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Top of Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

In the meantime, however, much had changed.

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

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

The presidential race had also been altered.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**No matter what happens in Tuesday's presidential election, the candidacy of Donald Trump has been an absolute demographic disaster for the Republican Party.

Why? Because Trump is running historically poorly among Hispanic voters, according to a new Washington Post-Univision national poll. Hillary Clinton is winning 67 percent of Hispanic voters, compared with just 19 percent for Trump.

If Trump continues to get somewhere in the neighborhood of one of every five Hispanic votes, it would mark a new low for Republicans in that critical voting bloc. George W. Bush got 44 percent of the Hispanic vote in his 2004 reelection race. John McCain got 31 percent in 2008. Mitt Romney took 27 percent in 2012. That's, um, not a good trend.

Especially when every projection of where the country is headed shows the continuing decline of whites and the continued growth of the Hispanic population. According to projections by the Pew Research Center, whites will make up 46 percent of the U.S. population in 2065. Hispanics will be 24 percent at that time, while African Americans will make up 14 percent of the population. By comparison, 62 percent of the U.S. population in 2015 was white, while 18 percent was Hispanic and 12 percent was black.

Need a more real-world example? In 1984, Ronald Reagan won the white vote by 20 points - and the election with 525 electoral votes. In 2012, Romney matched Reagan's margin among white voters; he won just 206 electoral votes. In 1984, 86 percent of all votes were cast by whites; that number dipped to 72 percent in 2012 - and is projected to drop to 70 percent (or maybe even lower) on Tuesday.

In the wake of that 2012 loss - and the demographic problems it portended - the Republican National Committee issued an autopsy report that had one central recommendation: Find a way to pass some sort of comprehensive **immigration** reform or else. It read (emphasis mine):

"We are not a policy committee, but among the steps Republicans take in the Hispanic community and beyond, we must embrace and champion comprehensive **immigration** reform. If we do not, our Party's appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only. We also believe that comprehensive **immigration**reform is consistent with Republican economic policies that promote job growth and opportunity for all."

"Our Party's appeal will continue to shrink to its core constituencies only." Remember those words.

Instead of finding a way to get behind comprehensive reform, rank-and-file Republicans killed even the consideration of such a bill - even after it had passed the Senate. And then the party chose Trump as its presidential nominee.

That's the same Trump who rose to prominence within the Republican Party on a pledge to build a wall on our southern border and make Mexico pay for it. And the same candidate who has openly embraced the sort of grievance politics that led him to, among other things, question whether a judge of Mexican heritage was fit to oversee a case regarding Trump University and to propose a temporary ban on Muslims entering the country.

In short: It's hard to conceive of a candidate who would run more contrary to the party's stated goal of expanding its coalition than Trump. Actually, it's not hard. It's impossible.

What Republican strategists are desperately hoping is that Hispanics will view Trump as an outlier, an isolated case who does not represent the broader views of the GOP. Again, the Post-Univision poll suggests that may be a false hope.

Seventy-six percent of likely Hispanic voters have an unfavorable view of Trump; 66 percent hold that same unfavorable view of the broader Republican Party. Those numbers compare horribly with the way Latino voters regard the Democratic Party: 71 percent have a favorable opinion, compared with 24 percent who have a negative one.

Yes, Hispanics view Trump more unfavorably than they view the Republican Party as a whole. But two-thirds of Hispanic voters have an unfavorable opinion of the Republican Party, and that is still disastrously bad. Those numbers suggest that Trump is not being viewed as something separate from the GOP and that the negative way Hispanics view him is rubbing off on the party he represents.

To go back to where I started: Yes, it is still possible that Trump could win the 270 electoral votes he needs to be president on Tuesday. (The white vote will still make up about 7 in 10 voters in this election.)

But, win or lose, Trump has set back his party among Hispanic voters in ways that may well be irreversible in the near to medium term. The current composition of the Republican Party's electorate is a winner for 1984. It's a near-certain loser for 2024 and beyond.

chris.cillizza@washpost.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

robert.samuels@washpost.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Pittsburgh

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

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

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

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

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

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

"The Trump wall isn't going to give me a job," he said. "Donald Trump doesn't make it better."

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

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

Somerset

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Carlisle

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Newtown

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

"Right?"

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

robert.costa@washpost.com

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

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

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

With the modest exceptions of a handful of advisory neighborhood commissioners and Franklin Garcia, who serves as the District's unofficial "shadow representative" in Congress, the city has never elected a Latino to local office.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

peter.jamison@washpost.com

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

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

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

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

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

They also were the real America.

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

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

They were the real America.

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

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

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

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

To me, that is America too.

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

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

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

fredhiatt@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BAR ELIAS, Lebanon - Samar Hijazi stood in front of the judge of the Sunni sharia court in this Bekaa Valley village last month as he addressed her in rapid-fire bursts from behind an imposing desk.

"This is against God's will," he said. "If you divorce, you'll have problems with your children. God will be against you. God won't bless you. Will you reconsider?"

"No," she said firmly.

The judge pronounced her divorced. Just like that, Hijazi, 45, was freed from a 33-year marriage to a man she described as abusive and domineering. The **refugee** from Syria's war had long wished for such an ending, but it had never seemed possible in her old life. That changed when the family fled to Lebanon two years ago. With shelter and food provided by aid organizations, she was less dependent on her husband. And as she began making decisions for the family and venturing out of the house alone, she felt, for the first time, self-sufficient.

When her husband delivered a beating that left bruises all over her body, she decided she had suffered enough.

"In Syria, because of the family and social pressure, I submitted to him," she said. "But here, the circumstances we've passed through made me stronger. Here, I feel independent."

For some Syrian women living in Lebanon, the bitter realities of life as a **refugee** have nourished an unexpected side effect: empowerment. Difficult economic and legal circumstances have pushed women to take on more responsibilities within their families, including many that were once a man's domain. Uprooted from some familiar social constraints and exposed to programs promoting women's rights through contact with aid groups, some of them have obtained a degree of personal autonomy they never experienced in Syria.

More than a million Syrian **refugees** live in Lebanon, seeking **refuge** from a war that has raged for more than four years. Amid fears that the influx would overwhelm the fragile country, in 2014 the government began requiring visas for arriving Syrians. Last year, it introduced stringent residency requirements that made obtaining legal status impossible for many of them. That has sharply restricted mobility - and the ability to work - for men, who are more at risk of arrest for undocumented status than women.

As a result, the women shoulder much of the burden of taking care of the family. It is an enormous shift for those who in Syria never left their houses without a male relative.

"Many of these women come from conservative societies where men do everything and women stay at home," said Nibal Al Alow, senior social counselor at Basmeh and Zeitooneh, an organization founded by Syrian expatriates that works with Syrian **refugees** in Lebanon. "Now they have to register the children in school, buy the food, take children to the doctor and take care of everything. Women have taken on larger roles."

Increasingly, that means women are working outside the home. The resulting economic empowerment is a major catalyst for change, giving women more say in decisions such as how the family spends its money or whether to send children to school.

For Um Mohamed, a 28-year-old mother of two, moving to Lebanon opened a door to the world beyond her home. In Syria, she rarely left the house, and never by herself. Her husband shopped for food, and she stayed home to cook and take care of the children. But in Lebanon, he doesn't work, and she takes a minibus to a women's empowerment center run by the Amel Association aid group in a Beirut suburb to learn how to make jewelry and decorative wall hangings that sell for small sums.

"In the beginning, my husband didn't want me to come here, and he tried to convince me not to," said Um Mohamed, who asked that her full name not be used for fear of angering her husband. But she prevailed, partly because of their difficult financial situation.

"I'm happy about it. I feel I can come and go as I like," she said, a smile creasing her lightly freckled face.

She now dreams about opening her own business when she eventually returns to Syria.

Yet as in Um Mohamed's case, the increased freedom for women often stems from the disempowerment of men. Many Syrian men say they feel ashamed of being unable to provide for their families and allowing their wives to work while they sit at home.

"When you talk about what is being a man [in Syrian society], it's the person who is responsible for the family, who provides the money and the house," said Gisele Abichahine, a psychotherapist who works at the Men Center run by Abaad, a civil society organization focused on gender equality.

When they can't provide these things, she said, some channel the resulting fear and frustration into physical violence against their wives and children - a widespread problem among Syrian **refugees** in Lebanon, according to aid groups. Empowering women can make it worse.

And not all women have experienced progress in Lebanon. For those who came from less conservative families in urban areas of Syria, the move can restrict their freedom, said Maria Assi, director of Beyond Association, which works with **refugees**. Girls and women who may have gone out freely at home are now kept inside by fathers and husbands afraid for their safety here or constrained by new neighbors from more conservative areas.

Still, for many women, the change has been significant. Hijazi was married at age 12 and bore six children in quick succession. They all lived under the thumb of her husband, who she said didn't allow her to leave their home in a Damascus suburb without him. She said he beat her and the children. When she fled to her parents' house, they sent her back.

The first time she stood up to her husband was when she demanded the family leave Syria in 2014. Their home had been bombed, and destruction followed them everywhere they fled. One son was detained at a government checkpoint and never heard from again, and two sons-in-law were killed in airstrikes, leaving seven grandchildren fatherless. Hijazi insisted it was time to leave, despite her husband's opposition.

"He was behaving like he was God, controlling my life," she said. "And when I took this decision, that's the first point I started feeling independent from him."

Now she lives in a spare and tidy prefabricated structure in a dusty **refugee** camp in Lebanon's Bekaa Valley. A small bed is pushed against the wall in the corner, and a brown flowered curtain hides shelves neatly piled with clothes and suitcases. It's small, but it's hers, and it's safe.

At her age, Hijazi is unlikely to remarry. But even if she did, she said, she would never accept a husband who restricted her freedom.

"I want to prove to myself that I exist and I am on my own, and to be free," she said.

foreign@washpost.com

Suzan Haidamous in Bar Elias contributed to this report. The reporting was supported by the International Women's Media Foundation Reporting Grants for Women's Stories Initiative.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL PASO - On Wednesday, shortly after El Paso County broke its record for early voting, Andres Villalobos walked into the downtown courthouse and cast a ballot for "Mrs. Clinton and the Democrats." He was 65 years old and had earned American citizenship after years of crossing back and forth across the Mexican border, a few blocks away.

But he had never voted before. Nothing had compelled him to vote until Donald Trump ran for president. If Trump won the presidency, he predicted the absolute worst.

"Maybe chaos," he said. "It would be ugly - very, very bad for the economy, for the city, for everyone. It would be bad for the border. It wouldn't work."

Leonardo Wong, 71, was also casting his first vote. He had registered while renewing the passport that let him walk back and forth across the border, and he had gotten behind Hillary Clinton.

"I don't think everybody's a rapist and everybody's a narco like Trump says," Wong said, referring to Trump's claims that many Mexicans crossing into the United States are violent criminals.

Texas is expected to go Republican this year, as it has in every presidential election since 1980. At Trump's lowest point, when he was buried by his own gaffes and debate performances, the state closed to single digits in polling; the latest polls have him leading by closer to 10 points.

But Democrats have watched a turnout surge wash over the state's most urban, least white areas. In 10 days of early voting, more than 115,000 ballots were cast in El Paso County, blowing past the record set in 2008. Turnout was up by 64 percent over 2012; it was up by close to 40 percent around Houston, Dallas, Austin and San Antonio.

Turnout has also grown in the deep red suburbs, but in El Paso, Democrats are no longer struggling to get their voters to the polls. According to We(Fillintheblank), a student-run political group that conducts the area's only exit polling, Clinton is on track to win 71 percent of the vote in El Paso, better than any Democrat since the Texas Republican Party became competitive.

The Trump candidacy has challenged a Republican project that had succeeded in Texas more than in any state - a coalition between conservative whites and culturally conservative Latino voters. Republicans, who have controlled every statewide office here since 1998, have won supermajorities of white voters and courted enough Latino votes to make the Democratic Party irrelevant.

It was supposed to show Republicans the way to a one-party future. In 1998, during a reelection campaign designed to prove his appeal to voters beyond Texas, then-Gov. George W. Bush campaigned hard in the Rio Grande Valley and El Paso. "I want it to be known that a conservative candidate can carry the Hispanic vote," he told reporters.

He did so, and won El Paso, a feat he did not repeat in his campaigns for president. In Bush's wake, even as the national party abandoned **immigration** reform, Democrats struggled to activate Latinos in Texas the way that they had in California, or Arizona, or the Midwestern states where there were more recent **immigrants**.

The struggle won national attention - the bad kind - in 2014. Battleground Texas, a political action committee created by Obama-campaign veterans, was launched on the theory that early spending and organizing could activate a slumbering nonwhite vote. "Texas isn't as red of a state as people say it is, if you look at the numbers," senior adviser Jeremy Bird said at the launch event.

The numbers did not change. Republican Greg Abbott, elected governor in a landslide two years ago, out-campaigned Democrat Wendy Davis with Latinos. Ads in the Rio Grande Valley played up Abbott's marriage to a Mexican American. Turnout in El Paso fell by more than half of its 2012 total, allowing now-Rep. Will Hurd (R-Tex.) to flip a House seat that Democrats had considered safe.

Then came Trump. Some Texas Republicans had been edging toward his rhetoric, away from the Bush approach. Dan Patrick, the lieutenant governor elected in 2014, did not sound different from Trump on the border, or when he crusaded against college tuition for undocumented **immigrants** in Texas. But voter awareness of Patrick was minimal; Trump blotted out the sun. Rep. Beto O'Rourke (D-Tex.), who in 2012 defeated an incumbent who had relied on the teetering Democratic machine, had never encountered a line for early voting. The line was 45 minutes long this year.

"There wasn't even a whole lot that someone like me needed to do to encourage that," O'Rourke said. "Finally, there was a very clear reason to vote."

In the summer, El Paso County Judge Veronica Escobar began to notice that people who crowded into the semiannual citizenship ceremonies dashed across the courthouse to get registered to vote.

"I think everyone understands how closely tied we are to Mexico," Escobar said, sitting in her office near one of the voting sites. "We lived through the devaluation of the peso, and when it happened, our economy was devastated. Insulting our most important economic partner and wanting to isolate it from us - most people here realize there'd be an economic price, and we would pay it."

The border described by Trump simply did not resemble the one many El Pasoans see. The Republican nominee was not wrong about the drug wars in Ciudad Juarez or the smugglers constantly changing their tactics to get opium and meth into the United States. But El Paso is growing. Unemployment is sinking. Thanks in large part to a policing buildup on the border, someone in Dallas or Houston was twice as likely to be a victim of violent crime. What was Trump talking about?

"He's an embarrassment," said Ana Morales, 31, a victims advocate who works with noncitizens and frets about how a Trump presidency would affect them. "I think he would put up a lot of barriers. There are very vulnerable people who would be hurt by him."

Said Edna Ortega, 42: "It would be like East Berlin. He would bring in an authoritarian type of government - very racist."

Republicans, who do not need El Paso to win the state, said that Trump's impact would be overrated. On Thursday, the local Republican Party headquarters was quiet but active. One volunteer made calls, near signs that advertised the summer social-media campaign to bring Trump to El Paso. (He never came.) Adolpho Telles, the county chairman, insisted that plenty of Democrats were quietly telling him that they would buck the tide and vote for Trump.

"People don't necessarily like the fence idea, the wall idea, whatever you want to call it," he said. "But when the cameras are off, they will tell you: They don't believe in illegal **immigration**. They do believe in securing the border."

In dozens of interviews at the polls, Trump supporters were happy to talk. None said that they were voting Republican because of Trump's **immigration** policy. Mike and Destiny Tipton, 32 and 34, said Clinton's record at the State Department put them off.

"These email things never seem to go away," said Mike Tipton, referring to a later-retracted Fox News report that Clinton risked indictment.

"I'm disappointed with her over the whole Benghazi thing," Destiny Tipton said.

Those sentiments were usually outweighed by genuine terror of Trump - and often admiration for Clinton. Some voters who spoke only Spanish talked about a hypothetical Trump presidency the way that tea party conservatives once discussed President Obama's reelection - a world-shattering event, the end of America as they knew it. At a polling station inside the Bassett Place mall, the Thursday lunch hour found a steady stream of voters entering, filling out their ballots quickly and exiting to explain why they had voted for Clinton.

Frank Noriega, 72, accompanied his wife as she voted for Clinton, then stayed behind to finish some errands. He had long ago decided to oppose Trump. The mystery, to him, was why more people didn't seem to trust Clinton.

"She's out there with regular public. She talks to them," he said. "For all the stuff that's come out, they've never proven she did anything wrong. If they had the proof, she couldn't be running."

david.weigel@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At long last, Americans get to decide. More than usual, most people don't like their choices. More than usual, many Americans believe that people who don't agree with them are not only wrong but are also best avoided.

On the eve of the election, America is afraid. People talk about buying guns to protect themselves from troubles to come. They talk about places they steer clear of and people they don't talk to anymore. Casual conversations have blown up into hurtful arguments. Friends vanish from Facebook feeds. People who used to put up yard signs don't for fear of what their neighbors might do. And people who thought things were improving, in their own lives and in their communities, wonder whether they missed the real story, a darker tale of division and despair.

But America is also what it's always been, a green field of possibility, a place where people relish rogues and truth-tellers, and a place where being appalled by politicians is part of the deal, something that can even bring people together.

Only eight years after millions of Americans poured into the streets in spontaneous, joyful celebration of the election of the nation's first black president, optimism seems to have been sucked out of the country's marrow, replaced by a heavy anxiety, a sense that things aren't right and can't easily be fixed.

The candidates for president have made it harder to be optimistic, many Americans say. One candidate said things were so bad that only he could make America great again. The other asked people to consider that the country would be stronger together. But neither captured the hearts or hopes of any broad cross-section of the people. Neither offered any grand idea for a more secure, happier future. There was no New Deal, no Great Society, no Thousand Points of Light.

Yet in the final hours before the vote, Americans remain bullish about their prospects, eager to keep plugging, for themselves and their children. In interviews across the country, whether they're voting for Donald Trump, Hillary Clinton, anyone but them or no one at all, Americans almost uniformly say that the politicians are clueless but that the people will eventually do what needs getting done.

Melinda Powers opens the heavy door of the industrial oven and carefully removes a fragrant, steaming apple crisp. She inspects it meticulously. At 19, she dreams of opening a bakery. She worries that this election is her obstacle.

To get from the culinary studies program at Newbury College in Brookline, Mass., to a business of her own, Powers expects she'll need her parents' help. But they're fighting over politics right now, and it's bad enough that Powers could see them breaking up, which would probably nix her bakery plan.

Powers's parents met at Winchester Repeating Arms - an Irish American guy who produced gun parts and an **immigrant** woman from Cape Verde who inspected guns. They fell in love on the shop floor.

But the election has driven a wedge between them. He's for Trump; she's for Clinton. "My dad jokingly brings it up all the time," Powers said, "but my mom doesn't think it's funny at all. Trump offends everything she's ever worked for."

Powers's mother is so disturbed by the racism and anti-**immigrant** sentiment she's seen this year that she sometimes threatens to move back to Cape Verde if Trump wins. "My dad obviously doesn't want to leave his Harley-Davidson buddies behind and move to a foreign country where he doesn't speak the language," his daughter said.

The campaign has also divided Powers from her old friends from Blue Hill Regional Technical High School in Randolph. Most of those friends are white, and all but one support Trump. "My white friends think they can say racial stuff more than they used to," Powers said. "They use the n-word a lot more now. ... There is more hate directed toward other races and toward **immigrants**."

Powers is still an optimist; no matter who wins, she will work hard to achieve her dreams. She says she still believes America is the greatest country. But she'd thought the battles over racism "were fought for me long ago," and now she sees a hate that masquerades as humor. "We can be driving somewhere," she said, "and they'll be like, 'Melinda, sit in the back.' Then they'll laugh. After a while, you do feel slightly left out, because at the end of the day, we are not all the same. I am the different one."

Optimism, perhaps the most exceptional of American traits, is down. A Washington Post-ABC News poll found earlier in the fall campaign that 42 percent of Americans were bullish about the next year, the lowest number since 2004, the first national election after the terrorist attacks on Sept. 11, 2001.

Yet here was Sheila Rushing, 67, knocking on doors, even on doors of houses that looked empty, with boards slanting over the windows. Rushing had avoided politics for years, a job requirement: The work that got her through divorce, at the Detroit museum of African American history, was a nonprofit, limiting her political activity. But when she retired, she canvassed for the first black president and now for Hillary Clinton.

"I'm doing great," she said. "Glad and blessed. Glad that the Lord woke me up."

Rushing, like many Detroiters, was offended when Trump declared that black Americans were living in "hell." The past eight years were no hell. She had raised her grandson, Armando, after his father died when the boy was 14. He turned 26 on Halloween, and Rushing had helped him through high school and on to Wayne State University to get his degree in criminal justice. And now he's working. Rushing took pride in her own ability to pay off her home note, and she thanked Obama for the bigger Pell grants that got Armando through school.

Rushing learned this fall not to broach the subject of politics with some friends. It was too raw. Still, she knocked on another door. The home was empty but not abandoned. She left a flier with a picture of Clinton and Obama deep in conversation in the Oval Office. "Protect his legacy," it read.

Nearly half of Americans - 45 percent in a Post-ABC poll in September - believe the United States is "less great" than it has been in the past; 37 percent said it is about the same; and 16 percent said it is greater. The idea that the country has grown less great is much more common among Trump supporters (77 percent) than among Clinton backers (21 percent).

Through the years, pessimism about the country's direction has been stronger among supporters of the party that's out of power. In 2008, as the economy weakened and the war in Iraq dragged on, an NBC-Wall Street Journal poll found that 77 percent of Obama supporters said the nation was in a "state of decline," compared with 57 percent of those backing the Republican, John McCain.

Tony Kadlcek first came to the United States from Czechoslovakia in 1990, soon after the revolution against his country's communist regime. His uncle invited him to visit, and while in Chicago, Kadlcek met the woman who would become his wife. The next year, Kadlcek legally migrated to the United States to be with her. He got a job with the commercial HVAC business that his wife's family owned. He still works there.

But 12 years ago, the couple moved farther from Chicago, to Lisle, a suburb to the city's southwest, because of corruption and crime, he said. Now he drives through Chicago, sees dilapidated buildings and worries about crime. "There were 17 murders" over one October weekend, he said. "Obama promised to be a uniter, but it seems like he divided us. People hate cops; blacks and whites seem more separate now."

Kadlcek, 47, likes his life; he has four kids, makes a good living and owns his own home as well as a six-apartment building that he rents out. But the building's value has not recovered since the economic crisis, and he partly blames Obama. He and his wife, a legal secretary, are fed up with high taxes, debt, corruption and illegal **immigration**. When their kids go to college, they might move to Wisconsin or Indiana. Frustrated about what's happened to the country, he worries about a crackdown on guns; he recently bought an "expensive rifle, so that if Hillary wins I'll be grandfathered in." He likes Trump's slogan, Make America Great Again, because it admits the country has gone downhill.

But Kadlcek isn't advertising his support for Trump. In years past, he put bumper stickers on his Cutlass Supreme, going back to Dole-Kemp in 1996. Not this time: "People are afraid if you have a Trump sticker on your car or a Hillary sticker, someone will key it."

Mae and Daniel Harrison are riveted to the campaign news - well, she is. He can take only so much. Both of them have seen the campaign eat away at relationships. They've argued with fellow shoppers in grocery lines. They avoid Trump supporters. And for the first time in many years, they've felt unwelcome in some places.

"We are fearful of going too far away from home because of what we see," Mae said.

The campaign is all the 74-year-old retired United Methodist pastor talks about these days. When her girlfriends call, she can't help but get into the emails. After a pastor friend from Texas phoned and declared she'd be voting for Trump, Harrison held her tongue. She hasn't called back. Not until after the election.

The Harrisons, who live in Fort Washington in Prince George's County, Md., read the paper, then have the TV on much of the day, CNN and MSNBC mostly. It's Trump and Clinton, and Trump, and Trump. Mae listens as she flits about the house. Daniel sometimes rebels.

"Cut that off, Mae," he tells his wife. "I don't like the sound of his voice."

Watch Netflix instead, he says. Sometimes, she does. But come 6 p.m., the temptation is too much, and she puts the news back on. Daniel gives up and goes upstairs to the computer or to watch a game show.

Daniel, 78, a retired microbiologist, grew up in Louisiana. Mae, a former teacher, came from North Carolina. For two accomplished African Americans from the South, Trump has unearthed a past they thought they had left behind when they moved to a prosperous, majority-black county in the shadow of Washington.

Now, the name-calling and bullying of the campaign has them wondering whether the old hatreds had only gone dormant. At a restaurant in Virginia, a group of bikers stared them down. At the supermarket, Daniel argued with a man who couldn't see how Trump was bringing out hatred. At a church event, Mae sat well away from a black woman who said supportive things about Trump.

She can't stop thinking, even if Clinton wins, what will the backlash look like? How long does this last? When does the healing begin?

Healing is normally the last thing Brent Beaupre thinks about around the family campfire in Kennebunk, Maine. On sweet summer nights, with three generations gathered, all should be copacetic. But one night this summer, Beaupre's grandmother turned to him and asked, "You're not going to vote for her, are you?"

"Oh, but I am," Beaupre said. He tried to explain himself. And then his grandmother turned to him again and said, "But you're not going to vote for her, are you?"

They went at it. "Can't you see how crazy he is?" Beaupre said.

"Yeah, but she's the biggest criminal ever," his grandmother replied.

"It's like talking to a wall," Beaupre said. "I love these people to death, but there's nothing that permeates."

He's 21, and this will be his first vote, and what he sees is utter **alienation** of each side from the other. "With the Romney-Obama cycle, you had two incredible intellects who very much knew their subjects," he said. "It was about the defense of our country. It was about the national deficit - real topics. I feel in this election cycle it's about sensationalism, whatever grabs the media."

With his stylish leather shoes and blue Oxford shirt, Beaupre moves with professional efficiency through the sea of denim and sweatshirts on the campus of Suffolk University in Boston. An honors student with a major in finance and a minor in big data, he has been offered a job upon graduation with a major bank.

"I'm a gay man who wants to work in financial services who comes from a conservative household and now lives in a very liberal city," he said. "It's a constant back and forth."

The first in his family to attend college, he's nonetheless worried about the future. "My friends entering the industry have been told point-blank that we should be wary of the economic situation we're in," Beaupre said. "If the economy doesn't do well, our jobs are going to disappear. Everybody's waiting for this election; everything is on hold."

Business is good for Ryan Snyder. Life is good, too, even if good does mean 12-hour workdays, seven days a week.

Snyder, 33, puts those hours into a little country breakfast-and-lunch spot in Goochland, Va. He bought Satterwhite's Restaurant from his father in January. The place sits at a rural crossroads that's unlikely to stay rural. Four miles away, the Richmond suburbs stretch out - a Whole Foods, a glitzy mall, and, if electric car guru Elon Musk gets his way with state officials, soon a showroom for six-figure Teslas.

For now, Satterwhite's sticks to what it has always been. The menu sticks to old favorites, such as salt herring with biscuits or toast for $7.85. Snyder thinks about adding a few items. Nothing fancy. "If it's not broke," he figures, "don't fix it."

He does think Washington is broken. Congress can't get anything done, and the federal government "gets too involved in a lot of things." And now this unacceptable choice. "I don't think I've heard anyone say, 'I like Hillary' or 'I like Trump,'" Snyder said.

He "can't stand Hillary. I think she's a liar," he said. "And Trump is Trump. You can't go to world leaders and just run your mouth." He won't vote for Clinton. Maybe Trump or Gary Johnson, though he knows the Libertarian Party nominee has no chance. Snyder and his wife have stopped talking about the election; Brittany thinks Trump is a misogynist. Ryan doesn't disagree; he just mistrusts Clinton more.

He expects little from whoever wins. But he remains upbeat about his own prospects. He and Brittany expect their first child in February. In September, they bought their first house, a brick rancher near a big dairy farm, 10 minutes from work.

Things look good outside the restaurant, too. New shopping centers, office parks and housing have gobbled up farmland and attracted more diverse residents. A Hindu cultural center and temple popped up about a mile away.

Some Satterwhite's regulars grumble about the new development, but Snyder likes it fine: "It'll do nothing but increase my business." New development means new people, some of them new to America. Snyder is concerned about terrorists, but he doesn't think it makes sense morally or economically to turn everyone away.

He figures the people at the new Hindu center are "educated and ready to work," he said. "How do you turn that away? We're all **immigrants** in this country, so you can't shut the borders down."

For many **immigrants**, there is a special urgency to this election, because of Trump's harsh rhetoric about keeping out Mexicans and Muslims, and because there have been so many deportations, with the prospect of many more.

As the sun set Wednesday night, Rosa Rosales walked the bridge from Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, to El Paso eating from a cup of corn and chilis. She paid her 50 cents to reenter the United States, and she was home, where she is a citizen. She had gone across the border to get her medicine.

The politicians fight forever about **immigration**, and Rosales walks the bridge. They fight forever about health care, and Rosales walks the bridge.

A home care nurse, she has no use for Trump or Clinton. She voted early, writing in her senator, Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), mostly because he agreed with her that Obamacare is no good. Too expensive, and it's wrong to punish people who lack insurance, she said.

She supported Obama eight years ago, but when she needs simple care, she crosses the border. If she has something big, like the kidney stone that bedeviled her a few years back, she stays in Texas.

She fears Trump. "He's a racist; he's rude," Rosales said. "He has a lack of respect for women. I'm a Mexican, and I think he will do something against Mexican people."

Rosales crossed the marker between the United States and Mexico and let out a little cheer. She had her dinner and her medicine, and she was okay.

Halfway across the southern edge of the country, Rafael Marin is secretly obsessed with the election. Patrons come into his downtown Miami shop, Richard's Fruit Center, for fresh fruit and smoothies. Marin, 59, plays '80s pop on the radio - no political talk shows. He likes to keep the vibe cheerful and positive.

In the city's busy working-class hub, people hang out drinking Cuban coffee, arguing about the election. But in Marin's shop, he tries to keep things peaceful. He hears "Ugh, those emails?" and he pivots to "Can I get you anything else?"

The rest of the country could learn a lot from downtown Miami, he said: "We all live together, and our language is a mixed language - Spanish, English, all used together ... a beautiful thing." Son of a Puerto Rican father and a Jewish mother, Marin lives in a city where nearly everyone is an **immigrant** of some sort, coming here from somewhere else. So Marin doesn't get Trump, doesn't want America to be seen as unwelcoming. Marin likes Clinton, marvels at her ability to withstand attacks and investigations.

Whatever happens, he said: "America will be fine; it rises and it falls like the waves. We owe some money, so what? Our credit is good, and we get to live here, in America."

A customer asks in Spanish whether raspberries, pineapple and ginger make a good smoothie. Marin nods in approval. Any blend is a good blend.

A thousand miles to the north, in Barstow, Va., Lynda Trinh Frank recalled the night four decades ago when her family left Saigon and piled into a lifeboat. Frank's mother lined up her six kids and told them they could each take one bag. Frank packed her toothbrush, pajamas and Smurf comic books. Six years later, after time in a **refugee** camp in Arkansas, her family was naturalized and living in Richmond, and Frank renamed herself after Lynda Carter, TV's "Wonder Woman."

Now 50, Frank wonders whether her five half-Vietnamese, half-Caucasian children "will have the same country that we hoped to live in when we came here." She left her job as a telecom consultant with a six-figure salary to be a full-time mom. "I'm here," she said. "I help shape my children." Her kitchen is decorated with children's artwork, Bible verses, and portraits of saints and Jesus.

Frank has instilled antiabortion values in her children from early on. Her youngest daughter, staying home from parochial school with a broken arm, whines; her arm itches and she's bored.

"Could you offer your suffering for the babies?" Frank asks.

"So they won't get killed, Mom?" the 7-year-old replies.

"Exactly," Frank says.

She wants leaders who will reject abortion and lower taxes. She has helped put up Trump-Pence signs. She likes Trump's hard stance against illegal **immigration**and applauds his evolution into antiabortion beliefs.

She worries that America no longer reflects her family's values. "The last eight years, instead of empowering people, it's 'gimme, gimme, gimme,'" she said. "Everything is a race issue. Look, I'm an Asian. I'm ethnic. I'm a minority. I don't say, 'You need to give me a job because I'm Asian and a woman.' No."

Carol Blaser sits in her Ford Mustang in the lot outside the hair salon where she works in Ann Arbor, Mich. She downs a McDonald's cheeseburger, worrying not about the election, but about her son, about his illness - one that, as she said, "nobody runs a 5k for."

Her adult son is mentally ill, in and out of the justice system, 31 now, doing better with good medication. But she frets about him when her clients go on like the talking heads on cable news, yammering about "low-information voters" and "the Paul Ryan effect."

Earlier that day, while cutting the hair of a homebound customer at his townhouse, the man's wife came into the living room to demonstrate their lifelong Democratic support by showing off a vintage 1990s T-shirt that read, "Support Hillary's Husband." "I wish I was that sure," Blaser, 58, said later. "One day I wake up and think I'm going to vote one way; one day I wake up and think I'm going to vote another."

Blaser hasn't spent the past year glued to the TV and Facebook following the twists and turns. She's been too busy with life. Two of her kids got married. Her daughter came out as a lesbian. Her 30-year-old's three kids had birthdays in October.

And she's leaving Delia's Salon, where she has rented a chair for 16 years, because Delia raised the rent by $30, to $230 a week.

Her neighborhood is dotted with Trump-Pence yard signs, and she considers herself conservative, but she voted for Obama twice after going for Republicans Bob Dole and George W. Bush. From what she can glean, Trump is an "idiot about a lot of things," but Clinton is "a conniving little b---h."

"I'm leaning towards Hillary just because she's the least evil, but I don't know if she's evil or not," she said. "I don't know! Do any of us really know what goes on, what they go through?"

Her absentee ballot sits on her counter, "and I keep walking by it and looking at it. I want to fill it out and get it away from me, but I don't know what to do. This damn election."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON - In the seaside cafes of Beirut, the whole thing looks "like a bad joke." To persecuted journalists in Burundi, it amounts to "a total loss of dignity." The government-scripted press of Beijing diagnoses "an empire moving downhill." And the spin doctors of the Kremlin see cause for pure and unambiguous delight.

The U.S. presidential election - America's quadrennial chance to showcase for the world how democracy works in the most powerful nation on Earth - has become instead an object lesson in everything that ails a country long seen as a beacon of freedom and hope.

Debates devoid of issues and deep in the gutter of personal insult. Interference from foreign intelligence services. Endless leaked emails, and FBI investigations that could extend long beyond Tuesday.

Americans may cringe watching their own election at close range. But the world's reaction has been, in a sense, even more poignant and foreboding.

People in small and distant countries who count on the United States to stand up for democratic values have been astonished to see the essential components - a free press, the rule of law, respect for the outcome of elections - trammeled.

Long-standing allies have been left to wonder whether the essential American character has changed, and whether the United States can be relied on when it counts.

Adversaries have looked on with glee, surprised at how easily the country that casts itself as the greatest can be knocked off kilter.

And even though the campaign still has days to go - with the outcome very much in doubt - the damage to American moral standing may already be done.

"I heard the election is being controlled by Russia. Is it true?" asked Anas al-Abed, 27, a Beirut cafe worker who said he has been following the campaign closely ever since he read that the Republican nominee, Donald Trump, had bragged about assaulting women.

"America always spoke to Arab countries as if they had so much to learn," he said. "And now we see their own democracy involves choosing between a woman from a dynasty and a man who says the system is manipulated. If that's democracy, then we don't want it."

This is not the first time that America's international reputation has been dealt a grievous blow. In recent years, the Iraq War brought global perceptions of the United States tumbling, only to be revived by the election of President Obama - who remains broadly popular overseas.

But political analysts worldwide said that never before have they seen a presidential campaign do so much to directly undermine America's core credibility.

"It's very shocking and disturbing to see this happening on such a scale in the richest country on Earth," said Koichi Nakano, a political-science professor at Sophia University in Tokyo.

It is not, of course, happening in a vacuum. Democracies from Southeast Asia to Western Europe are under pressure from within as populism and xenophobia surge. Autocrats from Moscow to the Middle East, meanwhile, are feeling emboldened.

"It isn't just about this election," said Jacob Parakilas, deputy head of the U.S. and Americas program at the London-based think tank Chatham House. "It fits into a broader framework of rising nationalism and the destruction of existing political norms."

But with the breakdown of those norms happening so vividly in America - a nation that proselytizes the virtues of democracy more aggressively than any other - the global swing toward less free and open societies could accelerate no matter who wins Tuesday.

"This campaign makes the implicit argument that the U.S. model of liberal democracy isn't what it's cracked up to be," Parakilas said.

America's top diplomat has acknowledged as much. Speaking to students in London on Monday, Secretary of State John F. Kerry called the campaign "downright embarrassing" and said that it has already damaged American influence.

Thanks to the election, he said, he is greeted with skeptical looks - or worse - when he sits down "with some foreign minister in another country or with the president or prime minister of another country and you say, 'Hey, we really want you to move more authoritatively towards democracy.'"

In the state-controlled media of America's nondemocratic rivals and adversaries, the campaign has only exposed what they long knew the country to be - a declining and morally bankrupt power.

"We are seeing the failure of U.S. democracy," wrote Zhang Zhixin, an expert on American politics at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations.

The message is not only that America is floundering but also that China, prosperous and stable, is growing strong in its place.

With Philippine President Rodrigo Duterte promising to "separate" from the United States and realign with China's "ideological flow," Communist Party-approved writers seem to see an opening for more shifts in China's favor.

A recent piece in Xinhua, the state-controlled news wire, cited work by Li Wen, an academic at the Chinese Academy for Social Sciences, who argued that instability in the United States shows the "twisted mentality of an empire moving downhill."

In Russia, the campaign has not exactly reshaped perceptions of the United States. But it has reshaped Russians' perception of what their country is capable of doing to the United States.

Russian observers barely hide their joy at the notion that Americans think that Moscow has the power to affect the outcome of a U.S. presidential election.

"When we hear that we are sitting here in Moscow and interfering in America's life, that makes us all happy," said Gleb Pavlovsky, a political consultant who served at the Kremlin between 1996 and 2011. "We don't need to do anything; we can just sit here and organize elections in the United States."

Like most Russians, Pavlovsky is unwilling to acknowledge the U.S. administration's accusation that Kremlin-sponsored hackers have been meddling in the campaign.

But in a country where people feel the United States has overplayed its hand as the world's sole superpower, American officials' consternation over Russia's suspected role is seen as payback - and a possible political advantage.

"The feeling is that the chaos, the turbulence that all this is causing in the American electoral process is good for Russia," said Alexei Venediktov, editor in chief of Ekho Moskvy radio. "Whoever wins will have to deal with domestic upheaval and internal problems, rather than paying attention to Russia, and that is a good thing."

To U.S. allies, however, it is potentially disastrous. Trump has struck fear into the hearts of European leaders with suggestions that he may not come to the aid of fellow NATO members if they are attacked. Several have broken with protocol - which calls for strict neutrality - and denounced the Republican nominee, while praising his Democratic opponent, Hillary Clinton.

But Europe is confronting its own backlash against international cooperation.

Across the continent, anti-**immigration** politicians who want to pull their nations out of the European Union have exulted in Trump's success.

"Until about a year ago, when I would meet American counterparts, they'd ask, 'What is happening in Europe?'" said Marietje Schaake, a member of the European Parliament. She listed far-right leaders and parties that no longer seem so **alien** in America.

"We're seeing a shared challenge arising: challenges to the open economy and open democracies," she said.

Among some American allies, the U.S. campaign has even been a strange source of comfort because their own politics no longer look so bad.

Israel, known for its bare-knuckles brand of political jousting and for corruption cases that have snared presidents and prime ministers, has been unusually fixated on this year's race.

"Our politicians are perhaps not as crooked or corrupt as yours," said Jonathan Rynhold, a political scientist at Israel's Bar-Ilan University. "Ours are fairly mild by comparison."

In India, too, the effect of such an ugly contest has been surprisingly validating.

"For many middle-class Indians, the U.S. is a model for democracy. But watching the election campaign there now makes Indians feel slightly superior," said Shiv Visvanathan, a government professor at O.P. Jindal Global University.

It has also been deeply disquieting.

"How can such a trigger-happy nation be part of the great nuclear club, and take global decisions?" he asked.

Many in the Arab world are asking similar questions and are particularly unnerved by the rise of Trump, said H.A. Hellyer, a political analyst and author of a book on the 2011 Egyptian uprising.

"The fact he's a genuine contender has damaged American standing almost everywhere - not least within the Arab world and the wider region," Hellyer said. "His discourse, which has attacked Muslims ... is not marginal. It is now mainstream, and that's deeply troubling."

The worry has also been especially acute in Mexico, where opinions toward Trump are overwhelmingly negative - no surprise given that his signature issue is building a border wall. He also launched his campaign by calling Mexican migrants "rapists."

Mexicans accustomed to feeling indifferent toward the U.S. presidential campaign have found themselves actively rooting for Trump to lose.

"For the first time there is a distinction: There's an American good guy and an American bad guy," said Ilà¡n Semo, history professor at the Iberoamerican University in Mexico City. "It was never like this in Mexico."

The angst over Trump is so deeply felt that the peso plunges every time his poll numbers rise, and there could be an immediate recession in Mexico if he comes to power, said Jonathan Heath, an economist in Mexico City.

Anxiety about the presidential contest extends far south of any potential future border wall.

Latin America has been shifting back toward the political center in recent years after a long period dominated by left-wing populism. But the new crop of pro-business leaders has found that no one in the presidential race is willing to stick up for the principles of free trade and open markets that the United States has been pushing in the region for years.

Political whiplash is happening in Africa, too. For many on the continent, Obama's election had been a triumph, evidence that American democracy could be a model of liberalism and tolerance.

Now, eight years later, Trump's threats to jail his political opponent mimics the behavior of some of the continent's own less-than-democratic leaders.

Among them is President Pierre Nkurunziza of the small central African nation of Burundi. He was sworn in for a third term in August 2015, and exiled activists have been lobbying the United States to help halt the extrajudicial killings and repression that have characterized his new term.

The campaign, however, has offered little cause for optimism in a country such as Burundi, far from America's geopolitical priorities but in dire need of help from a superpower.

Elvis Banyankiye, a 28-year-old Burundian who is now studying in France, said he had once hoped the Americans would do more to pressure his government to stop human rights violations. Watching the U.S. presidential campaign stagger from one new low to the next, his expectations sank.

"The U.S. has been a model for how to conduct elections. We used to see tolerance in the debates," he said. "We are losing confidence in that."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ï„„ Clodomir Jean-Louis, 27 Des Moines

People are very passionate about their views and who they want to support. They put a lot of stock into the people running for office, and once they get those people elected they disconnect from the process. That's the most serious crime of being a citizen in a country that requires its citizens to be engaged. In a democratic republic it doesn't work if people don't pay attention. This country has a long history of injustice. We like to focus on the glory of having conquered the westward expansion and having the entire North American continent or piece of it to ourselves. American exceptionalism and all that, but really it's, at the root, based on injustice. This election cycle seems to focus on pieces of that injustice, so I'm hopeful about that because that's a national dialogue we have not seen before. Not on this scale. What I fear for the country is the sort of rhetoric I hear from most of the Republican candidates. Where we have the sort of policies that really **alienate** us on an international level. We truly are a nation of **immigrants**. America would not exist without **immigrants**, so if you tell **immigrants** to stop coming here, what is America?

ï„… Maggie Laube, 49 Perrysburg, Ohio

I went to public schools, which were not very conservative, until I hit high school. I went to a Catholic school, which was very conservative. Where you live, you kind of have the same beliefs because you're in the same circumstances, so I saw both sides of it between [the] different schools. I mean, I'm conservative. I think conservative things offer more protection. I don't ever want to be dependent on things like my mom had to be to survive, to make sure we had something to eat and a roof over our head. I want people to be able to sustain themselves. I value my vote. I will always vote. I'm not going to be told by any political party who to vote for. I'm not going to let somebody's money tell me who is going to be the candidate. But I don't think it matters what I believe and what I want. I could vote somebody in; it's not going to mean anything. Once they get in there, they're going to go with whatever keeps them there. We're at a point of pivotal change. I'm not afraid of change, I'm just afraid that what we see now is not a real change. It's just more of the same.

ï„† Carmen Mendoza, 44 Arlington, Va.

When Obama came into power, it was the first time I felt like an American, even though I've been here since I was a kid. I always felt like an outsider. Like there's another president, another white guy that's going to take power, and hopefully the decisions they make are good for everybody, not just white middle America. [Obama] was different. He wasn't an old white dude. That's where America is turning. There are people of mixed races now everywhere. It's been there, but people ignored it. He brought all that to the surface. This is the America that made America what it is. You have to look and learn, then go forward. The faces of America are not white, blond kids with ponytails. When I go at my sisters' schools and volunteer, and I see those faces, they're from Somalia and Nigeria and El Salvador and Nicaragua. That's the future of the country, and you have to accept that it's changing. I still have the belief that when people go and vote, they look at their children and they want something better for them. All that rhetoric [Donald Trump] brought with his campaign, I don't think it's actually going to happen. But what he brought is this segregation. I don't think that's going away. He's stirred something in society, and unless something gets done, it's not going anywhere positively. That really terrifies me.

ï„† Très Johnson, 46 Council Bluffs, Iowa

If you work really hard, you can make something happen. I've spent 2 1/2 years diving into this business [a coffee shop], and I've created my own livelihood. I get out of my life what I put into it now, and when I talk to **immigrants** when they come into the country, that's what their dream is, too. I was politically active when I was 18 years old. I didn't care about turning 16 and being able to drive, and I didn't care about turning 21 and being able to drink. I cared about turning 18 and being able to be a part of the voting process. And I got to vote one time, and then I lost my rights. My criminal past slowed me down from moving forward. You start to overthink things and don't fix the problems, and then at some point I woke up and I'm like, "Okay, it's time to fix this and not blame the system anymore." So I broke the law 25 years ago. If I want a gun now to protect myself or whatever, I'm not allowed that same right as some meathead militia man that's overtaking government offices. Why does he get to protect himself where I can't? I paid my debt. I've done everything. I have a reconciled relationship with the person that I ripped off. So at what point do I get to be an American again?

ï„† Kelly Coffee, 38 Austin

When you don't agree with someone, people take it as personal attacks. There's a mentality in this country of "It's us against them." No matter what side you're on. The media focuses on the sensationalism because, let's be honest, the media is in the business of making money. What sells? Outrageous, sensationalized stories. Then everybody gets more divisive and we're more away from that inclusiveness America was supposed to be about. It's gotten way lost. We've gotten back into a civil war. It's not the North and the South, it's the reds and the blues. We want to blame everybody else for something. We want to blame ISIS for this, we want to blame so-and-so for guns and mass murders. It's easy to point fingers at somebody else instead of yourself. I'm not pessimistic. Things can be better. There's more good in the world than bad. Most people just want to live their lives and pay their bills and love their children. They don't want to be scared. I understand the importance of Barack Obama being president. Not only will little black and African American boys and girls grow up and realize that they can be president, but little white kids will grow up and accept the idea of a black man being president because it won't mean anything to them.

ï„† Harry Roberts Sr., 89 orangeburg, s.c.

I've lived all of my life in South Carolina, born in 1927. I like to see the right people going in, the right man going in so that we can get this country back on an even keel, because there's so many things going on. The civil rights is all right, but when they separated the schools down here and the blacks went to school with the whites, trouble started. The mixtures like that and all these foreign people coming in over here, and the government let them come in. They're going to take jobs away from the young people, and it just ain't going to mix. We're going to have a war, right here. All these people that's got their cities and stuff bombed out, we don't have room to accept them. You've got so many young people now that does not have a college education. I like Donald Trump. The things that he's saying is something that we really ought to do. Lower the drug costs, lower the food costs and put the right man in Washington. And of course, the man that goes in, it's going to take him two years to straighten out the things that Obama's done. I'm not prejudiced. Most of my customers are black. The only thing I care about is what color is your money.

ï„† Rita Cheng, 49 Potomac, Md.

People are very skeptical because they saw their parents lose money in the stock market. They saw their parents lose equity in their home. They saw their parents lose their jobs. I'd like skepticism to come down, and I'd like trust to come up. I don't know how to do that, other than it takes time to rebuild people's trust. I believe America is a place of opportunity. Many people from across the world come here to get educated. Talking about opportunity, one thing that does concern me - I'm a certified financial planner - I'm concerned about debts. I'm concerned about global debts in Japan and in Europe. I'm also concerned about our debt here, because debt can impact our opportunity set. I was the first in my family to go to school. I didn't borrow any money. My parents didn't borrow any money. I worked. I was able to graduate from school debt-free. That's [not] possible today. I'm multicultural: My dad is Chinese, and my mom is Irish and Czech. My dad came here with $17 and landed in Wisconsin. He told me it was so cold and he didn't even have a coat, but he made something of himself. I would like us to really focus on what does make America great. It's not perfect, but we have a lot to be thankful for.

ï„† Nelson Vazquez, 60 clemson, s.c.

We have these candidates who are very family-oriented and very positive, and you've got one especially that's very negative, so my overall view is trying to see what comes out of this that can make families stronger. That's really my hope, because with 70 percent of black mothers raising kids without fathers, [40] percent of the Latinos. When your family is stronger, your neighborhood is stronger, your community is stronger, your state is stronger, the country is stronger. But it is still difficult to think that it's going to be all that positive. I left Miami and the big city to be in a community like Clemson, where there's a lot of family values. That was my part in giving my children a good surrounding of other families. I just think that the way that this country was founded, that they had Christian values, that's what brought this country together. And those values coincide with family values, so that would be my biggest hope: that that can improve rather than disintegrate, which is what I think has been happening.

ï„„ Morris Christie, 61 Philadelphia

I'm a veteran. I fought for people to come here to be free, so how you going to say you don't want people to come here to have a chance, Mexicans, Latinos, whoever? That's wrong. They ain't saying nothing they going to do education-wise, or nothing, you know? In other words, Trump's saying, and it's bad to hear politics like this: If your mother and father can't send you to college, that ain't their problem. Why should he spend his money? You know,That ain't no leader, and I hate to see how the presidential election is going. What's with politicians? They want to cut the funds on this and that, they're shutting the schools, shutting the libraries. They're, shutting theyouth programs down. There's only one way for kids to go, and that's the streets, and it's a shame. My parents had it hard bringing me up, but I said I was going to amount to something because of the respect I had in my home. Politicians don't care no more about the children's educations, but they're building prisons and jails. I just hope thatif somebody do get in office they'll think of the American people instead of overseas all the time. Get the money here.Help us here first. There's people starving in America. I see this here.I'm going to be honest with you, what I see coming. We had the Civil War, now it's going to be overthrow the government. If ISIS don't get in and do it, somebody's going to because minimum wages ain't take care of no families now.

ï„… Demri Scott, 20 Castle Pines, Colo.

What I find pleasure in life is doing what I do for College Republicans: I love doing outreach on [the George Washington University] campus. Sometimes the Republican Party is missing out on the values that it once stood for, and that frustrates me, but [it's] also why I want to be more involved in the party. Politics nowadays is not about policy anymore. How do you expect to make your party look good, or expect people to understand your policy, if you're just bashing the other side constantly? It's good to be critical of your political affiliation, and I'm critical of the Republican Party because I care. Many of the girls in my sorority are Democrats and they know I'm a Republican, but they still love me and appreciate me for who I am. We realize we have the same goal, to make America great. Maybe not in Trump's sense, or Hillary's sense, but we respect each other. After November I want the country to be able to look past people's differences. You're not a good or a bad person because you're a Democrat or a Republican. You're a good person because you do good things.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**About 4,000 people have died or disappeared in the waters of the Mediterranean this year while trying to get to Europe, the highest number in recorded history.

