanistan, one of several he had made to the region.

According to an official who reviewed Rahami's travel and **immigration** record, he had spent several weeks in Pakistan and Afghanistan in 2011 when he married. He was also in Pakistan almost a year -- and visited Afghanistan again -- from April 2013 until March 2014.

Rahami was questioned every time he returned from Afghanistan to the United States -- as is standard procedure -- and received secondary screening on both visits, telling officials he was visiting family and satisfying whatever concerns they had.

The law enforcement official said Rahami first came to the United States in January 1995, several years after his father arrived seeking asylum. The official said Rahami was given a US passport in 2003, while a minor, and again in 2007 after he said he lost his first one. However, Rahami only became a naturalized US citizen in 2011.

What did his family know?

Rahami's family lives above First American Fried Chicken in Elizabeth, the city's mayor says. The family has a history of clashes with the community over the restaurant, which used to be open 24 hours a day, Mayor Chris Bollwage said. Investigators searched the building Monday, Bollwage said.

Perez said investigators would be asking family members what they had noticed.

"Was he making trial runs at this? Where was he doing that? If he was making these bombs, was his house or home a bomb lab, and how did no one notice? How did no one -- his brother, his father, his family? He lived with them. Those are questions right now that are being asked of his family members and anybody who saw any changes in his demeanor in the last few months."

The family alleged discrimination and harassment in a lawsuit against the city and its police department in 2011, arguing that officials conspired against them by subjecting them to citations for allegedly violating a city ordinance on hours of operation.

Bollwage said Monday a 2012 ruling on the case favored the city, adding that the family's restaurant was "disruptive in the city for many, many years."

In a Facebook post Monday, a family member asked for privacy.

"I would like people to respect my family's privacy and let us have our peace after this tragic time," wrote Zobyedh Rahami, who's believed to be Rahami's sister.

Where is his wife?

Rahami's wife left the United States a few days before this weekend's bombings, and US officials want to speak with her, a law enforcement official said on condition of anonymity.

The official didn't provide details about her travels but said authorities are working with officials in Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates to gain access to her.

Her timeline in the United States wasn't immediately clear. Rahami had tried earlier this decade to petition to bring his wife to the United States from Pakistan, though it wasn't clear when he succeeded.

A law enforcement official told CNN that Rahami filed the paperwork in 2011, and it was approved in 2012.

Then, in 2014, Rahami contacted the office of US Rep. Albio Sires, D-New Jersey, from Islamabad, Pakistan, saying he was concerned about his wife's passport and visa. It turned out her Pakistani passport had expired and the consulate wouldn't give her an **immigrant** visa until the passport was renewed, Sires said.

Once the passport was renewed, she found out she was pregnant, and officials told her they wouldn't give a visa until she had the baby, Sires said. They also told her an **immigrant** visa would be needed for the baby after the birth.

At that point, Rahami claims the consulate told him to go back to Karachi, Pakistan, but he claimed it was too dangerous to go there. The congressman doesn't know what happened after that.

How are the New York and New Jersey attacks connected?

Initially, a garbage can explosion near a Marine Corps charity race in Seaside Park, New Jersey, seemed to be an isolated incident. Two other unexploded bombs were found nearby, and no one was wounded in the blast.

Then came another blast Saturday night in West 23rd Street in Chelsea, injuring 29 people. As law enforcement cordoned off the area, investigators found a pressure cooker four blocks away on West 27th Street. The video of the man with the duffel bag -- thought to be Rahami -- shows him in both locations.

Authorities have said Rahami is "directly linked" to the Seaside Park and Chelsea bombings.

Sources told CNN he is also believed to be connected to pipe bombs found Sunday night in Elizabeth, New Jersey, though there is no direct evidence.

Rahami's last known address was in Elizabeth.

The five pipe bombs were found in a backpack outside a neighborhood pub --- one later detonated as bomb technicians deployed a robot to examine them.

What do the devices tell us?

The pressure cooker bombs found at the 23rd Street and 27th Street locations in Manhattan contained the homemade explosive hexamethylene triperoxide diamine, or HMTD, according to law enforcement officials. It is a highly unstable explosive similar to TATP, used in the 2005 London bombings.

The ingredients are easy to obtain, and recipes to make it are accessible online. Investigators believe Rahami used common precursor chemicals to make those explosives; now they are trying to find out where he purchased the ingredients, according to the officials.

CNN's Perez said it appeared Rahami did not have great expertise because the devices didn't work as well as they should have.

"Some of them were pipe bombs, some of them were pressure cooker bombs with cell phones to detonate. So the question is: How did he come up with this recipe? Who taught him to do this?"

CNN's Shimon Prokupecz reported from New York, and CNN's Emanuella Grinberg and Holly Yan wrote from Atlanta. CNN's Rachel Crane and Linh Tran reported from Elizabeth, New Jersey, and CNN's Pamela Brown, Evan Perez, Ivan Watson, Drew Griffin, Madison Park, Jason Hanna, Joe Sutton, Emily Smith, Max Blau, Deborah Feyerick and Jessica Schneider contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Could Ahmad Khan Rahami's wife provide clues about the bombing suspect and his plans?

Investigators want to speak with her, but they need to find her first.

Authorities haven't released the wife's name, and details about her background are scarce. Here's what we've learned so far:

She recently left the United States.

Rahami's wife left the United States a few days before Saturday's bombings in New York and New Jersey, a law enforcement official said.

The official, who spoke to CNN on condition of anonymity, didn't provide details about the wife's travels but said authorities are working with officials in Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates to gain access to her.

She married Rahami in Pakistan in 2011.

Rahami and his wife married in July 2011 in Pakistan, while Rahami was spending several weeks in the region, according to a law enforcement official who had reviewed his travel and **immigration** record.

Rahami had asked officials for help with her **immigration** paperwork.

That same year, Rahami filed a petition to bring his wife to the United States. The paperwork was approved in 2012, according to one official, who said it was unclear from the paperwork whether she'd come to the country.

Rahami ran into problems with his wife's **immigration** paperwork in 2014 and contacted a US congressman for help.

US Rep. Albio Sires said Rahami contacted his office about concerns with his wife's passport and visa. Her Pakistani passport had expired, according to Sires, and the US Consulate wouldn't give her an **immigrant** visa until the passport was renewed. Once the passport was renewed, according to Sires, Rahami's wife learned she was pregnant, and US officials told her they wouldn't issue a visa until the baby was born. Then, according to Sires, officials said they'd have to get an **immigrant** visa for the baby, too.

Sires said he doesn't know what happened next. At the time, he said, the consulate advised Rahami to travel to Karachi, Pakistan, but Rahami said it was too dangerous.

CNN's Pamela Brown, Evan Perez, Shimon Prokupecz, Jason Hanna, Susannah Cullinane, Emanuella Grinberg and Holly Yan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**11:15 more from speech, including Israel language 10:58 more updates 10:44 retops with Obama, new hed, writethru

UNITED NATIONS (CNN) -- President Barack Obama painted a dark picture Tuesday of a world divided between those who want to cooperate with global partners and those who want to retreat into division and isolationism.

"Our societies are filled with uncertainty and unease and strife," Obama said during his final address to the United Nations General Assembly, in remarks that seemed to reflect his view of the United States as well as countries abroad. "Despite enormous progress as people lose trust in institutions, governing becomes more difficult and tensions between nations become more quick to surface."

In pushing back against these global dynamics, Obama took an an indirect jab at Republican presidential challenger Donald Trump, declaring that "a nation ringed by walls would only imprison itself."

Obama acknowledged that voices pressing for globalization had too often ignored trends toward inequality, and assessed that indifference helped lead politics toward "aggressive nationalism" and a "crude populism ... often from the hard right."

He said that the world "cannot dismiss these visions," as they are "powerful," but he rejected them and choices that elevate authoritarianism, strongmen and other forces that harm liberalism.

"I believe that at this moment we all face a choice," Obama said. "We can choose to press forward with a better model of cooperation and integration or we can retreat into a world sharply divided and ultimately in conflict along age-old lines of nation and tribe and race and religion. I want to suggest to you today that we must go forward and not back."

He also defended key policies that have come under attack during the US presidential election, including global trade and **immigration**.

While he warned that "extremism will continue to be exported overseas," he argued that nations shouldn't isolate themselves by not welcoming outsiders.

"The world is too small for us to simply build a wall and prevent it from affecting our own societies," Obama said.

He also said that the United States and other developed nations must set a better example for emerging democracies.

Citing the pervasive role of money in politics, entrenched party allegiances and a patchwork of voting laws, Obama said it was up to long-established nations to show the way forward.

"Those of us who believe in democracy, we need to speak out forcefully. Because both the facts and history is on our side," Obama said. "We better strive harder to set a better example at home."

And in one of the thorniest issues currently confronting the world -- the civil war in Syria -- Obama said there was a "military component" to addressing it, but continued, "there's no ultimate military victory to be won" and that nations must "continue the hard work of diplomacy."

The President concluded his last UN address with a fatalistic warning on global politics.

"Time and again human beings have believed they finally arrived at a period of enlightenment only to repeat cycles of conflict and suffering. Perhaps that's our fate," Obama said in the final lines of his address.

"We have to remember the choices of individual human beings led to repeated world war," Obama said. "But we have to remember the choices of individual human beings created a United Nations so that a war like that would never happen again."

Individual leaders and nations "can choose to reject those who appeal to our worst impulses and embrace those who appeal to our best," Obama said. "We have shown we can choose a better history."

His speech was a final opportunity to harness the commanding optics of the stately General Assembly hall to bolster his message 49 days before votes are cast for his replacement, in a race as much a referendum on Obama's record as a choice for his successor.

Obama's address also came amid fresh reminders of the destabilizing threats he'll leave behind when he departs office in January. Diplomats gathering in New York this week have contended with terror threats at close range, with a blast injuring dozens in Manhattan as the UN convened nearby, as well as a stabbing plot at a mall in Minnesota and a pipe bomb in New Jersey.

Despite Obama touting his achievements, the array of places where Obama's approach hasn't yielded the outcomes he projected during his first appearance here in 2009 were also unavoidable. Those include closing the Guantanamo Bay naval prison, fully withdrawing US troops from Iraq and Afghanistan and negotiating peace between Israel and the Palestinians -- the last a major topic in his first four UN addresses that was entirely absent during last year's speech.

This year, the President took issue with both sides' actions toward one another.

He criticized Israeli settlements, saying the only path to Mideast peace will come when the two sides reconcile deeply held differences.

Palestinians must "reject incitement and recognize the legitimacy of Israel," Obama said.

But he also said peace won't come until "Israel recognizes it cannot permanently occupy and settle Palestinian land."

Obama plans to meet Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on Wednesday to "discuss the need for genuine advancement of a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the face of deeply troubling trends on the ground," according to White House Press Secretary Josh Earnest.

Other persisting crises -- the emergence of ISIS, a bloody civil war in Syria and Russia's continued incursion into Ukraine -- hadn't yet erupted when Obama entered office but have strained his efforts to foster global stability.

Those intractable problems are largely the focus of Obama's bilateral agenda in New York this week, including during talks with Iraq's Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi Monday to plot a campaign to retake ISIS-held Mosul. He also conferred with Chinese Premier Li Keqiang about North Korea's most recent nuclear test.

"On the one hand, there are enormous positive indicators in our world today in terms of economic growth, standards of living, the ability to forge international cooperation on very difficult issues like climate change," Ben Rhodes, Obama's deputy national security adviser, said last week. "At the same time, there's also a great deal of unease."

Obama was well-received when he arrived at the UN in 2009 and vowed to shift US tactics toward collective action rather than the more unilateral approach of President George W. Bush. Obama himself acknowledged that he arrived with outsized expectations rooted "in a discontent with a status quo that has allowed us to be increasingly defined by our differences, and outpaced by our problems."

In the ensuing seven years, Obama maintained his insistence upon pursing diplomatic resolutions to sticky global disputes, best evidenced in the controversial agreement to loosen sanctions on Iran in exchange for the country reducing its nuclear program.

"We made good on the President's pledge to engage with those with whom we disagree, opening up new, profound opportunities for diplomatic progress," said Samantha Power, Obama's ambassador to the UN since 2013. "I think it's hard to overstate the transformative effect that this approach has had."

For all of those achievements, global unease remains -- some of it connected to American political developments. UN delegates are witnessing the caustic final stretch of the US presidential campaign, which has left foreign allies unsure of their standing come January. Obama has used his UN addresses in the past to confront domestic anxieties, including during his reelection battle with Mitt Romney in 2012 and later when racial tensions prompted protests in Ferguson, Missouri, in 2014.

Last year, as isolationist vows and bombastic rhetoric were fueling Donald Trump's rise, Obama warned against turning inward.

"The increasing skepticism of our international order can be found in the most advanced democracies. We see greater polarization, more frequent gridlock, movements on the far right, and sometimes the left, that insist on stopping the trade that binds our fates to other nations, calling for the building of walls to keep out **immigrants**," he said a year ago. "The United States is not immune from this."

In the ensuing 12 months, those forces have strengthened, evidenced not only by Trump's clinching of the Republican nomination but also a vote in the United Kingdom to exit the European Union and a resurgence of nationalist parties across Europe.

Still, even as both Trump and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton also stopped by New York this week to meet with world leaders attending the General Assembly, Obama hopes to achieve a last push for greater cooperation between nations even after he leaves office.

"I think the way the President will approach this is trying to apply what we have done that's worked in the last eight years as a template for how we deal with other crises," Rhodes said ahead of Obama's speech.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- What Harinder Bains did isn't unusual: He saw something suspicious and called police.

But who Harinder Bains is makes this story special.

Bains is the bar owner who led police to Ahmad Rahami, the suspect in the New York and New Jersey blasts.

While officials haven't pinned an exact motive to the Afghanistan-born Rahami's act, a handwritten note is said to have contained ramblings, including references to previous terrorists, such as the Boston Marathon bombers.

That's what makes Bains actions remarkable.

Bains is a Sikh American. And every time an attack has been carried out by an Islamic extremist, Sikhs -- mistaken for Muslims because of their turbans and beards -- have borne the backlash. And 15 years after 9/11, Sikhs don't feel any safer. The hate spewed toward them, as **immigrants**, has only spiked because of the xenophobic tenor in some quarters these days.

Which brings us to Bains - a Sikh man, an **immigrant** -- who had a hand in stopping a suspect -- another **immigrant** -- from getting away with a crime.

"Not for nuthin' the guy who recognized & called the police on the bomb suspect was an **IMMIGRANT** named Harinder Bains. **IMMIGRANT**= HERO!" tweeted Cecile Kazemi, echoing a sentiment repeated over and over online.

But talk to Bains and he'll tell you his actions had nothing to do with his Sikh faith.

"I did what I think every American would have done," Bains told CNN's Chris Cuomo. "My neighbor would have done the same thing. Any Jewish, Christian, Sikh, Muslim. Anybody would have done the same thing."

"I'm from Sikh faith," he added. "I've been taught always stand up against the atrocities, any kind of persecution."

The discovery

On Monday morning, Bains spotted Rahami sleeping in the doorway of his bar in Linden, New Jersey.

At first, Bains said he thought Rahami was a "drunk guy" wandering the streets.

"This has happened before also -- somebody loitering in front of the bar. And always I go there and confront people and I yell at them. But somehow maybe [because] it was raining, I didn't do anything. I felt bad for him."

Later, as he was watching CNN from another business across the street, he recognized the 28-year-old as the person wanted for questioning in this weekend's bombings.

He called 911.

"I just told them the guy looks a little suspicious and doesn't look good to me," Bains told "Anderson Cooper 360."

When officers confronted him, Rahami pulled out a handgun and shot one of them.

"He shot twice and the glass splinters almost hit my store," Bains said.

A shootout ensued, and then the world watched as cameras caught Rahami being loaded into an ambulance on a stretcher.

It was a stunning end to a two-day manhunt.

Bains insists he is not a hero.

But he is using the spotlight to promote a message of inclusion: "We will be more stronger like this if we do everything together."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 10:21 a.m.: Adds breaking news; incorporates previous breaking news.

NEW YORK (CNN) -- [Breaking news update, published at 10:13 a.m.]

A notebook found on New York and New Jersey bombings suspect Ahmad Khan Rahami contained ramblings about terrorists and also mentioned Anwar al-Awlaki, the Yemeni-American imam who was a spokesman for al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula, according to a law enforcement official.

The notebook, which also referred to the Boston Marathon bombers, had a bullet hole; it's not clear whether that occurred during Monday's shootout between police and Rahami.

The reference to Awlaki, who was killed in 2011 and has been a source of inspiration for many terrorist attacks, appears to help bolster an emerging view among investigators that the weekend attacks weren't ISIS-inspired.

Meanwhile, a law enforcement source who previously said the notes were found with an unexploded pressure cooker bomb now says the notes weren't found with the bomb.

[Original story, published at 8:05 a.m.]

What was his motive? Was he working alone? What did his wife know? Why did he make lengthy trips to Afghanistan and Pakistan?

These are among the questions that have emerged in the wake of the capture of the man suspected of planting bombs in New York and New Jersey over the weekend.

Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, is "directly linked" to bombings Saturday in New York City and Seaside Park, New Jersey, authorities said, and is believed to be connected to pipe bombs found in a backpack Sunday night in Elizabeth, New Jersey.

Rahami, captured Monday morning, was charged with five counts of attempted murder of a law enforcement officer, second-degree unlawful possession of a weapon and second-degree possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose on Monday, according to the Union County (New Jersey) prosecutor's office.

Rahami was not initially cooperative with police who tried to interview him, a law enforcement official said. His bail has been set at $5.2 million.

Authorities also want to speak to his wife, who left the United States a few days before the bombings, a law enforcement official said on condition of anonymity.

The official didn't provide details about her travels but said authorities are working with officials in Pakistan and the United Arab Emirates to gain access to her.

The arrest

Rahami was captured after the owner of a bar in Linden, New Jersey, found him sleeping in the doorway of his bar Monday morning. Harinder Bains, owner of Merdie's Tavern, recognized Rahami after watching CNN on his laptop and called police.

When officers responded, Rahami pulled out a handgun and opened fire, striking an officer in his protective vest over his chest. A foot chase ensued, during which Rahami shot at a police car, causing a bullet to graze another officer in the face.

The chase ended when Rahami was shot multiple times. He was taken to a hospital for surgery.

Authorities believe the "main guy" has been caught but the investigation continues to determine if Rahami had help, sources told CNN.

Though FBI Assistant Director William F. Sweeney Jr., said there is "no indication" of an active operating terror cell in the New York area, evidence suggests Rahami was not acting alone, sources told CNN.

The investigation

Initially, a garbage can explosion at a Marine Corps charity race in Seaside Park, New Jersey, Saturday morning seemed to be an isolated incident. No one was injured, and two other unexploded bombs were found nearby.

Then an explosion Saturday night in New York's Chelsea neighborhood injured 29 people. As law enforcement cordoned off the area, investigators found a pressure cooker with wires coming out of it four blocks away.

Surveillance video showed a man believed to be Rahami dragging what appeared to be a duffel bag with wheels near the site of the West 23rd Street explosion about 40 minutes before the blast, according to local and federal law enforcement sources.

About 10 minutes later, surveillance video showed the same man with the same duffel bag on West 27th Street, near the site of the second bomb.

Rahami was identified Sunday afternoon through a fingerprint, a senior law enforcement official said. Evidence from the cell phone on the pressure cooker also led to Rahami's identification.

His last known address was in Elizabeth, the same city where the backpack with explosives was found Sunday night.

The latest bomb discovery

The backpack, which contained five bombs, was found in a wastebasket around 9:30 p.m. on Sunday outside a neighborhood pub in Elizabeth, about 16 miles from New York City.

As bomb technicians deployed a robot to examine the devices, one of the bombs detonated.

Who is the suspect, and what did his wife know?

Rahami first came to the United States in 1995 as a child, after his father arrived seeking asylum, and became a naturalized US citizen in 2011, according to a law enforcement official who reviewed his travel and **immigration** record.

Rahami traveled for extended periods to Afghanistan and Pakistan in the last five years, officials said. While in Pakistan in July 2011, he married a Pakistani woman. Two years later, in April 2013, he went to Pakistan and remained there until March 2014, visiting Afghanistan before returning to the United States.

Upon returning from both visits he told officials he was visiting family, satisfying any concerns **immigration** officials had at the time.

His family runs First American Fried Chicken in Elizabeth, Mayor Chris Bollwage said. The family has a history of clashes with the community over the restaurant, which used to be open 24 hours a day, Bollwage added.

In 2011, the family sued the city and its police department, alleging discrimination and harassment against Muslims stemming from disputes over the restaurant's hours. Investigators searched the building on Monday, the mayor said.

Obama comments on incident

Substantial police presence notwithstanding, life in New York appears to have returned to normal. Authorities had heightened security across the city as it hosts world leaders at the United Nations General Assembly this week.

People in the region are tough and resilient, President Barack Obama said on Monday.

"They don't get scared," he said. "That's the kind of strength that makes me so proud to be an American. And, that's the kind of strength that is going to be absolutely critical, not just in the days to come, but in the years to come."

CNN's Evan Perez and Shimon Prokupecz reported from New York, and CNN's Emanuella Grinberg and Holly Yan wrote this story. CNN's Rachel Crane and Linh Tran reported from Elizabeth, New Jersey, and CNN's Pamela Brown, Drew Griffin, Madison Park, Joe Sutton, Emily Smith and Max Blau also contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Sen. Angus King said Tuesday shutting down **immigration** until the system is perfect would be "a terrible loss" for the United States.

"You're never going to reach perfection," the Maine independent said on CNN's "New Day." "If we have to wait until we are satisfied that the system is absolutely perfect, any system, then you wait forever. I suppose Donald Trump might say, 'That's okay,' but that would be a terrible loss for this country."

Trump expanded this summer his blanket ban on **immigrants** to the US to include those "from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism."

"You have many, many groups, because we're allowing these people to come into our country and destroy our country and make it unsafe for people," Trump said Monday on "Fox and Friends," arguing that the stricter **immigration** policies he has proposed would better protect the US from terror.

But King, who normally caucuses with Democrats in the Senate and endorsed Hillary Clinton in July, said such a ban could prevent "thousands and thousands" of **immigrants** from contributing to the greatness of America.

"You've got the bad guys, but you've also got thousands and thousands of really good people who come into this country -- everybody from Einstein to Donald Trump's ancestors to mine and yours came in through the **immigration** system," King told CNN's Alisyn Camerota.

But being an open country doesn't mean that the US government should loosen its vetting process, King said.

"That doesn't mean that we relax or we stop, but to say that the system has got to be perfect before we do anything, I just don't think is realistic," he said.

The man who stabbed nine people at a Minnesota mall Saturday before being shot dead by an off-duty police officer was a "soldier of the Islamic state," according to an ISIS-linked news agency. Local reports identified him as being of Somali descent.

Rep. Keith Ellison, who is Muslim, said following terrorist attacks the Minnesota Islamic community becomes concerned about rising Islamophobia.

"We know there will be some people that are going to take the bait of the terrorists and say 'This is about the Muslim community, the Somalis or the **immigrants**.' And it's not about that," the Minnesota lawmakers said on CNN's "New Day."

Ellison said the best response to terrorism acts is for America to unify instead of becoming divisive.

"The answer really is to come together as a community to be vigilant, to share information and to never let them forget who we are and what we're about," he told CNN's Chris Cuomo. "America is a pluralistic, inclusive society. We're not going to stop being that because some horrible person decided to commit an atrocious act."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Sen. Angus King said Tuesday shutting down **immigration** until the system is perfect would be "a terrible loss" for the United States.

"You're never going to reach perfection," the Maine independent said on CNN's "New Day." "If we have to wait until we are satisfied that the system is absolutely perfect, any system, then you wait forever. I suppose Donald Trump might say, 'That's okay,' but that would be a terrible loss for this country."

Trump expanded this summer his blanket ban on **immigrants** to the US to include those "from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism."

"You have many, many groups, because we're allowing these people to come into our country and destroy our country and make it unsafe for people," Trump said Monday on "Fox and Friends," arguing that the stricter **immigration** policies he has proposed would better protect the US from terror.

But King, who normally caucuses with Democrats in the Senate and endorsed Hillary Clinton in July, said such a ban could prevent "thousands and thousands" of **immigrants** from contributing to the greatness of America.

"You've got the bad guys, but you've also got thousands and thousands of really good people who come into this country -- everybody from Einstein to Donald Trump's ancestors to mine and yours came in through the **immigration** system," King told CNN's Alisyn Camerota.

But being an open country doesn't mean that the US government should loosen its vetting process, King said.

"That doesn't mean that we relax or we stop, but to say that the system has got to be perfect before we do anything, I just don't think is realistic," he said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- The mayors of New York City, London and Paris released a joint op-ed Tuesday advocating for refugee resettlement and urging world leaders meeting at the UN this week to respond to a "watershed moment" with "relief and safe haven" for migrants

Writing in The New York Times, New York City Mayor Bill de Blasio, London Mayor Sadiq Khan, and Paris Mayor Anne Hidalgo also cautioned against the spread of anti-**immigrant** rhetoric amid escalating tension and in the wake of bombings in New York and New Jersey over the weekend.

"In the aftermath of an explosive device going off in the Chelsea neighborhood of New York last weekend, and other attacks in cities throughout the world, we recognize that the security of all our residents is paramount in large, open, democratic societies. But it is wrong to characterize **immigrant** and refugee communities as radical and dangerous; in our experience, militant violence is vanishingly rare," they wrote.

The mayors also released their op-ed to coincide with the meeting of the United Nations in New York this week, and directly called on those in attendance to provide "an effective response to a growing humanitarian crisis."

"As the mayors of three great global cities -- New York, Paris, and London -- we urge the world leaders assembling at the United Nations to take decisive action to provide relief and safe haven to refugees fleeing conflict and migrants feeling economic hardship, and to support those who are already doing this work."

They continued, "We know policies that embrace diversity and promote inclusion are successful. We call on world leaders to adopt a similar welcoming and collaborative spirit on behalf of the refugees all over the world during the summit meeting this week. Our cities stand united in the call for inclusivity. It is part of who we are as citizens of diverse and thriving cities."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**1114PM - adds grafs 5-7

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump Jr., Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's son, tweeted a graphic on Tuesday that likened Syrian refugees to Skittles, which was swiftly met with criticism.

"This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016," he tweeted, with a graphic 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."

The graphic had an official Trump logo that the Republican nominee shares with his running mate, Mike Pence.

And it appears the graphic's language wasn't a Trump Jr. original, but instead that of former Illinois Rep. Joe Walsh, a former tea party congressman from Illinois and now a conservative talk radio host.

Walsh tweeted at Trump Jr.: "Hey @DonaldTrumpJr, that's the point I made last month. Glad you agree."

Walsh's tweet included a screenshot of a tweet he made dated August 13.

Hillary Clinton's campaign spokesman Nick Merrill retweeted Trump Jr. adding: "This is disgusting."

The 2016 campaign has featured heated rhetoric around US policy for accepting refugees. Clinton has called for an increase in the number of Syrian refugees the US should accept and Trump has called for "extreme vetting" of **immigrants**, as well as a ban on **immigrants** from countries that are hotbeds of terrorism, such as Syria.

One of President Barack Obama's former speechwriters responded to Trump Jr. with a link to CNN reporting about a little boy in Aleppo, Syria who became the face of the humanitarian crises in Syria.

"Hey @DonaldJTrumpJr, this is one of the millions of children you compared to a poisoned Skittle today," Jon Favreau tweeted.

Former Obama campaign staffer, Jason Sparks, tweeted at Trump Jr. photos of the Syrian refugee children in the crises and said: "These aren't Skittles, @DonaldJTrumpJr."

And musician John Legend, who has been an outspoken critic of Trump on Twitter, wrote: "There's a tiny chance that anyone could be a murderer. Get rid of everyone now!!! #trumplogic"

Legend also retweeted a photo of the Aleppo boy, where someone said: "This is not a skittle."

The Trump campaign did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Last week, Trump Jr. was criticized for making a "gas chamber" reference when complaining about how the treatment his father has received form the media compared to the coverage from Clinton.

"They've let her slide on every discrepancy, on every lie, on every DNC game trying to get Bernie Sanders out of the thing," he said. "I mean, if Republicans were doing that, they'd be warming up the gas chamber right now. It's a very different system -- there's nothing fair about it."

This story has been updated.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 10 p.m. -- Rewrite, edits and trims throughout; quote from bar owner in graf 8; names and conditions of injured officers in graf 10; squotes from Obama grafs 39-42

NEW YORK (CNN) -- The man suspected in Saturday's bombings in New York and New Jersey was captured on Monday after a frantic manhunt and shootout.

Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, was charged with five counts of attempted murder of a law enforcement officer after a shootout Monday with police in Linden, New Jersey, Union County Prosecutor Grace H. Park said. He is also charged with second-degree unlawful possession of a weapon and second-degree possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose.

Authorities said Rahami is "directly linked" to bombings Saturday in New York City and Seaside Park, New Jersey, and is believed to be connected to pipe bombs found Sunday night in Elizabeth, New Jersey, sources said.

"We have every reason to believe this was an act of terror," New York Mayor Bill de Blasio said Monday.

But many questions remain, chief among them, why did he do it? And, is anyone else responsible?

The arrest

Rahami was captured after the owner of a bar in Linden, New Jersey, found him sleeping in the doorway of his bar Monday morning. Harinder Bains, owner of Merdie's Tavern, said he was watching CNN on his laptop from another business across the street. At first, he thought he was some "drunk guy" resting in the vestibule. Then, he recognized Rahami and called police.

"I'm just a regular citizen doing what every citizen should do. Cops are the real heroes, law enforcement are the real heroes," Bains told CNN's Anderson Cooper.

When officers responded, Rahami pulled out a handgun and opened fire, striking an officer in the chest. A foot chase ensued, during which Rahami shot at a police car, causing a bullet to graze another office in the face.

The chase ended when Rahami was shot multiple times. He was taken to a hospital for surgery. Officers Angel Padilla and Peter Hammer were taken to the hospital for treatment of non-life threatening injuries.

Rahami was not initially cooperative with police who tried to interview him, a law enforcement official said.

Authorities believe the "main guy" has been caught but the investigation continues to determine if Rahami had help, sources told CNN.

Though FBI Assistant Director William F. Sweeney Jr., said there is "no indication" of an active operating cell in the New York area, evidence suggests Rahami was not acting alone, sources told CNN.

As the investigation continues, law enforcement has stressed there is no reason to believe a bomber is on the run.

The investigation

Initially, a garbage explosion at a Marine Corps charity race in Seaside Park, New Jersey, seemed to be an isolated incident. Two other unexploded bombs were found nearby and no one was wounded in the blast.

Then came another blast Saturday night in New York's Chelsea neighborhood, injuring 29 people. As law enforcement cordoned off the area, investigators found a pressure cooker four blocks away.

Dark-colored wiring was connected by silver duct tape to what appeared to be a cell phone. Ball bearings and BBs were among pieces of metal that appeared to be packed inside, a federal law enforcement official said. A handwritten note found next to it contained ramblings, including references to previous terrorists, including the Boston Marathon bombers.

Surveillance video shows a man believed to be Rahami dragging what appears to be a duffel bag with wheels near the site of the West 23rd Street explosion about 40 minutes before the blast, according to multiple local and federal law enforcement sources.

About 10 minutes later, surveillance video shows the same man with the same duffel bag on West 27th Street, multiple law enforcement sources said.

In the video, the man leaves the duffel bag where police later found the unexploded pressure cooker. After he leaves, the video shows two other men removing a white garbage bag believed to contain the pressure cooker from the duffel bag and leaving it on the sidewalk, according to a senior law enforcement official and another source familiar with the video.

Investigators have not determined if those two men are connected to the man with the duffel bag, the sources said.

Rahami was identified Sunday afternoon through a fingerprint, a senior law enforcement official said. Evidence from the cell phone on the pressure cooker also led to Rahmani's identification.

A traffic stop Sunday night of five people in New York led to searches and interviews in Elizabeth, New Jersey, said Sweeney with the FBI. Rahami's last known address was in Elizabeth, the same city where the backpack with explosives was found Sunday night.

The latest bomb discovery

The backpack with five bombs inside was found in a wastebasket around 9:30 p.m. on Sunday outside a neighborhood pub in Elizabeth, about 16 miles from New York City. Two men found the backpack about 500 feet from a train trestle and alerted police, officials said.

As bomb technicians deployed a robot to examine the devices, one of the bombs detonated. The remaining four were taken to an FBI laboratory at Quantico, Virginia, Elizabeth Mayor J. Christian Bollwage said.

Police checked all garbage cans in the immediate area but found no other suspicious items.

By Monday, authorities said they believed Rahami was linked to the explosion.

Who is the suspect?

Rahami first came to the United States in 1995 as a child, after his father arrived seeking asylum, and became a naturalized US citizen in 2011, according to a law enforcement official who reviewed his travel and **immigration** record.

Rahami traveled for extended periods to Afghanistan and Pakistan in the last five years, officials said. While in Pakistan in July 2011, he married a Pakistani woman. Two years later, in April 2013, he went to Pakistan and remained there until March 2014, visiting Afghanistan before returning to the United States.

Upon returning from both visits he told officials he was visiting family, satisfying any concerns **immigration** officials had at the time.

His family runs First American Fried Chicken in Elizabeth, the city's mayor said. The family has a history of clashes with the community over the restaurant, which used to be open 24 hours a day, Mayor Chris Bollwage said.

In 2011, the family sued the city of Elizabeth, and its police department, alleging discrimination and harassment against Muslims stemming from disputes over the restaurant's hours. Investigators searched the building on Monday, Bollwage said.

'Bigger than ever' NYPD presence

The bombings came as New York hosts world leaders at the United Nations General Assembly this week.

Heightened security across the city is common during the UNGA. But after the Chelsea bombing, Cuomo said 1,000 additional New York State Police officers and National Guard troops will be deployed to patrol bus terminals, airports and subway stations.

"You should know you will see a very substantial NYPD presence this week -- bigger than ever," de Blasio said.

Substantial police presence notwithstanding, life appears to have returned to normal, whether you call it resilience or resignation.

As President Obama said Monday, "we all have a role to play as citizens" by making sure we don't succumb to fear.

People in the region are tough and resilient, he said.

"They don't get scared," he said. "That's the kind of strength that makes me so proud to be an American. And, that's the kind of strength that is going to be absolutely critical, not just in the days to come, but in the years to come."

CNN's Evan Perez and Shimon Prokupecz reported from New York, and CNN's Emanuella Grinberg and Holly Yan wrote this story. CNN's Rachel Crane and Linh Tran reported from Elizabeth, New Jersey, and CNN's Pamela Brown, Drew Griffin, Madison Park, Joe Sutton, Emily Smith and Max Blau also contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 8:48 p.m., more detail on stabbing victims, grafs 38 to 40, first reference of mayor moved down, graf 46, new subhed and chief's comment, graf 50, background on NY, NJ, grafs 54 to 57

(CNN) -- Dahir Adan had been in a "joyful" and "happy" mood on Saturday before he went to a St. Cloud, Minnesota, mall to buy a phone, a community leader told CNN on Monday.

Adan, a private security firm employee with a good reputation in St. Cloud's Somali community, was intent on purchasing the newly released iPhone 7, according to Haji Yussuf, a local Somali community leader who has been in contact with the man's family.

Adan, 22, is suspected of storming the mall and stabbing 10 people Saturday night before he was shot dead by an off-duty police officer.

Earlier, two Somali community leaders in contact with the man's family told CNN that Adan had been acting strangely before the incident.

Details about Adan and the incident began to emerge Monday as authorities worked to piece together the suspect's background and pinpoint his motive, St. Cloud Police Chief William Blair Anderson told reporters.

"We are trying to find everything," Anderson said. "I want to know everything about this man, from the day he was born until last Saturday."

Federal law enforcement sources and Somali community leaders identified Adan on Monday. An ISIS-linked news agency praised him as a "soldier of the Islamic state."

CNN hasn't independently verified the claim, and on Monday, authorities maintained that the suspect appeared to have acted alone.

"We haven't uncovered anything that would suggest this was anything but a lone attacker at this point," Anderson told reporters.

The FBI is calling the attack "a potential act of terrorism." But no evidence has been found tying the suspect directly to terror groups, the police chief said.

A portrait of the stabbing suspect

Adan had a stellar reputation in St. Cloud's close-knit Somali community, said Yussuf, who is a director at #unitedcloud, a group that works to resolve tensions in St. Cloud.

Yussuf called him a "very exceptional young man" who loved his family and respected his community. He was an "exceptional student" and "very smart," he said.

"We're all trying to find answers as to what happened," Yussuf said. "The family is very frustrated about this, very sad."

Yussuf said family members want to see the footage of the incident, in which the suspect was said to have lunged at people before he was shot.

Yussuf praised law enforcement, saying it is doing an "amazing job" trying to get to the bottom of the case.

But he finds any link between ISIS and Adan hard to believe and at this point, he said, there is no connection.

"The idea that people like ISIS will claim this responsibility for us is ridiculous," he said.

Community leaders fear anti-Muslim backlash

As news of the incident emerged, local newspapers in Minnesota, including the Minneapolis Star Tribune and St. Cloud Times, identified the attacker as a member of the Somali community from the central part of the state.

St. Cloud, a city of 67,000 about 65 miles northwest of Minneapolis, is home to one of Minnesota's larger **immigrant** Muslim communities, and the incident has rattled people there.

In recent years, the Muslim community has faced conflicts with other Minnesota residents, including vandalism to mosques and opposition to at least one new Islamic house of worship, according to the Star Tribune.

Federal investigators have tracked the recruitment of potential ISIS fighters in Minnesota. Since 2014, nine Somali-Americans from that state were either convicted at trial or pleaded guilty in a plot to join ISIS by traveling to Syria. Before that, dozens of male Minnesota residents had left to join Al-Shabaab, a terrorist group working to turn Somalia into an Islamist state.

Yussuf noted that the mall incident occurred amid a contentious US presidential election, with its debates about restricting the flow of **immigrants**, and Somalis worry it could threaten the amity forged between them and their neighbors.

"It's affected all of our community," he said. "Nationally, there is the issue of **immigrants** and the presidential elections and people are saying things about **immigrants** and refugees -- about Mexicans, about Muslims. For 30 years people have been building bridges in our community and we are all afraid that this will disappear because of this one incident."

Muslim and Christian clergy and community leaders gathered on Monday afternoon. They expressed unity and community spirit with one Muslim leader calling ISIS un-Islamic and better called a "Luciferian cult."

Jaylani Hussein, executive director for the Council of American-Islamic Relations Minnesota said leaders are starting a hashtag for social media #stcloudtogether.

"This community, after this horrific tragedy, will move forward," he said.

The attack at the mall

Police and witnesses said the attacker, wearing a private security company uniform, entered Crossroads Mall on Saturday night around 8. Inside the mall, he made a reference to Allah and asked at least one person if they were Muslim before he attacked.

Ashley Bayne, an employee of J.C. Penney at the mall, was visiting a co-worker at the time of the incident. When the stabbings began, Bayne ran out to the parking lot and took off in her car, crying and shaking in the aftermath of an event she said she never thought would happen there.

"All of sudden chaos just broke out," Bayne said. "There was a bunch of people running into the J.C. Penney mall entrance, and they were just screaming that someone was going around the mall stabbing people, and that there was blood everywhere."

Though the mall's security teams were on site, the security officers were not armed.

Initially, nine victims were counted. Chief Anderson Monday said the 10th victim was identified as investigators continued to search through additional security video.

The victim, a 21-year-old man from St. Cloud, was not badly injured, and he told police that because of the nature of his injuries, he didn't initially seek out medical attention and didn't notify police.

The other nine victims have been released from the hospital.

Cop is 'clearly a hero'

Amid the chaos, Jason Falconer, an off-duty police officer from nearby Avon, killed the suspect as he threatened other shoppers.

Authorities said Adan, the attacker, had three previous encounters with police. According to Anderson, most of the encounters were for minor traffic violations, none of which led to an arrest. The police chief declined to provide further details about the attacker until more information was known.

At a news conference Sunday afternoon, the mayor and police chief praised Falconer, a part-time officer and former police chief of Albany, Minnesota, for taking action. Both officials said they had viewed a surveillance tape from Macy's which revealed details of the confrontation.

"His heroic actions are exemplary of having witnessed what he did as the suspect was lunging at him with a knife," St. Cloud Mayor Dave Kleis said. "Not only did he fire, the suspect went down, came back up on three different occasions. He protected others from being injured and potentially loss of life. Clearly, a hero."

City changed forever

Anderson said the attack will change the city forever.

"Whenever something as awful as this happens, it's hard for things to be the same as they were," the police chief said.

After the attacker in Minnesota was killed, the police chief said two search warrants were executed at an address in St. Cloud, and the suspect's vehicle was impounded. Though the case may be closed soon, Anderson didn't see things going back to normal.

On the same day, explosions in NY, NJ

The mall stabbing was one of several incidents reported nationwide Saturday. In New York, an explosion ripped through the Chelsea neighborhood, leaving 29 injured. A second explosive device was found a few blocks away, authorities say.

In New Jersey, an explosion went off in a garbage can on the route of a Marine Corps charity run. Thousands of people were about to participate in the 5K race in Seaside Park. No injuries were reported.

The man suspected in the bombings in New York and New Jersey was captured Monday.

Ahmad Khan Rahami was charged with five counts of attempted murder of a law enforcement officer after a shootout Monday with police in Linden, New Jersey, Union County Prosecutor Grace H. Park said. He is also charged with second-degree unlawful possession of a weapon and second-degree possession of a weapon for an unlawful purpose.

Rahami is believed to be connected to pipe bombs found Sunday night in Elizabeth, New Jersey, sources said

'ISIS does not represent us'

After the Saturday stabbings, Lul Hersi stood outside the Crossroads Mall, waiting to find out if her son was among the victims.

Fear washed over the Somali-American mother, not just for her son's well-being, but also because of the potential backlash against her community.

"This has been a dark day; it is a day we will never forget," said Hersi. "ISIS does not represent us. It does not represent Islam, and it does not represent Somalis."

Hersi said she hoped the tragedy would bring St. Cloud residents together, rather than divide them further.

"Let us unite as one Minnesota," she said. "Please let's spread love instead of hate."

CNN's Jason Kravarik, Catherine E. Shoichet, Brad Parks, Evan Perez, Faith Karimi, Joe Sutton, Steve Visser, Chandrika Narayan, Dani Stewart, Sara Sidner and Lonzo Cook contributed to this report

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**() -- Atlanta -- For the last 15 years, we have lived in a climate of close calls.

Even though there have only been a few terror attacks since 9/11 that resulted in loss of life, there have been plenty of attempts: A botched car bombing, explosives smuggled in underwear, a bomb hidden in sneakers.

They have eroded our feelings of security and altered our behavior -- from how we board airplanes to how we react when we see a bag on the side of the road.

Now, after a tumultuous week that saw four incidents in three different states, we are confronted with fresh questions: Could these have been prevented? Is there a terror cell? And with a pivotal presidential election entering its final weeks, how will the candidates handle the attacks? How will we, the voters?

This is how the next few days will go.

First, we'll search for motives

Whenever we are hit by an attack, the most precious commodity is information. This means, a waiting game fraught with frustration.

No official has suggested ties between the mall attack in Minnesota and the explosions in New Jersey and New York, but the proximity of the attacks links them in people's minds.

Unease, vigilance and assumptions will color the coming days. It's never easy to parse facts from conjecture when our world is on edge, but some will confuse and conflate Dahir A. Adan, the Somali-born Minnesota attacker, and and Ahmad Khan Rahami, the suspect in the New York and New Jersey attacks. And as they do, some may lash out at innocent, law-abiding Muslims and **immigrants**, as we've seen happen before.

Next, we'll exercise an abundance of caution

After 9/11, a nationwide anthrax scare had us checking every fine white powder we came across. After Paris, we saw an immediate uptick in suspicious package and person alerts.

A climate of uncertainty creates a climate of false alarms. Already, we're seeing it happen.

On Monday, a train station in Boston was evacuated due to a suspicious bag. The Atlanta Federal Building in Atlanta was evacuated after a report of a suspicious package. Police cleared a suspicious package at New Jersey's Rutgers University.

In an everyday context, this caution means altering our routine. We take our shoes off at TSA gates. We pack tiny bottles of shampoo in our carry-ons.

In a larger context, terror attacks change our laws and the way our government works. Think of all of the changes 9/11 brought: The Patriot Act; the Department of Homeland Security.

Third, we'll talk about a 'new norm'

US Rep. Charlie Rangel, who represents Manhattan, said the weekend attacks -- and a level of vigilance needed to combat them -- represent "a new norm."

Christiane Amanpour posed the question after the Brussels bombings in March: "Is terrorism the new norm for Europe?"

After the Nice attacks, Florida Sen. Marco Rubio tweeted, "Civilized & freedom loving nations cannot allow this to become the new normal."

The "new norm" line is used fairly consistently after a major attack.

But what is the "new norm?"

"Our focus now is on a much more disparate threat that's hard to see -- unpredictable, motivated, and driven by people who are just disturbed," FBI Director James Comey said.

With threats coming from unpredictable places and from unpredictable people, maybe the new norm is just a constant low-burning awareness that the next human atrocity could be right around the corner.

Fourth, there's the fear of a backlash

There is quantifiable evidence that, following attacks carried out by Islamic extremists, Muslim communities suffer increased abuse and violence. In 2015, the Council on American-Islamic Relations reported an "unprecedented" spike in "discrimination, intimidation, threats, and violence" toward Muslims after the Paris attacks.

This summer in France, the memory of those attacks, coupled with the July tragedy in Nice, led more than 30 beaches to institute a "burkini ban." (It was overturned by a French court in early September, but the effects are still being felt. Just this week, an Australian woman said she and her mother were ridiculed and forced off a French beach for their conservative swimwear.)

The Muslim community in St. Cloud, Minnesota, where the mall attacker Adan lived, is already bracing for backlash.

"For thirty years people have been building bridges in our community," said local Somali community leader Haji Yussuf, "and we are all afraid that this will disappear because of this one incident."

The fact that so many Muslims in America, like thousands that call St. Cloud home, are also **immigrants** presents yet another opportunity to heighten the tenor of **immigration** and refugee debates.

Republican Presidential candidate Donald Trump made such a link Monday during a rally in Fort Myers, Florida.

"These attacks, and many others, were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system," he said. "**Immigration** security is national security."

Fifth, it may affect what happens in November

November's election inches ever closer. The stakes are high, and this weekend's events may add another layer of complexity to the crucial contest.

A CNN/ORC poll conducted in June shows more Americans think terrorist attacks in the US are imminent now than at any point since 2003. Obviously, these attacks are unlikely to change that perspective.

An ABC News/Washington Post poll conducted around the same time also shows more Americans believe Hillary Clinton would handle the issue of terrorism better than Donald Trump.

Both candidates have weighed in on the issue.

"This threat is real, but so is our resolve. Americans will not cower. We will prevail," Hillary Clinton said Monday. She also called her opponent Donald Trump a "recruiting sergeant for the terrorists."

Beside his comments on **immigration**, Trump fired back in Fort Myers by calling Clinton "weak." He also took to Twitter to say it was "time to change the playbook" when it comes to dealing with terrorism.

Eventually, it will be business as usual

Call it resilience or call it resignation but life will very quickly cycle back to normal. Viewed from a cynical eye, it's just the tides of human attention washing in and then out again.

From a more hopeful vantage point, a sense of normalcy, coupled with vigilance, is the most measured reaction to the threat of terrorism.

This is the M.O. of every great city that has been struck by terrorism. We saw it after the Boston Marathon bombing. We saw it after the Paris attacks.

Following Saturday's bombings, New Yorkers made a show of pointing out that, when you live in a big city, especially one that's survived an attack like 9/11, being tough and resilient is the only way.

"I am so proud of my fellow New Yorkers. Most of us defied the urge to lash out in fits of hysterics," one New York City resident wrote in a Facebook post. "Of course, we shouldn't have to fear when the next attack is going to happen, but they're going to keep trying. And we're going to keep staying strong."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Six days before the crucial first presidential debate, Donald Trump is using a spate of bombings and stabbings to build an interlocking argument on two issues where he thinks tough talk gives him a winning hand -- **immigration** and terrorism.

The attacks over the weekend mercifully did not kill anybody -- but they inevitably put the fear of terrorism back at the center of the showdown between Trump and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton.

From Trump's point of view, the new terror scares play directly into a vision of a nation under siege and which he must get Americans to buy into if he is to win in November.

"We cannot let this evil continue," Trump said in Florida on Monday after the capture of a US naturalized citizen of Afghan descent suspected of planting a series of bombs in New York and New Jersey over the weekend, and the stabbing of nine people in a separate attack in a Minnesota mall on Saturday in an attack claimed by ISIS. "If you chose Donald Trump, these problems are going to go away."

Still -- Trump's hard bore approach does carry risks. His Democratic rival Hillary Clinton is also maneuvering in the wake of the attacks, portraying herself as the kind of steely and calm commander-in-chief Americans traditionally turn to in times of crisis.

"I know how to do this," Clinton said at an airport news conference on Monday.

Trump is presenting the attacks as the result of what he says are lax, weak anti-terrorism policies pursued by President Barack Obama and his Democratic foe Clinton while she was secretary of state. And he's offering a solution: that the new threat of homegrown Islamic terrorism could be snuffed out if only the United States adopted the kind of "extreme" vetting of foreigners and drastic changes to the **immigration** system that he proposed and which lit a fire under his presidential campaign.

"Hillary Clinton's decisions overseas have left us with the threat we face today and her **immigration** policies will invite this threat onto our shores, and it's already happening," Trump said Monday. "Let me state very clearly, **immigration** security is national security."

Trump is also likely to seize on the fact that Ahmad Khan Rahami, the accused New York bomber, a US naturalized citizen of Afghan descent, had spent time in Afghanistan and Pakistan in recent years to renew his call for a halt on **immigration** to the US from nations with proven links to terrorism.

Though Trump's plans might not have prevented Rahami from visiting South Asia, where thousands of law abiding US citizens travel every month, Rahami's travels will play into the febrile political atmosphere that Trump is trying to tap into following the attacks.

And revelations Monday that at least 858 people that had been ordered deported or removed under another name were improperly granted US citizenship due to a failure to maintain adequate fingerprint records, according to a new report, will be used by critics of the **immigration** system to bolster his claims of the need for reform.

Trump's tough response to the terror attacks is likely to be a hit with his faithful supporters who have responded to such a message before -- for instance after attacks in Paris, San Bernardino California and Orlando which helped to shape the Republican primary process.

But it's a gamble because while some Americans like the tough talk, he risks exacerbating impressions that with his vehement response to terrorist attacks, he is exhibiting the deficiencies that have many other voters wondering whether he is fit to be president.

It's also unclear whether the limited human toll of the weekend's attacks will dilute their impact on an election still 49 days away -- in an election season in which the narrative often seems to shift by the hour. For instance, the huge campaign controversies of recent days -- Trump's false claim that Clinton was to blame for accusations that Obama was not born in the United States and the Democratic nominee's health issues dominated campaign conversation for days last week -- but barely got a mention on Monday.

Voters also appear conflicted on the how national security will factor into the election.

A CNN/ORC poll this month showed that voters trust the Republican more to tackle terrorism, by 51% to 45%. But the same survey found that voters think Clinton has the superior temperament required of a president (56% to 36%) and is better able to handle the responsibilities of commander in chief (50% to 45%).

Trump's potential temperamental vulnerability came into focus during his Florida rally, when he bemoaned the medical treatment offered to Rahami after he was injured in a shootout with police.

"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 will probably even have room service, knowing the way our country is. And on top of all of that, he will be represented by an outstanding lawyer," Trump said.

But New York Gov. Andrew Cuomo, a Clinton supporter, pointed out that what Trump was proposing was a wholesale repudiation of the humanitarian, civic and legal values for which the US stands -- a factor that could give some voters pause when they consider handing the White House to Trump."

"Welcome to America," Cuomo told CNN's Wolf Blitzer.

"We have a system of jurisprudence, you are innocent until you proven guilty, you have a right to counsel, you have a right to hospitalization if you are ill. That is our system and it's what makes this country special. And what makes this country great."

The Clinton campaign, for its part, has long believed that in the unwanted circumstances of an "October Surprise" terror attack, voters would turn to experience and a steady hand rather than Trump's more impulsive leadership.

"I have sat at that table in the Situation Room, I have analyzed the threats, I have contributed to actions that have neutralized our enemies. I know how to do this," Clinton said during her news conference.

While Trump responded to the fears of Americans, Clinton issued a call to their intellect.

"We should also launch an intelligence surge to help identify and thwart attacks before they can be carried out. We need to work more closely with Silicon Valley and other partners to counter terrorist propaganda and recruitment efforts online," Clinton said, repeating policies she has long embraced.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Peter Bergen is CNN's national security analyst, a vice president at New America and a professor of practice at Arizona State University. He is the author of "United States of Jihad: Investigating America's Homegrown Terrorists."

(CNN) -- Ahmad Khan Rahami, the suspect in this weekend's New York City and New Jersey terrorist attacks, is in many ways quite typical of jihadist terrorists in the United States since 9/11.

He is an American citizen, not a foreigner, a refugee or a recent **immigrant**.

That is overwhelmingly the profile of the approximately 360 jihadist terrorists who have been indicted or convicted in the States since 9/11 of crimes ranging in seriousness from sending small sums of money to an overseas terrorist organization to murder. According to research by New America, 80% of these militants are American citizens or legal permanent residents.

FBI Assistant Director William Sweeney said Monday there is no evidence that Rahami was part of a cell, which also makes him also a typical American terrorist in the post-9/11 era.

Every lethal terrorist attack since 9/11 has been carried out by a so-called "lone wolf" or a pair of terrorists who were not part of a larger cell.

Indeed, in many ways Rahami's background is similar to that of Omar Mateen, who killed 49 at an Orlando nightclub in June and was also an American citizen of Afghan descent born in New York who carried out his plot by himself.

The bomb that went off in the Chelsea neighborhood this past weekend, injuring 29, is the first jihadist terrorist attack in Manhattan since 9/11.

The bomb device in Chelsea was almost identical to those used in the Boston Marathon attacks three years ago. Pressure cookers were used to house the devices; shrapnel was added to increase the lethality of the charges, and Christmas lights were used to initiate the explosions, according to law enforcement officials.

Terrorist groups have posted these recipes online.

Just as is often the case in school shootings, jihadist terrorists also study previous attacks and it's interesting to note the close match between the Boston bombs and the device used in Chelsea. Adding to the similarities to the Boston attack, a pipe bomb in Seaside, New Jersey, that Rahami is believed to have planted also targeted a running event, a Marine Corps charity run, but the device didn't injure anyone when it detonated on Saturday.

Now that Rahami is in custody, law enforcement will have a number of questions: Is he a purely "homegrown" terrorist, or was he trained overseas in Afghanistan, a country he visited often? Was the attack ISIS-inspired? If so, is there any indication Rahami was in direct touch with members of ISIS using encrypted communications? Or was he inspired or directed by some other jihadist group based in the Afghan-Pakistan region, such as al Qaeda or the Taliban?

Also this past weekend, Dahir Adan was identified as the attacker in the Minnesota mall, where he stabbed 10 people. According to an American counterterrorism official, Adan had also grown up in the States.

Adan was quickly adopted by ISIS as a "soldier" of its so-called caliphate, the same nomenclature it used to describe Mateen after his attack in Orlando. Similarly ISIS embraced the perpetrator of the attack in Nice, France, that killed 84 people as a "soldier" of the caliphate.

There is no evidence these attacks were tied to ISIS in any way other than that the terrorist group supplied some degree of inspiration for them, and it only claimed responsibility for them after the fact. ISIS may also opportunistically claim Rahami as one of its soldiers.

There is already political fallout from the Chelsea attacks.

On Monday, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump told Fox that such attacks would proliferate "because we're allowing these people to come into our country and destroy our country and make it unsafe for people."

In fact, Rahami is a naturalized American citizen who arrived in the States around age 7. Friends describe him as very Americanized, which is not surprising given the fact he has lived in the States for the past two decades.

And this is precisely the challenge US law enforcement faces. Despite the fact that the FBI says it is conducting 1,000 investigations of suspected Islamist militants in all 50 states, by the law of averages terrorists using low-tech weapons such as pressure bombs or legally acquired semiautomatic weapons will occasionally slip below the radar.

Rahami, like the married couple who killed 14 in San Bernardino, California, last December, was not known to US law enforcement for his militant views or actions, according to the FBI.

Going forward there were will be others like Rahami who will carry out low-tech terrorist attacks. Because they are American citizens, barring **immigrants** from Muslim countries or places where terrorism is endemic will do nothing to stem this problem.

These jihadist militants are already here.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ESTERO, Florida (CNN) -- Donald Trump, speaking two days after the latest terrorist attack on US soil, sought to paint his rival Hillary Clinton as a "weak and ineffective" leader not prepared to confront the threat of radical Islamic terrorism, as he talked up his radical policy prescriptions.

The Republican presidential nominee, addressing more than 8,000 people at his first rally since the bomb attacks in New York and New Jersey, talked up his hardline **immigration** policies, argued domestic terror suspects, even US citizens, should be tried as "foreign enemy combatants" -- rather than receive due process under US law.

He also slammed Clinton for what he said was being tougher on his supporters than on Islamist terrorism.

"Hillary Clinton talks tougher about my supporters than she does about radical Islamic terrorists," Trump said, pointing to Clinton's comments that half his supporters belong in a "basket of deplorables."

"Has she ever talked that way about radical Islam? No," Trump said. "Are those words reserved only for hard-working Americans who truly love our country and they want to make a statement? One can be forgiven for getting the impression that these hardworking Americans are somehow a greater threat to our country than these Islamic extremists."

Clinton has, in fact, discussed terrorism. Earlier in the day, she touted her national security experience from serving as secretary of state, saying she would "launch an intelligence surge" and that she would put more into "training and intelligence they need to effectively prevent and respond to terrorist attacks."

Rather than the policies of President Barack Obama's administration, which Trump argued are responsible for the threat of terrorism, Trump called once again for a radical rethinking of counterterrorism policies in the US.

He emphasized the need for "extreme vetting" and again called for a ban on **immigrants** from countries that are hotbeds of terrorism -- the latest iteration of his ban on Muslims -- while arguing that "**immigration** security is national security."

"My opponent has the most open borders policy of anyone ever to seek the presidency," Trump said.

And championing the cause of many hawkish conservatives, Trump appeared to argue that terrorist suspects captured on US soil like Ahmad Khan Rahami, the New York and New Jersey bombing suspect who was apprehended earlier Monday, should be treated as "foreign enemy combatants."

Rahami is a naturalized US citizen who under current law is entitled to due process rights.

"Congress should pass measures to ensure that foreign enemy combatants are treated as such. These are enemies. These are combatants and we have to be tough and we have to be strong," Trump said.

Those comments came after Trump lamented the fact that Rahami would be treated humanely and in accordance with the law.

"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.

"We must also use whatever lawful methods are available to obtain information from the apprehended suspect to get information before it's no longer timely," he added.

Trump also responded to Clinton's accusations earlier Monday that Trump and his harsh rhetoric against Muslims has been a recruiting tool for ISIS.

Clinton had said: "I think it is important for voters to know and hear this and weigh it in making their choice in November. We know that a lot of the rhetoric we've heard from Donald Trump has been seized on by terrorists, in particular ISIS. Because they are looking to make this into a war against Islam."

"Her attacks on me are all meant to deflect from her record of unleashing this monster of evil on us," Trump said.

Instead, Trump boomeranged Clinton's attack back at her, arguing that Clinton and President Barack Obama's policies have helped ISIS's recruiting efforts.

"Weakness invites aggression and silence in the face of a brutal enemy ... allows them to spread and that's what's happening all over the world," Trump said.

The Republican nominee also speculated, without evidence, that if Obama could do it again he wouldn't choose Clinton to serve in his Cabinet.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- At least 858 people that had been ordered deported or removed under another name were improperly granted US citizenship due to a failure to maintain adequate fingerprint records, according to a new report.

The failure occurred, in part, because older fingerprint records were not digitized as part of DHS or the FBI fingerprint databases and therefore could not be readily searched thereby preventing those who had been ordered deported or removed from being identified.

The Department of Homeland Security Inspector General report said there are still "about 148,000 older fingerprint records that have not been digitized of **aliens** with final deportation orders or who are criminals or fugitives."

Failure to digitize these records risks "making naturalization decisions without complete information and, as a result, naturalizing additional individuals who may be ineligible for citizenship or who may be trying to obtain US citizenship fraudulently," the report added.

"US Citizenship and **Immigration** Services granted US citizenship to at least 858 individuals from special interest countries who had been ordered deported or removed under another name," according to the Department of Homeland Security Inspector General report.

The report describes special interest countries as "generally defined as countries that are of concern to the national security of the United States."

At least one of the people identified as having improperly been granted citizenship is now working in law enforcement, the report said.

It recommends the remaining older fingerprint records be digitized and that DHS review "the eligibility of each naturalized citizen whose fingerprint records reveal deportation orders under a different identity" and decide whether to seek denaturalization.

The report noted that the department has concurred with its recommendations and has begun implementing corrective actions.

Department of Homeland Security spokesperson Neema Hakim told CNN that "DHS is and has been taking steps to address this issue" including working to digitize the 1990s-era fingerprint records.

But Hakim added, "The fact that fingerprint records in these cases may have been incomplete at the time of the naturalization interview does not necessarily mean that the applicant was in fact granted naturalization, or that the applicant obtained naturalization fraudulently."

"Where the DHS review process finds that naturalization was obtained fraudulently, DHS will appropriately refer the case to the Department of Justice for civil or criminal proceedings, including for denaturalization," Hakim said.

"This failure represents a significant risk to America's national security as these naturalized individuals have access to serve in positions of public trust and the ability to obtain security clearances," Republican Sen. Ron Johnson of Wisconsin, the chairman of the Senate Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee, wrote in an open letter to Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson.

Failure to properly screen applicants for US citizenship, particularly from "special interest countries," is likely to further fuel controversy over the screening of **immigrants**, a contentious topic during the 2016 election cycle.

Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has called for **immigration** bans targeted at countries with connections to terrorism. He had previously called for a temporary prohibition of Muslim **immigrants**.

The apprehension of Ahmad Khan Rahami, the suspected perpetrator of the recent bombings in New York and New Jersey, is similarly likely to draw attention to the screening process as Rahami **immigrated** to the US from Afghanistan and subsequently was granted US citizenship.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Donald Trump's agenda risks putting the U.S. economy in recession while Hillary Clinton's plans would have a modest positive impact, a new analysis shows.

Oxford Economics, a forecasting firm, put the two candidates' proposals side by side and analyzed them. Its conclusion: Clinton would be better for the economy.

If Trump implements all his policies -- however difficult that would be -- the economy stands to lose $1 trillion and 4 million jobs by the start of 2021.

Under Clinton, about 200,000 additional new jobs would be added by 2021 if she implements all her policies, compared to a scenario where no policies are changed. Economic growth, which has averaged 1% this year, would also be modest if all her proposals became law.

Trump's senior policy adviser, Peter Navarro, denounced Oxford's findings, calling it a "ludicrous" analysis.

"This is a narrow and myopic piece of political propaganda that ignores the tremendous growth-inducing benefits of the Trump economic plan," Navarro told CNNMoney.

Oxford says it has no political agenda, and that its economic models are unbiased and highly regarded. It had a team of economists working on the analysis.

Here is how Trump and Clinton stack up on the economy, according to Oxford Economics.

Trade

Trump: He has threatened tariffs on Mexico and China, which could provoke retaliation from those countries, laying the groundwork for a trade war, Oxford says.

U.S. businesses that sell in China and Mexico -- America's second and third largest trading partners -- would be negatively hurt.

Navarro argues that China and Mexico wouldn't retaliate with tariffs because they wouldn't be able to sell their goods in America. Both countries export much more to the U.S. than the U.S. exports to them.

Clinton: Despite her opposition to the Trans Pacific Partnership, her trade stance is largely in line with current policies of the Obama administration. Her trade policies wouldn't have a much different economic impact, Oxford estimates.

Taxes

Trump: On Thursday, Trump said he would reduce the number of tax brackets to three from seven.

Trump's tax cuts could be an initial boost to the economy, Oxford says, but eventually they would need to be met with reductions in government spending.

If government spending isn't reduced at the same pace as tax cuts, Trump's tax policy stands to hurt the economy because it would increase the federal deficit.

But Trump's other proposals actually increase government spending, whether it's on infrastructure, or building a wall on the Mexican border.

Navarro says Trump's tax cuts would be met by increased economic growth, taking away the need to lower government spending. The stimulus from lower taxes would add trillions of dollars to the economy over 10 years, he argues.

He reiterated that Mexico would pay for the wall, no the U.S. taxpayer.

Clinton: Her proposals to raise taxes would be a drag on growth but could be counterbalanced by her spending on new roads, bridges and highways.

"The positive impact of increased government spending would offset the drag from higher taxes," says Greg Daco, chief U.S. economist at Oxford.

Oxford also notes that if Clinton were to implement her proposal for a $15 federal minimum wage, that would be a drag on job gains.

Without the minimum wage reform, Clinton adds roughly 800,000 more jobs to the economy than compared to the gains if no policies change. But with minimum wage reform, she only adds 200,000 more positions because employers would reduce future hiring and hours, Oxford forecasts.

**Immigration**

Trump: His promise to deport roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** would weigh down the U.S. economy, Oxford found.

The group estimates that Trump could only realistically deport 600,000 undocumented **immigrants** per year.

But deporting so many people would shrink the labor force and cut back on consumer spending, which is the engine behind much of the U.S. economy's growth.

Clinton: Her **immigration** plan to provide a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants** would have a positive effect: increasing the labor force at a time when it's shrinking because many Baby Boomers are retiring.

Economists note that legal workers tend to be more productive than undocumented workers. Right now, U.S. worker productivity is low and dragging down economic growth. More legalized citizens could help boost growth.

Public confidence

Trump: Americans of all stripes hate uncertainty. Whether it's decisions on buying a house, making a business decision or investing their money, Americans want to know the landscape ahead before opening up their wallet.

Oxford argues that Trump would create a "trial and error" presidency where he would implement a reform, then shift policy in six to 12 months.

"Businesses are going to retrench, investment is going to retrench because they're not going to know what the policy landscape will be 6 months ahead or 12 months ahead," says Daco.

Navarro says Trump's economic plan is clear: lower taxes, less regulation and trade deals that benefit Americans. Trump's proposal to lower corporate taxes will bring more, not less, business investment, he claims.

Clinton: She is one of the best-known commodities in politics. The expectation is that she would continue much of the policies of the Obama administration. The potential for the other party to control Congress would also likely create gridlock and that gives business owners and investors a clearer landscape, Oxford argues.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Najeeba Wazefadost is an Afghan refugee who arrived in Australia by boat in September 2000 aged 12. She is now a refugee advocate and president of Hazara Women of Australia. The views expressed are her own.

(CNN) -- As world leaders gather in New York to discuss refugees and migration, I want to use my voice to share my story.

I speak for those that are under discussion but are not able to contribute; I speak for those that are not able to talk about the situations they are fleeing from.

Leaving your country for good is one of the hardest decisions a person can be forced to make. It means a break with all that you know; your family, your livelihood, your friends, how to fit in, how to be part of a society.

But I was born in a country that's shattered after decades of war.

My childhood was stolen; I don't have good memories with other children, instead I remember persecution, death and being afraid. Afghanistan has few signs of justice, humanity and freedom left. People like me who were born into the minority ethnic group, the Hazara, are subjected to discrimination and slavery at the hands of the majority ethnic groups.

We got on a boat, on a piece of wood, not knowing where it was taking us; our safety and security limited to that piece of wood, risking starving or drowning at sea. We were coming from a war-torn country and were traumatized.

Jumping from a room on fire

When we arrived we found ourselves in the middle of desert at Curtin **Immigration** Center in Western Australia.

Former Australian **immigration** minister Philip Ruddock once called it the country's most primitive processing center. Others went even further, calling it a "gulag."

It felt like prison with no access to the outside world. There was no privacy, with 24-hour video surveillance. I was 12 -- a child -- and being locked up inside an overcrowded detention center created the sense of being treated like an object. I remember being known by a number, rather than my name. I didn't feel human.

Now, refugees don't even make it to Australia soil. Thousands are dumped out of sight in Nauru or Papua New Guinea.

Unfortunately, most international leaders seem to look at these people from a position of power rather than from a position of mercy.

I'll never forget the first time I was smiled at by an Australian woman. She taught me to start trusting other Australians, and that they weren't all the same as the security guards in detention.

I remember being so frightened sitting in a mixed classroom for the first time. And the first time we went shopping we filled up a trolley of food without knowing we had to pay!

Most people were welcoming, but at the same time many called us "queue jumper." But no queue exists -- coming by boat was our only choice. I always say to people, imagine a room with one window and a door to exit. If the room catches fire, even if exit is only through the window, you'll jump out of it rather than go through the door.

Not simple statistics

The U.N.'s refugee agency reports that the number of displaced people is at its highest ever, with the total at the end of 2015 reaching 65.3 million. The refugee problem from Syria is immense. Nearly five million refugees are now in the countries bordering Syria -- Turkey, Lebanon, and Jordan.

Unfortunately, these huge numbers are hard to grasp, and people end up being consigned to the status of simple statistics. It becomes easy to forget that people, whether they are asylum seekers or not, are mothers, fathers, wives, husbands, grandparents, daughters and sons.

Today, I am no longer defined by my past and I have been able to achieve dreams that I never thought possible. I have graduated with a degree in medical science and work as a case manager in Settlement Services International. I have my own house and have established my own childcare business.

I have been given many awards for my community work. I have built a new life and I have contributed to my new home's society. I am an individual: I have hopes, dreams, fears and feelings. I hope the world leaders in New York remember the 65 million refugees out there might be 65 million other people like me.

Closer to home

In my opinion, the Australian response to the refugee crisis is inadequate. Even the UN's Ban Ki-moon has urged Australia to rethink its refugee policy.

In my view, Australian politicians have indoctrinated people's minds to believe refugee issues are all about protecting the borders, as if all refugees are some kind of terrorist.

Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull is attending the summit Monday and Australian policy is expected to be under scrutiny. This week, he said: "Public opinion will not accept a strong, generous humanitarian program... unless the government is seen to be in command of its borders."

While individual countries accepting more resettled refugees is a welcome change, Australia, in my view, has accepted too few. I hope that during this summit Obama and the other world leaders use the language of humanity, because humanity is a language of shared responsibility.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**1030GMT Updates with Shubert context

(CNN) -- Germany's two largest parties were facing up to losses in the nation's capital Monday after large numbers of Berliners turned to the far-right.

Anti-**immigrant** party Alternative fur Deutschland (AfD) will enter Berlin's state parliament for the first time, after winning 14.2% of the vote.

Angela Merkel's center-right Christian Democratic Union (CDU) was knocked out of a ruling coalition with the center-left Social Democrats, after winning just 17.6% of the vote.

While the Social Democrats won the largest share of the vote, 21.6%, they will have to enter a coalition with two other left wing parties, Die Linke (15.6%) and the Greens (15.2%) to govern.

The Berlin result marks the second recent defeat for Merkel since Germany adopted its much vaunted but highly controversial refugee policy.

AfD was set up by a group disgruntled by Merkel's eurozone crisis management -- most notably the Greek bailouts -- but it grew into a more nationalist party that strongly opposed rising **immigration** levels, particularly of people from Muslim countries.

Merkel has stood firm on Germany's position of accepting nearly all asylum seekers found to be legitimate refugees. Germany took in more than one million refugees in 2015, making it the most open country in Europe to asylum seekers.

CNN's correspondent in Berlin, Atika Shubert, reports that refugees were not the top issue there, with rising rents and increasing gentrification being ranked as more important.

But she said: "The nearly 15% win for the right wing AfD even in this very liberal city shows that, like many other parts of the country, it has surged to become a real political force that Merkel cannot ignore."

Although this election is for regional parliament and has no impact on the government, Shubert said Merkel will have to acknowledge that voters are unhappy with her party, especially the controversial refugee policy.

Rise of the right

"She remains the strongest most stable politician not only in Germany, but arguably, Europe. And the European Union needs a strong Germany, not just to deal with the refugee crisis, but also Brexit and the debt crisis," Shubert said.

The rise of AfD in Germany reflects a surge in far-right populist parties across Europe.

"Because of its history, post-war Germany has lacked a viable right-wing political party. But the refugee issue has galvanized some voters to get behind the AfD as a palatable right-wing alternative," said Shubert.

"German voters are not convinced the government is fully prepared for the task of integrating so many thousands of people."

Alliance strained

In an interview with CNN this month, AfD party leader Frauke Petry claimed the CDU was "falling apart."

"We see that in many regions of Germany the CDU bases, the party bases, don't agree with Merkel's policy any more," she said.

One of Merkel's current allies, Bavaria governor Horst Seehofer, told German newspaper Der Spiegel that a rift in policy between them could worsen if the Chancellor fails to impose a ceiling on **immigration**.

"We don't want unlimited **immigration** like we saw last year and that's why we need binding measures as a guarantee," he is quoted as saying.

"Our constitution does not require us to take everybody who appears at our borders and demands asylum. And when someone comes from a safe country of origin, we can immediately repatriate them. The ceiling will work and it is consistent with the constitution."

In the run up to the election, current mayor Michael Muller warned that a large showing by AfD "would be seen around the world as a sign of the return ... of the Nazis."

"Berlin has transformed itself from the capital of Hitler's Germany to a lighthouse of freedom, tolerance, diversity and social cohesion," Muller wrote on Facebook.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**9:31 pm: Changes "divisive" to "Controversial" in copy and story highlights

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- President Barack Obama on Thursday night delivered an unmistakable -- though unnamed -- rebuke of Donald Trump's campaign rhetoric, claiming the GOP candidate had injected new "ugliness" into the debate over **immigration**.

"It is possible to insist on a lawful and orderly system while still seeing students and their hard-working parents not as criminals, not as rapists, but as families who came here for the same reasons that all **immigrants** came here: to work, and to learn and to build a better life," Obama said, recalling the descriptions of undocumented Mexican **immigrants** that Trump used during his campaign announcement more than a year ago.

In a bitter election season, "the talk around these issues is cut deeper than in years past," Obama said. "It's a little more personal. A little meaner. A little uglier."

Obama was speaking in Washington at a gala dinner for the Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, acting as a warmup for Hillary Clinton, who spoke afterward. Earlier, the White House said that no formal meeting was planned between the two Democrats, but that it was possible they would encounter each other backstage.

During his remarks, Obama bemoaned controversial language about **immigrants** emanating from the campaign trail, saying it was destined to **alienate** voters.

"There are a lot of folks who have this notion of what the real America looks like. And somehow it only includes a few of us," he said. "But who's going to decide who the real America is? Who's to determine that in this nation of **immigrants**, in a nation where unless you are a Native American, you came here from someplace else, that you have a greater claim than anybody here. So we can't let that brand of politics win."

The President's **immigration** agenda has largely been stalled by Republicans in Congress, who have resisted attempts at passing a comprehensive reform package. Obama worked to enact unilateral changes to the system, but much of his efforts have been blocked in court.

Obama said his successor will require support from lawmakers to advance meaningful **immigration** reform, "no matter how tough she is."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Javier Palomarez is the president and CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, America's largest Hispanic business association, which has endorsed Hillary Clinton's campaign. Palomarez is a campaign surrogate. You can follow them @USHCC. The views expressed are his own.

(CNN) -- No topic has received more media attention this year than **immigration**, particularly Hispanic **immigration**. But while Donald Trump's famous call to build (an extremely expensive) wall has received considerable press, another barrier has been created that is preventing Hispanics from having a say in a subject that affects their entire culture and their future.

Each and every day, major media outlets have been discussing candidate views and policies on Hispanic **immigration**. Yet the Commission on Presidential Debates has yet to select a single Hispanic-American academic, journalist or political figure to moderate a presidential debate.

This is a glaring omission that must change.

The reality is that Hispanic professionals know **immigration** better than anyone because we live with the issue every day. We have friends and families that have **immigrated** and understand the problems and stigmas faced as **immigrants**. More important, we understand what it is like to be labeled and judged based on all the media about **immigration**.

Hispanic-Americans are an important and growing demographic. Right now, almost one in every five U.S. citizens is Hispanic. One in every four children in the United States is Hispanic. By 2020, one in five workers in the US labor force will be Hispanic. Furthermore, Hispanics account for more than 27 million eligible voters, a figure that increases by 66,000 every month or 800,000 every year, according to the Pew Research Center.

**Immigration** is a complex issue. The American people therefore deserve the context necessary to understand a subject that requires a better solution than one gigantic and extremely expensive wall. Such context would be best presented through pointed questions about **immigration** from a talented and noted Hispanic media professional who lives and understands the plight of **immigrants** every day.

There are plenty to choose from. A great option would be Maria Hinojosa, the anchor of NPR's "Latino USA." She has won four Emmys, the John Chancellor Award for Excellence in Journalism, the National Association of Hispanic Journalists' Radio Award, the Edward R. Murrow Award from the Overseas Press Club and the Walter Cronkite Award.

Another selection could be José Díaz-Balart. He is one of the most respected journalists in America as the anchor of Telemundo's national daily newscast "Noticiero Telemundo" and the Saturday edition of "NBC Nightly News." He has received numerous accolades, including the George Foster Peabody Award, Alfred I. DuPont-Columbia University Award and the Broadcasting & Cable/Multichannel News Award for Outstanding Achievement in Hispanic Television.

A third option could be Maria Elena Salinas, one of Univision's most respected anchors and a journalist the New York Times has called "the Voice of Hispanic America." She has won a Peabody Award, a Cronkite Award, an Edward R. Murrow Award and a lifetime achievement Emmy Award, among others in her career.

These are professional, accomplished journalists who have earned the right to be listed with the successful journalists chosen to moderate previous presidential debates.

Both Democrats and Republicans recognize the need for Hispanic-American support to win this election. Indeed, there's no doubt that the Hispanic community has become a defining feature in the changing face of America. At this point, it's not a matter of deciding whether to engage with the Hispanic community -- it's a matter of how, when and where.

The 2016 presidential race has been unorthodox and unpredictable to say the least. Part of that is how we're seeing anti-**immigrant** rhetoric become a core theme of a campaign for the first time since President Millard Fillmore's 1856 campaign, when he ran on an anti-Catholic and anti-**immigrant** platform. Fillmore lost in part because he was challenged on his anti-diversity rhetoric. The same must be done this year in the spirit of accountability and fairness.

Ultimately, there are complex issues and nuances that the Hispanic community best understands. With that in mind, the only way to guarantee a true perspective on such a complex issue is to have moderators who understand it as no one else. That is why there should be a Hispanic-American moderator for at least one of the 2016 presidential debates.

Our organization advocates on behalf of more than four million Hispanic-owned firms, who collectively contribute more than $661 billion to our American economy every year. From taco truck vendors to owners of Fortune 500 companies, it is this rich diversity that makes our story an American story. Our members pride themselves on being American businessmen and women first. We take great pride in the products we bring to market and the jobs we create.

The Commission on Presidential Debates must correct the unfortunate failure to include a Hispanic-American voice in this election's presidential debates.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOS ANGELES (CNNMoney) -- For years, conservative commentators have railed against Democratic proposals for mandatory paid maternity leave.

"The government should NOT force employers to pay you while you take 2 months off maternity or paternity leave," A.J. Delgado, a conservative pundit, tweeted in April 2014. "It was your decision -- plan around it."

But this week, after Donald Trump proposed a plan calling for six weeks of mandatory paid maternity leave, Delgado's opinion on the matter seemingly changed.

"Sane, helpful, compassionate policies? Yes, please!" she tweeted.

Call it the Donald Trump Litmus Test. Time and again this campaign cycle, Trump's supporters in the media have changed their opinions on key conservative issues in order to support or defend the Republican presidential nominee. Viewpoints and policy proposals that were once anathema to them are now accepted and even celebrated. And that phenomenon has split the conservative media.

"It would seem to be easy for these folks to say, 'I support Trump, but idea X or policy Y is foolish,'" Rich Lowry, the editor of the conservative National Review, which has opposed Trump's candidacy, told CNNMoney. "Most of them seem determined to be 100 percent in the tank, though."

"I don't know what it will take conservatives to realize they are being scammed," said Stuart Stevens, a top strategist for Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign.

The maternity leave proposal provides a perfect example of the litmus test. To many conservatives, it ran counter to their beliefs in small government. Rush Limbaugh, the most influential conservative voice on talk radio, criticized it as evidence for big government's victory in the 2016 campaign. Amanda Carpenter, the former spokesperson for Ted Cruz, wrote that "by supporting a government-provided stipend for paid leave Trump has surrendered himself to the Democrat vision of a more socialist America."

Meanwhile, Delgado, who this week joined the Trump campaign as an adviser, told CNNMoney that Trump's proposal was different because it would be paid for through the existing unemployment insurance program. But she declined to comment on her apparent endorsement of the expansion of a government insurance program, which conservatives have railed against for decades.

Similarly, conservative pundit and radio host Laura Ingraham mocked paid leave in January 2015 -- "Paid sick leave... paid maternity leave... paid childcare... and it's all freeeeeeeeeeeee!" she tweeted -- but took greater interest in Trump's proposal this week: "Need to see details regarding how Trump proposes to pay for a new 6-week maternity benefit," she wrote. (Ingraham did not respond to a request for comment.)

Bret Stephens, the Wall Street Journal columnist and deputy editorial page editor, said Trump's defenders are simply unwilling to acknowledge any wrongdoing by their candidate.

"Once you've concluded that Hillary Clinton is Satan," Stephens said of pro-Trump conservatives, "nothing Trump can say or do can possibly be worse."

Jonathan V. Last, a senior writer at The Weekly Standard who has been chronicling these shifts, cites the reversals as evidence that "Trumpism corrupts."

"I've never quite figured out why Trump's big supporters are constantly being forced into these kinds of embarrassing contortions," Last wrote in his weekly newsletter Wednesday. "Why can't they support Trump while honestly and fully acknowledging all of his problems and contradictions?"

The first time Last wrote about Trump's "corrupting" influences was in February, when conservatives embraced his criticism of George W. Bush's handling of the Iraq War.

"Nine months ago, if you had asked Sarah Palin, Scott Brown, Jerry Falwell Jr., or Ann Coulter whether they would endorse a figure who takes the Code Pink, Michael Moore, MoveOn.org view of Iraq ('Bush lied, people died'), one suspects they all would have recoiled at the prospect," Last wrote at the time. "Yet in the hours after Trump insisted that George W. Bush intentionally lied the country into war, not one of the major figures who have endorsed him was willing to contradict his claim."

Last offers more recent exampes as well. For instance, he notes how conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt rushed to defend Trump's affinity for Vladimir Putin by arguing that Putin has "served his country's national interest" better than President Obama has served the U.S.

"It was as if Trumpism caused Hewitt to forget everything he knows about Madison, liberty, inalienable rights, and political philosophy," he wrote Wednesday. (Hewitt did not respond to a request for comment.)

At other times, pro-Trump conservatives will simply choose to ignore or downplay a Trump proposal that they dislike or do not agree with.

In August, when Trump expressed a new tolerance for allowing undocumented **immigrants** who are otherwise law-abiding to stay in the United States, websites like Breitbart and Drudge Report all but ignored the issue and focused instead on negative stories about Hillary Clinton.

"I'm old enough to remember when certain conservative outlets would go into a frenzy over GOP'ers wanting 'amnesty' for illegal **immigrants**," Oliver Darcy, the Business Insider politics editor who previously worked at Glenn Beck's The Blaze, wrote at the time.

Jim Swift, the deputy online editor at The Weekly Standard, said such blind faith in Trump is likely to continue through election day.

"At this point," he told CNNMoney, "all people who aren't afraid to say they support Trump will fall in line behind almost anything he does."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Presidential candidates make promises. Often, they go unfulfilled by the winner.

Sometimes a divided Congress is to blame. Once in the White House, priorities can change. Lobbyists and activists intervene. Candidates lie to grease their paths to high office.

Usually though, these failures to follow through on campaign pledges come after the official wins and takes office.

Not so for Donald Trump. The Republican nominee has repeatedly defied his own commitments and fudged assurances -- and done it well before a single vote was cast.

Here is a short list of guarantees the Trump has either reversed on or refused to deliver.

1. Make public his tax returns

Trump is the only candidate in the modern era to keep his tax returns under wrap. The campaign in recent months has repeatedly attributed the decision to what it describes as an ongoing audit.

But it wasn't always this way. Opponents have been calling on Trump to reveal the records since the early rounds of the GOP primary contest. And Trump has often expressed his willingness to do just that.

Asked by conservative radio host Hugh Hewitt in February 2015, a few months before the billionaire announced his candidacy, Trump said: "I would release tax returns."

How far back, Hewitt asked. "Three years, five years?"

"We'll take a good, strong look at that," Trump answered after some prodding. "But I have no objection to certainly showing tax returns."

By early 2016, though, Trump had gone back and forth on the issue. He had also become the front-runner for the GOP nomination.

In an interview on NBC's "Meet the Press" in January, he was questioned again. And again, he promised to make the paperwork public.

"We're working on that now," he said. "I have big returns, as you know, and I have everything all approved and very beautiful and we'll be working that over in the next period of time."

Trump hinted again in May that some kind of release could be in the works, telling Fox News, "I'll release. Hopefully before the election, I'll release."

Now, with 54 days until the polls open across the country -- and with Trump's son, Donald Jr., saying on Thursday the decision to withhold the returns is rooted in political concerns -- that seems unlikely.

2. Release 'detailed medical records'

Trump has repeatedly called out Democratic rival Hillary Clinton for a lack of "stamina," occasionally hinting at conspiracy theories that suggest his opponent is concealing a terminal or debilitating illness.