But few of them get obituaries. Often their deaths remain unconfirmed, with even their families lacking information.

This week, the Gambian national soccer federation said that one of its prominent players was apparently among the victims. Fatim Jawara, the goalkeeper on the women's national team, drowned when her boat went down off the coast of Libya last month, the federation said, according to news reports. She was believed to be 19.

That a star athlete would risk her life to board a smuggler's boat speaks volumes about Africa's migrant crisis. While the world has focused on **refugees** fleeing Syria, tens of thousands of Africans have tried to escape poverty and conflict for better lives in Europe.

Gambia, one of Africa's smallest nations, with about 2 million inhabitants, has produced a disproportionate number of those migrants. Gambians are among the top 10 nationalities of migrants who have crossed the Mediterranean for Europe, according to the U.N. **refugee** agency.

"We are grieving at the moment as this is a great loss to the national soccer team and the nation," the president of the Gambian soccer federation, Lamin Kaba Bajo, told Agence France-Presse. "She will be remembered for saving a penalty kick in a friendly encounter involving the national soccer team and the Glasgow Girls from Scotland."

The Associated Press quoted a spokesman for the soccer federation, Bakary B. Baldeh, as saying that the young woman died in Libyan waters and "must have been buried" in that country.

So far, no specifics of Jawara's decision to migrate have been reported. In perhaps one telling detail, a colleague told the BBC that the members of a local team she had played on - the Red Scorpions - were not paid salaries.

Gambia's president, Yahya Jammeh, seized power in a coup in 1994. He has since jailed members of the political opposition and made a number of widely ridiculed declarations - including saying that AIDS could be cured with herbs.

But what drives so many young Gambians to migrate is the lack of opportunity in a country that has grown more slowly than many of its neighbors. A huge portion of the population scrapes by as subsistence farmers, even as they now swipe through pictures of Europe's glittering lights on the Facebook posts of friends who have migrated.

Jammeh has argued fruitlessly that "true Muslims" would encourage their children to remain in Gambia.

kevin.sieff@washpost.com

ï…ŒExcerpted from washingtonpost. com/news/

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**They share ideas and ideology, friends and funders. They cross borders to appear at one another's rallies. They have deep contacts in Russia - they often use Russian disinformation - as well as friends in other authoritarian states. They despise the West and seek to undermine Western institutions. They think of themselves as a revolutionary avant-garde just like, once upon a time, the Communist International, or Comintern, the Soviet-backed organization that linked communist parties around Europe and the world. Now, of course, they are not Soviet-backed, and they are not communist. But this loose group of parties and politicians - Austria's Freedom Party, the Dutch Party for Freedom, the UK Independence Party, Hungary's Fidesz, Poland's Law and Justice, Donald Trump - have made themselves into a global movement of "anti-globalists." Meet the "Populist International": Whoever wins the U.S. election Tuesday, its influence is here to stay.

Although it is often described (by me and others searching for a shorthand) as "far-right," the Populist International has little to do with the "right" that has thrived in Western countries since World War II. Continental European Christian Democracy arose out of a postwar desire to bring morality back to politics; Gaullism came out of a long French tradition of statism and secularism; Anglo-Saxon conservatives had a historic preference for free markets. Most of them shared a Burkean small-"c" conservatism: a dislike of radical change, skepticism of "progress," a belief in the importance of conserving institutions and values. Most of them emerged out of particular local and historical traditions. All of them shared a devotion to representative democracy, religious tolerance, Western integration and the Western alliance.

By contrast, the parties that belong to the Populist International, and the media that support it, are not Burkean. They don't want to conserve or preserve what exists. Instead, they want to radically overthrow the institutions of the present to bring back things that existed in the past - or that they believe existed in the past - by force. Their language takes different forms in different countries, but their revolutionary projects often include the expulsion of **immigrants**, or at least the return to all-white (or all-Dutch, or all-German) societies; the resurrection of protectionism; the reversal of women's or minorities' rights; the end of international institutions and cooperation of all kinds. They advocate violence: In 2014, Trump said that "you'll have to have riots to go back to where we used to be, when America was great."

Sometimes they claim to be Christian, but just as often they are nihilists and cynics. Their ideology, sometimes formalized and sometimes not, opposes homosexuality, racial integration, religious tolerance and human rights.

The Populist International holds these goals to be more important than prosperity, more important than economic growth, more important than democracy itself. Like the parties that once formed the Comintern, they are eager to destroy existing institutions - from independent courts and media to international alliances and treaties - to obtain them. Last week, Britain's Daily Mail, a newspaper that propagates the ideas of the Populist International, actually denounced three high-court judges as "Enemies of the People" because they decreed that Britain's exit from the European Union would require parliamentary consultation. Trump is only one of many politicians - Poland's Jaroslaw Kaczynski, Hungary's Viktor Orban - who have launched attacks on the principles of their own constitutions.

Like their Comintern predecessors, the Populist International also understands that there is much to be gained by mutual support. German Christian Democrats would never have dreamed of campaigning on behalf of British Tories. And although they had much in common, Tories didn't intervene directly on behalf of U.S. Republicans. By contrast, Nigel Farage, the leader of the UK Independence Party, has openly campaigned for Trump, even appearing in a "spin room" to plug the Republican nominee after one of his debates with Hillary Clinton. Geert Wilders, the xenophobic Dutch politician, showed up at the Republican National Convention, where instead of observing, as a Dutch Christian Democrat would have done, he agitated on behalf of Trump, too. All of the populist parties and newspapers use the narratives put out by Sputnik, the Russian news service that serves as an endless source of conspiracy theories and fake news.

Last week, a fake account of a **refugee** in Austria acquitted of raping a child - originally broadcast on Russian state TV - was repeated by Russian President Vladimir Putin and then across Europe, including (again) in the Daily Mail.

All the signs are that the movement is still growing. If Trump loses, the story isn't over: His campaign will no doubt metastasize into a television channel and a news network, and will continue to spread. But his failure will encourage the antidotes - the citizens' parties, based on ideas rather than charisma, the independent journalists, the democracy movements - that have begun to emerge.

And if Trump wins? The Populist International will be invigorated, not just in the United States but around the world. Trump will be its leader, his daughter Ivanka will be its heir apparent, and liberal democracy, and the West as we know it, may cease to exist. Think about that before you vote.

applebaumletters@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As far as the Rev. Terry Jones knows, they were his ideas first.

"We are asking for the immediate halting of all Muslim **immigration** and the removal of all illegal **aliens** from the United States," the controversial Florida pastor told a Detroit radio station back in 2011. "We are asking for the monitoring of all the mosques in America."

At the time, Jones's demands were dismissed as crazy, part of a set of radical beliefs and xenophobia that impelled Jones to publicly burn Qurans and air mocking videos that provoked violent attacks on embassies and consulates in Egypt, Afghanistan and Libya.

Four and a half years later, those policy prescriptives are a core element of Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump's campaign.

The party's standard-bearer has borrowed heavily both in message and in membership from far-right conservative activists whose pronouncements on Islam have long been denounced as dangerous zealotry by mainstream conservative and liberal policymakers alike.

Former president George W. Bush and GOP candidates Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) and Mitt Romney all repudiated anti-Islam rhetoric as un-American.

Trump has become the first and only major-party presidential candidate to adopt these ideas as his own. With his calls for a complete ban on Muslim **immigrants**or "extreme vetting" on people entering the country, policy prescriptives once relegated to the fringe have become mainstream.

The migration of anti-Islam extremist views to major-party acceptance is, like much in American politics, a fusion of opportunism and ideology. It often has been highly profitable for its practitioners as well.

In 2007, Brigitte Gabriel, a former reporter for Pat Robertson's evangelical television channel and author of a book on the dangers of Islam, founded Act! for America, an organization that touted as its "first accomplishment" its 2008 campaign to shut down a Minnesota Islamic school.

That same year, former newspaper executive Pamela Geller used her increasingly popular libertarian blog AtlasShrugs.com to spread the falsehood during the 2008 presidential campaign that President Obama was born in Kenya and was a secret Muslim.

So did former Reagan administration aide Frank Gaffney Jr., whose neoconservative think tank argued that the country was at risk of falling victim to "civilization jihad" at the hands of the Muslim Brotherhood.

The Egypt-based Islamist movement, Gaffney alleged, harbored a sinister bid to destroy American society and implement Islamic law.

With the Obama rumors, Gaffney, Geller, Gabriel and others found a more direct way to advance a broader opposition to Islam - and a right-wing audience to embrace it. Along the way, Kellyanne Conway, now Trump's campaign manager, contributed polling to sharpen the message.

By 2010, anti-Muslim activists had launched a nationwide media campaign against what they dubbed "the Ground Zero mosque," a proposal to build a mosque and Muslim community center in Lower Manhattan. Act! for America convened its first "National Conference and Legislative Briefing" in Washington, which brought advocates together with lawmakers, including Rep. Peter T. King (R-N.Y.) and then-Rep. Michele Bachmann (R-Minn.).

Both went on to hold congressional hearings to examine militants infiltrating the country.

While most mainstream politicians continued to malign the activists - the Conservative Political Action Conference barred Gaffney from speaking in 2010 after he accused two of its members of working with the Muslim Brotherhood - they spread their ideas through a network of small conferences, tea party groups, conservative churches and Jewish groups, and right-wing news outlets such as Breitbart. Former Breitbart chief executive Stephen Bannon is now chief executive of the Trump campaign.

They told their audiences that Islam isn't a religion but a political ideology that is inherently violent and opposed to Judeo-Christian values. They warned that mosques and Muslims should be watched. And they argued that practicing Islam means belief in the oppression of women and the murder of infidels, and that the religion is therefore unconstitutional.

Most important of all, they said, was to stop the advance of what they labeled "creeping sharia," an alleged Muslim plot to impose Islamic law across American institutions.

Sharia is not a codified document like the U.S. Constitution, say religious and legal scholars, but rather a broad and variably interpreted set of ideas and principles for how to live life as a Muslim. It offers an array of guidance, including on prayer practices, marriage, diet and finances. It also draws on tens of thousands of texts and scholarly interpretations, meaning that there is no universally approved body of Islamic law, said Intisar A. Rabb, an Islamic legal scholar at Harvard University.

In the summer of 2010, former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) offered a darker vision. In a speech at the American Enterprise Institute, he said sharia is "a mortal threat to the survival of freedom in the United States and the world as we know it."

It was "the pre-eminent totalitarian threat of our time," said Gaffney's Center for Security Policy's report, "Shariah - The Threat to America." Among its authors were former CIA director James R. Woolsey and Joseph E. Schmitz, both of whom are now national security advisers for Trump.

The center's general counsel, David Yerushalmi, drafted a law to ban sharia, and with the help of Act! for America began shopping the draft to lawmakers in Southern states.

Bills to ban sharia now have been introduced in all but 16 states. To date, Tennessee, Arizona, Kansas, Louisiana and South Dakota all have passed some form of legislation to ban "foreign law"- wording adopted in most cases to avoid an explicit violation of the Constitution, which prohibits the favoring or targeting of one religion. Alabama's bill failed, but its voters banned sharia by ratifying a constitutional amendment.

Faiza Patel, the co-director of the Liberty and National Security Program at New York University Law School's Brennan Center for Justice, said "the idea that sharia law poses a threat to the United States is just laughable."

But it makes sense that sharia has worked as a focal point for the anti-Muslim movement. For many Americans, the definition offered by the activists was also their first introduction to the concept.

"The theory that 'the Muslims are coming'" has helped anti-Muslim activists to "malign Muslim individuals and groups, and suggest that they have some sort of terrorist ties," Patel said. "We've seen this with [longtime Hillary Clinton aide] Huma Abedin. And we've seen a concerted campaign against [Muslim lobbyist group] the Council on American-Islamic Relations for some time."

The business of speaking out against Muslims also has been lucrative.

Seven charitable groups provided $42.6 million to "Islamophobia think tanks" such as those run by Gaffney and Gabriel between 2001 and 2009, researchers at the Center for American Progress found.

In 2014, Gaffney was paid more than $308,000, and Gabriel earned at least $240,000, according to the IRS Form 990 filed by their organizations.

The 2014 rise of the Islamic State, with its gruesome beheading videos, created new fears and gave the movement new energy.

The Islamic State was practicing Islamic law when it executed journalists and religious minorities, the anti-Islam activists told their audiences, and so were the gunmen who carried out the 2015 and 2016 terrorist attacks in Paris, Brussels, San Bernardino, Calif., and Orlando.

When the 2016 election cycle rolled around, not everyone in the movement rallied immediately around Trump. Some, including Gaffney, initially joined the campaign of Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), and Ben Carson also won support with references to "civilization jihad."

But Trump ultimately incorporated the message into his presidential platform like no other major-party candidate had before.

In previous presidential campaigns, the Republican candidates "beat back" the movement's conspiracy theories, said Ken Gude, a senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, who co-authored an updated report on the movement last year. "Now we have a campaign that not only isn't pushing back against them, but is also pushing and advocating those kinds of views."

Walid Phares, one of Trump's foreign policy advisers, was part of a Lebanese Christian militia that took part in massacres during the Lebanese civil war and has previously accused the U.S. government of being beholden to an Islamist agenda. And another top adviser, retired Army Lt. Gen. Michael Flynn, joined the board of Act! for America shortly after joining the Trump campaign. Gingrich and Bachmann are also advisers.

But the "top expert with influence on these issues is Frank Gaffney, who advised Cruz, then provided research to Trump," Phares wrote in an email. He also named Schmitz, Flynn, Gingrich and former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani as key sources on developing policy ideas on Islam.

"A number of these folks are friends of mine," Gaffney said in an interview about Trump's inner circle. "I've had conversations with them, [and] the opportunity to provide input [to the campaign], at least informally."

When Trump in December first called for a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States," he cited a widely debunked poll , conducted by Conway for Gaffney's Center for Security Policy, that claims that 25percent of Muslims surveyed supported violence against Americans and that 51percent think Muslims should have the choice of being governed by sharia in America.

A large number of Americans have long recognized "the jihad threat," and Trump is giving voice to those sentiments, Geller said. It's only the mainstream media, "a Soros-funded propaganda arm for the far-Left and its Islamic supremacist allies," she said, that has stood in the way of broader acceptance.

On the campaign trail, where Trump warns repeatedly of the dangers posed by Muslims, the candidate is articulating, Gaffney said, "the most serious and thoughtful and necessary policy toward the threat that we face from the global jihad movement of anybody in public life at the moment."

"Anyone who believes sharia law supplants American law will not be given an **immigrant** visa," Trump said at an August campaign rally in North Carolina. The crowd shouted its response: "U.S.A.! U.S.A.!"

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com

Alice Crites contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**House Speaker Paul D. Ryan spent Wednesday afternoon touring a homeless shelter with embattled Rep. Rod Blum (R) in Waterloo, Iowa. The pair explained how the House GOP agenda could help alleviate poverty in Blum's district.

At the same time, seven of Blum's colleagues in the House Freedom Caucus were holding a private meeting here in Washington in the apartment of Rep. Mark Meadows (R-N.C.), who led the effort to dump Ryan's predecessor as speaker.

Freedom Caucus Chairman Jim Jordan (R-Ohio) called the secretive meeting with little notice, causing some attendees to rush back from their districts. Several lawmakers weren't even aware of the session, and reporters scurried to scout potential locations.

The meeting's overt topic was defending vulnerable Republican colleagues ahead of Tuesday's election. But there was no avoiding the elephant in the room - the debate over whether the group should try to unseat Ryan as speaker.

"Of course his name came up," Rep. Scott Perry (R-Pa.) said after the meeting. "He's in the news every day - he's the speaker."

A reluctant leader of his fractious conference, Ryan has waged an aggressive charm campaign to capture the support of the 40-something hard-line conservatives who form the Freedom Caucus, a perpetual thorn in the side of the House GOP leadership since the tea party wave sent most of them to Capitol Hill in 2010.

The Wisconsin Republican has personally campaigned for Freedom Caucusers in their districts and listened to them here in Washington, fielding their late-night texts and chatting about the budget over beers in his office. He added a second weekly meeting on the last day of each legislative week, where members can vent their frustrations and hash out differences before heading home.

All that has not been enough, however, for the hard-liners, who want to see the House GOP take an uncompromising stance on spending cuts and **immigration**, with no room for negotiation.

Several Freedom Caucus members have publicly floated plans to try to deny Ryan the speakership in their party's leadership election, scheduled for the week of Nov. 14. They accuse Ryan of breaking his promise to restore "regular order" to the spending process and blame him for not doing more to avoid a budget negotiation likely to end in a massive spending bill negotiated with Democrats at the end of this year.

"Ryan called last year's budget deal a crap sandwich," said Rep. Dave Brat (R-Va.), who unseated former Majority Leader Eric Cantor in a 2014 primary. "This year it is going to be a crap sandwich with extra portions and Obama at the table before he leaves office."

Ryan just finished his first year as speaker. He may not see a second. It is difficult to estimate just how many Freedom Caucusers actually support Ryan's ouster. The guarded group keeps its official membership rolls a secret, leaving it up to members to disclose their affiliation. At least five of them, including Blum, have publicly supported reelecting Ryan as speaker.

Many of these hard-liners hail from deep-red districts where GOP nominee Donald Trump is a hero and voters cheer chaos in Washington. They often say their supporters don't fear deep budget cuts or the specter of a government shutdown. That dynamic gives them license to adopt a take-no-prisoners form of politics antithetical to the political finesse typically required to pass legislation.

A little over 12 months after taking the job, that leaves Ryan in much the same position as former speaker John A. Boehner - well-liked but at the hard-liners' mercy. Next year, their clout is only likely to grow if, as expected, the House GOP loses seats on Tuesday. Those losses won't come in the hard-liners' districts.

Ryan insists he is running again for speaker, despite growing whispers that he will choose to bow out rather than wrestle to win the job again, only to fight endlessly with a large minority of his members.

"I am going to seek staying on as speaker," Ryan told WTAQ's Jerry Bader, while stumping for GOP candidates in Wisconsin. "This is the typical chatter you have every two years," he added of recent suggestions on Capitol Hill that he'll bow out of GOP leadership. "They call it 'palace intrigue' in the Hill rags."

The bomb-throwing approach is wearing on the nerves of Ryan allies tired of being blamed for a dysfunctional Congress.

"It is frustrating," said Rep. Adam Kinzinger (R-Ill.). "We have to quit governing from crisis to crisis."

Kinzinger, who is close to Ryan, said that not all Freedom Caucusers are unreasonable but some won't be satisfied with any outcome the group hasn't endorsed.

"You can't on the one hand tout how you love the Constitution and on the other hand basically believe that in a divided government - or even a government with all one-party rule - that you aren't going to have to compromise," Kinzinger said. "If you love the Constitution, you have to be open to compromise. They're not mutually exclusive."

Most conservatives say Ryan has done a lot of things right. He has an open-door policy - during the day, members can drop in to his office in the Capitol; at night they can find him in his personal office, where he still sleeps during the week. Members text him, call him and have relationships with his chief of staff, David Hoppe.

Earlier this year, Ryan invited members to his office for an informal "budget and beers" gathering where they chatted about the budget process ahead. He also has donated to several Freedom Caucus members and made campaign appearances for them.

Since 2014, Ryan's leadership PAC has donated just under $100,000 to Freedom Caucusers, according to a Republican source familiar with the spending. Those donations, the source said, have gone directly to more than a quarter of the hard-liners, including Reps. Alex Mooney (R-W.Va.), Barry Loudermilk (R-Ga.), Mark Sanford (R-S.C.), Warren Davidson (R-Ohio) and Mick Mulvaney (R-S.C.) - one of the lawmakers at Wednesday's meeting.

Ryan also headlined a fundraising event for Jordan's February birthday in Washington.

But the hard-liners want their friendship with Ryan, which they admit is a real thing, to translate into actual policy influence.

"Everyone likes Paul," Perry said after the meeting. "We have a bigger mission here. It's not personality-based."

That mission includes changing the rules of the House to allow groups like theirs to wield more power. They want better access to leadership slots and committee gavels, and they want the chance to force votes on conservative legislation. They also want Ryan to join them in the fight.

Many see the upcoming leadership election and spending negotiation as a litmus test for Ryan. They worry that the year-end budget negotiation will end with a massive omnibus spending bill filled with a litany of concessions to Democrats - they would rather vote on several smaller spending bills.

"I think everyone has a honeymoon phase," Meadows said in September before talk of Ryan's ouster took off. "You try to give people a little bit of latitude until the results show something different."

Some Freedom Caucusers, like Rep. Trent Franks (R-Ariz.), said that even if they disagree with Ryan, it's misguided to think that someone else would better be able to solve the House's problems. Franks said he warned members of that back when they started the charge to strip Boehner of his gavel.

"I said to them, 'If we do this you understand we'll be here again,'" Franks said. "It's not always the personality that's the problem here. It is the systemic issue that plagues the person in charge no matter who they are."

Franks compared the debate over Ryan to the disagreement within the party over endorsing Trump. He believes Republicans can debate behind closed doors, but publicly they should unite to protect their majority power.

"It is vital that when we're choosing in a binary choice - between someone who is not perfect and someone that's a disaster - that we make the right choice," Franks said. "I think that cedes power to the Democrats."

Over the course of the two years that Republicans held comfortable congressional majorities, Democrats were able to negotiate $80 billion in spending increases. They used last year's year-end spending bill to maintain tax credits for wind and solar energy that Republicans abhor and to reauthorize a land and water conservation fund.

Democrats also blocked nearly two dozen politically motivated initiatives, including measures to weaken campaign-finance laws and ban the United States from accepting **refugees** from Syria.

"At some point [obstructionist tactics are] going to force the conference to go to Democrats and say 'What do you need so we can get some things through?'" Kinzinger said.

kelsey.snell@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**'The trip today is about 24 minutes," announced the captain of our eight-passenger shuttle ferry. That was just enough time, I estimated, to be served and finish the rum punch I planned to order as we left port in St. Maarten.

I settled on a seat in the rocking vessel and squinted across the sparkling Caribbean at our destination. The relatively small, flat island of Anguilla appeared as a scrub-covered outcropping on the horizon, an easily overlooked smudge on the surface of the sea.

Anguilla's laid-back, gracious style, its white-sand beaches and dynamic culinary scene are well promoted. But with no dramatic towering volcanic hills, no waterfall-laced rain forest, no major port with glittering amenities - and one tiny airport - I wondered if white sand and fab food were enough to entice people to this off-the-beaten-path location in the Caribbean's Leeward Island chain. In other words, would reality match the hype? That's what I hoped to find out as I arrived at the Blowing Point Ferry Terminal, cleared **immigration** (in minutes), waited for my luggage (forever), and found a taxi near the ferry kiosks, where scrawny chickens scurried about.

With only one main road and a mere six stoplights, the 16-by-3-mile island isn't difficult to navigate. However, visitors like me, hesitant about left-side-of-the-road driving, may opt for the ease of fixed-rate taxis.

En route to Malliouhana, an Auberge resort perched on a bluff overlooking Meads Bay, I peppered my driver with questions about Anguilla, the main one being, "What is the correct pronunciation?"

"It's An-gwilla, sort of like gorilla. The name comes from its shape. Like an eel," said the driver, who was born and raised on the island.

Like many islands in the Caribbean, Anguilla was colonized in the 17th century by alternating groups of Europeans, primarily from Great Britain and France. After a 1967 revolution to separate itself from the Federation of the West Indies (established in the 1950s with nearby St. Kitts and Nevis), Britain intervened. By December 1980, Anguilla became a British Overseas Territory with some measure of governmental autonomy. The language of the island is English, though most of the population - estimated at 15,000 - speak a melodic Caribbean version.

My driver beeped his car horn and waved at other drivers, and those walking along the road, and it soon became apparent that everyone knew everyone. Since the largest slice of the business pie involves tourism, the majority of the people I met were unfailingly polite and happy to share their opinions of what to see and do on the island, including where to hear traditional soca, calypso, reggae and country music.

I arrived hungry - a good thing, as my visit was planned around experiencing as much of the island's purported tasty offerings as I could schedule in a three-day visit. After check-in and a swim in one of two pools with ocean views, I headed out to dinner.

Before opening Veya, chef Carrie Bogar along with her business partner and husband, Jerry, were looking to escape the gloomy Pennsylvania winters. "We googled, 'Caribbean restaurants for sale,' and packed up the kids and moved," Bogar said.

Located in tropical woodlands, this secluded restaurant has the feel of an exotic treehouse combined with a bohemian lounge. The eclectic menu fuses Caribbean tastes and ingredients with those from other far-flung steamy lands.

"I didn't want to be pigeonholed as just a Caribbean chef, so I started thinking about other countries with warm climates such as [the ones in] North Africa, South America and Southeast Asia," Bogar said.

Open since 2007, Veya is no secret. In high season, reservations must be made weeks in advance to sample Bogar's inventive dishes such as grilled jerk-spiced tuna with rum-coffee glaze or grilled local lobster with passion fruit mustard sauce. For light bites, tapas plates and crafted cocktails are offered in the garden lounge, Meze, along with music by local artists, including the soulful reggae beats of Omari Banks. A former celebrated cricketer, Banks is the son of Bankie Banks, a reggae singer known as the "Anguillan Bob Dylan."

It seems silly that I left the island to head to another island for lunch. But, indeed, I did.

Sandy Island is one of a number of small, uninhabited offshore islands, or cays - all accessible by boat - that are popular with beachcombers, snorkelers and kite surfers. Several of these islands sport casual tiki-style beach shacks that are open for lunch on varying days of the week.

At Sandy Ground in Road Bay, where those arriving by private yacht clear customs and **immigration**, I caught a shuttlecraft named Joy (the others are Happiness and Bliss) along with several young guys clutching beers and snorkeling gear. Frigate birds circled overhead as we cruised toward Sandy Island and in minutes, it seemed, we were jumping into the shallows and wading to shore.

The shaded, open-air restaurant, also known as Sandy Island, specializes in traditional local foods, all prepared on a seaside grill: freshly caught lobster, red snapper, crayfish and mahi-mahi, as well as baby back ribs, barbecued chicken and drunken coconut shrimp. I sat at a picnic table, feet in the white sand, enjoying a margarita mixed at the gaily painted bar while waiting (and waiting) for my meal to arrive. While chatting with guests at nearby tables, I learned that those in the know call ahead to place their orders.

But when on vacation, what's the rush? My succulent lobster with coconut ginger sauce and accompanying rice, beans and salad were worth the wait - in fact, pure bliss, which was the apt name of the shuttle I boarded back to port after post-lunch snorkeling (mask rentals are available) in the crystalline waters around the reef.

My other notable beachside lunch was at Bayside Bar & Grill, a popular spot overlooking boats and swimmers at Crocus Bay. Though tempted to order another lobster, I opted instead for grilled snapper and Creole sauce with corn, rice and peas while others around me, many of them locals, I guessed by their lilting accents, enjoyed barbecued chicken and ribs, rustic pizzas, burgers and salads. Before leaving, I peeked inside the grill's elegant sister property, da'Vida, where the dinner menu is a touch more formal - grilled Angus beef tenderloin, herb-crusted rack of lamb, ginger teriyaki sea scallops - but the vibe remains island-casual.

After a fruit-and-granola breakfast, some hotel guests headed out to play golf at the island's only course while others planned a day of Auberge spa treatments. I chose a day of lollygagging and swimming at a quiet cove, a short hike down a path from my hotel, where it was easy to imagine I was happily shipwrecked on a deserted island.

I planned a last night splurge at Pimms, a candlelit, open-air restaurant at Cap Juluca, a five-star resort with its own mile-long beach.

It can be awkward eating meals alone, especially at a place that blatantly conjures romance. Maybe it was days spent in the sun and the relaxed island vibe, but the staff at Pimms seemed extra-welcoming, the meal of lobster ravioli and grilled Anguilla crayfish extra divine. I sat at a table near the edge of the sea, where curved Moorish arches framed a view of Maundays Bay and the mountains of St. Maarten, the setting sun smearing pink and violet stains across puffy clouds. Anticipating my trip home in reverse - the taxi to the port, the shuttle boat and one last rum punch before airport security - I sighed and began plotting my next visit.

travel@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Melania Trump, the wife of Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump and an **immigrant** from Slovenia, was paid for 10 modeling jobs in 1996 before she received legal authorization to work in the United States, the Associated Press reported Friday night.

The AP cited detailed ledgers from Melania Trump's modeling agency as well as a contract she signed with the firm, concluding that she was paid more than $20,000 for the work over seven weeks.

The finding contradicts repeated statements from both Melania and Donald Trump, who have insisted that she scrupulously followed U.S. **immigration** law when she came to the United States as a striving model.

It also creates a potential political embarrassment for the Republican nominee, who has based much of his campaign on a vow to crack down on illegal **immigration** - including deporting people who have violated the terms of their **immigration** status.

The Trump campaign has said that Melania Trump came to the United States in 1996 and then met and began dating Donald Trump in 1998. In 2001, she received a green card that allowed permanent residency, the campaign has said, and became a U.S. citizen in 2006, the year after she and Trump were married.

"I am pleased to enclose a letter from my **immigration** attorney which states that, with 100% certainty, I correctly went through the legal process when arriving in the USA," Melania Trump tweeted in September, when she released a lawyer's letter outlining the history. The campaign provided no documentation of the narrative at the time.

The new information involves Melania Trump's activities in her first weeks after arriving in the United States. The Trump campaign has indicated that she arrived on Aug. 27, 1996, holding a B1/B2 visitor's visa. She then received a work permit on Oct. 18, 1996.

It is illegal to perform work for money while holding a visitor's visa. However, the AP located records showing that she was paid for multiple jobs during the weeks that she held the visitor's permit, including for Fitness magazine and the Bergdorf Goodman department store.

During that time, she also signed what appeared to be a standard management agreement with her agency, Metropolitan International Management, that appeared to have been executed on Sept. 4, 1996.

Neither a Trump campaign spokesman nor Michael Wildes, the lawyer who wrote the letter outlining Trump's **immigration** history in September, responded Saturday to requests for comment. Wildes told the AP that "these documents, which have not been verified, do not reflect our records including corresponding passport stamps," but he did not answer additional questions.

In recent days, Melania Trump has reemerged on the campaign trail after a long absence following a speech she delivered at the Republican National Convention that borrowed language from Michelle Obama. Melania Trump held a rally on Thursday in Pennsylvania, where she issued a call for civility in politics.

In a speech she delivered Thursday in a Philadelphia suburb, she again highlighted her legal **immigration** status. As she spoke of the years she spent getting her visas and green card, several Trump supporters in the audience shouted - "Yes! A legal **immigrant**!

Experts say many **immigrants** to the United States perform work illegally while holding a visitor's visa, putting them "out of status" and potentially endangering their ability to later become U.S. citizens. It is one reason, they say, that there are so many people living in the country illegally. Trump has promised to deport people who have violated the terms of their visas.

It is considered fraud to lie during the **immigration** process - by entering the United States with a visitor's visa but intending to work and falsely a telling a border control officer otherwise, for example.

If authorities can prove that a person has engaged in fraud, the consequences can be severe. **Immigration** authorities can retroactively seek to revoke citizenship of people found to have violated **immigration** law. But that process is very rare, generally used only in extreme cases, such as when a person is suspected of involvement with terrorism.

Still, the new information "shows a disregard for the rules," said Bruce Morrison, a former Democratic congressman and **immigration** expert. "Technically, it could unravel her status, if it is true."

Paolo Zampolli, a former partner in modeling agency, confirmed to the AP that the documents appeared authentic but that he could not recall additional details. He has told The Washington Post that he paid for Melania to come to New York in 1996 and arranged for her H-1B work visa so she could work at his Metropolitan Models.

She was 26 at the time, far older than the typical Eastern European recruit, usually 18 or 19.

Metropolitan was dragged into nasty contract disputes, and court documents related to them filed in New York detail many lavish parties its young models attended.

Metropolitan, like many modeling agencies, often threw parties, and their guest list included rich and influential men. It was at one of the parties in 1998 that Zampolli said he introduced Melania to Trump.

**Immigration** experts say questions remain about how Melania was able to obtain her green card in 2001, which allowed her to remain in the U.S. permanently.

She has said she was granted the permit because of "extraordinary ability," but experts say that visa category is generally reserved for people whose accomplishment is at the level of a Nobel Prize winner. It would be unusual, they say, for a model with no college degree to qualify.

rosalind.helderman@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the early hours after this year's Brexit vote, the top Google searches on the topic by shocked Britons were "what does it mean to leave the EU" and "what is the EU."

Don't let this happen here.

Now that James B. Comey has dedicated the FBI to the election of Donald Trump, a remote possibility is a serious prospect. But we don't have to wonder what the first 100 days of a Trump presidency would look like. Trump has given a clear picture of what he plans, and the rest would be filled in by events beyond Trump's control.

Among things you can expect: a trade war with China and Mexico, a restarting of Iran's nuclear program, millions losing their health insurance, the start of mass deportations, a possible military standoff with China in the South China Sea and North Korea, the resumption of waterboarding, the use of federal agencies to go after Hillary Clinton and other Trump critics, the spectacle of the commander in chief suing women who have accused him of sexual misconduct and a constitutional crisis as the president of the United States attempts to disqualify the federal judge in a fraud suit against him because the judge is Latino.

Oh, and the Fed would be audited, and guns would once again be allowed in schools - thank heavens.

Trump has said that on his first day in office he would label China "a currency manipulator" - kicking off punitive tariffs. Trump said he would seek a 45 percent tariff on Chinese imports. Likewise, he would on his first day announce that he would renegotiate or (more likely) withdraw from the North American Free Trade Agreement. He favors 35 percent tariffs on Mexican imports.

China and Mexico, thrown into recession, would likely retaliate by blocking U.S. businesses from their markets. In the ensuing trade war, American consumers would be unable to purchase products they rely on, and inflation would soar.

American businesses would lose hundreds of billions of dollars in exports. A Moody's report done for The Post predicts a net cost to the United States of 7 million jobs. Recession would come within a year - unless further economic shocks bring about a 1930s-style depression.

And where would such a shock come from? Well, Trump has said he would ask Congress, also on his first day, to repeal Obamacare. This would mean the loss of health insurance for 24 million Americans, and mass chaos.

At the same time, Trump would deliver a shock to labor markets: He would, on his first day, begin the deportation of more than 2 million "criminal illegal **immigrants**." The liberal Center for American Progress calculates this would cost $20.1 billion, and there's only enough funding currently to deport 400,000 per year.

Simultaneously, Trump pledges to deliver an immediate blow to local-government finances, cutting off hundreds of millions of dollars in public safety and other funds to "sanctuary cities." U.S. universities and laboratories would be hit by Trump's pledge to cancel payments to U.N. climate-change programs, the Center for American Progress says. Huge tax cuts that Trump pledged would require either massive cuts in government spending (and resulting job loss) or vast increase in debt.

The backdrop for these economic shocks: international chaos. Many Trump early-days promises - halting **immigration** from terrorist-prone countries, renegotiating NATO terms and the Iran nuclear accord, pulling out of the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the Paris climate-change agreement - would open rifts with allies in Europe, Asia and the Middle East.

As trade wars spread, shocks to the economy mounted and allies retreated, the new president would be distracted by legal proceedings. Though "Crooked Hillary" gets the attention, a judge in New Jersey last month ruled that there is probable cause to investigate a complaint of official misconduct against Gov. Chris Christie - the head of Trump's would-be transition - because of his role in the "Bridgegate" scandal. Ties to Russia by two Trump loyalists are reportedly under federal examination.

Trump University is facing multiple investigations and class-action suits accusing it of fraud. One such suit is scheduled to go to trial on Nov. 28 before U.S. District Judge Gonzalo Curiel. Trump called Indiana-born Curiel "Mexican" and said the judge can't be impartial because of his ethnicity.

Trump has threatened to use the power of the presidency against Curiel, much as he has threatened to use it against Clinton and the media. "They ought to look into Judge Curiel," he said, adding, "We will come back in November. Wouldn't that be wild if I am president and come back and do a civil case? ... This is called life, folks."

This is life in the early days of a Trump presidency: economic shock, international instability and constitutional crisis as Trump makes the presidency his plaything.

Don't say you weren't warned.

Twitter: @Milbank

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

habitatpwc.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

.

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

valda.wisdombrown@vdh.virginia.gov.

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

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

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

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

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

- Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This election had been eating at Chris Drake. A staunch liberal in his 20s, he became a Republican by 30. But now 45 and an independent, he couldn't stomach either Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump. And despite his libertarian leanings, he decided that Gary Johnson lacked the basic "depth of knowledge" to serve as president.

Then he saw the bumper sticker. A joke, sure, but it made sense: "Neil deGrasse Tyson/Bill Nye 2016." There it was. His write-in choice for president.

"Can we just have some rational people who deal with facts and see how they do?" Drake, a software engineer in Bellevue, Neb., said of his dream ticket, two TV-friendly men of science. "I know it's not going to matter. No one's ever going to win a write-in vote. But I also can't not make a vote."

The write-in option may be the last **refuge** of an **alienated** but committed electorate - and this year, it's hotter than ever. Everywhere you look this season, reasonable people are putting intensely philosophical and creative thought into how, exactly, they will throw away their vote for president.

"Planz for Nov. 8," Monica Moser, a Nashville musician, wrote on Twitter recently. "Write in @CondoleezzaRice."

"Anyone else trying to write in Theo Epstein on Nov 8?" tweeted Cameron Weiss, a Los Angeles sports agent.

Other popular choices: Michelle Obama. Jon Stewart. SNL's Kate McKinnon. David Brown, the former Dallas police chief. Ken Bone, that random red-sweater guy from the debate. The write-in option is where our deeply felt sense of civic rights and responsibilities - we should go to the polls, we need not be constrained by the ballot options - meets our fantasy-dinner party guest list.

Granted, there can be a whiff of strategy behind the pipe dream. After Bernie Sanders lost the Democratic nomination, some of his die-hards tried to mount coordinated write-in campaigns. But those efforts fizzled, largely because of Sanders's utter lack of interest. (There is literally no hope of drafting some noble but reluctant hero into the White House: In most states, even write-in candidates must get themselves registered for their votes to be counted.)

Recently, write-in mania has shifted to conservative circles - an escape hatch for Never Trump stalwarts who just can't see themselves pulling a lever for Clinton.

Ana Navarro, the GOP strategist, says she will probably write in her own mother. Mitt Romney has said he might write in his wife. Conservative columnist Charles Krauthammer wrote that "with Albert Schweitzer doubly unavailable (noncitizen, dead), I'm down to Paul Ryan or Ben Sasse."

More remarkable is the chorus of Republican lawmakers touting their write-in plans. It became especially fashionable after Trump's lewd groping confessions went public in an "Access Hollywood" video last month: Sens. Kelly Ayotte and Rob Portman said they will write in Mike Pence, Sen. John McCain said he's considering Sen. Lindsey Graham, and Tennessee Gov. Bill Haslam vowed to cast a vote for some other Republican TBA. Ohio Gov. John Kasich's office announced Tuesday that he wrote in McCain. But months earlier, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen was already promising to write in Jeb Bush, while Sen. Mark Kirk was talking up his vote for either David Petraeus or Colin Powell.

Of course, within these declarations lies a hidden message (Hey, guys, wouldn't it be FUN to cast a write-in vote?), designed to nudge Trump-resistant Republicans off their couches and to the polls - and, while they're busy scribbling in their fantasy pick, hopefully support their down-ballot candidates as well.

Still, the energy that people put into picking the perfect write-in is amusing, considering the utter fruitlessness.

"It's literally impossible to win a presidential election through a write-in vote," said Jan Baran, an elections lawyer with the Washington firm of Wiley Rein. That's because of the patchwork of rules governing how write-in votes are counted or whether they are even allowed at all. Nine states don't permit write-in voting for the presidential race.

So why does any voter bother to write someone in?

"Because they don't know what the rules are," Baran said. "Or they know that person is not going to be elected - so it is just therapy of some sort."

Our electoral Mad Lib may seem like a bit of polling-place whimsy, but the write-in option has deep roots. "At one time," said Edward B. Foley, a law professor at Ohio State University, "all votes were write-in votes."

Eventually, political parties started printing tickets of their anointed candidates, which voters could just shove into the ballot box. Some took to crossing out names and writing in their own picks.

Amid concerns of fraud, the United States shifted in the 1890s to government-provided ballots, with checklists of all the candidates. To accommodate old habits, they left a blank space for voters who wanted to choose someone entirely different.

Occasionally, write-in campaigns succeed. After petition snags got him thrown off the 2002 Democratic primary ballot, then-D.C. Mayor Anthony Williams ran for reelection as a write-in and won. Eight write-in candidates have been elected to Congress, according to Richard Winger, editor of Ballot Access News, including one who unseated John F. Kennedy's grandfather in 1919.

The option certainly came in handy in 1998, when Tennessee state Sen. Tommy Burks, a Democrat, was killed just weeks before Election Day - and his GOP challenger, Byron ("Low Tax") Looper, was charged with his murder. Burks was removed from the ballot, but Looper couldn't be, since he hadn't yet been convicted. So Burks's widow ran as a write-in and won, overwhelmingly. Without that option, Winger noted, "voters would have been forced to vote for a murderer."

Yet no write-ins have made a mark in presidential politics. Evan McMullin has high hopes this year: Running strong in Utah, he is balloted in 10 other states and drawing buzz among write-in enthusiasts elsewhere. But no presidential write-in candidate has, in a single state, ever won more than 2 percent - which was Ralph Nader's 2000 tally in Wyoming, one of the few places he was not on the ballot.

Is the write-in option good for democracy? The practice troubles some political theorists, because it essentially gives voters a free pass out of a tough decision.

The write-in vote undermines the process of forcing the electorate to hold its nose and just settle on a darn candidate. In a close race, it could launch the less popular of two major-party candidates to a plurality win.

But the write-in option also offers a fix for those who regard the system of winnowing the field as flawed. In 2010, Sen. Lisa Murkowski lost the Alaska GOP primary to a tea party challenger. She forged ahead as a write-in, arguing that her party's takeover by ultraconservatives had robbed general-election voters of a real choice. And she won.

Voting, Foley said, isn't just about putting someone in office. It carries "a symbolic and expressive value" that makes it hard to dismiss a write-in vote as a wasted one.

"Unless an election comes down to a single vote, no one vote is going to be decisive," he added. "So if I decide to cast my ballot as a write-in, that may be as important symbolically as if I cast a vote for a winner or a loser in a blowout race."

That's how Mike, a defense industry executive in Northern Virginia, sees it. A lifelong Republican (whose job prevents him from speaking publicly about politics), he was **alienated** early on by Trump's disparaging comments about McCain's POW ordeal.

"That was unforgivable. That's not the Ronald Reagan way, that's not the Bushes' way," he said. But as for Clinton? "I just know too much about her." So in early voting, he wrote the name of retired Marine Gen. James Mattis - "a common-sense, call-it-like-it-is guy."

"Some would consider it a protest vote," he said. "I consider it a vote of conscience."

Jenni Mammen Terry, 35, a social worker in Meridian, Idaho, went a step further. Dismayed by her options - "how is this happening, when I feel like everyone I know doesn't agree with these candidates?" - she set up a Facebook page to rally support for a write-in alternative.

But who? She settled on the wrestler-turned-movie star Dwayne Johnson.

"Everybody likes The Rock," she said. "We could all get behind him, right?"

Jenni! Do you really want The Rock to be president?

Perhaps not, she conceded.

"I'm not going to vote for the lesser of the two evils," she said. "I don't have much control. But you have to feel good about your vote."

amy.argetsinger@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Nov. 2 front-page article "In Nev. desert, warning of an uprising":

I tried to see the side of the Bundys and their ilk, in the dispute about the government's desire to save the formation-rich land near their property. To me, the operative words are "south of the Bundy family ranch." It is not their land. Also defining are the last statements in the article, about how the family just wants things to stay the same through the generations. Very few people have that luxury.

I have no sympathy for what seems to be a self-serving, anti-American group given a break in court who now feel they can make threats.

Harise Poland-Wright, Silver Spring

The Bundys, emboldened by the recent court verdict acquitting them in their 41 days of forceful armed takeover of "our" important Malheur National Wildlife **Refuge** in Oregon, are again threatening violence if Bureau of Land Management land in Nevada is raised to a higher level of protection.

Gold Butte has seen vandalism of its Native American petroglyphs, off-road vehicles damaging sensitive areas that protect endangered or threatened species, and further deterioration of the environment by grazing beyond its carrying capacity (including by the Bundy cattle), thus threatening native wildlife and plants. I have visited many of these lands that the Bundys think should not be under federal government control.

Yellowstone National Park is a prime example of government land that belongs to all Americans. Our lands include the myriad national wildlife **refuges** such as Malheur. They are there to protect our national treasures, which include migratory birds and lesser-known species of plants and animals. Our national lands, excluding national parks, are regulated in such a way that we can use their resources for mining, grazing, irrigation, logging, hunting and recreational pursuits. On-site staffers ensure that sound resource management policies are followed.

We have dedicated people in government agencies that are protecting our lands from abuse from the Bundys and their followers.

Wayne Wolfersberger, Herndon

The writer is a former employee of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Park Service.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS - At least 239 migrants are believed to have drowned this week in two shipwrecks off the coast of Libya, the United Nations **refugee** agency said Thursday, adding to the toll in what was already the deadliest year on record in the Mediterranean Sea.

Survivor accounts suggest that two crowded boats broke up just off the Libyan coast Wednesday, said Carlotta Sami, spokeswoman for the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**. The 31 survivors were taken Thursday to the Italian island of Lampedusa, which has become a rescue hub amid an ever-deadlier crisis as migrants depart Africa's northern shores trying to reach Europe.

The reports from the survivors could not be independently confirmed, but it is common for migrant ships to be filled far beyond capacity, and hundreds have perished in past sinkings. If true, the latest shipwrecks bring the toll of dead and missing in the Mediterranean to 4,220 this year, the highest on record, Sami said.

"This is an absolutely appalling figure," she said.

According to Sami, the 29 survivors of the first wreck said they capsized after wooden planks at the bottom of the rubber dinghy broke apart several hours after departing Libya around 3 a.m. Wednesday. Pregnant women and at least six children were on board, survivors told the UNHCR, but no children were saved in the rescue, which took place about 25 miles off Libya's coast. One woman lost her 2-month-old baby, Sami said, and 12 bodies were recovered.

The survivors said they were in the cold waters for hours before being rescued about 3 p.m. Wednesday. They said more than 140 people were aboard the boat.

Two survivors of the second shipwreck were rescued in a separate operation, Sami said. They said at least 120 had been on board their boat, which had problems immediately upon setting out and broke apart off the Libyan coast around 5 a.m. Wednesday.

The remaining passengers are believed to have drowned, Sami said. No further rescue operations are being performed at the location of those shipwrecks.

Most of the migrants appear to have come from sub-Saharan Africa, Sami said, but she said details were still being checked. She did not immediately know which agency carried out the rescue.

The European Union is conducting a search-and-rescue operation in the western Mediterranean that is temporarily being offered logistical help by the NATOmilitary alliance.

"In this, the deadliest year for boat migration to Europe, the E.U. remains focused on deterrence over protection," Judith Sunderland, associate Europe and Central Asia director at Human Rights Watch, said in a statement Thursday. "The E.U. should be pressing Libyan authorities for permission to operate in Libyan waters, so they can help those in distress and bring them safely to Europe."

This week, the Gambian soccer federation announced that one of its stars had died at sea while trying to reach Europe. Fatim Jawara, 19, the goalkeeper on the country's women's national team, drowned when her boat went down off the coast of Libya several weeks ago.

michael.birnbaum@washpost.com

Kevin Sieff in Kigali, Rwanda, contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The grocery store aisles have become ground zero for this election's politicized brands on social media.

First Skittles found itself unwittingly pulled into the political crosshairs after Donald Trump Jr. tweeted a meme comparing the candy to **refugees**. Then Tic Tac found itself as Donald Trump's preferred breath freshener "just in case I start kissing her," as he said in that lewd hot-mic video released in October. And last week, after Richard Yuengling Jr. said his beer company was behind Trump, a social-media debate erupted between Trump supporters who said they'd be buying the 187-year-old beer and his critics who said they would boycott it.

Now, following a New York Times story Monday that detailed how Chobani founder Hamdi Ulukaya has come under fire from far-right conservatives over his hiring of **refugees** and advocacy for them, the Greek yogurt brand has seen a wave of attention on social media. Ulukaya, an **immigrant** from Turkey who is of Kurdish descent, employs more than 300 **refugees** in his factories. He has started a foundation to get businesses involved in solving the crisis. And he has pledged to give away most of his wealth in support of migrants.

In response, the Times reported, he has become the target of articles on the conservative website Breitbart and a call for boycotts of his brand on social media.

In recent days, a groundswell of support for Chobani has emerged on social media, all but drowning out the boycott. The yogurt brand was mentioned more than 9,300 times on Tuesday, the day after the Times' story was posted, which was an 8,600 percent bump, according to analytics firm Brandwatch.

Eighty-five percent of the mentions about chief executive Ulukaya and 55 percent of the social-media mentions were positive, but that's a misleading number: The "negative" mentions weren't necessarily criticizing the company or chief executive, according to Brandwatch. Instead, they were largely condemning the threats made against the company for employing **refugees**.

On Twitter, the hashtags #chobani and #**refugees** and #buychobani far outpaced #boycott, Brandwatch noted.

Some tweets praised Ulukaya. "I vote with my wallet and look forward to buying a lot more @chobani," said one.

Republican strategist and Trump critic Ana Navarro called it the "insanity of the day," tweeting that she had two Chobani yogurts for breakfast. Tommy Vietor, a former National Security Council spokesman under President Obama, urged people to "please go buy @Chobani products to support them."

Others made a clear connection between the brand and an election in which GOP nominee Donald Trump has proposed a ban on Syrian **refugees**. One supporter declared Chobani his "election-night snack."

On the company's Facebook page, comments poured in with support for the chief executive's actions. Some referred to Ulukaya's treatment of employees. Chobani made headlines this year for giving its 2,000 full-time workers awards that could be worth up to 10 percent of the company's future value. Last month, Chobani added six weeks of paid parental leave for new mothers and fathers.

A representative for the company declined to comment. At a Fast Company conference, Ulukaya said it was the right thing to do to help **refugees** get jobs.

He spoke about the role corporations can play in filling the gap where government actions haven't worked.

"It has never been this important in human history that business owners and innovators are not disconnected from human life and definitely not disconnected from their own employees and communities," he said, according to Fast Company.

Ulukaya also talked about two employees, one of whom is now a manager, who escaped Afghanistan after their father was killed and they left their mother behind.

"These are two stories," he said. "I have 600 stories. These are all human beings."

jena.mcgregor@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Even as the electoral map shows new signs of volatility, a surge in early voting by Latinos is bolstering Hillary Clinton's prospects in battleground states including Arizona, Florida and Nevada in the closing days of a tightened race against Donald Trump.

Fresh election data suggest that the Democratic nominee appears to be benefiting from upticks in participation by Latinos, who historically vote in lower numbers than the electorate overall. The trend, say advocates seeking to expand the Hispanic vote, is largely motivated by distaste for Trump, who has proposed hardline **immigration** policies and stirred emotions from the outset of his campaign with a series of controversial statements about Mexicans and other Latinos.

"The Trump candidacy and the climate it's created has really heightened the importance and the personal nature of this election for Latinos," said Yvanna Cancela, political director of Culinary Workers Union 226, which represents casino workers in Nevada.