But even as Clinton has been faced with heavy criticism for a lack of transparency on this and other questions, Trump has offered less -- while promising more.

"I think that both candidates, Crooked Hillary and myself, should release detailed medical records," he tweeted late last month. "I have no problem in doing so! Hillary?"

Trump this week went a step further than he has in the past, releasing a brief letter from his doctor on Thursday that said he is in "excellent health." But that hardly amounts to "detailed medical records."

3. Hold a news conference on Melania **immigration** questions

Trump and wife Melania, a naturalized US citizen who was born in Slovenia, have repeatedly asserted that she "followed the law" as an **immigrant**.

When a series of reports surfaced this summer suggesting that her road had been more complicated, Trump -- who was mired in a series of damaging controversies at the time -- pledged to hold a news conference to quiet the doubters.

On August 9, Trump told reporters the event would happen "over the next couple of weeks." More than a month later, we're still waiting.

4. Forswear the use of teleprompters

In the early days of his campaign, as he mocked shell-shocked Republicans (and Clinton), Trump often equated the use of teleprompters with weakness or incompetence.

"I say we should outlaw teleprompters for anybody, right? For anybody! For anybody running for president," he said to cheers in Iowa last summer.

By 2016, though, Trump had changed his tune -- and not just when he was giving tamer speeches with the help of his own teleprompter.

"I like using them on occasion, too, by the way. It's not so bad," he told supporters during a June event. "I've been given good reviews when I use crazy teleprompters, can you believe it?"

5. Use his own money to finance campaign

The Trump campaign, at least in the beginning, was boosted by two fundamental guarantees.

First, that he would deport undocumented **immigrants** while preventing new entrants by building a wall on the US-Mexico border. The other: that he, alone among the candidates, could not be bought or influenced by donors because he was financing his own bid.

"I don't need anybody's money," Trump said, announcing his run. "It's nice. I don't need anybody's money. I'm using my own money. I'm not using the lobbyists. I'm not using donors. I don't care. I'm really rich."

But a review near the end of the primary season found that roughly a quarter of Trump's campaign cash had come from individual donations. The billionaire had loaned the operation money -- and would subsequently forgive those debts -- so he came close, but his pledge to eschew donors ultimately failed.

As for the general election race, Trump was clear in the spring he would embrace more traditional fundraising methods if became the standard-bearer. He has delivered on that front. Working with the Republican Party, the campaign banked $80 million in July alone.

On a related note: Earlier in the campaign, Trump's pledge to donate $1 million to a military veterans' charity, raised during an event organized in lieu of attending an early primary debate, came into question when, months later, he had still not delivered the cash.

The money finally went out -- along with a cranky Instagram video -- in late May, after weeks of intense media scrutiny.

6. Pay legal fees for rally-goer who punched a protester

Warned by security that he could be the target of, as he put it, "somebody with tomatoes" at an Iowa rally earlier this year, Trump first asked supporters to "knock the crap out of" any potential hurlers, then added: "I promise you, I will pay for the legal fees. I promise, I promise."

In March, after a 78-year-old man was charged with assault after sucker-punching an African-American protester at a North Carolina rally, Trump doubled down.

"I've actually instructed my people to look into (paying the legal fees of supporters)," he told NBC.

Trump would back off the claim, and the offer, in subsequent interviews. He has not provided financial support to supporters in legal trouble -- possibly because his initial comments could help make a case that his campaign should be held liable for the violence.

7. Make you tired of winning so much

Here's Trump on what his campaign would do and the effect his potential presidency would have on Americans:

"We're going to win so much, you're going to get tired of winning," he said in South Carolina before the February primary. "You're going to say, 'Please Mr. President, I have a headache. Please, don't win so much. This is getting terrible.' And I'm going to say, 'No, we have to make America great again.' You're gonna say, 'Please.' I said, 'Nope, nope. We're gonna keep winning.'"

Verdict? To be determined.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Earlier this month, Prabhjot Singh sat down with his 4-year-old son Hukam and tried for the first time to explain the horrific incident that altered the Manhattan family's life.

"A few years ago, a few men hurt me because of what I looked like, because they thought I was bad," Singh said.

Hukam stared back, confused. "Why?" he asked.

"Their hearts were asleep and they were not thinking about Papaji as a person," Singh said, using a Punjabi term of respect for father.

On the night of September 21, 2013, Singh, a highly accomplished doctor and professor, was walking with a friend on 110th Street near Central Park. Both men are Sikhs and have long beards and wear turbans. Singh heard someone yell: "Terrorist, Osama, get him."

Singh ran but not fast enough. A group of boys and young men on bicycles taunted him using racial slurs. One pulled his beard and then the attackers punched and kicked him repeatedly. He lay on the ground, waiting for them to stop, when passers-by intervened. Singh ended up in the hospital with a broken jaw, dislodged teeth and other gruesome injuries.

But Singh expressed gratitude. He understood it could have been so much worse.

Fifteen years ago Thursday, an Indian Sikh **immigrant** was gunned down at the gas station he managed in Mesa, Arizona. It was the first revenge killing in the wake of the September 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. The assailant said he wanted to "go out and shoot some towel heads" for the actions of Osama bin Laden.

Hate crimes against Muslims and those perceived as Muslims spiked after 9/11. Sikh men grow long beards and wear turbans as a commitment to their faith, and many Americans mistake them for Muslims.

Reports of incidents in the immediate aftermath of 9/11 and concerns that hate crimes would rise prompted the founding of the Sikh Coalition, which has grown into the largest Sikh advocacy and civil rights organization in America. In the first month after 9/11, the group documented more than 300 cases of violence and discrimination against Sikhs in America.

In the years since, hundreds of hate crimes have been reported, many of them described by police as cases of mistaken identity, like the September 15, 2001, murder in Mesa.

As America marks the 15th anniversary of 9/11 this month, many Sikhs say they feel no safer in this country. A climate of fear has prevailed since the Paris attacks in November; it has surfaced every time shootings and terrorist attacks are blamed on Muslims. Many feel the focus on **immigrants** in the 2016 presidential election has added to the hatemongering.

"I definitely feel the uptick of more hateful rhetoric in the country," says Singh.

The irony of being attacked was not lost on Singh: He had written about the violence against Sikhs, including a New York Times piece after the 2012 mass shooting at a Milwaukee temple. A year later, he, too, had become a victim, finding himself in the uncomfortable position of having to explain to his young son why he was attacked simply because of the way he looks.

"Whatever I think the environment is around us, I know children absorb all the messages," he says. "How can we prepare them to meet the world that may not be prepared to meet them?

"Why are we being attacked for being Sikh?" he says. "My tradition teaches me to ask what are we doing as a community to have a far more welcoming embrace of people who are different than us."

Sikhism was founded in the 16th century by Guru Nanak in Punjab, an area that is now divided between India and Pakistan. Nanak rejected the rituals involved with other South Asian religions and stressed the importance of good deeds such as serving others and treating all people equally.

The monotheistic religion has more than 25 million followers worldwide and about 500,000 in the United States. Yet a majority of Americans -- 60% -- admitted in a 2015 survey that they knew nothing at all about Sikhs.

Lawyer and activist Valarie Kaur says the threat of violence seems to have become mainstreamed.

Her grandfather settled in California a century ago, and she knows firsthand from her family that discrimination against Sikhs existed long before 2001. But 9/11, she says, was a paradigm shift, a turning point.

She used to talk about living in the "shadow of 9/11." Then the shadow turned out to be long, and what seemed temporary became permanent.

"Bigotry on the fringe has been cemented," says Kaur, whose 2008 documentary, "Divided We Fall," explored Sikhs in the United States and what it meant to be American in a post-9/11 world.

"The threat of hate and racism has become a part of our daily lives," she says.

Despite the current climate, both Singh and Kaur expressed optimism for the future. Both are vocal about their Sikh identities and talk about landmark changes they hope will make things better in America. They point to younger generations of Sikhs who are fiercely proud of their outward identities and to people like Rana Singh Sodhi, who lost two brothers within a matter of months and became a strong voice for his community.

'He was killed simply because of the way he looked'

On Thursday, Singh Sodhi will again gather with family and friends at the corner of 80th Street and University Drive in Mesa, Arizona.

The Chevron station had been the pride of his older brother Balbir, who arrived in the United States in 1988 and worked hard to achieve the American dream.

That dream shattered in 2001, and now a small marble-and-granite memorial bears these words etched in gold lettering: "He was killed simply because of the way he looked."

This is ground zero for the Sodhi family.

Balbir's killer, Frank Roque, told the police: "I'm a patriot and American. I'm American. I'm a damn American."

Balbir considered himself a patriot, too. An hour before he died, he had driven to a nearby Costco to purchase plants for new landscaping at the gas station. On his way out of the store, he emptied his wallet, donating $74 to the 9/11 victims' fund. Then he called Rana and asked him to bring a few American flags to display.

Balbir was the eldest of eight siblings in a farming family from the Indian state of Punjab. He and his brothers resettled in America and felt indebted to the nation that gave them new opportunities.

But 10 months after Balbir's murder, a second brother, Sukhpal, was also gunned down, while driving his cab in San Francisco. Police said it was not a hate crime, but Rana is certain that both his brothers were killed because of their Sikh identity.

"I understand that everyone has to leave this world but not because we wear a turban, wear a beard," he says. "America is the most diverse country in the world, but people have zero knowledge about who we are."

Rana Singh Sodhi could easily have been consumed by anger or bitterness. Instead he took it upon himself to begin educating people at churches, schools and community events.

He's saddened when he meets Sikh men who shave their beards and abandon their turbans out of fear.

"I don't want to live scared," he says. "This is America. I should be able to live the way I want to live."

Tracking hate, expressing love

Sikh Americans suffered their darkest moment on August 5, 2012, when white supremacist Wade Michael Page went on a shooting rampage at a Sikh gurdwara, or temple, in Oak Creek, Wisconsin. Page killed one woman and five men; all the men were wearing turbans.

At the time, it was the worst hate crime committed in a house of faith since the 1963 church bombing in Birmingham, Alabama. Although the incident made national news, it did not get the same attention as other shooting incidents, says activist Kaur.

"It happened on Sunday. By the following Sunday, we were bumped," Kaur says. "The media did not think the American public had the attention or did not care enough to understand this community. They could imagine a movie theater or an elementary school or a black church. But not a gurdwara."

Since then, Sikh Americans have made some important gains, Kaur says. That includes an announcement in 2015 that the FBI would begin tracking hate crimes against Sikhs. Sikh Americans had lobbied for years for such documentation, arguing it was a key step in combating such crimes.

The first report will be released later this year.

"It is not going to prevent an Oak Creek massacre, but it was a landmark civil rights victory," Kaur says.

Ultimately, she says, the only way to prevent violence and discrimination is for people to get to know each other. Oneness and love, core foundations of the Sikh faith, are the only way to save the Sikh community, she says.

Sikhism also embraces a concept called seva, which means selfless service. Kaur says Sikhs must go beyond education or lobbying and engage in seva in their neighborhoods to gain full acceptance in this country.

Prabhjot Singh, the Manhattan doctor, agrees.

"I deeply believe in the Sikh spirit of seva," he says. "Working in our communities where we live is one of the more powerful things we can do.

"Shortly after I was attacked, I prepared to shift my work, to work in a community context, and learn how to be more rooted in the work of creating a more loving nation. It's not easy, and I'm no expert. But if anything, being attacked primed me to listen more carefully and feel the consequences of our choices more deeply."

'Wake up their hearts'

When he sat down with his son, Singh told him their lives were forever connected to the lives of his assailants. And that they would spend a long time thinking and talking about it, just like he asks Hukam to think about times he hurts his younger brother.

One man was later arrested in connection with the attack and charged with aggravated harassment and committing a hate crime. No one else has been apprehended.

After the beating, Singh knew it was important for the Sikh community that justice was done, but more important for him, he would like to meet the perpetrators. Perhaps, he says, he is naïve, but he believes that getting to know people who are different is the best way to create change.

Singh would rather his attackers be taught than caught. He wants the streets of Harlem to be safe for his sons. More than anything, he wants that group of young men and boys to stop hating.

Singh posed the question to his son. "What should I do to them if I meet them?"

Hukam smiled. "You have to wake up their hearts."

For Singh, that was the right answer.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Sally Kohn is an activist, columnist and television commentator. Follow her on Twitter @sallykohn. The opinions expressed in this commentary are hers.

(CNN) -- The culture war began in 1970s America, when secular liberals and religious conservatives battled for the soul of the nation. Since then, there have been many skirmishes -- from gay rights versus traditional heteronormativity, feminism versus misogyny and racial justice versus white privilege and supremacy. But no matter the driving divisive issue, the culture war has always been a fight for our national cultural identity, a fight for who we are, how we define ourselves and what we decide falls within the boundaries of desirable societal norms.

To put it simply, the culture war has been a fight over what is "cool" in America. And perhaps more than any recent moment in time, the 2016 election highlights that the liberal left has decisively won that fight. Whatever you think of Hillary Clinton and her policies, it's clear that the cool kids are with her.

When I use the term "cool," I mean as defined by popular culture -- what the cool kids are doing, not merely because of fads, but in response to fundamental social, cultural and political shifts in society. There's a reason hip hop tends to dominate the music charts today instead of, say, country.

Hip hop both reflects the diverse America we are today, and the diverse America most of us embrace for our future. Country music, in stark contrast, is reflective of the past. That's not a knock on country music, which by the way I love. It's just a simple fact: Hip hop is significantly more mainstream because it reflects social and cultural aspirations -- or, in other words, what's "cool."

In recent years, pop cultural stars have learned to use social media to create auras of cool around them. And Twitter's No. 1 most followed person Katy Perry is no exception. As a tastemaker, she is a leader even in the political realm. Therefore, it was notable when Perry performed right before Clinton's convention speech. Her performance wasn't just about generating eyeballs and clicks. Perry's presence sent a message, especially to young voters, that liberal politics are cool.

And Perry isn't the only political tastemaker. Just as Beyoncé can bless kale with coolness, so, too, can she do the same for Black Lives Matter. When Amy Schumer stands up for common sense gun control and Lena Dunham speaks up for abortion rights, they're not just mobilizing their followings but deploying their cultural currencies. In other words, these celebrities are showing not just what cool kids wear and listen to, but what cool kids can and should believe in.

The contrast is stark when considering Donald Trump and the Republican Party. Scott Baio, an actor whose career peaked in the 1980s, and a potpourri of soap opera stars were the biggest names that Trump could draw to his disastrous and frightening Republican National Convention. And he hasn't received any notable celebrity endorsements since. Meanwhile, the list of Clinton's celebrity endorsers and donors is literally too long to mention.

And this celebrity tastemaker differential is critical. Celebrities influence everyday Americans, and those Americans have friends. Since elections and political movements have a peer influencer dynamic, what one's friend thinks matters. Neighbors are best at swaying other neighbors to vote, and people often become involved in social movements, at least initially, because their friends invite them to an event.

But the explicit appeal to a culture of cool reached a modern apex during Barack Obama's 2008 presidential campaign, when artists mobilized to create pop-art imagery of Obama. Bernie Sanders, in a sense, borrowed from Obama's playbook, though his campaign tried to make its revolutionary ideas and agenda, rather than its candidate, the star of the show. And Clinton is taking a cue from Bernie's campaign. Instead of trying to make herself cool (I mean...), she is working on making clear that America's fundamental values of inclusion, fairness and opportunity for all -- the essential values that are at stake in this election -- are deeply, infectiously cool.

The Trump campaign has taken a different approach. A Trump surrogate, Marco Gutierrez, told MSNBC's Joy Reid that if America doesn't do something about **immigration**, "You're going to have taco trucks on every corner." He said it as if taco trucks were a bad thing. But the problem for the Trump campaign is that cool kids like taco trucks. They can be found on every other street corner in trendsetting hipster neighborhoods.

And cool kids don't just like taco trucks. They like pluralism, tolerance, marriage equality, a path to citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**, and wait for it, Hillary Clinton. While in some ways this election seems like the last ditch effort on the part of the traditionalist right to "make America great again," the cool kids are not interested in entertaining such backward ideals. They like where we are as a country -- our progress toward gender equality, sexual freedom, racial justice and integration of **immigrant** communities into our national tapestry. They want that progress to continue, and even more quickly.

Last weekend, in the key swing state of Ohio, NARAL Pro-Choice America hosted a massive concert at a stadium in Cleveland featuring the musician Sia, actress Leslie Jones and "Daily Show" star Jessica Williams. At a time when Republicans in Congress are still trying to defund Planned Parenthood after dozens of failed attempts, it's a meaningful sign that more and more high profile celebrities are showing up to support abortion rights.

And the Cleveland concert is just one of many examples. These cultural icons are not just telling their fans to pay attention; they're not just using their celebrity status to attract media coverage. They're signaling victory in the decadeslong culture war. They are affirming that homophobia, racial discrimination, misogyny and the backward regressive policies of the right are increasingly a relic of the past. The cool kids know it -- and soon, hopefully, the entire American electorate will, too.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Marco Gutierrez, the "Latinos for Trump" founder who warned unchecked **immigration** would lead to "taco trucks on every corner," might have his nightmare come true on Election Day. Sort of.

The US Hispanic Chamber of Commerce is organizing an effort hoping to put taco trucks on every corner -- or, rather, every polling site -- on Election Day.

Gutierrez, a top Latino surrogate for Donald Trump's campaign, recently warned, in vivid terms, of negative consequences if America did not adopt tighter **immigration** policies.

"My culture is a very dominant culture. And it's imposing, and it's causing problems. If you don't do something about it, you're going to have taco trucks on every corner," Gutierrez told MSNBC's Joy-Ann Reid.

Last week, treating Gutierrez's warning as a challenge of sorts, the USHCC created the initiative "Guac the Vote." Its aim -- mobilizing taco truck owners to encourage its customers to register to vote, and park their trucks outside polling sites on Nov. 8.

"The idea of taking the taco trucks is not even a Mexican or Hispanic symbol -- it's an American symbol," said Chamber spokesman Pablo Manriquez. "The hope is that we're going to be able to deliver quite a few trucks to quite a few polling centers."

Trump's campaign did not immediately respond for comment to this story.

Manriquez said he's not sure how many taco trucks there are in the country -- but he believes its in the thousands -- and there's no recent data that shows how many election centers there are in the United States. Data in 2004 shows that there were 113,754 polling places, according to a report by the US Election Assistance Commission.

In July, the USHCC endorsed Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton for president, which was a first for the normally nonpartisan group.

"Hillary Clinton will be America's first American small business president. She grew up in a small business. She understands the challenges of small businesses. And throughout her campaign, she's engaged our organization and our business owners all over the country," the group's president, Javier Palomarez, told CNN's "New Day" at the time.

**Immigration** has been a hot topic in this election after Trump mentioned Mexican **immigrants** in his June 2015 campaign announcement.

"When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best," Trump famously 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."

Since then, Trump has faced criticism for his comments about building a border wall and having Mexico pay for it, as well as accusing a US-born federal judge of Mexican heritage, Gonzalo Curiel, for being biased about presiding about a Trump University case.

Trump met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Aug. 31 in Mexico City, to discuss his comments about Mexico paying for the border wall Trump has pledged to build if he is president. Peña Nieto reiterated his response that Mexico would not pay for such a wall.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Dean Obeidallah, a former attorney, is the host of SiriusXM's radio's daily program "The Dean Obeidallah Show" and a columnist for The Daily Beast. Follow him @TheDeansreport. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- "The viciousness of these Jews is unbelievable.... they are the dominant and dangerous power that exists in the United States of America today." Those are the words of former Grand Wizard of the Ku Klux Klan David Duke.

We're not reaching way back here: this is from just three months ago when he lashed out at Jewish members of the media who he claimed were "absolutely zeroing in now on Donald Trump." Duke, who is publicly supporting Trump, has since declared that voting against Trump is "treason to your heritage."

It really doesn't get too much more deplorable than that type of anti-Semitic rherotic. But when Trump's running mate was asked Monday night by CNN's Wolf Blitzer whether he would call it that, Republican vice presidential nominee Mike Pence refused. Instead, Pence offered a weak response: "We do not want his support and we don't want the support of people who think like him."

When Blitzer pushed Pence on whether Duke would "fit into that category of deplorables," Pence remarked, "No," adding, "I'm not in the name-calling business..."

Duke, who recently made robocalls urging voters to support Trump, was apparently pleased at this framing, and praised Pence: "It's good to see an individual like Pence and others start to reject this absolute controlled media." At this writing, Pence has not denounced even this new round of praise from the former Grand Wizard. (To Duke, "controlled" media is code for Jewish-run media.)

And Pence isn't the only one on the Republican ticket dangerously giving white supremacists a sense that he wants their support. Trump has infamously retweeted white supremacists' tweets on various occasions, including one from a user with the handle "WhiteGenocideTM." In fact, in January, a study found that 62% of the accounts Trump had retweeted recently had white-supremacist connections.

And, in February, when CNN's Jake Tapper questioned Trump about the former Klan leader's public praise for the candidate, Trump created a firestorm when he refused to denounce Duke. Instead, he remarked, "I know nothing about David Duke; I know nothing about white supremacists."

Trump eventually did condemn Duke, but this has not deterred Duke and other white nationalists who remain firmly on the Trump train. A recent study found that white nationalists on Twitter are "heavily invested" in Trump's campaign.

For example, some of them, including Duke, tweeted praise for Trump's recent hard-line **immigration** speech. And just last week, several leading white supremacists held a press conference "to discuss their affection for Donald Trump and their hopes for a white homeland," which they note needs to be free from Jews.

This is the backdrop against which we can assess Pence's unwillingness to denounce Duke.

Perhaps Pence's refusal to call Duke "names" is something that he truly believes in. Perhaps Pence -- an evangelical Christian -- is a man who won't malign others, even anti-Semites like Duke, because it clashes with his personal moral code. If this were the case, at least then we could attempt to understand Pence's hesitance to call Duke "deplorable" or any other word that would make it clear to Duke and his followers that the Republican presidential ticket rejects them unequivocally.

But that isn't the case. Just last week Pence had no problem mocking President Barack Obama as a weak and ineffective leader.

And last year, when Pence faced a backlash over the Indiana religious liberty law he had signed, which many argued legally sanctioned discrimination against the LGBT community, Pence had no problem lambasting the media, calling reporters, "shameless" and "reckless" in the way they were covering the issue.

Is David Duke not, at the very least, "shameless?" "Reckless?" Can Pence not conjure any such words of indictment and revulsion for the white supremacists who shame his ticket with their support?

America does not need or want leaders that lower themselves to the immoral opportunism on display here.

In this tightly contested election, is the Trump-Pence campaign worried that it can't **alienate** white supremacists -- even if they are racists and anti-Semites? We can't know for sure.

What is clear, however, is that Pence should've said more Monday night than: We don't want the vote of people who think like Duke. He should've made it clear to all -- especially the white nationalist Trump supporters -- that Duke and those like him are the very definition of deplorable.

Anything less is not only morally wrong, it brings hateful and un-American views into the mainstream -- and those may well stay with us long after this election is over.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNNMoney) -- Donald Trump's economic policies aren't getting good grades.

His presidency would cost the U.S. economy $1 trillion over the next five years, according to Oxford Economics a British forecasting firm with offices in the United States.

The analysis comes ahead of Trump's big speech on Thursday at the Economic Club of New York, where he's expected to offer more clarity on his economic policy promises.

Oxford Economics found that if fully implemented, Trump's economic, tax and **immigration** policies would cost 4 million U.S. jobs, weigh down global growth and U.S. consumer spending, and could spark a trade war with other nations.

"Combining these policies together, the impact could be significantly negative for the U.S. economy," says Jamie Thompson, head of macro scenarios at Oxford Economics.

Oxford's figures are in line with other analysis. The University of Pennsylvania's Wharton Budget Model forecasts Trump's **immigration** policy costing 4 million jobs and Moody's economist Mark Zandi -- a Clinton supporter -- also forecasts a similar job loss under Trump.

Thompson argues that Trump could hurt the very workers he says he'll help in America's manufacturing sector. In Oxford's "adverse case scenario" Trump slaps a 35% tariff on goods coming from Mexico, like cars and air conditioners.

But the problem is that almost half of the parts in those cars and ACs originate from U.S. suppliers. In other words, U.S. manufacturers who ship to Mexico stand to lose customers if the U.S. imposes a tariff on the products they contribute to.

CNNMoney also found similar stories when we spoke to denim manufacturers in South Carolina. They send an overwhelming amount of denim to Mexico, where it is cut and sewn into jeans, which are sold in America. They say NAFTA, the trade deal with Mexico and Canada, is critical.

"Without NAFTA, we would be out of business," says Rich Turner, who employs 2,700 workers at his denim plant in Mauldin, S.C. Turner is still supporting Trump because he refuses to vote for Hillary Clinton.

American buyers would stand to lose too if all of Trump's policies are implemented. Those tariffs would make the price of cars and other goods more expensive. Oxford forecasts consumer spending to decline by 4.4% over four years.

Trump's team acknowledges that a grocery trip would become more expensive with tariffs on other countries' goods.

"(Prices could go up) if those tariffs were actually enacted as proposed," Tom Barrack, one of Trump's economic advisers, agreed in an interview with CNNMoney's Cristina Alesci.

But Barrack counters that Trump would also bring back good-paying jobs to the United States. Trump would do that by creating an economic stimulus plan and lowering corporate taxes to convince companies to return offshore profits to the U.S. and spend that cash on new jobs and factories.

Many trade experts argue that raising tariffs on China and Mexico would only cause American companies to shift jobs to the next cheapest place, such as Vietnam or Central America.

Trump's trade proposals "would be ultimately self-defeating, and harm the U.S. economy and harm U.S. manufacturers," says Thompson, the economist from Oxford Economics.

When asked about Oxford's analysis, Barrack dismissed the report in one sentence.

"One thing we know about economists is that they never get it right," Barrack said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- With eight weeks to go before Election Day, Donald Trump holds a narrow lead over Hillary Clinton in Ohio and the two are locked in a near-even contest in Florida, according to new CNN/ORC polls in the two critical battleground states.

Among likely voters in Ohio, Trump stands at 46% to Clinton's 41%, with 8% behind Libertarian Gary Johnson and 2% behind Green Party nominee Jill Stein. In Florida, likely voters split 47% for Trump to 44% for Clinton, within the poll's 3.5 percentage point margin of error, and with 6% behind Johnson and 1% backing Stein.

In both states, Trump's support increases as a result of the likely voter screen, among all registered voters, Clinton edges Trump 45% to 44% in Florida, and in Ohio, Trump tops Clinton 43% to 39% with Johnson at 12%.

The polls come as other national and battleground state polls suggest a sharply tightened contest compared with mid-August. While Clinton emerged from her convention with the advantage in surveys in both states and nationwide, more recent surveys suggest a closer contest and an enthusiasm gap that tilts in Trump's favor. A Bloomberg Politics survey of Ohio voters released Wednesday morning found Trump ahead by five points, identical to the margin in this survey of Ohio voters, and Quinnipiac University surveys released shortly after Labor Day showed an even contest in Florida with Trump up four points in Ohio.

Nationally, several recent polls, including a Quinnipiac University poll released Wednesday and a CNN/ORC poll released last week, have shown the race within the margin of sampling error nationally.

In the new polls in both states, Trump holds a wide advantage among white voters, topping Clinton by 22 points in Ohio among whites and by 29 points in Florida. Non-whites, who make up a larger share of voters in Florida than they do in Ohio, break heavily for Clinton in both states; she's up by 70 points among non-whites in Ohio and by 43 points among non-whites in Florida.

And although the wide gap by education among whites that's emerged in most polling on this contest continues here (Clinton's support lands below 30 percent among those whites who do not have college degrees, while the race is closer among whites with degrees), Trump does hold an edge among whites with college degrees in both states; he's up 9 points among that group in Ohio and 8 points in Florida.

Both candidates have the support of roughly 9 in 10 of their own partisans in each state, but Clinton trails Trump among independent voters in both places, with Trump up 10 points among independents likely to vote in Florida and 8 points in Ohio.

Younger voters, who were a key driver of President Barack Obama's support in both 2008 and 2012, are not lining up as solidly behind Clinton in either state, and they are less likely than older voters to make it through a likely voter screen at this point in the campaign, suggesting they are less enthusiastic about voting in this election.

In Florida, Clinton tops Trump by 6 points among those under age 45 who are likely to turn out in November, and in Ohio, Clinton and Trump are about even among this group. Obama carried this group by double-digits in 2012 in both Florida and Ohio.

One big difference this time between younger and older voters: Support for Gary Johnson. In both states, Johnson reaches double-digits among those voters under age 45 who say they are likely to turn out, while he gets low-single-digit support among older voters.

These voters younger than 45 are also most apt to say they might change their minds between now and Election Day -- about 3 in 10 in each state say they haven't yet made a firm decision. Whether Clinton can spark their interest in voting and pull some away from a vote for Johnson could be critical to her chances in these battlegrounds.

In Ohio, Clinton faces deeper image challenges than in Florida. Her favorability rating there is worse than Trump's, even among the broader pool of registered voters. Just 36% have a positive impression of Clinton vs. 41% who view Trump favorably. Clinton also trails Trump by 12 points on the question of who is more honest and trustworthy.

Not all is negative for Clinton, though. She tops the GOP nominee as more trusted on handling foreign policy and as better at handling the responsibilities of commander in chief. Trump's strong points come on managing the economy, terrorism and **immigration**.

Still, voters in Ohio are roughly split on which candidate shares their values, with 44% saying Trump does, 41% Clinton and a sizable 13% saying neither of them does. The percentage saying neither shares their values spikes to 20% among whites who hold college degrees and 21% among political independents.

In Florida, the two candidates are about even in terms of favorability, with 46% having a positive impression of Clinton and 43% of Trump. Marco Rubio, the home-state senator who lost his Florida's Republican presidential primary to Trump before deciding to run for re-election, holds a higher favorability rating than either of the two presidential nominees, with 51% having a positive take on him.

Here too, Trump is broadly seen as better on the economy (52% to 44% who think Clinton would do a better job handling it) and Clinton holds the edge on foreign policy (55% to 39%), but the two are about evenly matched in Florida on **immigration** (Clinton 49% to Trump's 47%) and terrorism (Trump 48% to Clinton's 46%).

Clinton has the edge on shared values (47% choose her, 41% Trump) and handling the responsibilities of being commander in chief (51% to 44%) while Trump is more often seen as honest and trustworthy (47% say Trump is, 40% Clinton, 12% neither).

In both states, the Senate races break in favor of the Republican incumbents, with Rubio topping Democratic challenger Patrick Murphy by a 54% to 43% margin among likely voters, and Rob Portman well ahead of former Gov. Ted Strickland, 58% to 37% among those most likely to turn out in November.

The CNN/ORC polls were conducted by telephone September 7 through 12. Results in Florida are based on a random sample of 1,003 adults who live in the state, including 788 who are likely to vote in November. In Ohio, interviews were conducted with a random sample of 1,006 adults who live in the state, including 769 likely voters. In both states, results for the sample of likely voters have a margin of sampling error of 3.5 percentage points.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Melania Trump released a letter from her **immigration** attorney Wednesday aimed at settling questions about whether she properly followed **immigration** law when she came to the United States in 1996.

"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," Trump wrote in a post on Twitter, with a photo of the attorney's letter attached.

Michael J. Wildes, Trump's lawyer who signed the letter from the firm Wildes & Weinberg, wrote, "It has been suggested by various media outlets that in 1995, Mrs. Trump illegally worked as a model in the United States while on a visitor visa. Following a review of her relevant **immigration** paperwork, I can unequivocally state that these allegations are not supported by the record, and are therefore completely without merit."

"Contrary to published reports, Mrs. Trump never worked in the United States in 1995 because she was never in the United States in 1995," Wildes wrote, citing **immigration** documents that demonstrate that Trump's first entry to the country was in 1996.

The controversy over Trump's **immigration** history began in August when the New York Post re-published photos from an old photoshoot she had done in the 1990s, which seemed to place her in New York City in 1995, despite her claims that she had arrived in 1996. Critics questioned the timeline Trump had provided for her **immigration** history and whether she had obtained proper legal status.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**3:37 p adds Clinton video 11:25 a updates from Trump presser

(CNN) -- Donald Trump opened a new hotel in Washington Tuesday, the latest addition to a vast business empire that the real estate mogul rode to the Republican nomination.

The property's debut highlights the unprecedented prospect of a presidency riddled with conflicts of interest for a world-famous businessman, one whose financial stakes range from the corridors of American power to spots around the globe stretching from Panama to Dubai to South Korea.

One of Trump's central attack lines against Democratic opponent Hillary Clinton is that her family's foundation benefited from donations by foreign governments seeking to influence the then-secretary of state. The Republican nominee has slammed Clinton as possibly "the most corrupt person ever to seek the presidency" based in part on those donations.

But former presidential financial advisers and global business analysts say that Trump's massive, international financial holdings combined with his stated plan to entrust them to his children while in office pose a much thornier set of ethical questions. As president, he would be in a position to make decisions pertaining to the federal government, economy and foreign policy that could affect his family's bottom line.

A Newsweek magazine cover story published Wednesday details a web of Trump's business ties that could pose conflicts of interest.

Senior writer Kurt Eichenwald points, in one case, to Trump's suggestions that Korea take on its own nuclear defense -- a radical departure from the post-World War II security structure that could also enrich Trump's Korean business partner, Daewoo Engineering and Construction, a major nuclear energy company.

And in India, Trump's contracts with businesses linked to state governments and politicians -- and his plans to expand the family business there -- could raise questions about whether Trump's foreign policy decisions would be driven by US strategic interests or company priorities.

The story also outlines how the Republican candidate's comments about Muslims have deeply **alienated** Turkish President Recep Tayyip Erdogan, a crucial, if sometimes problematic, US ally in the fight against ISIS and other Sunni terror groups.

"The interests of these businesses, the interests of these politicians, often go directly against the interests of American national security. So right now you have Donald Trump in a situation where he makes money by aiding the people whose interests don't coincide with America's," Eichenwald told CNN's Chris Cuomo and Alisyn Camerota on "New Day" on Wednesday.

Some of the potential conflicts were on display when Trump arrived in Scotland in June to preside over the opening of a remodeled golf course.

Weighing in on UK voters' recent choice to leave the European Union, which sent the British pound plunging, Trump said at his Turnberrry golf resort: "If the pound goes down, they'll do more business."

"What it will be, for sure, is a constant drama as to whether his business ventures are benefiting or being harmed by his public policy decisions," said Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics, who said that having his children manage his properties wouldn't provide a strong firewall.

The Trump campaign declined requests for comment this story.

But asked by CNN's Sara Murray about his business holdings, he said he would cut ties with his businesses if he becomes president and their operations would be run by his children and top executives.

"I would most likely just put it in a blind trust and they would run it, or something," he said.

Financial experts, though, have noted that one's children and executives don't run "blind" trusts.

There is also the issue that his money is in specific properties, noted Kenneth Gross, who has advised previous presidential candidates on how to handle their finances.

"Putting it into a blind trust doesn't wipe out your knowledge of it. You know it's there," he said.

Democrats attack Trump

Trump's corporate practices are providing fodder for Clinton and other Democrats seeking to tarnish his business credentials in the minds of voters.

Soon after Trump's comments in Scotland, @HillaryClinton tweeted that "hours after the #BrexitVote, Donald Trump was in the U.K. talking about how he, personally, would benefit."

An attached video opens with breaking news alerts from news anchors warning about the shockwaves of an uncertain era that will impact financial markets before switching to a lounge music soundtrack and Donald Trump in the Scottish sunshine.

"Are you traveling with any of your foreign policy advisers?," a reporter calls out to him.

"Well, I've been in touch with them, but there's nothing to talk about," Trump says, before cutting to his comment that his businesses could benefit from a dropping pound.

On the eve of his visit to Scotland, the Democratic National Committee released a statement that the trip was "not the first time that Trump has promoted his products or properties, including steaks, water, wine and hotels, during his run for the White House." It continued, "But like the many other businesses Trump has hyped, his developments in Scotland and Ireland have been business failures."

A CNN/ORC poll released in June found voters think Trump should start distancing himself from his private ventures. The survey reported 69% of voters -- including 56% of Republicans and 77% of Democrats -- say they think Trump ought to step down as chairman and president of the Trump Organization while he's involved in politics. Only 28% think he should continue to run his eponymous company.

Whatever voters prefer, the law as it currently stands doesn't prevent a president from continuing to act as CEO of for-profit enterprises -- despite rules governing conflicts of interest for everyone from Cabinet secretaries to federal office clerks.

That raises concerns that decisions a President Trump might make in office on issues such as **immigration**, banking, land use or foreign ties could be colored by their impact on the personal fortunes of CEO Trump.

"We've never had a situation like this where the holdings of the president could create an acute conflict in carrying out his duties," said Gross, now a lawyer with Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meager and Flom. "I'm really not sure how it would all play out."

Trump, who has refused to release his tax returns, filed a personal financial disclosure form with the Federal Election Commission in May that shows income in excess of half a billion dollars, according to his campaign. In earlier filings, Trump has listed at least $1.4 billion in real estate and other assets.

Far-flung holdings

An examination of that Financial Disclosure Report reveals he has interests in at least 22 countries, including Saudi Arabia, China, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates. These include hotels, golf courses and at least one aviation company.

While the bulk of Trump's business interests are anchored in the US, his far-flung holdings -- which also include assets as far afield as India, Qatar, Egypt and Panama -- present significant potential conflict of interests, according to analysts.

"Most foreign policy decisions you would make would have real implications for your holdings and your net worth, which means the conflicts of interests would be piling up beginning with every morning's security briefing," said Norm Ornstein, a political scientist at the American Enterprise Institute.

Hufbauer said there's also a concern that foreign governments might try to use their leverage over Trump's personal businesses. Trump's property development work relies intensely on getting permissions from local regulators for everything from land use to building heights, Hufbauer said.

"There would always be the question, whether they're putting the screws on him in his private life to have him change his policies in his public life," Hufbauer said.

Since Trump uses his name conspicuously in his businesses and licensing agreements in the US and abroad, "it seems harder to completely separate what's going on in the business from his presence in a potential presidency," said Hufbauer.

A President Trump would appoint Federal Reserve Board members who set interest rates that affect his properties. He would choose commissioners to the Federal Trade Commission, which oversees consumer regulation and antitrust complaints such as the one against Trump University.

He would tap leaders for the agencies that determine how easy it is for workers at his businesses to unionize or how easy it is for foreign laborers to enter the US to work in his hotels. Or he might be in a position to approve the creation of a national forest next to one of his golf courses, Gross said, that would improve the views and allow him to raise the green fees.

The Berlusconi model?

The closest parallel to a President Trump in modern times, Hufbauer said, is Italy's former Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi.

"There were all these issues of whether there was some indirect influence" on government policy because of Berlusconi's sprawling business interests, Hufbauer said.

Trump himself has tried to raise the specter of foreign influence against Clinton, calling on her in a June 13 tweet to return "the $25 million plus" that Saudi Arabia had given to the Clinton Foundation -- run by former President Bill Clinton -- which matches donors to development projects aimed at solving the world's most pressing problems.

The foundation has rejected the suggestion of foreign influence, saying the money was earmarked for specific projects, including AIDS relief.

In response to conflict of interest concerns when Clinton became secretary of state, she made an agreement with the Obama administration to limit foreign donations to the foundation to those countries that had already been giving, as long as their contributions stayed at the same levels.

Clinton, who has spent her presidential campaign so far in the United States, primarily visiting key battlegrounds such as Ohio and Virginia, has said that if she's elected, she and her husband will "cross that bridge" on making a decision about the foundation. Bill Clinton has said things will change.

Hufbauer said one difference between Clinton's situation and Trump's is scale.

"We now see the Clintons are having some trouble in wondering what Bill will do with the foundation if Hillary is elected," he said. "The problems of a Trump would be substantially greater because of the conspicuous use of his name."

Few regulations for presidents

No law would require Trump to shed his holdings, though he would have to disclose them. And there's no regulation that would prevent him from promoting his overseas resorts or other properties if he sits in the White House.

There isn't even a legal requirement for presidents to place their holdings in a blind trust, which has become an accepted practice as candidates in previous years took steps to avoid a conflict of interest or the appearance of one.

And while executive branch employees are legally forbidden from taking part in a government matter that might affect their financial interests or those of their spouse or children, that rule doesn't apply to the president or the vice president.

Beyond creating a blind trust, candidates often sell their businesses, convert their holdings into cash or general financial instruments such as index funds. Bush sold his stake in the Texas Ranger's baseball team and put his securities in a trust, as did Republican candidate Mitt Romney.

Gross, who advised Romney, and others noted that Trump still faces the possibility of conflicts of interest even if he hands management of his assets over to his family.

"You're supposed to have no clue what the people in charge of the trust are doing with your money," Ornstein said.

Richard Painter, a corporate law professor at the University of Minnesota who served as the chief ethics lawyer for President George W. Bush, said another problem would be the way banks, regulatory agencies or other entities would relate to the family members managing Trump's properties.

"You think the banks are going to turn down the president's son on a leveraged loan?" he asked.

The Constitution's failure to address these kinds of potential presidential conflicts of interest is a "fatal flaw," said Painter, who pointed to history for an example of the impact personal financial interests can have on national fortunes.

Presidents including George Washington and Thomas Jefferson, along with many senators, owned plantations that relied on slave labor, a factor that Painter said affected their judgment.

"The first few presidents had conflicts of interests that made it impossible for them to intelligently and ethically deal with the country's first moral dilemma," Painter said. "The fact that we failed to deal with that in 1789 created the greatest political crisis and war in our country's history."

Some of Trump's businesses around the world

Editor's note: This story has been updated from the original version published on June 24.

CNN's Rachel Chason, Jennifer Agiesta, Jeremy Diamond, Dan Merica and Tal Yellin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**10:35 am: Graf 27, removes extra "fought"

(CNN) -- The days following the September 11, 2001, attacks were marked by political solidarity over confronting America's enemies. No longer.

As the 15th anniversary of the horrific attacks approaches Sunday, the political world is bitterly divided on how to address terrorism and national security.

Donald Trump dominated the GOP primaries after breaking with key elements of his party's post-9/11 ethos. He blamed former President George W. Bush, whose original response to the attacks sent his approval ratings to historic highs, for the terrorist strike. And Trump has proposed banning Muslims from entering the United States. Though he's softened the proposal somewhat in gearing up for the general election, his stance still represents a dramatic departure from Bush's visit to the Islamic Center of Washington, DC, six days after the attacks to proclaim "Islam is peace."

Today's political climate is a far cry from the days when Hillary Clinton, a freshman senator from New York, and then-New York Mayor Rudolph Giuliani came together to console grieving New Yorkers in the days after 9/11. Now Giuliani is one of Trump's top supporters, who repeatedly trashes Clinton.

For her part, Clinton, now the Democratic nominee, is still reckoning with decisions she made in the charged climate after the attacks, facing questions this week about her 2002 vote in favor of authorizing the Iraq War.

Meanwhile, Americans are more likely than five years ago to feel fear and anger when they think about what happened on September 11, according to a CNN/ORC poll released Friday.

Even talking about terrorism in the current atmosphere can spark political controversy, with the nation's leaders squabbling over whether to label the threat "radical Islamic terrorism."

The current commander in chief regularly faces media and political blowback in his attempts to argue that though terrorism is perilous, it does not represent an existential threat to the nation.

Meanwhile, Guantanamo Bay -- opened in the aftermath of September 11 to house foreign enemy combatants -- is still open, as President Barack Obama's vows to close it have been stymied by Congress.

Clinton and Trump spent the last few days feuding over the Iraq War --with both trying to outdo the other in their stated opposition to it.

Clinton voted for the war but now admits it was a mistake, while Trump says he was always against it even though he was on record backing it at the time. In both cases, the sea change shows the unraveling of unified public opinion on how to prosecute the war on terror.

And the fact that these issues remain such a core part of American political life as the nation pauses to observe the 15th anniversary of 9/11 reflects the enduring potential of terrorism to dominate the political conversation -- and explains why it is seen as such a potent tool by America's enemies.

With Syria in tatters, yet another new administration in Washington risks getting pulled into the morass of violence in the Middle East, a region US policies helped to splinter.

Judging by the plans so far unveiled by Clinton and Trump -- longer on tough talk than detailed new strategies -- of how to swiftly crush ISIS, terrorism is likely to be reverberating through US politics for years to come. And recent ISIS attacks have only heightened its impact on the current political environment.

Trump's decision to base his campaign around a vision of a nation under siege from foreign extremism may have contributed to the mood.

"It has made the 15th anniversary more charged than some of the recent ones," said Matthew Dallek, a George Washington University professor who has published a new book about the origins of Homeland Security in the 1940s.

"His message is we are losing this war, we are incredibly vulnerable, we are being overrun by Syrian terrorists," Dallek said. "He has contributed to that. A lot of people feel that."

Trump, seeking to undercut Clinton's claim that her experience as secretary of state uniquely equips her for the presidency, accuses his rival of botching a chance to make America safer.

"She refused to take accountability for failed policies in the Middle East that have produced millions of refugees, unleashed horror of radical Islamic terrorism all over, and made us less safe than ever before," Trump said of his rival in Ohio on Thursday.

Clinton is effectively accusing Trump of being ISIS' candidate over his calls for a ban on Muslim **immigration** and promises to reinstate waterboarding for terror suspects.

"They are saying, 'Please Allah, make Trump president of America,' "

Clinton said this week on Israeli television, arguing that her opponent's positions **alienate** Muslims to the benefit of ISIS.

"I'm not interested in giving aid and comfort to their evil ambitions," she said. "I want to defeat them. I want to end their reign of terror."

Whichever one wins the election will find out that the bitter politics of terrorism are often a distraction from the primary presidential function of keeping America safe.

In fact, despite fierce political differences between Bush and Obama and the hot rhetoric of the current campaign, there has been continuity in how America has fought the war on terrorism in the years since 9/11.

Obama streamlined his predecessor's approach and increased the lethality and frequency of drone strikes after taking office and can claim credit for having crushed the core leadership of al Qaeda. There is also broad agreement across the political spectrum on measures to protect the homeland and even for National Security Agency surveillance programs started under Bush and modified by Obama.

It is likely that for all the political back-and-forth in the campaign, a President Trump or a President Clinton would choose to keep many of the current administration's approaches in place.

The next president will have to deal with the long-term consequences of both Bush's decision to invade Iraq and Obama's decision to pull all US troops out. America's longest war, in Afghanistan, is still raging. ISIS is attracting adherents around the globe, while a host of other terrorist groups arm themselves.

Given public antipathy to sending hundreds of thousands of troops to Syria and Iraq, plans by Clinton and Trump to fight ISIS stress intensified air strikes, increased intelligence resources and an ideological challenge to the Islamic extremists. They also, however, mirror strategies Obama is already pursuing and don't seem likely to end the war quickly.

That's why Scott Mann, a retired Army lieutenant colonel and former Green Beret and Special Forces operative who conducted pioneering counterterrorism and counterinsurgency programs while serving combat tours in Iraq, Afghanistan and South America, said the next president must transform the politics of the fight against terrorism by steeling Americans for a fight that could last many more years.

He warns that launching air strikes and taking terror leaders off the battlefield may be effective in the short term but do not treat the underlying cause of terrorism.

Instead, Mann said, the US should send in troops to partner with clans and tribes in areas occupied by extremists in places like Syria and Iraq to empower local people to crush radicalism from the bottom up.

Mann's son was 3 when 9/11 happened; now he's in the military himself.

"There is no end in sight," Mann said. "He is now on his path to become an Army lieutenant. That is quite a span of war -- for your kid to go to fight the war you didn't finish."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**8:59 a.m. - adds Rubble quote

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump clashed Wednesday over national security issues that exposed deep divides about how to manage the military and conduct foreign policy in an increasingly complex world.

The forum offered a preview of how the two candidates will present themselves to the country when they appear on stage September 26 at the crucial first presidential debate. The gulf between them was especially apparent when the discussion centered on Russia and combating ISIS.

Clinton has repeatedly slammed Trump on the campaign trail for his embrace of Russian President Vladimir Putin. But at the "Commander in Chief" forum hosted by NBC News, Trump once again praised the Russian leader in comparison to President Barack Obama.

"Certainly, in that system, he's been a leader, far more than our president has been a leader," Trump said. "If (Putin) says great things about me, I'm gonna say great things about him. I've already said he is really very much of a leader."

Plans for ISIS

Trump has also presented varying answers about his plan to deal with ISIS and moderator Matt Lauer pressed the Republican nominee on the issue.

"I have a plan ... Look, I have a very substantial chance of winning," Trump said. "If I win, I don't want to broadcast to the enemy exactly what my plan is."

But he also said he would confer with US generals on his ISIS plan, although he criticized Pentagon brass, alleging generals have not stood up to Obama.

"I think under the leadership Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, the generals have been reduced to rubble."

With less than three weeks until the debate, Trump seemed at ease with the freewheeling style he has often demonstrated on the campaign trail. He caused a stir by defending a tweet that implied military sexual assault is a result of women serving in the military. Meanwhile, Clinton pivoted from questions about her email server to focus on her vision of a robust national security policy.

Asked about what critics call her hawkish foreign policy record, Clinton said: "We are not putting ground troops into Iraq ever again and we are not putting ground troops into Syria."

She added: "I view force as a last resort, not a first choice. I will do everything in my power to make sure our men and women in the military are fully prepared for any challenge they may have to face on our behalf, but I will also be as careful as I can in making the most significant decisions any president and commander and chief can make about sending our men and women into harm's way."

Clinton, who said defeating ISIS would be her "highest terrorism goal," spoke of using air power and regional alliances to defeat the group.

"We've gotta do it with much more support from the Arabs and the Kurds who will fight on the ground against ISIS," she said. "We have to squeeze them by continuing to support the Iraqi military. They've taken back Ramadi, Fallujah. They've gotta hold them. They've gotta now get into Mosul."

In a press conference Thursday morning, Clinton told reporters that the forum was "yet another test and Donald Trump failed yet again."

"We saw more evidence that he is temperamentally unfit and totally unqualified to be commander in chief," she said. "He trash talked American generals."

Iraq War

Trump repeated his claim that he was "against" the Iraq War, an assertion that has been repeatedly debunked. He praised the military campaign in Iraq in the first months after the invasion.

Trump has repeatedly attacked Clinton over her support for the war, saying it showed poor judgment. Clinton, when asked about her vote to authorize the war, said: "I have said that my voting to give President Bush that authority was, from my perspective, my mistake," she said. "I am asking to be judged on the totality of my record."

Undocumented soldiers

Trump said at the forum that he'd be open to "working" on a way for undocumented **immigrants** to serve in the US military -- a sharp contrast to his tone during a speech in Arizona last week where he said he would focus on deporting undocumented **immigrants** from the country.

"I think that when you serve in the armed forces, that's a very special situation," Trump said. "I could see myself working that. Absolutely. Now we have to vet very carefully, everybody would agree with that."

Veterans' health

A woman in the audience asked Trump during the forum what he'll do to stop the "20 veterans" from committing suicide daily.

"Actually it's 22. It's almost impossible to conceive that this is happening in this country," he said. "We're going to speed up the process, we're going to create a great mental health division. They need help."

Clinton, also asked about the issue, pointed to her recently rolled out mental health policy agenda.

"I have a whole section devoted to veterans' mental health. And we've gotta remove the stigma. We've gotta help people currently serving not to feel that if they report their sense of unease, their depression, that somehow it's gonna be a mark against them. We have to do more about addiction. Not only drugs but also alcohol," Clinton said.

Clinton on emails

Clinton, meanwhile, repeated "it was a mistake" to have used a personal email account and server while leading the department, and that she would "certainly not do it again."

"I make no excuses for it," she said.

But Clinton defended certain emails, including those that contained information about the country's covert drone program, as not revealing classified information.

"There were no discussions about any of the covert actions in process being determined about whether or not to go forward," she said. "But every part of our government had to deal with questions, secretary of state's office was first and foremost, so there are ways of talking about the drone program."

CNN's Jeremy Diamond and Dan Merica contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 6:26 a.m.: Fix typo

WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg told an audience Wednesday night that she thought "cooler heads will prevail" when asked about the Senate's refusal to hold hearings to fill the seat of Justice Antonin Scalia, adding she hoped it would happen "sooner rather than later."

The comments were an elaboration of Ginsburg's belief that the Supreme Court should have nine members.

Last May, she told an audience in New York: "Eight, as you know, is not a good number for a multi-member court."

The 83-year-old justice called Scalia's sudden passing the most "momentous occurrence" of last term, which included cases on abortion, affirmative action and **immigration**.

"His absence will be felt for many terms ahead," she said.

Wednesday's event was a wide-ranging conversation before students at Georgetown Law, where she dispensed advice, spoke about her trail-blazing cases as an advocate concerning gender discrimination, and addressed court cases she felt should be reversed.

Ginsburg was greeted by a standing ovation from the students, many who refer to her by her nickname the "Notorious RBG."

As she walked the students through the cases she argued as a young lawyer to bring down arbitrary gender lines, she recalled her own battles with discrimination. When she sought a job and "employers were totally up front in saying, 'We don't want any lady lawyers in the shop.' "

Her efforts in those days were to battle "variants of the same theme" that the man is the dominant partner and that the woman's domain is "home and children."

"We wanted to break down the stereotypical view of the world," she said.

The justice said that it was "beyond wonderful" to be part of a successful movement as a young lawyer when the law caught up with the experiences of many people.

Ginsburg -- who is about to begin her 23rd term on the court -- allowed that the most challenging part of being a justice (a job she called the hardest job she ever had) is the "sheer stamina" it takes.

She has shown no signs of slowing down, however, and next month she will take the bench for a term that will include cases on the death penalty, redistricting, disability rights and racial discrimination in housing among other issues.

The justices might also agree to hear a case concerning transgender rights. Also still pending is a long-shot request from the Obama administration to re-hear a case concerning the President's controversial **immigration** actions. Last term, the court deadlocked 4-4 in the case and in doing so affirmed a lower court opinion that blocked the programs.

The court has been unusually busy in late August and September, dealing with emergency petitions concerning voting rights issues in key election states such as North Carolina and Ohio. Because the court is closely divided on many voting rights issues, the possibility of 4-4 splits means that some lower court opinions remain the last word on the subject.

In her talk, Ginsburg did not delve deeply into last term's cases, but if a Democratic president succeeds in nominating the next Supreme Court justice, the court will take a turn to the left. Recent cases she thinks should have come out the other way include the 2010 campaign finance case, Citizens United, as well as Shelby County, a 2012 case that struck down a key provision of the Voting Rights Act.

She also went out of her way to mention a dissent written by Justice Stephen Breyer she called impressive on why "the death penalty is cruel and unusual punishment."

Even with only eight justices, by and large last term was a good one for liberals on the bench. The court struck down a Texas abortion law that critics said was one of the most strict nationwide, and it upheld the race-conscious admissions policy at the University of Texas. Justice Anthony Kennedy's vote was key in those cases.

Ginsburg was not asked and she did not offer any comments concerning Republican Donald Trump's presidential candidacy.

She caused a firestorm at the beginning of the summer for comments she made to media outlets concerning the businessman. She told Joan Biskupic, CNN's legal analyst and Supreme Court biographer, for instance, "he is a faker."

"He has no consistency about him. He says whatever comes into his head at the moment. He really has an ego ... How has he gotten away with not turning over his tax returns?" she said.

Ginsburg later issued a written statement saying she regretted the remarks she had made to the press.

"On reflection, my recent remarks in response to press inquiries were ill-advised and I regret making them," Ginsburg said in the statement. "Judges should avoid commenting on a candidate for public office. In the future I will be more circumspect."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Who is the real Donald Trump? Often, that depends on when you catch him.

As the campaign hits the home stretch, the task of trying to nail down Trump and some of his increasingly muddy policy proposals is taking on added urgency -- and growing difficulty.

He has proven himself to be a more artful candidate than many observers believed, especially as his poll numbers corkscrewed in mid-summer, with the ability to jarringly alter the substance and tone of his rhetoric to accommodate more moderate audiences. Polls now show a tight race nationally, even as Trump lags in some key swing states.

While politicians of all stripes have been "playing to the crowds" for centuries, Trump's willingness to manicure his message undercuts his promise to eschew "political correctness" and speak his mind, come what may.

Here's what the Two Trumps look like:

The Wall

After a meeting with Mexico's President Enrique Peña Nieto last week, Trump delivered a well-mannered statement, calling the Mexican people "spectacular" while describing his invitation as "a great, great honor."

On the issue of the wall he's vowed to build on the US-Mexico border, Trump said:

"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 Mexico."

But later that same day, away from the international press and back in the cauldron with his raucous supporters in Phoenix, Trump struck a more strident tone:

"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. ... On day one, we will begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful southern border wall."

Deportation

How Trump discusses his plan for the forced removal of an estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** -- and whether he intends to launch a "deportation force" at all -- also seems to vary depending on the audience.

In his Phoenix speech, the nominee made it clear that no undocumented **immigrants** were safe:

"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."

But in televised interviews both in the days before and after, Trump has hinted at a "softening."

During a Fox News event hosted by Sean Hannity on August 24, he offered this more tempered message:

"Now, everybody agrees we get the bad ones out. But when I go through and I meet thousands and thousands of people on this subject -- and I've had very strong people come up to me, really great, great people come up to me -- and they've said, 'Mr. Trump, I love you, but to take a person who's been here for 15 or 20 years and throw them and their family out, it's so tough, Mr. Trump,' I have it all the time. It's a very, very hard thing."

African-American voters

Trump has struggled to crack the mid-single digits with African-American voters, polls show. But his renewed pitch to the community can sound very different depending on the audience.

This is Trump speaking, in theory, to African-American voters last month in a room mostly full of white supporters in Dimondale, Michigan:

"What do you have to lose by trying something new like Trump? I say it again, What do you have to lose? You're living in poverty; your schools are no good; you have no jobs; 58% of your youth is unemployed. What the hell do you have to lose?"

A few weeks later, at a largely African-American church in Detroit -- with people of color on stage and in the pews -- Trump sounded a much different appeal:

"We talk past each other and not to each other. And those who seek office do not do enough to step into the community and learn what's going on. I'm here today to learn, so that we can together remedy injustice in any form, and so that we can also remedy economics so that the African-American community can benefit economically through jobs and income and so many other different ways."

The media

It's no secret that Trump has a love-hate relationship with the press. But even if his language can be wild, his timing is often cleverly calibrated -- as we saw this past holiday weekend:

On Saturday, a shot at CNN:

"@CNN is so disgusting in their bias, but they are having a hard time promoting Crooked Hillary in light of the new e-mail scandals."

A day later, it was The New York Times' turn:

"Wow, the failing @nytimes has not reported properly on Crooked's FBI release. They are at the back of the pack - no longer a credible source"

But on Labor Day, he offered this assessment of the journalists picked to moderate the fall presidential debates:

"I like them. I respect the moderators. I do respect them. It's interesting."

CNN's Brian Stelter also reported Wednesday that Trump was ending his controversial "blacklisting" of some media organizations.

Letting Trump be Trump

Sometimes saying things with little or no regard for how those words might strike the broader population can be politically counterproductive, Trump observed about a week after hiring Breitbart executive Steve Bannon and elevating pollster Kellyanne Conway to campaign manager.

Here's how he explained his new attempts at self-discipline to The New York Times on August 23:

"I have been staying on message more now because, ultimately, I'm finding that I do better with voters, do better in the polls, when I'm on message."

But just a few days earlier, speaking to an audience of supporters -- as opposed to reporters on a phone call -- he seemed to denounce that kind of tactical thinking:

"But one thing I can promise you is this: I will always tell you the truth. I speak the truth for all of you, and for everyone in this country who doesn't have a voice."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton addressed questions Wednesday on issues from the Iraq War and veterans' health to Clinton's email use and Trump's statements about Vladimir Putin and sexual assault in the military, during an NBC forum.

One audience member asked Trump: "As president, what specifically would you do to support all victims of sexual assault in the military?"

Trump agreed it's "a massive problem," and something should be done.

"And the best thing we can do is set up a court system in the military. Right now, the court system practically doesn't exist," he said.

But Trump stood by a 2013 tweet that implied military sexual assault is a result of women serving in the military, when asked by Lauer.

"26,000 unreported sexual assaults in the military-only 238 convictions. What did these geniuses expect when they put men & women together?" Trump had tweeted.

"I think that that's absolutely correct," he said during the forum. "No not to take them out, but something has to happen. The problem is nobody gets prosecuted."

ISIS plan

Lauer asked Trump whether he knows more about ISIS than President Barack Obama's generals, a statement he has previously made.

"I think under the leadership of Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton, the generals have been reduced to rubble," Trump said. "They have been reduced to a point where it's embarrassing for our country."

Trump, who has both said he has a secret plan to defeat ISIS and, if elected, that he would give generals 30 days to present him with a plan to beat ISIS, also offered little clarity as to which was the case.

"So is the plan you've been hiding this whole time -- asking someone else for their plan?" NBC's Matt Lauer asked Trump.

"No, but when I do come up with a plan that I like and that perhaps agrees with mine, or maybe doesn't, I may love what the generals come up with," Trump responded.

Lauer asked: "But you have your own plan?"

"I have a plan ... Look, I have a very substantial chance of winning," he said. "If I win, I don't want to broadcast to the enemy exactly what my plan is."

Clinton said defeating ISIS would be her "highest terrorism goal."

"And we've got to do it with air power. We've gotta do it with much more support from the Arabs and the Kurds who will fight on the ground against ISIS," she said. "We have to squeeze them by continuing to support -- the Iraqi military. They've taken back Ramadi, Fallujah. They've gotta hold them. They've gotta now get into Mosul."

Clinton on emails

Clinton, meanwhile, repeated "it was a mistake" to have used a personal email account and server while leading the department, and that she would "certainly not do it again."

"I make no excuses for it," she said.

But Clinton defended certain emails, including information about the country's covert drone program, as not revealing classified information.

"There were no discussions about any of the covert actions in process being determined about whether or not to go forward," she said. "But every part of our government had to deal with questions, secretary of state's office was first and foremost, so there are ways of talking about the drone program."

Iraq War

Trump, again said he was "against" the Iraq War, though he said he supported the invasion one month before Congress voted to authorize it, and praised the military campaign in Iraq in the first months after the invasion.

Trump has repeatedly attacked Clinton over her support for the war, saying it showed poor judgment. Clinton, when asked about her vote to authorize the war, said: "I have said that my voting to give President Bush that authority was, from my perspective, my mistake," she said. "I am asking to be judged on the totality of my record."

Asked about what critics call her hawkish foreign policy record, Clinton said: "We are not putting ground troops into Iraq ever again and we are not putting ground troops into Syria."

She added: "I view force as a last resort, not a first choice. I will do everything in my power to make sure our men and women in the military are fully prepared for any challenge they may have to face on our behalf, but I will also be as careful as I can in making the most significant decisions any president and commander and chief can make about sending our men and women into harms way."

Undocumented soldiers

Trump said at the forum that he'd be open to "working" a way for undocumented **immigrants** to serve in the US military -- a sharp contrast to his tone during a speech in Arizona last week where he said he would focus on deporting undocumented **immigrants** from the country.

"I think that when you serve in the armed forces, that's a very special situation," Trump said. "I could see myself working that. Absolutely. Now we have to vet very carefully, everybody would agree with that."

Veterans' health

A woman in the audience asked Trump during the forum what he'll do to stop the "20 veterans" from committing suicide daily.

"Actually it's 22. It's almost impossible to conceive that this is happening in this country," he said. "We're going to speed up the process, we're going to create a great mental health division. They need help."

Clinton, also asked about the issue, pointed to her recently rolled out mental health policy agenda.

"I have a whole section devoted to veterans' mental health. And we've gotta remove the stigma. We've gotta help people currently serving not to feel that if they report their sense of unease, their depression, that somehow it's gonna be a mark against them. We have to do more about addiction. Not only drugs but also alcohol," Clinton said.

Putin

A member in the audience asked Trump how he would deescalate tension with Russia.

"I think I would have a very, very good relationship with Putin. And I think I would have a very, very good relationship with Russia," he said.

Lauer then asked Trump what about his relationship with Russian President Vladimir Putin, who "annexed Crimea, invaded Ukraine, supports Assad in Syria, supports Iran, is trying to undermine our influence in key regions of the world."

"Well, I think when he calls me brilliant, I'll take the compliment, OK?" Trump said. "The fact that he calls me brilliant or whatever he calls me is going to have zero impact."

He added: "Now, it's a very different system, and I don't happen to like the system. But certainly, in that system, he's been a leader, far more than our president has been a leader. "

CNN's Jeremy Diamond and Dan Merica contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton addressed questions Wednesday on issues from the Iraq War and veterans' health to Clinton's email use and Trump's statements about Vladimir Putin and sexual assault in the military, during an NBC forum.
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"I think that when you serve in the armed forces, that's a very special situation," Trump said. "I could see myself working that. Absolutely. Now we have to vet very carefully, everybody would agree with that."
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A woman in the audience asked Trump during the forum what he'll do to stop the "20 veterans" from committing suicide daily.

"Actually it's 22. It's almost impossible to conceive that this is happening in this country," he said. "We're going to speed up the process, we're going to create a great mental health division. They need help."

Clinton, also asked about the issue, pointed to her recently rolled out mental health policy agenda.

"I have a whole section devoted to veterans' mental health. And we've gotta remove the stigma. We've gotta help people currently serving not to feel that if they report their sense of unease, their depression, that somehow it's gonna be a mark against them. We have to do more about addiction. Not only drugs but also alcohol," Clinton said.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: This is the first of a two-part series looking at the path to victory for Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Click here for the second story: How Hillary Clinton could win.

(CNN) -- Donald Trump is aiming to pull off one of the greatest political comebacks in history.

The Republican nominee is rebounding from a summer of repeated stumbles that threatened to undermine his candidacy, underscoring his ability to claw his way back and stay competitive despite controversies that would sink any other politician.

Trump and Hillary Clinton enter the critical post-Labor Day phase of the campaign in a dead heat. A CNN/ORC national poll released Tuesday finds Trump ahead of Clinton by two points -- 45% to 43% -- among likely voters. The race is also tight among registered voters, where Clinton has a three point advantage. Both findings are within the margin of error.

The narrowing of the race is a remarkable feat for Trump, who was down 10 points a month ago in CNN's Poll of Polls.

Trump still faces serious hurdles that strong poll numbers can't mask. He's **alienated** much of the electorate, especially minorities who showed up in droves over the past two cycles to support Barack Obama. He's doing poorly among college-educated women, who are typically a Republican stronghold, and his rudimentary organization is dwarfed by Clinton's political machine in swing states where he still lags in most polls.

Narrow path to the White House

But if Trump can spend the next 63 days shining a relentless and unforgiving spotlight on Clinton's vulnerabilities and avoid more self-inflicted wounds, there could be a path -- however narrow -- for him to reach the White House.

"Can he fundamentally alter the focus of this election right now --- which is on him?" asked Bill Lacy, a GOP veteran who ran presidential campaigns for Bob Dole and Fred Thompson. "He needs to make this election about Secretary Clinton."

Trump's best chance for altering the race lies in the presidential debates, which begin September 26 and will serve as critical tests of his temperament and knowledge. In front of a vast television audience, the GOP nominee could reshape perceptions of his character and readiness -- if he can avoid being drawn into gaffes and personality clashes by Clinton.

He will benefit from rock-bottom expectations, given controversies whipped up by his tempestuous personality and the vast gulf in experience between Trump and Clinton.

But the formal one-on-one presidential debates -- which personify the "commander-in-chief test" many Americans ponder as they select their next president -- are a far stiffer test for Trump than the crowded free-for-alls of the Republican primary race.

There will be no space for the billionaire to relax and regenerate his energy while rivals spar or networks cut to commercial breaks. The intensity of the questioning and his confrontation with a prepared and experienced candidate like Clinton will leave no place to hide.

Still, there is much for him to gain in the three scheduled televised showdowns and he will get an unfiltered chance to raise Clinton's political vulnerabilities before the American people.

Clinton's liabilities

Those liabilities, and the historic challenge Clinton faces in seeking a third consecutive White House term for her party and the nation's sour political mood, also help explain why Trump is still alive.

In recent weeks, the Democratic nominee has yet again been hounded by the controversy over the private email server that has revived questions about her character and honesty. Her campaign has also been forced to deny claims of influence peddling between her family's philanthropic Clinton Foundation and the State Department while she ran US diplomacy.

In an interview Monday with CNN's Jeff Zeleny, Vice President Joe Biden acknowledged Clinton's struggles with questions about honesty.

"The truth is Hillary knows it's a problem and she's trying to figure out how to remedy it," Biden said. "My advice to her: The best way to remedy it is to talk about what you care about and talk about it with some passion and people will see through it."

For his part, Trump needs to do more than simply disqualify Clinton. He must show he's ready to lead the nation.

To mount an authentic comeback, Trump must finally forge an emotional connection with voters outside his natural base, who have yet to embrace his vision of a nation under siege from terror and crime.

"His appeal to the base Republican vote that won him the nomination in effect has turned many swing voters and Democratic voters against him," said Lacy. "He has to address it by being presidential and doing so constantly."

The Clinton campaign doubts Trump has it in him.

"He would have to do things in the last eight weeks that he appears to have been incapable of doing in the last 16 months," said Clinton's chief strategist Joel Benenson, citing Trump's need to build a ground game, court swing voters and improve his appeal to suburban women.

Clinton is banking on a huge turnout from minority voters who helped Obama win the presidency in 2008 and 2012. So far, Trump's attempts to improve his paltry standing among voters who are suspicious of him has been halting and awkward.

Last week, for instance, his trip to Mexico had clear presidential overtones. But hours later, he delivered an angry speech on **immigration** that further **alienated** Latino voters and prompted some Latino GOP leaders to take back their endorsement of Trump. And on Monday, he refused to rule out granting legal status to undocumented **immigrants**.

And on Saturday, Trump met an African-American congregation in Detroit in a bid to counter claims he is a racist. He was politely received but didn't seem to change many minds, according to interviews by CNN afterward.

Still, signs of life in Trump's polling and his energetic performance last week cheer some GOP operatives.

'The wind is at our back'

"It's not just the crowd size, and the enthusiasm and the rallies, but it's (that) all of these polls are now closing in major ways," Republican National Committee Chief Strategist Sean Spicer told CNN. "Look at the wind right now ... the wind is at our back."

Still, Trump has fewer routes than Clinton to the 270 electoral votes needed to win the presidency.

He must start by taking solid red states such as Arizona and Georgia, where Clinton is unusually competitive, off the table. He must also lock down North Carolina, a swing state in recent elections without which he may lack a credible route to 270 electoral votes.

Then Trump must close in on Clinton in all the swing states, in Iowa and Virginia and New Hampshire, as well as Ohio and Florida.

Then, to win a narrow victory in the electoral college, Trump must turn at least one state that went for President Barack Obama in 2012.

Possible candidates include Pennsylvania, where he currently trails Clinton by between three and nine points in polls released over the past month. Another possible target is Michigan, where recent polls have Clinton up by 11 points.

Pennsylvania is a must-win for Trump. If Clinton adds just the Keystone state and Virginia -- home to her running mate, Tim Kaine -- to states considered solidly Democratic, she will be only 10 electoral votes short of the presidency. That will happen even if Trump wins perennial bellwethers Ohio and Florida.

A recent Pennsylvania poll by Monmouth University shows Trump is dangerously weak in the populous Philadelphia suburbs that are often decisive -- a position he must address if he is to compete in the state. Clinton leads 62% to 29% in seven congressional districts around Philadelphia, an area that typically accounts for 40% of statewide turnout. Obama won the region 62% to 37% over Republican Mitt Romney in 2012.

Trump does better than Romney in less populous and diverse western and central Pennsylvania -- but not by enough to make up for his deficit around Philadelphia. He also trails Clinton among white voters with a college degree by 10 points. Romney won that subset by 15 points in 2012.

Unless Trump can turn those voters around, his hopes in Pennsylvania, and in key suburban districts in other swing states such as Columbus, Ohio, look remote.

**Alienating** moderate Republicans

That's why it surprised many analysts when Trump ditched a plan to soften the hardline on **immigration** that **alienated** many moderate white Republicans.

According to CNN exit polls of the Republican primary in Pennsylvania, only 12% of voters said **immigration** was the most important issue to them. But 60% of Trump voters said it was -- suggesting that the billionaire's position on the issue locks in his base but hurts him among less ideological Republican voters.

Trump's fiery **immigration** speech last week suggested he has given up on broadening his coalition and instead is betting that the pool of voters marginalized by globalization and the loss of blue-collar jobs is much larger than pollsters believe.

"This speech is directed at those people living in Ohio, who have thought for whatever reason that their country is not what it was when they grew up," Trump's former campaign manager Corey Lewandowski told CNN after his **immigration** speech last week.

Trump supporters are also predicting that Democrats have underestimated the size of the GOP nominee's support.

"There's a factor in this election that the media is just ignoring and that is that Hillary Clinton is the most unlikeable person who has ever run for office. Her support is ten miles wide and a half of an inch thick," said Wayne Allyn Root, a conservative commentator from Nevada and author of the recently published "Angry White Male." "I think Hillary Clinton's number of voters will be down 30% versus Obama's four years ago, and I think Trump's share of the white electorate will be up dramatically. He'll gain 4 million extra votes, most of them (from) the white community."

Trump's best bet may be to target the Rust Belt where his anti-trade rhetoric resonates.

Kathleen Hartnett White, a member of Trump's economic advisory council, says the billionaire should relentlessly stress growth, expanding energy production and the slashing of regulations.

"I hope after Labor Day, and I think that is a good day to pivot, that these should be issues in those Rust Belt states," she said. "I would reiterate them over and over again."

October surprise

If all else fails, Trump could benefit from an October surprise.

A stunning news event, such as a terror attack at home or abroad, could prompt some fearful voters to fully embrace Trump's call for curbs on Muslim **immigration** and warnings that Clinton just does not understand the scale of the threats facing Americans.

Or a sudden global crisis, economic shock -- or even a smoking gun suggesting a hidden Clinton scandal -- could also shake up the race.

Unless he starts making headway soon, with early voting only weeks away, it may take something that jarring for Trump to win. And it's always possible that Trump has already sown the seeds of his own defeat simply by **alienating** so many voters on the way to the Republican nomination.

"Even if they ran a miracle comeback campaign," Lacy said, "at this point I honestly don't know if it is starting soon enough."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump's **immigration** policies are highly unpopular, but voters are split over whether the Republican presidential nominee or his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, would better handle the issue, according to a new CNN/ORC Poll.

About 6-in-10 oppose building a wall along the entire border with Mexico, and most doubt that Mexico would ultimately pay for that wall, as Trump has suggested (74% say that's unlikely). Two-thirds oppose mass deportation of the kind Trump advocated in an **immigration**-focused speech in Arizona last week, with 66% saying the government should not attempt to deport all people living in the country illegally (even among Trump's supporters, just 45% support such a plan).

But there's a tight split among voters over which candidate would do the better job handling **immigration**, according to results from the same CNN/ORC Poll released Monday. Among registered voters, 49% say they trust Clinton on the issue, 47% Trump. Those who trust Clinton on **immigration** overwhelmingly say the nation's top **immigration** priority should be finding a way for those in the country illegally to stay (71%), while the Trump backers are more focused on stopping people from entering the country illegally (56%).

Overall, 51% say developing a plan to allow legal residency for those working in the US illegally should be the nation's first priority in terms of **immigration**policy, while 36% say developing a plan to stop **immigrants** from entering the US illegally should be the first priority. Far fewer say the focus of US **immigration** policy should be on deporting **immigrants** living in the US illegally, just 11% rate that as a top priority.

There's broad consensus on a bill to allow those **immigrants** working in the US illegally, who have been in the country for some time, speak English and are willing to pay back taxes, to remain in the country and eventually apply for citizenship (88% favor such a plan). On that, Clinton and Trump voters agree even though the candidates don't, with 80% of Trump's backers saying they would support such a bill and 94% of Clinton's backers behind the idea.

Trump's proposed wall along the border with Mexico provokes the largest gap between Clinton and Trump backers, 82% of Trump backers support the wall, 89% of Clinton voters oppose it.

**Immigration** now rivals the economy as a top concern for voters when considering who they'll support in November, with 16% naming an **immigration** related issue as their top concern in an open-ended question. The voters who name it as a top issue are more apt to support Trump's approach to handling **immigration**. Overall, 61% of them say they trust Trump on **immigration**, 38% Clinton.

These **immigration** voters split between prioritizing border security (43% call that the top priority) and a plan to allow those working in the US illegally to stay (39% see that as the top priority). They are more apt than others to favor building a wall along the entire border with Mexico (54% compared with 41% overall) and deporting all **immigrants** living in the US illegally (43% vs. 30% overall).

Yet a broad majority, 78%, say they would favor a bill to allow those **immigrants** working in the US illegally, who meet certain criteria, to stay and eventually apply for citizenship.

The CNN/ORC Poll was conducted by telephone September 1-4 among a random national sample of 1,001 adults. The survey includes results among 886 registered voters and 786 likely voters. For results among registered or likely voters, the margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3.5 percentage points.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Top Donald Trump surrogate Ben Carson said Tuesday it was "relatively irrelevant" that the mogul seemed to be eschewing promises made over the primaries to strike a more moderate tone ahead of the general election.

Carson also told CNN's Jake Tapper on "The Lead" that the real estate mogul should apologize for insinuating that President Barack Obama was not born in the US and that a recent controversy over a contribution Trump made to the current Florida attorney general did not undermine his criticism of Hillary Clinton's ethics record.

Carson, commenting on Trump's apparent openness to a path for legal status for undocumented **immigrants** -- a proposal voiced by many of Trump's primary foes -- told Tapper that Trump needed to present "rational and workable plans" to the general electorate.

"Well, it's relatively irrelevant at this point because it is what it is," Carson told Tapper. "He is the nominee and has to come up with rational and workable plans, has to work with various advisers and experts in terms of the best way to do this and it needs to be done in a fair and compassionate way that is consistent with the way we in America do things."

When Tapper pushed back on Carson's argument that promises made to voters were irrelevant, Carson said campaign policies were often refined once a candidate took office.

"Well, I didn't say that they were irrelevant but bear in mind, what you talk about during a campaign and what actually happens, as you know, in all administrations are different," Carson responded. "You get different information, you learn things along the way, and you make adjustments along the way."

Carson added: "Perhaps there were others who had already learned those things. It doesn't matter. The important thing is that it does get learned and it does get integrated into the process of decision-making."

Carson denied that Trump's shift to policies similar to his Republican opponents undermined the sincerity of his campaign promises.

"Well, very much like the promises that have been made to people in our inner cities for decades and yet their condition is not getting any better," Carson said. "Those matter too."

'Birther' apology?

Carson said Trump's appeal among African-American voters could be improved if the real estate mogul apologized for his persistent claims that Obama was not born in the US.

"I think that would be a good idea, absolutely," Carson told Tapper. "I suggest that on all sides."

Trump was a prominent mouthpiece for the "birther" conspiracy theory in 2011, leading the push for the Hawaiian-born Obama to release his birth certificate as proof that he was not born in Kenya. Asked about the so-called "birther" issue during a gaggle with reporters aboard his campaign plane Monday, Trump replied, "I don't talk about it."

"Let's get all of the, you know, the hate and rancor out of the way so that we can actually discuss the issues," Carson said, adding that both candidates should focus on issues such as the economy, national security, criminal justice reform and education.

Carson continued: "These are the big issues and how we get caught up in all this other stuff is a reason that we will go down the tubes if we don't correct it."

African-American voter outreach

But Carson said he was pleased Trump was engaging with voting blocs who usually support the Democratic Party, despite recent polls suggesting his efforts among non-white voters has so far been in vain.

"But wouldn't you agree, Jake, that it's better that he do some outreach?" Carson said. "You know, traditionally the Republicans have pretty much left the African-American vote to the Democrats and assumed that there was no point in even trying for it. He is at least making an effort and putting out some proposals that are actually pretty darn good, you know, in terms of school choice and school vouchers."

Carson accompanied Trump on his highly anticipated visit Saturday to Great Faith Ministries, a nondenominational church in Detroit, Trump's first major pitch made directly to the black community as a presidential candidate.

Carson added Trump's corporate tax reforms, however, would appeal to the entire electorate, not just voters in the country's inner cities.

"I think a lot of this stuff is not Democrat or Republican stuff. This is what works for America," Carson said. "And if our inner cities are not functioning at a high level, there is absolutely no way that our nation will succeed."

IRS fine

Carson shrugged off suggestions that a recent IRS fine against Trump for a donation he made to Florida's attorney general undermined his argument against Clinton's record at the State Department.

Trump recently paid the IRS $2,500 after he donated $25,000 to a group backing Pam Bondi while she was deciding to investigate Trump University over allegations of fraud. Meanwhile, Trump has accused Clinton of engaging in "pay-to-play" practices at the State Department involving donations to the Clinton Foundation.

"Pam Bondi is a very meticulous lawyer and would be looking very carefully at anything that looked askew," Carson told Tapper. "So I say if people want to investigate it, they certainly should, but it would not be consistent with what I know."

When Tapper informed Carson that Trump had already been fined by the IRS for making the donation using money from the Trump Foundation, Carson said he did not have a problem with Trump incurring the penalty if the contribution was in fact illegal.

"Well, you know that Donald Trump has admitted that he knows how the system works and that he has worked with both Democrats and Republicans and that money has been exchanged," Carson replied. "You know he's not tried to hide the fact that has occurred. A lot of times the rules become more clear after you've done something."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- The United Nation's human rights chief has launched a blistering attack on the West's populist politicians, comparing their use of "half-truths and oversimplification" to spark fear in voters to the strategies used by ISIS.

Zeid Ra'ad Al Hussein, UN high commissioner for human rights, directed a brutal verbal assault on controversial Dutch lawmaker and leader of the Dutch Freedom Party (PVV), Geert Wilders, criticizing him and others for spreading hatred and prejudice for the sake of political points.

"I wish to address this short statement to Mr. Geert Wilders, his acolytes, indeed to all those like him -- the populists, demagogues and political fantasists," said Hussein, addressing a security conference Monday at the Hague.

Recognizable rhetoric?

Hussein criticized the Dutch politician's philosophy, likening it to that of Donald Trump, Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban, right-wing French National Front leader Marine Le Pen and Brexit leader Nigel Farage among others, saying that they all share an ideology of "deceit, bigotry and ethnic nationalism." He also noted the similarities of their political platforms to that of ISIS.

"All seek in varying degrees to recover a past, halcyon and so pure in form, where sunlit fields are settled by peoples united by ethnicity or religion -- living peacefully in isolation, pilots of their fate, free of crime, foreign influence and war.  A past that most certainly, in reality, did not exist anywhere, ever.

"The formula is therefore simple: make people, already nervous, feel terrible, and then emphasize it's all because of a group, lying within, foreign and menacing. Then make your target audience feel good by offering up what is a fantasy to them, but a horrendous injustice to others. Inflame and quench, repeat many times over, until anxiety has been hardened into hatred," he said.

"Make no mistake, I certainly do not equate the actions of nationalist demagogues with those of Daesh, which are monstrous, sickening; Daesh must be brought to justice.  But in its mode of communication, its use of half-truths and oversimplification, the propaganda of Daesh uses tactics similar to those of the populists," Hussein said, using an alternate name for ISIS.

Donald Trump has previously called for a complete ban on Muslims entering the US, but in August suggested an ideological test to keep would-be **immigrants**with radical views out of the country. He also pledged to work to work with moderate Muslim communities and countries.

CNN has reached out to Marine Le Pen for comment, but did not get an immediate response. However, she has previously acknowledged the perceived comparisons with Trump, saying it's because they are both conducting iconoclastic campaigns against their country's political "establishment."

"We are similar because we are not part of the establishment, we are not part of the system, and we do not depend on anybody and we don't take orders from anyone," she told CNN's Hala Gorani on August 31.

Meanwhile Britain's Nigel Farage, former leader of the UK Independence Party, has become increasingly linked with the far-right for his Pro-Brexit stance and euroskepticism. Farage's comments through the UK referendum campaign were highly controversial, with critics denouncing him for apparently advocating racist and xenophobic views. He defended his stance, saying he was trying to battle Britain's open **immigration** policy with the European Union -- one that he says has caused a mass influx of people and created civic tension.

A spokesman for Farage told CNN Tuesday Hussein's statements are "so ridiculous it shows the desperation of the establishment in their struggle to maintain the status quo."

Defender of each individual, everywhere

Hussein said he saw similar sentiments when he served in the UN peacekeeping force during the Balkan wars 20 years ago -- wars he said were spawned "from this same factory of deceit, bigotry and ethnic nationalism."

And now he's fighting to "defend and promote the human rights of each individual, everywhere."

"To them, I must be a sort of nightmare ... I am a Muslim, who is, confusingly to racists, also white-skinned; whose mother is European and father, Arab. And I am angry, too. Because of Mr. Wilders' lies and half-truths, manipulations and peddling of fear."

The voice of human rights for the UN denounced what he called Wilders' recent "grotesque" manifesto ahead of the Dutch elections in March next year, in which the politician proposed a "de-Islamification" of the Netherlands. It laid out an 11-point plan pledging to shut down all the country's mosques, Islamic schools and asylum centers, as well as closing borders to migrants from Islamic nations and outlawing Islamic headscarves, should his PVV party win at the polls.

Wilders called Hussein's remarks "foolish."

''What an utter foolish comment from the UN Jordanian bureaucrat. Another good reason to get rid of the UN. I lost my personal freedom in my fight for freedom and I don't want my country to lose its freedom as well. That's why we really do have to de-Islamize. Islam and freedom are totally incompatible," Wilders said in a statement emailed to CNN.