According to the data firm Catalist, one of the largest increases of early voting by Latinos is taking place in Arizona, a traditionally Republican state that Clinton visited for the first time during the general election on Wednesday. Her running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, delivered a speech there in Thursday entirely in Spanish.

Significant upticks are also taking place in Nevada and Florida, two other states where a burgeoning Hispanic vote could prove key in determining the outcome.

With Latinos accounting for about half of its 57,000 members, the culinary union in Nevada has launched an unprecedented door-knocking and phoning effort to urge members and their neighbors to cast their votes early.

In Florida, more Latinos had voted early as of Wednesday than did so during the entire early voting period in 2012, according to the Clinton campaign. Some of the biggest registration gains there have come along the Interstate 4 corridor, which has witnessed a big influx of Puerto Ricans since in the wake of the island's economic difficulties.

More modest increases in Latino participation, meanwhile, are being seen in battleground states including Colorado and Virginia, where most polls show Clinton with a shrinking lead over Trump. Manassas Park, a suburb in the fast-growing Washington region with the highest concentration of Latino voters in Virginia, has seen an uptick in absentee voting, as has surrounding Prince William County, according to the state elections board.

In Texas, a red state where Trump maintains a lead in polling, counties with the highest shares of Latino voters, all located along the Mexican border, have also seen surges in early voting, according to the office of the secretary of state.

Among Hispanics, Clinton maintained roughly a 50 percentage point lead in a new Washington Post-Univision News poll released Thursday, with Trump's deep unpopularity raising questions about how much his candidacy has hampered Republicans' long-term chances to win back support from the nation's largest minority-group voting bloc.

At the same time, early voting among African Americans - another key part of the constituency Clinton is counting upon to prevail - until recent days had been lagging voter participation from four years ago.

Clinton sought to shore up support among black voters during a pair of appearances in North Carolina on Thursday in which she argued that Trump's vision for his presidency would leave them behind.

"He has spent this entire campaign offering a dog whistle to his most hateful supporters," Clinton told a crowd of about 1,800 on the grounds of Pitt Community College. "He retweets white supremacists and spreads racially tinged conspiracy theories."

Clinton noted that Trump has been repeatedly accused of housing discrimination at his real estate properties - and that he repeatedly proclaimed the guilt of five black and Hispanic men, known as the Central Park Five, on assault and rape accusations, even after DNA evidence exonerated them.

"Do any of us have a place in Trump's America?" Clinton asked.

Republicans pointed to some favorable trends in absentee and early voting numbers for their standard-bearer, including upticks in GOP participation in counties in Ohio that Mitt Romney, the party's 2012 nominee, carried. Ohio, which has a large white, working-class population, is among the swing states where Trump has shown the most appeal.

As the race has tightened nationally, Trump has sought to put several Democratic-leaning states in play that share similar demographics, including Wisconsin and Michigan, which figure in his ticket in the race's closing days.

His campaign has also been buoyed by tightening poll numbers in New Hampshire, a largely white state that Clinton until recently appeared to have locked down.

On Thursday, Trump also appeared in North Carolina, a state key to his political fortunes.

In Concord, N.C., Trump cast Clinton as a "candidate of yesterday" and complained that he is held to a different standard than his Democratic rival.

At his rally, Trump continued to draw attention to the FBI's renewed inquiry into Clinton's email practices while she was secretary of state, when she used a private server.

"Now she's got bigger problems. If she were to win, it would create an unprecedented constitutional crisis that would cripple the operations of our government," Trump said.

The GOP nominee also criticized now-interim Democratic National Committee Chairwoman Donna Brazile, after an email released by the anti-secrecy website WikiLeaks indicated that she had provided debate questions in advance to the Clinton campaign. Trump said that if he had done something similar, he would have faced a bigger backlash.

"Headlines: 'Trump to leave race,' " Trump said, opining about what the media reaction would have been had that happened.

Clinton's oft-changing travel schedule provides clues to the day-by-day, hour-by-hour evaluation of the campaign map.

Her campaign is balancing a need to solidify support in Colorado, New Hampshire and Michigan with efforts to counter Trump's momentum in Florida and North Carolina. Bill Clinton made a sudden detour to Detroit on Thursday for outreach aimed at black voters, also a sign of where the campaign sees potential signs of trouble. Hillary Clinton will be there Friday.

Clinton has several ways to assemble the needed 270 electoral votes that do not depend on winning all three of the closest, biggest contests now - Florida, Ohio and North Carolina. But all depend on holding a bedrock of states such as Michigan that have seemed out of play for months.

Both campaigns announced new television ad buys for Michigan for the final week of the campaign. Trump was already advertising there, but Clinton hadn't aired ads in the state since the Democratic primaries.

Trump's slim path to victory most likely depends on peeling off a Democratic-leaning state such as Michigan or Wisconsin atop run-the-table victories in Florida, Ohio, North Carolina and Iowa.

Clinton's effort to pick up Arizona - or at least force Trump to spend time and money there - reflects confidence in her current standing, aides say, as well as a belief that the Latino voting numbers give her a fighting chance.

Kaine delivered an entire campaign speech in Spanish on Thursday evening in Phoenix, where he stressed his belief in a brand of inclusive politics that celebrates diversity. He criticized Trump's controversial rhetoric about **immigrants**, calling the GOP nominee a "payaso," a clown, and specifically criticized his attacks on Judge Gonzalo Curiel and former Miss Universe Alicia Machado.

"For the first time in a long time Arizona is competitive," Kaine said in Spanish, urging voters to vote early - and immediately after the rally. "The power of the Latino vote can make a big difference in many states, in a historic way."

In Arizona, Latinos represented 13.2 percent of all early voters as of Tuesday, up from 11 percent at the same point in 2012 and 8.1 percent in 2008, according to Catalist, a firm that works with Democrats and progressive groups.

In Nevada, Latinos make up 11.8 percent of early voters so far, compared with 10.5 percent in 2012 and 9.1 percent in 2008. And in Florida, they accounted for 14.1 percent of all returned ballots as of Tuesday, up from 9.6 percent at the same point in 2008.

john.wagner@washpost.com
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Jenna Johnson in Florida and North Carolina, Abby Phillip in North Carolina, and Scott Clement, Ed O'Keefe, Sean Sullivan and Karen Tumulty in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**This is no ordinary election. Time for a reminder of what's at stake:

Climate policy and the clean-energy economy: For anyone who accepts the scientific consensus that global warming poses a clear and present danger, there is only one choice. Hillary Clinton will continue along the path laid out by President Obama and other world leaders. Donald Trump has claimed, ridiculously, that climate change is a hoax invented by the Chinese.

For the first time, the three nations most responsible for spewing heat- trapping carbon dioxide into the atmosphere - China, the United States and India - have all formally agreed to curb emissions. The landmark Paris agreement is the biggest and most important step taken to date. Clinton would honor the accord; Trump would renounce it on his first day in office.

The rest of the world is moving rapidly toward renewable sources of energy, which recently surpassed coal as the largest global source of power- generating capacity. According to the International Energy Agency, last year an estimated 500,000 solar panels were installed worldwide every day. Clinton would encourage the growth of the clean-energy sector, which has the potential to create millions of jobs. Trump promises a renaissance of fossil fuels - mining more coal, pumping more oil - even though the electric-power industry is moving on.

The Western alliance: Since the end of World War II, NATO has been the globe's most important military alliance, a bulwark against Soviet - now Russian - expansionism and a source of peace and prosperity. It is no accident that the United States and Europe are the world's biggest economic powers.

Clinton may be a bit hawkish for some tastes, but she is firmly committed to the NATO security framework. Trump describes NATO as if it were a protection racket.

Trump has repeatedly and consistently expressed a desire for an alliance with Russia, even after it seized Crimea from Ukraine and intervened to save the murderous regime of dictator Bashar al-Assad in Syria. Trump often voices his admiration for Russian President Vladimir Putin - who, according to U.S. intelligence analysts, has deployed an army of Internet hackers against the Democratic Party in a shocking and unprecedented attempt to meddle in our election. Trump has done nothing to refute Clinton's claim that he would be Putin's "puppet" in the White House.

**Immigration** reform: An estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** live in the United States, most of them from Mexico and Central America. Clinton supports common-sense **immigration** reform that would secure the southern border, modernize our system of legal **immigration** and bring undocumented people out of the shadows by giving them legal status and a path toward citizenship. Trump does not.

Trump launched his campaign by saying of Mexican **immigrants**: "They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists. And some, I assume, are good people." He has called for building a physical wall along the entire border with Mexico and absurdly said that Mexico would somehow pay for it. And he pledges to deport all of the undocumented, in what would amount to a massive campaign of ethnic cleansing. Doing so would require a gargantuan and intrusive deportation force the likes of which this country has never imagined, let alone witnessed.

The social fabric: The country is undergoing inexorable demographic change. By 2044, if not sooner, according to the Census Bureau, there will be no racial or ethnic majority; non-Hispanic whites, in other words, will be less than 50 percent of the population, becoming a minority just like every other group. This is already the case in California, Texas, New Mexico and Hawaii, and nationwide among children younger than 5.

Clinton understands and embraces these changes. Trump, by contrast, has become the champion of those whites who, like King Canute, would hold back the sea. It is no accident that he is avidly supported by the likes of David Duke, the unabashed white nationalist, Holocaust denier and former imperial wizard of the Ku Klux Klan. When Trump says "Make America Great Again," many minorities hear "Make America White Again."

Fiscal sanity: Clinton proposes new spending - including to improve the Affordable Care Act - that would increase the national debt by $250 billion over the next decade, according to the bipartisan Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget. Trump's combination of huge tax cuts and increased spending, however, would balloon the debt by a crushing $10 trillion over the same period.

I could go on, but you get the point. Donald Trump gravely threatens our future. He must be stopped.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON - Britain's plan for getting out of the European Union was thrown into doubt Thursday as a senior court ruled that Prime Minister Theresa May will need to get Parliament's approval before she acts.

The surprise decision introduced new uncertainty to a process already fraught with complication and threatened to derail May's timetable of triggering Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for exiting the E.U., by the end of March.

It also boosted the odds that the prime minister, in office only since July, will have to call a fresh election next year to win the mandate she needs to launch E.U. divorce talks.

The decision drew immediate condemnation from pro-Brexit politicians, who warned of an angry backlash from voters who favor leaving the 28-member bloc and had thought the matter was settled when they opted in a June referendum to get out.

Pro-E.U. leaders, meanwhile, showered the ruling with praise, and the pound jumped on hopes that Brexit might be postponed - or somehow avoided altogether.

A statement from May's office at 10 Downing Street said it was "disappointed" by the ruling and would appeal to the Supreme Court. Justices are expected to take the case next month.

At the heart of the legal dispute is a clash between direct and representative democracy. Although the British opted for Brexit by a margin of 52 percent to 48 percent, a large majority of members in Parliament wanted Britain to stay in the E.U. By giving Parliament a voice, the London-based High Court handed power back to a group that is skeptical or even hostile toward the very idea of Brexit.

Mujtaba Rahman, Europe director for the Eurasia Group political consultancy, said Thursday that lawmakers will be reluctant to incur voters' wrath by going directly against their will and blocking exit plans.

Nonetheless, he described the court's decision as "a severe setback for Theresa May's government."

If the Supreme Court upholds the judgment on appeal, Rahman wrote in a Thursday analysis, then pro-E.U. lawmakers could use the process to "seek to tie May's negotiating hand."

One option for May, in turn, could be to call a general election next year "to ask the public to endorse her negotiating goals - in effect, to use an election to override Parliament," he added.

That would be a sharp break from the plan May has repeatedly outlined. She intends to trigger Brexit on her own, without Parliament's input, and has ruled out an early election.

Thursday's decision instantly threw that plan into disarray. A three-judge panel representing England and Wales dismissed government lawyers' arguments that May has the executive power necessary to launch Brexit talks on her own and sided with a group of plaintiffs who contended that Parliament must weigh in first.

"The most fundamental rule of the U.K.'s constitution is that Parliament is sovereign and can make and unmake any law it chooses," the judges wrote. "As an aspect of the sovereignty of Parliament it has been established for hundreds of years that the Crown - i.e. the Government of the day - cannot by exercise of prerogative powers override legislation enacted by Parliament."

The court's decision stunned British political and legal observers - just as the referendum outcome also defied predictions that voters would favor staying in the E.U. Until Thursday, most analysts had predicted the court would side with the government. The High Court in Northern Ireland had ruled as recently as last week that May's government could bypass Parliament.

Thursday's ruling sparked an immediate rally in Britain's beleaguered currency. The pound has been battered since the referendum and has been one of the worst-performing currencies in the world this year.

Mark Carney, governor of the Bank of England, warned again Thursday of likely inflation next year and said the ruling is "an example of the uncertainty that will characterize this process."

Brexit advocates quickly denounced the decision, saying it amounted to a betrayal of the public's will.

"I now fear every attempt will be made to block or delay triggering Article 50," tweeted Nigel Farage, a longtime Brexit champion. "They have no idea the level of public anger they will provoke."

Suzanne Evans, a candidate to succeed Farage as leader of the U.K. Independence Party, added a condemnation of "activist judges" who "attempt to overturn our will."

"Time we had the right to sack them," she wrote.

Pro-E.U. politicians, meanwhile, pressured May to share with Parliament her negotiating strategy - something she has steadfastly refused to do, insisting she will not give "a running commentary" on the talks.

"So far May's team have been all over the place when it comes to prioritizing what is best for Britain, and it's time they pull their socks up and start taking this seriously," Liberal Democrat leader Tim Farron said in a statement.

Pro-E.U. leaders also pointed to what they described as hypocrisy on the Brexit side. One prominent argument for getting out of the E.U. was to restore the sovereignty of Parliament. But in this case, anti-E.U. leaders want Parliament nowhere near a decision that carries huge ramifications for the country's future.

The court ruling - assuming it is not overturned on appeal - sets up a crucial decision for the 650 representatives in Britain's House of Commons. Members of the ruling Conservative Party were almost evenly split when the country voted June 23 on whether Britain should stay in the E.U. or leave. But solid majorities of the other major parties in Parliament - including Labour, the Scottish National Party and the Liberal Democrats - all opposed an exit.

May, who took office in July following the resignation of David Cameron, has only a narrow majority in Parliament and could struggle to pass legislation authorizing the start of Britain's departure.

An early election could be a way for May to regain the initiative. Dominic Raab, a pro-Brexit Tory member of Parliament, alluded to that possibility in an interview with the BBC, effectively daring pro-E.U. parties to force a new vote. "I don't think those trying to break the verdict of the referendum would be rewarded," he said in reference to polls that show Conservatives well ahead of their rivals.

Some analysts played down the ruling's impact, noting that Parliament is unlikely to risk the ire of voters by undermining Brexit.

"We're moving towards the sovereignty of the people," said King's College London historian Vernon Bogdanor, "which is quite a different concept."

Since taking power, May has often promised that "Brexit means Brexit." But her government has struggled to put together a coherent strategy for the tough negotiations to come with Europe.

The talks - set to last two years once Article 50 has been triggered - are likely to focus on the trade-off between Britain's desire to control E.U. **immigration** into the country and its wish to retain access to the E.U.'s common market.

Foreign Secretary Boris Johnson, a leading Brexit proponent, has said the government's objective "should be having our cake and eating it."

But European leaders have said that will not be possible and that Britain will have to allow **immigrants** if it wants to maintain the market access that is at the core of its trading relationships with Europe.

Johnson on Wednesday appeared to make unwitting reference to the government's struggles, saying in a speech at an awards ceremony sponsored by the conservative Spectator magazine that Britain would make "a titanic success" of Brexit.

George Osborne, Britain's pro-E.U. former treasury chief, quickly interjected, "It sank."

griff.witte@washpost.com

Brian Murphy in Washington and Karla Adam in London contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE PICTURE that accompanied a New York Times article about the founder of Chobani yogurt showed him with a giant American flag in the background. That was fitting, because Hamdi Ulukaya epitomizes the American success story - **immigrating** here, working hard, overcoming adversity, building a successful business and now giving back by helping others. Unfortunately, there is another strand to his story, and it is one of xenophobia that too often has marked the country's reaction to waves of **immigration**. Even more distressing is that this ugliness has been enabled by the rhetoric of a presidential candidate who extols brute nationalism as a badge of honor.

Mr. Ulukaya, a Turkish **immigrant** of Kurdish descent who has built a flourishing business making a popular Greek yogurt, has become the target of racist attacks on social media and negative articles on alt-right websites. Mr. Ulukaya's sin? Employing some **refugees** at his plants in upstate New York and in Twin Falls, Idaho, and advocating that other companies do more to assist **immigrants**.

The attacks have been encouraged by a series of conspiratorial articles. "American Yogurt Tycoon Vows to Choke U.S. With Muslims" headlined one article on the far-right website WND. Breitbart, the conservative website whose former executive chairman Stephen K. Bannon is now running Donald Trump's presidential campaign, ran what the Times characterized as misleading articles tying the hiring of **refugees** to two rape cases in Idaho as well as a spike in tuberculosis in the state. Now there are calls to boycott Chobani.

It is hard not to see the events as an outgrowth of the overheated debate about **immigration** in the presidential race. That Mr. Trump has opposed resettling **refugees**, summarily dismissed one nationality as criminals and rapists, and proposed a ban on **immigrants** of a certain religion has helped to feed the hate. It is no mere coincidence that Mr. Ulukaya, an **immigrant**, was targeted while other executives who have aided **refugees** were not.

Here is what should not get lost. Chobani has annual yogurt sales of about $1.5 billion. It employs about 2,000 people. Mr. Ulukaya, by all accounts, has proved to be a generous employer, paying more than the minimum wage and offering paid parental leave and Chobani shares to employees. He is, in short, a perfect rebuke to those who want to scare the United States into shutting the door to **immigrants**. Thankfully, much like other people who came to this country and encountered prejudice, he shows no sign of being deterred.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**KABUL - Abdulhalim fled the northern city of Kunduz this month after militants and security forces had been clashing for days.

Now he's 200 miles away in Kabul, sleeping in a tent and living on aid. He is part of a looming humanitarian crisis aid agencies here are struggling to contain.

Before the current crisis, more than a million people had already been uprooted last year. This year, at least another million Afghans are "on the move" inside Afghanistan and across its borders, in what the United Nations warns is an alarming new wave of displaced people.

Many, like Abdulhalim, fled violence or conflict; others escaped hardships such as poverty or drought. Still others were forced to return from Pakistan and Iran.

Even as the numbers grew, Afghanistan agreed to accept Afghan asylum seekers deported from the European Union. The deal, signed in October, could lead the E.U. to construct a separate terminal for deportees at Kabul's international airport, and as many as 100,000 Afghans could return.

"This sudden increase [in the displaced] has put a lot of pressure on Afghanistan, which has had 30 years of war," said Nader Farhad, spokesman for the U.N. **refugee** agency in Kabul. "It's not easy to put together the infrastructure, to provide the services that are required," he said, adding that the displaced need everything from food and blankets to jobs and health care.

"To the European countries, we say: Instead of investing in the return of Afghans to Afghanistan, tackle the root causes," Farhad said. If the United Nations and other aid agencies fail to provide emergency assistance, "it will be a humanitarian crisis," he said.

Massive displacement has plagued Afghanistan for years, beginning with the Soviet invasion in 1979.

That conflict kindled two decades of war. When the United States invaded in 2001, some 4 million Afghans were living in Pakistan and Iran.

Many of those **refugees** later returned, driven by hopes for stability and peace. But now, Afghanistan is witnessing some of its worst violence since the United States helped to topple the Taliban.

More than 1,600 civilians were killed in the first six months of 2016, according to a U.N. report released in July. That was the highest number of civilian casualties in the first half of a year since the United Nations began keeping track in 2009.

The violence has been driven by Taliban assaults on Afghan cities, putting more civilians in the crosshairs. And the clashes have pushed even more people from their homes.

"The fighting was intense. There was artillery, rockets, aerial bombardment," Abdulhalim, 38, said of this month's days-long battle between Afghan and Talibanforces in Kunduz city. Insurgents briefly seized the city at the same time last year.

"My children were screaming, our neighbors' houses destroyed," said Abdulhalim, who like many Afghans goes by one name. "We had no option but to leave."

In Helmand province, in the restive south, more than 60,000 people have been displaced this year, according to the United Nations, and militants have fought pitched battles in the provincial capital, Lashkar Gah.

At least 5,000 of those displaced in Helmand were forced out only in the past two months, the United Nations says, and thousands more have fled to neighboring provinces and beyond.

"In some provinces, the [armed] groups have more power there, and the government, it is very difficult for us to reach" the affected population, said Sayed Rohullah Hashemi, an adviser to the minister of **refugees** and repatriation. "We don't have the capacity to do so, especially in our ministry. The government cannot reach everyone on its own."

In a dusty lot east of Kabul, the U.N. **refugee** agency has erected a center for the hundreds of thousands of Afghan **refugees** arriving from Pakistan. At least 5,000 **refugees** cross the border from Pakistan every day. The United Nations gives them a small stipend and vaccinates the children against measles and polio.

The influx began after Pakistani authorities announced a deadline for Afghan **refugees** - of which there were 1.7 million registered with the United Nations - to leave. Many of the **refugees** had lived in Pakistan for decades, or were even born there after their parents had fled Afghanistan.

Jumauddin, 27, was born in Pakistan to Afghan parents. Now he is heading to Kunduz province, to the Khanabad district, where Taliban fighters hold sway. He says he has no choice.

"Kabul is too expensive, and maybe in Kunduz I can plow a plot of land," Jumauddin said. "I know that there was fighting there even last week, but I have no other option."

The government is worried about the return of **refugees** to areas where insurgents are active. But right now, the Taliban controls more territory than at any time since 2001.

"We are facing the return of tens of thousands of Afghans each month. ... This will add very much to the vicious cycle of insecurity and joblessness," said Bashir Bezhen, an Afghan analyst and political commentator.

Reports have already surfaced of returning **refugees** clashing with locals over resources and land. The displaced are often rejected, or pushed into squalid camps. They also face the threat of forced eviction and rarely have access to clean water or food.

"They are the poorest of the poor. They often live in open air," the U.N.'s Farhad said. "But they should go back [to their homes] when they feel secure. It has to be voluntary and of their own accord."

In the area where Abdulhalim took shelter, the displaced worried that the government would force them out. The fighting in Kunduz city had subsided, but they couldn't just pack up and go home.

"They want us gone from here, but we don't have anything, not even the money to get back," Abdulhalim said. He first fled Kunduz on foot, with his children and the clothes on his back.

Bezhen said that the government "is incapable of creating jobs for these people or of improving the economy in the remote places where they live." He said criminal and terrorist networks will seek out the jobless and displaced youths.

"It will push Afghanistan into deeper crisis," Bezhen said.

erin.cunningham@washpost.com

Sayed Salahuddin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Kianna Alexander, Alyssa Cole, Lena Hart and Piper Huguley

Although romance novels may be best known for fantasy and extravagance, they can also take on real-life issues, from the domestic to the political. This month, a single romance anthology shows how well the genre can speak to important matters in our past and present.

Daughters of a Nation, from authors Kianna Alexander, Alyssa Cole, Lena Hart and Piper Huguley, is a powerful, timely anthology of historical romance stories featuring black suffragettes. Each of the stories in this self-published book offers an important moment in American voting history and the brave women who fight tirelessly for change and win love in the balance.

Hart's "In the Morning Sun," set in the Reconstruction era, tells the story of Madeline Asher, who heads for Nebraska after a brutal attack, committed to teaching freed men to read and write and fight for the vote. She does not expect her long-lost love, Union veteran James Blakemore, to appear, scarred but alive. This is an emotional tale of an interracial couple separated by war and reunited in a battle of a different kind, changed but still perfect for each other - and strong enough to stand together in their passionate fight for civil rights.

The heroine of Huguley's "The Washerwomen's War" is Mary "Maime" Frances Harper, daughter of the real-life abolitionist and suffragette Frances Harper. Maime is fighting for rights and fair pay for black washerwomen in 1881 Georgia. She vows never to become a minister's wife - a vow she reaffirms after she re-connects with the handsome Rev. Gabriel Whitman, a man she has scorned once before and who now warns against her impassioned work to aid workers in their strike. Of course, heroines do not back down, and Gabriel soon finds Maime and her fearless advocacy irresistible. Huguley - a beloved voice in inspirational romance stories - paints a beautiful portrait of love, faith and politics.

"A Radiant Soul" by Alexander is set in 1881 North Carolina, where heroine Sarah Webster is visiting from the Wyoming Territory. In the West, Sarah was a vocal and public advocate for women's suffrage, a detail she keeps from her family and friends back east. At first glance it seems that she is the perfect match for Owen Markham, who is working with Sons of the Diaspora to enforce the 15th Amendment. The two are immediately drawn to each other and then are quickly at odds: Owen believes that the fight for women's suffrage distracts from the work of his organization. What ensues is a thoughtful look at politics and passion and the frustration that can arise when the two fail to coincide.

The stunning "Let Us Dream" is the capstone of the anthology - a meditation on gender, race, sex, **immigration** and bias that, despite being set in Harlem in 1917, easily echoes the political and social climate of today. Cole's heroine, cabaret owner Bertha Hines, is willing to do almost anything to ensure that the men of New York give women the right to vote, including using her cabaret to tempt them into doing the right thing. When she hires chef Amir Chowdhury, a Muslim Indian **immigrant** disillusioned with the American Dream, the two are soon working together to protect themselves and their future. Cole seamlessly layers powerful, relevant issues - feminism, race, sexual politics and social justice - with deft storytelling. Bertha and Amir are beautiful, brilliant people who are attracted to each other on all levels, which makes the romance sexy, smart and incredibly scintillating. "I love it when you talk unionizing and naturalization," Bertha says to Amir at one point. So will readers.

bookworld@washpost.com

Sarah MacLeanreviews romance novels monthly for The Washington Post. Her most recent book is "A Scot in the Dark."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BUNKERVILLE, Nev. - Less than a week after being acquitted at a trial over last winter's armed occupation of an Oregon federal wildlife **refuge**, Nevada rancher Ryan Bundy said another protest action will be justified if President Obama goes ahead with plans to create a huge national monument abutting the Bundy family's ranch here.

"Absolutely! That's the best thing in the world for [people] to do," Bundy said Monday in a telephone interview from an Oregon jail, where he is being held pending a February trial related to a separate armed standoff in 2014 with federal agents at his family's ranch.

"Read the Declaration of Independence," he said. "It says right there that if the government becomes abusive, it's our right and our duty to abolish that government. If the government won't restrain itself, whatever happens is their own fault."

The suggestion of a potential uprising underscores the extent to which two competing political movements - defiance of federal authority, and Obama's determination to permanently protect vast federal lands - could collide next in this arid patch of land 110 miles northeast of Las Vegas.

Federal officials were alarmed by the jury's decision to acquit Bundy, his brother Ammon and five others who staged a 41-day occupation early this year at the Malheur National Wildlife **Refuge** in remote eastern Oregon.

While the Bundys' supporters hailed the surprise verdict as a victory against what they see as federal overreach, federal officials said it could embolden anyone with a grievance to take over government property and endanger federal workers.

Ryan Bundy is angry that Obama, before he leaves office, may use his executive power under the 1906 Antiquities Act to impose new restrictions on Gold Butte, a 350,000-acre parcel of pristine desert wilderness just south of the Bundy family's ranch.

Obama administration officials said federal officials were rattled by the Oregon verdict, but individuals briefed on the process say the White House is pushing ahead with plans to create a monument that would permanently preserve a federally owned tract filled with soaring peaks, exotic red sandstone formations, an imperiled desert tortoise population and thousands of ancient Native American rock etchings called petroglyphs.

Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.), who has worked to protect the area for years, has described a monument designation as one of his final goals before retiring this year.

Bundy, 44, wouldn't say whether he and his family would encourage some kind of anti-government action over Gold Butte, because "I never say what we will do." But asked whether violence was ever justified against an abusive government, Bundy said: "Ask George Washington."

Repeating an argument common in the West but disputed by most mainstream constitutional scholars, Bundy said the Constitution does not grant the federal government power to own large tracts of land, nor does the president have legal authority to create national monuments. Bundy said that creating the Gold Butte monument would be an abuse of presidential power and a valuation of tourism and endangered species over the economic needs of struggling communities.

"The government should be scared. They are in the wrong. The land does not belong to the government. The land belongs to the people of Clark County, not to the people of the United States," said Bundy, who spoke over the phone as his wife, Angie, sat nearby beneath a shady mesquite tree at the family's 160-acre ranch on the parched banks of the Virgin River.

"The only peaceful resolution to all this is for them to obey the Constitution," he said. "Read it, understand it, abide by it. There doesn't have to be violence. None of that has to happen if they would just abide by the Constitution."

That kind of talk is exactly what officials have worried about after the Oregon verdict. They fear that a potential flash point for anti-government action could be Obama's fast-paced creation of national monuments where grazing, timber-cutting, mining and other commercial activities are generally prohibited. Obama has already created or expanded 27 national monuments, more than any president since Franklin D. Roosevelt.

For many generations, ranchers in Bunkerville have paid a fee to graze their cattle on the Gold Butte land, but nearly all of them allowed the Nature Conservancyand other groups to buy out their permits years ago. The Bundy family, which has fewer than 600 head of cattle, is the last full-time ranching family in the area. Their animals still graze for free, as they have for years, in defiance of federal courts twice ordering the Bundys to desist. The family has refused to pay more than $1 million in fees and fines.

When officials from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the National Park Service tried to remove the cattle in 2014, they were met by the Bundy family and hundreds of armed supporters.

Fearing bloodshed, authorities eventually retreated. Earlier this year, family patriarch Cliven Bundy, along with sons Ammon and Ryan, and 16 others, were charged with an array of federal firearms, conspiracy and assault counts in the 2014 incident. They face trial in Nevada in February.

Interior Secretary Sally Jewell has called the Nevada standoff the worst moment of her tenure. And after last week's acquittal in Oregon, she warned her employees, including those at the BLM, to "take care of yourselves" and "remain vigilant."

A coalition of environmentalists, tribal groups, academics and some business owners eagerly support the Gold Butte plan.

"Gold Butte has captivating landscapes that Americans across the country would love to explore," Sierra Club Executive Director Michael Brune said in an interview. "But it's also home to thousands of archaeological sites that currently have no protection and that could be enjoyed and studied for future generations."

In the two years since BLM staffers withdrew from the area, there has been vandalism, graffiti and habitat degradation through off-road vehicle use, according to a report by Friends of Gold Butte, a group that supports a national monument for the wilderness.

Reid has been the highest-profile advocate for the project. He has devoted much of his career to brokering such deals: During his 34 years in Congress, the amount of federal land off limits to development in Nevada has grown from 67,000 acres to 4.8 million acres.

Speaking on the Senate floor just after Bundys were arrested this year, Reid said: "I've tried to protect Gold Butte for a long time. And the reason we haven't been able to do anything to this point is the Bundy boys and their pals. So that's why I'm grateful for the Antiquities Act. Because of this legislation and because of the fact that the Bundys are in jail, I'm going to reach out to the White House."

As he has personally lobbied the president, Reid has framed the issue as a test of federal will. "Let's tell others how important this is," he said during a news conference in August, "and tell people to keep their damn hands off public lands."

Republicans have opposed Obama's use of "unilateral" executive power to create national monuments. "The establishment of any new national monument in the State of Nevada, regardless of location, ought to be considered in the public Congressional process," Sen. Dean Heller (R-Nev.) wrote in an April letter to the president.

On the Bundy ranch, Angie Bundy said she suspects that the federal government wants to keep control of uranium and other minerals. Local ranchers are far more effective stewards of the land than "bureaucrats from back East," she said, and the government should respect that.

"They should let people who have been protecting this land for generations take care of it," she said. "And they shouldn't be sending in heavily armed military forces to point weapons at a rancher who hasn't paid his taxes."

On Monday, Reid said in a statement that the Gold Butte monument would not be derailed by threats of resistance from "radicals ... intent on using public lands like Gold Butte for their own selfish purposes."

That kind of talk infuriates Duane Magoon, a rancher and Bunkerville town official who was raised by the Bundy family. He said he doubted that local people would rise up against the government over Gold Butte, as they did in Oregon or at the Bundy ranch in 2014. But, he said, "you never know."

"Why would the feds even want to find out? Is the government stupid?" he said. "They are aware that we are upset. Why would they rock that boat? If something happens, it's because of them."

Deep in the heart of Gold Butte one hot afternoon this week, Jim Boone hiked among the otherworldly swirling and jagged sandstone formations known as Little Finland. He admired petroglyphs carved into black stone and salt formations that turned the rock a vibrant shade of blue.

Boone, an ecologist and writer who chronicles Gold Butte's wildlife and history, said lush vegetation covered this area thousands of years ago. But over the centuries, the land dried, and today the vegetation is mainly prickly brush and creosote bushes.

Not far from the Bundy ranch, Boone pulled off the gravel road to look at about 20 of the family's cattle grazing on the parched land.

"In a way, you can understand the Bundys," he said. "The world is changing all around them, the environment and the politics, and all they want to do is have the world stay the same and let their grandchildren do exactly what they did."

kevin.sullivan@washpost.com
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Eilperin reported from Washington.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Democratic Party officials filed lawsuits in four states this week against presidential candidate Donald Trump and the Republican Party, accusing campaign officials and supporters of seeking to threaten minorities to keep them from voting.

With the bitter election just days from ending, these lawsuits were part of a flurry of legal action that could alter what voters experience on Election Day and how party officials can approach voters going forward.

The federal lawsuits in four battleground states - Arizona, Nevada, Ohio and Pennsylvania - arrived just over a week before Election Day and amid polls showing a tightening race between Trump and Hillary Clinton, his Democratic rival. In the suits, officials accuse Trump's campaign and his backers of what the Ohio complaint describes as a "coordinated campaign of vigilante voter intimidation."

Trump has repeatedly described the election as "rigged" without offering any evidence, claims that have worried officials preparing for potential unrest or violence on Election Day. Party leaders and officials across the country have also expressed concerns about voter intimidation and problems at the polls.

In the Ohio lawsuit, the state Democratic Party asked a federal judge to stop the Trump campaign, state party officials and a group associated with Trump supporter Roger Stone from sending people not officially appointed as poll watchers to show up at voting locations.

Attorneys for the Ohio Republican Party, the Trump campaign and Stone did not immediately file court documents responding to that suit, but they were ordered to respond by the end of the day Wednesday.

"This is nothing more than a publicity stunt from the Ohio Democratic Party," Brittany Warner, a spokeswoman for the Ohio GOP, said in a statement. "The arguments cited are not at all related to our official operations at the Ohio Republican Party. Republican leadership in Ohio has created opportunities for greater ballot access and in no way would we ever be involved in the intimidation of voters. Our attorneys are working to prepare the appropriate response."

In a statement, Stone called the lawsuit "bogus" and said that his group, Stop the Steal, "is conducting a neutral, scientifically based exit poll" that would involve interviews only after people cast ballots.

"We are not coordinating with the Trump campaign, the Republican National Committee or the individual Republican state committees," Stone said. "We are not engaged in poll watching. We seek only to determine if the election is honestly and fairly conducted and to provide an evidentiary basis for a challenge to the election if that is not the case."

The Trump and Clinton campaigns did not respond to requests for comment about the lawsuits, nor did the Republican or Democratic national committees.

Voting advocates, who are also expecting some confusion on Election Day because of a wave of stricter election laws still facing litigation, say they are already receiving more calls about problems at polls.

"When people call and tell us they're experiencing something they deem hostile, we take that seriously," said Kristen Clarke, president of Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights Under Law, which has seen increased calls to their offices this election cycle.

Last week, Clarke said that her group received calls about Trump supporters using bullhorns to shout at Clinton supporters and voters outside an early polling location in West Palm Beach, Fla. Video posted by the news outlet ProPublica showed a Trump supporter on a bullhorn yelling, "How many Syrian **refugees**, Muslim **refugees**, are you taking into your home?"

Clarke said her organization complained to authorities, who then ordered the individuals to move farther from the polling site.

These issues were also likely to continue playing out in court. In another potentially key legal filing this week, a federal judge on Monday ordered the Republican National Committee - which is still under a consent decree issued in 1982 - to turn over "all agreements" between the committee and the Trump campaign "regarding voter fraud, ballot security, ballot integrity, poll watching, or poll monitoring."

mark.berman@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The arrival of families, women and children from Central America seeking asylum is not related to a broken **immigration** system, and it is not just about destitution. It is, as pointed out in the Oct. 27 editorial "A border crisis returns," directly related to horrific levels of violence in the region.

The Obama administration's refusal to recognize this as a **refugee** situation and treatment of it as a border-security issue focused primarily on deterrence, punishment, detention and obstructed access to due process represent the wrong approach. The administration's attempts for the past three years have not worked; **refugees** keep coming. It is time to acknowledge this as what it is and respond accordingly by addressing the violence in Central America while investing in improving our asylum-screening and adjudication procedures. All this can and must be done while remaining faithful to our principles as a haven for those seeking liberty and safety and maintaining orderly border procedures.

We cannot and should not stop people from fleeing violence to save their children's lives, but we can ensure that the process through which they reach safety is orderly and efficient and complies with fundamental American values.

Michelle Brané, University Park

The writer is director of migrant rights and justice at the Women's **Refugee** Commission.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Venezuelan officials stopped a Washington Post reporter at the Caracas airport late Monday night and denied him entry, in the latest case of blocking a foreign correspondent from covering the mounting political and economic turmoil in the South American country.

**Immigration** officials told Joshua Partlow, 38, a dual U.S.-Canadian national, that he lacked a required work visa. Partlow and many other foreign correspondents with non-U.S. passports had routinely visited Venezuela in the past without work visas.

Venezuela is mired in its worst recession in decades, and opposition groups have organized protests in recent weeks that have drawn hundreds of thousands of people. Another demonstration had been called for Thursday, although it was postponed late Tuesday.

Carlos Lauria, program director for the Americas at the New York-based Committee to Protect Journalists, said Venezuela adopted a regulation in 2004 requiring visiting correspondents to apply in advance for authorization from the Communications Ministry. But that has rarely been enforced in recent years.

"They are enforcing this selectively now, I think, because they don't want coverage of the protests," Lauria said in a telephone interview.

He said journalists from Spain, Peru and other countries have also been turned back at the Caracas airport in the past few weeks because they lacked authorization. The committee's own representative was also denied entry to the country in late August, with officials saying he lacked press credentials from Venezuela.

American journalists have also been prevented from working in Venezuela. In August, the Miami Herald reported that its correspondent, Jim Wyss, was detained by Venezuelan **immigration** authorities on arrival at the Caracas airport even though he had a valid journalist visa. An ABC News correspondent, Matt Gutman, was picked up by security forces last week while reporting on poor conditions at a hospital and ordered to leave the country, according to news reports.

Partlow, based in Mexico City, had entered Venezuela three times over the past year using his Canadian passport to cover developments in the country. On Monday night, he was instructed to stay in the Caracas airport and board the next flight to Miami, which left Tuesday morning.

"This is a moment when the world should be watching Venezuela, and the barring of a Washington Post journalist at such a key juncture is both arbitrary and outrageous," said The Post's foreign editor, Douglas Jehl.

A spokesman at the Communications Ministry said Tuesday that he did not know the details of Partlow's case. He said visiting correspondents were required to apply at least five days ahead of their trips for authorization from the ministry. Asked why officials had not previously enforced that requirement, he replied that "the ministry doesn't have power over that" and said **immigration** authorities applied the law. He said he was not authorized to provide his name.

Another Post correspondent, Nick Miroff, a U.S. citizen, has tried repeatedly in the past year to get a visa to report from Venezuela but has not received a response from authorities. Venezuela's government announced in February 2015 that it would require American visitors to get visas.

Lauria said that governments have the right to establish requirements for visiting journalists but that the committee was still waiting to see whether journalists would receive permission in a timely manner to report in Venezuela under its newly adopted practices.

Venezuelan President Nicolà¡s Maduro's popularity has shrunk amid an economic crisis that has caused widespread food shortages in the oil-rich country. The government is also under fire for marginalizing the political opposition, most recently by blocking a referendum to recall the president. The Vatican is coordinating talks between the government and opposition leaders in an effort to ease tensions.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In 1996, Botswana erected an 83-mile fence along its border with Namibia. The goal was to protect domestic cattle from the highly contagious foot-and-mouth disease. Within a year, though, the barrier had snared five giraffes, one elephant, several antelopes and numerous other wild animals.

In the 20 years since, border barriers have proliferated to unprecedented levels - and become one of presidential candidate Donald Trump's frequent talking points. But while attention has focused on the human consequences of a more bordered world, the effect on wildlife is also dramatic.

Trump has proposed sealing off the U.S.-Mexico frontier with a "great" expansion of the current wall, which spans about 650 miles along the United States' 2,000-mile southern front and is already harming animals. Bison along that border have been spotted climbing over barbed-wire fencing to get to food and water. According to a 2011 study, 16 species in California have had as much as 75 percent of their range blocked.

"Completing a barrier that's impregnable for animals would be a really major problem," said Jesse Lasky, a biologist at Pennsylvania State University and author of that study. The move could affect more than 111 endangered species and 108 migratory birds, according to a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provisional report, including jaguars, wolves and ocelots. The Trump campaign did not respond to multiple requests for comment on the proposed wall's potential effect on wildlife.

Two recent studies have shed light on the often-overlooked effects walls have on wildlife. The fences can "curtail animals' mobility, fragment populations and cause direct mortality," according to an article published last month in Review of European, Comparative and International Environmental Law. Authors of another study, released this year in the journal PLOS Biology, wrote that barriers "represent a major threat to wildlife."

The latter study focused on Slovenia, which has been fencing its border with Croatia in an attempt to block an influx of **refugees** that the government fears could morph into an outright "humanitarian catastrophe." So far, 111 miles of barbed- and razor-wire fencing has been erected along about one-third of the border. A slew of mangled animal carcasses - especially deer - have been found in, on or around the "temporary technical obstacles."

"These events are horrid," said co-author Aleksandra Majic, a biologist at the University of Ljubljana in Slovenia. But, she added, "what is worrying in the long term is the fragmentation that such fences cause."

Slaven Reljic, another co-author, tracks brown bears along the Slovenia-Croatia border and has found that of 33 radio-collared animals, 16 cross between the two countries.

"Conservation success for large carnivore populations here is largely depending on this trans-boundary connectivity," she said, adding that lynx along the border are most at risk. The lynx population hovers around a mere 20 and is in danger of local extinction within the next decade, Majic said, adding that "habitat fragmentation would speed up this process."

Barriers are hardly new. Construction on the Great Wall of China began in the 3rd century B.C., and it still splits animal habitats today. The Berlin Wall divided East and West Germany throughout the Cold War. When the Iron Curtain fell in 1989, people began moving and trading en masse across increasingly porous European borders. Wildlife, as biologists documented, also reaped rewards.

Animals could move freely, and "countries began working together," said John Linnell, an ecologist at the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research and the lead author of the Slovenia study. That meant improved conservation legislation and coordination.

Although the post-Cold-War chaos led to a rise in poaching that contributed to a collapse in the saiga antelope population in parts of the former Soviet Union, the overall result was encouraging, Linnell said. He pointed to successes such as the reintroduction of wolves into Germany and the creation of a European Green Belt, among others. It felt, he said, like a "world where borders of all types were softening and disappearing."

That quickly ended.

Today, the number of barriers around the world is at an all-time high, said à‰lisabeth Vallet, author of "Borders, Fences and Walls: State of Insecurity?" Displaced people moving into Europe and illegal **immigration** to the United States have contributed to that surge, but Vallet says the proliferation of walls began in the late 1990s, when rapid globalization helped revive nationalist sentiment. The Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks drastically accelerated the trend, and by 2010, her research found, 45 new walls had gone up, from Morocco to India, totaling 18,000 miles in length.

Even fences aimed at improving wildlife conservation have had unintended consequences, such as when poachers fashion the fencing material itself into snares.

"We've been sleeping, pursuing dreams of a borderless world," Linnell said, "while the borders have been closing all around us." Now, however, conservationists seem to be paying attention.

In an email, the Slovenian government characterized its efforts as "an urgent and temporary measure, which is necessary for the protection of the state." The ultimate scope of the project, officials say, depends on migrant flows into Europe. In case the obstacles do become permanent, they insist they are working to find ways of ensuring uninterrupted animal migration and conforming to the European Commission's Habitats Directive, a legal cornerstone of the continent's conservation efforts.

Linnell's study, on the other hand, argues that a permanent wall in Slovenia would "undo decades of conservation and international collaboration efforts." At the very least, he said, he would like to see more consideration given to wildlife - for example, by designing small openings for animals.

But all migrants, human and nonhuman, tend to gravitate toward the same spaces along borders. That makes stopping one group but the not the other an extremely difficult task. "I think there is a fundamental conflict," Lasky said. "Animals like to disperse under cover of vegetation and darkness. But so do people."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Myron Haughton was picked up by authorities, he was an illegal **immigrant** with three felony convictions. Yet the Maryland resident convinced an **immigration** judge last year that he was a changed man, a husband and father who should be granted permanent residency, not be deported.

So why is he still behind bars?

That question places Haughton, of Silver Spring, in the thick of a debate playing out in courts across the country. He and more than 1,000 other **immigrants** in similar circumstances say they should have a chance to return to their homes and families while fighting deportation.

The government - which is appealing the **immigration** judge's ruling in Haughton's case - firmly disagrees that he or any of the others deserves a bond hearing.

Recently, a U.S. district judge in Virginia sided with Haughton, 29, saying that his detention, already lasting more than a year, had become unreasonable and that he deserved a bond hearing. Although she was the first judge in Virginia to take that position in such a case, six of the nation's federal appeals courts have issued similar rulings.

The broader controversy could be resolved this term by the Supreme Court, which is scheduled to consider the case of California inmates contesting prolonged detention in such instances. A decision, assuming the high court can put together a majority, is eagerly awaited.

According to the American Civil Liberties Union, the cases of about 4,500 detainees nationwide have been pending for more than six months. The ACLU estimates that 5,000 to 10,000 **immigrants** are being held because of criminal histories. Many of them, like Haughton, face consequences that they and their supporters consider disproportionate to their transgressions.

"Myron Haughton is as American as any other American," his attorney, Alfred Robertson, said. "He deserves to be with his family. Although he's made mistakes in the past, he's already paid for those mistakes."

Haughton's childhood was marked by trauma. He was abused by his stepmother in Jamaica, according to court records, and by his mother after he came to Maryland, illegally, at the age of 11. When a teacher noticed his bruises, he was sent to live with an aunt. But two years later, the aunt returned him to his mother, and the abuse resumed.

At 16, Haughton ran away from home and began living on the streets of Silver Spring with a group of petty criminals who broke into cars and unoccupied homes. Haughton was arrested after a break-in committed soon after his 18th birthday. He briefly escaped juvenile detention by stealing a teacher's car keys and driving through a fence; then he pleaded guilty in 2006 to burglary and theft.

Haughton served 18 months of a five-year prison sentence and then was released on probation. He soon met Tatiana Barrow. She was raised in a Russian orphanage after being removed from her parents' home because of neglect, and she was adopted by U.S. citizens at age 15.

Barrow and Haughton have two children - Adelina and Ayden, now 6 and 4. Haughton took care of the children and worked odd jobs, limited by his lack of legal status. Court records show that he received traffic tickets over the years for driving without a valid license.

It was one such incident that sparked his current troubles. In December 2013, he was arrested in Virginia's Prince William County and charged with driving without a valid license. When **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement (ICE) learned that he was in the country illegally, he was transferred to federal custody and slated for deportation.

Haughton was detained in the Arlington County jail until September 2014 as **immigration** officials struggled to put together the documents they needed to send him back to Jamaica. During that time, Barrow and Haughton were married. He was released under supervision for a year, until the paperwork was in order, and then he was taken back into custody in rural Farmville, Va. From jail, he applied for permanent residency through his wife, a U.S. citizen.

Barrow told an **immigration** court that because of the cost of day care, she had been living "paycheck to paycheck" since her husband's incarceration and had fallen months behind on her rent. She also said the separation caused the family emotional strain.

"Because we grew up - he grew up with abuse, I grew up in an orphanage - ... we don't want this for our kids," she told the court.

In May, an **immigration** judge agreed that separating the family would cause "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" and granted Haughton permanent residency. The government appealed the decision. Haughton remained in custody but has asked a federal court for a bond hearing.

The Supreme Court ruled in 2003 that mandatory detention of noncitizens with certain criminal records is constitutional for "the brief period necessary for their removal proceedings." At issue now is whether the many months that **immigrants** are spending in detention centers meet that standard.

The government argues that Congress chose to make detention mandatory and that delays caused by a detainee's appeals should not be used to justify the detainee's release.

"It is a statistical certainty ... that some of those criminal **aliens** will abscond and that some will commit further crimes that detention would have prevented," Solicitor General Donald B. Verrilli Jr. wrote in his brief to the Supreme Court.

A study by Syracuse University found that 14 percent of **immigration** detainees released on bond failed to return to court during fiscal 2015.

Advocates argue that the cases that last the longest are those in which the **immigrant** in question has the best chance of winning permanent residency - and thus is probably least deserving of indefinite detention.

"A large percentage are lawful green-card holders who committed a crime that ICE thinks might make them deportable," said César Cuauhtémoc Garcà­a Hernà¡ndez, a professor at the University of Denver's Sturm College of Law. "These are people who are fully incorporated into U.S. society. ... It's hard to justify treating them differently because they're not citizens."

Haughton is not a green-card holder, and the government contends that his detention is not extraordinary or unwarranted. His continuing imprisonment is attributable to his own "belated decision to seek an adjustment of status," prosecutors argued in one court filing. ICE "vigorously disputes" the decision to grant him permanent residency, Assistant U.S. Attorney Lauren Wetzler wrote.

Yet U.S. District Judge Leonie M. Brinkema found that Haughton deserved a bond hearing, using a multi-part test as four federal appeals courts have done in similar cases. Advocates would rather see the Supreme Court adopt a standard applied by two other appellate courts and require bond hearings for all detainees after six months. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit, which includes Maryland and Virginia, is not one of those six appeals courts.

"It really is night and day with the kind of remedy and the kind of system you end up with," said Michael Tran, an **immigration** lawyer with the ACLU. In California, where the six-month rule applies, he said thousands have received hearings. In Delaware, New Jersey and Pennsylvania, where there is no firm time limit, only about two dozen **immigrants** have.

The Supreme Court could embrace one of the standards applied by the federal appeals courts, set yet another standard or rule that bond hearings are not required at all.

The justices could also decide whether the burden of proof in such a hearing would fall on the government or on the detainee, an issue that has divided lower courts. Prosecutors in Virginia are fighting Brinkema's decision to force the government to prove that Haughton is a flight risk or a danger.

Another question is what the court will make of the government's admission that the statistics it relied on in 2003 were wrong. The solicitor general had said that appealed cases take an average of 233 days to complete, or a little less than eight months. In fact, the office acknowledged in August that, on average, cases took 382 days, or more than a year.

In 2015, according to the Justice Department, the average case took 313 days, but that does not include the time a person spent in detention before filing or any post-decision court action.

Haughton is scheduled to get his bond hearing before an **immigration** judge on Wednesday, after 395 days in detention.

rachel.weiner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When Susan Benesch began looking at how speech could incite mass violence, her research took her to far-flung places such as Kenya and Burma.

Lately, however, she's been unable to ignore a case study at home.