Without action, a future of 'colossal violence'

Hussein said that the repercussions of encouraged prejudice were already being felt around the globe, citing an acceleration of workplace discrimination while "entire communities are being smeared with suspicion of collusion with terrorists."

He called for action to defy rather than dismiss controversial comments from politicians, warning that to allow these ideologies to fester could lead to a future rife with xenophobia and intolerance.

"Communities will barricade themselves into fearful, hostile camps, with populists like them, and the extremists, as the commandants. The atmosphere will become thick with hate; at this point it can descend rapidly into colossal violence.

He added: "Do not, my friends, be led by the deceiver. It is only by pursuing the entire truth, and acting wisely, that humanity can ever survive. So draw the line and speak."

Wilders is currently leading in Dutch polls and appeared in court in March over allegedly inciting hatred against the Dutch Moroccan community. The trial will take place in late October. He previously was acquitted of making anti-Islamic statements in 2011.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**VIENNA, Ohio (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Monday refused to rule out granting legal status to undocumented **immigrants** who remain in the United States, breaking with an **immigration** proposal he laid out just last week.

The Republican nominee vowed last week during a major speech in Phoenix that undocumented **immigrants** seeking legal status would "have one route and one route only: to return home and apply for reentry like everybody else."

But asked Monday aboard his plane whether he could rule out a pathway to legal status for undocumented **immigrants**, Trump declined.

"I'm not ruling out anything," Trump said. "We're going to make that decision into the future. OK?"

Trump's answers came as reporters repeatedly pressed the Republican nominee over his position on providing a pathway to legal status to some undocumented **immigrants** living in the US.

But the apparent shift only further muddled Trump's position on **immigration**, less than a week after Trump's speech in Phoenix, which aimed to clarify Trump's stance on a core issue in his presidential campaign.

In the week before that speech, Trump suggested he was "softening" his stance and would be open to a pathway to legal status for non-criminal undocumented **immigrants** -- before shifting away from that days later.

Trump reaffirmed in his **immigration** speech last week that no undocumented **immigrants** could hope to obtain legal status under his administration without first leaving the US, but did not say outright that he would deport all estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants**.

Trump's latest repositioning Monday on the question of legal status came one day after key campaign surrogates and his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, gave conflicting answers about whether the nominee's **immigration** plan still includes mass deportations. Former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani said Trump has moved away from that idea, while Pence and campaign manager Kellyanne Conway were coy about specifics of the **immigration** proposal.

Trump on Monday again stressed that those seeking citizenship would have to first leave the country -- a bar he had previously set for both acquiring citizenship and legal status.

"To become a citizen, you're going to have to go out and come back in through the process. You're going to have to get on line. This isn't touchback. This is you have to go out, and you have to get in line and you have to come back in to become a citizen."

While Trump said unequivocally in his **immigration** address last week that undocumented **immigrants** could not obtain legal status without leaving the US, he did not reissue his call for deporting all undocumented **immigrants**.

Instead, Trump focused on the need to secure the border and deport undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the US and those who have overstayed their visas, and left the door open to reexamining the cases of the remaining millions of undocumented **immigrants**.

"Then and only then will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain," Trump said. "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."

Trump allowed a small pool of reporters and photographers to join him aboard his private plane Monday between campaign stops in Ohio -- a first, which came on the same day Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton took her inaugural flight on a plane with her entire traveling press corps. The rest of Trump's traveling press corps continued to fly on a separate plane on Monday.

Trump said Monday aboard his plane that he was open to regularly allowing a pool of reporters to travel on his aircraft going forward.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON (CNNMoney) -- What exactly is going on with Brexit?

More than two months have passed since the U.K. voted to leave the European Union and the British government has still not revealed any details about how it plans to reshape relations with its most important trading partner.

Prime Minister Theresa May said on Monday she was determined to get "the best possible deal" for the U.K., but also warned of "difficult times ahead" for the British economy.

May's motto "Brexit means Brexit" doesn't reveal much. The slogan was designed to reassure Brexit voters that May, who campaigned for the U.K. to stay in the EU, would not try to reverse the result of the June 23 referendum.

Here is what we know:

'Bespoke model'

May says the U.K. will not copy the arrangements countries such as Norway and Switzerland have with the EU. They enjoy privileged access to EU markets, but only in return for accepting free movement of EU citizens across their borders, and for paying into the EU budget.

The U.K. will be seeking a "bespoke deal," according to May. She has made clear that freedom of movement won't be allowed to continue.

But she hasn't even revealed when she will formally launch the process of withdrawing from the EU, beyond saying that it won't be before the end of this year.

Tricky trade talks

Britain is hoping to use Brexit as an opportunity to negotiate new free trade deals around the world. But it's starting to look like that won't be smooth sailing.

At the G20 summit in China, May said a number of countries, including South Korea, Mexico and Singapore, have expressed a willingness to strike deals with the U.K.

But these countries account for a miniscule portion of U.K. trade. Britain's biggest trading partners have expressed concerns about its exit from the world's biggest single market.

Japan said dropping out of the single market could drive Japanese companies out of the country, while President Obama said finalizing a trade deal with the EU, not an agreement with the U.K., is the priority for his administration.

Broken promises

May stepped back from two promises of the pro-Brexit campaign on Monday: first that the U.K. would limit **immigration** by using points to score applicants; and second that leaving the EU would result in more money for the National Health Service.

May "said many times in the past, a points-based system [for **immigration**] will not work and is not an option," her spokesperson said.

She also refused to commit to increasing the healthcare budget by 100 million pounds a week. The promise of more cash for health was central to the Brexit campaign.

May wasn't part of the campaign, but some of her key ministers, including Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, were.

Economy resilient, so far

The British economy hasn't shown many signs of crumbling. The Bank of England has slashed interest rates and revived its stimulus program, and May has signaled she'll ease up on austerity to boost the economy.

The pound is trading around $1.33, more than 11% below the level it reached on referendum day. But the stock market has bounced back, retail sales are surging and unemployment has dropped in July.

There was also a rebound in confidence in the service sector in August, after a big slump in July.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is one in a series of Fast Facts offered from the CNN Library giving a more in-depth look at a person or topic in the news.

(CNN) -- Here's a look at controversial police encounters in the news.

1991 - Los Angeles - Rodney King March 3, 1991 - LAPD officers beat motorist Rodney King after he leads police on a high-speed chase through Los Angeles County. George Holliday videotapes the beating from his apartment balcony. The video shows police beating King more than 50 times with their batons. Over 20 officers are present at the scene, mostly from the LAPD. King suffers 11 fractures and other injuries.

March 15, 1991 - A Los Angeles grand jury indicts Sergeant Stacey Koon and Officers Laurence Michael Powell, Timothy Wind, and Theodore Briseno in connection with the beating.

May 10, 1991 - A grand jury refuses to indict 17 officers who stood by at the King beating and did nothing.

April 29, 1992 - The four LAPD officers are acquitted of beating King. Riots break out at the intersection of Florence and Normandie in South Central Los Angeles. Governor Pete Wilson declares a state of emergency and calls in the National Guard. Riots in the next few days leave more than 50 people dead and nearly $1 billion in damages.

May 1, 1992 - Rodney King makes an emotional plea for calm, "People, I just want to say, can we all get along? Can we get along? Can we stop making it horrible for the older people and the kids?"

August 4, 1992 - A federal grand jury returns indictments against Koon, Powell, Wind, and Briseno on the charge of violating Rodney King's civil rights.

April 16, 1993 - The federal jury convicts Koon and Powell on one charge of violating King's civil rights. Wind and Briseno are found not guilty. No disturbances follow the verdict.

August 4, 1993 - US District Court Judge John Davies sentences both Koon and Powell to 30 months in prison. Powell is found guilty of violating King's constitutional right to be free from an arrest made with "unreasonable force." Koon, the ranking officer, is convicted of permitting the civil rights violation to occur.

April 19, 1994 - The court awards King $3.8 million in compensatory damages in a civil lawsuit against the City of Los Angeles. King had demanded $56 million, or $1 million for every blow struck by the officers.

June 1, 1994 - In a civil trial against the police officers a jury awards King $0 in punitive damages. He had asked for $15 million.

1992 - Detroit - Malice Wayne Green November 5, 1992 - Two white police officers approach Malice Wayne Green, a 35-year-old black motorist after he parks outside a suspected drug den. Witnesses say the police strike the unarmed man in the head repeatedly with heavy flashlights. The officers claim they feared Green was trying to reach for one of their weapons. Green dies of his injuries later that night.

November 16, 1992 - Two officers, Larry Nevers and Walter Budzyn, are charged with second-degree murder. Sgt. Freddie Douglas, a supervisor who arrived on the scene after a call for backup, is charged with involuntary manslaughter and willful neglect of duty. Another officer, Robert Lessnau is charged with assault with intent to do great bodily harm.

November 18, 1992 - The Detroit Free Press reports that toxicology tests revealed alcohol and a small amount of cocaine in Green's system. A medical examiner later states that Green's head injuries, combined with the cocaine and alcohol in his system, led to his death.

December 1992 - The Detroit police chief fires the four officers.

August 23, 1993 - Nevers and Budzyn are convicted of murder after a 45-day trial. Lessnau is acquitted. Nevers sentence is 12 to 25 years, while Budzyn's sentence is eight to18 years. The charge against Douglas had been dismissed before the trial.

1997-1998 - The Michigan Supreme Court orders a retrial for Budzyn due to possible jury bias. During the second trial, a jury convicts Budzyn of a less serious charge, involuntary manslaughter and he is released with time served.

2000-2001 - A jury finds Nevers guilty of involuntary manslaughter after a second trial. He is released from prison in 2001.

2006 - Nevers' book about the incident and the trial, "Good Cops, Bad Verdict: How Racial Politics Convicted Us of Murder" is published.

2013 - The city demolishes a structure with a memorial for Green, a mural painted on the building near the street where the fatal confrontation took place.

1997 - New York - Abner Louima August 9, 1997 - Abner Louima, a 33-year-old Haitian **immigrant**, is arrested for interfering with officers trying to break up a fight in front of the Club Rendez-vous nightclub in Brooklyn. Louima alleges, while handcuffed, police officers lead him to the precinct bathroom and sodomized him with a plunger or broomstick.

August 15, 1997 - Police officers Justin Volpe and Charles Schwarz are charged with aggravated sexual abuse and first-degree assault.

August 16, 1997 - Thousands of angry protesters, many waving toilet plungers, gather outside Brooklyn's 70th Precinct to demonstrate against what they say is a long-standing problem of police brutality against minorities. Throughout the day, protesters, many of them Haitian, taunt police, chanting, "No justice, no peace." At some times, protesters stand toe to toe with officers watching the protest from behind a barricade, and call the officers racist and fascist.

February 26, 1998 - Volpe, Bruder, Schwarz, Wiese are indicted on federal civil rights charges in Louima's case. A fifth officer, Michael Bellomo, is accused of helping the others cover up the alleged beating, as well as an alleged assault on another Haitian **immigrant**, Patrick Antoine, the same night.

May 1999 - Volpe pleads guilty to beating and sodomizing Louima. He is later sentenced to 30 years in prison.

June 8, 1999 - Schwarz is convicted of beating Louima, then holding him down while he was being tortured. Wiese, Bruder, and Bellomo are acquitted. Schwarz is later sentenced to 15 and a half years in prison.

March 6, 2000 - Charles Schwarz, Thomas Wiese, and Thomas Bruder are convicted for conspiring to obstruct justice by covering up the attack.

July 12, 2001 - Louima receives $8.75 million in a settlement agreement with the City of New York and the Patrolmen's Benevolent Association.

February 28, 2002 - The US Second Court of Appeals overturns the convictions of former officers Schwarz, Wiese, and Bruder on the obstruction of justice charges.

1999 - New York - Amadou Diallo February 4, 1999 - New York Police officers mistake the wallet Amadou Diallo's held in his hand for a handgun. Elite crimes unit officers Sean Carroll, Edward McMellon, Kenneth Boss, and Richard Murphy fire upon him 41 times and hit him 19 times.

March 24, 1999 - More than 200 people are arrested outside New York City's police headquarters, the most in one day in what has become almost daily protests since Diallo's fatal shooting.

March 25, 1999 - A Bronx grand jury votes to indict the four officers for second-degree murder.

February 25, 2000 - The officers are acquitted of state murder charges.

January 2001 - The US Justice Department announces it will not pursue federal civil rights charges against the officers.

January 2004 - Diallo's family settles a wrongful death lawsuit for $3 million dollars.

2005 - New Orleans - The Danziger Bridge shootings September 4, 2005 - Six days after Hurricane Katrina devastates the area, New Orleans police officers receive a radio call that two officers are down under the Danziger vertical-lift bridge. According to the officers, people were shooting at them and they returned fire.

-- Brothers Ronald and Lance Madison, along with four members of the Bartholomew family, are shot by police officers. Ronald Madison, 40, who is mentally disabled, and James Brisette, 17 (some sources say 19), are fatally wounded.

December 28, 2006 - Police Sgts. Kenneth Bowen and Robert Gisevius and officers Robert Faulcon and Anthony Villavaso are charged with first-degree murder. Officers Robert Barrios, Michael Hunter and Ignatius Hills are charged with attempted murder.

August 2008 - State charges against the officers are thrown out.

July 12, 2010 - Four officers are indicted on federal charges of murdering Brissette: Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon and Villavaso. Faulcon is also charged with Madison's murder. Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon and Villavaso, along with Arthur Kaufman and Gerard Dugue are charged with covering up the shooting.

April 8, 2010 - Former officer Michael Hunter pleads guilty in federal court of covering up the police shooting. In December, he is sentenced to eight years in prison.

August 5, 2011 - The jury finds five officers guilty of civil rights and obstruction charges: Kenneth Bowen, Robert Gisevius, Robert Faulcon, Anthony Villavaso and Arthur Kaufman.

October 5, 2011 - Ignatius Hills receives a six and a half year sentence for his role in the shooting.

April 4, 2012 - A federal judge sentences five former police officers to prison terms ranging from six to 65 years for the shootings of unarmed civilians. Faulcon receives 65 years. Bowen and Gisevius both receive 40 years. Villavaso receives 38 years. Kaufman was not involved in the shooting, just the cover up, so he receives a lighter sentence than the others do.

March 2013 - After a January 2012 mistrial, Dugue's trial is delayed indefinitely.

September 17, 2013 - Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon, Villavaso and Kaufman are awarded a new trial.

April 20, 2016 - Bowen, Gisevius, Faulcon, Villavaso and Kaufman plead guilty. Their sentences -- from three to 12 years in prison -- are remarkably less severe than the six to 65 years in prison they were originally sentenced to back in 2012.

2006 - New York - Sean Bell November 25, 2006 - Sean Bell, 23, dies in a 50-bullet barrage by police outside a Queen's nightclub -- hours before he is to be married. Two of his companions, Joseph Guzman and Trent Benefield, are wounded in the gunfire.

December 2006 - Rev. Al Sharpton leads a rally in Manhattan, "Shopping for Justice," to protest the shooting.

March 2007 - Three of the five officers involved in the shooting are indicted: Detectives Gescard F. Isnora and Michael Oliver are charged with manslaughter, and Michael Oliver is charged with reckless endangerment.

April 25, 2008 - The three officers are acquitted of all charges.

February 16, 2010 - The Department of Justice announces that it will not pursue federal civil rights charges against the police officers.

July 27, 2010 - New York City settles a lawsuit for more than $7 million filed by Bell's family and two of his friends.

2009 - Oakland, California - Oscar Grant January 1, 2009 - San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit officer Johannes Mehserle shoots Oscar Grant, an unarmed 22-year-old, in the back while he is lying face down on a platform at the Fruitvale BART station in Oakland, California.

January 7, 2009 - Footage from station KTVU shows demonstrators rampaging through the streets of Oakland protesting Grant's death. About 105 people are arrested for charges, which include inciting a riot, vandalism, assault on a police officer and unlawful assembly. Some protesters lie on their stomachs, saying they were showing solidarity with Grant, who was shot in the back.

January 27, 2010 - The Bay Area Rapid Transit train system reaches a $1.5 million settlement over Grant's death, filed by the mother of Grant's young daughter.

July 8, 2010 - A jury finds Mehserle guilty of involuntary manslaughter. At the trial, Mehserle says that he intended to draw and fire his Taser rather than his gun.

November 5, 2010 - Mehserle is sentenced to two years in prison. He will be able to apply his 292 days of credit and can be released in as little as seven months. Outraged by the light sentence, protests that night turn violent.

June 2011 - Mehserle is released from prison.

July 30, 2013 - A federal appeals court rejects Mehserle's claim of immunity. This allows Grant's father to file a civil lawsuit against Mehserle.

July 7, 2014 - The federal jury does not award any damages in the civil lawsuit brought by Grant's father's.

2011 - Fullerton, California - Kelly Thomas July 5, 2011 - Fullerton, California police officers respond to a call about a homeless man looking into car windows and pulling on handles of cars. Surveillance camera footage shows Thomas being beaten, clubbed and stunned with a Taser by police. The video sparks a nationwide outcry. Thomas, who is mentally ill, dies five days later, and his death is ruled a homicide.

May 9, 2012 - Officer Manuel Ramos is charged with second-degree murder and involuntary manslaughter, and Cpl. Jay Patrick Cicinelli is charged with involuntary manslaughter and felony use of excessive force.

May 16, 2012 - The City of Fullerton, California, awards $1 million to Thomas' mother, Cathy Thomas.

January 13, 2014 - A jury acquits former officers Ramos and Cicinelli.

2014 - New York - Eric Garner July 17, 2014 - Eric Garner, 43, dies after Officer Daniel Pantaleo tackles him to the ground in a department-banned chokehold during an arrest for allegedly selling cigarettes illegally. "I can't breathe! I can't breathe!" Garner, who has asthma, says repeatedly while restrained on the ground by several police officers. The incident is videotaped on a cellphone.

August 1, 2014 - The New York City Medical Examiner rules Garner's death a homicide.

December 3, 2014 - A grand jury decides not to indict Pantaleo. Protesters pour onto the streets of New York and other cities, including Washington, D.C., Philadelphia and Oakland, California, chanting in unison some of Eric Garner's last words, "I can't breathe! I can't breathe!"

July 14, 2015 - New York settles with Eric Garner's estate for $5.9 million.

2014 - Ferguson, Missouri - Michael Brown August 9, 2014 - During a struggle, a police officer in Ferguson, Missouri, fatally shoots unarmed 18-year-old Michael Brown.

August 9-10, 2014 - Approximately 1,000 demonstrators protest Brown's death. The Ferguson-area protest turns violent and police use tear gas and rubber bullets to disperse the crowd.

August 15, 2014 - Police identify the officer as 28-year-old Darren Wilson. Wilson is put on paid administrative leave after the incident, and he is required to undergo two psychological evaluations before returning to duty. Governor Jay Nixon decides to put the Missouri State Highway Patrol in charge of security.

August 18, 2014 - Governor Jay Nixon calls in the Missouri National Guard to protect the police command center.

November 24, 2014 - A grand jury does not indict Darren Wilson for Brown's shooting. Documents show that Wilson fired his gun 12 times. Protests erupt after the hearing in Ferguson and nationwide.

November 29, 2014 - Darren Wilson resigns from the Ferguson police force.

March 11, 2015 - Ferguson Police Chief Thomas Jackson resigns a week after a scathing Justice Department report slams his department.

April 23, 2015 - The family of Michael Brown files a civil lawsuit against the city of Ferguson.

August 9-10, 2015 - The anniversary observations of Brown's death are largely peaceful during the day Sunday. However, after dark police say, a teen shoots at officers who return fire, businesses are damaged and tense standoffs between officers and protesters occur. On Monday, a state of emergency is declared and fifty-six people are arrested during a demonstration at a St. Louis courthouse.

2015 - North Charleston, South Carolina - Walter Scott April 4, 2015 - Officer Michael Slager fires eight shots at 50-year-old Walter Scott. Scott, who is unarmed, is killed. The officer initially says he used a Taser gun on Scott and that Scott grabbed his Taser. Slager had pulled Scott over for a broken tail light.

April 7, 2015 - Cell phone video of the incident is released to the public. It shows Scott, with his back to Slager, running away. Slager is charged with first-degree murder.

April 8, 2015 - Though it's unknown if race was a factor, protesters at the city hall in North Charleston wear T-shirts that read "Black Lives Matter," and chant the phrase that became popular after several police-involved killings of black men around the country.

September 10, 2015 - Slager's attorneys make the case for him to be released on bond, after court documents reveal new details from the toxicology report, blood analysis, and Taser data.

September 14, 2015 - The judge denies Slager bond.

October 8, 2015 - The North Charleston City Council approves a $6.5 million settlement with the family of Walter Scott.

January 4, 2016 - The judge grants Slager a $500,000 cash bond.

May 11, 2016 - A federal grand jury indicts Michael Slager for misleading investigators and violating the civil rights of Walter Scott.

2015 - Baltimore - Freddie Gray April 12, 2015 - Police arrrest 25-year-old Freddie Gray on a weapons charge after he is found with a knife in his pocket. Witness video of the arrest records him screaming as officers carry him to the prisoner transport van. After arriving at the police station, he is transferred to a trauma clinic with a severe spinal injury. He falls into a coma and dies one week later.

April 21, 2015 - The names of six officers involved in the arrest are released. Lt. Brian Rice, 41, Officer Caesar Goodson, 45, Sgt. Alicia White, 30, Officer William Porter, 25, Officer Garrett Miller, 26, and Officer Edward Nero, 29, are all suspended.

April 24, 2015 - Baltimore police acknowledge Freddie Gray did not get timely medical care after his arrest and was not buckled into a seat belt while being transported in a police van.

April 27, 2015 - Protests turn into riots as looting and fires engulf Baltimore on the day of Gray's funeral. At least 20 officers receive injuries, as police and protesters upset over Gray's death clash on the streets. A video shows police in riot gear take cover behind an armored vehicle, as protesters pelt them with rocks. Gov. Larry Hogan's office declares a state of emergency and activates the National Guard to address the unrest.

May 21, 2015 - A Baltimore grand jury indicts six officers in the death of Freddie Gray. The officers now face a range of charges from involuntary manslaughter to reckless endangerment. The driver of the transport van, Caesar Goodman, will face the most severe charge, of second-degree depraved-heart murder.

September 10, 2015 - Judge Barry Williams denies the defendants' motion to move the Freddie Gray trials out of Baltimore, a day after officials approve a $6.4 million deal to settle all civil claims tied to Gray's death.

November 30, 2015 - Officer William Porter, the first of six city police officers, goes on trial. Porter faces charges of manslaughter, assault and reckless endangerment. The Baltimore jury is comprised of eight women, five black and three white, and four men, three black and one white. The alternates are three white men and one black man.

December 7, 2015 - Due to a medical emergency, the judge dismisses a juror. The jury is now comprised of seven women, four black and three white, and five men, three black and two white. The alternates are two white men and one black man.

December 16, 2015 - The judge declares a mistrial in Porter's case after jurors say they are deadlocked.

May 12, 2016 - The bench trial of Edward Nero, one of the six officers charged in the case of Freddie Gray, begins in Baltimore. Nero faces charges of second-degree intentional assault, reckless endangerment and two counts of misconduct in office.

May 23, 2016 - Edward Nero is found not guilty.

June 9, 2016 - The bench trial of Caesar Goodson, Jr. begins in Baltimore. As the driver of the van that transported Gray, Goodson faces the most severe charges alleging second-degree depraved heart murder, involuntary manslaughter, second-degree assault, reckless endangerment and other lesser charges.

June 23, 2016 - Goodson is acquitted of all charges.

July 18, 2016 - Lt. Brian Rice, the highest-ranking officer to stand trial over Gray's death, is found not guilty on all charges. Rice had been charged with involuntary manslaughter, reckless endangerment and misconduct in office. Judge Barry Williams issued the ruling in a bench trial.

July 27, 2016 - Prosecutors drop charges against the three remaining officers awaiting trial in connection with Freddie Gray's death.

August 10, 2016 - A Justice Department investigation finds that the Baltimore Police Department engages in unconstitutional practices that lead to disproportionate rates of stops, searches and arrests of African-Americans. The report also finds excessive use of force against juveniles and people with mental health disabilities.

2015 - Chicago - Laquan McDonald October 20, 2014 - A Chicago police officer shoots and kills Laquan McDonald, 17. McDonald had a 3-inch knife and, according to toxicology tests, had PCP in his system, but he was not within 10 feet of anyone at the time the shots rang out. Several other officers were at the scene, and none fired any shots. According to a police union spokesperson, a police officer told McDonald to drop the knife but he did not listen, the officer then fires on him out of fear for his life. Later, an autopsy shows McDonald was shot 16 times.

April 13, 2015 - Federal and state authorities announce that they will conduct a joint investigation into McDonald's death spearheaded by the Chicago branch of the FBI.

April 15, 2015 - The city reaches a settlement with McDonald's family, agreeing to pay $5 million, though the family had not filed a lawsuit.

November 19, 2015 - A judge in Chicago orders the city to release the police dashcam video that shows the shooting. For months, the city has fought attempts to have the video released to the public, saying it could jeopardize any ongoing investigation. The decision is the result of a Freedom of Information Act request filed earlier this year by freelance journalist Brandon Smith.

November 24, 2015 - Officer Jason Van Dyke is charged with first-degree murder in connection with the shooting death of McDonald.

December 1, 2015 - Mayor Rahm Emanuel announces he has asked for the resignation of Chicago Police Superintendent Garry McCarthy.

August 30, 2016 - Chicago Police Superintendent Eddie Johnson files administrative charges against six officers involved in the fatal shooting of McDonald. Five officers will have their cases heard by the Chicago Police Board, which will rule if the officers will be terminated. The sixth officer charged has resigned.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 9:13 a.m. -- Adds Frauke Petry and Angela Merkel quotes from Monday, trims, adds byline

(CNN) -- Could the success of a far-right party in Germany's local elections be a harbinger of things to come?

The Sunday contest was viewed by many as a referendum on Chancellor Angela Merkel's **immigration** policy, and her party suffered a significant defeat on her home turf.

Merkel admitted Monday that decisions on **immigration** played a role in the result, but insisted that she has made the right ones.

Alternative für Deutschland, or AfD, defeated the Christian Democratic Union -- Merkel's party -- in local elections in the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, coming in second behind the Social Democratic Party, according to exit polls.

AfD was only formally founded in April 2013, yet it defeated the CDU in the German chancellor's home state.

Although AfD has performed strongly in several other regional elections, most notably coming in second with 24% of the vote in Saxony-Anhalt in March, it's an unprecedented moment in modern German politics that the CDU is set to finish behind a party so far to its right on most issues.

The preliminary results indicate the Social Democratic Party won 30.6%, Alternative für Deutschland took 20.8% and the Christian Democratic Union got 19%.

A referendum on refugees

In an interview with CNN Monday, AfD party leader Frauke Petry interpreted the party's success in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern as a personal defeat for Merkel.

Petry suggested that with her party gaining across the country, the Christian Democratic Union is "falling apart" and said it's time for Germany to close its borders.

"We see the political climate changes towards AfD and against the established parties, especially the Christian Democrats, Angela Merkel's party -- 21 percent in the northeast of Germany is an absolutely brilliant result," Petry told CNN.

"The CDU is falling apart, but not only up there," she added. "We see that in many regions of Germany where the CDU bases, the party bases, don't agree with Merkel's policy anymore.

"We want that the German government closes German borders to illegal migration... We don't want a new border in Germany. But we need controlled borders. We need a change of legislation on a German level, but also an EU level, to avoid illegal migration."

Merkel has stood firm on Germany's position of accepting nearly all asylum seekers found to be legitimate refugees. Germany took in more than 1 million refugees in 2015, making it the most open country in Europe to asylum seekers.

Merkel admits there's a lot to do

Responding to the preliminary results from the weekend vote, Merkel -- who is in China at the G20 summit -- told reporters she was "dissatisfied with the outcome of the elections."

She admitted that "many people do not have our confidence regarding the refugee question."

After a series of terrorist attacks in July, Merkel refused to back down on her **immigration** policy, which she has termed a moral responsibility, especially to people fleeing the horror of civil war in Syria.

Monday the Chancellor insisted the decisions made on how to handle the refugee crises were correct, but acknowledged: "We still have to do a lot to regain our (party's) confidence."

Not a disaster, but of concern

Experts say the results don't mean there's a looming disaster for Merkel in next year's election if she chooses to run -- the AfD would likely have trouble forming a coalition with more traditional political parties -- but they do signal some concerns for Merkel.

Politico's senior European Union correspondent, Ryan Heath, said analysts believe Merkel still has an overwhelming likelihood of winning the national elections in 2017. However, these predictions are based largely on the national weakness of the Social Democrats, currently the junior partner in the coalition government.

Rise of the right

Formally founded in April 2013, AfD was set up by academics disgruntled by Merkel's eurozone crisis management -- most notably the Greek bailouts. However, AfD mutated into a more nationalist party that strongly opposed rising **immigration** levels -- particularly of people from Muslim countries.

Heath noted that the growing strength of the populist, anti-**immigrant** AfD mirrored similar parties in France, Poland and Hungary as well the Brexit vote in the United Kingdom and the rise of Donald Trump as the Republican presidential nominee in the United States.

CNN's Joshua Berlinger, Atika Shubert and Nadine Schmidt contributed to this report

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**12:26 a.m. -- write through

(CNN) -- Could the success of a far right party in Germany's local elections be a harbinger of things to come?

The Sunday contest was viewed by many as a referendum on Chancellor Angela Merkel's **immigration** policy, and her party suffered a significant defeat on Merkel's home turf.

Alternative für Deutschland, or AFD, defeated the Christian Democratic Union -- Merkel's party -- in local elections in the state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern this weekend, coming in second behind the Social Democratic Party, according to exit polls.

Mecklenburg-Vorpommern is Merkel's home state.

Experts say the results don't mean there's a looming disaster for Merkel in next year's election if she chooses to run -- the AFD would likely have trouble forming a coalition with more traditional political parties -- but do signal some concerns for Merkel.

"What she has got right now is an insurgent, surging right-wing party, the Alternative für Deutschland, that has proven that they can succeed even on her home turf, so that party has really hit a tipping point now," Ryan Heath, Politico's senior European Union correspondent, said.

Merkel cannot simply dismiss the AFD no matter what her national strength, Heath said.

"They are not the fringes; they are not in the single digits; they are in more than half the state parliaments."

Heath said analysts he spoke to believe Merkel still has an overwhelming likelihood of winning the national elections in 2017, but those predictions were based largely on the national weakness of the Social Democrats, currently the junior partner in the coalition government.

Still, the AFD hailed the results as a rejection of politics-as-usual.

"The elections in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern show that the citizens are no longer intimidated by the lip service of the old parties," AFD party leader Frauke Petry tweeted Sunday.

The polls indicate the vote was:

• 30.5% Social Democratic Party

• 20.8% Alternative für Deutschland

• 19.0% Christian Democratic Union

A referendum on refugees

Merkel's position on opening Germany's border to migrants may have hurt her party.

Peter Tauber, general secretary of the CDU, immediately blamed Merkel's refugee policy for what he called a "bitter result, a new experience."

Those are the lowest results ever seen for Merkel's party in the Eastern state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and her party came in behind a party established in 2013.

Merkel vowed to boost security and improve counterterrorism measures, but she stood firm on Germany's position of accepting nearly all asylum seekers found to be legitimate refugees. Germany took in more than 1 million refugees in 2015, making it the most open country in Europe to asylum seekers.

"We decided to fulfill our humanitarian tasks," she told reporters at a news conference, according to a translator. "Refusing humanitarian support, that would be something I wouldn't want to do and I wouldn't recommend this to Germany."

Merkel, who is in China at the G20 summit, is expected to make a statement Monday, when the official results are to be announced.

Rise of the right

Heath noted that the growing strength of the populist, anti-**immigrant** AFD mirrored similar parties in France, Poland and Hungary as well the Bexit vote in the United Kingdom and the rise of Donald Trump as the Republican presidential nominee in the United States.

The AFD is allied in neighboring Austria with the far-right Freedom Party, whose candidate Norbert Hofer nearly won a national election earlier this year. Petry told The Guardian in June that it was natural for her party to have relationships with its Austrian counterpart or other like-minded parties such as the True Finns or Danish People's Party.

"It would be stupid not to talk to each other," she told the British newspaper.

Just over a month ago, after a series of terrorist attacks in July, Merkel refused to back down on her **immigration** policy, which she has termed a moral responsibility, especially to people fleeing the horror of civil war in Syria.

The attacks have given way to mockery by some Germans as well as foreigners, who have dubbed the recent weeks of bloodshed on social media as #MerkelSommer, or even "Merkel's summer of slaughter."

Petry took over AFD after its founder, Bernd Lücke, was ousted. Lücke complained the party had become too xenophobic and pro-Russian. Lücke had targeted the euro, but the party grew because of the backlash against refugees.

Petry has contended the party is not against "real refugees," but against migrants.

"There is enough space for refugees in Germany, but the problem is that we don't distinguish anymore between migrants and asylum seekers," she told The Guardian.

That might be a moot point since the closure of borders in southern and eastern Europe has stemmed the tide of refugees, which has allowed the AFD to campaign on stopping the "Islamification" of Germany.

The AFD has been called the political arm of the German group Patriotic Europeans Against the Islamisation of the West. The group, known as PEGIDA, organized anti-**immigration** rallies a couple of years ago that drew thousands of people. It has adherents in neighboring countries.

The AFD, however, has been able to broaden its reach to Germans who may have been offended by the PEGIDA rallies. Petry has noted her party has positions on issues from improving state television to seeking a better balance between the state and individual.

That could represent a maturing that more Germans will find attractive, Heath said

"One of the hot-button issues is **immigration**, but it is more than **immigration** and what you are seeing is these parties getting more subtle and a bit more sophisticated about how they reach out and grow their constituencies," Heath said. "They are really developing this momentum so they can be not just one-hit wonders. ... They are getting national appeal."

CNN's Joshua Berlinger and Nadine Schmidt contributed to this report

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- One of Donald Trump's top supporters insisted Sunday that the Republican nominee is backing away from one of his most controversial **immigration** proposals: mass deportations.

In an interview with CNN's Jake Tapper on "State of the Union," former New York Mayor Rudy Giuliani said Trump doesn't want to break up **immigrant** families in America.

Giuliani told CNN's Jake Tapper on "State of the Union" that Trump "would find it very, very difficult to throw out a family that has been here for 15 years and they have three children, two of whom are citizens. That is not the kind of America he wants."

Giuliani's comments follow a hardline **immigration** speech Trump delivered last week in Arizona. The former mayor cited an Associated Press report characterizing Trump's comments as "a sharp retreat" from his pledge during the primary season to remove all 11 million undocumented **immigrants** from the United States.

Still, other Republicans, including Arizona Sen. Jeff Flake, rejected the idea that Trump had softened. And Trump's running mate, Mike Pence, and campaign manager Kellyanne Conway were coy on the issue. Their comments triggered criticism from the campaign of Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton, over "attempts to mislead" about Trump's **immigration** plan.

Trump's Phoenix speech took a tough line on his signature issue of **immigration**. He rolled out a list of 10 proposals to crack down on illegal **immigration**, including building a wall along the US-Mexico border and ramping up deportations of undocumented **immigrants** who have committed other crimes within the United States.

"In a Trump administration, all **immigration** laws will be enforced," Trump said. "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. 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."

Trump in his speech drew a line at any form of amnesty.

"For those here today illegally who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined above. Those who have left to seek entry under this new system will not be awarded surplus visas, but will have to enter under the **immigration** caps or limits that will be established."

Trump added: "We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. There will be no amnesty."

But on Sunday Giuliani insisted "all 10 policies are largely directed toward criminal illegal **immigrants**," drawing a distinction between those **immigrants** and others who haven't broken additional laws in the country.

Giuliani said Trump was calling for the United States to secure its borders and remove those who have committed additional crimes -- and only then address what to do with the majority of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, including so-called "Dreamers" -- undocumented **immigrants** brought into the country as children.

"That's the point that he was making in the speech, and I agree with you that point got lost to some extent in the emotion of the moment," Giuliani told CNN's Jake Tapper on "State of the Union" Sunday.

He chalked that emotion up to the parents of Americans slain by undocumented **immigrants** who shared the stage with Trump, underscoring Trump's call to end so-called "sanctuary cities" that don't deport undocumented **immigrants**.

Democrats said they weren't buying Giuliani's claims about Trump's stance on **immigration**.

"Donald Trump should have gone to the Olympics as a gymnast, because there's a lot of contortionism there," said Labor Secretary Tom Perez, a Clinton supporter, on "State of the Union."

He cited Trump's use of a Phoenix-area sheriff known for his sharp crackdown on undocumented **immigrants** on-stage last week.

"If you're trying to get kinder and gentler, it's a curious strategy to get Joe Arpaio to introduce you at a speech," Perez said. "He stands for what Donald Trump stands for, and that is, Mexicans are 'rapists.'"

Sen. Flake, who isn't yet supporting Trump, told Tapper on "State of the Union" that he didn't get the same message as Giuliani from Trump's speech.

"If it was there, it was buried pretty deep. And no, I didn't catch it," he said of any new indications of Trump's openness to allowing some undocumented **immigrants** to remain in the United States.

Of Trump's speech, Flake said: "It just really doubled down on a lot of the rhetoric that he used before, and it really didn't explain with any clarity where he's going to move ahead in the future."

Flake's comments caught the attention of Trump. On Sunday night he tweeted, "The Republican Party needs strong and committed leaders, not weak people such as @JeffFlake, if it is going to stop illegal **immigration**."

Trump sooner followed up on Twitter with a more personal jab at Flake.

"The Great State of Arizona, where I just had a massive rally (amazing people), has a very weak and ineffective Senator, Jeff Flake. Sad!"

Differing views on **immigration** among Team Trump members

Trump's vice presidential pick, Gov. Pence, on Sunday deflected questions about the fate of those undocumented **immigrants** who haven't committed additional crimes in the United States, on NBC's "Meet the Press."

"With all due respect to the media's focus on the 11 million or whatever that number is, he was focused on the more than 300 million people who are citizens of this country and are here legally in this country, and driving policies in **immigration** that will work for them, work for the future of our nation," Pence said.

Trump campaign manager Kellyanne Conway also wouldn't say what Trump's eventual plan for the majority of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States would be.

On ABC's "This Week," Conway said that "once you enforce the law, once you get rid of the criminals, once you triple the number of ICE agents, once you secure the southern border, once you turn off the jobs magnet, jobs and benefit magnet, then we'll see where we are."

"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," Conway said. "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."

The comments by Conway and Pence brought criticism from the Clinton campaign.

"Donald Trump has stated very clearly throughout his campaign that he will deport everyone who is undocumented, something that was reinforced in his speech in Arizona last Wednesday," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook said in statement Sunday afternoon.

"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," Mook added. "**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."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: John Stubbs is a founder of Republicans for Clinton in 2016 and was senior advisor to the US Trade Representative in the White House of George W. Bush. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- Steve Moore has unleashed a wild jeremiad against fellow Republicans who have said they can't back Donald Trump and want to defeat him by voting for Hillary Clinton this year.

Under the nasty headline, "The Republican Turncoats," Mr. Moore begins with the sort of ad hominem attacks that he's avoided throughout his career. He claims Republicans who plan to vote for Clinton -- and according to polls, there are at least six million of us -- "believe their anti-Trumpism is a principled act of heroism," reeking of "self-righteousness" and "defiance."

He says we are "subversive," that we're sore-loser Bush and Romney "operatives" doing it to appeal to the Washington Post and the New York Times. All, utter rot.

Then he rolls out three straw men and sets them afire. He says we're voting against Trump because he "can't win," that he is "not for free trade," and that Republicans need to concentrate on the Senate and the House.

Actually, few, if any, anti-Trump Republicans oppose him because they think he can't win. We are motivated, in large part, by the fact that if Trump has a 1 in 30 chance of being president, we are not comfortable with those odds. But he is not running as a fringe third party. He is on the Republican ticket and his chances are far better than 1 in 30.

More to the point, we oppose him because, for example, "he lacks the character, values, and experience to be president" and that he "would be the most reckless president in American history." Those are comments from a letter signed by 50 national security experts who served in Republican administrations, including two former Homeland Security secretaries, two former deputy secretaries of State, a former CIA director, and so on.

On trade: Sure, I'm troubled by Trump's protectionism. So is Steve Moore. A year ago, he and Larry Kudlow wrote a piece in the National Review, criticizing what they call "Trump's Fortress America Platform," finding the candidate's trade policies similar to those of Herbert Hoover, and positing that the "recent panic in world financial markets is in part a result of the Trump assault on free trade."

Moore and Kudlow added, "Trump is also running full throttle on an anti-**immigration** platform that could hurt growth as well as **alienate** the GOP from the ethnic voters it needs to win in 2016."

Trump's trade and **immigration** policies derive from isolationism, fueled by race-baiting fearful white supremacists, which should be repugnant to any Republican. I was four years old when Ronald Reagan was elected, and his vision of optimistic globalism is what shaped my childhood and attracted me to the party in the first place.

It's why I vote Republican and why I later worked for Jack Kemp, Rob Portman, Susan Schwab, Josette Sheeran and Bob Zoellick, among other Republican leaders very different in worldview, fitness and preparation than the current nominee.

Trump, by contrast, has touted an approach he calls "America First." Who knows whether he has read enough history to recognize this term? It was, of course, used by the pro-German, anti-Semitic organization that in the 1940s tried to get the U.S. to sign a treaty with Hitler and stay out of World War II.

On the third straw man: I could not agree more. Republicans should focus their on congressional races. That's why we asked the RNC to shift resources to those races. That's why we asked Republicans giving money to Clinton's campaign to stop, and give it instead to House and Senate races. Because of Trump, and only because of Trump, the GOP may lose control of the Senate and suffer significant losses in the House.

The New York Times now has the likelihood of Republicans losing their 4-seat majority in the Senate to the Democrats at 60%. Prior to the conventions the forecast was 60% for Republicans. I would encourage Mr. Moore to not discourage ballot-splitting, and instead, help us get the millions of Republicans disaffected by Trump to the polls.

I don't agree with all of Clinton's policy positions, but I am confident she will be a better president than Trump. In my admittedly limited experience -- I worked for Republicans in my 20s and not as an operative but as a nerd, writing memos -- he simply does not have the temperament for a serious job, and she does.

Often in foreign policy we focus on least worst options. And there are no heroes. There is only living to fight another day.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**update 10:30 a.m. Boris Johnson's remarks about Poland, grafs 30-35

LONDON (CNN) -- Britain's exit from the European Union "may create some difficult times ahead," UK Prime Minister Theresa May told the BBC ahead of a summit with world leaders in China.

Approved by a national referendum in June, Britain's EU departure -- informally known as Brexit -- "is not about the UK suddenly wanting to be inward looking," Britain's new leader said in her first major interview since taking office. "Actually we will continue to be a bold, out-looking country"

May's televised comments were made before leaders of the world's most industrialized nations gathered in Hangzhou at the G20 summit this weekend to discuss top issues, including the global economy. The G20 includes 19 of the world's major economic powers plus the European Union.