A highly respected American University law professor and Harvard University faculty associate, Benesch, 52, has dedicated the past six years of her life to a unique area of research. With funding from the MacArthur Foundation, she has been developing and testing a framework for identifying dangerous speech.

Over the past several months, Benesch has been grappling with whether Donald Trump's rhetoric constitutes dangerous speech as she has come to define it. Her measuring stick includes five indicators, two of which must be true to rise to the level of dangerous speech.

First, the speech must come from a powerful speaker with a high degree of influence over the audience.

Also: The audience must have grievances and fears that the speaker can cultivate. The speech act must be clearly understood as a call to violence. The speech must occur in social or historical context that is propitious for violence, for any of a variety of reasons, including long-standing competition between groups for resources, lack of efforts to solve grievances or previous episodes of violence. And the means of dissemination of the speech should be influential in itself: for example, because it is the sole or primary source of news for the relevant audience.

"Trump's speech is very difficult in the sense that he is so often slippery with it," Benesch said. "The meaning is so often ambiguous."

Still, that she's getting the question so often stuns Benesch.

"I didn't imagine that so soon after beginning this work I'd be asked to explain it to someone abroad who would want me to describe a case study," she said, "and choose a case study in my own country."

'No one is born hating'

On an unseasonably warm fall afternoon, Benesch sat barefoot on the stone steps outside her townhouse on a tree-lined street in Washington's popular Logan Circle neighborhood. Inside, a young researcher was hunched over a laptop at her kitchen table. Her home is also the headquarters for her Dangerous Speech Project, which was born out of her research grants.

Benesch, who was born and raised in New York City, explained that she comes from a lineage of "**immigrants**, **refugees** and people who were killed because other people had been taught to hate them," but that's all the personal detail she will divulge. She is eager to discuss her work, but, perhaps because she is an expert in speech, she is precise about what she shares.

She credits the time spent much of her adult life immersed in the mass atrocities people commit all over the world - first as a foreign correspondent for the Miami Herald and then as a human rights lawyer - for her drive to understand why and how people turn to violence.

As a young lawyer in the 1990s, she did international work in the aftermath of the ethnic conflicts in Yugoslavia and Rwanda. As they pored over whom to prosecute for the terrible crimes, Benesch was drawn to the question of whether one could detect warning signs for genocide before it occurs.

This question resurfaced several years later when she was teaching a clinic at Georgetown's law school representing **refugees** in asylum cases. As she and her students worked to help people piece their shattered lives back together, she began thinking anew about whether there was a way to foresee the crises that created **refugees**.

She wanted to not only identify the kind of rhetoric that brought about social conflicts, but research how to counter it without suppressing freedom of speech. In other words, could genocide be thwarted by simply drawing attention to the "dangerous speech" that precedes it?

"I've learned a few specific things about humanity. ... No one is born hating, or wanting to see or do violence," she said.

"Also, no particular group - religious, ethnic, cultural or national - has a monopoly on dangerous speech. ... All people are capable of producing and being influenced by dangerous speech. I see that as an opportunity."

Comedy as counter to speech

For Benesch, it's important that people understand that the type of speech she wants to counter is different from hate speech, which she says is a broad category for which there is no agreed-upon definition. An advocate of free speech, she does not believe that hate speech can or should be silenced. In fact, it's one of the central reasons she sought to differentiate dangerous speech.

There's no way to say definitively when speech has led to genocide or mass atrocities, because there are many contributing factors. Conversely, it's hard to say whether Benesch's efforts to counter that speech has succeeded in preventing mass violence. But she has anecdotal evidence that both are significant.

After the results of the 2007 presidential election in Kenya were disputed, there were attacks that left more than 1,000 people dead and 500,000 displaced. In the lead-up to it, political leaders used incendiary language about other ethnic and tribal groups.

Benesch did her first field study for the Dangerous Speech Project in Kenya leading up to its next presidential election, held in March 2013. Her work attempting to counter dangerous speech included writing four episodes of a popular Kenyan courtroom comedy in which the actors discredited inflammatory statements. The 2013 election produced little violence.

Currently, she's looking at the impact of shaming the speakers or using humor to minimize them.

Her work inspired the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum this year to publish a guidebook on countering dangerous speech.

Rob Faris, director of the Berkman Klein Center at Harvard, described Benesch's work as "innovative" in how it attempts to delegitimize dangerous speech rather than try to stifle it, thus protecting freedom of speech.

Her framework is focused primarily on discouraging large incidents of violence.

"In any given time, in any society there is a subset of people who hold extreme views and are willing to resort to violence, and I don't think one can suppress that or expect to wipe it out," Benesch said. "What I'm more concerned about is the large mass of people who are malleable, who can be influenced."

Over the past several months, she's been attempting to gauge whether Donald Trump's speech could have such a negative effect. In other words, is it truly dangerous?

When the GOP presidential candidate said his supporters could use the Second Amendment against Hillary Clinton, "it seems to me impossible that people didn't understand that as a reference to violence," she said.

And when Trump suggested that Clinton and President Obama were founders of the Islamic State, that was a "hallmark of dangerous speech to describe an in-group member as the enemy," she said.

And now, Trump's assertions that if he loses the election, it will be because the voting system is rigged against him are laying the groundwork for potential unrest, she said.

But because he has not directly incited violence, Benesch said, it's unclear whether Trump's speech could be classified as dangerous.

She concludes that the United States "is not in danger of mass intergroup violence. But she is concerned that Trump's speech "can undermine some Americans' belief in our own democratic institutions, which can make them more susceptible to dangerous speech going forward."

Despite her rather grim area of study, Benesch is an optimist when it comes to the growing propensity of people worldwide to push back against the worst human tendencies.

"Hatred and fear and even mass atrocities are not at all new in human history - it's the widespread efforts to push back against them that are new," she said.

Humans are much less likely to die at the hands of another human than in the past, she said.

"There is far more work to do, and the daily headlines are often distressing and discouraging, but I can also see, paraphrasing Dr. Martin Luther King, that the arc of the moral universe is long but it bends toward peace."

colby.itkowitz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Billionaire tech investor Peter Thiel reiterated his support for Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump on Monday, telling a room of journalists that a Washington outsider in the White House would recalibrate lawmakers who have lost touch with the struggles of most Americans.

Thiel said it was "both insane and somehow inevitable" that political leaders would expect this presidential election to be a contest between "political dynasties" that have shepherded the country into two major financial crises - the tech bubble's burst in the early 2000s and the housing crisis and economic recession later that decade.

The support Trump has received is directly tied to the frustration many across the country feel toward Washington and its entrenched leaders and they should not expect that sentiment to dissipate, regardless of whether Trump or Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton wins on Nov. 8, Thiel said.

"What Trump represents isn't crazy, and it's not going away," he said.

To call Thiel an anomaly in liberal-leaning Silicon Valley would be an understatement. Tech executives there have voiced ardent support for and opened their wallets to Clinton, including Apple chief executive Tim Cook, Facebook Chief Operating Officer Sheryl Sandberg and Eric Schmidt, executive chairman of Google parent Alphabet.

Thiel offered a full-throated endorsement of Trump at the Republican National Convention in July. During a six-minute prime-time speech, Thiel told millions of television viewers to disregard social issues that "distract" from the flagging U.S. economy and government's lack of innovation, which he described as more pressing concerns.

Some in Silicon Valley have tried to distance themselves from Thiel over his support of Trump or have criticized his views.

In an October post on Medium, former Reddit chief executive Ellen Pao said that her group Project Include would not work with the tech incubator Y Combinator, citing its ties to Thiel. This was after Thiel had announced he was donating $1.25 million to political groups supporting Trump, putting him among the largest single donors to the Republican nominee.

"While all of us believe in the ideas of free speech and open platforms, we draw a line here," Pao wrote, adding: "Giving more power to someone whose ascension and behavior strike fear into so many people is unacceptable. His attacks on Black, Mexican, Asian, Muslim, and Jewish people, on women, and on others are more than just political speech; fueled by hate and encouraging violence, they make each of us feel unsafe."

Thiel was clear Monday, as he has said in the past, that he does not support all of Trump's actions and words. In particular, he called the "Access Hollywood" tape in which Trump made remarks about unwanted sexual advances on women "clearly offensive and inappropriate." He said he did not support Trump's words about Muslims "in every incidence."

Thiel also criticized the media's coverage of Trump's bombastic remarks. He said that while the media takes Trump's remarks "literally" but not "seriously," he thinks Trump supporters take them seriously but not literally. In short, Trump is not actually going to impose religious tests on **immigrants** or build a wall along the Mexican border, as he has repeatedly said, but will simply pursue "saner, more sensible" **immigration** policies.

"His larger-than-life persona attracts a lot of attention," Thiel said. "Nobody would suggest that Donald Trump is a humble man. But the big things he's right about amount to a much-needed dose of humility in our politics."

Silicon Valley backlash?

Thiel said that he "didn't think there was going to be this sort of visceral reaction" in Silicon Valley to his support for Trump, saying that his past embrace of fringe ideas in business and technology were better received than political views similar to those of "half" the country.

"This is the first time I've done something that's actually conventional," Thiel said. "It's the first time I've done something big in my life that is just what half the country believes in, and it's been the most controversial thing ever."

While the Silicon Valley tech corridor and suburbs around Washington have thrived in the past decade or more, many other parts of the country have been gutted by economic and trade policies that closed manufacturing plants and shipped jobs overseas, Thiel said.

"Most Americans don't live by the Beltway or the San Francisco Bay. Most Americans haven't been part of that prosperity," Thiel said Monday. "It shouldn't be surprising to see people vote for Bernie Sanders or for Donald Trump, who is the only outsider left in the race."

Thiel later said he had hoped the presidential race might come down to Sanders and Trump, two outsiders with distinct views on the root cause of the nation's economic malaise and the best course of action to fix it. "That would have been a very different sort of debate," he said.

Thiel's prepared remarks seemed more of an admonishment of the state of the country than a ringing endorsement of Trump's persona and policies. He decried high medical costs and the lack of savings baby boomers have on hand. He said millennials are burdened by soaring tuition costs and a poor outlook on the future. Meanwhile, he said, the federal government has wasted trillions of dollars fighting wars in Africa and the Middle East that have yet to be won.

What America needs

Trump is the only candidate who shares his view that the country's problems are substantial and need drastic change to be repaired, Thiel said. Clinton, on the other hand, does not see a need for a hard reset on some of the country's policies and would probably lead the United States into additional costly conflicts abroad, he said.

A self-described libertarian, Thiel amassed his fortune as the co-founder of digital payment company PayPal and the data analytics firm Palantir Technologies. He has continued to add to that wealth through venture capital investments in companies that include Facebook, Airbnb, Lyft and Spotify, among many others.

Thiel's remarks took place at the National Press Club in Washington, perhaps an odd choice of venue for a businessman whose relationship with the media is somewhat tenuous. The billionaire secretly bankrolled wrestler Hulk Hogan's invasion-of-privacy lawsuit against Gawker Media, which Thiel called a "sociopathic bully" during Monday's talk.

The lawsuit and resulting judgment helped push the company to bankruptcy earlier this year - and followed a 2007 Gawker blog post that publicly outed Thiel as gay. The case caused much consternation in journalism circles about the ability of a wealthy man with a vendetta to take down a news outlet. Thiel said the circumstances of the Gawker case - a sex tape published without Hogan's consent - are unique and that he doesn't expect other wealthy individuals to follow his lead.

"Wealthy people shouldn't do that," Thiel said. "I think if they tried, they won't succeed."

steven.overly@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I normally see my therapist, Mario, every week. Over the years, he's become like a big brother to me, the kind of mensch who looks out for you, listens, remembers every detail, gives you smart and sensitive feedback, and cares.

Perfect, right?

Well, it has been. Until late September turned into October. That's when the nightmare began: This psychotic, all-encompassing, toxic presidential election began driving me absolutely over-the-top crazy. It was more than Mario could handle in 50 minutes once a week.

The touchy issues being bandied about in newspapers, social media and personal conversations - particularly, **immigration** and minorities' and women's rights - sent me into hyper, unstoppable rants. (Admittedly, being home alone with a sinus infection, bronchitis and unlimited time spent in the company of CNN and MSNBC didn't help my outlook.) Political malaise gradually dominated our sessions, compelling me to request an extra weekly appointment until Nov. 9.

Are you beginning to see the real cost of this election? For me, it means paying my therapist double.

And I'm not alone in my angst.

An ABC News poll of likely voters found nearly half reported the election was a source of stress in their lives. And a survey for the American Psychological Association found many respondents felt the same way.

"We're seeing that it doesn't matter whether you're registered as a Democrat or Republican: U.S. adults say they are experiencing significant stress from the current election," Lynn Bufka, APA's associate executive director for practice research and policy, said in a statement.

And of course, Bufka said, all the political arguments you overhear or get into, the provocative or nasty comments on social media and the constant media bombardment only make it worse.

This is the psychological landscape that confronted me - and Mario. We are both **immigrants** and political **refugees** - I from Cuba, he from Argentina - so we understand each other based on shared background, identity and language.

Mario considers himself my "keeper" and is there for me through all my weeks' meshugas: career, love, health and the daily struggle of being an adult in the world.

But these past few weeks have been something else.

At the beginning of October, once my favorite month, I came down with what felt like the worst flu in the history of humanity: body aches, exhaustion, sore throat, coughing, laryngitis, fever, runny nose, migraines. My teeth hurt; every sound but the purr of my cat, Lilly, deafened me; and the smell of coffee made me sick. (That last one meant that whatever I had was Really Serious.)

I'm the creator of a beauty site, MoreLovely.me, and even sitting at my desk writing about fun things such as red lipstick, French cologne and lavender bath oil was impossible; it required sustained verticality.

This is what put me in front of the TV and into the initial stages of CNN commentator psychosis. Days passed, and my confined contagion consisted of sleep, Cream of Wheat, applesauce, tea, emails, texts from my mother telling me to hydrate, Facebook, feeding Lilly, TV news, more TV news and multiple phone sessions with Mario, who said to watch Comedy Central instead of the news. I was too far over the edge to listen.

What ailed me wasn't some mild form of free-floating election blues. No. This election and its coverage consumed me. It changed me physiologically. I'd watch and read the news and grind my teeth. I'd squeeze my hair. I'd drop my head into Lilly's belly and refuse to budge despite her literally sharp protests. Even my favorite TV commentator, Van Jones, couldn't make it better, and he is awesome.

Mario upped the anti-anxiety meds Ativan and Xanax, and added a short-term dose of the antidepressant Lexapro, and I continued to talk him and vent. A lot. I became artificially calmer and less depressed, but I was still politically possessed.

The aftermath of each debate, and then that appalling Al Smith dinner, sent me into psychic paroxysms. I'd spend every last of my 100 weekly therapeutic minutes in a Munchian position: that solitary, abstracted being, screaming alone on a lonely bridge.

Certain words, phrases and names sent me into Pavlovian freakouts: rigged, temperament, locker room, sue, access, Hollywood, "Access Hollywood," polls, down-ballot, Kellyanne, Billy, Rudy.

When I was able to go to Mario's office and our sessions' time was up, I'd drop into the patients' sofa like an exhausted, post-tantrum toddler.

And so I came to pay my therapist double to exorcise this political malignancy from my being so I could, you know, function.

Sort of.

Is that right? Is that fair? I didn't ask for this sicko election. It was foisted upon me. I am innocent. And I want my money back. I want both candidates to reimburse me for all that extra mileage, all those extra minutes and all those pricey pills.

Or maybe just Huma Abedin. I doubt her check would bounce.

I've been taking my prescriptions faithfully: cefdinir 300 mg (for the bacteria); promethazine-codeine syrup (for the cough); and Ativan 0.5 mg., Xanax 0.25 and Lexapro 20 mg. (for the election). I take them all twice a day, except for the Lexapro, which is once a day. And thank goodness; I've gained almost 10 pounds since I started taking it. (Unfortunate Lexapro side effect.)

I'm slowly starting to feel better, though, and Mario says the weight will drop off once I vote and stop the Lexapro. Also, I turned off the TV. Silence is the best sound ever.

By next weekend, I'll bet I'll love coffee again and have the energy to shave my hairy legs and write about fancy beauty products.

And if I start getting pyscho election coverage flashbacks when I go vote on Nov. 8 or have the urge to discuss politics with Van on Twitter, I'm resistant. An Ativan refill awaits.

health-science@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It might seem as if the United States' allies, from Mexico to Britain to Japan, are holding their breath while not-so-silently praying that Donald Trump does not become president. They've been watching Trump's campaign "with disbelief, a good portion of dismay and distinctly growing apprehension," as Sweden's former foreign minister and Post columnist Carl Bildt put it.

That's true - but not entirely so. There are, in fact, a number of important U.S. allies, in and outside NATO, who either openly or quietly are rooting for Trump to win. They offer a road map of some of the trouble a Clinton administration would face as it tried to rebuild U.S. leadership in Europe, the Middle East and Asia.

Let's start with the two NATO heads who have publicly endorsed Trump: President Milos Zeman of the Czech Republic and Prime Minister Viktor Orban of Hungary. Zeman, an admirer of Vladimir Putin, holds a mostly ceremonial position, and the Czech government disagrees with him. But Orban is the leader of a powerful political current in Central Europe: nationalistic, xenophobic and autocratically minded. He gave a speech praising Trump for, among other things, favoring a halt in Muslim **immigration** and opposing "the policy of exporting democracy."

Orban is a role model for Slovakian Prime Minister Robert Fico, known for declaring that "Islam has no place in Slovakia," and Poland's de facto leader, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, whose party has been accused by the European Union of dismantling democratic checks and balances.

Earlier this year Kaczynski and Orban plunged into a public feud with Bill Clinton after the former president undiplomatically but accurately remarked that Poland and Hungary "have now decided this democracy is too much trouble." Orban responded by saying that Clinton, like "the leaders of the Democratic Party," was the pawn of a "shadow empire" controlled by George Soros, the Jewish U.S. financier who was born in Hungary. For his part, Kaczynski suggested Clinton needed a mental-health examination.

Imagine Hillary Clinton's first NATO summit: She could find herself seated between a statesman whose boss called her husband mentally ill and one who believes that the Democratic Party is controlled by a Jewish cabal. Kaczynski meanwhile will be expecting Clinton to deliver on plans to station U.S. troops and missile defenses in Poland, regardless of his insults to the former president, or to Polish democracy.

He might have asked Benjamin Netanyahu what happens when a foreign leader takes sides in a U.S. presidential election. After making obvious his support for Mitt Romney in 2012, the Israeli prime minister found himself a perennial target for leaks and insults from the Obama White House, especially during his own reelection race.

This year Netanyahu has been conspicuously silent. But sources say he's inclined to agree with the right-wing media close to his Likud party that have tilted in Trump's favor. True, Trump has made anti-Semitic statements and attracted a neo-Nazi following. But he's far less likely to pressure Netanyahu about Palestinian statehood than Clinton, who once called the Israeli leader to deliver a blunt chewing-out over the expansion of a Jewish neighborhood near Jerusalem.

Even more partial to Trump is Egyptian President Abdel Fattah al-Sissi. The dictator met both candidates in New York last month: While Clinton brought up his human rights record and called for the release of an imprisoned U.S. citizen, Trump offered unqualified support. So never mind Trump's hostility to Islam or plans to restrict Muslim **immigration**; the Sissi regime is pulling for him. So is Turkish strongman Recep Tayyip Erdogan, another NATO ally, who, as the Wall Street Journal's Yaroslav Trofimov reported, likes Trump's tolerance for his mass repression of opponents following a coup attempt.

There are some common themes here. The less committed a U.S. ally is to liberal democracy, and the more hostile to **immigrants**, the more likely its government is to favor Trump. Allies uncomfortable with subtlety in U.S. diplomacy - whether it is support for human rights in pro-U.S. dictatorships, or a Palestinian state, or outreach to Iran - tend to see Trump as refreshingly one-sided. The ranks of the horrified are mostly restricted to Western Europe and northeast Asia - though Latin Americans, who have endured the destructive populism pioneered by Hugo Chà¡vez, tend to see Trump as a U.S. version of that pestilence.

In short, there is a constituency in the world for Trump's brand of U.S. chauvinist nationalism, even if its slogan is "America First." Not a few traditional American friends would welcome a U.S. administration that ignores human rights, favors curtailing global movements of people and capital, and divides friends and enemies into unambiguous camps. If Trump loses, Orban, Sissi and their like may lose some momentum, but they will still be out there. Clinton will need a strategy for managing them.

Twitter:@jacksondiehl

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BERLIN - One year after the height of Europe's migrant crisis, Germany - a nation that took in more asylum seekers than the rest of the continent combined - is confronting the Solomonesque task of deciding who gets to stay. Yet as authorities adjudicate cases, a contentious truism is emerging: Not all nationalities are created equal.

If you're from Syria or Iraq, sanctuary is almost guaranteed. But if you're from Nigeria or Pakistan, chances are you journeyed halfway across the world in vain.

Nearly 37 percent of all claims processed by the German authorities are being rejected, including an increasing number of people from countries afflicted with violent insurgencies, such as Afghanistan. Even Syrians are increasingly falling short of winning full **refugee** status.

Authorities say they're simply applying national and international asylum law, weeding out those who do not qualify. But critics say that overburdened asylum officials are turning a deaf ear to at least some genuine petitions simply because they come from asylum seekers arriving from nations outside the much-publicized war zones of the Middle East.

Pakistani Mohammad Nabeel is among the unlucky ones. This month, German migration authorities informed him that his case had been closed before he even had an official hearing. The Federal Office for Migration and **Refugees** (BAMF) said he had missed his appointment, although Nabeel said he was never notified.

Even if he had been, experts say, his case falls into the gray area that often leads to rejection. The 23-year-old claims he was in love with a rich girl in his home town. But her family was against the relationship with Nabeel, who was poor and didn't have the right family name, important factors in some areas of Pakistan for arranging a marriage. The girl's brother and father set out to kill Nabeel, he says, to protect the girl's honor. His only proof, he says, are fading scars on his body from being severely beaten by members of her family.

Nabeel arrived in Germany after traveling six months and crossing seven different countries. Now, he may be sent back. "I won't go back; I'd rather kill myself," Nabeel says. He plans to appeal the asylum official's decision.

There are loopholes in the German system allowing for people like Nabeel - who aren't strictly fleeing from war or political persecution - to temporarily stay in Germany on humanitarian grounds. Some are eventually granted permanent residence. But only about 4 percent of asylum requests by Pakistanis are currently decided in their favor. And Nabeel's rejection comes at a time when the German government is increasingly taking measures targeting those migrants it deems ineligible for protection. It is determined to enforce deportation more strictly and even hired a consulting firm to help. Negotiations for deportation deals with Afghanistan and Nigeria are underway on the national and the European level.

Politicians in favor of a more restrictive asylum policy argue that some migrants apply for **refugee** status based on flimsy evidence and come to Germany for purely economic reasons. Others, they say, could escape the dangers they're facing by simply approaching the local police or by moving to a different part of their home country.

Daniel Owolabi Ajibade is one of the more than 10,000 Nigerians who applied for asylum in Germany this year. The business consultant claims that members of a Nigerian cartel attempted to kill him because they feared that the high-quality marbles and tiles he wanted to bring into the country would ruin their business with cheap Chinese imports.

Although the 35-year-old has a newspaper article to prove the incident, the chances are high that German migration officials won't heed his plea. The protection rate for Nigerians is only about 9 percent, and to be allowed to stay, Ajibade will have to convince authorities that he had nowhere else to go.

"I'm very afraid of what the outcome will be, since going back to Nigeria would be very risky," he says. "I understand that there's a real war in Syria and our problems with Boko Haram are mostly in the north . . . but I wish that the German government would also accept more of us until things quiet down."

"Our system caters primarily to those who have a concrete claim for protection, as bitter as this might be for some individuals," said Ansgar Heveling, a lawmaker with Angela Merkel's Christian Democratic Union and chairman of the German parliament's Home Affairs Committee. Heveling said he thinks that the vast majority of applicants are given their due. "If in individual cases a wrong decision is made, we have courts to correct them," he said.

The nongovernmental organization Pro Asyl says that the flood of appeals against the Federal Office's decision suggest that the system is flawed. So far, 18,666 Syrians went to court this year to fight for a better status of protection than they were granted. Many cases were dropped, but of the 1,943 verdicts, 1,547 were in favor of the plaintiffs.

Stephan Dünnwald, spokesman for the Bavarian **Refugee** Council, said that there is a danger of the German authorities sweepingly rejecting certain groups of asylum seekers because they're overburdened or because of political decisions made in Berlin.

"The decision-making is a disaster, because there are so many new and inexperienced deciders who are under a lot of time pressure. ... In some situations, where there should be additional probing, this simply isn't done. The quality of the interpreters has declined rapidly. There are no quality standards," Dünnwald said. "Sometimes it almost feels as if people must be beaten to death before they are being believed."

anthony.faiola@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Republican supporters of Donald Trump and Latino **immigrants** backing Democrat Hillary Clinton during this contentious presidential campaign will converge at polling sites on Nov. 8, and that has election workers in Prince William County preparing for the worst.

"If something is amiss and you feel the need to call 911 right away, call 911 right away," Michele L. White, general registrar of the Northern Virginia county's elections office, told about 30 election workers during a recent training session for Election Day duty. "Please use your sixth sense; don't hesitate."

In a highly volatile campaign, in which Trump has called for his supporters to be on the lookout for voter fraud and civil rights leaders are pushing back against what they see as voter intimidation, election officials are changing their routines in an attempt to minimize conflict at polling places.

Nowhere in Virginia is that more apparent than in Prince William County, home to a fast-expanding Latino community as well as an active group of conservatives who have been vocal about their opposition to illegal **immigration**. More than 20 percent of residents are Latino, a ratio greater than twice the state average. At the same time, the chairman of the Board of County Supervisors is Corey A. Stewart (R-At Large), a 2017 candidate for governor who has celebrated Trump's heated rhetoric against illegal **immigration** and likes to say, "I was Trump before Trump was Trump."

Hoping to ease tensions during an Election Day that is expected to draw about 80 percent of the county's 270,000 registered voters, election officials are taking measures to speed up voting and minimize disruptions.

For the first time, each of the county's 91 precincts will have "line chasers" whose job will be to check IDs outside the polling station to ensure that everyone is in the right place and that lines move quickly. Those people will also keep an eye out for potential disturbances, officials said.

Inside the stations, precinct chiefs will monitor election observers from both major parties - essentially watching the poll watchers. If those observers are overzealous in their scrutiny of voters, they may be kicked out of the polling station, county officials said.

Also for the first time, every polling station will be in direct contact with county officials through walkie-talkie radios to coordinate actions in the event of an emergency. All election workers will be wearing neon yellow or orange construction vests, so voters know where to turn for help.

"Honestly, I expect people to behave themselves in public; I know my expectations may be unrealistic at this point," said Rosanna West, a precinct chief who will oversee voting in the Bristow Run district, the county's busiest with 4,796 registered voters. "I try to keep a smile on at all times."

Keith A. Scarborough, secretary of the county electoral board, said the more aggressive measures stem from the "bad karma" brought on by this presidential race. Election officials around the country are taking novel steps, including those in Denver who for the first time trained their poll workers on how to respond to an active-shooter situation.

For weeks, Trump has warned that the general election will be "rigged." He has called on his backers to "get everybody to go out and watch" polling sites on Election Day, particularly in Philadelphia, Pittsburgh and Ohio. But generally, he said that voting locations should "have the sheriffs and the police chiefs and everybody watching."

Scarborough, a Democrat, said those suggestions coming from the top of a ticket may fuel suspicions and compel people to try to interfere with voting in unprecedented ways.

"We have one of the major candidates talking about having a rigged election," Scarborough said. "That's never happened before. There's a lot of bad rhetoric coming down."

The groups that plan to send volunteers to the polling stations say they want to avoid conflict.

**Immigration** activists are deploying several dozen volunteers to Prince William and nearby Manassas - mainly, they say, to guard against voter intimidation. Other nonprofit organizations, including the progressive New Virginia Majority, also plan to send volunteers.

"We're just going to go from polling station to polling station, making sure that everything is okay," said Fernanda Durand, spokeswoman for the CASA in Action **immigrant** advocacy group.

John Fredericks, chairman of the Trump campaign in Virginia, estimated that about 1,200 people have signed up to work as poll watchers.

"We've got more volunteers coming in by the day than we can figure out where to put them," Fredericks said. "We don't expect any confrontations with anybody legitimate. If the Hillary campaign decides to hire people to do things like throw eggs or start fights, I guess our volunteers will have to deal with it in a professional manner."

The county's electoral board briefly considered asking private groups that host polling stations to impose a one-day ban against guns on Election Day but abandoned the idea when Del. Robert G. Marshall (R-Prince William) raised objections, citing the state's "open carry" gun law.

Under that law, weapons are already prohibited inside public schools, of which 70 in Prince William will function as polling stations. Prince William schools will also be closed on Election Day.

Scarborough said election officials are being instructed to treat a voter carrying a gun in the same way they would treat one with a loud hat or T-shirt: Ignore it.

"They're legally entitled to do that," he said. "As long as they don't do anything to cause disruption."

Kimball Brace, chief of the county's newly created Sudley precinct just north of Manassas, said he anticipates some disturbances.

The precinct of 2,054 voters is in the heart of Prince William's rapidly growing Latino **immigrant** population.

"I would imagine we'll have a target on the door or something along that line," Brace said.

To guard against confrontations outside the polling station, Brace - a former general registrar in the county elections office - said he is prepared to move the line of voters completely inside Sudley Elementary.

"If I'm hearing reports of people feeling like they're being intimidated or that sort of thing, then we end up going outside and talking to people," he said. "Ultimately, under Virginia law, we do have the right to call 911."

At a recent county training session, several polling station workers said they were unsure what they will face on Election Day.

"I'm expecting hecticness," said Ross Fontana, 17, who decided to help with elections in the Manassas area upon the advice of his high school government teacher.

Safiya Samman, 70, who has worked several previous elections in Prince William, said she expects some hostilities to be directed toward her because she is a Muslim who covers her head with a hijab.

During the state elections last year, one voter angrily refused her help when there was a problem with a ballot scanner.

"I just stepped back, and I waited," said Samman, a U.S. citizen for 41 years.

But, she said, she is eager to work this presidential election.

"I want them to see my face," Samman said. "To see that we're all part of this."

antonio.olivo@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Opponents of Question B, the Montgomery County ballot proposal for term limits, received two big infusions of cash this month, according to campaign finance reports filed Friday.

Service Employees International Union Local 32 BJ, which represents about 7,000 commercial office cleaners who live and work in the county, contributed $5,000 to "No on B," the political committee organized to oppose term limits. The measure would amend the county charter to restrict council members and the county executive to three consecutive terms.

Another donation, for $1,500, came from County Executive Isiah Leggett's campaign committee. Leggett (D), serving his third term, has announced he will not run again.

No on B reported a total of $11,000 in the bank through Oct. 23.

"I'm pleased where we stand," No on B chair Tom Moore said in an email Saturday.

Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits reported just under $2,200 in contributions and $4,600 in the bank. Major donors were developer James Gingery ($1,000) and Howard Cohen ($500), head of Federal Health Counsel, a health lobbying firm. He lives in Potomac, according to federal lobbying reports.

Spokeswoman Ann Hingston said the pro-term-limits group was not discouraged by the nearly 3-to-1 gap in cash on hand.

"It doesn't worry us at all. We still have checks coming in," Hingston said, adding that those donations will be reflected in subsequent reports. The committee has picked up endorsements from the Montgomery County Civic Federation, an umbrella organization of neighborhood groups, and the Parents Coalition of Montgomery County.

Both sides are using the money primarily for yard signs, fliers, T-shirts and other relatively low-cost campaign items.

Local 32 BJ is the second union to take a formal position against term limits. The Montgomery County Education Association, which represents about 12,000 classroom teachers, educators and support staff, is recommending a no vote in its Apple Ballot, which is mailed to registered Democrats and distributed at the polls.

"This is simply a Republican/Trumpian war on competent government," 32 BJ's vice president, Jaime Contreras, said of the pro-term-limits push. "Because they can't win at the ballot box, they are trying to obstruct, which is a direct and unacceptable threat to democracy."

Local 32 BJ, which has a predominantly Latino membership, has pushed hard for a bill sponsored by County Council member Hans Riemer (D-At Large) that would require large employers to provide janitors a minimum workweek of 30 hours so that they can qualify for employer-provided health care. While some union members could acquire insurance through the Affordable Care Act, undocumented **immigrants** in the rank-and-file are not eligible. The bill is pending.

The large donation is also a response to Help Save Maryland, a group critical of current **immigration** policies whose founder, Brad Botwin, was active in gathering signatures for the ballot measure. The group has been described as a "nativist-extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center.

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**'You have raised your voices in an unmistakable chorus," President Bill Clinton said on Inauguration Day in 1993. "I earned capital in this campaign, political capital, and now I intend to spend it," President George W. Bush said upon being reelected in 2004. Most succinct was President Obama in 2009: "I won."

With just over a week until the 2016 election results are tallied, it seems overwhelmingly likely that Hillary Clinton will be the next president of the United States. And her campaign clearly has mandate-building in mind as it makes its final push. Not content to merely fight for Florida or Ohio, just one of which would be needed to deny Donald Trump the presidency, the Clinton team has deployed surrogates like Michelle Obama to places like Arizona in hopes of running up the score. It is quite likely that if Clinton takes the stage to give a victory speech, she will make a claim similar to those of the presidents before her: that Americans have clearly endorsed her vision for the country.

Some political pundits and supporters are already laying out the case for her. "Clinton is in a position to notch a resounding victory by historical standards," Frank Bruni wrote in the New York Times. Similarly, Damon Linker argued in the Week: "The wider Clinton's margin of victory and the closer she comes to winning an outright majority of the votes cast, the more persuasive her claim of a mandate will be. And if she actually crosses the 50 percent threshold, she'll have one of the strongest claims to a mandate in nearly a century." Running mate Tim Kaine told CNN: "Donald is still going to whine if he loses. But if the mandate is clear, I don't think many people will follow him."

Would a big Clinton win actually mean a mandate, though? In an election where voters are more disappointed than ever in the choices they face, where an astonishing number will cast a ballot primarily as a way to oppose a different candidate and where core issues have taken a back seat to tabloid headlines, even a legitimate landslide wouldn't necessarily clarify what, exactly, Clinton had been sent to the White House to do.

Mandates are often talked about in relationship to the decisiveness of victory. But in practice, the two may not have much to do with each other. Political scientist Julia Azari, the author of "Delivering the People's Message: The Changing Politics of the Presidential Mandate," describes presidential mandates as "elite constructions," more about credible claims than objective facts. They are grand narratives about support for a particular agenda - and serve as a threat that Congress ought to go along with that agenda or else face the wrath of the voters. They are a product of those eager to leverage election results to further political goals. Consider that when Bill Clinton invoked that "unmistakable chorus," only 43 percent of voters had raised their voices for him.

Bush's presidency offers another good example of the disconnect between mandate and margin of victory. Despite his narrow win in 2000, his administration governed as if it had a mandate, and in its first term it enacted many of the policies he ran on, including tax cuts, education reform and Medicare Part D. After Bush's reelection, when he defeated Sen. John Kerry by more than two percentage points in the popular vote and by 35 electoral votes, Bush decided to devote his "political capital" to fixing entitlements. The effort failed. Peter Wehner, who headed up the Bush White House's Office of Strategic Initiatives, says the White House had a "false sense of comfort" about the public willingness to rally behind the president's proposals.

Even electoral landslides such as Lyndon B. Johnson's defeat of Barry Goldwater in 1964 do not protect presidents from political challenges, with Johnson's "mandate" curdling into a loss of Democratic seats in Congress in 1966 and his loss of control of his own party by the 1968 election.

The Clinton camp seems concerned that Trump's repeated claims that the election is "rigged" could chip away her mandate. But though doubts about legitimacy make a president more likely to assert a mandate - Azari's research has found that mandate claims have risen as trust in government and other institutions has declined - whether or not a president has a mandate is not the same as a question of legitimacy. Presidents can be fairly and legitimately elected and yet not have a mandate to push through their agendas.

A bigger factor undercutting Clinton's claim to a mandate is the unprecedented level of negativity that voters feel toward both candidates in this election. According to Pew, a majority of Trump supporters say their vote is mostly about taking a stand against Clinton, and nearly half of Clinton's voters say their vote is mostly to oppose Trump. Compare that with the 2012 election, which at the time felt like an incredibly negative race. Both Mitt Romney and Obama had positive net-favorables in polls, meaning more people liked them than disliked them. Only 10 percent of voters in the exit polls that year said their vote was primarily cast as a way to stop the opponent. At the very least, Obama could claim that the vast majority of those voting for him affirmatively wanted him to be president; it would be harder for Clinton to say the same.

Yes, voters may choose to stay home, vote for a third-party candidate or write in someone else if they dislike both Trump and Clinton. But the stakes may feel too high in this election - especially in swing states - to cast a protest vote just to feel good; better to hold one's nose and do the unpleasant thing to stave off an even graver threat to one's way of life. (No wonder the American Psychological Association found half of Americans expressing election-related stress.)

The concept of a mandate also relies on the idea that voters do not elect just a particular person but one with a specific vision. On this front, too, the Clinton campaign is lacking. While she does discuss policy a great deal, she rarely articulates clear priorities or which issues she would tackle first. And the media frenzy around Trump has pushed all positive messaging about policy agendas out of the headlines. "I don't know that voters could name what her policies are," says former Obama speechwriter Jon Favreau.

Of course, elections are often more about personalities than policies, and voters may be drawn to candidates for a variety of reasons that may not overlap. But this election seems to be especially short on substance. Gallup has asked voters for decades whether or not presidential candidates are "talking about issues you really care about." Typically as Election Day approaches, more and more voters say yes; in 2016, the trend has been the opposite. And whereas about three-quarters of voters said yes at the equivalent point in previous election years, less than half said yes in this month's survey.

Even on the few issues that have broken through, it's unclear that there's overwhelming support for Clinton. Take **immigration**. Kaine has expressly used the term "mandate" in this context, telling voters at a rally in Nevada that a Clinton win would affirm a strong preference for **immigration** reform over Trump's vision of a "deportation nation." But while support for mass deportation is low, and a majority of voters reject Trump's proposal to build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, The Washington Post's most recent polling shows voters fairly evenly divided between trusting Trump or Clinton on **immigration** issues, and Pew polling has found that the plurality of voters think there should be equal weight on border security and a path to citizenship.

If elections are a chance to sell voters on an issue agenda, both candidates have completely squandered that opportunity.

Some progressives have tried to head off debate about Clinton's mandate by arguing that mandates are meaningless, given the toxic relationship between the parties. "The truth is that the people who have to approve or reject the president's agenda don't give a damn about mandates one way or the other - they'll support what they want to support and oppose what they want to oppose, whether because of their sincere beliefs or the political demands of their districts and states," Paul Waldman wrote in the American Prospect. And in New York magazine, Jonathan Chait called mandates "an archaic holdover" from a time when "crossing the aisle was common" and members of Congress could be influenced by "moral pressure" to pass the agenda of a president from the opposing party.

Actually, Azari's research - going back to 1928 - shows that it is in a moment like this that mandates matter most. When party polarization is low, there isn't much need for talk of mandates. In periods of intense polarization, invoking mandates helps presidents defend what they want to do, especially when they can't do it alone.

And research has shown that legislators do change their voting behavior, at least temporarily, in response to perceptions of a mandate. "For some it is a means of insulating themselves from the changing electoral landscape," write the authors of a 2003 paper published in the American Journal of Political Science. "These members' responses to the mandate election are, we believe, an attempt to stave off the possibility of electoral defeat. For other members the mandate provides new opportunities to vote their ideological preferences."

It's true that after this election, there will be little incentive for either side to bend to the will of the opponent on any particular policy issue, even in defeat, and it will be shocking if the next president gets anything resembling a honeymoon period.

But even if a Clinton win does not come with a clear mandate for her specific agenda, it should send a wake-up call to Republicans. It will at a minimum be a repudiation of the way Trump has conducted himself, and the anger and division he has sown, in this campaign. Clinton may be seen as unlikable and untrustworthy, and she may not represent significant majorities on key issues, but in polls she is at least viewed as having the temperament to serve as president. If she has a mandate at all, it would be to use that temperament to thaw relations with Capitol Hill and to take steps toward progress on the sorts of major challenges - tax reform, entitlements, infrastructure - both parties agree are facing us, even though they hold deep disagreements on how to solve them.

To the extent that any presidential election is ever about choosing an individual for the express purpose of enacting an explicitly articulated policy agenda, this election is most certainly not about that. Voters are fed up and frustrated, disappointed in their choices, and disheartened by how little they have heard about the issues that matter to them.

Clinton will probably win the White House in a large, legitimate victory in the ugliest election America has seen in decades - even if the "unmistakable chorus" is not exactly singing in unison. But once the cacophony of the election has died down and governing begins, the new president will have to work to earn the support of the people on the issues that matter most.

Twitter: @KSoltisAnderson

is a pollster with Echelon Insights, a columnist for the Washington Examiner and the author of "The Selfie Vote: Where Millennials Are Leading America (And How Republicans Can Keep Up)."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Liberal advocacy groups are preparing blacklists of candidates for appointments to a Hillary Clinton administration, with one organization even producing opposition research to torpedo contenders they consider too soft on Wall Street or other corporate interests.

Planning for a Democratic victory on Nov. 8, these interest groups and like-minded lawmakers are laying the groundwork to push Clinton, if she is elected, to prove her progressive bona fides through early legislation and personnel appointments.

One liberal group has already forwarded to Clinton's transition team the names of 150 acceptable appointees for economic positions, while others on the left are engaged in opposition research against prospects for administration jobs whom they see as unacceptable.

Leading liberal lawmakers - including Sens. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) and Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) - have also started conveying, privately and publicly, guidance on top prospective Clinton appointees and legislative priorities.

The activity reflects the fragile alliance between Clinton and the progressive wing of her party as she nears the end of a tumultuous race against Republican Donald Trump. Although Clinton has campaigned on several of their key issues, many liberals remain skeptical that she will push those priorities adequately if she wins the presidency - and wary that her ties to Wall Street might affect the administration she would build.

"A lot of people are along for the ride through November 8th and will need assurances after that with big, bold action," said Adam Green, co-founder of the Progressive Change Campaign Committee (PCCC). "If you lose people early on, it's hard to get them back on board."

Clinton and her aides have declined to discuss personnel issues, citing a policy of staying mum on that front until after the election. But it's clear that conversations with the left started early: Warren sent Clinton a list of potential administration appointees before Jan. 6, 2015, according to an email hacked from the account of Clinton campaign chairman John D. Podesta and published by the anti-secrecy group WikiLeaks.

Warren, Sanders and other leading liberals have proved loyal soldiers to Clinton during the general-election contest, campaigning regularly and urging their supporters to vote for her. Activists hope these efforts will provide the left with leverage if Clinton wins. But they foresee a very short honeymoon next year should she start nominating unacceptable candidates to positions such as treasury secretary.

Among more than a dozen liberal activists interviewed for this article, there is broad agreement that Mary Jo White, chair of the Securities and Exchange Commission and a frequent target for the left, should not remain in her post in a Clinton administration. At the Treasury Department, progressives see red flags for several potential leaders, including Facebook chief operating officer Sheryl Sandberg and Federal Reserve Board member Lael Brainard.

One potential candidate whom Warren and others on the left have signaled to be acceptable is Deputy Treasury Secretary Sarah Bloom Raskin, who has a long history of consumer advocacy and is the wife of Jamie B. Raskin, a Maryland state senator running for Congress this year.

Gary Gensler, former chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, is also viewed favorably, although Gensler's past work at Goldman Sachs has given some progressives pause. Gensler is the chief financial officer of Clinton's presidential campaign.

Others whose service is being pushed include Tom Perez, President Obama's labor secretary; Rep. Donna F. Edwards (D-Md.), who lost a Senate primary in April; former senator Byron L. Dorgan (D-N.D.); Joseph Stiglitz, an economist and Columbia University professor; Heather C. McGhee, president of Demos, a liberal public-policy organization; and Lori Wallach, an expert on trade with the advocacy group Public Citizen.

"You can't claim to want to rein in Wall Street if your Treasury Department is filled with Wall Street executives," said Jeff Weaver, president of Our Revolution, an organization launched to carry out the agenda of Sanders's presidential campaign.

Weaver, who served as Sanders's campaign manager, said progressive groups are "prepared to mobilize people to put a tremendous amount of pressure" on the new administration and the Senate in cases where confirmation of nominees is required.

The assembly of a Clinton administration would be the first major test of power for progressives since Sanders's unsuccessful presidential run. Activists, guided by Warren's mantra that "personnel is policy," are wary of a repeat of Obama's 2008 transition, in which their influence was muted and which led to an administration they view as disappointingly friendly to corporate interests.

There are some new challenges this time: a Clinton team on which some of the more influential voices are not part of the formal transition process; and a fear that some of Clinton's choices could harbor policy aims less ambitious than the liberal advocates would like.

Emboldened by their success in blocking investment banker Antonio Weiss from the job of undersecretary of the treasury for domestic finance in 2014, liberals hope to see their influence reflected not only in first-tier fiscal roles under Clinton but also in picks for attorney general and lower-ranking yet powerful regulatory positions across the government. (Weiss withdrew his name from consideration for the post, which remains unfilled, and joined the Treasury Department as a counselor to the secretary.)

The proposed AT&T merger with Time Warner has highlighted what progressives see as the need for like-minded officials in the Justice Department's antitrust division. Advocates also see the U.S. trade representative, the SEC chair and the director of the National Economic Council as vital to their policy mission.

The Roosevelt Institute, a New York-based liberal economic advocacy group, has been particularly active in culling names of potential appointees, forwarding to the transition team about 150 who they say reflect the country's ethnic and geographic diversity.

An array of other liberal groups are also involved in the effort, including the Center for Economic and Policy Research, which houses the Revolving Door Project, a shop devoted to investigating public figures for the left.

Some activists have described the project's executive director, Jeff Hauser, as the keeper of a list of undesirable candidates and a researcher into their backgrounds. Reached by phone, Hauser confirmed that he is researching many potential Clinton appointees.

While Warren has privately communicated her desires to Clinton on personnel, Sanders has started speaking out about his standards for treasury secretary and other positions.

Podesta's hacked emails reveal Clinton's inner circle maneuvering to attend to Warren and stay on her good side. Central to this effort are Gensler and Mandy Grunwald, a Warren strategist turned Clinton campaign consultant who communicated regularly with Podesta and others last year about actions that might **alienate** the progressive left.

Clinton speechwriter Dan Schwerin also pursued a working relationship with Warren adviser Dan Geldon, meeting with him in early 2015 about possible administration personnel. Schwerin described the meeting in a follow-up email as "polite" but "not exactly warm."

"They seem wary - and pretty convinced that the Rubin folks have the inside track with us whether we realize it yet or not - but open to engagement and to be proven wrong," Schwerin wrote to Podesta and others, referring to former treasury secretary Robert Rubin, who was an executive from Goldman Sachs.

As the prospective transition approaches, progressives are also keeping a close eye on Clinton's approach to ethics.

Clinton has said she supports a bill proposed by Sen. Tammy Baldwin (D-Wis.) to prevent financial executives entering the government from receiving massive bonuses known as golden parachutes. But when asked by The Washington Post whether Clinton would choose to implement this policy for her own administration, the campaign declined to answer.

Progressive groups are also starting to weigh in on what legislation Clinton, if elected, should push once Congress returns in January.

Among the initiatives that she campaigned on, several are favorites of progressives, including a debt-free-college plan that Clinton revised with Sanders's input after the primaries. At his urging, she incorporated part of his plan to making public colleges and universities tuition-free for families making up to $125,000 a year.

A strong push for that plan by a President Clinton would send a positive signal that she is willing to "go bold" on a progressive agenda, PCCC's Green said.

"If Republicans want to be the party of letting students graduate with debt, let them try that," he said.

Clinton has not pledged to make the college plan part of her first-100-days agenda. Instead, she plans to push two objectives with more centrist appeal: infrastructure investment and an overhaul of **immigration** policy. Clinton has also pledged to start the process of overturning Citizens United, the Supreme Court decision that opened the door for moneyed interests to participate heavily in elections.

Clinton spokesman Brian Fallon said that as president, Clinton would champion the same progressive priorities that she has since the Democratic primaries.

"The same people who are trying to cast doubt on how she would approach her presidency were predicting she'd make some sort of pivot in the general election, and that hasn't happened," Fallon said, adding that Clinton looks forward to working with progressive lawmakers to implement her agenda.

john.wagner@washpost.com

elise.viebeck@washpost.com

Karen Tumulty contributed to this report.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

habitatpwc.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Tiny Malditos used to own this village, strutting around with their rifles and 9mm pistols, their gang allegiances tattooed in crude gothic script across their slender teenage backs and chests.

These days, Santa Teresa doesn't have much of a gang problem. One by one over the past year, the "sons of the community," as the town's Catholic priest calls them - or "terrorists," as the government prefers - have been killed, arrested or driven out.

There was the young man shot by police behind the abandoned adobe house; three more gunned down by officers in the church courtyard; the girlfriend of a jailed gangster, found topless in a roadside ditch with two bullet holes in the back of her head.

The dismantling of the Tiny Malditos is part of a fierce government crackdown on gangs, whose battles had turned El Salvador into one of the world's deadliest nations. The government boasts that its strategy is working, with a homicide rate running below last year's. Nevertheless, there have been more than 4,000 killings this year in a country with approximately the population of Maryland - which had fewer than 400 homicides in 2014, the latest data available.

El Salvador's hostilities appear to be taking on a dangerous new dimension. Once predominantly a street fight between rival gangs, the conflict has shifted to a war between the gangs and the state. Soldiers and police are being linked to human rights abuses and assassinations, an echo of the civil war between leftist guerrillas and the U.S.-backed government fought a quarter-century ago.

The conflict is prompting massive population flight. Since the start of 2014, nearly a quarter-million Salvadorans have been caught in transit by U.S. and Mexican **immigration** officials. This year, an average of 8,354 Salvadorans a month have been apprehended on their journey north, more than at the height of the **refugee**crisis two years ago, when women and children swarmed the U.S. border.

In tiny Santa Teresa, the police have killed at least 10 gang members in the recent crackdown, while losing none of their own. Some residents applaud what they acknowledge are heavy-handed police tactics, saying that the authorities have restored calm. But the village burns with resentment, as the gangsters' families and friends see the police as their most dangerous enemy.

As one police officer in the area put it, "What we have now is a civil war."

A gang takes over

The Tiny Malditos - "Malditos" means "the Damned" - were a clique of about 20 teens and young men. Many were born and raised in Santa Teresa, a farming settlement shrouded in lush vegetation at the base of a volcano, in the central province of La Paz.

Experts estimate that 70,000 people in this country of 6 million belong to gangs, with a half-million more involved in economic activities related to the gangs. In the vast outlaw geography of El Salvador, the Tiny Malditos played a bit part, working for a much larger national gang known as the 18th Street Revolutionaries.

By the start of last year, the Tiny Malditos had taken over this town. They brandished guns, manned checkpoints on back roads and demanded payments from residents. The police rarely intervened.

"It was terrible," one resident recalled, speaking the on condition of anonymity because of a fear of reprisal. "You started to hear gunfire inside the community. You couldn't visit your neighbors. If you tried to go out in the evening and you weren't registered with the gangs, they wouldn't let you pass."

One afternoon in the spring of 2015, an off-duty police sergeant was sitting on a concrete bench outside Santa Teresa Catholic Church, waiting for his car to be repaired, when two members of the Tiny Malditos walked up. Words were exchanged and one of the gangsters fired a gun. The sergeant took a bullet in the leg.

"The slaughter began after they shot that policeman," said Jorge Bernal, 33, who lives a few houses down from the church.

'We see the policeas terrorists'

In the next few weeks, four young men 16 to 24 years old were fatally shot by police during two incidents. Police on both occasions reported an "enfrentamiento," or confrontation, in which gangsters fired on them. Relatives of the dead said that the officers killed the young men unprovoked.

As with much of the violence here, getting to the truth is difficult. Investigations are often cursory. Some residents said they are too afraid of the police to provide testimony. What is clear is many residents' deep resentment of the security forces.

"We see the police as terrorists," said an aunt of one of the four victims, 16-year-old Bryan Rodrigo Santos Arevalo.

The aunt, who spoke on the condition of anonymity, citing a fear of authorities, said that a witness who escaped told her that police had executed the teenager. The right side of Santos Arevalo's face was blown off, morgue photos show.

If police were using lethal force, so were the gangs. On July 3, 2015, four local police officers were returning from a call when "they attacked us from both sides," recalled a police supervisor who was present, speaking on the condition of anonymity. Gang members positioned on earthen mounds overlooking the road sprayed gunfire at the officers' truck, he said. The police sped off, firing frantically, but the driver was hit in his left side. The supervisor was shot in the right knee.

"It's a miracle that I am alive to tell this story," the supervisor said.

Three days later, local police along with members of a San Salvador-based SWAT team shot and killed two members of the Tiny Malditos outside a farmhouse in Santa Teresa. The police reported taking gunfire on arrival. Morena Leiva de Silva, the mother of one of the dead, said a farmworker who was present told her that the officers shot the two gang members as they fled.

"They ran from the police because they were terrified," she said. "They panicked."

A truce ends

President Salvador Sà¡nchez Cerén was a Marxist guerrilla in the 1980s. Now he is the one defending the state.

"Although some say we are at war, there is no other road," Sà¡nchez Cerén said in March.

The government of Sà¡nchez Cerén's predecessor, Mauricio Funes, had engineered a truce between major gangs, transferring their leaders into more lax prisons where they could coordinate with their followers. The homicide rate fell, although critics argued that the respite allowed the gangs to grow stronger.

On taking office in June 2014, Sà¡nchez Cerén brought a swift end to the truce. His government transferred the leaders back to maximum-security lockups, banned visits and cut off cellphone access. He called up military reservists to join the fight against the gangs. The director of the national police announced that officers should feel free to use their weapons to protect themselves. New legislation made it more difficult to investigate police officers when they alleged self-defense.

Homicides shot up. Last year, police were responsible for an estimated 1,000 of the country's 6,600 killings, a steep increase, experts say.

The gangs began targeting police, soldiers, prosecutors and their families in a way unseen. Gang members killed more than 60 police officers last year, nearly doubling the total the year before. Police have confiscated an increasing number of military-style assault rifles from gang members. The attorney general's office recently accused one of the biggest gangs, Mara Salvatrucha, of planning to assemble a 500-man unit of trained gang members to attack security forces. Last fall, a car rigged with explosives detonated outside the Finance Ministry.

The U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights warned in June that allegations of assassinations by El Salvador's security forces are "intolerable and are likely to fuel even greater violence."

The national human rights prosecutor's office, an independent agency, has compiled a registry of nearly 100 cases of alleged assassinations by security forces or shadowy "extermination groups," which often include off-duty police, since mid-2013. But the agency acknowledges that there may be many more.

Walter Gerardo Alegria, a deputy head of the office, said it wasn't clear whether such killings were ordered by authorities.

"However, from the quantity of cases that we have, one can assume that this is a systematic practice," he said.

The director of the national police, Howard Cotto, said he couldn't rule out that some officers may have taken part in summary executions, but he denied that such behavior was permitted.

"We are not willing to tolerate that under the guise of solving security problems we cover up for people who commit crimes or summary executions," he said.

The campaign against gangs has been popular among many Salvadorans. But it might come at a terrible cost to this young democracy, said Héctor Silva àfivalos, who has written a book about the Salvadoran police.

"If between death squads, citizen squads, rough police officers, they kill enough gang members to actually diminish the territorial control of the gangs - then who's going to be in charge?" he asked. "Police commanders with no respect for human rights?"

Bodies pile up

By early this year, the Tiny Malditos were on the run. They moved through the jungle near Santa Teresa, sleeping in hammocks or in a cave tucked beneath banana trees.

Emerson Jhonatan Rivas, 27, was hiding at his girlfriend's hair salon in Santa Teresa when police found him. The girlfriend, Fatima Lopez, and her mother, Veronica, said they watched as police arrived, captured Rivas and marched him, barefoot, out of their place of business. He was found dead 160 yards down the road, behind an abandoned adobe house, lying face down next to a sugar cane field.

The police explanation had a familiar ring: a shootout with terrorists.

"It was not like they said, a confrontation," recalled one of the neighbors, who spoke on the condition of anonymity out of fear of reprisal from the police. "They took him from the house."

Police ordered Santa Teresa's inhabitants to not give food to the outlaws, residents said. Jose Miguel Angel Martinez Diaz, a 29-year-old farmworker, said he was beaten on two occasions by police as they demanded information about the gangs.

"I had bruises all over my arms and body," he said. The local police supervisor denied the charge.

Along Santa Teresa's main road is the Catholic church, with a grassy, enclosed yard. The Rev. Santos Martinez said he disapproved of the gangsters' crimes and intimidation, but he also recognized the young men as part of the local fabric. Their relatives sat in his pews; he had attended their family weddings, baptized their younger siblings.

"People here don't accept the authorities," he said in an interview. "I believe that it is the authorities' duty, their obligation, to be present, providing security, but they do these [violent] things and only they know why."

One of the most chilling deaths involved the girlfriend of a gangster jailed for extortion. Nuri Isela Castillo, 31, worked at a snack shop at the village school.

About 1 a.m. on April 28, someone banged on the door of Castillo's one-story yellow house, down a dirt road in a grove of mango trees. The police had searched the house eight days earlier, according to her family and a neighbor. Nuri's sister, Flor de Maria Castillo, 25, opened the door.

Masked policemen entered the tile-floored dining room, put white plastic flex-cuffs on Nuri's wrists and loaded her into a truck, Flor de Maria and her mother recalled. Nuri's topless body was found in a ditch five hours later.

Police deny that they arrested Nuri Castillo that night and blame the killing on a gang feuding with her boyfriend's group. But in addition to Nuri's family, a local resident has told the human rights prosecutor's office that the police were involved.

When Flor de Maria went to identify the corpse, a police officer told her that if she made a formal complaint, "I would end up like my sister," she recalled.

Concerns abouta 'culture of death'

One of the last surviving Tiny Malditos, Rudy Melendez, lived as if his days were numbered. A stem-thin 15-year-old with wary, darting eyes, Melendez met with a reporter in a house in Santa Teresa recently, the butt of a pistol visible in the pocket of his pants, his 7-year-old brother standing outside as a lookout. At one point, when a police patrol passed, Melendez sprinted into a bamboo thicket to hide.

"They're coming to kill," he said after he crept back inside. "They have a great hatred."

He described how three of his fellow gang members had been slain by the police. It happened one night in February, after Melendez and the three other young men had scaled the wall of the Catholic church and bedded down outside the chapel while the priest was sleeping in his chambers. Before dawn, police burst into the courtyard. Melendez claimed that the officers shot the three young men and then planted weapons alongside them as he hid under a pile of leaves and trash, watching.

Government investigators have not been able to confirm such police malfeasance. Investigators found gunshot residue on the gang members' hands, indicating they may have fired the guns - but it wasn't clear whether they had shot first. The police, who suffered no injuries, said they had engaged in a shootout with the gang members. The priest said he didn't see anything.

Regardless, the deaths carved a new wound in the community. Hundreds of people turned out for the funeral, marching down the main street behind the coffins.

"Whoever they catch here, they kill," Melendez said in the interview. "The ones in this village get killed."

But he would face another fate. Melendez fled to a town along the Guatemalan border. This month he was arrested by Salvadoran police and is being held in a juvenile jail about 50 miles north of his home.

At a candlelit Sunday morning Mass recently, Martinez told the congregation that the country was penned in by a "culture of death."

"We want there to be no more death, that our youth stop being beleaguered by gangs and by the authorities, who we know sometimes come here to beat and to kill," he said.

Hanging on the chapel wall were framed photos of four American nuns murdered by security forces in 1980 during the civil war. At that time, most Santa Teresa residents supported the army. Government death squads regularly dumped bodies, including the nuns', in the area.

Many worry that a war mentality has again taken hold.

After the service, Martinez chatted in the courtyard with Eriberto Reyes, a former youth leader for the church.

Reyes, for one, did not mourn the dead gangsters.

"If the law were just, then yes, it would have been better to detain them," he said. But he added that gang members could easily bribe judges to free them from prison.

"It's a better option to exterminate them."

joshua.partlow@washpost.com

Sarah Esther Maslin in San Salvador, Fred Ramos in Santa Teresa and Gabriela Martinez in Mexico City contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Arlington County voters headed to the polls Nov. 8 will have few choices when it comes to the school board: Just two candidates, both endorsed by the Arlington County Democratic Party, are running for two at-large board positions.

Incumbent Nancy Van Doren and newcomer Tannia Talento would be part of a board that faces some challenges. The high-achieving district is struggling with overcrowding, a byproduct of a surge in enrollment, which is expected to grow from about 26,000 to 30,000 students in the next five years.

The school system is on track to build a middle school in Rosslyn and retrofit an aging school to make it suitable for additional middle school students. It also plans to build an elementary school and remodel some facilities. The board also will be redrawing enrollment boundaries for the district's three comprehensive high schools in the coming year.

Voters also will weigh in on a $139 million school bond referendum, borrowed money that would be used to construct and remodel school buildings.

Van Doren, 56, who is the school board chair, was appointed to the panel in 2014 to fill a seat vacated by Noah Simon, who stepped down so he could spend more time with his family.

Van Doren, the former president of the Thomas Jefferson Middle School PTA, was elected that fall to serve the rest of the term.

In her two years on the board, Van Doren, a strong advocate for career and technical education, helped draft a capital improvement plan that addresses the school system's projected enrollment growth. She also helped develop a program to serve children with dyslexia. Van Doren supported the opening of Arlington Tech, a novel four-year program for high school students centered on hands-on courses.

Van Doren, who previously worked in corporate communications for an insurance company and in business development for a newspaper, has a lengthy record as a school volunteer, serving on numerous parent advisory committees.

She said Arlington must focus on boosting achievement among its lowest performers, including English-language learners and special-needs students, while building out school facilities to accommodate enrollment growth.

"The biggest challenge is continuing to improve outcomes for all Arlington students, because I think we are so close to actually closing the achievement gap," Van Doren said.

Talento, 40, is the daughter of Guatemalan **immigrants**. She grew up in the Washington area, attending schools in the District, Virginia and Maryland.

She said she decided to run for school board because she recalled her own experience as a student at Suitland High in Prince George's County. As a high school student, she said, she cared for her ailing mother, helped to raise younger siblings and worked part time.

When she thought she needed to drop out because of family responsibilities, she went to her counselor, who told her to "tough it out," she recalls. Instead, Talento called the Prince George's County Board of Education, where someone told her about an alternative program that would allow her to graduate a few months late.

"I really had to advocate for my education," Talento said.

Talento went on to work as a clerk, research assistant and legal secretary at a D.C. law firm. She attended night classes at Northern Virginia Community College, but she did not receive a degree.

In 2009, she left her job at the law firm to focus on raising her daughter and son, who now attend Washington-Lee High School. At that time, she also became involved in parent advisory committees.

Talento has served on committees that advise the superintendent, including a mathematics advisory committee, a committee that focused on education for English-language learners, and others that gave input on planning and curriculums. She also has helped struggling students navigate the school system, teaching them to advocate for themselves, she said.

Talento said she hopes to focus on building a better relationship between the school district and **immigrant** parents, who may struggle with English or lack an Internet connection, making it difficult for them to connect with teachers and school officials.

She also hopes to boost awareness of mental-health issues in the school community if she is elected.

moriah.balingit@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LOVELAND, Colo. - Standing in front of someone else's banner last week, looking out at signs that read "Lion Ted" and "We Love Cruz," Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) picked up where he had left off. The election, he said, was about "jobs, freedom, and security" - just as he had said when he was running for president earlier this year. It was not just about electing Republicans.

"If, God forbid, Hillary wins this thing - and I pray that she does not - we desperately need a Republican Senate to check the president," Cruz said Wednesday at the first of three events for Republican U.S. Senate candidate Darryl Glenn of Colorado. "If the Republican nominee wins the presidency, we still need a Republican Senate to check the president, because that's the constitutional responsibility of the Senate, whether the president is Democrat or Republican."

Over 22 minutes in Loveland, and 24 more minutes in Denver, Cruz never mentioned Donald Trump, whom he had finally endorsed one month earlier. In between those events, Cruz told The Washington Post that if his party held the Senate, there was "long historical precedent for a Supreme Court with fewer justices."

Like other rising stars - House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), Ohio Gov. John Kasich (R) - who were felled or humbled by Trump, the runner-up for the Republican nomination was bidding to be the leader of the opposition. His argument, and the ones made by the candidates he stumped for in Colorado, hinted at how Republicans might pivot from 2016 by changing as little as possible.

Cruz's visit to Colorado was one of three Senate campaign swings he scheduled for October. He hit Nevada for Rep. Joseph J. Heck, who is running for the seat being vacated by Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid; Cruz will campaign for Missouri's Sen. Roy Blunt next.

At each stop, Cruz largely echoed the message of all Republicans ducking the Trump tornado, assuring conservatives that the country wanted to elect them. He compared the release of impounded Iranian money, a part of the nuclear deal, to Democrats walking duffel bags of $20 bills to a bank. When one supporter's errant elbow turned off the lights in Loveland's Embassy Suites ballroom, he joked that "Obama's NSA" was censoring conservatives.

"We just saw yet another round of massive premium increases in Colorado," Cruz said in Loveland. "If your premiums have dropped $2,500 a year, vote for Sen. Michael F. Bennet (D-Colo.). If they haven't, and your health insurance premiums have gone up, vote for Darryl Glenn."

Such talk had voters wondering what the 2016 election might have been like with a non-Trump candidate leading the party. At each public stop, Cruz - who will be 49 during the next presidential election in 2020 - spent almost as much time glad-handing and taking photos with supporters as he spent giving his speech.

"It's too bad what happened in the primary," said one fan, clutching a copy of the senator's memoir.

"Life is long," Cruz said.

Like Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), like Mitt Romney - and less auspiciously, like former senator Rick Santorum (R-Pa.) - Cruz ran a strong primary campaign that seemed to give him a claim on the next presidential race. According to former spokesman Rick Tyler, Cruz's poorly timed endorsement of Trump, which came months after he refused to back the businessman at the convention and days before the first presidential debate began the nominee's polling swoon, put him "on the losing end of either side of the argument" about a post-Trump GOP.

But Cruz made that endorsement after hearing from grass-roots conservatives in Texas; grass-roots conservatives in Colorado were just as happy that he'd evolved.

"I'm committed to him," said Linda Feather, 75, who worried that a Hillary Clinton presidency would lead to a surge of Syrian **refugees** into the United States. "I'm looking for him to run again in four years. I feel deeply that he was the only one who could have beaten Hillary. Mike Pence has strengths and weaknesses, but I see Ted as the most illuminating, most viable person in the movement."

Voters with that same attitude had nominated Glenn, a county commissioner from Colorado Springs who was elevated at the same state convention - packed with conservative activists - that gave Colorado's Republican delegates to Cruz.

"It was the most biased thing I've ever seen in politics," said Grady Bouie, 32, a Trump supporter who came to see Cruz in Denver. "Absolutely corrupt."

Cruz called Bennet the "most vulnerable" Democrat in the Senate, but he didn't mention how Glenn's nomination sent national Republicans running from the race. In an average of recent polls, Bennet, who won his first term in a squeaker, led Glenn by 15 points. Glenn's convention victory and subsequent campaign were reminders that the wing of the party that put up the strongest fight against Trump - Cruz's wing - had electability issues of its own.

Glenn had won the nomination with support from Cruz allies, such as the Senate Conservatives Fund, and with a rousing conservative speech he'd later adapt for the Republican National Convention. To Republican delegates, he promised to be an "unapologetic Christian conservative, pro-life, Second Amendment." To journalists, he sketched out a possible Senate career that sounded a lot like Cruz's.

"Republicans have abrogated their responsibility to lead," Glenn told the Denver Post this summer, "so now Republicans are expected to turn to Democrats for leadership, instead of laying out an agenda that Democrats also could agree with."

Bennet, a laconic politician who had never won an election before 2010, has dismantled Glenn much the way Democrats had intended to dismantle Cruz had he become the nominee. Tracker video, and Glenn's own interactions with the press, yielded "apologetic" quotes that were easy to weaponize.

"If you want an abortion, don't ask me to pay for it," Glenn said in a 2015 video that Democrats threw back at him in October. "That's a gift from God. There are no exceptions with that."

Glenn raised money - $2.8 million in the last quarter, $600,000 more than Bennet - but seemed to be running in a different universe. Bennet's commercials have talked viewers through his battles to save Centers for Disease Control and Prevention facilities and to pass the farm bill. Glenn's most striking spot shows the Air Force veteran and former powerlifter sweating through a workout and promising vaguely to change Washington.

But apart from Cruz's visit - and a Friday campaign tour with Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) - Glenn's race had faded from the national discussion. In the rest of his short conversation with reporters, Cruz got no questions about Glenn's race. He did get one about Trump - specifically, whether Trump would **alienate** female voters - and navigated around it.

"There have been no shortages of fireworks in this election cycle, and that's been unfortunate," Cruz said. "I'm doing everything I can, down-ballot, to turn out conservatives."

david.weigel@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A jury's stunning rejection of the government's case against seven people charged in connection with this year's armed occupation of a federal wildlife **refuge** in Oregon has reignited the combustible debate in America over the federal government's authority and its land use policies in the West.

While land rights and anti-Washington activists greeted the jury's decision as a long-overdue victory for American liberty, others called it a terrifying invitation for armed protesters to occupy federal land and buildings with impunity, potentially putting federal workers at risk.

"People are starting to pay attention to the narrative that the government is trying to push upon the people, and they're not buying it. The government is overreaching, and it's time for that to stop," said B.J. Soper, an Oregon activist who closely monitored the trial and also was present at the 41-day occupation in January and February of the Malheur National Wildlife **Refuge**.

The acquittal after a six-week trial comes at a time when tensions across the nation are already amped up because of the vitriolic presidential campaign and growing fears of potential violence on and after Election Day.

"This absolutely shocking verdict is sure to embolden armed paramilitary groups in the white-hot political environment in this country," said Tarso Luis Ramos, executive director of Political Research Associates, a human rights organization that has studied the anti-government activism in Oregon. "This sends a signal that not only is it appropriate to challenge the rule of law through armed militancy, but that it is effective to do so."

The defendants argued that their occupation was a peaceful act of civil disobedience, in the tradition of Martin Luther King Jr., in protest of vast federal land ownership in the West. They said they acted after years of frustration with government agencies that they say strangle local economies with over-regulation and pay little attention to local concerns.

Federal prosecutors charged that the well-armed occupiers, led by brothers Ammon and Ryan Bundy, illegally occupied the property and used guns and the threat of force to hold it in an incident that drew international attention to the remote, snowy plains of far Eastern Oregon.

The six men and one woman acquitted Thursday were officially charged with conspiracy to prevent federal employees from doing their job, an argument rejected by a federal court jury in Portland.

That decision was "vindication for everyone who has stood up and said to the government: 'What you are doing is wrong, and we want you to stop,'" Soper said.

The jury's full reasoning remained unclear Friday, however. One juror wrote to the Oregonian newspaper after the trial, saying, "It should be known that all 12 jurors felt that this verdict was a statement regarding the various failures of the prosecution to prove 'conspiracy' in the count itself - and not any form of affirmation of the defense's various beliefs, actions or aspirations."

Mark Heckert, of the Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, a sportsmen's group, could barely control his rage at the decision, which he said did not represent the "rural values" cited by supporters of the defendants.

"Negotiating at the barrel of a gun is not a rural value; that's just intimidation," said Heckert, who visited the **refuge** during the occupation as a public lands advocate. "It emboldens these guys who think if something doesn't go your way, grab a gun and go out and force people to change it. I'm disgusted at the actions that people can take without any consequences."

In addition to the seven people acquitted Thursday, 11 others charged have already pleaded guilty; seven more face trial in February.

But most attention has been focused on the trial of the Bundy brothers, whose father, Cliven Bundy, has become a potent symbol for activists angry over land policies in the West, where the federal government owns more than 50 percent of the land in many states.

Hundreds of armed activists faced off with armed Bureau of Land Management agents and other federal authorities at Bundy's Nevada ranch in 2014 in a dispute over Bundy's refusal to pay more than $1 million in overdue fees to graze his cattle on federal land.

Fearing bloodshed, federal authorities backed off for almost two years before filing federal firearms and other charges against Bundy and 18 other people, including Ammon Bundy, 41, and Ryan Bundy, 43. Despite their acquittal Thursday, the brothers were ordered held in jail pending their trial in Nevada in February.

That withdrawal from the land in 2014 has been seen as emboldening militia groups, including the Oath Keepers and the 3 Percenters, to stage armed confrontations with authorities at mines on federal property in Oregon and Montana - as well as the wildlife **refuge** occupation.

Critics said the jury's verdict would encourage them further.

"It's disastrous; what this verdict is very likely to do is to unleash these people," said Mark Potok of the Southern Poverty Law Center, which monitors anti-government extremism. "The danger is that we get armed invasions of all kinds of public lands and similar institutions, to push the completely bogus idea that the states are the real owners of public lands. The real danger is bloodshed."

Michele Fiore, a Nevada state assemblywoman and high-profile supporter of the Bundys, said that such predictions were groundless. She said that many of the defendants had spent nine months in jail awaiting trial, so their activism has come with a heavy price despite the acquittal.

"Personally, I don't see anyone just going in and taking over federal buildings because we got a not-guilty verdict," she said.

J. David Cox Sr., president of the American Federation of Government Employees, the largest federal employee union, representing 670,000 workers - including hundreds of BLM agents - disagreed.

"This acquittal sends a very dangerous message that members of the public can engage in an armed takeover of a federal facility and face no consequences," Cox said in a written statement.

Interior Secretary Sally Jewell sent a note to all employees Friday, including those at the Bureau of Land Management, saying she was "profoundly disappointed" in the decision and "concerned about its potential implications."

"In the coming days and weeks, I encourage you to take care of yourselves and your fellow employees," she wrote. "The armed occupation in Oregon was and continues to be a reminder that employees in all offices should remain vigilant and report any suspicious activity."

Jamie Clark, president of Defenders of Wildlife, issued a statement Friday saying the jury's decision represented "a day of national sorrow for all who care about our country's magnificent public lands, and a time for deep concern among our nation's law enforcement officers who will confront increased threats of violence across the West."

Bob Dreher, another official of that organization, said, "The signal that it sends is that they got away with it." He said the verdict adds validation to statements by Ammon Bundy and others "about how the federal government is illegitimate," which "puts everybody at risk - federal workers at risk, federal lands at risk of intrusion."

Joseph Rice, a local Republican official in Southern Oregon, noted that Americans have "a constitutionally protected right to redress grievances with the government."

"It doesn't say how or when it's done. It's at the individual's choosing," Rice said.

Rice said history suggests that civilians have more to fear from the government than vice versa. He said federal authorities instigated violence at the 1990s standoffs at Ruby Ridge, Idaho, and Waco, Tex., which resulted in scores of deaths and energized the anti-government militia movement. At the Oregon standoff, he said, Oregon State Police troopers fatally shot LaVoy Finicum, who had been a spokesman for the group.

Finicum was killed when state police and the FBI stopped a car in which he and other occupation leaders were driving. Officials said Finicum was shot when he appeared to reach for a loaded gun in his jacket, and the troopers were later cleared of wrongdoing.

"Lavoy Finicum was basically set up and assassinated," Rice said. "That man was denied his day in court, and, as we saw yesterday, would have been found innocent. He broke no law yet was murdered by the government."

Rice faulted the BLM for failing to make good-faith efforts to communicate with and work with local people who feel that their traditional means of earning income - including grazing, timber-cutting and mining - are threatened by federal environmental policies that they believe favor endangered species over the economic well-being of communities.

The acquittal came as a shock to black activists in Portland. Earlier this month, during the Malheur trial, police used pepper spray to break up a peaceful sit-in over a police union contract at City Hall.

"We were all thrown down the stairs and out the door by riot cops because our mayor said he didn't feel comfortable with us being in a public space," said Teressa Raiford, a community organizer active in the Black Lives Matter movement who is also running a write-in campaign for Multnomah County sheriff.

"It's very racist out here, and this is a serious message to everybody that says, 'You know what, if you don't look like us, if you don't stand for America - and I guess America is white - you're an insurgent and we'll treat you as such,'" she said. "It's horrible."

Thursday's verdict came on the same day that Native American protesters of an oil pipeline in North Dakota were tear-gassed, which came as no surprise to Jarvis Kennedy, an official with the Burns Paiute Native American tribe, which lived on the land where the Oregon wildlife **refuge** is now located.

"I kind of figured they'd get off because there were no minorities there," Kennedy said. "It's all about white privilege."

kevin.sullivan@washpost.com

Sottile reported from Portland. Lisa Rein in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Pat Tiller, who retired in 2005 after 30 years with the National Park Service, is a lecturer on historic preservation at George Washington University.

We must soon make a choice for which future generations of Virginians and Americans will forever hold us responsible. Dominion Virginia Power plans to construct 44 massive electric transmission towers across and near the historic James River within close sight of Jamestown Island, the first permanent English settlement in the New World and arguably one of our nation's most historically significant places.

This thoughtless plan would negatively affect not only Jamestown Island but also the much-admired Colonial Parkway and the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail. This wanton act of vandalism must not happen for the sake of this generation and succeeding generations. The Army Corps of Engineers is mulling the question at this moment.

This is personal for me. I write as a direct descendant of one of the early émigrés to Jamestown: Lt. Col. Walter Chiles (1609-1653). Chiles was a merchant and served in the House of Burgesses and on the royal governor's council. But in a larger sense, I write on behalf of all Americans, whether they arrived in Virginia in the 17th century, arrived unwillingly from Africa in the 18th and 19th centuries or arrived yesterday from Syria, Nicaragua or India. We are a nation of **immigrants**, and Jamestown was the beginning of the American **immigration** story. The Jamestown story is all of our stories.

Jamestown Island is a national historical park, a unit of America's "best idea," as American author Wallace Stegner called the national park system. Regrettably, many of our national parks are under threat from unsympathetic development on their borders, climate change and chronic underfunding. We must not permit Jamestown to join these ranks.

Today, Jamestown Island's historic setting remains virtually unchanged since the 17th century. Colonial National Historical Park's millions of visitors each year can stand on the island and see the identical view those brave men and women saw more than 400 years ago. This must be preserved for generations yet to come and not marred with 44 transmission towers - some as tall as the Statue of Liberty - covered in blinking lights.

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is considering this misbegotten idea and will soon decide whether to provide the permit needed for Dominion Virginia to proceed. We all recognize and respect the need to meet increased demand and to provide more cost-effective electricity for our fellow citizens. But this must not be done at so egregious a cost to one of our nation's most significant and precious historic places. Credible industry experts have identified reasonable alternatives, including burying the lines under the river or adding capacity to other transmission line corridors, but Dominion summarily rejects these alternatives. The Corps must require Dominion to explore these by undertaking the federal environmental impact statement process, which requires a full review of the project's effects and any reasonable alternatives.

To date, thousands of citizens and federal and state agencies, local governments and nonprofit organizations have voiced opposition to this project. There are other ways to solve the commonwealth's and the nation's energy challenges. The Army Corps of Engineers and Dominion have a higher responsibility to the nation, to our history and to future generations.

The Old Dominion deserves better from Dominion Virginia Power.

The writer, who retired in 2005 after 30 years with the National Park Service, is a lecturer on historic preservation at George Washington University.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**After a week of listening to it, Lady Gaga's "Joanne" still sounds like a medium-size bowl of who cares. That's surprising, even though it shouldn't be. The Lady's previous albums each came with their share of vanilla lumps, but usually with cherries on top, too - maraschino megahits to distract us from the fact that pop's leading wild thing makes lots of blah music.

To our retinas, she was never dull. Lady Gaga's flamboyance turned heads, but it also radiated deeper messages about freedom, affirmation and empowerment. When she presented herself as larger-than-life, her fans felt a permission to be themselves, and that's a beautiful thing. But on her patently austere new album, Gaga's music has never sounded more conservative, lightweight, unctuous or uncentered - it's as if she's gotten lost inside her truer, blander self. Considering that this superstar once strode across the world's biggest stages with the valiance of a freak, she now seems to be exuding the quiet desperation of a fraud.

The difference is important. Freaks lead. Frauds follow. Freaks want out. Frauds want in. Freaks are truth-tellers. Frauds are attention-hounds. Freaks are driven by their weirdness. Frauds perform weirdness for the delight of strangers. Freaks are tenacious. Frauds are thin-skinned. Freaks are in it for life. Frauds are in it for laughs - and when the party's over, they can always move back home to Connecticut and start studying for the LSAT.

That isn't an option for true freaks, who are gnarly by nature and are always risking something. Their strange magnificence invites ostracism, insult, humiliation and **alienation**. Frauds risk very little. In fact, their performative freakiness is simply a means of achieving greater security through affection, praise, admiration and acceptance. (When freaks receive those positive responses, it's cosmic serendipity. See: Parliament-Funkadelic, the Ramones, Kate Bush, Prince, Bjork, Young Thug, et al.)

In pop music, fraudulence is only offensive if you uphold freakiness as the most reliable measure of honesty. Will Oldham - who performs folk songs as Bonnie "Prince" Billy - is a good example of how that works. His ballads aren't honest because he's a Kentucky-raised punk strumming Appalachian melodies on an acoustic guitar; they're honest because Oldham's lyrics are so transparent and unrepentant about the funny business that goes on inside his skull. Setting your most freakish thought bubbles to melody takes a lot more courage than singing about heartache, loneliness or the plight of the American autoworker.

Oldham is great, but I'm not suggesting that white guys make for the most consummate freaks in popland. It's the opposite, really. White men continue to enjoy the most security in our society, and because fraudulence doesn't require much risk, Caucasoid fraud-bros are all around us. Among the most irritating to materialize in recent memory is Father John Misty, an obsequious indie-folk carpetbagger whose zany-smug lyrics about sex and cynicism help to posit him as a bit of a cad. When the New Yorker recently invited him to give a public talk in Manhattan, the singer greeted the audience by saying, "I cannot believe you guys bought tickets to this." A fraud move for sure, but also something he might consider saying at the outset of every Father John Misty concert.

Because frauds sometimes run in packs, Gaga recruited Fr. Misty to help write a couple of songs for "Joanne" - the hammy "Sinner's Prayer" and the glammy "Come to Mama," unimaginative '70s throwbacks, both. And although Gaga has somehow found a way to make ham and glam feel like musical austerity measures, it doesn't necessarily make her dislikable. It only makes her boring.

Here's something that makes her dislikable: her response to a review of "Joanne" in the New York Times that accused the singer of sounding less than inspired. On Twitter, Gaga replied, "how far must ANYONE need to [fishing pole emoji] 4 inspiration & write a song re: the tragic murder of Trayvon Martin as I did w/ 'Angel Down.'"

Yikes. Gaga was referring to one of the deeper cuts on "Joanne," an overwrought, oversung ballad about gun violence that never specifically mentions Martin. And was the angel that Gaga was actually singing about a reference to another Times story about how the late Michael Brown was "no angel"? Either way, Gaga appears to believe that "Angel Down" was created with such righteously woke intent, it should put the rest of "Joanne" above reproach. Which is disgusting on a few different levels - leveraging a human life against a bad review, for one.

And so this muddled little album - and its subsequent thud - have thrown Lady Gaga's entire endeavor into question. What if her altruism has been opportunism all along? What if her magnanimous esteem-boosting was just empty-calorie prattle from an overdressed motivational speaker? What if all these fantastic characters that Gaga has played - meat-frock maven, **alien** pod hatchling, estranged David Bowie cousin - were mere disguises for a careerist with no greater goal than her own success? Here's the freaky truth: These questions probably wouldn't matter if she'd given us something good to sing along to.

chris.richards@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NAIROBI - Three months ago, the town of Bidi Bidi in northern Uganda was mostly rugged grassland, speckled with a few small buildings and homes.

Now Bidi Bidi is home to the world's fourth-biggest **refugee** camp, according to U.N. officials - home to 160,000 South Sudanese who fled the most recent spasm in their country's civil war.

Most people associate the global migrant crisis with Europe's struggle to accommodate the massive numbers of people who have arrived over the past two years, but African nations continue to host as many **refugees**. (African and Europe each has around 4.4 million, according to the latest figures, from 2015, issued by the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**.) Remarkably, 26 percent of the world's **refugees** now live in Africa, in some of the world's poorest nations, least equipped to handle the inflow.

There is no better example than Bidi Bidi of how rapidly Africa's **refugee** problem has surged, even as Europe's influx appears to have stabilized.

The makeshift camp has received the same number of **refugees** since July as all of Greece did from January to September, according to data from the International Organization for Migration and UNHCR.

In July, fighting in South Sudan's capital shattered a fragile cease-fire that had been in place for about a year between forces led by the country's president and forces led by the vice president. Hundreds of people were killed over several days. Immediately, civilians started fleeing their homes. Many of them crossed the border to Uganda. On one day alone, 8,000 people arrived.

"It became clear that we had to identify a new settlement area," said Charlie Yaxley, a UNHCR spokesman in Uganda.

The numbers kept on increasing as hopes for reconciliation in South Sudan faded - there are now around 2,500 arrivals every day. Bidi Bidi now hosts the world's fourth-biggest **refugee** camp, behind camps in Dadaab, Kenya; Dolo Ado, Ethiopia; and Kakuma, also in Kenya, according to U.N. officials.

In South Sudan, an untold number of women had been sexually abused during the conflict. Boys were forced to join militant groups. Those who escaped to Uganda told stories of horror. Many children arrived alone after their parents were killed. Government and opposition forces in South Sudan have been accused of the abuses. Much of the fighting has fallen along tribal lines.

Women and children make up 85 percent of new arrivals at Bidi Bidi, according to UNHCR. Officials are expecting thousands more to arrive in the coming months.

But as with Africa's **refugee** crisis as a whole, the United Nations was vastly underresourced to handle the influx. UNHCR's funding appeal for Uganda in 2016 is $250 million. It has received only 30 percent of that amount.

One sign of that shortfall: The United Nations had to cut by 50 percent the food rations it had initially provided to many **refugees**.

"Even deeper cuts may be necessary," Yaxley said.

Uganda now hosts about 500,000 **refugees**, including those in Bidi Bidi. Other people in the camps are from Burundi, Somalia and Congo.

But the country also hosts one of the most progressive **refugee** policies in the world.

**Refugees** in Uganda are given the right to work and travel freely. They are given materials to build homes and a plot of land to cultivate. They are even allowed to vote and stand for office at a local level.

The World Bank has called Uganda's **refugee** policy "one of the most progressive and generous in the world."

"It is my view that an economically empowered **refugee** is beneficial to the national economy and as a nation we should work towards this," said Marcel Tibaleka, Uganda's ambassador to Germany and the Vatican, during a forum on "Free Movement of Persons," held in April in Bonn.

But despite that policy, the country still needs far more help to host the **refugees** than it is receiving. Malnutrition remains a problem among children, and the volume of water available "remains inadequate to meet the growing demand of the settlement," according to the United Nations.

kevin.sieff@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The callers in India, claiming to be officials with the Internal Revenue Service or **immigration** services, would present those who answered the phone with an ultimatum. Pay us, or we'll fine you, deport you or arrest you.

Their network was expansive, and their work lucrative. Justice Department officials announced charges against 61 people and entities Thursday and said the call center scheme had scammed at least 15,000 victims out of more than $250 million.

Phone scams are not new, but the breadth and sophistication of this one is notable. Justice Department officials said the defendants - 24 of them based in the United States - ran at least five call center groups overseas. Leslie Caldwell, the assistant attorney general in charge of the Justice Department's Criminal Division, said she hoped the efforts of U.S. and Indian authorities would put a dent in the robust industry of phone scammers.

"We have seen a drop-off in the success rate of these scams," Caldwell said.

U.S. authorities said they arrested 20 people in this country and carried out nine search warrants Thursday. A few others involved were already in custody. Earlier this month, in a separate case, police in Mumbai raided a call center and detained 770 employees for questioning. The Justice Department said that it was focused on a network of call centers in Ahmedabad and that some of the centers' owners have been charged.

A grand jury in federal court in the Southern District of Texas returned an indictment in the case on Oct. 19. Officials announced the unsealing of it on Thursday. The charges against those involved include conspiracy to commit identity theft, impersonation of an officer of the United States, wire fraud and money laundering.

Bruce Foucart, assistant director of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement's homeland security investigations, said the scammers conducted online research on potential targets using Facebook and other online sources and bilked "savvy, successful and law-abiding people." He said they went to "frightening lengths" to ensure the success of their scheme.

In one instance, Foucart said, scammers convinced a Southern California woman with cancer that police would show up at her workplace for purported unpaid tax bills stemming from her medical treatment. She paid the scammers $7,000, Foucart said.

In another instance, he said, when a man did not respond to phone demands for four years of purported back taxes, the scammers called 911 posing as the man and told the dispatcher he was armed and wanted to kill police. Armed officers showed up at the man's house, where his daughter was home alone, Foucart said.

"They convey authority and a sense of urgency that leaves their victims terrified," he said.

Those involved had a network of U.S.-based co-conspirators who would liquidate and launder the ill-gotten gains by buying prepaid debit cards, which they often registered using the personal information of identity-theft victims. They also would send wire transfers using fake names and use money transferring methods known as "hawalas," in which money is effectively moved internationally outside the U.S. banking system.

Caldwell said the scammers were able to display their numbers on caller ID systems as being from the U.S. government, though she said no government agency would call demanding money as they did.

"If you get one of these calls," she said, "it is not the U.S. government calling you."

Authorities said callers also sometimes would defraud victims by offering small, short-term loans or telling them they were eligible for grants, then requesting a processing fee or a good-faith deposit to demonstrate the victims' ability to pay it back. The callers would pocket that money and never provide the grant or loan, authorities said.

Caldwell said that authorities would seek to recover the money that was stolen but that doing so might be difficult and that it is possible that victims would not be repaid.

matt.zapotosky@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Survive

Long derided as uncool, the keyboard synthesizer has made something of a comeback. Part of that renewed interest has been driven by the rediscovery of '80s horror film soundtracks. Such films as "Halloween III" and "Sorcerer" used electronics to generate moody tones and **alien** textures - far from the ebullient sounds of new-wave pop. The music was very distant from rock-and-roll, but undeniably heavy.

So it's not surprising that "RR7349," the new album by Survive, is out via renowned metal imprint Relapse. The Austin-based quartet's instrumental compositions are eerie, but undeniably hooky. Pulsing bass lines and robotic squelches provide the foundation for broody minor-key melodies. The songs could slot with just about any cinematic action sequence: helicopters touching down, frenzied flight from a malevolent **alien**, etc.

If the music gives you a feeling of déjà  vu, it's not just because Survive draws from familiar source materials. Band members Kyle Dixon and Michael Stein also provide the score for the popular and similarly retro-minded Netflix series "Stranger Things." It's an appropriate pairing: The show applies modern longform television narrative tropes to a story inspired by '80s horror and sci-fi classics. Like Survive, it's a fresh spin on an old formula.

<iframe width="560" height="315" src="https://www.youtube.com/embed/Z30CFPklA8Q[https://www.youtube.com/embed/Z30CFPklA8Q]" frameborder="0" allowfullscreen></iframe><p class="caption"></p>

- Aaron Leitko

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**There are more than two months left in 2016, but the number of people who have died this year trying to reach European shores via smuggling routes across the Mediterranean Sea has surpassed last year's grim total. A spokesman for the United Nations' **refugee** agency said Wednesday that 3,800 have died attempting the voyage this year.

And that number could rise further. More than 90 migrants are feared dead after their boat sank in the Mediterranean east of Tripoli, a Libyan coast guard spokesman said Thursday. The coast guard said at least 29 migrants have been rescued, but survivors said 126 people had been on the inflatable boat.

All told, only about a third as many migrants have tried the sea crossing this year compared with 2015. That means something about migration dynamics has changed that makes reaching Europe three times as deadly.

The reasons are manifold. They stem from the unintended consequences of hard-nosed decisions by governments, as well as the inevitable consequences of reckless decisions by smugglers.

Before March, the relatively short sea crossing from Turkey to various Greek islands was the preferred route to Europe, especially for those fleeing the war in Syria, which borders Turkey. More than 1 million people arrived in Greece via this route between January 2015 and March 2016.

In March, the European Union and Turkey reached a deal. It stipulated that all **immigrants** arriving in Greece would be returned to Turkey, where they could apply for asylum. Although the deal didn't totally stop people from using the route, it dissuaded many. **Refugee** camps in Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan have swollen. Fifty-thousand **refugees** are stuck in Greece after European nations reneged on pledges to resettle them across the continent.

So attention has shifted to what is known as the "central Mediterranean" route, from North Africa to Italy. The route accounts for about half of the total arrivals in Europe but most of the migrant deaths. Its watery graveyard is populated almost entirely by Africans fleeing conditions that although not warlike are dire, including extreme poverty and hunger.

"People are having to take a more dangerous route," said Chris Boian, a spokesman in Washington for the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**. "It's that simple."

Weather is often worse in the central Mediterranean, he said, but distance is a more decisive factor. Patrols must travel farther for rescues. And the more time a boat is in the water, the more opportunity it has to sink. Especially when the boat is flimsy to begin with.

William Spindler, Boian's counterpart in Geneva, said risky practices are becoming more and more common among smugglers based in North Africa.

"Smuggling has become a big business; it's being done almost on an industrial scale," Spindler told reporters Tuesday. "So now they send several boats at the same time, and that puts rescue services in difficulty because they need to rescue several thousand people on several hundred boats."

That "mass embarkation" strategy has resulted in single-incident death tolls reaching into the hundreds.

More than 1,000 died off the Libyan coast in a single week in May. In September, 162 bodies were recovered from a wreck off the Egyptian coast. The incident that pushed this year's total over last year's occurred overnight Tuesday when a Doctors Without Borders rescue ship came across an inflatable dinghy with 107 live passengers and 25 dead ones. The dead were found crushed underfoot on the dinghy.

One out of every 47 people attempting the crossing from North Africa has died, Spindler said. When the route to Greece was in full swing last year, that number was 1 in 269.

max.bearak@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PORTLAND, Ore. - The armed occupation of Oregon's Malheur National Wildlife **Refuge** spanned 41 freezing-cold days in January and February. The trial for the standoff's leader, Ammon Bundy, his brother Ryan and five others took six weeks. And the verdict came in just five days: All defendants were found not guilty of federal conspiracy charges.

It was the grand finale of a federal trial that played out like a three-ring circus.

Just after 4 p.m. Thursday, Judge Anna Brown read all charges: All defendants were found not guilty of conspiracy to impede federal officers and not guilty of possession of firearms in a federal facility. One of the occupiers, Kenneth Medenbach, was found not guilty of theft of a government-owned truck. The jury was hung on the charge of theft of government cameras against Ryan Bundy.

Ammon and Ryan Bundy will remain in custody because of charges they face in Nevada - where they will stand trial for the 2014 standoff with Bureau of Land Management officers on the family's ranch. The men will be transferred to Nevada, where their father, Cliven, is currently incarcerated, officials said.

After four days of deliberation, a juror sent a note to the judge, suspicious that another juror might be biased because of past employment with the Bureau of Land Management - a point that came up in jury selection. After a day of argument, the judge dismissed the juror, called in an alternate, and deliberations started anew.

The narrative that the defense pushed throughout the trial, that the Malheur occupation was simply a protest, convinced the jury.

The occupation of the wildlife **refuge** followed a peaceful protest on Jan. 2 in Burns, Ore., against the imprisonment of Dwight and Steven Hammond, father and son ranchers who pleaded guilty to charges of arson on federal land.

Later that day, Bundy and a group of gun-toting, camouflage-clad men executed a military-style takeover of a Southeastern Oregon bird **refuge** - and then occupied its buildings for several days.

Ammon Bundy - the son of Nevada rancher Cliven, who had his own standoff with federal agents in 2014 on his Bunkerville, Nev., ranch - served as a cowboy-hatted spokesman and leader to a group of "Patriots" who saw their takeover as an act of peaceful, political protest. They were advocating the rights of rural ranchers. They were taking a "hard stand" after years of "oppression" by government agencies. But locals were spooked: Schools in Burns, Ore. - 30 miles away - stayed closed for a week. Federal offices kept their doors shuttered. The county sheriff prepared for his office to be invaded. Signs popped up around town: "Bundys Go Home!"

In the final hours of the standoff, when just four people remained and armored FBI vehicles inched toward them, their screams and tears transmitted to the ears of some 60,000 live listeners on YouTube.

In the courtroom, a new drama began. While many of Bundy's 26 co-defendants pleaded guilty to conspiring to impede federal officers from performing their duties,

others steadfastly insisted on their innocence.

national@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When the Justice Department announced two months ago that it wanted to end the use of private prisons, Cibola County Correctional Center was exactly the kind of facility that officials desired to shut down. After a history of questionable deaths and substandard medical care, the New Mexico facility lost its contract. In recent weeks, it was emptied of inmates.

But the vacancies won't last for long.

As soon as this week, U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement - which is separate from the Justice Department - is going to begin moving **immigrant**detainees into the facility under a new set of agreements with Corrections Corporation of America, a county official said.

The country's **immigration** enforcement agency is expanding its use of for-profit prisons, even while another government agency says the facilities are less safe and effective than government-run prisons. The move illustrates the difficulties of ending the government's reliance on private prisons and jails, especially as **immigration** authorities deal with an influx of detainees.

In addition to inking a new contract for up to 1,116 beds at Cibola County, **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, or ICE, recently extended a contract with Corrections Corporation of America for a 2,400-bed facility in Texas. The agency also seems to be eyeing jail space in Youngstown, Ohio, where Corrections Corporation of America has posted advertisements for several job openings, according to the American Civil Liberties Union.

The Justice Department's announcement in August that it would eventually stop using private prisons was a significant critique of the industry. Deputy Attorney General Sally Yates wrote that for-profit facilities "do not maintain the same level of safety and security" as government-run prisons.

Yates referred to an inspector general report that found private facilities had higher rates of assaults and eight times as many contraband cellphones confiscated each year on average. The report listed many examples of mayhem at private facilities, including a May 2012 riot at the Adams County Correctional Center in Mississippi in which 20 people were injured and a correctional officer was killed. That incident, according to the report, involved 250 inmates who were upset about low-quality food and medical care.

Jennifer D. Elzea, an ICE spokeswoman, said in a statement the agency was "committed to providing a safe and humane environment for all those in its custody." She said the agency used various contractors and other arrangements to house inmates "to meet the agency's detention needs while achieving the highest possible cost savings for the taxpayer."

The Department of Homeland Security, of which ICE is a part, said soon after the Justice Department's announcement that it would consider whether to follow suit. The department has created a subcommittee to study the issue, and its evaluation is due Nov. 30. If DHS ultimately decides to end its use of private prisons, the long-term future of a facility such as Cibola would be unclear.

Gang- and drug-related violence in El Salvador, Guatemala and Honduras has been driving a surge of asylum seekers from Central America, who are winding up in the detention centers. Until two years ago, such asylum seekers were generally not held in detention.

For the first years of the Obama administration, the United States kept fewer than 100 beds for family detention, but - under pressure to show border security was of concern - had plans to expand to more than 3,000 beds by the end of 2014.

As of August, ICE had an average daily population of 33,957 across the facilities it uses, according to data provided by the agency.

On Wednesday, the ACLU sent a letter to that subcommittee blasting **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement for moving forward with private prison contracts while the advisory council's review was ongoing.

Singling out the Cibola facility in particular, the advocacy organization wrote that the case "illustrates how CCA is literally operating a revolving door - shuttling out prisoners one month, shuttling in **immigration** detainees the next month."

"It's astonishing that a prison that was found unfit and unsuitable for federal prisoners is now going to be used to lock up **immigration** detainees," said Joanne Lin, legislative counsel with the ACLU's Washington Legislative Office.

Lin acknowledged that **immigration** detention rates have "exploded," which she attributed to the government's tough stance on detaining asylum seekers crossing the southern border. Those detainees are not criminals, but often people who have fled countries where violence has grown rampant.

A Corrections Corporation of America spokesman did not return messages seeking comment.

In the meantime, demand remains for the facilities to remain open, one way or another.

Cibola County Board of Commissioners Chair T. Walter Jaramillo said local authorities had been pushing for the private prison deal since the Bureau of Prisons decided to end its contract to use the facility this summer.

"It's employment," Jaramillo said, adding the contract would prevent 350 people from losing jobs. "It's all about the economics in the community."

At the time of the Justice Department's directive, the Bureau of Prisons had just 13 contract facilities, including Cibola, totaling a little more than 22,000 inmates.

Facilities contracted by both the Bureau of Prisons and ICE house those in the country without documentation. The Bureau of Prisons is responsible for those convicted of federal crimes, while ICE detains illegal **immigrants** convicted of state offenses that render them deportable and those pursuing asylum or other claims in **immigration** court.

The private-prison industry has been lobbying against the Justice Department's directive to end the use of its facilities. The industry has argued that the government's comparison of for-profit facilities to government-run prisons was unfair because they house different populations.

Officials have said the successful implementation of the directive depends on continued reductions in the federal prison population. As the inmate population goes down, the Bureau of Prisons plans to modify or allow contracts with private prison operators to expire, with the goal of ultimately ending their use entirely.

matt.zapotosky@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TOKYO - It sounds like a sadly familiar story. A plan for the family to stick out the war in Syria while the children finish their education - but then a missile strikes their home.

Jamal, 24, remembers running to the basement after the first explosion and hearing the horrifying sounds above. His younger sister went into shock, prompting his terrified mother to slap her. Like so many other Syrians, they decided they had to leave.

But Jamal and his sister and mother didn't follow other Syrians to Europe or North America. Instead, after a brief stay in Egypt, they flew to Japan in October 2013. The next year, they were granted **refugee** status.

In their new home, that makes them an oddity. According to recent figures from the Japanese Justice Ministry, as of 2015, only six Syrians have been accepted as **refugees** in the country. Jamal's family - who asked not to be fully identified because of concerns about relatives in Syria - make up half that number.

The situation isn't much better for **refugees** from other nations. Last year, Japan received a record 7,586 applications for **refugee** status. Just 27 were granted.

This unusual situation has helped make Jamal's a sought-after voice. He is frequently interviewed by Japanese reporters and gives lectures to students about his experiences. "I always start my presentations talking about Syria," he said recently over coffee in the suburbs of Tokyo, "because most Japanese people think that it is just a desert or something."

To be fair, back in Syria there was a lot Jamal didn't know about Japan, either. His closest interaction with Japanese culture came through anime, which he watched online with Arabic subtitles.

Jamal's family had planned to head to Sweden, where a cousin was living. But the Swedish visa was denied, and an uncle who was married to a Japanese woman helped them get to Japan instead.