She said her administration wants to "emphasize the role that we would be playing in the world" including forging new deals. "We want to be an independent Britain, forging our own way in the world."

"I am not going to pretend that it is all going to be plain sailing," May added. "I think we must be prepared for the fact that there may be some difficult times ahead, but what I am is optimistic."

During scheduled meetings with President Obama, May said she wants "to start to scope out what the negotiations on a trade deal would look like, so when the time comes, when we are ready to sign those deals, we can do so."

Obama said Sunday he wanted to gauge the new leader's plans during their meetings. The US has insisted the UK's departure from the EU must proceed in an organized fashion. The "special relationship" between the US and the UK would guide Washington's view of the process, he said.

"The bottom line is that we don't have a stronger partner anywhere in the world than the United Kingdom," said Obama. "Despite the turbulence of political events over the last several months, we have every intention to making sure that that continues."

The weekend summit is Obama's first face-to-face encounter with May since she replaced David Cameron, a close Obama ally who resigned after the Brexit vote. Obama took the unusual step of personally lobbying against Britain's UK exit. After the vote didn't go his way, the President said he would stand by Britain amid the country's internal struggles.

During a joint news conference with Obama on Sunday, May said exit negotiations would move forward.

"Brexit does indeed mean Brexit," she said, using the slogan she coined after taking office in July.

In the BBC interview May repeated several times that she and her party "respect the wishes" of the British electorate. "The British people want us to leave the EU and that is what we would do."

About a Scottish referendum to leave the UK

On the possibility that Brexit might prompt a second Scottish referendum to leave the UK, May explained, "I don't think there is a question of whether there could be a second Scottish referendum, it is a question of whether there should be a second referendum."

In her comments, she cast distinctions between's Scotland's 2014 referendum and the larger vote by the UK to exit the EU. In that 2014 vote, 55% of Scottish voters cast ballots in favor of remaining in the United Kingdom.

She said Scotland wasn't the only part of the UK that overall voted to remain. "But the overall view of the UK was to come out of the EU."

Scotland is one of four countries that make up the United Kingdom. England, Wales and Northern Ireland are the others. Scottish voters overwhelmingly backed remaining in the EU, with 62% in favor and 38% who wanted to leave.

Days after the referendum, Scottish First Minister Nicola Sturgeon said her government would begin preparing legislation for a new vote that could be held before the UK formally leaves the EU.

She said in June it appeared unlikely that UK leaders would try to block the effort, saying it is "highly likely" that a new independence referendum will be held.

On Britain's economy

On the British economy she told the BBC: "We have had some good figures and better figures that some had predicted would be the case, but what is important for us now is that we maintain that policy of ensuring economic stability and a strong economy for the future.

Part of that is going to be -- as we come out of the EU -- ensuring we have trade deals around the world," May said. "I want the UK to be a global leader in free trade."

On **immigration**

Regarding **immigration**, May said Bexit vote sent a "very clear" message from the British people "that they don't want free movement to continue in the way that it has done in the past. They don't want to see controls of people coming in from the EU. "

When asked about the rights of EU foreigners living in the UK, May said, "I expect to be able to guarantee their status for the future, but the only circumstances where that wouldn't be possible would be if the status of British citizens living in other EU countries was not guaranteed."

Boris Johnson: We welcome more Polish **immigrants**

Separately, UK's Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, one of the leading voices in the Brexit campaign, said Britain looks forward to welcoming a new generation of Polish **immigrants**, according to the Guardian.

Johnson spoke to reporters after visiting a British Council language school in the Polish capital of Warsaw on Saturday, the Guardian reported.

The foreign secretary only briefly alluded to the killing of a 40-year-old Polish man in Harlow. Factory worker Arek Jozwik died after being attacked late last month in an open air shopping center in the town, northeast of London. Poland has launched an investigation into the murder, which authorities there believe could be a hate crime.

Police in Britain have recorded a dramatic rise in racist attacks in the wake of Brexit, with five times the usual number of incidents reported after the country voted in a June referendum to leave the European Union.

"London is the most welcoming, multicultural, happening city on Earth -- no disrespect to Warsaw -- and there is no room for xenophobia," Johnson said during a media appearance alongside his Polish counterpart Witold Waszczykowski.

Johnson made the short stopover in Poland on the way back to the UK after attending the EU foreign ministers' meeting in Slovakia.

CNN's Kevin Liptak in Hangzhou, China, and Michael Pearson in Atlanta contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump in a recent speech was actually backing away from one of his most controversial GOP primary-season **immigration**proposals -- mass deportations -- former New York City Mayor Rudy Giuliani said on Sunday.

Giuliani, a top Trump ally, said the GOP nominee's shift got largely lost amid Trump's hard-line anti-**immigration** rhetoric in a major speech in Phoenix last week -- an assertion later contradicted by a prominent Senate Republican critic of Trump, Jeff Flake of Arizona.

Giuliani told CNN's Jake Tapper on "State of the Union" that Trump "would find it very, very difficult to throw out a family that has been here for 15 years and they have three children, two of whom are citizens. That is not the kind of America he wants."

Giuliani cited a report on the speech by The Associated Press, which characterized Trump's remarks as "a sharp retreat" from his primary pledge to remove all 11 million undocumented **immigrants** from the United States.

Agreeing with that characterization, Giuliani said a careful reading of Trump's speech "leaves a very big opening for what will happen with the people who remain here in the United States after the criminals are removed and after the border is secure."

Trump rolled out a list of 10 proposals to crack down on **immigration** -- including building a wall along the US-Mexico border and ramping up deportations of undocumented **immigrants** who have committed other crimes within the United States.

"All 10 policies are largely directed toward criminal illegal **immigrants**," Giuliani said, drawing a distinction between those **immigrants** and others who haven't broken additional laws in the country.

Giuliani said Trump was calling for the United States to secure its borders and remove those who have committed additional crimes -- and only then address what to do with the majority of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, including so-called "Dreamers" -- undocumented **immigrants** brought into the country as children.

"That's the point that he was making in the speech, and I agree with you that point got lost to some extent in the emotion of the moment," Giuliani told CNN's Jake Tapper on "State of the Union" Sunday.

He chalked that emotion up to the parents of Americans slain by undocumented **immigrants** who shared the stage with Trump, underscoring Trump's call to end so-called "sanctuary cities" that don't deport undocumented **immigrants**.

Democrats said they weren't buying Giuliani's claims about Trump's stance on **immigration**.

"Donald Trump should have gone to the Olympics as a gymnast, because there's a lot of contortionism there," said Labor Secretary Tom Perez, a Clinton supporter, on "State of the Union."

He cited Trump's use of a Phoenix-area sheriff known for his sharp crackdown on undocumented **immigrants** on-stage last week.

"If you're trying to get kinder and gentler, it's a curious strategy to get Joe Arpaio to introduce you at a speech," Perez said. "He stands for what Donald Trump stands for, and that is, Mexicans are 'rapists.'"

Sen. Flake, who isn't yet supporting Trump, told Tapper on "State of the Union" that he didn't get the same message as Giuliani from Trump's speech.

"If it was there, it was buried pretty deep. And no, I didn't catch it," he said of any new indications of Trump's openness to allowing some undocumented **immigrants** to remain in the United States.

Of Trump's speech, Flake said: "It just really doubled down on a lot of the rhetoric that he used before, and it really didn't explain with any clarity where he's going to move ahead in the future."

Trump's running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, deflected questions about the fate of those undocumented **immigrants** who haven't committed additional crimes in the United States, on NBC's "Meet the Press" Sunday.

"With all due respect to the media's focus on the 11 million or whatever that number is, he was focused on the more than 300 million people who are citizens of this country and are here legally in this country, and driving policies in **immigration** that will work for them, work for the future of our nation," Pence said.
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WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A subdued Donald Trump on Saturday directly addressed a largely African-American audience for the first time as a presidential candidate, delivering a warmly received message of unity that focused on fixing economic hardship in the black community.

Trump spoke to members of the Great Faith Ministries, a nondenominational church in Detroit, part of his outreach to what is typically a sizable Democratic voting bloc. His visit, however, was greeted by protests outside of the church ahead of his arrival.

Sitting in a pew at the front of the congregation, Trump took a selfie with a church member and at one point held up a baby over his shoulders. He then addressed the congregation.

"For centuries, the African-American church has been the conscience of this country. So true," Trump said, reading from prepared remarks. He added, "The African-American faith community has been one of God's greatest gifts to America and its people."

Trump told the audience he was there to "listen to your message" and said he hoped his appearance would "also help your voice to reach new audiences in our country." He said he would lay out his plans for economic change and school choice -- issues that he said would benefit black communities -- in the future.

"When I see wages falling, people out of work, I know the hardships this inflicts and I am determined to do something about it. I will do something about it," Trump said. "I do get things done, I will tell you. I'm going to get things done."

Speaking in a measured tone, Trump lamented what he said was a nation that was "too divided."

"We talk past each other and not to each other. And those who seek office do not do enough to step into the community and learn what's going on. I'm here today to learn, so that we can together remedy injustice in any form, and so that we can also remedy economics so that the African-American community can benefit economically through jobs and income and so many other different ways."

"I believe we need a civil rights agenda for our time," said Trump, before he concluded by citing 1 John 4:12.

"No one has ever seen God, but if we love one another, God lives in us and his love is made complete in us," Trump said, adding, "That's so true."

Draped with prayer shawl

After Trump finished speaking, the church's pastor, Bishop Wayne Jackson, draped a prayer shawl over Trump's shoulders, much to the crowd's delight, and handed him a Jewish Heritage Study Bible.

"This is a prayer shawl straight from Israel. Whenever you're flying from coast to coast -- I know you just came back from Mexico and you'll be flying from city to city -- there is an anointing. And anointing is the power of God," Jackson said. "It's going to be sometimes in your life that you're going to feel forsaken, you're going to feel down, but the anointing is going to lift you up. I prayed over this personally and I fasted over it, and I wanted to just put this on you."

Later, Trump swayed along with the music as the congregation's chorus sang.

After the service concluded, Trump accompanied Ben Carson, his former primary rival turned top surrogate, to the retired neurosurgeon's boyhood home in Southwest Detroit. Carson told CNN's Jeremy Diamond he wanted Trump to see areas in the city that are now blighted but were prosperous when Carson was a boy.

Mixed reviews

Carletta Vaughn, a Hillary Clinton supporter and a senior pastor at Holy Ghost Cathedral in Detroit, said Trump was "scripted" but she felt like he was "honest and transparent" with his message.

"I think that the experience of being in an African-American church and the presence of God, it was clear that it was new to him, but it was not in any way offensive," she said. "It was great."

Vaughn, 63, said she doubts he changed any minds in the crowd but that he left people with a more relatable impression.

Taurus Simpson, a pastor from Saginaw, Michigan, said he saw a more "humble" version of Trump. But Simpson said he doubts the mogul will make large gains with black voters "overnight," saying it will take a while to erase the perception that African-Americans have of Trump.

"Perception is everything. What we had seen is that he had no care about the blacks at the beginning of this," he said, referring to Trump's campaign.

Sonia Green, 53, also said she saw a different side of the politician. "I saw Donald Trump the human being, instead of Donald Trump the guy that just, you know, 'We're going to build a wall, we're going to keep them out,'" she said.

As far as whether Trump will make inroads with minority voters, however, Green said the "proof will be in the pudding."

"We'll see about what he says, the actions that he takes," Green said. "Not just for people of color, but all people."

Greeted by protesters

Dozens of protesters gathered outside the church before Trump arrived, some of whom chanted, "Whose city? Our city!"

At one point, several tried to rush toward a gate near the church's entryway. Four police officers on horseback blocked them. Some of the protesters urged others to remain peaceful.

Lawrence Glass, the president of the Council of Baptist Pastors of Detroit and Vicinity, addressed reporters and demonstrators at a news conference earlier in the morning, declaring that black voters "will not be trumpets to get his message of fear and hate out."

"He is speaking at a black church, which is not equivalent to speaking to a black church," Glass added.

As Trump was set to speak, about a dozen mostly black protesters outside the church followed around Eric Jones, a black Trump supporter from Michigan who was wearing a Trump T-shirt and button. They called him a "sellout," with one protester hurling a racial epithet at him.

Some of the protesters attempted to converse with Jones, who tried to respond to their questions, but the taunting and shouting drowned him out. He tried walking away but was followed by the group.

Jones told CNN he wasn't surprised by the reaction, and that he experienced a similar response when he walked among protesters at the Republican convention in Cleveland last month. "The fact is, you got to have honest dialogue in order to change your circumstances."

Jones said he likes Trump because he's an "outsider" and "has the best policies," like his proposals to reform **immigration** laws.

"You can't have a country unless you have some borders," he said.

Outreach to African-Americans

The Republican nominee has been criticized throughout his campaign for not reaching out to African-American voters in their communities, an issue Jackson said Trump was looking to remedy.

"If we don't sit down and dialogue, then we don't know. You just can't get up and say, 'Well, what the "H" you have to lose?' We need promise that's going to be real," Jackson told CNN's Brooke Baldwin Friday. "And you only can make it happen when you sit down and have a dialogue with someone, a communication with someone. And I'm encouraging him."

Jackson held a one-on-one interview with Trump before the service Saturday that will eventually air on the Impact Network, an African-American-founded Christian broadcast television network. The interview came under controversy when it was revealed Trump was provided with questions ahead of time so he could better prepare.

Jackson told reporters Saturday that Trump's answers weren't scripted, though he acknowledged Trump was ready for the questions.

"He just sat down like a normal guy and answered the questions," Jackson said.

The GOP nominee has stepped up his outreach to African-American voters in recent weeks, trying to draw a contrast between himself and Clinton, whom he has called "a bigot" for seeing minorities as votes, rather than human beings.

Early Saturday evening, Trump's campaign issued a statement outlining its "new civil rights agenda," highlighting his previously stated positions on public safety, education and job security.

It says a Trump administration would work with law enforcement at all levels of government -- and even the Mexican government -- to fight crime, in particular gangs, violent offenders and "the international drug cartels."

The statement called for school choice and allowing states to use federal money to "help parents and students" find alternatives to public schooling, including charter schools, religious schools and home schooling.

Regarding job security, Trump railed against globalization and said illegal **immigration** -- a signature cause of Trump's campaign -- was particularly harming African-Americans.
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(CNN) -- Donald Trump's highly publicized efforts to woo minority voters aren't going exactly as planned.

In the week and a half since Trump's advisers touted an aggressive push to make inroads with African-American and Latino voters, the GOP nominee delivered a hardline **immigration** speech, lost the support of some of his prominent Latino backers and faced ridicule for attempting to tightly choreograph his visit to an African-American church slated for Saturday.

"It's going abysmally bad for Trump right now," said Javier Palomarez, chief executive of the US Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, in a blunt assessment of Trump's outreach to Hispanic voters.

The Trump campaign's sudden decision to spotlight minority outreach efforts with less than three months until Election Day came amid mounting concern in his campaign that some voters viewed the GOP nominee as racist.

But some have viewed Trump's efforts thus far as ham-handed. That's partly because he regularly makes his pitch to minority voters in front of almost entirely white audiences. But it's also because -- even as the Trump campaign has added events with more diverse audiences -- they've tended to be small roundtables stacked with participants selected by the campaign.

"He talks about us, and he doesn't talk to us," said Bettina Inclán, the 2012 director of Hispanic outreach for the Republican National Committee. "It doesn't matter whether you are white, black, brown, yellow or red, (voters) want authenticity -- that you're not just going to them for their vote but you care about their issues."

She was one of multiple strategists and leaders of minority efforts who questioned whether Trump's appeals were truly aimed at non-white voters and whether they are focusing more on optics than actual engagement.

"Sometimes these outreach efforts seem like they're geared to appease Republicans and white voters who are leaving him," Inclán said.

Jason Miller, a spokesman for Trump, dismissed that perception.

"Mr. Trump is committed to being a president for all Americans, and unlike Hillary Clinton, that includes campaigning hard for everyone's vote," said Miller, as he knocked Clinton for her relatively light public schedule. "Mr. Trump knows that by working together, we can improve economic opportunities for everyone, make our communities safe and break up Washington's rigged system that has left too many behind."

Ahead of Trump's visit to an African-American church in Detroit on Saturday, a New York Times report suggested Trump's latest diversity stop would be scripted by his advisers. After receiving advance questions from Bishop Wayne Jackson for Saturday's question-and-answer session, Trump's advisers prepared an eight-page transcript of replies for the candidate.

The pastor now says he plans to ask some questions that haven't been pre-screened and said Trump would also address his congregation.

"He's been preaching to African-Americans from a backdrop of white people," Jackson, the pastor of the Great Faith Ministries Congregation in Detroit, told CNNon Friday. "His statements are that 'I'm going to make the black community better.' ... We want to know how you're going to do that."

Jackson told reporters Saturday that Trump's answers weren't scripted, though he acknowledged Trump was ready for the questions.

"He just sat down like a normal guy and answered the questions," Jackson said.

Throughout his presidential campaign, Trump has turned down opportunities to speak to diverse audiences. He declined an invitation to the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People convention, as well as four different invitations from the National Urban League to participate in questionnaires, briefings or conventions, according to the group.

Another blow to Trump's efforts came this week when he delivered his highly anticipated **immigration** speech. While several of his advisers and Hispanic supporters expected him to moderate his approach, Trump delivered an enforcement-focused address that baffled and offended even some of his supporters.

Rev. Tony Suárez, who sits on the executive evangelical committee for Trump, called the policy address "disappointing and confusing."

Unlike other high-profile Hispanic supporters who dumped Trump after the speech, Suárez said he hasn't left the advisory board because he doesn't want to make a "rash decision." Still, he said if Trump's latest speech is an indication he's backing mass deportations, the GOP candidate would "virtually close the door of every **immigrant** majority congregation in the United States."

Political operatives and leaders of minority-focused organizations said there are plenty of more authentic and effective opportunities available for Trump to engage with minority voters.

Inclán suggested Trump buy television advertising in Spanish in Nevada -- a state where polls show him within striking distance of Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton -- to highlight his business record and focus on job creation.

In the past, GOP candidates have focused their efforts on minority business or evangelical communities. Less-scripted campaign stops, like stopping by Versailles -- an iconic eatery in Miami -- for coffee with Cuban Americans, could also benefit Trump, Inclán said.

In a more intimate environment, some voters have come away with a more positive impression of the bombastic billionaire.

Oz Sultan, who identified himself as a conservative Muslim, recently participated in a meeting at Trump Tower with the candidate and young Republicans like himself who are part of the GOP's Republican Leadership Initiative, a program with a diverse class of activists.

He went into the meeting torn between voting for Trump or Libertarian nominee Gary Johnson. He said he was impressed with Trump's interest in the issues that were raised and walked away leaning toward Trump.

"I think that was a human side of Trump that we saw," Sultan said. "It definitely made me really reconsider him."

Alfred Liz, whose parents were born in the Dominican Republic, also said he was surprised by Trump's affable demeanor at the roundtable.

"When people are actually able to meet him and get to know the real Donald Trump, he's completely different," he said. "When people get over that barrier that's been put in place and enforced by Democrats, then people will be able to see that that's the guy they want to vote for."

Perhaps the most resounding criticism of Trump's new outreach effort, though, is that the candidate should have started his appeal to minority voters far sooner.

A Suffolk University/USA Today poll released this week was the latest to illustrate the chasm between Trump and Clinton when it comes to non-white voters. While 24% of Hispanic voters opted for Trump, 65% backed Clinton. And he received just 4% of the African-American vote, compared to her 92%.

"Minority outreach, stakeholder engagement and coalition-building -- those are long-term projects. Those aren't just things that happen when you say you're going to go and engage the African-American community," said Jeff Polesovsky, who served as the political director of Gov. John Kasich's presidential campaign and deputy campaign manager when Kasich ran for re-election in Ohio in 2014. That year, Kasich won 26% of the African-American vote.

"You have to spend a lot of time listening, understanding their needs and then reacting with a sense of urgency," Polesovsky said. The Trump campaign "made it political before it even got off the ground."

Now, it may be too late.

Palomarez, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce head, said he believes Trump has little chance of improving his numbers with Latino voters after his latest **immigration** speech.

"Honestly, it just seems like there's no going back. The offense is so deep, so outlandish," he said. "I really don't know when or how or if the Republican community will ever recover."
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(CNN) -- On Labor Day, it's time to celebrate the contributions of **immigrants** to America's bountiful economy.

This is not the message you hear from Donald Trump's presidential campaign. During his speech about **immigration**, in which Trump defied predictions that he was about to make his so-called pivot to moderation, he doubled down on his hardline stance against **immigration**. Surrounding himself with parents and family whose loved ones had been killed by undocumented "illegal **aliens**," Trump reiterated his hardline opposition to **immigrants** and outlined the reasons why he thought President Obama's and Hillary Clinton's positions are destructive.

Although he backed away from earlier primary claims that he would deport 12 million illegal **immigrants**, now saying that only 2 million criminals would be getting the boot, that was not much of a concession. He stood firmly against embracing a path to citizenship and his fierce rhetoric belied any possibility that he was turning some corner.

At one key point in the speech, Trump undertook a Nixonian move by pitting **immigrants** against working Americans. He said: "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 of 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."

By separating working people from **immigrants**, Trump ignores something that is fundamental to the history of the United States. **Immigrants** have been the backbone of our economy from the very start of the Republic. Unless one stipulates that workers can only be white and native born, his argument doesn't hold water.

**Immigrants** have been a driving force in the work of America. We are a country founded by **immigrants** and refugees who came here and settled the colonies, seeking new opportunities.

During the 1840s and 1860s, Chinese **immigrants** were central to the construction of the railway system which became the heart of the American economy. Scottish **immigrants** settled in Midwestern states where they farmed the land. Many were perceived to be the most efficient and effective farmers of the period. German and Irish **immigrants** who flocked to the cities provided the manpower behind the construction of our urban infrastructure and creation of our financial system. They were there at the start as the steel and coal industry propelled the US into a major economic power.

These **immigrants** were joined by another wave who followed them seeking opportunity as well as freedom. Between the 1880s and 1920s, **immigrants** from Eastern and Southern Europe constituted the unskilled labor that fueled most of the major areas of economic growth, from the automobile industry to the garment industry.

Some of the most important labor leaders to emerge from these years, such as Sidney Hillman, arrived from overseas (Hillman was born in Lithuania). Even after nativists closed the doors to these groups in the 1920s, Mexican Americans kept arriving to the US as many farmers in the Southwest depended on them to keep their businesses running. When the Eisenhower administration tried to crack down on these communities through the brutal "Operation Wetback" deportation program, the president ultimately failed and the INS increased the number of Bracero visas given to workers.

The same pattern has been true since the **immigration** reform of 1965, as the influx of newcomers from Latin America and Asia have been pivotal to filling lower wage positions in the service economy as well as more lucrative positions in tech. A large percentage of the doctorate programs in science and engineering, which most agree are essential to innovation, are filled with foreign students. One study found that between 2006 and 2012, there was at least one founder born overseas in two-fifths of all start-up tech companies in Silicon Valley.

There is a reason business has historically supported liberal **immigration** policies. **Immigrants** expand the workforce. In current times, **immigrants** have encouraged the creation of more business start-ups. The Small Business Administration reported that **immigrants** were 30% more likely than non **immigrants**to start a business. **Immigrants** spend money, boosting consumer demand. Studies consistently show that **immigrants** don't take jobs away from those who are already here, instead doing jobs that are otherwise unfilled, and overall they boost the strength of the industries where they work, allowing owners to employ even more people.

**Immigrants** have not only been pivotal at the lower and middle levels of the labor force, but they have also proven to be some of the greatest titans of industry. Most famously, the steel magnate Andrew Carnegie came to the US after growing up in poverty in Scotland. Starting work in a cotton mill at age 13, Carnegie became one of the most powerful players in the economy. Louis Mayer, one of the founders of Hollywood, our most beloved American product, was born in Russia and came to the US in his late teens.

Today there are many economic power brokers who came from abroad or grew up in **immigrant** families. Sergey Brin, the co-founder of Google, came to the United States from Moscow at the age of 6. Tesla and SpaceX founder Elon Musk arrived in the States from South Africa.

Don Won and Jim Sook, the co-founders of Forever 21, a popular clothing store, arrived from Korea in 1981. Don Won started working in janitorial jobs before he and his wife opened their first store in 1981. Josie Natori, who arrived from the Philippines in 1965 to attend Manhattanville College and became a citizen in 1974, founded the Natori Company that sold sleepwear to stores including Target. Jose Wilfredo Flores, who came to Philadelphia from El Salvador at 14 years of age is the owner and founder of W Concrete, which earns several million a year.

If you use WhatsApp to communicate with your friends, you can thank Jan Koum, who came here with his mother from a small village in Ukraine to live in a government-subsidized apartment, and if you like soft drinks, you've benefited from the work of PepsiCo CEO Indra Nooyi, who grew up in Madras, India. Linda Alvarado, the president and CEO of Alvarado Construction and co-owner of the Colorado Rockies, grew up in a Latino family in New Mexico.

Besides the economy, **immigrants** have continually enriched our politics, our culture, and our society. The story of the United States is a story of an **immigrant**nation.

So on this Labor Day, in the middle of a campaign where **immigrants**, legal and illegal, have been blasted with a ferocity that has taken many people by surprise, it might be good to pause and remember just how vital they have been to the making of our economy.

While Trump argued that workers and **immigrants** are in opposition, in fact they are the same. We are all **immigrants** in this nation and each generation makes new contributions to our success. Instead of castigating, it's time to start celebrating.
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(CNN) -- Not long ago, Angela Merkel's dominant position in Germany and her status as the most influential leader in Europe seemed secure.

Now voters in her home state of Mecklenburg-Vorpommern appear poised to inflict a humiliating defeat to the German Chancellor and her Christian Democtratic Union party in Sunday's regional elections. A recent poll for Cicero placed the CDU at 20%, behind the populist-nationalist Alternative für Deutschland, or AfD, at 23% and the Social Democratic Party, or SPD, at 28%.

Although AfD has performed strongly in several other regional elections, most notably coming second with 24% of the vote in Saxony-Anhalt in March, it would be an unprecedented moment in modern German politics if the CDU were to finish behind a party so far to its right on most issues.

Formally founded in April 2013, AfD was set up by academics disgruntled by Merkel's eurozone crisis management -- most notably the Greek bailouts. However, AfD mutated into a more nationalist party that strongly opposed rising **immigration** levels -- particularly of people from Muslim countries.

Some in the party made common cause with the anti-Islam PEGIDA movement, whose large street rallies in Dresden and other German cities made headlines around the world.

Following months of bitter internal struggles, in July 2015 the party's original leader, Bernd Lucke, was forced out and replaced by Frauke Petry, prompting many of its founding members and early supporters to resign.

Unsurprisingly, this internal warfare damaged AfD's standing with voters, and for a while the party struggled to break through the 5% barrier necessary to secure Bundestag seats.

This all changed when Germany decided to suspend EU rules stipulating that asylum seekers must be processed in the first member state in which they arrived, and Merkel famously declared that Germany had a responsibility to take in as many refugees as it had to, dismissing concerns by repeatedly stating. "Wir schaffen es" (We can manage).

International media and commentators tend to overstate the extent to which this move was a unilateral decision by Merkel, overlooking the extent to which this course was broadly supported by her Cabinet, most politicians in mainstream political parties, much of the media and commentariat, charities and civil society as well as thousands of ordinary Germans.

Collectively, it helped cement the country's reputation as a haven for refugees and migrants, in turn prompting many more to arrive. Nonetheless, not all Germans bought into this consensus, and many of them gravitated toward AfD as the only party publicly voicing their concerns.

Whereas **immigration** had not been at the forefront of public concern before, the influx of refugees and migrants from September onward saw AfD's poll ratings climb steadily upward, eventually hitting 15% nationally in some polls, and even higher in the former East Germany.

Support was further boosted by the mass sex assaults in Cologne on New Year's Eve -- compounded by the perception the media were initially unwilling to report on the incidents -- and by the recent spate of terror attacks in Germany, two of which were perpetrated by recently arrived asylum seekers claiming allegiance to ISIS.

This brings us back to Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, where AfD has been campaigning hard on the refugee and migration issue with Leif-Erik Holm, the party's local leader, talking about the need to protect Germany's Christian heritage from the threat of "Islamic supremacy." This is despite the region taking in relatively few asylum seekers -- 5,627 so far in 2016, the fewest of any German state -- and overall numbers arriving in Germany falling since the conclusion of the EU-Turkey agreement.

A good result will allow AfD to regain momentum ahead of next year's federal elections; its support has fallen back a bit in the wake of the fallout from the UK's "Brexit" vote and an anti-Semitism row within its Baden-Württemberg parliamentary faction.

Conversely, such a defeat, in her home state will heap pressure on Merkel.

Invariably, it will reignite the debate over whether she ought to seek a fourth term. Merkel has so far been characteristically reserved, telling public broadcaster ARD that she will announce her decision "in due course."

Despite liking stability at the top, there are signs German voters are developing Merkel fatigue -- a recent poll for Bild am Sonntag found 50% did not want her to stay on beyond 2017 against 42% wanting her to remain.

In my view, it is probable she will decide to stand again, not least because she still retains enough backing within her party, the fact that there are no obvious successors, and because she sees the refugee and migration crisis as unfinished business: Stepping down would be interpreted as admitting defeat.

Ultimately, barring any shocking developments, it is hard to see beyond the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union winning again, with support for the SPD languishing in the mid-20s. The key question is what the margin of victory will be, and what coalition configurations will be possible; this is where AfD will play a pivotal role.

Although it has emerged as a serious competitor to the CDU/CSU for conservative voters, it would be wrong to see AfD as only posing a threat to the center right. In fact, AfD draws support from across the political spectrum; its anti-establishment credentials have helped it win over a disproportionate number of hard-left Die Linke voters and previous nonvoters. Its exact impact on the vote shares of other parties therefore remains hard to gauge.

AfD remains too toxic to be a viable partner itself, but its presence in the Bundestag could restrict other parties' ability to form a viable coalition, potentially forcing the CDU/CSU and SPD to stick with the grand coalition -- the third in four parliamentary terms -- or encouraging the formation of a more exotic three-party coalition.

A minority government would be unlikely because it would allow the AfD to determine the outcome of crucial votes.

Either way, it will allow the party to define itself further against the political mainstream and claim the mantle of the "real" opposition, and to continue shaping the country's debate on issues of **immigration** and cultural identity that the crisis has ignited.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Marielena Hincapié is executive director of the National **Immigration** Law Center **Immigrant** Justice Fund, which is dedicated to defending and advancing the rights and opportunities of low-income **immigrants** in the U.S. She supports Hillary Clinton for president. the opinions expressed in this commentary are solely those of the author.

(CNN) -- This week Donald Trump painted an ugly picture of our present: In his view, the United States is a mess. Terror lurks around every corner. Those of us who were born elsewhere have been transformed from friends and neighbors who add to this country's strength to threatening people who should be deported. It's a wonder any of us gather the strength to leave our houses each day.

From this twisted vision emerges Trump's policy proposals. They are a reflection of whipped-up fear and are not based in fact.

These proposals should send chills down the spine of anyone who believes in freedom and community strength. Trump claims he will unleash a "deportation task force," tripling the number of **immigration** officers dedicated to deportation.

He would increase Customs and Border Protection rolls by an additional 5,000 officers, despite the fact that the agency has already doubled in size since 2004.

He would force local police to become de facto **immigration** agents, despite ample evidence that such measures would further fray ties between communities of color and law enforcement.

In fact, Trump's vision for the future is a virtual police state, where **immigrants** (or those who "look" or "sound" like **immigrants**) must live in fear of having "papers" demanded of them at any moment. Children of aspiring Americans living without work authorization would spend each day in terror, wondering whether their father or mother will be there at the end of the school day.

Trump asserts these measures are necessary to rid our country of the scourge of **immigrants** living here without authorization.

Again, he has his facts wrong.

So let's review some of the facts.

**Immigrants** (I am one) are a boon to any neighborhood. They commit fewer crimes than the native population. **Immigrant**-rich cities -- El Paso, to name one -- have lower crime rates than others.

As Bianca Bersani, director of the criminal justice program at the University of Massachusetts, noted in an analysis in Justice Quarterly, "Foreign-born individuals exhibit remarkably low levels of involvement in crime across their life course."

**Immigrants** are less likely to be incarcerated than those born in the United States.

And, when **immigrant**-inclusive measures are adopted, everybody thrives.

But these facts get in the way of Trump's vision, which paints Syrian refugees looking to start their lives anew in the United States as a "Trojan Horse," and describes Mexican **immigrants** as largely "rapists" or "criminals."

Using racially charged rhetoric isn't a new move. In fact, politicians in our country have long criminalized black and brown people, employing "dog whistle" racism to drive wedges between our communities

The GOP candidate continues to lavish praise on Eisenhower's deportation policies, but never by name. That's intentional: The name of Eisenhower's deportation campaign was Operation Wetback, and it terrorized those in Latino communities, regardless of country of birth. This resulted in even U.S. citizens of Mexican descent being deported, simply because they were perceived to be Mexican **immigrants**.

Trump's own prescription, if enacted, would turn back the clock on hard-fought civil and human rights. Many of the "solutions" he proposes are simply unconstitutional.

Another fact he fails to mention is that our country already spends more money on deporting **immigrants** -- and ripping families apart -- than it does on all other federal law enforcement agencies combined, according to a study by the Migration Policy Institute.

His mass deportation proposals would cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars more than we already spend, and the disruption to our communities and economy would be devastating.

Nearly everyone agrees that the **immigration** system is dysfunctional. In fact, many agree that aspiring Americans should be allowed to get on a road to citizenship. Yet you wouldn't know it by listening to Trump.

His wildly outlandish claims, which have no bearing on the truth or sound public policy, are a stark example of what is at stake this November. Our country is at the precipice of one of the most consequential presidential elections in modern history.

The American people must look past the rhetoric on both sides of this crucial debate and instead consider what is best for our families, for our economy, and for our future.

Do we want fear-based policies that drive our communities apart, or should we choose an inclusive society that sees our diversity as our strength? The choice will be ours to make on November 8 -- and the whole world is watching.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**6:07 pm: Adds Fallon

(CNN) -- A Latino surrogate for the Trump campaign warned Thursday that without tighter **immigration** policies from the Republican presidential nominee, "you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

Latinos for Trump founder Marco Gutierrez's comments came while he was defending Donald Trump's **immigration** position to MSNBC's Joy-Ann Reid.

"My culture is a very dominant culture. And it's imposing, and it's causing problems. If you don't do something about it, you're going to have taco trucks on every corner," Gutierrez said.

Moments before, Gutierrez had argued that "the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few" and that "we need to understand that this is a different time and we're having different problems" regarding illegal **immigration**.

Trump's campaign did not respond to a CNN request for comment.

The Trump supporter's comment about "taco trucks" sparked backlash and mockery on social media, with the hashtag #tacotrucksoneverycorner trending on Twitter throughout the night.

"Hey, what's wrong with #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?! Use my Evamoji for the taco truck! #Evamoji" actress and activist Eva Longoria wrote on Twitter, including an image of taco truck.

Hillary Clinton's campaign also joined in, with spokesman Brian Fallon tweeting, "(Clinton campaign manager) Robby Mook & Team Brooklyn is fired up for #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner."

**Immigration** policy has been at the center of the Trump campaign's messaging over the last week, as the Republican nominee made a high-profile trip to Mexico to meet with President Enrique Peña Nieto. Trump followed that up the same day with a major speech on his **immigration** position, intended to clarify a stance that had become muddled as the candidate vacillated between "softening" his policy and maintaining the hardline policies he'd touted during the primary.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Alice Stewart is a CNN Political Commentator and former Communications Director for Ted Cruz's presidential campaign. She has worked in communications for the presidential campaigns of Mike Huckabee, Rick Santorum and Michele Bachmann, as well as communications for Concerned Women for America. The views expressed are her own.

(CNN) -- As Donald Trump delivered his noteworthy **immigration** speech in Arizona on Wednesday, it became increasingly clear that the success or otherwise of his signature campaign issue rests on his ability to apply a central tenet of his book "The Art of the Deal": Maximize your options.

Indeed, amid all the recent talk of an **immigration** pivot, Trump has indicated that he intends to keep all options on the table even as he indicated he might be prepared to take some off -- all while doubling down on his hardline **immigration** policy. In other words, Trump has been going with his gut.

But while such instincts have served him well in the business world, they could prove to be risky in politics.

There's no doubt that Trump remains committed to building a wall, having Mexico pay for it, and deporting the "most dangerous criminal illegal **aliens**" on day one.

For a start, in his speech Wednesday, Trump stood firm on his commitment to build an "impenetrable physical wall" along the southern border, and stated with confidence, once again, that Mexico will pay for 100% of it.

"They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for the wall," Trump said.

Of course, the question of who will foot the bill comes on the heels of Trump's presidential-style meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto, following which Peña Nieto made it clear his country would not be paying for the wall. Still, while the media may have enjoyed the ensuing back and forth over whether there was actually a discussion about who would pay for a wall that even by Trump's own estimate would cost about $10 billion, voters were not concerned or interested.

Trump also largely held his ground on his position of deporting undocumented **immigrants** who are seeking legal status, saying, "They will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry."

Trump had originally announced his intention to deport all of the estimated 11 million **immigrants** who are in the United States illegally, but in Wednesday's speech seemed to scale back on that goal with an emphasis on zero tolerance for criminal illegals, especially the estimated 2 million he says are here now. They will "begin moving them out day one," he said.

The problem is that there were few details about what will be done with the remaining undocumented **immigrants**. And, despite his insistence that everyone will be treated in a humane fashion, the lack of specificity in Trump's plans only fuels concerns, something he will need to address if he is to win over voters still undecided.

Trump's Republican challengers routinely called him out on the lack of details during debates and on the campaign trail, warning voters that Trump could not follow through on his promises. Clearly, such criticism did not prove effective with primary voters -- Trump won them over by continuing to tout his plan while taunting his rivals. The question now is whether Trump will be able to persuade voters in the general election that he can work with Congress to follow through on his **immigration** pledges.

Trump deserves credit for standing firm on his word to primary voters. But the reality at this stage of the game is that this campaign needs to be a matter of addition, not subtraction. Trump's base of support is solid, but he needs to add Hispanics, African Americans, and white, college-educated voters. His hard line on **immigration** makes that increasingly difficult. With Labor Day right around the corner, it's past time to shift to a general election mode.

Did Trump's **immigration** speech adequately lay the groundwork for him to build on a platform that electrifies his base?

As the Rolling Stones once sang, "You can't always get what you want, but if you try sometimes, well, you just might find, you get what you need." Donald Trump has a firm **immigration** policy. But he also needs a plan that will appeal to the broader electorate. The Republican nominee may have gotten what he wanted. But did he get what he needs?

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Updated at 12:00 p.m. In last graph, corrected spelling of Barletta.

HAZLETON, Pennsylvania (CNNMoney) -- A decade ago, the small city of Hazleton, Pennsylvania, came into the national spotlight for its tough laws aimed at cracking down on "illegal **immigrants**." The city threatened steep fines and penalties for anyone renting a room or employing someone who was undocumented.

But things have changed dramatically since that time. These days, Latinos are Hazleton's driving economic force.

Since 2000, the town's Latino population has exploded from 4% to more than 40% and dozens of Latino-owned businesses have opened, providing thousands of much needed jobs.

Spanish is the prevailing language spoken on Hazleton's streets, and Bachata music plays from passing cars' windows.

"Before we arrived, this town was dead," said Demetrio Juarez, a chef and owner of El Mariachi, a Mexican restaurant who has lived in Hazleton for 21 years. "We gave this town life."

Not so long ago, Hazleton was on the edge of extinction. The coal mines were shutting down, the older generation was dying off and younger residents were leaving town to find better paying jobs.

Local lawmakers started offering generous tax incentives to attract local manufacturing companies. Slowly, warehouses, distribution centers and other plants began to set up shop in or near town.

However, these companies weren't offering the type of high-quality jobs with good pay, upward mobility and pensions that residents had grown accustomed to, said Jamie Longazel, an assistant professor at Dayton University's Human Rights Center in Dayton, Ohio.

"People that get college degrees don't tend to come back to live here," said Longazel, who grew up in Hazleton and chronicled the town's evolution in his book, Undocumented Fears.

But many first and second-generation Latino **immigrants** saw Hazleton differently. Many of the area's jobs didn't require a higher education and the cost of living was low.

Starting in the early 2000s, Latinos began moving to the town in droves.

The demographic changes were startling. Hazleton's schools and hospitals began to feel the strain of the sudden influx of new residents, locals say.

By 2006, the situation hit a fever pitch. Hazleton's mayor, Lou Barletta, vowed to make the city "one of the toughest places in the United States" for an illegal **immigrant** to live and passed the Illegal **Immigration** Relief Act Ordinance.

Under the law, landlords who were found to be renting to undocumented **immigrants** could be fined up to $1,000 per day. Companies could also be penalized if they hired undocumented workers. And tenants were also required to prove they were lawful residents and register with the city.

After the ordinances passed, Lou Dobbs -- a CNN anchor at the time, who had been railing against "illegals" for years -- aired his program live from Hazleton. Barletta appeared on the show several times and Hazleton soon became known as an anti-**immigrant** hotbed. (Dobbs left CNN in 2009.)

"When Barletta was mayor, there was a lot of fear. People wouldn't come eat here anymore," said restaurant owner Juarez. "Now it's different. The new politicians don't go against the **immigrants**."

Barletta, who is now a U.S. Congressman, maintains that his position is "decidedly pro-**immigrant**."

"Because who is hurt the worst when people who have broken **immigration** laws come to this country seeking employment? It is the legal **immigrant** -- and other legal workers -- who will be in direct competition with illegal **immigrants** for jobs that are already scarce," Barletta wrote in an email to CNNMoney.

The ordinances were ultimately ruled unconstitutional by a federal appeals court in 2010. "What is disappointing in the entire saga, however, is the fact that the Supreme Court declined to hear our case," Barletta went on to write.

'New blood'

"I consider these people coming in as new blood," said Carmen DeLese, an 84-year old Hazleton native who owns Carmen's Bakery on Broad St. "We have a lot of small Hispanic stores opening up. They're working, they're paying taxes." he said.

Not only are many of the city's small businesses owned by Latinos, but three of the area's biggest employers -- Bimbo Bakeries USA, Mission Foods, and Wise -- are Mexican-owned companies.

Together, these companies employ about 5,000 workers, said Francisco Torres-Aranda, the region's commissioner of Latino affairs.

Torres-Aranda, a dual Mexican and American citizen who was born in Hazleton, also owns Advanced Tech, an research and development facility for shale drilling products.

"It's incredible that Hazleton, which was the epicenter of the [anti-illegal **immigration**] rhetoric that we're hearing now, is actually a place where Mexican-owned corporations are creating jobs for everyone," said Torres-Aranda.