Tokyo was overwhelming. Jamal's family didn't speak the language or understand the culture. Tensions soon boiled over in his uncle's house, so they moved out. Not yet able to work legally, Jamal found sketchy, sometimes dangerous demolition jobs. After a nail went through his foot, he got tetanus and spent a week in the hospital.

"It was the worst period in my life," he said. Later, he worked 15 hours a day, six days a week, at a burger chain. By then he was legally able to work, but it was still grueling; the commute took an additional hour and a half.

He eventually found a job teaching English to children of kindergarten age. After the family's **refugee** status was approved, he began taking full-time language lessons, and he now speaks Japanese at a conversational level. He has made friends through soccer, playing for two local clubs. Like his Japanese teammates, Jamal heads out to the izakayas for post-match beer and food - though the beer is alcohol-free and he avoids pork because of his faith. He attends Friday prayer at Tokyo Camii, the largest mosque in Japan.

Nation looks inward

Japan isn't used to outsiders. Less than 2 percent of the population was born in a foreign country.

As the Syrian crisis got worse, Tokyo stepped up its donations to UNHCR, the United Nations' **refugee** agency. In 2014, it gave $181.6 million, making it the second-largest donor after the United States.

But it balked at taking in **refugees**. Last year, Prime Minister Shinzo Abe told reporters that the country needed to look after its own. While other wealthy nations have resettled thousands of Syrians from **refugee** camps in the Middle East, Japan has not offered a single resettlement place.

Only a small number of Syrians are in the country - around 500, according to the Japan Association for **Refugees**, one of a handful of groups that work with **refugees** in the country. Most arrange temporary visitor visas through friends and acquaintances to allow entry to the country. Some visitors apply for **refugee**status, though the vast majority of the requests are denied.

This has put Japan at odds with the U.N. **refugee** agency, which generally considers all Syrians to be eligible for **refugee** status. In a recent interview, Yasuhiro Hishida, assistant to the director of Japan's **Refugee** Status Recognition Office, noted that almost all Syrians are allowed to temporarily stay in Japan for humanitarian reasons, even if they are not granted **refugee** status.

Jamal could not explain why his family was the exception.

He said he understands Japan's apprehension about **refugees**, to an extent. Friends who have ended up in Germany have told him about dangerous Syrians they've met in the country. "If you are at home," he said, "and somebody knocks on your door and says, 'I want to come in,' you wouldn't let him come, right? You need to know him."

But Japan should still do more than it's doing now, Jamal said. "If, for example, they accepted all the Syrians who are living here - 500 or so - it wouldn't have such a big impact, because they are separated in each prefecture."

Yet a recent survey conducted by Ipsos MORI found that just 18 percent of Japanese believed that **refugee** integration could be a success, while 46 percent disagreed.

A small step

Jamal said that the polite nature of Japanese society shields him from verbal or physical abuse. In comments on YouTube videos of his media appearances or lectures, however, Japanese users accuse him, sometimes in unprintably vulgar terms, of being a terrorist or stealing taxpayers' money.

Even so, that same Ipsos MORI poll found that 37 percent of respondents said they didn't know how Japan should respond to **refugees**, by far the largest proportion of any of the 22 countries polled.

"It seems that people see it as a fire on the other side of the shore, so to speak," said Hidenori Sakanaka, a former head of the Tokyo **Immigration** Bureau. "There are no huge voices over here saying we should accept **refugees** or not in Japan."

Sakanaka now runs the Japan **Immigration** Policy Institute, a rare pro-**immigration** voice in Japan. He has argued that Japan should accept 10 million **immigrants** over the next 50 years, with perhaps as many as 500,000 **refugees**. That position puts him at the fringes of mainstream debate in Japan. Yet Sakanaka said he does see a shift in that debate. He pointed to the announcement by Abe's government in May that it would allow 150 Syrian students to continue their education in Japan. These Syrians will not be considered **refugees**, but they may be able to apply for **refugee** status once they arrive.

"It's an embarrassingly small number, but at the same time it's one outstanding step," he said.

Jamal hopes to return to his studies next year and wants to find a career as a translator. His aim is to become fluent in three languages. His sister attends Japanese high school and speaks the language fluently, while his mother has been working at Uniqlo and has learned enough of the language to get by. Jamal's father has been able to join them, although he has not received **refugee** status.

While his parents bitterly miss Syria, Jamal said he can't imagine leaving Japan. "I've started here, so I can't go start from zero again in another country," he said. "I'll build my future here."

adam.taylor@washpost.com

Yuki Oda contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Sharbat Gula's haunting green eyes were immortalized on the cover of National Geographic in 1985. You might have seen her while sitting at a dentist's office or while bending over to pick up your mail, but whenever it was, it was hard to pull your eyes away. Her penetrating stare seemed to encompass the pain of Afghanistan's civil war and the perseverance of the **refugees** who fled to Pakistan.

She was just 12 when she was photographed by Steve McCurry in a camp for displaced people in Peshawar, the biggest city along Pakistan's frontier with Afghanistan. Now in her 40s, she is still in Peshawar, but as of this week, she is in police custody.

Pakistani **immigration** officials detained her on charges that she possessed a fake Pakistani national identification card. They had been investigating her for years, and last year Pakistani media published the picture attached to her allegedly fake identification card. As an Afghan national, she should not have been able to obtain such a card.

Gula is one of at least 1.5 million Afghan **refugees** who live in Pakistan, up from a onetime high of 5 million. The majority came during the country's civil war in the 1980s, which very nearly left the entire country in ruins.

Afghanistan has not emerged from constant strife since and continues to be a major source of **refugees**, although many try to reach Europe instead of the overcrowded camps in Pakistan. Last year, 250,000 Afghan **refugees** in Pakistan returned home, according to the United Nations. Many were seeing their "home country" for the first time; as many as three-quarters were born in Pakistan.

Authorities have struggled to register the **refugees**, and amid the confusion, many obtain fake documents like Gula's. Pakistan's National Database and Registration Authority (NADRA) says it has detected 60,675 cards that may be illegal.

A major concern for Pakistan is that a thriving fake document business lets militants from across the border move freely within Pakistan. For instance, in May, when a U.S. drone strike killed Taliban leader Akhtar Mohammad Mansour, such fake documents were found with him.

Shahid Ilyas, an official at NADRA, told reporters that Gula faces seven to 14 years in prison and a fine of $3,000 to $5,000 if convicted.

max.bearak@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ECONOMIC DESTITUTION and horrific drug violence in Central America, combined with a broken-down **immigration** system, are creating the conditions for a new migrant crisis. Illegal crossings have spiked for children and families from the Northern Triangle - Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala - reawakening fears of an emergency similar to the one that rattled Americans two years ago.

In such a situation, messaging matters. And the messages on **immigration** being received by desperate Central American families are counterproductive in the extreme.

Despite some effective U.S. programs aimed at gangs and drug crime, El Salvador, Honduras and Guatemala remain three of the world's bloodiest nations, each with stratospheric homicide rates. That helped drive the spike in unaccompanied minors who flooded through Mexico and into the United States in 2014.

The Obama administration dampened that flow mainly by jawboning it, cautioning migrants about the danger they faced from smugglers and the likelihood of deportation, while pressing Mexico to interdict Central Americans as they headed north. Barely a year later, that policy was in shreds after federal courts rejected the administration's attempt to deter underage border-crossers by detaining them, and Mexico proved an ineffective buffer.

Worse, the logjam in U.S. **immigration** courts made a mockery of President Obama's warning that migrants would be sent back. In fact, relatively few are. Cases are pending for more than half the 117,000 minors sent to **immigration** courts over the past nearly three years. Of that total, just 23,000 underage migrants were ordered deported - most of them no-shows at their hearings - and just a fraction have been located and removed.

The effect has been to signal Central American youths, who often arrive with their mothers, that if they can make it across the border they will be able to stay in the United States for at least a few years.

Hillary Clinton, who initially joined Mr. Obama in advising underage migrants to stay home, hasn't helped by switching positions. In March, she promised not to deport migrant children or their family members. It's no excuse that she flip-flopped under pressure from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), who favored an open door for Central American youths. She has through her remarks contributed to the spike in illegal border crossings by minors, which have already reached 2014 levels.

Some measures to address the problem over the long term are underway: Congress has appropriated $750 million to help lift Central America from its misery. More immediately, however, U.S. officials should be unclogging **immigration** courts by hiring more judges and implementing a "rocket docket" to hasten minors through the system, not just to a preliminary hearing.

Terrible conditions in Central America cannot mean a suspension of border security. If images of thousands of migrants pouring northward become common, so will centrist support for mass deportations. That would be the worst outcome, and the end of any hope for an overhaul of the **immigration** system.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lev Golinkin's Oct. 22 op-ed, "My mom, an **immigrant**, is vetted every day," told a story that is unfortunately too common. He described how his **refugee** mother had a successful career as a psychiatrist in Ukraine, only to work as a night security guard in the United States. Mr. Golinkin's mom is not alone. In fact, nearly 2 millionimmigrants and **refugees** who come to the United States with a college education and in-demand skills are unemployed or working survival jobs. The barriers to meaningful employment for **refugees** - even those who are highly educated and have specialized skills - are vast and often insurmountable without support.

We need to help **refugees** and **immigrants** find their place in the U.S. workforce because, as a country, we have as much to gain from them as they do from us. As Mr. Golinkin put it, "**Immigrants** respect and cherish this land, not because they're **immigrants**, but in spite of it." We are a nation built by **immigrants**. Let's draw on this proud heritage and help **refugees** fully integrate into the economic and social fabric of this country they now call home.

Nikki Cicerani, New York

The writer is president and chief executive of Upwardly Global.

Lev Golinkin's op-ed about his mother's **immigration** from Ukraine and her loving acceptance of the United States was a mean-spirited criticism of this country and its treatment of **immigrants**. Despite the many ways Mr. Golinkin's mother was hindered by her non-native status, such as her inability to practice psychiatry, she loves America.

I suggest Mr. Golinkin remember the Statue of Liberty's welcome to **immigrants**: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free." He just might better understand his mother's loyalty to and love of America.

Jim Pembroke, Washington

Lev Golinkin's tribute to his mother brought tears to my eyes and rekindled memories of my own mother, who came to this country in the 1920s. In 1953, she took my brother and me to visit relatives in Germany. Her first act upon returning home to the United States was to kneel and kiss the ground of her beloved Vereinigten Staaten.

Alfred Duncker, Gaithersburg

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GILBERT, Ariz. - Sen. John McCain is already thinking about life after Donald J. Trump.

The Arizona Republican turned a recent question about millennial farmers into a soul-searching answer about the Republican Party's future once, presumably, Trump loses the presidential election.

"Speaking as a proud Republican, we're going to have to look at our party and look at how we can get back to the party of Abraham Lincoln and Teddy Roosevelt and Ronald Reagan," McCain told leaders of the Arizona Farm Bureau. "Ronald Reagan used to say if a fellow agrees with me 80 percent of the time, then I'm with him."

He lamented the purist ideological approach that many conservatives now apply.

"You've got to be 110 percent, otherwise you're out," McCain said. "We've got to be a big-tent party."

McCain, 80, can afford to think about his party's future, largely because he is improbably well ahead in his bid for a sixth term. Following a competitive August primary against a tea party conservative in which he barely cleared 50 percent, the senator is now leading Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick (D-Ariz.) by about 10 percentage points in a state where some polling shows Hillary Clinton pulling ahead of Trump.

An Arizona Republic poll found McCain with a solid establishment coalition, garnering more than 75 percent of Republican voters, 50 percent of independents and 25 percent of Democrats. It's a surprising turnaround for a man whose introduction on the national stage came as an anti-establishment truth-teller riding his "Straight Talk Express" in his unsuccessful bid for the 2000 Republican presidential nomination.

Trump has targeted the senator in this year of deep anti-establishment fervor, first by slamming the former Vietnam prisoner of war as not being a "war hero" because he was captured. Yet McCain made a clean break from Trump only after the release early this month of a 2005 videotape in which Trump openly bragged about lewd sexual advances.

Public polling is split on whether that decision has cost McCain among deeply conservative voters. But Democratic strategists continue to privately say this race is not among their top targets. The Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee and its liberal super-PAC allies have not spent on the airwaves here in the general election, believing that Kirkpatrick can topple McCain only if Clinton routs Trump in the presidential race.

To that end, Clinton's campaign has gone all-in trying to win Arizona, something only one Democrat, Bill Clinton, has done in a presidential race since Harry S. Truman in 1948.

Clinton's campaign dispatched Michelle Obama to the state for a rally Thursday - Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.) was in Flagstaff on Tuesday - and invested $2 million to be spent largely on the ground. The key demographic will be the state's burgeoning Hispanic vote, which might top 20 percent for the first time and is largely against Trump's nativist campaign.

Kirkpatrick is trying to lasso this late burst of activity to pull off what would be the biggest upset of the election season. She is focusing on highlighting McCain's shifting positions on issues, with TV ads showing McCain sounding like Trump in his last reelection rodeo in 2010 as he called for a "danged fence" along the border. McCain's back-and-forth on Trump's candidacy plays into the idea that he is not taking firm stands.

"They can't believe John McCain didn't stand up for himself when Trump insulted him, and they really believe if he can't stand up for himself, he's not going to stand up for voters in Arizona," Kirkpatrick said after an event with several dozen retired federal workers in Tempe.

But McCain has built a modern campaign organization that has helped shield him from the turmoil of the presidential race, modeled in large part after the 2014 reelection bid by Sen. Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.), now the Senate majority leader, who like McCain first had to fend off a primary challenge from the right.

The octogenarian has a small army of college and high school interns who knock on doors in search of likely McCain supporters. It's a more aggressive and data-driven approach than Senate campaigns have normally taken, having previously relied more heavily on state Republican parties and the Republican National Committee for get-out-the-vote operations.

Another prince of the Republican establishment, Sen. Rob Portman (Ohio), a former member of House GOP leadership and an adviser to both Bush presidents, used a similar model. It has helped position Portman for a surprisingly easy victory over former governor Ted Strickland, who was essentially abandoned by Democrats in the late summer because he fell so far behind.

McCain and Portman have adopted the overwhelming-force doctrine in their campaigns, amassing a huge stockpile of campaign cash and dispensing it early and often. Even as McCain navigated a primary challenge that did not conclude until the end of August, his campaign ran a heavy dose of ads portraying Kirkpatrick as a liberal ally of President Obama and Hillary Clinton.

One such ad shows Kirkpatrick walking away from angry voters during the run-up to her vote for the 2010 Affordable Care Act, then cuts to images of McCain's time as a POW.

Polls over the summer showed Kirkpatrick within a few points of McCain in a head-to-head matchup, but Democrats in Washington think those numbers were false positives. They suggest that McCain's vote was underestimated because some conservatives were unwilling to support the incumbent until his primary was over. They cite a similar dynamic in the presidential primary, with Sanders supporters unwilling to back Clinton before that contest ended.

Following his primary victory, McCain quickly pivoted to the general election. During the primary, his campaign literature called only for making "the border stronger, safer and more secure" without mentioning a 2013 **immigration** bill he co-authored. But this week, McCain, unprompted, brought up his support for a path to U.S. citizenship for undocumented **immigrants**.

"Sooner or later we're bound to take up **immigration** reform again, because there's 11 million people that are in this country illegally," he told the farm leaders. "We're going to have to address it."

Some Arizonans have grown tired of McCain's pivots. Jim Keyser, the head of the local federal employees union, said he backed McCain as recently as 2008 in his race against Obama. "It's time for a change," said Keyser, 69. "He's been there forever."

Joyce Vogt, 45, became upset when she asked McCain about Trump's behavior toward women and its contribution to "rape culture."

The senator handed the microphone to his wife, Cindy McCain, who has worked for years fighting sex trafficking and other issues related to abuse of women.

"He dodged it. He handed it off to his wife," Vogt said after an event with business leaders in Chandler, southeast of Phoenix. "He needs to retire."

For now, however, more voters appear to be taking the view of Stefanie Smallhouse, vice president of the state's farm bureau. She is happily voting for McCain and reluctantly backing Trump.

"When people ask me and talk to me about the election, I just tell them I'm voting for the Supreme Court," she said.

Smallhouse told McCain that she suffers "extreme anxiety" and sleepless nights, disgusted by Trump's behavior but fearful of more Democratic regulations on farm policy.

"I've heard more people express exactly what you just expressed in my campaign than I've ever heard before," he said, trying to ease her concerns.

Of course, by his own actions, McCain is effectively rejecting a Trump presidency. He's not certain Clinton will win, but he's ready to begin the conversation about what Republicans do after the race is over.

As he searched for answers, he acknowledged that there were no easy solutions.

"Stay engaged," McCain told the audience.

paul.kane@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The U.S. Chamber of Commerce is close to announcing changes in its leadership structure that will shape the group's lobbying strategy as it prepares for a new Congress and president in a political climate that is increasingly hostile to the business community's agenda.

The impending changes, expected to be announced in the coming weeks, will address how the powerful business lobby plans to fill the role of longtime chief lobbyist Bruce Josten, who is slated to retire at the end of the year, Chamber leaders said. It is unclear whether the changes will result in replacing Josten directly or will be one step in a broader reshuffling of top-level executives at the Chamber.

The move comes at an important juncture for the Chamber and the broader business lobby in Washington as populist movements in both parties have put in peril many of the top items on their agenda, including trade deals and **immigration** reform. For years, the business community could count on the strong support of Republicans, but that alliance has frayed in recent years with tea party Republicans complaining about corporate influence and "crony capitalism."

"Members [of Congress] want to know what the Chamber says, but it isn't going to dictate their vote on a regular basis like it once would have," said Dan Holler of Heritage Action for America, one of several conservative groups that have emerged as a strong counterweight to the business lobby with congressional Republicans on issues such as renewing the Export-Import Bank's charter.

How the Chamber decides to replace Josten will offer a clue as to what degree it will restructure its lobbying strategy and operations to deal with the changing political climate.

"The country is moving in a more populist mood, versus a what's-good-for-business-is-good-for-America kind of thing," said longtime lobbyist Rick Hohlt.

Chamber officials were tight-lipped about the upcoming announcement and the specifics of plans for its lobbying operation after Josten's departure.

"Bruce is irreplaceable, but filling his job and his job functions is not," said Tom Collamore, the Chamber's senior vice president of communications and strategy.

The future of the Chamber's president and chief executive Tom Donohue, 78, has also long piqued the interest of the influence industry, and even longtime allies and friends wonder when he might start dialing back his involvement.

When asked about Donohue's future, Collamore said the Chamber's chief will continue steering the group's strategy in the post-election "lame duck" session, the next Congress and the first 100 days of the new administration.

Succession planning at the Chamber has been the topic of much speculation on K Street for years - Josten and Donohue occupy two of the most coveted jobs downtown - but the rumor mill is buzzing extra loudly these days. To many in the influence industry, the thought of replacing Josten, a key player in Donohue's transformation of the Chamber from a sleepy association to a lobbying and fundraising powerhouse, is almost unimaginable. Josten has led the Chamber's lobbying arm for 22 years, and Donohue has helmed the group for 19.

"Tom is the Chamber outside Washington, Bruce is the Chamber inside Washington," said one Republican lobbyist familiar with the Chamber's workings who asked not to be named, to preserve relations with the organization. "Together they're a phenomenal act."

Suzanne Clark, executive vice president at the Chamber and a trusted adviser to Donohue, is said to be well positioned to take on a more senior role, according to former Chamber staffers and others familiar with its operations. Clark was a close aide to Donohue from 1997 to 2007, ultimately becoming chief operating officer overseeing the organization's day-to-day operations. She left in 2007 to lead research and analysis firms and returned to the Chamber in 2014.

The challenges facing the Chamber have been on display over the past two years with regard to two important initiatives for the business community, the Export-Import Bank and the Trans-Pacific Partnership trade deal (TPP), both of which have been curtailed or stalled despite well-funded efforts to push them through by business groups.

Although the Ex-Im Bank's charter was renewed last year, the credit export agency has not been able to review large deals, the result of a lack of a quorum on the bank's board of directors - a process that's been halted by Senate Banking Committee Chairman Richard C. Shelby (R-Ala.). And the TPP, which the Chamber aggressively lobbied in favor of, is all but dead unless the next president revives it, and even Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton, who supported the pact as secretary of state, now opposes it.

The Chamber also has lobbied Republicans hard on **immigration**, with Donohue saying the group would "pull out all stops" to push legislation through Congress in 2014, but the momentum died in the House and the political environment is now even less hospitable to moving overhaul legislation.

The Chamber has in recent years adjusted its political strategy in recognition that some Republicans pose as big a threat to its agenda as Democrats.

In 2014, it broke with tradition by taking sides in GOP primary races, spending $12 million to back establishment candidates over tea party challengers. The strategy was successful, with the Chamber emerging undefeated in those races. They continued the strategy this year with some success, helping defeat a tea party firebrand, Rep. Tim Huelskamp, in the Kansas primary by backing his opponent, Roger Marshall.

The Chamber is dedicating plenty of money this election cycle, spending $16.7 million on eight toss-up Senate races - including backing Sens. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) and Patrick J. Toomey (R-Pa.) - more than 2.5 times what it spent on elections at this point in 2014, according to an August report by the Brennan Center for Justice.

It is also spending at least $1 million in ads to back Rep. Todd C. Young (R) over Democratic former senator Evan Bayh in Indiana - despite Bayh's pro-business record and previous work for the Chamber giving speeches and appearing at events on its behalf after he left office in 2011.

One thing remains constant for the Chamber as it ponders its upcoming lobbying challenges - it has plenty of money to push its agenda.

It is the perennial top spender on K Street, shelling out nearly $85 million in 2015 to lobby the federal government.

catherine.ho@washpost.com

Tom Hamburger contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CHATTANOOGA, Tenn. - Behind the closed door of a private study room in their campus library, three members of the College Republicans broached a subject that had become taboo among many of their friends: whether their club should publicly support Donald Trump.

"This could be our last chance if we don't vote for him," said Derek Kukura, 24, a junior at the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga who heads the club, arguing that for all of Trump's flaws, the real estate tycoon and GOP presidential nominee would be better than letting another liberal politician cement big-government policies. "Maybe we should tell people."

"Not me," said Tucker McClendon, 21, shaking his head so furiously that his bowl cut flopped. "I don't want to be associated with it."

Nicholas Chapin, 18, said he planned to cast his first presidential vote for Trump - but he was in no hurry for the group to advertise it. "Maybe we should wait for another election," he said.

The age of Trump has complicated a rite of passage for many young conservatives. Instead of getting their first taste of canvassing, working phone banks or rallying for a cause, they are grappling with the baggage of a nominee whose words and record are fueling emotional debates about racism, misogyny and sexual assault. The campaign has split college Republican clubs nationwide and turned those willing to stand up for Trump into targets for criticism and ridicule.

GOP clubs at Harvard and Princeton made headlines over the summer when they declined to endorse Trump, citing his proposal to ban Muslims from entering the United States and his comments about Mexican **immigrants**. The head of the National College Republican Party followed suit. And last week, following a Washington Post report about a 2005 video in which Trump bragged about sexually assaulting women, a student group at the overwhelmingly conservative Liberty University in Lynchburg, Va., derided him as a man "who constantly and proudly speaks evil."

Here at UT-Chattanooga, a picturesque campus in the shadow of the Appalachians of eastern Tennessee just north of the Georgia state line, conservatives have felt unsettled ever since controversy erupted over a public display of support for Trump in April, a political lifetime ago.

A small group of students wrote "Trump 2016" on the sidewalk of a busy thoroughfare, part of a national "chalking" movement designed to show solidarity among young people with the campaign. The pro-Trump chalkers scrawled the campaign slogan "Make America Great Again" and drew an illustration of the U.S.-Mexico border wall that Trump promised he would build.

A freshman named Hailey Puckett posted a picture of the image online.

"Super proud of our art work, but I have a feeling half of UTCs campus is gonna hate it," she tweeted.

Within 26 minutes, Puckett recalled, her Twitter feed was filled with people asking her how she could do such a thing. Some called for her to step down from her position in student government.

Some students interpreted the message as a symbol of segregation between races on campus and in the country. Students were running to the site of the chalk with buckets in hopes of washing it away.

Some conservatives, taken aback by the response, worried that the campus was no longer a safe space for their beliefs.

Trump backers on campus looked to Kukura, who had recently revived the campus chapter of the College Republicans, to take a stand. He declined.

"We were a new club and we didn't want to take sides," he said.

Months later, the idea of standing up publicly for Trump has only become more toxic. Kukura said he has stopped checking his Facebook feed as often because he has grown tired of the vitriolic back-and-forth.

This was not how Kukura had originally envisioned his view of the 2016 campaign. He had grown up in a small Minnesota town and was enrolled in a local community college, but was eager to follow his parents when they retired outside Chattanooga. From blue state to red state, he thought, moving to Tennessee would be a fitting start to a budding political career - and heading the College Republicans chapter would be an ideal first step.

Kukura, who describes himself as more of a Jeb Bush Republican, was unsure about Trump until he spent three weeks during the summer in Italy, learning about Machiavelli. In the sandwich shops and on the streets, he said, strangers told him that "Trump might be good for the United States, but bad for the world."

"They had a perspective that we might not be able to see because we're so close to it," Kukura said. Trump's focus on putting "America first" appealed to him, he said, because he thought politicians weren't doing enough to tackle the drug epidemic or to reduce the national debt. The threat of terrorism seemed palpable to him - after all, four Marines were killed in a terrorist attack at a military recruitment center in 2015, a few miles away.

But, Trump was not an easy sell for college students. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton had taken up the call by her former rival, Sen. Bernie Sanders (Vt.), for tuition-free public college, and surveys have shown Clinton making up ground among the young voters she had been struggling with.

Kukura and his friends didn't like the sound of free college, mostly because they rejected the stereotype that their generation felt too entitled. Nonetheless, it bothered them that they never heard Trump utter a word about how to make college more affordable.

Chapin, one of Kukura's fellow College Republicans, thought about the folks in the state whom Trump had captivated and declared him the candidate for the "angry white man." He sighed: "Instead of feeling like it's my generation's first election, it feels like my parents' last."

McClendon, who said he plans to vote for independent candidate Evan McMullin, has argued that as young white men in the South, he and his friends have a duty to reject the sort of hateful rhetoric that characterized many of their forebears.

"The man is a racist and a bigot," McClendon said of Trump.

Across campus, Trump's candidacy has prompted a larger discussion about whether this generation should even care about electoral politics.

"It's kind of become like a big joke," said Fallyn Iles, 20, a nursing major. Earlier that day, she said, her friends were sharing a cartoon on social media of Trump electrocuting Clinton.

"It shouldn't be funny, but it kind of is."

Her friend Brittany Lockwood, 20, a political science major from Memphis, chimed in. "I did not think, until this past year, I would have ever considered voting Democratic. Now I am."

Lockwood said she wondered why others around her were so easy to dismiss Trump's comments about women and minorities.

"This is the South, so there are a lot of times people kind of use other reasons to discriminate against minorities and people of color," Lockwood said. "It's one thing to support Trump, but when I find out about a friend supporting him, it raises a lot of questions and concerns with me that they are looking for an excuse to be racist."

Michelle Deardorff, a political science professor, said she understands why tensions amplified so quickly after the April chalking incident. She said the students had not grown up with the idea of friendly political discussions, but were accustomed to mirroring fiery disagreements that devolved in name-calling. She found herself quoting John Stuart Mill's "On Liberty" to students, preaching about the importance of differing views in a democracy.

"This is a campus that is not used to talking about race, and this election has provoked the conversation," Deardorff said.

After the chalking, administrators asked Deardorff to convene a town-hall meeting to address students' feelings. Puckett, 19, a nursing major, sat in the last row. At the event's conclusion, she said she had no idea that the wall would be interpreted as racist. She said she simply believed in tougher **immigration** laws. The event turned out to be a cleansing moment for Puckett and others at the school.

"I listened to many people after the experience telling me why they felt uncomfortable with what I said, but mostly how I said it," she said. "I learned more in that one week than I have in my entire life."

Among her lessons: Politics can become "too touchy of a subject."

"It honestly has changed my willingness to talk about politics in front of certain people, but I do not like that," she said.

At least the College Republicans had one another.

One recent evening, Kukura placed a sign in the student center that read, "College Republicans: The Best Party on Campus." Half a dozen students attended their first meeting of the year, amid empty chairs and empty tables.

"So, I'm just curious," Kukura said to the group. "What do you guys think of Trump?"

"I abstain," McClendon said.

"I'm not absolute on all his policies, but I'm voting for him," one said. "She lies too much."

"I feel good if he'll take advice from Mike Pence," said another.

"Even though he's crude, he's a kick-ass, take-names guy, and that's what our country needs."

"The Supreme Court is the most important thing," said Brittany Self, 21, a communications major who was wearing a Marco Rubio T-shirt. "It just can't be her."

But when Kukura mentioned that the group could make some phone bank calls before the election, Self sounded less eager.

She was happy to work the phones, she said, but only for local candidates - not for Trump.

robert.samuels@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CALAIS, France - More than 1,600 migrants were bused to new shelters across France on Monday as authorities prepared to dismantle the notorious "Jungle" camp in Calais, a last stop for those desperate to cross the English Channel and enter Britain.

France maintains that it is closing the camp for humanitarian reasons and to end the stateless limbo for thousands of migrants, many of whom have made unsuccessful attempts to cross the channel. But the camp also has become a glaring symbol of Europe's struggle to cope with a massive influx of migrants and **refugees** since last year, many from war-torn places such as Syria and Afghanistan.

There were worries that some migrants in Calais would not leave the camp without a fight. In a demolition attempt earlier this year, police used tear gas on migrants, some of whom threw rocks at police while others stitched their lips shut in protest.

The Interior Ministry has said that France "does not want to use force" but will not hesitate to intervene to quell unrest. On Sunday, French media broadcast images of skirmishes between migrants and police as authorities distributed leaflets about the camp's closure.

According to the Interior Ministry, 7,500 beds will be made available in temporary asylum centers for evicted Calais migrants.

The camp was eerily quiet on Monday morning. Its once-noisy streets - lined with restaurants, general stores and even libraries - were suddenly transformed into a ghost town. Tents were abandoned, fire pits were cleared out, and trash was littered throughout.

There were no signs of major clashes with police. At least 1,200 officers were on standby. Late Monday, Interior Minister Bernard Cazeneuve praised the "calm and orderly manner" of the operation.

On a misty, cold morning, rows of buses waited to take the migrants to new camps farther inland. As mostly young men nervously clutched suitcases in a line that extended for blocks, few could say where they were headed.

"No one has told me anything. I'm scared," said 17-year-old Aron Tesfaye from Ethiopia, who has lived in the camp for three months. "I'm afraid of what's going to happen because I don't want to stay here in France."

Like many of the migrants here, Tesfaye's dream is to go to Britain. He said he has tried almost daily to jump onto the trucks making their way through the tunnel to Britain, just 20 miles across the English Channel to the northwest.

The migrants in Calais, mostly from Afghanistan and Sudan, believe there are more job opportunities in Britain than in France. Many speak some English - as opposed to French - and think they will fare better across the channel. Many also say they have family or friends in Britain.

For some Afghan migrants, the recent attacks in France by Islamic State-affiliated militants suggest that the country is under siege by the same forces that have targeted their homeland.

Wahid Sahil, 20, a **refugee** from Kabul who arrived in the Jungle on foot eight months ago, said his father was killed in a July bombing linked to the Islamic State in the Afghan capital. Like Tesfaye, he is determined to get out of France.

"For **refugees**, it's way better," he said, referring to Britain. "You can go to school, work. Everything's better."

Frank Esnée, 48, the head of the Calais mission of Doctors Without Borders, a French humanitarian organization, said that seeking asylum in France would probably be a faster option for many migrants than continuing their bids to reach Britain.

Besides, Esnée added, the French government's network of reception centers will provide immediate medical support, legal advice and even job assistance.

"But what's important is that we don't make the choice for them," he said. "If they want to go [to Britain], we just tell them the options. It's difficult to tell someone to abandon their whole plan."

Lucie Carpentier, a lawyer working in the camp to help minors process asylum applications, said there has been little clarity about where the migrants will go.

"We've been asking authorities for weeks and weeks and weeks for information, and we only started getting it a few days ago," she said at the now-abandoned youth center in the camp. "What we have is hardly specific enough - we don't know what the process is or where they will end up."

The migrants were registered and then put on buses to "welcome centers," where, in theory, they can apply for asylum in France. Most of these centers are far from the coast and the ports leading to Britain.

The Calais camp - which had as many as 9,000 people at its height - has long sparked outrage in both France, still reeling from the recent attacks, and post-Brexit Britain, where anti-**immigrant** sentiment has soared in the wake of the country's June referendum to exit the European Union.

In France, it has become a major campaign issue before next year's presidential election.

Seeking a second term, President François Hollande ordered the demolition of the camp with hopes of projecting an image of strength despite immense unpopularity at home. Challenger Alain Juppé, the conservative front-runner, said last week that the Franco-British border should be moved back to southern England, ending a 2003 agreement that has trapped migrants who wish to enter Britain on the shores of northern France.

"We can't tolerate what is going on in Calais," Juppé told reporters. "The image is disastrous for our country, and there are also extremely serious economic and security consequences for the people of Calais."

After a long campaign led by humanitarian organizations, the British government began accepting child **refugees** from Calais last week. Most arrived in south London to be reunited with family members already in Britain. On Saturday, the first group of unaccompanied children without family in Britain crossed the channel.

Remaining unaccompanied minors will be temporarily housed in shipping containers on the outskirts of the Jungle until their claims are processed.

Well into Monday evening, migrant men poured out of the Calais camp's main entrance, dragging suitcases down rocky and muddy pathways to the registration center. Few seemed to harbor any sentimental feelings about a place that had claimed months of their lives.

"I'm glad they're closing the camp," said Sahil, the Afghan migrant, gesturing at the Jungle behind him. "It's animals in there. People don't live like humans."

james.mcauley@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Every four years, while the rest of the nation heads to the polls, Washington's coterie of lobby firms works overtime to tend to a mad rush of demands from corporate clients who all want to know the same thing: How do we best lobby a new president? A new Congress?

That season is now upon us. The fall and winter that bookend a presidential election are the busiest months for K Street's hired guns. Late October is particularly harried, as they scramble to draw up contingency plans mapping out all potential outcomes of the election - presidential, House and Senate - and how companies should adjust their lobbying strategies accordingly. The most likely scenario at the moment looks to be a Democratic White House, a Republican-led House and an apparently Democratic majority in the Senate.

"The period from November to March around a presidential transition is probably the busiest time for lobby and public affairs firms," said GOP lobbyist Stewart Verdery, who runs the lobby firm Monument Policy Group. "Trying to figure out how to engage a new administration, who the appointments are, changes with [congressional committee] chairmen: That's a huge amount of work for clients. At least 60 percent of business development work is done in the next couple months."

The momentum is reflected in the latest quarterly revenue figures reported by lobby firms last week. Many firms reported year-over-year revenue gains compared with 2015. Verdery's firm picked up three clients in the past six weeks and has earned $4.4 million in revenue so far in 2016 - up 7 percent compared with this time last year.

No matter who wins the White House, Congress is poised to tackle a handful of issues critical to the business community, such as **immigration**, tax revision and infrastructure spending, said lobbyists of both parties.

"There's going to be lots of business opportunities to focus on," said Republican lobbyist Marc Lampkin, who heads the lobbying group at Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck. "You're very likely to get, in the first six months, an overhaul of the tax code. You're going to have some examination of both legal and illegal **immigration**. For the business community, legal **immigration** for a number of years has been a top priority. There's going to be lots of businesses that are going to want to have an impact in Washington."

Companies should also be paying attention to leadership changes in key congressional committees - particularly if Sen. Claire McCaskill (D-Mo.) takes over the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, said Democratic lobbyist Zach Williams, a partner at Forbes-Tate. The firm has earned $7.1 million so far in lobbying revenue this year - up 8 percent compared with last year.

The subcommittee, which is currently chaired by Sen. Rob Portman (R-Ohio) with McCaskill as the ranking Democrat, recently opened an inquiry into the drugmaker Mylan over the high price of the allergy auto-injector EpiPen.

"With McCaskill with the gavel, you're looking at a much more aggressive investigatory arm," Williams said. "There's going to be a lot more companies brought in, whether it's drug companies or others."

catherine.ho@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Unable to vote in the presidential election, a group of undocumented **immigrants** is knocking on doors in Northern Virginia in support of Hillary Clinton and other Democratic candidates, convinced that the outcome of the vote will determine whether they can secure a path to citizenship in the country they have known since childhood.

The vote-seekers are some of the 750,000 recipients of temporary legal status under the Obama administration's 2012 Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. They are acutely aware that Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has pledged to deport the nation's 11 million illegal **immigrants** and that under a GOP-controlled Congress, past attempts at **immigration** reform have failed.

"All DACA recipients should take this on as an added responsibility, to change the power structure," said Luis Angel Aguilar, 28, who received his protected status in 2013 and is helping to coordinate the effort. "Our voices need to be heard," he said.

Four years after the DACA program was launched, many of the beneficiaries are still in a kind of limbo, unsure about whether their status would be renewed under a President Trump and concerned that their family members could be deported.

The uncertainty was underscored earlier this year when the U.S. Supreme Court let stand a federal court injunction against an expanded version of DACA and Obama's Deferred Action for Parents of Americans and Lawful Permanent Residents program, which could benefit an additional 4 million people.

"The only way to resolve this is through the election," said Kim Propeack, political director of CASA in Action. "There's been a recent uptick of despair and energy around that 4-4 vote."

The Maryland-based group is behind the Virginia campaign and one in central Pennsylvania. Similar efforts are underway in Arizona and other battleground states. The Clinton campaign launched a separate effort earlier this year, "My Dream, Your Vote," in which young undocumented **immigrants**, many of them brought to this country as children, urged Latino voters in North Carolina, Nevada, Florida and elsewhere to cast ballots for the Democratic nominee.

In Virginia, where Clinton is leading by double digits, the group has turned its focus to the suddenly close race in the 10th Congressional District, where incumbent Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) faces an aggressive challenge from Democrat LuAnn Bennett.

CASA is also targeting voters in Prince William County, where more **immigrants** live and where Trump also has more support.

In the 10th District, which stretches west from McLean, through Loudoun County, toward the West Virginia border, Comstock backed Sen. Marco Rubio (Fla.) in the state's GOP presidential primary. She has kept her distance from Trump, and, after the revelation of a 2005 recording of the nominee's comments about women, she declared that he would not get her vote.

But Trump's history of controversial remarks about women, Mexican **immigrants** and Muslims has nonetheless weighed Comstock down among voters in the largely wealthy district, which includes steadily growing Latino and Asian **immigrant** populations. Although the incumbent initially was favored, several political analysts have recently said the race is a toss-up.

The **immigrant** advocates who are working to take down Comstock are modeling their efforts after a largely successful campaign last year to stir up anti-Trump sentiments in Prince William in favor of Jeremy McPike (D-Prince William), who beat Manassas Mayor Harold "Hal" Parrish II, a Republican, in a race for an open state Senate seat. Several of the people who knocked on doors last week also were involved in the earlier campaign.

"Did you know Barbara Comstock compared **immigrants** to FedEx packages?" Nayely Lopez, 29, asked a voter in Herndon, referring to a statement that the congresswoman made about a desire for tougher **immigration** laws while campaigning two years ago. "Just put a label on us so they can track us."

The voter said she had not heard about the statement, and she took a Bennett flier.

Like other DACA recipients, Lopez said she has become more confident in taking political stances as her life has improved.

A native of Mexico who arrived in Virginia when she was 13, Lopez grew up with fears of being deported. Although she was an A-student in high school, she said she had to turn down college scholarship offers because she was in the country illegally.

She found a job answering phones at a tax preparer's office in Fredericksburg, Va., and worked her way up through several promotions. After receiving protected status under DACA in 2012, Lopez opened her own tax preparation office.

The single mother, who has a 12-year-old daughter, said she is concerned about relatives who are not protected under DACA and also worries that a more anti-**immigrant** administration could mean her work authorization, and her livelihood, gets stripped away.

"I still have family that doesn't have legal status," she said. "For me, this is very personal."

But, in a swing state where Trump has recently renewed efforts to win over voters, that does not guarantee sympathy. At a home in Herndon, Pat Blizard, 78, told Lopez that she already voted for Trump with an absentee ballot.

"I'm sorry," Blizard said, noting that she was frustrated with the spread of Spanish-speaking residents throughout the region. "I'm originally from Spain. My father never let us speak Spanish. He said, 'You live here.'"

Lopez thanked her and moved on. "I understand people have other ideas," she said, noting that an aunt had married a U.S. citizen who also supports Trump. "We discuss that a lot in my family."

Jennifer Romero, 19, thought about her own relatives as she hustled through a different Herndon neighborhood of quiet cul-de-sacs with large two-story houses. She and a younger brother received protected status under DACA in 2014. Her parents, from Mexico, remain undocumented and vulnerable to deportation.

"That's the fear," said Romero, who lives in Stafford County, Va. "It's like they'd take away what little we have."

On a different afternoon in Woodbridge, the group tried to secure a few extra votes for Clinton and to get people to oppose a state constitutional amendment on the November ballot that would prohibit union organizing.

Aguilar scrolled through his smartphone to find likely Democratic voters through an online campaign database. At one stop, he encountered Mohammad Zoki Moqami, 44, whose family had recently arrived as **refugees** from Afghanistan.

"I cannot vote," Moqami said apologetically.

"I can't vote, either," Aguilar said, before mentioning Trump's remarks about Muslims.

Handing Moqami a flier, he said, "Tell all your friends who can vote."

antonio.olivo@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MCALLEN, TEX. - A dispatcher's voice crackled over the scanner, and Raquel Medina turned up the sound. Traffic north of the river. An agent had spotted footprints in the dirt.

Medina gunned the engine of her green-and-white U.S. Border Patrol truck, drove down a dirt road, pulled over and plunged into the brush. It was 106 degrees.

She darted through spiny bushes that reached above her 5-foot-8 frame. A branch caught her curly brown hair, coiled in a bun. Those could be families up ahead, in which case there would be no need for the handcuffs dangling from her right hip. Or children traveling alone. They could be men smuggling drugs or inked with teardrop tattoos, meaning they had killed someone or had done time.

The chase unfolding in broad daylight by the Rio Grande has become more and more common along the busiest stretch of the U.S. border with Mexico.

The river valley became a conduit two years ago for a wave of men, women and children fleeing gang and drug violence in Central America. It has not let up since. The Border Patrol apprehended 186,855 migrants here this fiscal year, when crossings crept up after a year-long drop.

Donald Trump, the Republican presidential nominee, promises to build a "big, beautiful" wall to seal the country off from Mexican **immigrants** he has classified as "rapists." In a testy exchange over illegal **immigration** at last week's debate with Democrat Hillary Clinton, Trump called many migrants "bad hombres" who should not be here. Clinton opposes a wall. Instead, she emphasizes bringing undocumented **immigrants** who are already here "out from the shadows."

For Medina and the 17,500 agents on the front lines who make up the human wall, the reality is personal - terrifying, heart-rending, defeating all at the same time.

She is a woman in a mostly male profession, a native of the border whose choice of work reflects both a sympathy for and a skepticism of those coming across. It is through her eyes that the challenges of the border, blurred by politics this year, are more vivid.

When she reached a clearing on a late-September afternoon, Medina joined another agent and a German shepherd whose job is to follow the migrants' scent. They spotted seven men running in a field ahead, a barbed wire fence between them. Medina was the first one over.

She frisked the men for weapons - they had none - and commanded them to empty their pockets and take off their shoelaces.

"Do you have drugs?" Medina asked in Spanish. They all shook their heads.

The men had hitchhiked from Central America and met in Mexico. Each had paid a smuggler about $10 to cross the river. One had lived, undetected, for nine years in New Jersey before running a stop sign and getting deported.

"A lot of people don't know what goes on at the border," Medina often says. "They're clueless."

"I was clueless."

Proving herself

A descendant of Mexican **immigrants**, Medina, 40, had spent almost her whole life 12 hours northwest in El Paso, another border city, before she became an agent. Growing up in the 1980s, migrants used to pass her parents' house, and her mother always left a bell on the front porch. When they rang, she greeted them with burritos, water and extra clothes for their trip north.

Back then, the United States was not at war over illegal **immigration**.

Her own history had always made Medina wonder about the people who left these footsteps she tracks through the brush. "I thought: 'Where are they going? What are their stories?'"

Six years ago, she was managing a Nike store when she saw a recruiting poster for the Border Patrol at the airport. As an anthropology major at Texas State University, Medina developed a fascination with other cultures and loved to travel. After her divorce, she wanted a more stable career. In south Texas, a federal job is a good job.

Her parents were anxious. The border was more dangerous than ever, and their daughter would be working alone. Her mother begged her to become a high school teacher instead, but when the Border Patrol made an offer three years later, she joined.

It was late 2013, just as hundreds of women and children a day started streaming across the Texas border to the Rio Grande Valley, seeking asylum amid escalating violence in Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador. By summer 2014, the Border Patrol had apprehended 50,000 unaccompanied children in the Rio Grande Valley. The agency was looking to hire people just like Medina: Latinas who spoke Spanish and could put children and women at ease.

To this day, she has neither drawn her gun nor fired it. But she is always fearful. "I mean, every night you go out there you're scared."

When she got her first assignment to the Valley, as the region is called, she felt she had to prove herself to the male agents, show that she had their backs. To the migrants, too, she knew that being a woman had the potential to make her look weak.

She sees things differently today than she did as a girl. "Now I understand that not everyone comes across to work here," she said. "There are definitely some bad people."

Some migrants are carrying knives and rucksacks stuffed with marijuana when she apprehends them. After a shift like that, Medina said, she feels as though she has made a difference.

Her union, in its first-ever endorsement for president, is supporting Trump. For Medina, the politics of border security are beside the point. She doesn't vote. Never has.

A day at the border

She began her shift as she always does, with a 5 a.m. alarm and a fruit smoothie in her small apartment 15 minutes from the McAllen station. After 6 a.m. muster, she pulled her gun belt, Camelbak water bottle and green bulletproof vest from her locker, where a photo of her cat, Toby, and her family are taped to the door.

Medina sprayed herself with sunblock and slid a bottle of Repel 100 for mosquitoes into the pocket of her green uniform before getting into her SUV. She checked the siren and drove into the pre-dawn darkness.

Through the windshield of her Chevy Suburban passed the ranch lands and sugar cane fields of the Valley. Two Border Patrol trucks drove by on the other side of the road, heading in from the midnight shift.

Medina looked up at bumper-to-bumper trucks crossing the Anzalduas International Bridge to Mexico, carrying produce and farm and building supplies for this growing region driven by the North American Free Trade Agreement. It's a place built by Latino **immigrants**. At the local Stripes convenience store, where she often stops for breakfast, everyone orders in Spanish.

She drove toward the river, arriving at a levee flanked by the border fence built after the 9/11 attacks. It's the closest thing that exists to Trump's wall. The reddish metal barrier is 18 feet high in some places, just three feet in others. Sometimes it disappears altogether.

Just one-third of the southern border is guarded by fencing. In the Rio Grande Valley, it's one-fifth.

A Border Patrol truck was parked in a gap in the fence, watching. Medina rolled down her window. "Anything going on?" she asked.

The agent told her about a wall breach at sensor 216 earlier that morning, resulting in two "gotaways." The migrants had scaled the fence, probably with a rope ladder.

"A fence and a wall are not going to stop them," Medina said.

What does stop them? Agents like her, patrolling in her SUV, watching for footprints. Overhead surveillance blimps like the silver one that hovered nearby, which used to be deployed by the U.S. military in Afghanistan. Sensors buried in the ground. Helicopters. Dogs.

Now the river came into view: the muddy brown Rio Grande, snaking 316 miles through impassable brush.

The lights of the homes, warehouses and fast-food restaurants of the Valley began to glow. On the scanner came word that a group of UAMs - unaccompanied minors in Border Patrol speak - had turned up north of the river.

Medina headed that way. She likes to be there when children are apprehended. She tries to imagine what they've gone through to get here and hopes she can provide some kind of comfort in a bad situation.

As she pulled up, she saw three teenage girls with long brown hair wearing skinny jeans and a tall boy with an Elvis Presley haircut. The girls were all 13, sisters and their cousin, who wore a pink Hello Kitty T-shirt.

They had been told to pull their identity cards from their pockets and remove their shoelaces and belts. An agent wrote down their names and where they came from on a clipboard.

At this spot the morning before, 43 people who had slipped through were caught.

The teenagers' meager possessions, which included four uneaten Snickers bars, went into a clear plastic bag with "Department of Homeland Security" printed in black letters on the front. Medina told them in Spanish to eat the candy before it got thrown away.

The girls had survived on sandwiches for 13 days on multiple bus rides from El Salvador and were trying to get to Miami, where the cousin's mother lived. The boy, 15, came from Guatemala, hoping to find his brother in Boston. Gangs were threatening them at school, they all said.

They had turned themselves in as soon as they saw the Border Patrol, instructed by the coyote they paid to bring them here that this was how to get asylum in the United States.

"I think their goal is just to land on U.S. soil," Medina said.

The girls were smoothing their hair. "No se preocupe. Se ve bien," Medina told them gently. "Don't worry, it doesn't matter. You look good."

"They always worry how their hair is going to look," she said.

The boy and girls were escorted in a van to the station, where they would be fingerprinted and interviewed. Probably, because they were minors, they would get to stay in the United States.

Searching for footprints

On the radio in her SUV, Medina heard the agent monitoring the surveillance blimp announce that two groups of migrants were amassing on the Mexican side of the river.

"As soon as he calls that they're crossing, we'll go help them out," Medina said.

It might take hours, as the smugglers waited to collect enough people to try crossing over.

Now that the activity had quieted, she started sign-cutting - a painstaking way of detecting whether the migrants left marks in the grass or dirt. She crept along at 12 miles per hour, her driver's side door open, scanning for fresh footprints or matted-down grass.

Tire marks and old footprints cluttered the road. So Medina found four tractor tires left by an agent on the previous shift and attached them with a heavy chain to the rear bumper of her SUV. The Suburban dragged them, clearing the old footprints.

Now the road would be smooth for the next agent.

Intercepting migrants

By 2:30 p.m., the radio chatter said that one of the groups amassing at the border was now crossing the river. Medina drove south to meet a team of agents waiting to apprehend them. The rafts made landfall, but immediately turned back, probably sensing danger.

"I think a lot of people, they think we can catch everybody," Medina said.

It was time to head back to the station, where she washed off the dust and mud that built up on her SUV. She filled the gas tank, and returned her gun belt and vest to her locker.

At home, leftover chicken waited in the fridge, and the novel she was reading, "White Oleander," the story of a child who is separated from her mother and learns to survive in the foster home system, waited on her nightstand.

Over the past 24 hours the Border Patrol had apprehended 651 migrants in the Rio Grande Valley.

Now, it was time for sleep. Her 6 a.m. shift was just hours away.

lisa.rein@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In her Oct. 19 op-ed, "The GOP paved Trump's ugly path," Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) failed to mention the principal Republican culprits who caused Donald Trump to get the Republican presidential nomination: former House speaker John Boehner (R-Ohio) and House Judiciary Committee Chairman Robert Goodlatte (R-Va.).

In 2013, by a vote of 68-32, the Senate passed an **immigration** reform bill, but Boehner and Goodlatte never allowed the House to vote on it.