"Five or six years ago, we didn't have a Lowe's or Wal-Mart or a Giant Supermarket with 24-hour service," said Amilcar Arroyo, a 30-year Hazleton resident and editor of El Mensajero, a monthly Spanish Language paper. "They just built a big car dealership with four big brands in Hazel Township."

Among Hazleton's largest employers are a Cargill meatpacking plant and an Amazon.com distribution center, Longazel said.

Still, the town has a ways to go. The unemployment rate, which hit a peak of 17% in July 2012, has fallen to around 10% -- but it is still well above the national rate, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. And median income, at $16,871 in 2015, is also well below the national median, according to the Census Bureau.

But with big new investments and improvements in downtown Hazleton, locals are optimistic.

"We just redid the whole downtown Broad Street roadway. It was a $36 million dollar project through the heart of the city," said Hazleton's new mayor, Jeff Cusat. "Now there's businesses popping up on both sides of the highway there."

Also, three buildings that were left for dead are being converted into office space. "So that's another $20 to $30 million project," he said.

"The new mayor has good relationships with the Hispanic community here and there are many opportunities to expand their businesses in this city," said Ben Medina, a local community organizer. Medina is the executive director of Hazleton One Community Center, which offers Spanish and English classes, after school and GED classes and other programs for the Hazleton community.

"There were definitely lessons that we learned from the fight with Barletta," said Juarez. "We won't let ourselves be intimidated, especially by politicians who want to hurt us and make us feel like we're less-than."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- A Latino surrogate for the Trump campaign warned Thursday that without tighter **immigration** policies from the Republican presidential nominee, "you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

Latinos for Trump founder Marco Gutierrez's comments came while he was defending Donald Trump's **immigration** position to MSNBC's Joy-Ann Reid.

"My culture is a very dominant culture. And it's imposing, and it's causing problems. If you don't do something about it, you're going to have taco trucks on every corner," Gutierrez said.

Moments before, Gutierrez had argued that "the needs of the many outweigh the needs of the few" and that "we need to understand that this is a different time and we're having different problems" regarding illegal **immigration**.

CNN has reached out to the Trump campaign for comment and have not yet received a response.

The Trump supporter's comment about "taco trucks" sparked backlash and mockery on social media, with the hashtag #tacotrucksoneverycorner trending on Twitter throughout the night.

"Hey, what's wrong with #TacoTrucksOnEveryCorner?! Use my Evamoji for the taco truck! #Evamoji" actress and activist Eva Longoria wrote on Twitter, including an image of taco truck.

**Immigration** policy has been at the center of the Trump campaign's messaging over the last week, as the Republican nominee made a high-profile trip to Mexico to meet with President Enrique Peña Nieto. Trump followed that up the same day with a major speech on his **immigration** position, intended to clarify a stance that had become muddled as the candidate vacillated between "softening" his policy and maintaining the hardline policies he'd touted during the primary.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK (CNN) -- A top foreign policy adviser to Donald Trump on Thursday denounced white supremacists who praised the Republican nominee's **immigration** speech in Phoenix, calling them "disgusting."

"Not only does Donald Trump disavow them, but I think most Americans disavow that line of thinking and those kinds of groups," retired Army Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn told CNN's Erin Burnett on "OutFront," adding that he personally finds white supremacists and their views "disgusting."

Flynn, the former director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, said Trump's message on **immigration** is directed at all Americans and it would be a "big, big mistake" to try to connect racism to the Trump campaign, or to link the Ku Klux Klan to the Republican Party or conservative movement.

Speaking directly to former KKK Grand Wizard David Duke's praise of the speech, Flynn said Trump can't control what Duke says, but stressed there is "zero support -- zero -- and zero avowment of what he represents."

Trump said last week he does not want the support of white supremacists.

In his speech Wednesday night, Trump insisted there would be "no amnesty" for undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States and repeated his promise to build a wall between the United States and Mexico, with the southern US neighbor paying for it.

Flynn called it "an excellent speech, very comprehensive and I thought there was a lot of meat to it."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**5:43 pm: Removes errant "t" in graf 5 Update 2:16 a.m. -- Adds graf 18

(CNN) -- Donald Trump flew into a nation he has constantly berated during his campaign to meet President Enrique Peña Nieto and said they discussed a wall Trump has vowed to build on the US southern border, but not his demand that Mexico pay for it -- an assertion the Mexican president later disputed.

"Who pays for the wall? We didn't discuss," Trump had said when asked by a reporter during a news conference following their meeting in Mexico City. "We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date."

But Peña Nieto later claimed the two had discussed the wall and who would pay for it -- and he had "made it clear" to Trump it wouldn't be Mexico.

"At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall," Peña Nieto tweeted, after their meeting Wednesday.

He added that his conversation with the Republican nominee then moved on to other topics in a respectful fashion.

Jason Miller, Trump's senior communications adviser, called the meeting "the first part of the discussion and a relationship builder" between the two men, after Peña Nieto tweeted.

"It was not a negotiation, and that would have been inappropriate. It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation," he said in a statement.

In subsequent interviews in Mexico, Peña Nieto reiterated his version of events. He told CNN affiliate Televisa in an interview late Wednesday some of the positions Trump has taken "are a threat to Mexico."

He also told the outlet he was very clear with Trump about the subject of a wall at the border and insisted Mexico would not pay for it and he made Trump aware that the people of Mexico had been "very insulted."

Peña Nieto, speaking alongside Trump during their joint appearance, twice stressed the "responsibility" he has to defend Mexican people around the world and said Trump has made "assertions that regrettably had hurt and have affected Mexicans."

"The Mexican people have felt hurt by the comments that have been made. But I am sure that his genuine interest is to build a relationship that will give both of our society's better welfare," Peña Nieto said.

Trump apparently left his tough deal-making persona at home as he received a presidential-style news conference on foreign soil while on a high-risk trip to Mexico on Wednesday.

The visit appeared to be an attempt to bolster Trump's credentials as a potential world leader, following searing attacks on his temperament by his Democratic rival Hillary Clinton. The spur-of-the-moment trip also came hours before Trump was due to deliver a speech in Arizona meant to clarify his murky **immigration**policy amid signs he is softening his prior promise to deport 11 million undocumented migrants.

Trump's claim that they didn't discuss who would pay for the wall -- despite his call for Mexico to finance it being a central theme of his campaign and one he frequently uses to fire up his supporters -- appeared to be a noteworthy omission from Wednesday's conversation when he mentioned it at their joint appearance.

The cost is one that Peña Nieto has previously refused to shoulder, just one of many issues where the two men have clashed. Peña Nieto, who has previously compared Trump to Adolf Hitler, greeted him courteously and said he was committed to working with whomever Americans elect as their next president in November.

But turning the tables on Trump, he gave the billionaire an earful on trade, said illegal **immigration** from Mexico to the US peaked years ago and complained of the torrent of guns that he said crossed the border and worsened Mexico's drug wars.

Nieto said in an interview late Wednesday that some of the positions Donald Trump has taken "are a threat to Mexico." He told CNN affiliate Televisa that he made Trump aware that the people of Mexico had been "very insulted" by his comments.

Trump's backers were left to defend his decision not to mention his demand that Mexico pay for the border wall after the visit. Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff Joe Arpaio told CNN's Jake Tapper: "What difference does it make? The wall's important no matter who pays."

While Trump's decision not to raise who would pay for the wall appeared to undercut his deal-making swagger, it could also reassure some wavering Republican voters who dislike Clinton but are not yet convinced Trump possesses the restraint and sobriety required of a US president.

The sight of Trump alongside the Mexican president provided the photo-op that the campaign appears to have banked on despite not knowing how the candidate would be received.

Still, the Clinton campaign came out swinging, accusing Trump of failing to make good on his pledge to make Mexico pay for the wall by not raising the issue.

"Donald Trump has made his outlandish policy of forcing Mexico to pay for his giant wall the centerpiece of his campaign. But at the first opportunity to make good on his offensive campaign promises, Trump choked," Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement.

"What we saw today from a man who claims to be the ultimate 'deal maker' is that he doesn't have the courage to advocate for his campaign promises when he's not in front of a friendly crowd," Podesta said, before accusing Trump of wanting to build a costly wall at American taxpayers' expense.

Podesta later added: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

Peña Nieto began his remarks alongside Trump by saying the two held a constructive exchange of views even though "we might not agree on everything."

He then launched into a detailed defense of US-Mexican trade and its benefit to both countries delivered by the North American Free Trade Agreement -- a common punching bag for Trump on the campaign trail.

The Mexican leader told Trump that both the US and Mexico had benefited from NAFTA, saying more than six million US jobs rely on exports to Mexico.

"I don't think that commerce must be considered a zero sum game, so that only one wins and the other one loses," he said, though added he was prepared to make the two-decades-old deal, which also includes Canada, better for both nations.

Trump was also told by his host that Mexicans deserve everybody's respect wherever they are, in an apparent reference to the GOP nominee's harsh rhetoric towards undocumented migrants.

Trump, who listened to his host's long remarks with a somber look on his face while a woman stood beside him at the podium translating for him, said that Mexicans were "spectacular" people when it was his turn to talk.

But he laid bare disagreements between the two men when he said it was imperative to stop the "tremendous outflow" of jobs from the United States over the southern border, and that NAFTA had benefited Mexico more than the US. And he stood up for America's right to build a "physical barrier or wall" on its territory to stop illegal **immigration** and drug traffickers. Trump warned that NAFTA would have to be renegotiated.

Trump's calls for deporting all undocumented workers, labeling many Mexican **immigrants** "rapists" and "criminals," and plan to build a wall along the border -- that Mexico would pay for -- have earned him withering criticism from Peña Nieto, as well as many independents and moderate Republicans.

But they are central pillars of his campaign, which has galvanized his white working class base behind his White House bid. Those most fervently opposed to **immigration** have pushed back against the rumored "softening" in his stance that he could articulate on Wednesday night.

Trump, speaking from prepared remarks, was far more metasured than in his campaign trail appearances. Though he mostly stuck his positions on renegotiating NAFTA and halting illegal **immigration**, he was also conciliatory. He referred to illegal **immigration** from Central America rather than just from Mexico. He said a secure border barrier would benefit both nations. And he spoke of the flight of jobs not from the United States but from also from Mexico and Central America to overseas economies.

It is not unusual for presidential candidates to venture abroad during a campaign. Both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney made trips to bolster their foreign policy credentials in 2008 and 2012.

But Trump's approach -- like the rest of his campaign -- is highly unorthodox. Presidential candidates do not typically show up in foreign capitals for talks with leaders without intense preparation and highly choreographed game plans. Often, the parameters of a meeting are settled in advance. This trip was announced Tuesday night.

In addition, they usually visit strong allies where they are assured of a warm reception that will make for positive media coverage rather than sitting down with a leader who has compared them to Hitler and has disparaged their policy proposals.

Trump's style, however, is more impulsive and unpredictable. He had never before met a foreign leader in an official capacity. So his trip represented something of a risk. Even though the meeting with Peña Nieto was private, he has no control over how the Mexican leader will address the public and how his officials will brief journalists about it afterward.

The trip was also unusual for not including his traveling press corps and coming against the advice of US diplomats.

The campaign's decision to travel to a foreign country -- one rife with security risks for a candidate who has stoked tensions with his rhetoric on Mexican **immigrants** -- without reporters following close behind marks an unprecedented moment in the coverage of major party presidential nominees.

In addition, staff at the US Embassy in Mexico advised the Trump campaign against making such a hastily arranged trip, suggesting it would be logistically difficult to organize on such short notice, according to a source familiar with the discussions.

CNN's Mark Preston, Sara Murray, Elise Labott, Kevin Liptak, Ashley Fantz and Dan Merica contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- A prominent Latino surrogate for Donald Trump announced Thursday he had officially withdrawn his support from the Republican presidential nominee after the real estate mogul resumed his hard-line **immigration** position in a major policy speech in Arizona.

Latino Partnership for Conservative Principles President Alfonso Aguilar told CNN he felt disappointed and misled by Trump and his campaign after recent speculation the Republican nominee would soften his stance on undocumented **immigrants**.

"For the last two months, he said he was not going to deport people without criminal records," Aguilar told CNN's Carol Costello on "Newsroom." "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 until yesterday morning that he was going to deal with the undocumented in a compassionate way."

Trump on Wednesday returned to the same **immigration** rhetoric that saw him clinch the GOP nomination, telling an audience in Phoenix that there would be "no amnesty" for undocumented migrants living in the United States under his presidency.

Aguilar, who has been critical of Trump's tone and posture on race and **immigration** in the past, slammed Trump for his plan, with Aguilar describing it as being "even worse than what he initially proposed."

"They're going to leave the country, self-deport or be removed, and there's no guarantee that they will return," Aguilar said. "I mean that speech was a restrictionist speech. And I just think he's embraced Jeff Sessions and people like Ann Coulter and forgotten about building a coalition to win this election. I'm so sorry, but I just can't be part of that."

But Aguilar remained adamant that he would still not vote for Democratic presidential candidate, Hillary Clinton, in November.

"I mean, people who think that she's (Clinton) committed to **immigration** reform, she's misleading them just like Donald Trump misled us," Aguilar said. "So, look, I don't think we have a good choice right now. I think I have to talk to our coalition of leaders and figure out, you know, what our next step is, but certainly, it's not going to be to support Trump nor Hillary Clinton."

Aguilar's announcement follows a report by Politico on Wednesday that high-profile Latino Trump surrogates, including Trump National Hispanic Advisory Council member Jacob Monty, were wavering in their support after the address at the Phoenix Convention Center.

Monty also officially distanced himself from the Republican Party's standard-bearer Thursday, telling CNN he had stepped down from the council.

"We need more security but when he called for the deportation of (Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals) recipients, that is just unrealistic, cruel, (and) not productive for the economy because they're working, they're going to school," Monty told CNN's Wolf Blitzer on Thursday. "And the biggest thing for me was when he completely punted on the issue of what to do with the 11 million, when we discussed that with him."

Monty added, "And 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."

Monty said he too was not prepared to vote for Clinton and had decided not to vote for either of the candidates at the top of the ticket, supporting Republicans further down the ballot instead.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Tamar Jacoby is a registered Republican and president of **ImmigrationWorks** USA, a federation of small business owners in favor of **immigration** reform.The opinions expressed in this commentary are solely those of the author.

(CNN) -- So much for the Trump **immigration** pivot. It was intriguing while it lasted -- all 10 days. Last night, the old Trump was back.

His much anticipated **immigration** speech Wednesday night began with a throwaway line about his "love for the people of Mexico," and he blew a few kisses at his new best friend, President Enrique Peña Nieto of Mexico. Also uncharacteristically, Trump had done a little homework, consulting with experts and studying up on **immigration** law.

But most of the 73-minute speech was given over to a wild, dystopian rant: criminal **aliens**, foreign terrorists, runaway welfare use, **immigrant**-driven job loss and downward wage pressure -- an **immigration** system, Trump summed up, that's "worse than anybody ever realized because the media won't report on it."

That's a hard claim to counter -- by design. If you buy it, it means no known facts matter. No one else's arguments carry any weight, because others don't know what you know. And in Trump's telling a handful of appalling instances -- cases in which an unauthorized **immigrant** slated for deportation murdered an American citizen -- outweigh all that **immigrants** contribute to the United States, economically and in other ways.

The GOP candidate's Manichean vision is simple and clear. If anything, it came through more starkly in this supposedly sober, considered address than it has in over a year of unscripted stump speeches.

Thanks to several decades of unprecedented **immigration** and lack of control on the border, "our country is in a mess" -- "a terrible and dangerous mess." Illegal **immigration** and our elite's misguided response to it is the major challenge we face as a nation -- and once we get control, all of our problems will disappear.

"Peace and law and justice and prosperity will prevail. Crime will go down . . . . Gangs will disappear . . . . Welfare use will decrease. We will have a peace dividend to spend on rebuilding America . . . . You'll be proud of our country again."

It sounds great. If only it were true.

You can dispute many of Trump's facts. You can question his racial and ethnic biases -- and many will. But what's most pernicious about this vision is what it leaves out.

What about the **immigrant** who invented the Pentium chip -- or the **immigrant** third of the Silicon Valley science workers who drove the dot-com boom in the 1980s and 90s? What about the **immigrant** workers who keep America's farms growing food and staff the kitchens in our restaurants? The housing boom ended badly, but before it did, it brought wealth to millions of Americans, and it would never have happened without **immigrant** construction workers -- they built the houses. But not in Trump's vision. He sees only the criminal **aliens**.

His policy recommendations are similarly skewed. He gets one big thing right: American **immigration** policy should be driven by American interests -- not what's good for **immigrants**. He makes the point in a particularly ugly and vindictive way, but he's on to something -- and too many **immigration** reform advocates get it wrong.

Some of his specific recommendations are also reasonable: Despite dramatic advances in recent years, we aren't in full control of the border, and state and local law agents should play some role in **immigration** enforcement.

But even in his policy specifics, there is too much focus on an exaggerated threat and not enough understanding of what **immigrants** bring to America. As Mexican President Pena Nieto pointed out in his comments Wednesday, standing on a stage next to Trump, the net influx of unauthorized Mexican **immigrants**is at a 10-year low -- in effect, zero.

It's not the major problem we face as a nation. And no amount of scapegoating will make it so.

On the much-contested point of what should happen to the 11 million unauthorized **immigrants** already living in the U.S., the speech was wildly contradictory -- a little something for all voters, liberal and conservative.

The notion of prioritizing the most threatening **aliens** was still in the mix, but Trump's criteria for who should be prioritized have grown so broad that the very concept of priority has become all but meaningless. The speech also embraced the old, unrealistic proposal of "touchback": Make the unauthorized go home and apply to be readmitted under the same quotas as everyone else.

But then, a few paragraphs later, came a conflicting nod to more pragmatic voters: "In several years, when we have . . . ended illegal **immigration** for good," we'll turn to the problem of those already here and decide what to do.

Bottom line: what would a President Trump do about the 11 million? It's still anybody's guess.

Where does it leave us? Pretty much back where we started some 15 months ago when Trump announced his candidacy by denouncing Mexican **immigratnts**as criminals and rapists. Apparently, that's still his main bid -- his vision of how to right what's wrong with America. If you think that's right, he's your man. But don't tell me this was a thoughtful presidential speech -- it was anything but.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Donald Trump vowed Wednesday in a signature speech on **immigration** to dismantle so-called sanctuary cities, which he blamed for harboring dangerous **immigrants** who commit crimes against Americans.

"Block funding for sanctuary cities ... no more funding. We will end the sanctuary cities that have resulted in so many needless deaths," Trump said in Phoenix. "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."

Sanctuary cities have previously come under fire for not cooperating with federal **immigration** authorities. They have existed since the 1980s, and returned to the spotlight last year after a 32-year-old San Francisco woman was allegedly killed by an undocumented **immigrant** with a felony record who was deported five times. Her family has filed a federal lawsuit that names San Francisco, a sanctuary city, for "their failures to perform mandatory duties."

Trump has made Kate Steinle's death a rallying cry for his **immigration** policies. He said Wednesday that on his first day in office, he would ask Congress to pass "Kate's Law ... to ensure that criminal **aliens** convicted of illegal reentry face receive strong mandatory minimum sentences."

He also had parents whose children were killed in sanctuary cities join him on the stage.

'Going after police chiefs'

Sen. Tim Kaine, Hillary Clinton's running mate, countered Trump's argument on Thursday morning, saying the U.S. should prioritize the deportation of violent criminals. He told CNN's Chris Cuomo on "New Day" that he trusts police chiefs to keep their communities safe.

"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," Kaine said.

Sanctuary policies increase the public's safety, said the former Virginia governor. He told Cuomo of how he was advised not to let cities work more closely with the U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency.

"My law enforcement officials, who are tough law enforcement people, came to me and said do not do this, because if the **immigrant** community starts to sees us as **immigration** officials, they won't call and complain about crimes in their neighborhood," Kaine said. "They won't be witnesses in cases. Instead, what you need to do is work with the community to protect and serve them and let (**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement) do their job."

So what is a sanctuary city?

Sanctuary cities -- a controversial term that supporters don't like -- generally have policies or laws that limit how much local law enforcement and government agencies can work with federal authorities on **immigration** matters. Some states and counties have similar policies. There's no legal or unified definition for these places.

More than 200 state and local jurisdictions have policies that call for not honoring ICE detention requests, the agency's director, Sarah Saldana, told Congress last year.

They are mainly located on the West Coast, in the Northeast, as well as in Florida, Iowa, New Mexico and Colorado, according to the Center for **Immigration**Studies, which advocates curbing **immigration**. These jurisdictions rejected more than 17,000 ICE requests to gain custody of **immigrants** in the 19 months ending September, 2015.

The sanctuary movement is said to have grown out of efforts by churches in the 1980s to provide sanctuary to Central Americans fleeing violence at home amid reluctance by the federal government to grant them refugee status. They became popular in more diverse locales to counter what officials there saw as overzealous federal **immigration** policies, particularly against those arrested for minor, non-violent crimes.

Critics, however, say that sanctuary cities endanger public safety by serving as a haven for criminals, who know they are less likely to be deported in these places. ICE officials say thousands of undocumented convicted criminals are released onto the streets every year.

CNN's Michael Pearson contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Democratic vice presidential nominee Tim Kaine said Thursday Donald Trump's trip to Mexico was a "photo op fly-by" and said he thinks "it shows that diplomacy is not for amateurs."

Kaine was in full attack-dog mode during a series of television interviews, mocking Trump's high-profile meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on CNN's "New Day." He also criticized Trump for giving a more moderate **immigration** message to the Mexican leader, before delivering a fiery speech hours later to an American audience.

"Donald Trump did a kind of photo op fly-by, where he didn't even have the nerve at the last minute to bring up this issue about the wall," Kaine told CNN's Chris Cuomo. "This is the central piece of his campaign -- **immigration** and deportation, and we're going to build a wall and make Mexico pay for it. But when he looked President Peña Nieto in the eye, he couldn't even bring that up."

Trump said Wednesday that the payment for the proposed border wall didn't come up during his meeting with Peña Nieto, but the Mexican president disputed that assertion.

"That was a choke, and I think it shows that diplomacy is not for amateurs. Donald Trump's an amateur," he added.

"But isn't diplomacy about the soft sell?" Cuomo asked.

Kaine saId: "I think diplomacy is primarily about honesty and candor, and standing up for the values that you believe in. So Donald Trump's been saying for months, we're going to build a wall and Mexico's going to pay for it -- if he really believed that, when he was sitting down with President Peña Nieto, why not even bring that up? Then he goes back, and then to the hometown audience, he gives this fiery speech, language of division, you know?"

Kaine also said that Clinton would pursue **immigration** reform "in the first 100 days of the administration," modeled after the "pillars" of the Senate's 2013 attempt at **immigration** reform with the "Gang of Eight" bill.

The Virginia senator also hit Trump for his plan to target sanctuary cities.

"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," he said.

Citing his experience with the issue as a former mayor and governor in Virginia, Kaine said that local law enforcement explained to him that "if the **immigrant**community starts to see us as **immigration** officials, they won't call and complain about crimes in their neighborhood, they won't be witnesses in cases."

Kaine argued that "instead what you need to do is work with the community to protect and serve them, and let (**Immigration** and Customs Enforcement) do their job."

Kaine also responded to criticism that the Clinton campaign has been inaccessible to the press -- symbolized by the campaigns ongoing refusal to hold a press conference, a trend that has continued for 271 straight days.

The Virginia senator pointed to Clinton's appearance at a press event with the National Association of Black Journalists and the National Association of Hispanic Journalists as an example of a press conference, and argued that the campaign "talks to the press every day."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CHICAGO (CNN) -- Death first stared at Sonia, straight in the eyes, when she was only 10 years old.

"I was wondering, 'When is it going to be my last day?'" Sonia told CNN. "I wasn't living. I was surviving."

The ruthless gangs in her native Guatemala had her in the crosshairs during her early teenage years, she said, following her and threatening her in the street. Sonia, who asked CNN to change her name because she fears for her safety, said they threatened her mother, as well.

"They told her, 'We are going to rape your daughters,' " Sonia said.

As menacing messages followed, her parents fled north to the United States. Sonia and her two younger sisters were put up for adoption at an orphanage. At 16, she made her own desperate decision to journey from Guatemala to the United States.

At 16, she made her own desperate decision to journey from Guatemala to the United States.

"My father, he almost died in the desert and my mother got kidnapped in Mexico, and I still decided to take the risk," Sonia said.

Surviving the six-month voyage, some of it by foot, from Guatemala City to Chicago only strengthened her determination to achieve her American dream. She wanted to become the first in her family to earn a college degree, she said. But as she prepared to graduate from high school with a 4.1 GPA, Sonia's heart sank at the realization that as an undocumented **immigrant** she would qualify for little to no college financial aid.

"I'm Christian, so I was always praying," she said.

Prayers answered

Sonia received a college acceptance letter signed by a Jesuit priest, Father Stephen Katsouros, who is an "Olivia Pope," of sorts, for marginalized students in Chicago. Olivia Pope is the fictional crisis manager played by Kerry Washington in the hit series "Scandal."

Katsouros is the dean and executive director of Arrupe College of Loyola University Chicago, the first Jesuit community college in the world. The mission of this new two-year college, which just began its second year, is offer a liberal arts education to "a diverse population, many of whom are the first in their family to pursue higher education." Many of their students struggled in high school, but have the drive and desire to transfer to a four-year university.

Katsouros picks apart and solves the real-life emergencies Arrupe's students face every day. When he found out one of his students was homeless, his team placed the student in a safe home, he said.

Another time, when a student walked the halls with a swollen face, Katsouros asked, "What happened to you?" The student had an abscessed tooth, but hadn't gone to the dentist because of a lack of insurance, he said. Katsouros put him in contact with a Loyola donor who happened to be a dentist. The student was back in good health in no time.

When Katsouros learned his students didn't have laptops, his team raised money and provided computers. And when he figured out most of his Arrupe students had qualified for reduced or free breakfast and lunch in high school, they rolled out a free breakfast and lunch program at Arrupe. Needs like eating don't go away just because you're 18, Katsouros said.

And while Katsouros' has handled many crises, he can't say "It's handled" just yet.

The higher education gap

The students' stories of poverty and homelessness shed light on the litany of personal setbacks that some have to overcome to get a secondary education. Another factor pulling down many black and Hispanic youth: violence. With an average of nearly 82 shootings per week, the city will likely pass last year's mark. Chicago averages nearly 82 shootings per week.

The higher education gap in Chicago is divided along racial lines. In 2014, between 6% and 16% of African-American and Latino students attained a college degree, while 27 to 36% of white students earned a degree, according to a study by the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research.

"These students are not strangers to failure," said Father Michael Garanzini, the mastermind behind Arrupe. "These kids, they struggle. Because they struggle and because they are motivated, I'm going to put my money on them."

The goal, Garanzini said, is to give low-income students who would otherwise not attend college an opportunity for a two-year degree, debt free -- and the preparation to continue on to a four-year college.

"There's a new feeling among the Jesuits that we have to be careful that we don't become too elitist, where we are educating the wealthy and the well off only," said Garanzini, who named the college Arrupe, after Pedro Arrupe, a Spanish Jesuit priest who promoted the alleviation of poverty and eradication of racial discrimination.

Call it academic social justice, Jesuit-style, or social justice period. Students with a high GPA, like Sonia, are the exception at Arrupe. The inaugural class, which just started its second year at Arrupe, has an average high school GPA of 2.8 and an average ACT score of 18, according to Arrupe records. The student body is 68% Latino, 21% African American and 4% white.

Program directors at community colleges in Chicago warned Garanzini that the student profiles he was looking to help were "not going to finish" college unless they were hand-held through a very structured program, he told CNN. Indeed, according to a study conducted by Complete College America, 5% of full-time students pursuing a two-year degree graduate on time.

Defying the odds

Sounds like a a job for the Jesuit "Olivia Pope."

Katsouros embraced the challenge to help his students defy the odds. He proudly says Loyola created a very "intrusive" program that "provides a lot of structure, a lot of predictability, a lot of routine and not many choices."

"When they are accepted we send them a [picture] frame," Katsouros told CNN. "And I tell the students 'right now you can put a picture of yourself [in there]. A selfie. I don't care; but hang on to this frame because two years from now you'll put your diploma from Arrupe College and Loyola University on this frame'."

Sonia said she decided to keep the picture frame empty and use it as a form of motivation to keep striving for her goal.

But, indeed, students have few choices to make at Arrupe. At the beginning of the first year, students choose from three concentrations, Arts and humanities, business, or social and behavioral sciences. Sonia chose business. The average classroom size is 23. Students take two courses in eight-week terms, with five terms a year, and attend classes four days a week from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m., with most of the homework completion done inside the classroom. The students also get access to a counselor, social worker and tutors.

"These are the students that often time the higher-ed culture doesn't invest in [because] their grades are too low," Katsouros told CNN. "They don't get the same opportunities that other students get. So we are saying 'you are worthy of our investment and I think you can do this. And we are going to walk with you through the first couple of years of undergrad. We interviewed you and you showed us that you have what it takes'."

The Arrupe model appears to be working, Katsouros said. Among the students, 86% are on track to finish their associate degree in two years, compared to the 5% national completion rate for students at two-year colleges. The retention rate for the inaugural year, he said, is 91%.

"I think they respond to people believing in them," Katsouros said.

"Everyone comes here with a dream," Sonia said. "We are here to show the world that even though we don't have the same opportunities, we can be someone. I think this support makes you feel comfortable and makes you do great things."

One more rule: 'No borrowing'

To make sure that the dreams of Sonia and her classmates are not shattered by the daunting student debt problem in the United States, Garanzini said he added one more rule to Arrupe's already structured secondary education program.

"No borrowing," Garanzini said.

To make sure that Arrupe students earn their two-year degrees debt free, Garanzini said that Arrupe pays for most of students' educations through donations. Students are only responsible for about $10,000, per year, he said. It's mostly covered by financial aid. In addition, financial aid counselors also help students fill out private scholarship aid applications, which usually covers remaining costs. Students are also encouraged to work one day a week.

However, for the 34 undocumented students, including Sonia, coming up with $10,000 is more challenging. Undocumented students don't qualify for many types of financial aid.

When Sonia learned she couldn't apply for certain student aid because of her legal status, she realized what it meant to "live in the shadows" in the United States, she said.

It means "that you don't have the same opportunities that everyone else has, despite how hard you work," Sonia said.

Despite the setback, Sonia said she wasn't discouraged. She applied for scholarships with no citizenship requirement, and was awarded more than $35,000 for her first two years of college, and another $15,000 if she continues on to a four-year college or university.

Even though her college bills are paid for the foreseeable future, she said she is "still scared" about getting deported to Guatemala.

"I tell my sister, 'When will we have a normal life?' " she said. "I just want to be a normal girl. I just want to be normal."

The next challenge

Even Katsouros can't help Sonia with her legal status; that's up to US **immigration** authorities. Sonia said her **immigration** case is pending. For now, she's looking forward to her second year of schooling getting underway.

"My dream has come true," Sonia said. "I'm [a] first generation [college student] and I just finished my first year. I have straight As."

Sonia's story and the Arrupe education model is resonating with universities and colleges around the country which look to narrow the secondary education gap between the wealthy and the marginalized. Eight universities and colleges are looking into duplicating the Arrupe model, said Katsouros. The University of St. Thomas in Minnesota is the first to publicly announce its intention to replicate the Arrupe model at its Catholic school campus.

University of St. Thomas President Julie Sullivan said that her team is planning to open their two-year-program by the fall of 2017, given that they "have preliminary approval" from the board of trustees. But before the new college opens its doors, Sullivan said, more needs to be done to secure funding for scholarships and a work program for students.

While the University of St. Thomas would tailor its Arrupe-model college to meet the local needs of its community, the overarching goal, said Katsouros is to "provide [the students] with the confidence and the skills to be successful in a four-year college, and to be successful in the workplace."

Arrupe's next challenge, according to Garanzini, is making sure that students transition seamlessly into a four-year university.

"We need to keep up with them because they need a year of transition," he said. "They need to know that someone is watching, asking 'How did the first semester go?' Or we need to partner with the universities or colleges that they go to."

"I have the best gig in higher ed," Katsouros said. "To be a part of this extremely innovative, compelling, relevant, educational model that we believe will be the leader of a new movement is most exciting."

'My friends keep dying'

While Sonia is overjoyed about being part of the inaugural class of a trailblazing secondary education model, she reflects on the violence that surrounds her childhood friends still living in Guatemala.

"A lot of my friends keep dying. They are killed," Sonia said as her voice cracked. "I have this feeling that I'm here safe and they are still there dying. I really feel really bad."

While Sonia's future in Chicago is still insecure, she counts her blessings and vows to pay it forward. She feeds the homeless at a soup kitchen, visits hospital patients and elderly people in nursing homes as a chaplain. She also lobbies at the Illinois state legislature for the rights of undocumented **immigrants**.

"It makes me feel really good because I'm doing something for this community," she said. "They are giving me something, so I'm going to give back."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Editor's note: Felix Sanchez is the chairman and co-founder of the National Hispanic Foundation for the Arts. The opinions expressed in this commentary are his.

(CNN) -- The red-meat speech on **immigration** would come soon enough. But first...Donald Trump flew earlier in the day Wednesday into Mexico, bringing his own version of magical realism. He landed at Los Pinos--the Mexican White House.

Trump, the surreal aggressor, voluntarily helicoptered into enemy territory to face an unknown outcome.

Two embattled men facing abysmal approval ratings looked to each other for salvation. The Mexican President, who had nothing to lose, suddenly found himself as the unexpected power broker/mediator to the world's most unruly potential head of state.

They were meeting about two months before the US presidential elections: a scene out of a Gabriel Garcia Marquez novel. Trump --abandoned in the polls by educated whites, blacks and Latinos -- was reaching for a lifeline.

And indeed the trip brought a surprising result. With his command of the timing and optics of the event -- and his canny positioning to ensure that his comments were the last word -- this may well represent the event at which Trump became a politician.

Like him or not, Trump scored a home run with this strategic surprise trip to Mexico, a nation presently in mourning over the death of its world musical icon, Juan Gabriel. Trump, standing at the matching podiums with an American ally, elevated his presidential stature.

The visual parity between a world leader and a world leader contender emphasized Mexican and US equality---a new world order, even, with Mexico, in this instance, taking center stage.

Only a few hours later, of course, it was Trump's 10-point xenophobic tirade, presented with Latino antagonists, like Sheriff Arpaio, in tow that took center stage, as the candidate reverted to his old self in a speech on **immigration**, completely unbraiding the potentially progressive message he began in Mexico City.

He had had his Los Pinos photo op and now it was back to reassuring his base. A shame.

But let's not let that completely tarnish his foray to visit with Peña Nieto, who deserves praise.

Despite the fantastical nature of the encounter, the Mexican President confronted head-on Trump's disinformation campaign against Mexicans and Mexican-Americans. Trump's reliance on extreme images of marauding Mexicans pillaging and looting the US has created the new American bogeyman, the new Willy Horton.

For the courage to face off with Trump, President Enrique Peña Nieto should get kudos for defending the honor of Mexicans and Mexican-Americans. It's not like Barbra Streisand, Ben Affleck or Oprah Winfrey had come to our defense.

But what was remarkable was that it was not the Mexican President who was arriving at Trump Tower for a benediction, but the United States Republican presidential candidate who appeared to come to seek the Mexican President's counsel.

It was not a visit to the capitals of Britain and Germany, but it is a true North American summit: a unique moment where Mexico flexed and exercised power over the possible next US President. Mexico was the only place Trump could come and attempt to achieve a crucial validation he lacks.

Mexicans, after all, still hold the key to a locked US voting demographic.

Trump did well in his Mexico trip, though he was not spiritually cleansed of his sinful, vitriolic rhetoric and **immigrant** fear-mongering. But he aimed his pitch at Mexican-American voters and nervous Republicans worried that he had taken his message too alt-right.

How might this have helped his candidacy?

The Democratic Latino coalition has always had an Achilles heel that includes three critical Latino segments: Cuban-Americans, who don't have an **immigration** issue thanks to the US dry foot, wet foot policy; Puerto Ricans, who similarly do not have an **immigration** issue, because all Puerto Ricans are born US citizens; and finally multigenerational Mexican-Americans, who for the most part do not have **immigration** concerns.

Not that these US Latinos don't have empathy or support for Latino **immigrants** and their struggle, but it is not their top priority. Jeb Bush understood the Latino sweet spot and how these voters were ripe to support him, which is why the Clinton campaign worried more about Jeb Bush than any other GOP candidate.

But it's hard to see how this will work for Trump, particularly if they got an earful of his call to arms against **immigrants** later in the evening on national television. These Latino swing voters appear to have coalesced behind Secretary Clinton, who has a long and authentic history with the Latino communities from Texas to Puerto Rico.

What the Mexican President did today was to reframe the US --Mexico relationship, by emphasizing how the border economy affects far more than just US Latinos, it floats the economies of major states from California to Texas. In their joint appearance, the debate shifted away, however briefly, from finger pointing to bi-national, shared governance. The exclusive focus on undocumented **immigration** expanded to include discussion of the illegal flow between both countries of cash, drugs and guns and how they contribute to perpetuating gangs and drug cartels.

What the Trump meeting also showed is how little we actually understand how the major cogs of the US economy work: our reliance on trading partners like Mexico, the benefits that have redounded to both nations under free trade agreements, and the importance of perfecting, but not discarding bilateral commercial agreements.

Trump may have won the optics of the day (the first part, at least) and he may have somewhat resuscitated his campaign, deemed by many to be on life support, but the issue is whether this moment will propel Trump all the way to the White House.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump vowed Wednesday "there will be no amnesty," making his case for a United States less hospitable to, and accessible for, undocumented **immigrants**.

But amid the hardline bluster, Trump didn't repeat his previous commitment to round up and deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants** already in the United States -- focusing instead on a narrower subset who have committed crimes within the country, and pointedly insisting those already here will have no path to citizenship.

In his highly anticipated speech in Phoenix, Trump embraced a hardline conservative position -- painting a bleak picture of the impact of **immigration**, rallying the Republican base and defending his signature proposal: a wall on the US-Mexico border. But the speech might have done little to appeal to the broader electorate -- especially suburban white voters who could be crucial on Election Day.

Here are the seven quotes that defined Trump's speech, and why they mattered:

"Anyone who is in the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

Trump repeatedly emphasized that his first focus would be deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the United States.

But the big question entering Wednesday night's speech was whether he'd stand by his calls for mass deportations -- including families that hadn't violated additional laws.

This was Trump's way of blurring the lines and shifting to a conventional hardline stance more consistent with his party's leaders on Capitol Hill. He suggested that undocumented **immigrants** who are caught will be deported -- with no exceptions -- but didn't directly call for actions that would lead to the mass deportations of all 11 million in the country. Instead, he made clear that their legal status would not change under his presidency.

"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 re-entry like everybody else under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined today," the Republican presidential nominee said.

"Mexico will pay for the wall. 100%. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for the wall."

Trump traveled to Mexico City and met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto earlier Wednesday -- but the two wound up telling different stories about their meeting. Trump told reporters they didn't discuss who would pay for the border wall he's proposing; Nieto tweeted that he told Trump Mexico wouldn't foot the bill.

It was clear Trump was trying to avoid attacking Mexicans generally, and keep his focus on undocumented **immigrants**. But he wasn't backing away from the proposal that has animated his campaign.

"They're great people, and great leaders," he said of Mexicans during his Phoenix speech, "but they're going to pay for the wall."

"Maybe they'll be able to deport her."

Trump's rhetoric would have fit right into the Republican primary. His speech was red meat for the GOP base -- exemplified by this joking suggestion that **immigration** officials boot Democratic rival Hillary Clinton from the country.

"It's our right as a sovereign nation to choose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us."

By asserting authority to pick and choose **immigrants**, Trump was defending some of his most controversial campaign proposals -- including a ban on Muslims, which he called for and has not yet disavowed, and a more targeted restriction on **immigrants** from countries that don't satisfy his vetting requirements.

"Within ICE I'm going to create a new special deportation task force."

Trump had previously called for a "deportation force." He wasn't backing away from that terminology on Wednesday night.

However, again, Trump shifted his emphasis -- saying those officers would work with local and state law enforcement officials to round up criminals immediately, rather than suggesting they'd boot all undocumented **immigrants**, regardless of their actions within the United States.

"If we can save American lives, American jobs and American futures, together we can save America itself."

**Immigration** has long been Trump's signature issue -- and he used the speech to pitch it as the most important one in 2016's presidential election, too.

He brought the parents of Americans slain by undocumented **immigrants** onto the stage, asking them to briefly tell their stories. And he cast **immigrants** as a primary reason workers -- including African-Americans and Latinos -- have struggled to find jobs.

"Anyone who tells you the core issue is the needs of those living here illegally has simply spent too much time in Washington."

Trump's calculation is that he needs the blue-collar worker in Ohio or Pennsylvania much more than the new Latino voter in Colorado or Arizona.

He made clear that he isn't concerned about the human impact of deporting undocumented **immigrants** -- including so-called "Dreamers," or those who were brought into the United States as children. Trump insisted he'd revoke President Barack Obama's executive actions allowing those **immigrants** to remain in the country.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**full reflow - 12:25am

PHOENIX (CNN) -- That idea that Donald Trump is softening his **immigration** policy: Not going to happen.

The Republican presidential nominee on Wednesday re-upped the harsh **immigration** rhetoric that electrified his primary campaign, vowing "no amnesty" for undocumented migrants living in the United States and promising to build a "beautiful" and "impenetrable" border wall that Mexico would pay for -- hours after that country's president vowed that it wouldn't.

"This election is our last chance to secure the border, stop illegal **immigration**, and reform our laws to make your life better," Trump said in Phoenix at the end of a dizzying day in which he made his first foray into international diplomacy with a visit to Mexico City, then baited a fired-up crowd with red-meat rhetoric.

On what might have been one of the most important days of his presidential campaign, Trump appeared to be recommitting his electoral fate in November to the white conservative base voters who swept him to victory in the GOP primary rather than seeking to broaden his base to a wider coalition of Americans.

Still, adding to the uncertainty that has clouded his **immigration** plan in recent days, Trump did not give a definitive answer about what he would do with most of the 11 million undocumented people who are not criminals, leaving open the possibility they would have to continue to hide in the shadows.

But it was the tone of Trump's speech that was most notable.

"This is it. We won't get another opportunity -- it will be too late," he said in a speech that recreated the vision of a dystopian, crime-riddled nation on the edge of an existential crisis that he deployed in his convention speech in Cleveland in July.

He vowed to create a "deportation task force" within the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement division "focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **aliens** in America." He said he would boost the ranks of enforcement agents to enforce existing laws. He vowed that any undocumented **immigrants** who are caught crossing into the US will be "detained until they are removed from our country" and sent back to their country of origin. And he promised to repeal President Barack Obama's executive orders shielding some younger undocumented people, including those born in the United States -- so called Dreamers, from deportation.

Fate of 11 million undocumented **immigrants** uncertain

Trump left the fate of most of the 11 million undocumented people who are not criminals in the country murky.