Mr. Trump's signature issue has been to prevent what he calls hordes of Mexican rapists, criminals and freeloaders from crossing the border into the United States. Had the **immigration** reform legislation been enacted, it is unlikely that Mr. Trump's anti- **immigrant** rantings would have captured the imagination of so many Republican voters in the primaries.

Lee Hurwitz, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton is pouring $1 million into Indiana and Missouri in the campaign's final weeks - not because the Democratic presidential nominee thinks she can carry those reliably Republican states, but because she believes that, with an extra push, Democrats can win the Senate and governors' races there.

In Michigan, the Clinton campaign is propelling a late surge by Democratic state legislative candidates to regain their House majority. In parts of Maine, Nebraska, Virginia and other states, Clinton volunteers are touting Democratic congressional candidates in their phone calls and fliers to voters. And as Clinton rallied supporters across Pennsylvania on Saturday with running mate Tim Kaine, she touted Senate hopeful Katie McGinty and attacked her GOP opponent, Sen. Patrick J. Toomey, as beholden to presidential nominee Donald Trump .

"Katie is exactly the kind of partner we need in the Senate," Clinton said at a Pittsburgh rally. "We have got to get things done for the people of Pennsylvania and America. And Katie will help us break through the gridlock, actually make a difference in people's lives."

Emboldened by polls predicting an electoral-college landslide in the presidential race, Clinton is shifting her strategy to lift up other Democrats coast to coast. She and her party are rushing to capitalize on a turbulent turn in Trump's candidacy, which has ruptured the Republican Party, to make down-ballot gains that seemed unlikely just a month ago.

For Clinton, the move is opportunistic and has governing implications. If elected, a mandate may not be enough for her to muscle a progressive agenda on **immigration** and other issues through a Republican-controlled Congress. She would almost certainly govern more efficiently with Democratic majorities.

"Hillary recognizes, as we look at the past eight years, how important it is to have allies and like-minded elected officials who can just help get things done," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook said.

Flush with cash, the Clinton campaign is steering resources and deploying thousands of field staffers and volunteers to help Democrats secure the Senate majority and pick up seats in the House. It also is targeting a handful of governorships and state legislative races where wins could give the party an advantage in redrawing congressional districts following the 2020 Census.

Mook estimates the campaign has spent more than $100 million, in coordination with the Democratic National Committee , to benefit other Democrats.

"As we're traveling in these last 17 days, we're going to be emphasizing the importance of electing Democrats down the ballot," Clinton told reporters Saturday night.

The shift is evident not only in Clinton's spending decisions, but also in her message. For months, Clinton talked about Trump as a singular threat, frustrating other Democratic leaders who saw an opportunity to turn voters' revulsion toward Trump into a broader rejection of the Republican Party. They argued that years of GOP extremism and strident opposition to President Obama had paved the way for Trump's nomination.

But Clinton is starting to adjust her message slightly to condemn the GOP writ large - and Obama is doing so more pointedly, shaming Republican politicians who have stood by Trump as he mocked and denigrated Americans over their gender, race or religion. Obama's target last Thursday was Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.), who has been favored to win reelection.

"How can you call [Trump] a 'con artist' and 'dangerous,' and object to all the controversial things he says, and then say, 'But I'm still going to vote for him'?" Obama said at a Clinton rally in Miami Gardens, Fla. "C'mon, man."

Recent polls show Rubio's race against Democrat Patrick Murphy tightening to a dead heat. Still, Democrats have withdrawn most of their financial support. With 10 media markets, Florida is one of the most expensive states in which to advertise, and party officials calculated their money is better spent elsewhere.

Democrats are well-positioned to win the Senate majority. There are nine competitive Senate races - eight of which Republicans are defending, most in presidential swing states. Democrats need to net at least four seats to control the chamber if Clinton wins the presidency, in which case Kaine would serve as the tiebreaker.

Steve Schmidt , a top strategist for George W. Bush's and John McCain 's presidential campaigns, said Republican senators can hang on if Trump loses their states narrowly - but that a Trump loss of eight or 10 or more percentage points could spell defeat.

"It's the difference between falling out a second-floor window and a ninth-floor window," Schmidt said. "One of them, you might break an ankle; the other one, you're probably going to die."

In the House, Democrats face a much taller order. To win the majority they would need to flip 30 seats, which party strategists concede is unlikely because it would require both a surge in Democratic turnout to 2008 and 2012 levels as well as a depressed Republican vote. Democratic leaders, including House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (Calif.), have suggested a 20-seat gain would be a good outcome.

As of Friday, the party's two largest House campaign organs - the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee and the House Majority PAC, a super PAC aligned with Democratic leaders - had reserved airtime in only 31 Republican-held districts. Three seats now in GOP hands are expected to flip without an influx of national money.

But Democrats are also playing defense in seven districts they hold. If they keep all seven seats, they still would need to win nearly 90 percent of the remaining contests to secure the majority. Ali Lapp, the super PAC's executive director, called that scenario "aspirational," but added, "This election is extremely volatile."

A late-breaking wave could alter the landscape. While senators often can insulate themselves from the national environment by establishing their own brands, House races tend to be proxies for the national parties. About half of this year's targeted House races are in presidential battleground states, while many others are in states that favor Clinton, such as California, Illinois and New York.

Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.) said Clinton's growing lead in national polls should help. "The most important thing she could do is keep her eye on the prize, understand that she has to get people to vote for her," he said. "She does well, we do well."

Republican leaders have advised incumbents to localize their races as much as possible. While GOP officials concede they are poised to lose seats, they say Democrats failed to recruit enough top-tier challengers to fully capitalize on Trump's unpopularity.

GOP candidates are buoyed by record fundraising hauls by House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) and House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy (R-Calif.). But McCarthy last week sounded the alarm, pleading with safe incumbents to spread their campaign cash to help colleagues endangered by Trump.

Even if Democrats fall short, picking up seats would shrink the size of the GOP majority, potentially creating problems for Ryan because it could strengthen the power of conservative hard-liners inside the conference while also enhancing the prospects for more progressive legislation.

Clinton decided early in her campaign to run a robust, coordinated campaign that assists down-ballot Democrats in ways Obama's did not always, including sharing office space in the states. "I want to bring as many Democrats with me to Washington as I possibly can," she said in Iowa in July 2015.

But it was not until after a video surfaced Oct. 7 showing Trump bragging in a 2005 "Access Hollywood" interview about sexually assaulting women that Clinton's advisers decided to make late investments.

Private polls reviewed by Clinton strategists showed Democratic Senate and gubernatorial candidates rising in Indiana and Missouri. The Clinton team concluded that in Missouri, for instance, a well-funded ground game to turn out African Americans could be the deciding factor.

"We saw new opportunities popping up," Mook said. "We felt a moral obligation to help."

Missouri has emerged as a top priority for a Democratic Party hungry for new stars. Jason Kander - a 35-year-old military veteran who gained attention for a television ad showing him touting support for tougher gun laws while assembling an AR-15 blindfolded - is giving a surprisingly strong challenge to Sen. Roy Blunt (R-Mo.). Recent polls show the race effectively tied.

Sen. Charles E. Schumer (D-N.Y.), who is poised to succeed retiring Sen. Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.) as leader of Senate Democrats, said Kander is "smart, he's hard-working, and he has the right image for Missouri."

Both parties agree Democrats are poised to pick up Senate seats in Illinois and Wisconsin. Toomey and Sens. Kelly Ayotte (R-N.H.) and Richard Burr (R-N.C.) are in danger. Ayotte in particular has struggled to navigate Trump, saying in a recent debate that the nominee was "absolutely" a role model for children. She later revised her position to say neither Trump nor Clinton set good examples.

In some states, Republican senators are trying to portray themselves as counterweights to a Democratic president. In New Hampshire, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce is airing an ad touting Ayotte as someone who "works across the aisle to get things done," while speculating of her Democratic opponent, Maggie Hassan, "just imagine what she'd do unchecked in Washington with a new president."

It is unclear whether there will be a national push to portray Republicans as a "check" on a President Clinton, as the GOP did in 1996 to protect the House and Senate majorities when presidential nominee Robert J. Dole was losing badly.

"If we see it working in other places, then we'll absolutely go there," said Rob Engstrom , the Chamber's political director. "It's not effective everywhere."

The only Democratic Senate seat Republicans hope to snatch away is Reid's. Republican Joseph J. Heck had been weathering the season relatively well, but after the "Access Hollywood" video came out he withdrew his endorsement of Trump, sparking a backlash from Nevada conservatives.

Democrat Catherine Cortez Mastro is trying to saddle him with Trump's baggage nevertheless. An ad airing frequently on Las Vegas airwaves juxtaposes video of Trump attacking undocumented **immigrants** and a disabled journalist with Heck's previously supportive comments of the nominee.

Cortez Mastro hopes to benefit from the robust turnout operation Clinton is preparing in Nevada, especially among Latino voters - as does Ruben Kihuen, a Mexican-born **immigrant** who is challenging Rep. Cresent Hardy (R-Nev.) in a majority-minority Las Vegas-area district.

Republicans have a structural advantage because of the way congressional districts have been drawn to favor them, but Trump's declining popularity in suburban areas presents fresh opportunities for Democrats.

Mook pointed out Reps. Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) and Mike Coffman (R-Colo.), who represent suburban bellwether districts, as ripe for defeat. Comstock has kept her distance from Trump from the start, while Coffman's posture has been more confusing. In a debate last week, when asked whether Trump was a "sexual predator" in light of allegations of unwanted kissing and touching, Coffman said, "Oh, I don't know."

"He's in real hot water," Mook said. "We're going to be doing a lot of voter turnout, and I think we can make a huge difference."
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Abby Phillip in Pittsburgh and Paul Kane in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Oct. 18 front-page article "Obama works to shape how his story is written":

President Obama's legacy should include that he is at least partly responsible for the thousands and thousands of casualties in Iraq and Syria and the million **refugees** who have flooded Europe. His "red line" ultimatum should have been adhered to and not run away from. He should have listened to his advisers who wanted him to set up a no-fly zone in Syria before the war got out of control. He did not hesitate to do that in Libya, and President George H.W. Bush did that to protect the Kurds in Iraq.

If he had done that one thing, there would be no Russians in Syria bombing innocent women and children. The Russians' Syrian friends taught us the meaning of "barrel bombs," which are designed to inflict as many casualties as possible. Also there would not be the flood of **refugees** all over Europe.

That is the true legacy for our president, along with a world that is in such turmoil, a world much less safe than it was before he took office.

Wayne Schrader, Ashburn

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Even if he loses, Donald Trump isn't going away. But the man and the political phenomenon he has unleashed over the past 16 months are already posing a difficult chicken-or-egg question: Has Trump transformed America, or simply revealed it?

Trump's slash-and-burn march to the Republican nomination and on into this fall is perhaps the ultimate blending of entertainment and politics, a coarse yet mesmerizing new show that appears to have changed political language and deepened divisions in an already polarized nation. But is this a singular moment, tied exclusively to Trump's larger-than-life personality and searing rhetoric, or has he loosed into the culture a new virus of confrontation and anger?

"Win or lose, the Trump effect will be felt long after the election," said David Nevins, president of Showtime, who has spent decades reflecting the nation's mood on TV shows such as "24," "Friday Night Lights" and "Homeland." "Trump and his followers are in many ways a rebuke to the elites who are perceived as controlling popular culture. The people who feel left out, passed over, now have a champion, even though he's actually one of the New York media power establishment."

Admire him or loathe him, many Americans are fascinated by Trump, and that fascination is feeding a wave of new work that will aim to entertain and challenge the public in the coming years. Trump's ability to embrace - or manipulate - average Americans' anxieties is inspiring more raw and rough rhetoric in politics, darker and more somber popular music, and in TV, movies and other arts, an edgier, more nervous set of characters and themes.

Social media expose rifts

Has Trump granted Americans license to express overt racism or new levels of acrimony? "It seems like a plausible narrative, but I seem to recall all kinds of sketchy things said about races and genders and groups aired publicly on a weekly basis before, say, the summer of 2015," said John McWhorter, a Columbia University professor who studies public rhetoric. "He is distinct only in being someone of such prominence saying such things. I think the real change was Facebook and Twitter in 2009. Trump is just a symptom."

Even as offensive language and ethnic insults became routine at Trump rallies, McWhorter saw the real culprit as social media. Twitter and Facebook became the foundations of daily communication for many Americans between 2007 and 2009, "revolutionizing conversation about, well, everything," and pushing political chatter in a far meaner direction, McWhorter said.

In this view, the Trump effect is not unique to the man but is a natural, almost inevitable, result of economic and social forces unleashed by swift, powerful technological change that had, even before Trump's candidacy, made the country meaner, more confrontational and more divided.

The populism Trump represents and the social strains that made millions of Americans eager for someone like him appear regularly throughout American history. Previous bursts of populism have usually burned through in less than a generation, fading away as economic expansion, war or political reform eased people's sense of insecurity.

The frustration and resentments evident among Trump's supporters have roots, some historians say, as far back as Pat Buchanan and Ross Perot's third-party insurgencies in the 1990s. Others say Trump's success is the result of disorienting, displacing changes in the world beyond politics, in the technological revolution that has altered the way Americans relate to one another and in the arc of millions of work lives.

On college campuses, battles over clashing worldviews, identity politics and the definition of free speech have raged for years. Online, many Americans had already spent years swimming in a virtual ocean of pornography, foul language and sexual misbehavior - long before Trump's coarse language about women and the allegations about his inappropriate advances became campaign issues.

Although much of the country had moved toward acceptance of same-sex marriage, the issue continued to divide many people by faith, family tradition and cultural expectations. The tea party, the Occupy movement and Barack Obama's 2008 campaign all demonstrated a popular hunger for thoroughgoing change and a realignment of the political parties.

"Trump didn't appear out of nowhere," said Chris Buskirk, a Trump supporter and talk radio host in Arizona who runs a conservative website called American Greatness. "He's amplified things that were already happening, anyway. In two years, politicians are going to look at Trump and say, maybe I can be more revealing, more authentic."

Buskirk, 47, said Trump's blunt rhetoric and coarse language would have been startling decades ago but today only mirrors a society in which many people feel stifled by new limits on what can be said at work or school. "We'd all like a high level of public discourse," he said, "but a 3 a.m. tweetstorm isn't among my worries about the next generation." Buskirk views Trump as a breakthrough candidate who has spread optimism that "change is still possible when the American people act on their own behalf. Trump supporters see not his coarseness or vulgarity but a sense that an ordinary person can rise up and make a difference."

Donald Trump, ordinary person? "Yeah, it doesn't compute in a certain way," Buskirk quickly conceded, "but even though he's a billionaire, he's a guy from Queens, not the Upper East Side, and he talks like average Americans talk."

Effects on pop culture

In TV, movies and the theater, programming decisions are starting to reflect Trump's impact. Showtime's "Billions," a drama pitting a crusading prosecutor against a morally shady hedge fund operator, "would never have caught on without Trump," Nevins said. "Two years earlier, I wouldn't have put it on. But with Trump the billionaire running against the billionaire class, we're confronting all these questions of when our aspiration and our worship of wealth and business comes in conflict with our anger at what the big guys are getting away with."

As the writers putting together the next season of the political thriller "Homeland" thought about "how to reflect the Trump era," Nevins said, they searched, as ever, for "the edge of what you can get away with on television. That's a line that's constantly moving, not so much sexually as what qualifies as subversive or dangerous." And Trump's campaign has pushed that line in a coarser, angrier direction.

R.J. Cutler, a documentary filmmaker who has focused on political culture in movies such as "The War Room" and "The World According to Dick Cheney," is developing a TV series set in small-town America, in post-election 2017, "when any bad thing seems possible, when we no longer know the ground rules about the weather, about democracy, about very basic things."

Trump didn't emerge from the blue, Cutler said. A figure like him - charismatic, media-savvy, offering "believe me" solutions and bountiful blame - was inevitable. "Trump arose out of the perfect storm - the power of television at its most pervasive, the maturation of social media, and the world's greatest huckster," Cutler said. "Trumpism isn't going away. Even if he only wins 37 percent of the vote, that's tens of millions of people, and in a way, it's even better for Trump if he loses, because then his policies never have to be tested."

If Trump loses, he can say, as he has been for weeks now, that the system is rigged - the voting apparatus, the media, the parties' domination. That opens the door to Trump or a would-be successor to lead a movement of disaffected Americans against both major parties and the elites that support them.

But couldn't a post-Trump exhaustion set in, making it harder for a lasting movement to develop? No one interviewed for this article argued that Trump or his followers would simply vanish after a loss, but some wondered whether many Americans might crave escapism over another round of battle.

The widespread unhappiness with this year's choices - Trump and Hillary Clinton are the least liked presidential candidates in modern times, polls consistently show - is part of a national spirit that's been growing grumpier for years. Pop music, which often reflects the mood of the country, has been trending slower and darker, following a period of much more energetic hits around the start of the economic recovery in 2009, said Sean Ross, who analyzes pop music and radio play for Edison Research.

"This was the summer of unhappy popular music," Ross said. "There's an almost complete dearth of up-tempo, major-chord happiness. There's no tempo right now in country, pop, R&B, anywhere."

In the summer hit, "Stressed Out," the indie group Twenty One Pilots sang, "I was told when I get older, all my fears would shrink, but now I'm insecure and I care what people think. Wish we could turn back time, to the good ol' days ... but now we're stressed out ..."

The Chainsmokers' hit, "Don't Let Me Down," tells a story of being "stranded, reaching out. ... I think I'm losing my mind now."

The exception to the trend proved the rule, Ross said: Justin Timberlake's "Can't Stop the Feeling" was "the only up-tempo tune of the summer, and it was immediately scooped up by an anxious audience." Ross said the current popularity of slow, low-energy songs is the most striking run of such music since the early 1980s - also a time of severe economic stress.

Since Trump became a mainstay of TV viewing, that soundtrack has accompanied notably harsher debate in politics and beyond. For generations, candidates could assume that voters wanted leaders who could achieve consensus. Trump capitalized on the ideological polarization of the past two decades and the more recent cultural shift toward the kind of hot takes that go viral on social media.

The result is a new pressure on politicians to be at once entertaining, provocative, and even outrageous. The shift is evident in the media, advertising, even sports. "There's no place in 2016 for considering the other guy's point of view, unless you want to be called a wishy-washy, namby-pamby flip-flopper," Sports Illustrated columnist Steve Rushin wrote last month. "There will never be a sports talk show called 'You May Be Right,' no TV roundtables called 'Point Well Taken.'"

The muzzles are off

Trump supporters say he has liberated them to speak out against political correctness, whether in opposition to same-sex marriage or in defense of police officers accused of racial animus. "Trump has given some people permission to say things they were afraid to say," said John Lott Jr., president of the Crime Prevention Research Center and an opponent of gun control who joined dozens of researchers and academics on a pro-Trump petition. "People are just tired of having their motives questioned, of being demonized. Trump's letting people give voice to that feeling."

Over the past year, Trump's blunt, provocative rhetoric has morphed from outrageous to virtually ordinary for many Americans, said Frank Luntz, the longtime Republican consultant who uses focus groups of voters to analyze not only what they believe but also how they express it.

"Early on, people were horrified by his offensive statements," Luntz said. "But as time went on, they came to enjoy it and absorb it. There's no filter anymore. I hear Trump's words over and over: 'We have to keep them out.' Trump has liberated their inner voice, and I'm shocked at what I hear now."

Luntz sees no indication that the rougher rhetoric is a passing fad. "The more coarse language gets, the more coarse it stays," he said. "We don't go back. We don't suddenly become civil and good to each other."

In Luntz's focus groups recently, the tone of disagreements has deteriorated into the kind of attacks that once would have silenced the room. "'You're an idiot' has become relatively common," he said. "It's gotten to the point where I cannot stop people from yelling at each other."

Luntz has seen a sharp increase in parents telling him that their children are using Trump-inspired smears at school. "It's 'Lyin' Thomas' and 'Little David' in fifth or sixth grade," he said. "That's when you know you have a problem."

Teachers around the country report not only a disturbing rise in the number of kids who mimic Trump's insults but also a burst of fear among **immigrant** children about the threat of deportation, even when their families are legal U.S. residents.

In the Roxbury section of Boston, Karene Hines, an eight-grade English teacher, was startled recently to see a boy shaking with fear. She asked what was wrong, and the boy, whose family **immigrated** legally from Colombia, said that a Trump campaign sign that the owner of the neighborhood laundromat had posted had freaked him out: "He thought it meant that the INS was going to sweep through and he'd be rounded up even though he is legal," Hines said.

"These kids are always asking, 'Why does he hate us? We haven't done anything,'" the teacher said. "These are kids who before Trump were interested in the latest sneakers, the Red Sox, the Patriots. Now they're hyperfocused on Trump. One boy brought me his cellphone to show me Trump's tweets. They know his insults by heart. They're scared."

Both of the nation's major teachers unions - which have endorsed Clinton - and the Southern Poverty Law Center have been collecting such reports as evidence of a Trump effect in which the candidate's comments about minorities and women show up in classrooms and schoolyards.

Fear has not been limited to children. Psychiatrists and counselors say people on both sides of the nation's ideological divide are losing sleep and expressing concerns likely to extend beyond Election Day.

When a patient recently complained that he's being kept awake by his fear that a President Trump might start a nuclear war, Washington psychiatrist Bernard Vittone added the man to a growing list of people "whose main anxiety is Trump anxiety." The doctor, who runs the National Center for the Treatment of Phobias, Anxiety and Depression, said that in three decades of practice, "I've never had people come in like this, about four a week, coming in scared, actually frightened, about a candidate winning an election. They may hate Clinton, but they're not scared of her. They may have hated Bush, they may have hated Obama, but they were never scared."

Vittone said he normally treats such patients with cognitive behavioral therapy, in which "you try to get people to look at things more realistically. But in this case, I can't really dispel their anxiety because they have facts and quotes from Trump that they spout back at me that totally nullify my attempts to ease their fear." The psychiatrist tends to treat Trump-fearing patients with anti-anxiety medication.

A darker future?

Such frayed nerves reflect a loss of trust and community that predates Trump's political emergence. In a culture in which characters on reality-TV shows lash out at one another for sport, in a society in which bonds of trust have frayed as relationships become distanced from physical proximity, "along comes Donald Trump to give us permission to say out loud the things we've been saying anonymously online," said playwright Joshua Harmon, whose short play, "Ivanka: A Medea for Right Now," will be read at Washington's Studio Theatre next month as part of a flash festival of Trump-related plays at five D.C. theaters. "He's closer to how a lot of people are living than Hillary Clinton. A lot of men talk exactly like Trump online; he's just the first person to do that while running for president."

In most of popular culture, there's a long lag between social change and the art that bubbles up from the streets. Playwrights, novelists and songwriters say that when Trump-inspired works begin to appear, they will probably focus on the sense that, as Harmon said, "People are immersed in their own worlds now. We were already being horrible to each other on social media, so we were kind of ripe for someone to come along and further dehumanize us."

Many new works may be dark or tragic. "This doesn't feel like something that people will look back and chuckle about," Harmon said.

Very little in the culture points toward any 'what was that all about?' reckoning if Trump loses. More likely, Trumpism will continue to be the agitator that propels the nation's political machinery.

For many, Trump's lasting impact is directly tied to his domination of the news media this year. "The depressing and dangerous change that Trump brought is this: The media have surrendered their airtime to him," said Doug McGrath, a satirist and playwright whose show, "Beautiful," is running on Broadway. "There seems to be no calculation other than 'can we get him on and can we keep him on?'" Even before Trump came along, cable news had morphed from traditional reporting to "mainly people yelling at each other," as McGrath put it.

Now, Trump has taken that coarsening of the culture and exacerbated it. "In Trump, we have the candidate himself making jokes about his own penis size, or calling women terrible names," McGrath said. "He has obliterated the idea that tone matters ... that there is such a thing as going too far. For the next person who tries it, it will seem less shocking because this has been accepted by the media who report it in detail (mostly without shock or complaint) and by the rest of us who grumble but keep watching."

marc.fisher@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ABOUT THE only certainty about the battle for Mosul, which began on Monday, is that this large Iraqi city will be wrested from the control of the Islamic State. With tens of thousands of Iraqi army and militia forces deployed, backed by U.S. airpower and artillery, the military outcome can hardly be in doubt. President Obama surely hopes to preside over the clearing of the city before leaving office, and he has a good chance of doing so. Whether he, and Iraqi Prime Minister Haider al-Abadi, will be able to claim victory may be quite another matter.

As the history of previous offensives in Iraq has painfully demonstrated, an enduring defeat of the Islamic extremists will depend mostly on nonmilitary factors, including the physical and humanitarian costs it imposes and whether it is followed by workable political arrangements. The United States and its Iraqi allies failed on those fronts in 2003 and 2007 - and the outlook for Mosul in 2016 is mixed, at best.

The good news is that the U.S.-trained Iraqi counterterrorism forces that will lead the advance into the city may well by greeted - at last - as liberators by a Sunni population subjected to 28 months of brutal oppression by the Islamic State. If the more than 1 millioncivilians living in the city remain in place - as they are being urged to do by millions of leaflets dropped by U.S. B-52s - the rudimentary network of **refugee** camps being set up by the United Nations outside the city may not be overwhelmed. If screening of **refugees** is left to international agencies, as is planned, the atrocities committed by Iraqi Shiite militias during the recapture of other Sunni cities could be avoided.

The next big challenge will be preventing collisions among the Shiite militias, controlled by Iran; Kurdish units loyal to the Kurdistan regional government; and possibly Turkish troops and allied Iraqi tribal forces - all of which may seek to enter Mosul or seize territory around it. Mr. Abadi and Turkish president Recep Tayyip Erdogan have publicly quarreled over Turkey's potential intervention; Shiite and Kurdish forces could fight each other even as they provoke resistance from Mosul's Sunnis. The United States, which has leverage, if not necessarily commanding influence, over the Iraqi, Turkish and Kurdish governments, has a crucial role to play in preventing sectarian conflict - though neither Washington nor Baghdad can control the Shiite militias.

If a post-Islamic State war can be avoided, a series of political settlements still will be needed between Mr. Abadi's Shiite central government and Sunnis and Kurds. A plan to restore Mosul's pre-Islamic State government is a stopgap; real stability will require a broad decentralization of power from Baghdad to Mosul and other Sunni-populated areas, and a settlement with Kurdistan over its borders and access to oil revenue. This, too, is unlikely without robust U.S. engagement.

Ultimately, victory over terrorist forces in Iraq will require a sustained American presence, both military and civilian, extending well beyond the liberation of Mosul. The president should be laying the groundwork for that now, with Mr. Abadi and with U.S. allies, so that his successor can avoid Mr. Obama's signal mistake in Iraq: a premature and self-defeating withdrawal.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lev Golinkin is the author of the memoir "A Backpack, a Bear, and Eight Crates of Vodka."

I doubt my mother would pass the "extreme vetting" process Donald Trump has in mind for **refugees** seeking a new life in the United States. After 26 years in this country, she still speaks with a heavy accent, misplaces tenses, mumbles. She doesn't know the Pledge of Allegiance. Her job as a night security guard requires staying awake and making sure the doors stay locked, the perfect position for an **immigrant** like her.

Before coming to America, Mom was a psychiatrist, working in a busy clinic in the Ukrainian city of Kharkiv. The city's population was more than a million, but after 30 years as a doctor, she couldn't run an errand without bumping into a former patient or grateful family member. It used to annoy me as a child, and I'd tug on her arm, impatient to move on. Once we came to the United States, that was no longer a problem.

We know a handful of ex-Soviet **refugees** with medical degrees who managed to remain doctors once they came to the United States. Most didn't. They landed at JFK airport; they received three months' assistance from a **refugee** resettlement group, secondhand furniture and driving lessons, if they were lucky; and then the bills came. Medical boards and years of sleepless residency are a gantlet for 20-somethings who speak fluent English and have no children. Mom was pushing 50, had no money and couldn't speak the language. At first she tried to become a nurse, then a nursing aide, then an EKG technician. The closest she got to returning to the medical field was a stint helping an old woman take her meds.

I don't blame the United States for this. You become a **refugee** because something has gone terribly wrong, because your life reached a point where your best option meant abandoning your goals, roots, identity and the graves of your forefathers, and placing yourself at the mercy of strangers. Not even the land of opportunity can magically make up for all that, which is why the United States has the best-educated taxi drivers and home health aides in the world. For many, menial labor and humiliation are the price of admission to America. You scrub, you drive, you dream that your children will do better, and you try not to think of the past.

I don't want Americans to pity my mother; the most obnoxious sound in the world is the cooing tone some people reserve for talking to toddlers and **immigrants**. I don't even need Americans to respect her. The only way for them to comprehend the full extent of her sacrifice would be to go through the process themselves: sever all ties and live as perpetual strangers in a foreign land, where the minimum wage is the best hope and dignity comes at a premium. People often ask if it bothers me that Americans take things for granted. I always reply that I think that's fantastic. One out of every 113 people on the planet is stateless or internally displaced. We don't need more.

My one wish is for Americans to appreciate the degree to which my mom and the millions of other stuttering, thick-accented **immigrants** in menial jobs have already been vetted, and continue to be vetted, every day. They've been stripped of their personalities, skills, jokes, opinions, dignity and dreams by the language barrier. They've been questioned about who they are and what they're doing in this country - by police, store clerks, employers, customers and the ghosts of their past. They've been vetted since they set foot on U.S. soil, they're vetted every time they open their mouths, and they'll continue to be vetted, in an extreme fashion, for the rest of their lives.

When I was a teenager, soaking up English and reveling in my freedom, I was frustrated because I didn't think my mother loved America in the same blind way that I did. Didn't she realize this was the land of new beginnings? How could she retain nostalgia for her old life? Then I grew up and imagined having my education nullified, my career and aspirations destroyed, my communication ability reduced to the level of a child's, and then having to go on knowing that, as far as some were concerned, the lowest, native-born drug dealer would always have a greater claim to this country than I did. And the sickening magnitude of my mom's sacrifice hit me. I'm in awe that she loves the United States at all.

And yet she does, as do so many others. That's the best-kept secret about America. **Immigrants** respect and cherish this land, not because they're **immigrants**, but in spite of it. In spite of being reduced to Trojan horses, rabid dogs and poisoned Skittles. In spite of the Trumps in their lives. In spite of all the vetting.

Lev Golinkin is author of the memoir "A Backpack, a Bear, and Eight Crates of Vodka."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX

Donald Trump is running against democracy itself.

Here, in the land of Barry Goldwater, democracy is fighting back.

Only once since 1948 has Arizona gone Democratic in a presidential election, and that was the Ross Perot-skewed 1996 contest. But Trump's manifold charms - most recently his threat to ignore the results of the election - have given Hillary Clinton a five-point lead in this red state, according to a new Arizona Republic/Morrison/Cronkite News poll. Disgust with Trump sent thousands of white, black and brown Arizonans on Thursday afternoon into the Phoenix Convention Center (where Trump weeks ago pledged mass deportation of illegal **immigrants**) to hear Michelle Obama denounce Trump's assault on the democratic process.

"We are fortunate to live in a country where the voters decide our elections," the first lady said. "The voters decide who wins and loses. Period. End of story. And when a presidential candidate threatens to ignore our voices and reject the outcome of this election, he is threatening the very idea of America itself, and we cannot stand for that. We do not keep American democracy 'in suspense.'"

The crowd roared its approval.

Obama's speech (she crossed the country to give the remarks, then immediately flew back to Washington) is part of a push by the Clinton campaign to expand the electoral battleground into reliably Republican states such as Texas, Georgia, Utah, Alaska and, particularly, Arizona, that have been put into play by Trump's outrages. The Clinton campaign, which already has 32 offices and 160 staffers in Arizona, announced this week that it is spending an additional $2 million here and dispatched Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.), Chelsea Clinton and the first lady to campaign in the state. The campaign is considering sending the candidate herself.

As a matter of math, Arizona is irrelevant: If Clinton is doing well enough to win here, she will already have locked up the election elsewhere. But if Trump is to be denied in his bid to subvert democratic institutions by claiming a rigged election, he needs to be defeated resoundingly, removing all doubt. Clinton needs to run up the score.

The need to deal Trump a humiliating defeat has a sociological basis in the "degradation ceremony," in which the perpetrator (Trump) is held by denouncers (officeholders and others in positions of influence) to be morally unacceptable, and witnesses (the public) agree that the perpetrator is no longer held in good standing.

Psychologist Wynn Schwartz, who teaches at Harvard Medical School, explained to me that what's needed to have a successful degradation of Trump is an epic defeat. "If it is lopsided enough," he said, "you don't have critical masses of people who feel disenfranchised" or "who feel justified in saying that it was stolen."

But if Clinton's victory is narrow, the degradation ceremony fails, because a large chunk of the population feels swindled and remains loyal to Trump. "The margin matters a lot," Schwartz said.

Trump's recent actions - talking about a "rigged" election while laying the foundation for a Trump TV network - suggest that he will attempt to defy the degradation ceremony that a loss typically confers. Hence the importance of a landslide.

Arizona would offer an ideal rebuke. Carolyn Goldwater Ross, granddaughter of the conservative icon, introduced Obama on Thursday by saying, "I come from a long line of Republicans and I've stayed independent. ... But this time it's different." She submitted that Trump violates her grandfather's "basic values."

Apparently, many Arizonans agree. Maricopa County Sheriff Joe Arpaio, the anti-**immigrant** icon and Trump backer, is trailing his Democratic opponent by 15 points in polling by the Republic. The newspaper endorsed Clinton, its first embrace of a Democrat for president in its 126-year history. Arizona's junior Republican senator, Jeff Flake, is an outspoken Trump critic, its senior Republican senator, John McCain, has been attacked by Trump, and former Republican attorney general Grant Woods has endorsed Clinton.

A growing Latino population has the state trending gradually Democratic, but not enough to put Arizona in play in 2016 in ordinary circumstances. That's all about Trump.

"Trump accelerated what's happening anyway," Moises Mejia, a Mexican-born engineer at Thursday's rally, told me. Mejia, who took one of his sons out of school to attend the rally, said he comes from a Republican family and agrees "with the Republicans' principles, but they've taken it so far they've lost a lot of us in the middle."

The first lady, in her fiery speech, reached out to Republicans offended by Trump's disregard for the democratic process. "Our democracy is revered around the world, and free elections are the best way on Earth to choose our leaders," she said. "This is how we elected John F. Kennedy, Ronald Reagan, two George Bushes, Bill Clinton and Barack Obama."

That's right. This isn't Trump vs. Clinton but Trump vs. Democracy. And the way to degrade the threat is to defeat Trump, convincingly.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Rep. Barbara Comstock received a friendly but subdued reception from the Muslim community Friday night at a candidates forum that focused on Islamophobia, **immigration** and improving relations with law enforcement.

Comstock (R-Va.), in the midst of a tightening race for reelection in her Northern Virginia district, told a crowd of several hundred at the ADAMS Center in Sterling that she fights for their rights and rejects the "very unpleasant" rhetoric of the presidential campaign.

But the liberal-leaning audience gave a warmer reception to Democratic challenger LuAnn Bennett, clapping loudly and nodding as she called for comprehensive **immigration** reform and said the United States needs to accept more **refugees** from Syria.

The forum came the same day Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton's campaign released a powerful ad featuring Khizr Khan, a Virginia resident and father of a Muslim American Army captain killed in Iraq in 2004, in which he says through tearful eyes, "I want to ask Mr. Trump: Would my son have a place in your America?"

Earlier in the day, Bennett announced that she had won the endorsement of the American Muslim Women PAC. At the forum, Comstock said she was endorsed by the Emerge USA PAC, which is dedicated to protecting minority rights. Both groups support Clinton.

Members of the civically engaged ADAMS - which stands for All Dulles Area Muslim Society - Center mosque represent a key voting bloc in the 10th Congressional District, which has been held by a Republican for decades, but this year is considered a "toss-up" tilting Republican by independent analysts.

The district is anchored by Loudoun County, home to many college-educated women and minorities who polls indicated are cool to Republican nominee Donald Trump's candidacy. It includes Loudoun County, Manassas, Manassas Park and Clarke and Frederick counties as well as parts of Fairfax and Prince William counties, where the GOP presidential nominee has more support.

Last year, Trump called for a ban on foreign Muslims entering the United States - a position he later softened - and his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, wants to keep Syrian **refugees** out of Indiana.

The day after Trump proposed the ban in December, Comstock panned the idea as "unconstitutional" and "un-American," and she later criticized Trump's negative comments about the Khan family and U.S. District Court Judge Gonzalo Curiel, the U.S.-born judge whose Mexican heritage Trump said disqualified him from hearing his cases.

But Comstock, who supported Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in the GOP primaries, avoided saying for whom she would vote on Nov. 8 until earlier this month when a 2005 video surfaced in which Trump bragged about groping women. She quickly rebuked him, said she would not vote for him and urged him to drop out of the race.

"This has not been a pleasant political year for anybody," she said at the forum. "What you have heard has been very unpleasant. This is why I did stand up in those first days."

Asked about **immigration** changes, Comstock said she favored immediate passage of policies lawmakers can agree on - such as visas for skilled workers - instead of a comprehensive approach.

"We are a nation of **immigrants**. We are also a nation of laws," she said.

When moderators noted that she did not support a House resolution sponsored by Rep. Don Beyer (D-Va.) condemning hate crimes against Muslims, Comstock said she would look at the measure. Earlier, she noted that the First Amendment guarantees religious freedom.

"It's first for a reason," she said.

Comstock praised the center's active Scout troops, food banks, health clinic and job fair and presented the group with an American flag that was flown over the U.S. Capitol.

The format of the event consisted of sequential interviews with each candidate, who answered questions from moderators and the audience.

Comstock made no reference to Bennett during her interview, but Bennett sought to draw a contrast between her positions and Comstock's record.

She said Comstock voted against bringing more Syrian **refugees** to the United States, drawing one of the few boos of the evening.

Bennett said the United States should take more than the 10,000 Syrian **refugees** President Obama has accepted under a resettlement program, while continuing to implement a "long and complicated and hard" vetting process.

Asked about **immigration**, she rebuked the House for failing to pass sweeping **immigration** changes before Comstock took office but provided no plan of her own.

Although she never mentioned Trump, Bennett alluded to the national political climate and said Clinton needs Democrats in Congress to further her policies.

"The hateful rhetoric that we have heard in this election has been the most destructive thing to our democracy that I have seen in my lifetime," she said.

During the lighthearted final minutes of each candidate's interview, they were asked to name their favorite book. Comstock said the Bible; Bennett said she could not think of one on the spot and would get back to them.

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

habitatpwc.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

.

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CALAIS, France - When France begins demolition of the "Jungle" migrant camp here on Monday, the fate of 1,300 children will remain largely unanswered.

After a long, heated campaign led by humanitarian organizations, the British government began accepting a small number of unaccompanied child **refugees** from Calais last week. But hundreds more may not qualify for asylum before the Jungle is destroyed, and time is running out. On Friday, Interior Ministry officials said more than 7,500 places have been made available for the **refugees** living in the camp and that the minors remaining in France will be dispersed in special centers for teenagers where they will not mingle with adults.

For the few children who are allowed to cross the 20 miles of the English Channel - more than 40, as of Friday - there is neither certainty nor peace, as a number of lawmakers have demanded mandatory dental checks to ensure that the incoming migrants are, in fact, minors.

"I'm not pandering to hysteria," David Davies, a Conservative lawmaker, told the BBC on Wednesday. "If we want to help children, that's great, I'm all in favor of that. But I'm not in favor of allowing people in their 20s to say, 'I'm a child,' and then to come into the U.K. and make a mockery of our rules."

His comments followed the publication of a Home Office document, obtained by the Daily Telegraph newspaper, that said 65 percent of **refugees** whose ages were disputed by British officials were found to be adults. The figures come from asylum applications made in 2015.

Meanwhile, as the first convoys of Calais children arrived in south London last week, family members and locals with banners and balloons were on hand to greet the **refugees**. But British tabloids splashed pictures of the newcomers on their front pages. "Tell us the tooth," screamed a headline on the front page of the Sun newspaper, next to a picture of a young man the paper said looked about 40.

Britain's Home Office has dismissed the idea of screening by dental examination. "We do not use dental X-rays to confirm the ages of those seeking asylum in the UK," it said in a statement. The office defended its process of assessing the ages of the **refugees**, saying it works with French authorities and interviews candidates if there is uncertainty.

Inside of the Jungle, a swarm of children and teenagers crowded outside of the camp's makeshift youth center late Wednesday afternoon, seeking information from French and British volunteers about their chances for asylum in Britain. As young as 12 and as old as 18, those with shoes kicked soccer balls while they waited. Those without stood quietly, shielding their socks from the mud and the rain.

Amid the typical sounds of children at play, there was a palpable frustration as many were told they did not qualify, either because they have no immediate family in Britain or are older than 18. Two Sudanese boys stormed away when a French volunteer told them they had little chance.

Another boy, Sharif Sarfari, 17, said he has lived in the Jungle for 10 months now, having arrived alone from Afghanistan. He said he has tried every legal means of claiming asylum in Britain, where he hopes to finish his studies in engineering. Although in theory he would qualify, he said he has no proof that he is 17 and, thus, no means of crossing the channel.

"If the legal way is not supporting me," he said, "then I must go in the lorries. I told them I have friends there who will support me, but they are not accepting. So where do we go?"

By "lorries," he meant the large freight trucks that smugglers typically use for the illegal transport of migrants through the channel tunnel, often at great expense to migrants and usually without the drivers even knowing. It is not a safe passage: Throughout the past year, migrants have repeatedly died en route, mostly from suffocation.

Sarfari said he would continue trying to stow away on one of those trucks, as he has nearly every night since his arrival. Well aware of the dangers involved, he said that he had watched friends from the Jungle make the journey safely.

In theory, there are two categories of children eligible for asylum in Britain. The first are the "Dublin" children, who fall under the Dublin III Regulation, a European Union law permitting the resettlement of **refugee** children younger than 18 in member states where they have family. The second are the "Dubs" children, named for Alf Dubs, a Kindertransport survivor and House of Lords member who successfully pushed for an amendment earlier this year permitting the resettlement of unaccompanied migrant children without family in Britain.

As the British government has prioritized the Dublin children, critics have attacked the registration process as bureaucratic and chaotic. Citizens UK, an aid organization, threatened legal action against the Home Office on Thursday if more immediate action was not taken. Likewise, about 120 members of both houses of Parliament signed a letter urging Home Secretary Amber Rudd to ensure the children remain safe even after the camp is demolished.

"The modus operandi is so at odds with what needs to happen to come to a satisfactory solution to evacuate the children," Baroness Shaista Sheehan, who jointly organized the letter, said in an interview. "Something that's happening is that the children are leaving the camp and going to even more dangerous camps."

When the French government last demolished a portion of the Jungle, 129 children disappeared. There is no official population census inside the camp, and not all of the children have communication devices.

Susan Williams, a Home Office minister in the House of Lords, told Parliament on Wednesday that there were approximately 1,300 children in Calais, one-third of whom were eligible to go to Britain. Meanwhile, Rudd recently told the Daily Mail that 300 children from Calais would be a "really good result."

In an interview, Dubs, 84, whose own experience as a child **refugee** in the late 1930s inspired the recent **immigration** amendment, said he asks the Home Officewhen and how the eligible Dubs children will be processed nearly every week but has yet to receive an answer. If the Jungle is demolished Monday, he said, it will be impossible to register all of the children in time.

What concerns him the most, he added, is that children in the Jungle may not know what their options are and which is best. "None of them have been given proper information as to what their situation is," Dubs said.

Sadaam Ibrahim and Ramadaan Juma, both 17 and from the Darfur region of Sudan, were gathered outside the container units where British authorities were reportedly registering migrants for transfer across the English Channel. Ibrahim, who wants to be a computer scientist, and Juma, who wants to be a doctor, both said they wish to claim asylum in Britain. Neither had heard of the Dublin regulation or the Dubs amendment.

"We have no way to go, but we need help from people to find out how," Juma said.

james.mcauley@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Gazing from New Jersey across the Hudson River toward Manhattan, a city still riding out a "Hamilton" craze, is one founded by Alexander Hamilton himself: Paterson. Though it's not the kind of place that lands on glossy lists of hot vacation destinations, it's a city that tells a story of resilience and reinvention, played out along streets designed by Pierre L'Enfant and immortalized by William Carlos Williams. More important, the food is fabulous.

As a food writer who haunts family-run markets instead of T-shirt shops in search of vacation souvenirs, Paterson was a dream come true: neighborhoods crammed with bakeries, bodegas and butcher shops; the streets filled with the mingling scents of coffee, garlic and toasted pistachios. The city was also devoid of bearded bartenders sporting man-buns, an anti-hipster enclave that puts the focus on communities and businesses built by generations of **immigrants**, evidenced by the names of local politicians on yard signs in advance of a city council election: Akhtaruzzaman; Guzman; Cleaves; Khalique.

Boasting 52 ethnic populations among its 146,000 residents - including Bangladeshis, Syrians, Albanians, Peruvians, Dominicans, Jamaicans, Italians, African Americans, Jews and one of the largest Muslim populations in the United States - Paterson is rich in traditional foods, including tiny takeouts late at night dishing up the Peruvian fried rice known as arroz chaufa, in the Little Lima neighborhood, Dominican mamey milkshakes at El Sabor and the tiny cups of espresso served each Saturday morning at San Remo, where Rep. Bill Pascrell Jr. (D) holds court with his constituents.

It was the unrelenting nagging of John Lawrence - a family friend and native Patersonian who worked on Capitol Hill for 38 years before retiring as House Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi's chief of staff - that prompted me to plan a weekend jaunt to northern New Jersey with our respective spouses. In the weeks leading up to what can only be described as The Paterson Pilgrimage, our email inboxes were populated with messages from John: "Well, here we are nearly in April, and you know what that means! Can you stand the excitement?" Itineraries were created, hotel rooms booked, dogsitters scheduled.

We arrived at lunchtime, just as Hamilton did on his first visit in 1778, when he picnicked on cold ham, tongue and, according to an aide-de-camp, "some excellent grog" with George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette along the banks of the Passaic River overlooking the 77-foot natural waterfalls. Eschewing the tongue, John led us to Libby Lunch, a counter located steps away from Hamilton's picnic spot, home of the Hot Texas Weiner. It is a deep-fried hot dog topped with a cinnamon-and-cayenne-spiked meaty Bolognese known locally as "Greek sauce," along with spicy mustard and chopped onions.

"As far as I know, the Hot Texas Weiner has no relationship to Texas," John told us, "but Libby's is the kind of place where you'll find a judge and a guy who just got off a street-cleaning detail sitting at the counter together. It's the perfect place to start understanding the city."

Just outside Libby's is Paterson's pride and joy, the Great Falls of the Passaic River. It is the centerpiece of local officials' campaign to establish Paterson as a tourist destination and the impetus for Hamilton's plan to create a manufacturing center that would lessen America's dependence on European factories. Now a national park nestled amid abandoned redbrick mills, the falls are majestic in their natural beauty, one of the most powerful waterfalls east of the Mississippi.

"If Thomas Jefferson had lunched here," John quipped, "he would have just seen a bucolic landscape. Hamilton saw a natural source of power upon which to build an economy."

Paterson lies in the valley under the Passaic Falls/its spent waters forming the outline of his back. He / lies on his right side, head near the thunder / of the waters filling his dreams! Eternally asleep, / his dreams walk about the city where he persists/incognito.

So begins the epic Williams poem "Paterson," published in five volumes between 1946 and 1958, setting the scene for Hamilton's vision of industrializing the land along the banks of the Passaic River, harnessing the natural power of the Great Falls to welcome a flood of manufacturers, producing cotton, firearms, and locomotives, not to mention so much silk that Paterson came to be called "Silk City" during the 19th century. (Literary footnote: The Pulitzer Prize-winning poet also wrote the introduction to "Howl," the most famous book by a fellow poet-son of Paterson, Allen Ginsberg.)

Okay, Hamilton didn't technically found the city, but as treasury secretary in 1791, he chartered the Society for Establishing Useful Manufactures, or S.U.M., promoting the establishment of a planned city that he called a "national manufactory." Rather than naming his brainchild after himself, Hamilton chose to solidify support for his plan by conferring that honor on William Paterson, who was then governor of New Jersey and signed the 1792 charter that established the Town of Paterson. The original plan for the city, dreamed up by French engineer Pierre Charles L'Enfant, envisioned an ambitious system of aqueducts, raceways, and radiating roads; L'Enfant was later dismissed in favor of Hamilton's friend Peter Colt, who eschewed grand plans in favor of practical solutions that would get mills quickly up and running.

"There's a sense of civic pride here today that I don't remember when I was growing up," John said as we wandered along the rocky banks of the Passaic after lunch. "Certainly the interest in 'Hamilton' on Broadway has helped. People are recognizing the historic significance of this city."

From the falls, we headed to Little Ramallah, a bustling neighborhood with Turkish, Syrian, Palestinian, Lebanese and Jordanian flavor and a Main Street lined with halal butchers and shawarma shops. John came prepared with a large cooler packed with ice, which he filled with fresh sausages, baklava and marinated chicken kebabs from Fattal's Syrian Bakery.I loaded up on gallons of Lebanese olive oil, monster-size jars of sumac, fresh green almonds and sour plums, and spreadable halvah mixed with cocoa, a Middle Eastern version of Nutella.

We feasted on kibbe, baba ghanouj and fateh - a delicious mishmash of chickpeas, yogurt and toasted pine nuts served on a toasted pita - at Syraan Restaurant, just down the street from Fattal's. I had one request: a visit to Gelotti for dessert. Only a fan of "The Real Housewives of New Jersey" would want to go there. Now you know my guilty secret. The handmade gelato, especially the Cassata Siciliana - a ricotta-based confection spiced with cinnamon and studded with candied fruits - did not disappoint.

Ricotta took center stage the next morning at Cyndia's, a popular local breakfast spot in the nearby borough of Totowa, where ricotta pancakes were topped with fresh apricot jam. Then we made our way up Garrett Mountain to Lambert Castle, the former home of one of Paterson's manufacturing barons, where we had a clear view of the Passaic Valley and the Manhattan skyline 15 miles away. Filled with exquisite architectural details and period furnishings, it also boasts the world's largest spoon collection, totaling more than 5,400 items. This strangely fascinating trove featured nautical and religious motifs, as well as spoons made from shells and animal horns, or boasting mechanical parts, such as miniature windmills with moving blades.

Before heading home, we toured east Paterson, which was a largely Jewish neighborhood when John - and his father before him - was growing up, the landscape retelling the saga of the city's burgeoning **immigrant** population. Driving past his childhood home, John pointed out the Jewish bakery that is now a Jamaican restaurant and the mom-and-pop grocery store whose shelves are now filled with Hispanic and Middle Eastern products.

"There's a lot of symbolism there," John said. "Paterson has a permanent cultural mix, but it's a changing kaleidoscope of colors."

travel@washpost.com

Hartke is a food writer and editor based in Washington, D.C.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**On Wednesday, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump told millions of debate watchers that "some bad hombres" have **immigrated** to our country illegally. Soon after, we found ourselves explaining the difference between "hombre" and "ombre" to thousands.

I'm a lexicographer at Merriam-Webster, where I track the words people are interested in. During the most recent debate, our website saw a spike in look-ups for "amnesty" (Trump used the word in talking about illegal **immigration**) and "regime" (he used this one to describe the Obama administration). People wanted to know the definitions of "a lepo" (a mishearing of "Aleppo"), "rigged," "sleazy" and "entitlements."

It was another example of the way Americans use to the dictionary to help decode the presidential campaign and the day's rhetoric.

That's the way we like it. In 1996, Merriam-Webster put its dictionary online, available for all without a fee. For the first time in 150 years, we had real-time information about how people were using their dictionaries: what words they looked up and when.