He did not commit to deporting every undocumented **immigrant** living in the US as he previously had, but vowed that **immigrants** living in the US illegally would never have a path to legal status under his presidency.

"For those here today illegally who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system."

But later, Trump said that once a new **immigration** system is in place, "we will be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those who remain."

In his speech, the billionaire repeatedly called attention to the crimes of some undocumented **immigrants** and drew on stories of Americans killed by undocumented **immigrants**, bringing parents of some of those victims on stage to share their graphic and heart-wrenching tales of loss.

Consistent with the law-and-order theme he has emphasized, Trump vowed a "zero tolerance" policy toward criminals living in the US illegally.

As he painted a picture of a country besieged by "illegal **alien**" crime, Trump accused Washington politicians and the media of underplaying the dangers posed by illegal **immigration** and warned voters that the stakes this election will never be higher.

"If we can save American lives, American jobs and American futures, together we can save America itself," Trump said.

A quieter Trump in Mexico

Trump's hard-line speech contrasted strikingly with his more moderate tone in Mexico City hours earlier when he put on a restrained and respectful performance, even as he publicly disagreed with President Enrique Peña Nieto, who had invited him and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton to Mexico for talks.

The visit was an apparent attempt to portray Trump in a statesmanlike light and to counter Clinton's claims that he is temperamentally unfit to be President. Trump's campaign will likely be pleased that he got a photo-op with a foreign leader and appeared to avoid any damaging gaffes as he stood soberly on stage, beside an interpreter.

But the risks of such a visit -- Trump's first official encounter with a foreign leader -- were underscored when the stagecraft began to unravel over the issue of the wall on the Mexican border.

Trump had told reporters that he and his host did not discuss the cost of who would pay for the multibillion-dollar project -- a statement that the Mexican president did not contest while alongside Trump. But he quickly said on Twitter that the wall came up, and there was no way Mexico would be paying.

"At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall," Peña Nieto tweeted.

The confusion and apparent contradiction between the two men was quickly seized upon by the Clinton campaign, which mocked Trump, arguing the disconnect undercut his image as a great dealmaker.

"Trump just failed his first foreign test. Diplomacy isn't as easy as it looks. --H" Clinton said in a personally signed Tweet.

Jason Miller, Trump's senior communications adviser, called the meeting "the first part of the discussion and a relationship builder" between the two men.

"It was not a negotiation, and that would have been inappropriate. It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation," Miller said in a statement.

Peña Nieto twice stressed the "responsibility" he has to defend Mexican people around the world and said Trump has made "assertions that regrettably had hurt and have affected Mexicans."

"The Mexican people have felt hurt by the comments that have been made. But I am sure that his genuine interest is to build a relationship that will give both of our societies better welfare," Peña Nieto said.

The Clinton campaign also argued that Trump's performance in Mexico proved that his tough guy image was just an act.

"Donald Trump has made his outlandish policy of forcing Mexico to pay for his giant wall the centerpiece of his campaign. But at the first opportunity to make good on his offensive campaign promises, Trump choked," Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement.

"What we saw today from a man who claims to be the ultimate 'deal maker' is that he doesn't have the courage to advocate for his campaign promises when he's not in front of a friendly crowd," Podesta said, before accusing Trump of wanting to build a costly wall at American taxpayers' expense.

Podesta later added: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

But Trump was adamant in his speech in Arizona that Mexico would indeed finance the wall if he becomes President.

"Mexico will pay for the wall. 100 percent," Trump said.

"They don't know it yet, but they are going to pay for the wall."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**update 6:49 a.m. -- fixes day of the week

Editor's note: Now you can get "5 Things You Need to Know Today" delivered to your inbox daily. Sign up here.

(CNN) -- Good Thursday morning. We're trying a slightly different approach today. Let us know if you like it. In fact, feel free to share your thoughts about any and all things newsletters. We've been known to send a goodie or two. Here's what you need to know to Get Up to Speed and Out the Door.

Brazil politics

Dilma Rousseff better get to polishing her LinkedIn profile.

Why? Brazil's Senate voted to boot her - a blow not just to Rousseff, the country's first female president, but to the fortunes of her leftist Workers' Party, which has governed for more than a decade.

But why? Rousseff's accused of massaging government accounts, filling holes by taking loans from state banks without congress saying it was OK.

But really, why? Brazil's in the midst of a mother of all slumps. The constitution doesn't allow a no-confidence vote. So, impeachment was one way to go.

So, now what? We haven't seen the last of Rousseff. A motion to bar her from holding public office failed. For now, the Brazilian Democratic Movement Party will take over. It's not exactly squeaky clean either.

NC voter ID law

The Supreme Court has denied North Carolina's request to reinstate its uber-restrictive voting rights law.

Why? The 4-4 deadlocked justices didn't say why.

But really, why? For that, let's revisit what a federal appeals court said when it struck down the law, sending the case to the Supremes:

It was an attempt by NC's Republican legislature to "target African Americans with almost surgical precision."

It required voter ID even though not one single person has ever been charged with in-person voter fraud in NC.

It reduced early voting from 17 days to 10. African-Americans "disproportionately used the first seven days of early voting."

It exempted absentee voting by mail - something more whites than blacks use AND where there was evidence of fraud.

Campaign 2016

In a speech last night, Donald Trump cleared up the confusion swirling around his **immigration** policy. Kind of.

What's in: Those who commit crimes are definitely out. Kind of like what the US already does.

What's out (we think!): A deportation force to round up all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. No mention of that.

What's in: The wall -- and Mexico paying for it. Funny thing is he didn't talk about the whole payment thing when he met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto earlier in the day. Would've have been a great time to bring it up.

Migrant crisis

If he were alive today, Alan Kurdi would have been 4 years old. it's been a year since he washed up on that beach, a limp body clad in a red shirt and blue shorts. He was one of tens of thousands of kids forced to make that perilous journey across the Mediterranean. What happened to them? Here are the stories of the one who made it, and the ones who perished.

Storms

Florida is hurricane alley again. Tropical Storm Hermine will strengthen to a hurricane before it slams into Florida's Gulf Coast tomorrow night. Residents should expect 10 to 20 inches of rain. Meanwhile, way out west, Hawaii's hoping to dodge two bullets. Looks like Tropical Storm Madeline has weakened and will miss a direct hit on the Big Island. But Hurricane Lester is still out and may whack the islands as a Category 1 hurricane in a few days.

BREAKFAST BROWSE

People are talking about these. Read up. Join in.

Quote of the day

"How dare you keep this from us and just let our kids play in lead and arsenic soil? How dare you?"

Shantell Allen, a mother of five from East Chicago, Indiana, after she found out lead in her yard had sickened her children and that officials knew about it.

Cool kids' table

Bo Paske has autism and often eats alone. But not when the FSU football team visits his school and one of the players chows down with him.

Can you hear me now?

Here's a bit of science that proves what we already knew: A new study suggests that Fido really does understand what you're saying.

Photobombare

You find the perfect spot on the river for your high school senior photos, then this guy shows up and ruins it. Dude!

Bright idea

As if we didn't have enough ways to feed our Netflix addiction, now there's a light bulb that'll stream it to your wall.

Why we can't have nice things

Who's shooting sea otters out in California? Carcasses have been washing ashore with gunshot wounds. There's a $10,000 reward to help stop this.

E.T. hang up?

So maybe the **aliens** aren't trying to reach us after all. That strange space signal everyone went crazy over? It may be from one of our satellites. Bummer.

Yo (Excuse me Chris)

What's up with Chris Brown? Lately the R&B singer's been building a bigger rap sheet than a hits list. His latest arrest this week doesn't help things.

AND FINALLY ...

Duck and cover

Enzo the golden retriever is one brave puppy. He's not scared of anything, except windshield wipers. And maybe vacuum cleaners.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Hillary Clinton's presidential campaign will begin airing ads in Arizona on Friday, multiple Clinton aides tell CNN, a move that comes hours after Donald Trump said "there will be no amnesty" in a fiery **immigration** speech that Clinton aides dubbed "his darkest speech yet."

Role Models, an ad that features kids watching Trump make some of his more salacious comments, will begin airing on Friday as part of the six-figure ad buy, the aides said.

A Democrat presidential candidate has only won Arizona once in the last ten elections -- Bill Clinton won the state in 1996 -- but Clinton's top campaign aides believe that Trump's strategy to stay on the right on **immigration** and not moderate opens a lane for them to possibly win the state if a higher than average number of Latinos turn out.

The ad buy comes weeks after Clinton's campaign decided to expand their political and organizing operations into Arizona, telling state Democratic leaders that they planned to invest six figures in a ground operation in the state. Clinton currently has two offices in Arizona.

Clinton's investment states like Arizona and Georgia -- another state the campaign pledged to spend more on organizing -- is less about a sure-fire belief that Clinton will win them, but rather to expand the battleground map and make Trump fight hard for those two red states.

The hope within Clinton's inner circle is that their talk of putting the states in plan will force the Trump campaign to consume valuable time and money it could be devoting in more solidly swing states like Ohio, North Carolina and Florida. And if Clinton is within striking distance in Arizona, Trump already has a narrow path to the 270 electoral votes needed to win.

While Clinton world is making this foray into the two states, Priorities USA, her top dollar super PAC, maintains that it has no plans to spend in Arizona.

The group announced on Wednesday a plan to work with three Latino organizing groups to air $3 million worth of ads in Florida and Nevada aimed at turning out Latino voters. Arizona was not on their list of planned states.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Update 2:16 a.m. -- Adds graf 18

(CNN) -- Donald Trump flew into a nation he has constantly berated during his campaign to meet President Enrique Peña Nieto and said they discussed a wall Trump has vowed to build on the US southern border, but not his demand that Mexico pay for it -- an assertion the Mexican president later disputed.

"Who pays for the wall? We didn't discuss," Trump had said when asked by a reporter during a news conference following their meeting in Mexico City. "We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date."

But Peña Nieto later claimed the two had discussed the wall and who would pay for it -- and he had "made it clear" to Trump it wouldn't be Mexico.

"At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall," Peña Nieto tweeted, after their meeting Wednesday.

t

He added that his conversation with the Republican nominee then moved on to other topics in a respectful fashion.

Jason Miller, Trump's senior communications adviser, called the meeting "the first part of the discussion and a relationship builder" between the two men, after Peña Nieto tweeted.

"It was not a negotiation, and that would have been inappropriate. It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation," he said in a statement.

In subsequent interviews in Mexico, Peña Nieto reiterated his version of events. He told CNN affiliate Televisa in an interview late Wednesday some of the positions Trump has taken "are a threat to Mexico."

He also told the outlet he was very clear with Trump about the subject of a wall at the border and insisted Mexico would not pay for it and he made Trump aware that the people of Mexico had been "very insulted."

Peña Nieto, speaking alongside Trump during their joint appearance, twice stressed the "responsibility" he has to defend Mexican people around the world and said Trump has made "assertions that regrettably had hurt and have affected Mexicans."

"The Mexican people have felt hurt by the comments that have been made. But I am sure that his genuine interest is to build a relationship that will give both of our society's better welfare," Peña Nieto said.

Trump apparently left his tough deal-making persona at home as he received a presidential-style news conference on foreign soil while on a high-risk trip to Mexico on Wednesday.

The visit appeared to be an attempt to bolster Trump's credentials as a potential world leader, following searing attacks on his temperament by his Democratic rival Hillary Clinton. The spur-of-the-moment trip also came hours before Trump was due to deliver a speech in Arizona meant to clarify his murky **immigration**policy amid signs he is softening his prior promise to deport 11 million undocumented migrants.

Trump's claim that they didn't discuss who would pay for the wall -- despite his call for Mexico to finance it being a central theme of his campaign and one he frequently uses to fire up his supporters -- appeared to be a noteworthy omission from Wednesday's conversation when he mentioned it at their joint appearance.

The cost is one that Peña Nieto has previously refused to shoulder, just one of many issues where the two men have clashed. Peña Nieto, who has previously compared Trump to Adolf Hitler, greeted him courteously and said he was committed to working with whomever Americans elect as their next president in November.

But turning the tables on Trump, he gave the billionaire an earful on trade, said illegal **immigration** from Mexico to the US peaked years ago and complained of the torrent of guns that he said crossed the border and worsened Mexico's drug wars.

Nieto said in an interview late Wednesday that some of the positions Donald Trump has taken "are a threat to Mexico." He told CNN affiliate Televisa that he made Trump aware that the people of Mexico had been "very insulted" by his comments.

Trump's backers were left to defend his decision not to mention his demand that Mexico pay for the border wall after the visit. Maricopa County, Arizona, Sheriff Joe Arpaio told CNN's Jake Tapper: "What difference does it make? The wall's important no matter who pays."

While Trump's decision not to raise who would pay for the wall appeared to undercut his deal-making swagger, it could also reassure some wavering Republican voters who dislike Clinton but are not yet convinced Trump possesses the restraint and sobriety required of a US president.

The sight of Trump alongside the Mexican president provided the photo-op that the campaign appears to have banked on despite not knowing how the candidate would be received.

Still, the Clinton campaign came out swinging, accusing Trump of failing to make good on his pledge to make Mexico pay for the wall by not raising the issue.

"Donald Trump has made his outlandish policy of forcing Mexico to pay for his giant wall the centerpiece of his campaign. But at the first opportunity to make good on his offensive campaign promises, Trump choked," Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement.

"What we saw today from a man who claims to be the ultimate 'deal maker' is that he doesn't have the courage to advocate for his campaign promises when he's not in front of a friendly crowd," Podesta said, before accusing Trump of wanting to build a costly wall at American taxpayers' expense.

Podesta later added: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

Peña Nieto began his remarks alongside Trump by saying the two held a constructive exchange of views even though "we might not agree on everything."

He then launched into a detailed defense of US-Mexican trade and its benefit to both countries delivered by the North American Free Trade Agreement -- a common punching bag for Trump on the campaign trail.

The Mexican leader told Trump that both the US and Mexico had benefited from NAFTA, saying more than six million US jobs rely on exports to Mexico.

"I don't think that commerce must be considered a zero sum game, so that only one wins and the other one loses," he said, though added he was prepared to make the two-decades-old deal, which also includes Canada, better for both nations.

Trump was also told by his host that Mexicans deserve everybody's respect wherever they are, in an apparent reference to the GOP nominee's harsh rhetoric towards undocumented migrants.

Trump, who listened to his host's long remarks with a somber look on his face while a woman stood beside him at the podium translating for him, said that Mexicans were "spectacular" people when it was his turn to talk.

But he laid bare disagreements between the two men when he said it was imperative to stop the "tremendous outflow" of jobs from the United States over the southern border, and that NAFTA had benefited Mexico more than the US. And he stood up for America's right to build a "physical barrier or wall" on its territory to stop illegal **immigration** and drug traffickers. Trump warned that NAFTA would have to be renegotiated.

Trump's calls for deporting all undocumented workers, labeling many Mexican **immigrants** "rapists" and "criminals," and plan to build a wall along the border -- that Mexico would pay for -- have earned him withering criticism from Peña Nieto, as well as many independents and moderate Republicans.

But they are central pillars of his campaign, which has galvanized his white working class base behind his White House bid. Those most fervently opposed to **immigration** have pushed back against the rumored "softening" in his stance that he could articulate on Wednesday night.

Trump, speaking from prepared remarks, was far more metasured than in his campaign trail appearances. Though he mostly stuck his positions on renegotiating NAFTA and halting illegal **immigration**, he was also conciliatory. He referred to illegal **immigration** from Central America rather than just from Mexico. He said a secure border barrier would benefit both nations. And he spoke of the flight of jobs not from the United States but from also from Mexico and Central America to overseas economies.

It is not unusual for presidential candidates to venture abroad during a campaign. Both Barack Obama and Mitt Romney made trips to bolster their foreign policy credentials in 2008 and 2012.

But Trump's approach -- like the rest of his campaign -- is highly unorthodox. Presidential candidates do not typically show up in foreign capitals for talks with leaders without intense preparation and highly choreographed game plans. Often, the parameters of a meeting are settled in advance. This trip was announced Tuesday night.

In addition, they usually visit strong allies where they are assured of a warm reception that will make for positive media coverage rather than sitting down with a leader who has compared them to Hitler and has disparaged their policy proposals.

Trump's style, however, is more impulsive and unpredictable. He had never before met a foreign leader in an official capacity. So his trip represented something of a risk. Even though the meeting with Peña Nieto was private, he has no control over how the Mexican leader will address the public and how his officials will brief journalists about it afterward.

The trip was also unusual for not including his traveling press corps and coming against the advice of US diplomats.

The campaign's decision to travel to a foreign country -- one rife with security risks for a candidate who has stoked tensions with his rhetoric on Mexican **immigrants** -- without reporters following close behind marks an unprecedented moment in the coverage of major party presidential nominees.

In addition, staff at the US Embassy in Mexico advised the Trump campaign against making such a hastily arranged trip, suggesting it would be logistically difficult to organize on such short notice, according to a source familiar with the discussions.

CNN's Mark Preston, Sara Murray, Elise Labott, Kevin Liptak, Ashley Fantz and Dan Merica contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CINCINNATI (CNN) -- Hillary Clinton on Wednesday night dismissed Donald Trump's day trip to Mexico, arguing the Republican nominee is woefully lacking in diplomatic skills and "just failed his first foreign test."

The former secretary of state pounced on conflicting messages from Trump and Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto following their meeting. Trump told the press in Mexico City that while he and Peña Nieto discussed plans to build a wall along the US-Mexico border, they did not talk about Trump's pledge to make Mexico pay for it.

Peña Nieto did not refute Trump's comment during their press conference, but he tweeted hours after that he told Trump that Mexico "will not pay for the wall."

"Trump just failed his first foreign test. Diplomacy isn't as easy as it looks," Clinton tweeted, signed with an "H" to indicate she personally blessed the message.

A campaign tweet a short time later followed up: "We are not going to criminalize, profile, round up, and deport 16 million people."

John Podesta, her campaign chairman, said in a statement: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

The Clinton campaign also released a web video on Wednesday that accused Trump of lying about his trip to Mexico and sarcastically called him the "Great Negotiator."

And after Trump delivered a hardline **immigration** speech, the Democrat's campaign quickly condemned it.

"In his darkest speech yet, Donald Trump doubled down on his anti-**immigrant** rhetoric and attempted to divide communities by pitting people against each other and demonizing **immigrants**," said Lorella Praeli, Clinton's national Latino vote director, in a statement.

She added: "He showed us, very clearly, what's at stake in this election by painting a picture of his idea of America: one in which **immigrants** are not welcomed and one in which innocent families are torn apart."

The Clinton campaign's tough language about Trump came after the former secretary of state on Wednesday urged veterans at an American Legion conference to reject the mogul's view of the world, arguing he doesn't have what it takes to build and maintain alliances.

Though Clinton was more subtle in her attacks on Trump in front of the audience of veterans, she did blast the businessman-turned-politician for what she said were his insults toward the military, attacking the family of a soldier killed in action and being too cozy with Russian President Vladimir Putin.

Building alliances and trust with other nations, Clinton said, takes "more than a photo op, it takes consistency and reliability."

"You don't build a coalition by insulting our friends or acting like a loose cannon. You do it by putting in the slow, hard work of building relationships. Getting countries working together was my job every day as secretary of state," Clinton said. "It's just like building personal relationships -- people have got to know they can count on you -- that you won't say one thing one day and something totally different the next."

Clinton then added that building those relationships "certainly takes more than making up for a year of insults by dropping in on our neighbors for a few hours and flying home again."

The former secretary of state pledged on Wednesday that, as president, she would "never, ever disrespect Gold Star families who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our nation or prisoners of war who endured so much in our name."

Trump blasted the Khan family after they spoke at the Democratic National Convention this summer. Khizr Khan, a Pakistani-American lawyer and the father of the late Humayun Khan, powerfully hit Trump during his speech and Trump responded by questioning his family's motives. Earlier in the campaign, Trump also downplayed the heroism of Arizona Sen. John McCain, a POW, citing his capture during the Vietnam War.

"To insult them is just so wrong," Clinton said. "And it says a lot about the person doing the insulting."

Clinton continued her outreach to Republican voters as well Wednesday, pledging before a somewhat muted crowd to "be a president for Democrats, Republicans, independents, for people who vote for me, for people who don't, for all Americans."

Trump's campaign responded to the speech by saying that Clinton has proven that she is "fundamentally unequipped to further the national security interests of the United States and stand up for our veterans."

"Those who have served and wear the uniform today deserve to have a commander in chief who is looking out for them rather than donors and corrupt bureaucrats," said Matt Miller, director of Veterans for Trump. "Only Donald Trump and Mike Pence have a detailed plan to fundamentally improve both the (Department of Veterans Affairs) and the way veterans are treated in this country."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW DELHI (CNNMoney) -- Want to live in India? You can, if you're willing to invest $1.5 million.

The Indian government is launching a new program that rewards foreigners with a 10-year residency permit if they invest $1.5 million in the country over an 18-month period.

Investors are also required to generate a minimum of 20 jobs for Indian residents per financial year.

In return, investors will receive a multiple entry visa and the right to purchase a property. Family members will be able to work and study in India for the duration of the visa, which can be extended by another 10 years.

Roughly 20 countries currently offer **immigrant** investor schemes. They include the United States, select countries in Europe and a smattering of island nations in the Caribbean.

The required investments range from $500,000 to several million dollars, and some countries offer citizenship rather than a residential permit.

In India, the program could attract foreign entrepreneurs who are eager to do business in the world's fastest growing major economy.

Under the current rules, foreigners are often caught in tangle of bureaucracy that requires them to frequently switch visas, exit the country for prescribed amounts of time and complete reams of paperwork.

Still, the relatively high investment of $1.5 million could deter businesspeople in all but a few select professions.

For comparison, the U.S. EB-5 **immigration** program hands out green cards to foreigners who invest just $500,000 and create 10 jobs. St. Kitts & Nevis in the Caribbean mandates only a $400,000 investment in real estate, or $250,000 in its sugar industry.

-- Sophia Yan contributed reporting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**full reflow - 12:25am

PHOENIX (CNN) -- That idea that Donald Trump is softening his **immigration** policy: Not going to happen.

The Republican presidential nominee on Wednesday re-upped the harsh **immigration** rhetoric that electrified his primary campaign, vowing "no amnesty" for undocumented migrants living in the United States and promising to build a "beautiful" and "impenetrable" border wall that Mexico would pay for -- hours after that country's president vowed that it wouldn't.

"This election is our last chance to secure the border, stop illegal **immigration**, and reform our laws to make your life better," Trump said in Phoenix at the end of a dizzying day in which he made his first foray into international diplomacy with a visit to Mexico City, then baited a fired-up crowd with red-meat rhetoric.

On what might have been one of the most important days of his presidential campaign, Trump appeared to be recommitting his electoral fate in November to the white conservative base voters who swept him to victory in the GOP primary rather than seeking to broaden his base to a wider coalition of Americans.

Still, adding to the uncertainty that has clouded his **immigration** plan in recent days, Trump did not give a definitive answer about what he would do with most of the 11 million undocumented people who are not criminals, leaving open the possibility they would have to continue to hide in the shadows.

But it was the tone of Trump's speech that was most notable.

"This is it. We won't get another opportunity -- it will be too late," he said in a speech that recreated the vision of a dystopian, crime-riddled nation on the edge of an existential crisis that he deployed in his convention speech in Cleveland in July.

He vowed to create a "deportation task force" within the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement division "focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **aliens** in America." He said he would boost the ranks of enforcement agents to enforce existing laws. He vowed that any undocumented **immigrants** who are caught crossing into the US will be "detained until they are removed from our country" and sent back to their country of origin. And he promised to repeal President Barack Obama's executive orders shielding some younger undocumented people, including those born in the United States -- so called Dreamers, from deportation.

Fate of 11 million undocumented **immigrants** uncertain

Trump left the fate of most of the 11 million undocumented people who are not criminals in the country murky.

He did not commit to deporting every undocumented **immigrant** living in the US as he previously had, but vowed that **immigrants** living in the US illegally would never have a path to legal status under his presidency.

"For those here today illegally who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and only one route: to return home and apply for re-entry under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system."

But later, Trump said that once a new **immigration** system is in place, "we will be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those who remain."

In his speech, the billionaire repeatedly called attention to the crimes of some undocumented **immigrants** and drew on stories of Americans killed by undocumented **immigrants**, bringing parents of some of those victims on stage to share their graphic and heart-wrenching tales of loss.

Consistent with the law-and-order theme he has emphasized, Trump vowed a "zero tolerance" policy toward criminals living in the US illegally.

As he painted a picture of a country besieged by "illegal **alien**" crime, Trump accused Washington politicians and the media of underplaying the dangers posed by illegal **immigration** and warned voters that the stakes this election will never be higher.

"If we can save American lives, American jobs and American futures, together we can save America itself," Trump said.

A quieter Trump in Mexico

Trump's hard-line speech contrasted strikingly with his more moderate tone in Mexico City hours earlier when he put on a restrained and respectful performance, even as he publicly disagreed with President Enrique Peña Nieto, who had invited him and Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton to Mexico for talks.

The visit was an apparent attempt to portray Trump in a statesmanlike light and to counter Clinton's claims that he is temperamentally unfit to be President. Trump's campaign will likely be pleased that he got a photo-op with a foreign leader and appeared to avoid any damaging gaffes as he stood soberly on stage, beside an interpreter.

But the risks of such a visit -- Trump's first official encounter with a foreign leader -- were underscored when the stagecraft began to unravel over the issue of the wall on the Mexican border.

Trump had told reporters that he and his host did not discuss the cost of who would pay for the multibillion-dollar project -- a statement that the Mexican president did not contest while alongside Trump. But he quickly said on Twitter that the wall came up, and there was no way Mexico would be paying.

"At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall," Peña Nieto tweeted.

The confusion and apparent contradiction between the two men was quickly seized upon by the Clinton campaign, which mocked Trump, arguing the disconnect undercut his image as a great dealmaker.

"Trump just failed his first foreign test. Diplomacy isn't as easy as it looks. --H" Clinton said in a personally signed Tweet.

Jason Miller, Trump's senior communications adviser, called the meeting "the first part of the discussion and a relationship builder" between the two men.

"It was not a negotiation, and that would have been inappropriate. It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation," Miller said in a statement.

Peña Nieto twice stressed the "responsibility" he has to defend Mexican people around the world and said Trump has made "assertions that regrettably had hurt and have affected Mexicans."

"The Mexican people have felt hurt by the comments that have been made. But I am sure that his genuine interest is to build a relationship that will give both of our societies better welfare," Peña Nieto said.

The Clinton campaign also argued that Trump's performance in Mexico proved that his tough guy image was just an act.

"Donald Trump has made his outlandish policy of forcing Mexico to pay for his giant wall the centerpiece of his campaign. But at the first opportunity to make good on his offensive campaign promises, Trump choked," Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement.

"What we saw today from a man who claims to be the ultimate 'deal maker' is that he doesn't have the courage to advocate for his campaign promises when he's not in front of a friendly crowd," Podesta said, before accusing Trump of wanting to build a costly wall at American taxpayers' expense.

Podesta later added: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

But Trump was adamant in his speech in Arizona that Mexico would indeed finance the wall if he becomes President.

"Mexico will pay for the wall. 100 percent," Trump said.

"They don't know it yet, but they are going to pay for the wall."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WASHINGTON (CNN) -- Donald Trump vowed Wednesday "there will be no amnesty," -- making his case for a United States less hospitable to, and accessible for, undocumented **immigrants**.

But amid the hardline bluster, Trump didn't repeat his previous commitment to round up and deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants** already in the United States -- focusing instead on a narrower subset who have committed crimes within the country, and pointedly insisting those already here will have no path to citizenship.

In his highly anticipated speech in Phoenix, Trump embraced a hardline conservative position -- painting a bleak picture of the impact of **immigration**, rallying the Republican base and defending his signature proposal: a wall on the US-Mexico border. But the speech might have done little to appeal to the broader electorate -- especially suburban white voters who could be crucial on Election Day.

Here are the seven quotes that defined Trump's speech, and why they mattered:

"Anyone who is in the United States illegally is subject to deportation."

Trump repeatedly emphasized that his first focus would be deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the United States.

But the big question entering Wednesday night's speech was whether he'd stand by his calls for mass deportations -- including families that hadn't violated additional laws.

This was Trump's way of blurring the lines and shifting to a conventional hardline stance more consistent with his party's leaders on Capitol Hill. He suggested that undocumented **immigrants** who are caught will be deported -- with no exceptions -- but didn't directly call for actions that would lead to the mass deportations of all 11 million in the country. Instead, he made clear that their legal status would not change under his presidency.

"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 re-entry like everybody else under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined today," the Republican presidential nominee said.

"Mexico will pay for the wall. 100%. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for the wall."

Trump traveled to Mexico City and met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto earlier Wednesday -- but the two wound up telling different stories about their meeting. Trump told reporters they didn't discuss who would pay for the border wall he's proposing; Nieto tweeted that he told Trump Mexico wouldn't foot the bill.

It was clear Trump was trying to avoid attacking Mexicans generally, and keep his focus on undocumented **immigrants**. But he wasn't backing away from the proposal that has animated his campaign.

"They're great people, and great leaders," he said of Mexicans during his Phoenix speech, "but they're going to pay for the wall."

"Maybe they'll be able to deport her."

Trump's rhetoric would have fit right into the Republican primary. His speech was red meat for the GOP base -- exemplified by this joking suggestion that **immigration** officials boot Democratic rival Hillary Clinton from the country.

"It's our right as a sovereign nation to choose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us."

By asserting authority to pick and choose **immigrants**, Trump was defending some of his most controversial campaign proposals -- including a ban on Muslims, which he called for and has not yet disavowed, and a more targeted restriction on **immigrants** from countries that don't satisfy his vetting requirements.

"Within ICE I'm going to create a new special deportation task force."

Trump had previously called for a "deportation force." He wasn't backing away from that terminology on Wednesday night.

However, again, Trump shifted his emphasis -- saying those officers would work with local and state law enforcement officials to round up criminals immediately, rather than suggesting they'd boot all undocumented **immigrants**, regardless of their actions within the United States.

"If we can save American lives, American jobs and American futures, together we can save America itself."

**Immigration** has long been Trump's signature issue -- and he used the speech to pitch it as the most important one in 2016's presidential election, too.

He brought the parents of Americans slain by undocumented **immigrants** onto the stage, asking them to briefly tell their stories. And he cast **immigrants** as a primary reason workers -- including African-Americans and Latinos -- have struggled to find jobs.

"Anyone who tells you the core issue is the needs of those living here illegally has simply spent too much time in Washington."

Trump's calculation is that he needs the blue-collar worker in Ohio or Pennsylvania much more than the new Latino voter in Colorado or Arizona.

He made clear that he isn't concerned about the human impact of deporting undocumented **immigrants** -- including so-called "Dreamers," or those who were brought into the United States as children. Trump insisted he'd revoke President Barack Obama's executive actions allowing those **immigrants** to remain in the country.
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PHOENIX (CNN) -- Donald Trump on Wednesday stated clearly there would be "no amnesty" for undocumented **immigrants** living in the US, putting to rest questions about whether he was softening his stance on the issue that's driven much of his campaign.

"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 re-entry like everybody else under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined today," the Republican presidential nominee said.

He added: "There will be no amnesty."

"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," Trump said.

He did not commit to deporting every undocumented **immigrant** living in the US as he previously had, but vowed that **immigrants** living in the US illegally would never have a path to legal status under his presidency.

Trump's hardline speech on illegal **immigration** contrasted strikingly with his tone in Mexico hours earlier.

He vowed to deliver "the truth" about illegal **immigration** as he began to lay out his policy proposals to remedy the the US **immigration** system, which he argued "is worse than anybody ever realized."

"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," Trump said.

He added: "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 also pledged his administration would enforce a "zero tolerance" policy toward criminal undocumented **immigrants**.

"Day one, my first hour in office, those people are gone," Trump said of undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the US.

Trump vowed to create a "deportation task force" within the **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement division "focused on identifying and quickly removing the most dangerous criminal illegal **aliens** in America."

"Maybe they'll be able to deport her," Trump said, joking the task force could deport his Democratic rival, former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton.

Just hours after meeting with the Mexican president, Trump reasserted his pledge to build a wall along the US-Mexico border and force Mexico to pay for the wall.

"Mexico will pay for the wall. 100%. They don't know it yet but they're going to pay for the wall," Trump said as his supporters roared.

The wall, Trump said, will be "beautiful" and "impenetrable," and will include high-tech technologies to prevent illegal border crossings.

Trump also vowed that any undocumented **immigrants** who are caught crossing into the US will be "detained until they are removed from our country" and sent back to their country of origin.

The speech was expected to lay out a range of policy prescriptions to stem the tide of illegal **immigration** and follows a week during which Trump and his campaign publicly wrestled with how to handle the more than 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the US.

It's an especially fraught moment for the Republican nominee because he surged to victory in the primaries with hardline rhetoric against illegal **immigration**, including a pledge to deport all undocumented **immigrants**. But he appears poised to strike a more moderate tone that could appeal to suburban white voters in the general election without **alienating** his base.

Trump began his week of public handwringing on the issue by vowing last Monday that he was "not flip-flopping" on **immigration**, but that he was looking to "come up with a fair but firm process."

The next day, he told Fox News' Sean Hannity that "there could certainly be a softening" of his deportation policy and suggested his administration would "work with" undocumented **immigrants**, rather than deport them -- which would mark a major flip-flop. But two days later, he told CNN's Anderson Cooper that he would offer "no path to legalization" and suggested deportation was back on the table.

Meanwhile, his campaign scrapped plans for Trump to deliver his **immigration** speech last Thursday in the battleground state of Colorado and then dismissed reports Trump speak on **immigration** Wednesday in Phoenix, until Trump tweeted he would in fact deliver the speech there.

Democrats have seized on Trump's refusal to disavow his mass deportation plan, while Trump's most right-wing supporters have struggled to save face amid the real estate mogul's waffling. And some moderate Republicans have cautiously embraced Trump's apparent tone shift.

Trump did not tip his hand Wednesday as he spoke alongside Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto following their meeting.

Trump stressed the need to secure the US-Mexico border with a "physical wall," but did not signal whether he still favors deporting all undocumented **immigrants** living in the US.

Trump also said that while he discussed the need for a wall with the Mexican head of state, the two did not discuss payment.

"Who pays for the wall? We didn't discuss," Trump said in response to a volley of questions. "We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date."

Mexico's president disputed that assertion later Wednesday, tweeting that, "At the beginning of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall."

The Trump campaign remained tight-lipped on the content of the speech, but Trump's son, Donald Jr., said Tuesday on CNN that the speech won't address every aspect of Trump's **immigration** policy but that the campaign would "continue to lay things out in the coming weeks and months."

But any distance Trump takes from his proposal to deport all estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrations** via a "deportation force" would mark a major flip-flop on the very issue that drew many Trump supporters to the billionaire's brazen outsider candidacy.

"They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. Some, I assume, are good people," Trump said launching his candidacy last summer.

Within weeks, he was vowing to deport all undocumented **immigrants**.

"You're supposed to come in legally. I would get people out and I would have an expedited way of getting 'em back into the country so they can be legal," Trump told CNN's Dana Bash in July. "We will find them, we will get them out."

But it's possible Trump will glaze over the fate of the 11-plus million undocumented **immigrants** living in the US in his speech Wednesday despite hammering his bold plans to deport them all throughout the Republican primary -- a policy position that drew millions of Republican primary voters to his campaign and helped Trump cast his opponents as weak, ineffective and tied to the failures of Washington.

While rarely raising his deportation plans, Trump has consistently and vociferously pledged his commitment to building a border wall, leading his supporters in a boisterous call-and-response chant of "Who's going to pay for the wall?" to a resounding "Mexico!" That dialogue was, of course, noticeably absent from Trump's tête-a-tête with the Mexican president.

Trump's campaign surrogates in recent days have slammed the media for focusing on those 11 million people, instead touting Trump's commitment to first deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have committed crimes in the US and his plan to build a wall on the border with Mexico, and make that country pay for it.

And they have also rejected the notion that Trump is softening his stance -- despite Trump using that specific word last week.

"He wasn't softening on anything. He didn't change his stance on anything," Donald Trump, Jr. told Cooper on Monday, adding that Trump's policy on deportations has "been the same."

Former Texas Gov. Rick Perry asserted Monday on Fox News that "Donald Trump's not softening his position on **immigration**."

"I think there's a lot of talking heads that try to get, you know, 'I'll grab a word here, I'll grab a word there.' Donald Trump is going to secure that border," he said.

Trump's speech comes at a critical juncture for his candidacy, which has stared down deficits in every major national poll in the last month as well as in a slew of polls in key battleground states.

And in Arizona, a state Republican nominees carried in the last four presidential elections, Trump is only maintaining a slight polling lead over Clinton.

Sen. John McCain, who is supporting Trump's bid but has also publicly warred with Trump, will not attend Trump's speech Wednesday, which comes a day after McCain won his Senate primary election.

"Senator McCain is spending a much-deserved day off with his wife, Cindy, at their home in Sedona," a McCain aide told CNN on Wednesday.

Trump has sought to flip his fortunes by shaking up his campaign leadership -- ditching his campaign chairman Paul Manafort in favor of hiring a new campaign manager and chief executive -- and ramping up outreach to minority communities, notably African-Americans and Hispanics.

In doing so, Trump has argued that those minorities have been the most affected by undocumented workers taking low-wage jobs and by the crime Trump claims undocumented **immigrants** have contributed to society -- despite lacking the evidence to back up a connection between undocumented **immigrants**and higher crime rates.

Hispanic leaders and Republicans mindful of the party's need to draw in Hispanics to remain competitive in years to come have stressed the need for Trump to move beyond his deportation policy proposal and begin addressing other ways to deal with the undocumented population.

Asked whether "building the wall or doing something with the 11 million here illegally" was more important, Trump's new campaign manager Kellyanne Conway didn't hesitate.

"It's absolutely building the wall," she said.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Donald Trump on Wednesday stated clearly there would be "no amnesty" for undocumented **immigrants** living in the US, putting to rest questions about whether he was softening his stance on the issue that's driven much of his campaign. "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 re-entry like everybody else under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined today," the Republican presidential nominee said. He added: "There will be no amnesty." "People will know that you cant just smuggle in, hunker down and wait to be legalized -- it's not going to work that way. Those days are over," Trump said. The billionaire did not commit to deporting every undocumented **immigrant** living in the US as he previously had, but vowed that **immigrants** living in the US illegally would never have a path to legal status under his presidency.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**(CNN) -- Donald Trump's meetings often end the same way -- with two very different takeaways.

The billionaire businessman has a private conversation with a prominent figure. Afterward, the two sides offer vastly -- sometimes comically -- different versions of that interaction.

This routine has been on display throughout Trump's presidential campaign, and surfaced once again on Wednesday following the Republican presidential nominee's high-stakes meeting with Mexico's president, Enrique Peña Nieto. The two men appeared to make contradicting statements on whether their private meeting included a discussion about how Trump's proposed wall along the US-Mexico border would be paid for.

Trump's approach illustrates how the real estate mogul doesn't follow the normal rules of the political game -- a style that is no doubt popular with some of his supporters and has turned off plenty of others.

"He's the worst type of politician because he'll think he can buy his way into what he wants and says whatever he thinks the audience wants to hear," David McIntosh, president of the Club for Growth, told CNN last year. (Trump tweeted that McIntosh was "pathetic.")

Here are some examples of the war of words that have emerged after a meeting with Trump:

August 31, 2016: Meeting with Mexican President

Trump surprised the political world when he announced late Tuesday that he would travel to Mexico the next day to meet with the head of the country. Some of Trump's ideas and rhetoric -- including his famous proposal to build a wall along the US-Mexico border and his reference to some Mexicans as "rapists" and "criminals" -- have angered many Mexicans, making this last-minute meeting highly anticipated.

What they said:

"Al inicio de la conversación con Donald Trump dejé claro que México no pagará por el muro."

Translated: "At the start of the conversation with Donald Trump, I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall." (Peña Nieto on Twitter)

What Trump said:

"Who pays for the wall? We didn't discuss... We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date." (Trump at a joint news conference in Mexico City following his meeting with Peña Nieto)

September 1, 2015: Meeting with Javier Palomarez, CEO of the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce

Under fire from the Hispanic community for his tough rhetoric on **immigration**, Trump met privately in his New York office with Palomarez, discussing issues like **immigration**, the Hispanic electorate and the role of undocumented workers in the broader economy.

What they said:

"He jokingly said, 'I don't need the Hispanic vote.' He was talking about his ratings and how he's doing in the polls and arguing he's doing fantastically. But he was joking." (Palomarez to CNN after the meeting)

What Trump said:

"No, I never said you don't need the Hispanics. I think I'm going to win the Hispanics. I never said that." (Trump to CNN's Don Lemon after the meeting)

August 24, 2015: Meeting with Anthony Scaramucci, a national finance co-chairman for Scott Walker

Scaramucci, a hedge fund manager and high-profile Walker supporter, met with Trump at his office in July 2015 and expressed concern about some of the presidential candidate's rhetoric towards his industry. (Trump has recently railed that hedge fund managers pay too little in taxes).

What they said:

"We met. I explained to him I am a very loyal person and could never walk away from a friend like Scott Walker. It was clear. How the story came out like that only Mr. Trump can say." (Scaramucci to CNN at the time)

What Trump said:

"He wants to drop Walker and go with me. He wants to endorse me. He said, 'I want to drop Walker and endorse you.'" (Trump to the Wall Street Journal after the meeting)

July 8, 2015: Phone call with Reince Priebus, head of the Republican National Committee

The Washington Post reported in July 2015 that the head of the RNC spoke on the phone with Trump and that the two men discussed the candidate's controversial remarks about **immigration**.

What they said:

"The head of the Republican National Committee, responding to demands from increasingly worried party leaders, spent nearly an hour Wednesday on the phone with Donald Trump, urging the presidential candidate to tone down his inflammatory comments about **immigration** that have infuriated a key election constituency." (The Washington Post, citing "donors and consultants briefed on the conversation and confirmed by the RNC")

What Trump said:

"Totally false reporting on my call with @Reince Priebus. He called me, ten minutes, said I hit a "nerve", doing well, end!" (Trump on Twitter)

"He did say, 'You know, you could keep it down a little bit, but you can't change your personality and I understand that.' It was really a nice call, a congratulatory call." (Trump to CNN)

May 26, 2015: Meeting with David McIntosh, president of the Club for Growth

Earlier that year, the head of the conservative advocacy group met with the billionaire in his New York City office.

What Trump said:

"The president of the pathetic Club For Growth came to my office in N.Y.C. and asked for a ridiculous $1,000,000 contribution. I said no way! When I intelligently turned down The Club For Growth crazy request for $1,000,000, they got nasty. What a waste of money that would have been." (Trump on Twitter)

What they said:

"Actually @realDonaldTrump asked for that mtg & then asked for races he could support. Thought he could buy us off. Worst Kind of Politician" (Club for Growth on Twitter)

Editor's Note: This story has been updated to reflect more recent events
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