It is fascinating. People don't look up what we thought they did: extremely difficult words, the sorts of terms you might think dictionaries are for - National Spelling Bee words. Instead, they look up terms they are familiar with, with meanings they have some vague knowledge about. What they are looking for, it seems, is nuance and explication. What exactly does "pragmatic" mean? What parts of your personality are covered by "disposition"?

People's curiosities change based on the news cycle. When an earthquake strikes, "temblor" and "epicenter" spike; during a hurricane, "inclement" jumps. Other times, people are drawn to words used by people they admire. When quarterback Peyton Manning announced his retirement, our users did not look up "quarterback" or "retirement": They looked up "revere," from Manning's statement that he reveres football.

This pattern has become even clearer during the campaign. Readers don't, for instance, look up key policy words: no "economics" or "security." Instead, they seek out things that catch them by the ears. One of the biggest searches we've seen this election cycle is "bigly," an unusual word supposedly used quite a bit by Trump (as in "I'm going to cut taxes bigly"). In many cases Trump isn't really saying "bigly" - it's actually "big league" - but no matter. That's what people hear, so that's what they look up. Thanks to our real-time tracking tools, lexicographers can watch a word's look-up rank jump in parallel to the news.

In 2009, we started sharing these trends on Twitter. To our surprise, people talked back - and haven't stopped.

Lexicographers are notoriously introverted. But as we've gotten more into social media, we've seen in our daily conversations a mostly hidden truth: Language is personal. We play with it, argue over it, feel deeply about it. Don't believe me? Just turn to someone nearby and say "moist."

Of course, it's hard to say anything about this election without getting accused of being political. Sometimes people complain that we are in the tank for Trump or Hillary Clinton. Others accuse us of distracting from the issues at hand.

The truth, though, is that we're in the tank only for the English language. It doesn't matter whether a dictionary user is politically left or right, whether they live in Manhattan, N.Y., or Manhattan, Kan. When they look up "temperament" or "bigot" to verify that a candidate's use jibes with their understanding of the word, or when they search for "dystopian" or "deplorable" because they feel hopeless about whichever political prospect may lie ahead, they aren't alone. The look-ups provide an unfiltered and unprecedented look at the collective mind of the electorate, and in sharing them, we all learn something.

Most people assume that the dictionary is a static, fixed thing - the place where English is codified, formalized, memorialized. But in reality, it is an ever-changing cross-section of a living language. It follows its speakers like a dog tailing a messy eater, gobbling up everything it can.

Social media has given us word nerds a place to geek out, to share knowledge, to have a meaningful connection with other people who love this confusing and brilliant language just as much as we do. During the first presidential debate, Clinton said that "words matter." It's only natural that we'd agree. But we're finding more and more that it's the people behind the words who matter most.

Twitter: @KoryStamper

is a lexicographer at Merriam-Webster and the author of the upcoming book "Word by Word: The Secret Life of Dictionaries."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Coalition

When I tried to enlist a couple of other video-game critics to take on the new "Gears of War" campaign with me, one declined because he finds the franchise "too bro-ish" while another said he had no interest whatsoever. So, let's get this out of the way: I don't have any counterarguments to persuade skeptics to give "Gears of War 4" a go. This is still a franchise about muscle-bound men and alpha women using machine guns fixed with gainsays to eviscerate battalions of antagonists. But I love it unlike any other big-budget shooter series.

When it debuted on the Xbox 360 in 2006, "Gears of War" was a sensory marvel. Its run-down world where humans squared off against barbaric **aliens** was not, as it is now, one of so many dystopian playgrounds filled with burnt-out cars and derelict buildings. There was a griminess to it, accentuated by the game's desaturated color palette, that gave it a look that would be much imitated. ("Fallout 3's" super mutants, for example, always struck me as walk-ons from the "Gears" universe.)

From the start, "Gears of War" set itself apart from so-called run-and-gun games. Up to that point most shooters were built around strafing - moving from side to side to make your avatar a difficult target. "Gears," on the other hand, stressed what its developers called a "stop-and-pop" approach to shooting whereby players ducked in and out of cover clamoring for tactical ground.

For those of us who, at that time, were accustomed to playing shooters like "Quake," the third-person mechanics in "Gears" added an expressive physicality to its avatars. Characters didn't so much as scurry behind walls and barricades as throw themselves against them like athletes. (The game trumpeted its own analogy with football by making one of its soldiers a talkative ex-player.) Moreover, when characters leapt over obstacles you could sense the weight of their equipment bearing down on the velocity of their movements. These details contrasted favorably with many first-person shooters where players glide around environments like floating cameras.

And then there was the violence. "Gears" did for shooters what "Mortal Kombat" did for fighting games - shamelessly cater to the gore-hounds in its audience. I'm not into horror movies since I tend to over-empathize with the actors on screen, but depictions of violence against polygonal characters don't rattle me in the same way. In "Gears," chainsawing an opponent or reducing one to meaty bits with a shotgun blast always struck me as more outlandish than revolting.

If you've played any of the previous games, it should be an easy jump right into "Gears of War 4." Its new campaign picks up a quarter-century after the events of "Gears of War 3." The game focuses on a new band of heroes, two of whom are former soldiers who defected from the COG, the coalition of governments, in order to be free of its totalitarian bureaucracy. We're introduced to them while they are attempting to steal a "fabricator," a device for making weapons, from a COG facility. The goal of these would-be Robin Hoods is to aid a group of outsiders who took in the AWOL soldiers.

Their plan hits a snag when they run into robot sentries guarding the base. My friend and I - another longtime fan of the series - found these early skirmishes underwhelming. The robots and our smack-talking protagonists reminded us too much of "Borderlands." Yet we needn't have worried over whether Microsoft's new development team, The Coalition (which took over the development of the series after Epic Games sold the rights), had decided to push the game in a more overt lighthearted direction. After you return to the outsiders' village, it's attacked by unknown **aliens** who lay waste to it but not before the mother of one of your squad members locks your group in a building for its own protection.

Your journey to help a teammate find out what happened to her mother takes you into territory that looks increasingly like living viscera. Playing the game on the second-highest difficulty, "Hardcore," I was treated to plenty of firefights that left my palms sweaty. It's a forgone conclusion that I'll play through the campaign again, with another friend, on the highest difficulty level, "Insane." Although I did encounter a number of technical issues - frame-rate slowdowns in the campaign and lag in multiplayer matches - the mechanics are so well polished, and the enemy encounters so well choreographed, that I can't wait to revel in the experience with as many friends as possible.

I'm also looking forward to sneaking more time in with "Gears of War 4's" multiplayer modes. As much as I'm drawn to Horde - an old staple of the series, where players work together to repel waves of increasingly difficult enemies - newer modes like Dodgeball and Arms Race also have caught my attention. The former encourages a series of power plays since downed teammates don't respawn unless players on the opposing team get knocked out, while the latter is an exercise in chaos in which your weapons are constantly changing, making it difficult to settle into a rhythm when you never know if your next firearm will be a short-, medium- or long-range weapon.

Sorry all of you "Pokémon Go" players, "Gears of War 4" is my social game of the season.

style@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GETTYSBURG, Pa. - Speaking near what he called the "hallowed ground" of a Civil War landmark, Donald Trump sought to look to the future of his potential first 100 days in office, but he first he returned to the past, vowing to sue the women who have accused him of sexual assault and accusing the media of biased reporting.

In his first campaign appearance of the day, the Republican presidential nominee gave a speech in a ballroom at the Eisenhower Hotel and Conference Center near Gettysburg National Military Park, the site of a bloody Civil War battle and a famous 1863 speech by President Abraham Lincoln.

"It is my privilege to be here in Gettysburg, hallowed ground where so many lives were given in service to freedom - amazing place," Trump said soon after taking the stage. "President Lincoln served in a time of division like we've never seen before. It is my hope that we can look at his example to heal the divisions we are living through right now."

But Trump spent the first part of his speech airing a litany of grievances. He branded as "liars" the nearly one dozen women who have come forward in recent weeks to accuse him of groping them against their will and vowed to sue them after the election. The allegations - including one from an adult film actress that was announced on Saturday - followed the release of a 2005 "Access Hollywood" recording in which Trump bragged about being able to force himself on women against their will because of his celebrity.

"Every woman lied when they came forward to hurt my campaign. Total fabrication," Trump insisted Saturday. "The events never happened. Never. All of these liars will be sued after the election is over." (In many cases, the women accusing Trump of misconduct have provided the publications with the names of witnesses and others who have supported their accounts.)

The nominee blasted the media and said that the women and news organizations are attempting to "poison" the minds of American voters. He also said, without providing evidence, that the accusations were the doing of the Democratic National Committee and Hillary Clinton's campaign. He added later that "we'll probably find out about their involvement" through litigation and that he was "so looking forward to doing that."

After spending more than 13 minutes on the attack, Trump read several numbered lists of things that he would do on his first day in office or during his first 100 days. Nearly all were things that he has repeatedly promised to do, but this was the first time he listed them in a speech.

In June, Trump gave a similar speech where he laid out just eight chief goals: Appoint judges who will uphold the U.S. Constitution, push for **immigration** reform, challenge countries that benefit too much from trade deals, stop the flow of jobs out of the country, lift restrictions on energy production, repeal and replace the Affordable Care Act, push for tax reform and impose new ethics rules for the office of the secretary of state.

In Saturday's speech, Trump listed more than two dozen things he wants to do, including amending the Constitution to create term limits in Congress, renegotiating the North American Free Trade Agreement and other trade deals, overwriting "every unconstitutional executive action, memorandum and order issued by President Obama" and suspending **immigration** from "terror-prone regions."

Meanwhile, in California, an adult film actress named Jessica Drake stepped forward to accused Trump or someone acting on his behalf of offering her $10,000 and the use of his private jet if she would agree to come alone to his hotel suite at night after a golf tournament in Lake Tahoe in 2006.

At a news conference, Drake said she met Trump while working a booth at the tournament for her employer, Wicked Pictures. Trump then invited her and two other women to his suite in the evening, where, while wearing pajamas, Drake said he kissed the women each in turn without their permission.

According to Drake, after the group left his suite, a man called and asked her to return alone. When she declined, Drake said she was then called by Trump, who asked her to come to his suite for dinner and a party. "What do you want?" she said he asked. "How much?"

Later, she said Trump, or a man calling on his behalf, phoned again, this time with the monetary offer, which she said she declined.

Trump's campaign issued a statement calling Drake's account "totally false and ridiculous" and indicating that Trump "does not know this person, does not remember this person and would have no interest in ever knowing her."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

jose.delreal@washpost.com

DelReal reported from Washington. Rosalind S. Helderman in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Carolyn Hax is on leave. This column originally ran Sept. 1, 2013.

Dear Carolyn: We are expecting our first baby - a little girl! Just before the tell-all ultrasound, my mother-in-law expressed surprise that we would want to find out the gender and informed my husband that she does not want to know until the birth.

We have shared the good news with other people, and there are gender-specific items in the nursery and on our registry. She knows we know, but it's still a secret for her, which she doesn't think is a big deal.

However, I am stressed about "ruining" the surprise for her; my parents are, too. I also am sad she did not get to share in our excitement about finding out the gender halfway through the pregnancy, and I feel like we are being judged for already making bad parenting decisions - that finding out the gender was somehow "wrong."

My husband thinks I am making a big deal out of nothing and I should just ignore her. Should I just bite my tongue and respect her wishes, or should I talk to her about this?

Expecting in the Mid-Atlantic

Expecting in the Mid-Atlantic: You don't just have a baby coming (congrats!); you're also getting a new stage in your relationship with your mother-in-law.

To get things off to a sustainable start, try viewing the gender juggle from the following perch:

lYou can have different approaches without judging each other.

l If she is judging you, then that's her problem, since it will gain her nothing (seriously - is there any practical use for smugness?) while compromising her chance at a close relationship with you, her son and her granddaughter.

l You can't make her respect your choices, but you can set the tone by respecting hers. Yes, she "didn't get to share" in this particular excitement, but there will be others. Don't dwell.

l You also can't bear responsibility for her choices beyond respecting them. That means you can remind yourself to watch what you say, but you can't blame yourself if someone slips or brandishes something pink.

l When in doubt on any of the above, act as if adults are actually adults. Bite your tongue, sure, but also treat the possibility of "ruining" her surprise as a mild bummer, not an irreparable tear in the family tapestry.

This isn't just for baby-gender surprises; swap in just about any other issue and it still works.

If you think it would help in this case to talk to her, then do, based on the above principles. Maybe, "We will all do our best not to ruin your surprise, though I obviously can't promise anything. That's okay, right? The baby's health is all that matters?"

Dear Carolyn: I'm 31, and I have chronic pain - every moment of every day. After many years of trial and error, my pain is relatively well managed. While I'd very much prefer to keep this private, there have been times when I had a noticeable limp or other physical symptoms, had to take time off work, or been unable to travel, so co-workers and friends are generally aware.

Pain has taken a lot from my life that I've spent a lot of time mourning, and I find it hard to talk about in a matter-of-fact way.

I take narcotic pain medication every day. I hate feeling drugged so I've worked really hard to find meds and dosing that don't impact my behavior or personality. Many people are judgmental about taking these drugs and think I'm headed straight to rehab or secretly wonder if I'm faking the pain just to get the drugs.

So how do I respond to questions about my treatment? ("How do you treat your pain?" "Have you tried massage/chiropractic/supplements/eliminating gluten ... ?")

I can't find answers that don't lead to follow-up questions, which leave me close to tears. What I want to say is, "That's a really private topic to me, and while I know you are just trying to be helpful/caring, I'm grieving the loss of a life I loved, and dealing with this has been traumatic and painful. Thanks for your concern, but please don't ask ever again." But I don't want to **alienate** the question-askers. This is a daily thing - please help.

L.

L.: I'm sorry for all you have lost.

You've got the right answer, and every right to say it. Any time you doubt that, remind yourself that your social obligation not to "**alienate** the question-askers" comes with a matching one: theirs not to **alienate** you.

I do suggest you streamline, though: "I appreciate your concern, but I prefer not to discuss it." Not only is that better suited to daily use, but it also tracks more closely with the basic principle that you don't owe the merely curious any details about your condition. Your version flirts with being both explanation and apology for not feeding them news, neither of which you owe. If they press: (Smile, deep breath,) change subject.

Write to Carolyn Hax at tellme@washpost.com. Get her column delivered to your inbox each morning at bit.ly/haxmail.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It is tempting to laugh at Donald Trump's eruptions and outrages because he is such a cartoonish buffoon. But he gave chilling evidence Wednesday night of why he poses a grave and urgent threat to our democracy - and why he must be defeated.

There have been many bitterly contested elections in our nation's 240-year history, but never has the loser refused to accept the outcome and claimed the presidency was stolen by fraud. Trump threatened, in advance, to do just that. "I'll keep you in suspense," he said, proving once again that he cares more about protecting his fragile ego than serving the country he asks to lead.

Debate moderator Chris Wallace gave Trump two opportunities to say that he would accept the people's verdict. Both times he defiantly refused - and in the process disqualified himself as a candidate for the nation's highest office.

Not that he hadn't already given us a thousand and one reasons why he should never be president, mind you. But how can any Republican official support a man who so challenges the very legitimacy of our democratic system? To all who, like House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.), have shown disdain for Trump but made the political calculation not to fully renounce him, I ask this: Why should anyone, ever again, take seriously your idealistic rhetoric about the United States being a "city upon the hill" and a beacon to the world? You are supporting a man who spits on your ideals.

That moment completely overshadowed the rest of the debate, as far as I'm concerned. Trump must not be president and deserves to lose in a landslide on Nov. 8. Voters should send him back to his Trump Tower aerie and administer the cruelest possible punishment: ignore him.

Hillary Clinton, meanwhile, once again demonstrated her preternatural poise and command of the issues - and, yes, also her ability to get under Trump's exceedingly thin skin.

Those praising Trump's performance in the first half-hour of the debate are grading him on a generous curve. For a short while he was able to enunciate standard GOP positions - against abortion, against gun control - without making any major pratfalls, but also without any notable sophistication or subtlety. Clinton defended Roe v. Wade and advocated sensible gun restrictions in terms that seemed intended to appeal to Trump's female voters, if he has any left.

On **immigration**, Clinton outlined the sensible centrist solution - border control, deporting criminals, and providing a path to legalization and citizenship for the millions of undocumented migrants already here - that should have been adopted long ago. Trump, by contrast, began to go off the rails, first denying but then later affirming his pledge of mass deportations. And when he talked about **immigrants** who commit crimes, he called them "bad hombres" - an apparent attempt to drive his party's Latino support even closer to zero.

When the debate turned to Trump's bizarre admiration for Vladimir Putin, he said that the Russian leader, "from everything I see, has no respect for this person," indicating Clinton.

"Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States," Clinton snapped back. This, incredibly, is what followed:

Trump: No puppet. No puppet.

Clinton: And it's pretty clear ...

Trump: You're the puppet!

Clinton: It's pretty clear you won't admit ...

Trump: No, you're the puppet.

Any kindergarten teacher could see that Trump would have benefited at that point from a spell in the timeout chair. Unfortunately none was furnished by the Commission on Presidential Debates, so he blathered on and went steadily downhill from there. He lost the ability to wait his turn, instead interrupting with "no" or "wrong" when Clinton was making a point. He denied ever saying that nations such as Japan and South Korea should develop their own nuclear weapons rather than rely on the U.S. shield, even though there is videotape of him saying precisely that in an interview with moderator Wallace.

He maintained that all of the women who have accused him of groping or making other unwanted sexual advances are lying, saying improbably, "Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody."

"Everybody" would be closer to the truth.

We knew that Trump is unfit to be commander in chief. We knew that he is only superficially acquainted with his own proposed policies, foreign and domestic. What we didn't know is that he has such utter contempt for American democracy. He's not a statesman, he's a spoiled brat, and the nation should turn him over its collective knee.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Some people take up arms for a cause. Emmylou Harris picks up her guitar.

The singer-songwriter has been touring the country with shows aimed at raising awareness of the global **refugee** crisis - and money for the aid organization Jesuit **Refugee** Service. To share the stage, Harris enlisted pals she's made in her four-decade-and-going-strong career, who just happen to be some of the greats: Steve Earle, Buddy Miller and the Milk Carton Kids have been joined by a rotating guest lineup including Robert Plant, Joan Baez and Nancy and Beth (a.k.a. actress Megan Mullally and her friend Stephanie Hunt).

The last stop on the tour is Friday night at Lisner Auditorium, marking a homecoming of sorts for Harris, who got her start playing Washington clubs. We caught up with Harris ahead of the show to talk about helping people locate their "compassion chips" to help **refugees**, how she's avoided watching the political debates, and her friend Bob Dylan's big prize.

How did you come to the issue?

It goes way back to my friendship with Gail Griffith [a former Georgetown administrator and student who now heads JRS's education campaign]. She used to be one of two or three people in the audience when I was first knocking around, and she got me involved in the campaign to end land mines.

We put together the same blueprint as now - we'd get some musicians together and tour, and we did that off and on for a couple of years. We didn't end land mines, but we raised a lot of money and shone a light on the issue.

Gail came to me and said, "You know, this **refugee** crisis is becoming catastrophic. What do you think of doing it again?"

In this election season, politics must keep spilling into the issue.

We don't even think about that - we've been blissfully doing shows on the nights of the debates!

How do you go about enlisting all these big names - do you have to twist arms?

No, scheduling is the bugaboo - you're asking people, "Can you give up your time and do what you do for a living, and you're not going to get paid?" But I've found musicians to be some of the most generous people.

Is D.C. still a special place for you?

I still have friends here, people I played with, and I still have family nearby. This will always be one of my home towns - this is the place where it all happened for me, the place that launched me to where I am now.

As a songwriter, what do you make of Bob Dylan winning the Nobel?

Dylan truly changed the English language, and not just in songwriting. There is "Before Dylan" and "After Dylan."

What do you hope people take away from the shows?

We have this chip of compassion and empathy for others in all of us. So many of these **refugees** are women and children, and so I'd like for people to look at their own families and realize what these families are going through. [**Refugees**] have to be brought into the world of normalcy - they should have homes and education and safety. We just have to raise our compassion quotient.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In the final debate of a tightening contest for a Northern Virginia congressional seat, Democratic challenger LuAnn Bennett on Wednesday departed from her practice of tying Republican Rep. Barbara Comstock to Donald Trump.

Instead, she worked to paint the incumbent as an extreme partisan in a do-little Congress and mentioned the Republican presidential nominee just once when asked about him.

Comstock touted her local connections and said she has been an ally to congressional Democrats representing the region in the GOP-controlled House. She also called Bennett out of touch with the district's priorities.

Trump has lost support in the state, according to recent polls, and has been a lightning rod in the race in the 10th Congressional District. Independent political analysts have responded by moving the contest from "lean Republican" to "toss-up" and tilting toward the Republican.

The 10th District includes all of Loudoun, Clarke and Frederick counties, the cities of Manassas and Manassas Park, and parts of Fairfax and Prince William counties.

Questions at the debate, hosted by the Northern Virginia Chamber of Commerce, focused predominantly on transportation, which both candidates agreed is a barrier to economic development in the congested region.

Comstock noted that she sits on a committee that negotiated a compromise five-year transportation bill passed by Congress that will help fund infrastructure improvements.

"There's only one person on this stage who will be in the majority," she said. "We don't need another minority member of Congress."

Bennett responded, "First of all, that's a big assumption at this point."

She added that Congress has not passed an appropriations bill in many years and avoids votes on tough issues.

"If that happened in your business or my business, we would be out of business," said Bennett, a 63-year-old real estate developer and longtime Democratic donor who is making her first bid for public office.

Turning to the Affordable Care Act, Comstock said lawmakers pleaded with President Obama to get bipartisan buy-in on the landmark legislation.

"Obamacare was totally partisan," said Comstock, 57, a onetime GOP staffer who is finishing her first term in Congress. "Not a single Republican voted for Obamacare. What we need is to have bipartisan solutions."

At the end of the hour-long debate, candidates were asked what priority they would promote if a president of the opposite party invited them to dinner.

Comstock said in a theoretical meeting with a President Hillary Clinton, she would advocate continuing Vice President Biden's "cancer moonshot" to advance a cure.

Bennett said she would talk up ways to boost investment in the Northern Virginia economy if Trump becomes president, "and not some stupid wall and pretend someone else is going to pay for it."

Comstock steered clear of Trump. "I've made my statement known and my views," she told reporters.

For much of the campaign, Comstock, who supported Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in the state GOP primary, avoided saying whether she would vote for Trump. But after a 2005 video surfaced this month in which he bragged about groping women, Comstock became one of the first Republicans in the country to denounce his behavior. She urged him to drop out of the race and said she could not vote for him or Clinton, the Democratic presidential nominee.

With the move, Comstock risked **alienating** Trump supporters but may have endeared herself to independent voters in the bellwether of Loudoun County, where polls indicated many voters are turned off by the party's standard-bearer.

In a debate in Loudoun County two weeks ago, Bennett worked Trump into answers to many questions.

But at the Fairfax County debate Wednesday, she mostly focused on Comstock's record, including her opposition to a tax-laden transportation funding bill and Medicaid expansion through the Affordable Care Act in the General Assembly.

Asked after the debate about the shift, Bennett said she was not changing strategy. She said Trump and Comstock have similar views on abortion, equal pay, climate change and **immigration**.

"This is an agenda she will take to Congress," she said. "If you don't like Donald Trump's agenda, you shouldn't like Barbara Comstock's either."

Mark J. Rozell, dean of the Schar School of Policy and Government at George Mason University, said House races are mostly about local issues and personalities, and Bennett is diversifying her case for unseating the incumbent.

"The Trump factor is there, there's no denying it, and LuAnn Bennett doesn't need to say it anymore, quite frankly," said Rozell, who attended the debate. "Trump's campaign is in a downward spiral, it seems, and she's already getting that benefit."

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS - A defiant Donald Trump used the high-profile setting of the final presidential debate here Wednesday night to amplify one of the most explosive charges of his candidacy: that if he loses the election, he might consider the results illegitimate because the process is rigged.

Questioned directly as to whether he would accept the outcome should Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton prevail on Nov. 8, Trump demurred. "I will keep you in suspense," the Republican nominee said. Clinton called Trump's answer "horrifying," saying he was "talking down our democracy."

After a sober start, the candidates shifted gears into a series of fiery exchanges over their fitness to serve as president and character traits. But over the course of the third and final debate, they delved deeper into their substantive differences than they did in the first two forums and offered a clearer contrast in the directions they would take the country. They drew sharp distinctions on the economy, trade, terrorism, **immigration** and hot-button social issues including abortion and guns.

Russian President Vladimir Putin loomed as an unseen third presence onstage. Clinton and Trump sparred over which of them would be more effective as commander in chief in dealing with his aggression and Russian cyberattacks. Clinton labeled Trump as Putin's "puppet" - prompting Trump to snap back, "You're the puppet!" - while Trump charged that Putin had "outsmarted and outplayed" her when she was secretary of state.

After Clinton cited the findings of 17 U.S. intelligence agencies that the Russian government had committed espionage - including by hacking the emails of Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta - to interfere in the U.S. election, Trump said he did not agree with that conclusion.

"Hillary, you have no idea," Trump said. "Our country has no idea."

Clinton and Trump clashed intensely about each other's character deficiencies in an urgent bid to persuade undecided voters just 20 days before Election Day and as people in many states already have begun casting ballots.

Trump was trying to present himself in a more presidential light than at the other two debates, but at times he could not contain his impulses to jab and insult.

As Clinton was needling Trump for not paying taxes, Trump interjected, "Such a nasty woman."

The animus between the two had reached such a critical mass that the candidates dispensed with the traditional gesture of shaking hands, before and after the debate.

Trump responded angrily to a question about the chorus of women who have stepped forward in recent days to accuse him of unwanted kissing and groping, in some cases recalling episodes dating back decades. "I didn't know any of these women," Trump insisted, dismissing all of their stories as "lies."

Clinton sought to claim the moral high ground by recounting Trump's recent mockery of the women's appearances and physiques on the campaign trail.

"Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger," Clinton said. "He goes after their dignity, their self worth, and I don't think there's a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like. We now know what Donald thinks, what he says and how he acts toward women. That's who Donald is. I think it's up to all of us to demonstrate who we are."

Trump's retort: "Nobody has more respect for women than I do."

In the debate hall, the audience laughed, prompting moderator Chris Wallace, of Fox News Channel, to admonish them. "Please, everybody," he said.

The 90-minute debate, held on the sprawling campus of the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, addressed a variety of issues that have received scant attention on the campaign trail, such as the Supreme Court and abortion rights.

The debate opened with a discussion of one of the most consequential decisions awaiting the next president: filling at least one vacancy on the Supreme Court. Clinton cast herself as a champion for progressive values, saying she would appoint justices who would defend women's rights and gay rights and help to overturn the Citizens United ruling that has opened the floodgates to money in politics.

"I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful, corporations and the wealthy," Clinton said.

Trump said he would appoint conservative justices who would be strict constitutionalists - "so, so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be." And he accused Clinton of wanting to appoint justices who would severely restrict gun rights, saying the Second Amendment is "under absolute siege."

In her retort, Clinton noted that because she lived in Arkansas for 18 years and represented Upstate New York in the Senate, she has an appreciation for gun traditions. "But I also believe that there can and must be reasonable regulation," Clinton said.

Clinton and Trump sparred intensively over abortion rights, with Trump acknowledging that if he gets two or three appointees to the Supreme Court, the landmark Roe v. Wade decision would be overturned "automatically."

Trump went on to describe late-term abortion procedures in graphic language, suggesting that many women end their pregnancies in the final one to four days. "You can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb," he said.

Clinton used the moment to make a gender-based argument, telling Trump: "You should meet with some of the women I've met with, women I've known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family could possibly make. ... The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families."

One of the sharpest differences between the candidates was on **immigration** and border security. Trump tried to put Clinton on the defensive, saying the country would fall apart if the border with Mexico is not strengthened.

"We have no country if we have no border," Trump said, vowing to build a wall. "Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders."

Expounding upon the influx of illegal drugs into the United States, Trump used a Spanish word in declaring, "We have some bad hombres here and we're going to get them out."

Clinton said she opposes mass deportations, as Trump has proposed, because "I don't want to rip families apart." And she portrayed Trump as a hypocrite because he has used undocumented workers to grow his real estate empire, including to build Trump Tower, his iconic showpiece in New York.

Clinton also accused Trump of getting weak in the knees when he met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto in Mexico City this summer because he did not bring up his vow that he would make the Mexican government pay for the border wall.

"He choked," Clinton said. "And then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said, 'I'm not paying for that wall.'"

Trump seemed to argue for a hands-off policy in Syria, effectively conceding that the rebel-held portions of Aleppo - which are under heavy bombardment from Syrian government forces and their Russian allies - were already lost. "It has fallen, I mean, from any standpoint. What do you need, a signed document? I mean, from any standpoint," Trump said.

He criticized Syrian leader Bashar al-Assad as "a bad guy," but praised him for outsmarting President Obama and others who had called for Assad to step down. "He's just much tougher, and much smarter, than her and Obama," Trump said.

Trump again and again tried to cast Clinton as corrupt, saying the global charitable foundation run by her family is actually "a criminal enterprise" because it has accepted millions of dollars from foreign governments and multinational corporations.

Clinton defended the foundation's work and argued that Trump's charitable endeavors often work to his own benefit.

"I'd be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people to buy a 6-foot portrait of Donald," Clinton said, referencing a report in The Washington Post. "I mean, who does that?"

The dynamic of the presidential race has reversed since the two candidates met on Sept. 26 for their first debate. At that point, Trump was cutting into Clinton's lead in the polls and surveys indicated that Trump's supporters were more enthusiastic than hers.

Though both campaigns have hit bumps since then, Clinton has moved ahead in the national polls and has a lead in nearly every swing state as well. Trump's lead has eroded even in states that previously seemed safe. At least one recent poll has shown Trump behind in three states won by GOP nominee Mitt Romney in 2012: Georgia, Arizona and Utah.

The election has taken a strikingly personal and disturbing turn in recent weeks, as Trump has escalated his attacks on Clinton and her family while responding to scrutiny over his own treatment of women. Trump has assailed former president Bill Clinton's past marital indiscretions and has accused him of sexually assaulting women.

In the hours before the debate, Trump signaled that he would aggressively prosecute long-held grievances against the Clintons in a play to his base. Trump invited several controversial guests to sit in the audience for the debate, including Malik Obama, the president's half brother and an avowed Trump supporter.

karen.tumulty@washpost.com

philip.rucker@washpost.com

David A. Fahrenthold and Jose A. DelReal in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his Oct. 16 Outlook essay, "After Trump," E.J. Dionne Jr. argued with good reason that we need to understand "why Trump happened," but I believe his analysis overplayed the role of economic anxiety and underemphasized cultural factors in explaining Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's rise.

The Post has explained that Mr. Trump's supporters have not been disproportionately harmed by trade deals and **immigration**, and as other studies have also shown, their median annual household income is about $70,000.

In my view, what is more telling is that they tend to lack advanced education and to hold a lot of views that are simply not factually correct about a wide range of issues, even though they have legitimate grievances, as do many other Americans. For example, they seem to be either unaware of or confused about the many positive developments of the Obama administration and look to the wrong factors - trade and **immigration** - in trying to explain why things are not as good as they should be (which actually has a lot more to do with automation, the rise of computers, outsourcing, etc.).

And with respect to culture, it is true many such people lament the end of their old neighborhood, but they also appear to lament the loss of the America that existed before the important social advancements of the past several decades, such as the increased role of women and minorities in society and the greater acceptance of issues such as gay marriage.

Louis Golino, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LAS VEGAS - At one of the last debates during the Republican primaries, rival Ted Cruz turned to Donald Trump and asserted he was too cozy with Hillary Clinton to take her on - much less take her down - in a presidential debate. Trump shot back that he was "the last person that Hillary Clinton wants to face."

By May, Trump was getting downright cocky. "I sort of wish we had more than three," he boasted on CNBC.

But at the end of the third debate Wednesday night, it was clear that Cruz had been correct, if for different reasons: Trump proved to be no match for Clinton.

For the first hour or so of a competition that he desperately needed to turn into a referendum on Clinton, Trump advanced a methodical contrast of their views on guns and the Supreme Court and offered an aggressive, if shaky, critique of Clinton's record on **immigration**, abortion and other matters. But he appeared rattled at times by her jabs and then fell back into a habit that has tripped him up time and again: making the debate about himself and his controversial views.

"I will look at it at the time," he said in a response to a question from moderator Chris Wallace about whether he would accept the results of the election, echoing unsubstantiated claims he has made on the campaign trail of a "rigged" contest. Later he added: "I will tell you at the time. I will keep you in suspense."

The real estate businessman and reality TV star long billed himself as the ideal messenger to prosecute a devastating case against Clinton before tens of millions of onlookers - a political outsider with a knack for piercing insults who could sow serious doubts about her character.

Instead, during nearly 300 minutes spent debating Clinton over the past month, Trump repeatedly missed chances to communicate a clear case against her. Instead, he mostly shone a spotlight on his own weaknesses and stumbled through unforced errors - feeding concerns about his treatment of women, his readiness for the presidency and his temperament for the job.

For Trump, the debates have been at the center of the most destructive two-month period of his campaign, when he has faced accusations of unwanted sexual advances to women and blowback over his vulgar comments on a hot microphone about forcing himself on women sexually. He now trails Clinton by a wide margin in nearly all national and battleground state polls, and party leaders fear it is too late for him to recover.

For the GOP, the debates have amounted to an enormous missed opportunity to mount a case against Clinton, which has been years in the making and which many Republicans were once confident would be their key to victory. The Republican nominee struggled throughout the debates to keep a consistent focus on Clinton rather than himself, just as he has in the rest of the campaign.

At times Wednesday night, Trump showed flashes of the debater many Republican leaders have been eager to see emerge. He landed a blow against her shift on trade and raised a recently revealed video showing a Democratic operative bragging about disrupting Trump rallies.

But for the most part, Trump was repeatedly on the defensive on issues that have dogged him throughout the year.

"I don't buy boats. I don't buy planes," he said in response to a question about his charitable foundation, which has come under heavy scrutiny over its questionable practices.

Clinton seemed keen to get under Trump's skin by needling him with certain words. She said he "choked" during his meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto by not pressing his proposal to build a wall on the southern border of the United States and make Mexico pay for it.

She later said Vladimir Putin preferred a "puppet as president of the United States," referring to Trump's repeated praise of the Russian president as a strong leader. "You're the puppet," he shot back.

"I never met Putin. This is not my best friend," Trump said a few minutes later, while casting doubt on the finding by U.S. intelligence agencies that Russia is behind a series of hacks aimed at disrupting the U.S. elections.

When Trump emphasized his hard-line views on **immigration** and border security, he opened himself up to Democratic attacks by remarking, "We have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out."

"'Hombres'? The only bad hombre here is @realDonaldTrump and his racist, xenophobic rhetoric," Catherine Cortez Masto, the Democratic nominee for a closely contested U.S. Senate seat in Nevada, wrote on Twitter.

In the hours leading up to Wednesday's debate, Trump's unpredictability flared up. He skipped his morning walk-through, according to a campaign aide. Details surfaced about his motley guest list, which ranged from President Obama's estranged half brother Malik Obama, to Leslie Millwee, who emerged in recent days to accuse former president Bill Clinton of sexually assaulting her more than three decades ago.

Trump's debate problems started at Hofstra University in New York on Sept. 26. For weeks leading up to the eagerly anticipated matchup, polls showed that he was chipping away at the lead Clinton had gained after the Republican and Democratic conventions. But he failed to capitalize, missing chance after chance to rebuke Clinton for labeling half of his supporters a "basket of deplorables" or to raise her use of a private email server as secretary of state.

He lingered on the "birther" controversy that many Republicans wish he would have dropped long ago. Trump reignited feuds with comedian and actress Rosie O'Donnell and with Alicia Machado, the 1996 Miss Universe winner from Venezuela, who has said that Trump called her "Miss Piggy" and "Miss Housekeeping."

Two days before the second debate, The Washington Post reported on a 2005 tape on which Trump can be heard bragging about forcing himself physically on women sexually. The comments were a focal point at the debate in St. Louis, where he apologized for the remarks but also dismissed them as "locker room talk."

While Trump won some credit for putting Clinton on defense over her emails and the Clinton Foundation, the second faceoff was still in large part about him and he did little woo skeptical moderate voters.

In the week and a half since then, a series of women have come forward accusing Trump of making sexual advances without their consent. He once again denied all the allegations Wednesday night and tried to move past them, declaring that no one has more respect for women than he does.

But toward the end of the debate, Trump, who desperately needs to improve his image among female voters, attacked Clinton in a way that could further complicate the task.

"Such a nasty woman," he said with disdain in his voice.

sean.sullivan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The drowning man reaches his arm up out of the water. He is desperate. Does anyone see him? Does anyone care?

You can see him from the George Washington Memorial Parkway just beyond Collingwood Road, on the left when you're headed south away from Old Town Alexandria. He's a large sculpture, made of driftwood and deadfall, carefully arranged in the Potomac River in the form of an upraised forearm and a human head, mouth open in a silent scream.

At high tide, the artwork seems to float.

It's the creation of artists Robin Croft and Marcos Smyth, who toiled over several recent weekends to make it.

I wrote about Robin two years ago, when he built what looked like a ghostly ship from found materials underneath a highway overpass in Prince William County, not far from where he lives in Manassas, Va. Trained as an artist, Robin had run out of room in his backyard studio for large-scale works and had started creating outdoors.

Marcos, a goldsmith and artist from Alexandria, Va., saw my column and saw in Robin a kindred spirit.

"We both had very similar histories and approaches to artwork," Marcos said. "We both enjoyed working outdoors on large projects in situations where we're using materials found right there on-site that we would just let be reabsorbed into the environment."

In April, they collaborated on a series of driftwood figures that seemed to stride across the muddy flats of the Potomac.

That work, like the pair's latest one, was inspired by the **refugee** crisis. Robin and Marcos were moved by images coming from the Mediterranean of overloaded boats and bodies washed ashore.

"We were going to have multiple arms and hands coming out of the water, but we got interrupted by lack of materials," said Robin, 58.

I asked if it was hard to work together, given that most artists have strong personalities and unique visions.

"There was no ego trip," said Marcos, 61. "It was truly a partnership, helping each other haul things and sharing design ideas. We were able to do larger projects that we wouldn't be able to do on our own."

This type of environmental work is ephemeral. "They only last a few days to a few weeks, depending on the tidal effect," Robin said.

Sometimes it's something other than the tides that destroys the works. Robin had been working on a large wooden construction where he built his shipwreck two years ago. "Somebody stomped it all into the dirt, and I haven't been back there since," he said.

They didn't get permission to build "Drowning **Refugee**" - Robin's title for the latest sculpture - but don't think that's a problem.

"We're very careful not to impact the environment in any way," said Marcos. "We use only biodegradable cord to tie the pieces together. We're not bringing outside material in. Typically it disintegrates within a few weeks and is just washed back up on the beach. ... If we were disturbing anything there, I could see where we'd get in trouble. I don't think there's any reason for anybody to object."

Or even, necessarily, to notice. We typically encounter art in a museum, in our home, in the lobby of our dentist or set into the middle of a public square. We're primed to see a painting or a sculpture, prepared to think about it. "Drowning **Refugee**" (Croft and Smyth, 2016, driftwood and flotsam) comes with no label. Most people won't even know it's there, might not understand it if they do see it, won't mourn it when it's gone.

That doesn't really bother the artists. "It either engages the viewer or it doesn't," Marcos said.

He hopes it does. Earlier this week, he watched as four crowded tour buses - probably on their way toward Mount Vernon - slowed to round the bend where the sculpture is visible from the GW Parkway.

"A lot of those people must have seen that, looking out to the river," Marcos said. "I was trying to imagine their shock at seeing something like that in the river and what kinds of thoughts that generated in their minds."

Does anyone see him? Does anyone care?

john.kelly@washpost.com

Twitter: @johnkelly

ï…Œ For previous columns, visit washingtonpost.com/johnkelly.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Finally, the end

Here are seven takeaways from Wednesday's Las Vegas debate:

1. Donald Trump was peculiarly subdued, low energy, as he once said of Jeb Bush. Hillary Clinton was happy to talk policy and generally ignore Trump.

2. On **immigration**, Trump outrageously declared that we have some "bad hombres" in the United States. Clinton did an effective job describing Trump's extreme mass deportation plan. (Trump didn't dispute her characterization.) Given that more than 70 percent of voters disagree with his **immigration** approach, this was a winning issue for her.

3. Clinton lured Trump from a discussion of "open borders" into a discussion of Vladimir Putin. She declared that Trump would "rather believe Vladimir Putin" than our intelligence and military agencies sworn to defend us. Remarkably, Trump refused to specifically concede that Russia is hacking Democrats on his behalf. That was just the beginning of a painful interchange for Trump in which he was forced to defend his comments on NATO and nuclear weapons. "This is just another lie!" Trump spat out. "I'm just quoting you," Clinton said quietly.

4. Given a chance to talk about jobs, Trump bizarrely reverted to a discussion about NATO. Clinton effectively slammed him on big tax cuts for the rich.

5. Trump's meltdown occurred about 50 minutes in, when asked about female accusers. He claimed the women's stories had been debunked. That's a lie. He accused Clinton of putting the women up to it, and bragged that he had not apologized to his wife, because the claims were not true. Clinton calmly recited his own words, rebuking him for demeaning women to make himself feel big.

6. Trump, in the end, always does himself in, as he did when he repeatedly refused to promise he would concede the election if he lost. "I will look at it at the time," he said. Chris Wallace sounded incredulous; Clinton blasted Trump and recounted that whenever things don't go his way he claims things are "fixed." It was a devastating performance for Trump. There is a certain rough justice in his pounding the final nail in his political coffin. He has always been his worst enemy.

7. Clinton needed simply not to have a disaster in order to lock down the election. Instead, she was error-free and eviscerated Trump, helping to remind voters what a nut he is. She won hands down and now has a shot to win by a very large margin.

- Jennifer Rubin

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**3Malaa, a mysterious Parisian house producer who hides his identity with a balaclava, and Toronto-based DJ/producer Rezz, one of Billboard's "Dance Artists to Watch in 2016," spin at Glow on their North American Lunatic Tour. For ages 18 and older. Thursday at 10 p.m. Soundcheck, 1420 K St. NW. 202-789-5429. www.clubglow.com[http://www.clubglow.com]. $20.

THU 20

Dylan Moran The British star and co-writer of "Black Books" performs stand-up on his Off the Hook Tour. 7 p.m. Lincoln Theatre, 1215 U St. NW. 202-888-0050. www.thelincoln[http://www.thelincoln] dc.com. $35.

Salman Rushdie The author of "The Satanic Verses" delivers the inaugural Eudora Welty lecture and discusses his beginnings as a writer. 7:30 p.m. Washington National Cathedral, 3101 Wisconsin Ave. NW. 202-544-7077. www.folger.edu[http://www.folger.edu]. $24; seniors and students, $19.20.

Zakir Hussain with Niladri Kumar Washington Performing Arts presents tabla player Hussain in duet with Kumar, who plays a five-stringed electric sitar that he invented, called the zitara. 8 p.m. Sixth and I Historic Synagogue, 600 I St. NW. 202-408-3100. sixthandi.org. $40.

FRI 21

American Fine Craft Show Washington The show includes functional and sculptural pottery and art glass, wearable art, weaving, basketry, sculpture, painting, jewelry, leather, mixed media and handmade furniture from artisans all over the country. Friday, 4:30-8 p.m.; Saturday, 10 a.m.-6 p.m.; Sunday, 10 a.m.-4:30 p.m. D.C. Armory, 2001 E. Capitol St. SE. 845-355-2400. www.americanfinecraft[http://www.americanfinecraft] showwashington.com. Friday, $8; Saturday-Sunday, $15; ages 65 and older, $14; students, $8; ages 11 and younger, free; weekend pass, $16.

"To Have Done With the Judgement of God" Theatre Du Jour stages encore performances of the play based on Antonin Artaud's bizarre and irreverent Theater of Cruelty radio play touching on subjects of government, nature, God and the body. Opens Friday at 7:30 p.m.; continues Saturday at 7:30 p.m. Through Nov. 12. D.C. Arts Center, 2438 18th St. NW. 202-462-7833. www.theatredujour.org[http://www.theatredujour.org]. $20.

Lampedusa: Concerts for **Refugees** Emmylou Harris, Steve Earle, Patty Griffin, Buddy Miller, the Milk Carton Kids and Robert Plant perform an acoustic show benefiting Jesuit **Refugee** Service to raise awareness about the worldwide **refugee** crisis. 8 p.m. George Washington University, Lisner Auditorium, 730 21st St. NW. 202-994-6800. lisner.gwu.edu. $55.

Shovels & Rope The married Americana duo of Michael Trent and Cary Ann Hearst performs music from its latest album, "Little Seeds." With Matthew Logan Vasquez from Delta Spirit. 8 p.m. 9:30 Club, 815 V St. NW. 202-265-0930. www.930.com[http://www.930.com]. $30.

The Suzanne Farrell Ballet: All-Balanchine Program Three Balanchine classics are performed as part of the company's 15th season: "Danses Concertantes," "Gounod Symphony" and "Stars & Stripes." Friday at 8 p.m., Saturday at 2 p.m. and 8 p.m., Sunday at 2 p.m. Kennedy Center Eisenhower Theater, 2700 F St. NW. 202-467-4600. www.kennedy-center.org[http://www.kennedy-center.org]. $39-$99.

SAT 22

Fall Festival and Craft Beer Showcase Cathedral Commons presents live music, local food, craft-beer tastings, a pumpkin patch and children's activities. Noon-4 p.m. Cathedral Commons, 3401 Idaho Ave. NW. 877-289-5833. www.cathedralcommons.com[http://www.cathedralcommons.com]. Free; beer tasting, with souvenir glass, $5.

The Head and the Heart The folk band released its third album, "Signs of Light," in September. With Declan McKenna. 8 p.m. DAR Constitution Hall, 18th and C streets NW. 202-628-4780. www.dar.org/conthall[http://www.dar.org/conthall]. $42.50.

SUN 23

Shucktoberfest The event offers unlimited beer from Blue Point Brewing Co. and oysters from Rappahannock Oyster Co., live bluegrass, games and a football-viewing lounge. Noon-4 p.m. The Courtyard at Maurice Electric, Union Market, 500 Penn St. NE. www.eventnation.co/event/shucktoberfest[http://www.eventnation.co/event/shucktoberfest] 2016. $75.

Die Antwoord The South African rap-rave duo stops by on its Mount Ninji and da Nice Time Kid Tour. 7 p.m. Echostage, 2135 Queens Chapel Rd. NE. 202-503-2330. www.echostage.com[http://www.echostage.com]. $48.60.

MON 24

Lindsey Stirling The violinist and dancer released a new album, "Brave Enough," in August. With Shawn Hook. 8 p.m. DAR Constitution Hall, 18th and C streets NW. 202-628-4780. www.dar.org/conthall[http://www.dar.org/conthall]. $43-$73.

TUE 25

Washington International Horse Show The six-day show features more than 500 top horses and riders. Highlights include the Longines FEI World Cup Jumping Washington competition (Saturday night), the Puissance high jump (Friday) and Kids' Day (Saturday). Tuesday opens with hunter events, including a children's championship during the day and an adult championship in the evening. Through Oct. 30; see schedule for events. Verizon Center, 601 F St. NW. 202-628-3200. www.wihs.org[http://www.wihs.org]. Daytime passes $15; seniors, military and students, $10. Evening passes, $20-$40; seniors, military and students, $15-$40; ages 3-12 $10-$20. Anytime passes, $100; ages 3-12, $50.

Har Mar Superstar Sean Tillmann's funny, hypersexual hip-hop identity is based on the Har Mar Mall in Minnesota. With Sweet Spirit. 7:30 p.m. Black Cat, 1811 14th St. NW. 202-667-4490. www.blackcatdc.com[http://www.blackcatdc.com]. $15.

WED 26

"Evolving Elections: The Transformation of Campaigns, Inclusivity and Festivity, 1916 and 2016" This exhibition compares this election with that of 100 years ago, featuring 1916 campaign buttons and Woodrow Wilson's unique election walking stick. Opens Wednesday. Through Feb. 26. Woodrow Wilson House, 2340 S St. NW. 202-387-4062. www.woodrowwilson[http://www.woodrowwilson] house.org. Free; tours, $10.

- Compiled by

Carrie Donovan

from staff reports

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Social studies teachers have long used presidential elections to provide engaging, real-time lessons about democracy, helping them bring to life what students read in textbooks about American politics, history and civics.

But this election cycle, unique in so many ways, also has proved a dicey challenge for classroom consumption, with teachers struggling to explain and dissect developments that, at times, have been far too lurid for young minds. Just the language of the campaign - including allegations of sexual assault, lewd comments about women, attacks on each candidate's supporters - would be the kind of talk that would land a child in the principal's office.

"The challenge that this election has presented is that sometimes the things that are said during the course of the campaign occasionally will conflict with how I like my students to conduct themselves in class, especially with regards to treating each other respectfully," said Michael Palermo, who teaches government at Yorktown High School in Arlington.

"If you're going to express your views in class, you have to do so in way that is respectful of your classmates and doesn't demean any individual or any group," he said.

Many teachers say they have shifted their lesson plans to keep things G-rated and to ease anxiety among minority and **immigrant** students, some of whom feel as if they are in the line of fire. Some teachers have avoided classroom discussion of the election altogether; others say their students are too captivated to avoid it.

They want to assign students to watch the third presidential debate - scheduled for Wednesday night - but they also are afraid of what their students might see and hear.

During the most recent presidential debate, audience member Patrice Brock noted that much of the back-and-forth could be rated for "mature audiences," and she asked Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton whether they feel they're "modeling appropriate and positive behavior for today's youth," noting that some teachers assign the debates as homework.

Brock, 42, of Eureka, Mo., said in an interview that her question arose out of concern for her nieces - ages 12 and 15 - who have been watching the debates. Brock said she thinks those who seek public office should be role models for young children, but the acrimonious tone and lack of manners in the first presidential debate disturbed her.

"I want our kids to think that our president is cool - and that they're good," Brock said.

At Burgundy Farm Country Day School in Alexandria, Scout Osborne, who teaches a class of fourth- and fifth-graders, asked students to watch 15 minutes of the debate with their families as homework. She also told parents that they could screen the debate ahead of time and pick which 15 minutes students would watch to avoid inappropriate topics.

The election has proved deeply polarizing among her young students, who started the school year bickering about politics in the classroom. She decided to turn the election into an extended lesson on how to "argue respectfully," including listening to classmates without interrupting and not raising their voices. The presidential debates have provided important teaching moments - but not in the way she would have hoped.

After the first presidential debate, her students noticed that the candidates regularly interrupted each other, Osborne said: "They picked up pretty quickly that's not how we would do things in our classroom."

Some teachers say the lack of substance in the presidential campaign, and the vitriolic nature of the discussion, has been frustrating.

"This is the first time I've really said to myself, 'I can't cover this election like I want to because it's not school-appropriate,'" said Kris Goldstein, who teaches government to seniors at Tokay High School in Lodi, Calif. It was a realization he had after Republican nominee Donald Trump attacked a critic by urging people to watch her sex tape. "There's certain things I don't want to be talking about."

Goldstein asked his students to watch a recent debate, identify four policy issues and write about each candidate's stance on them. Several students found they couldn't complete the assignment, and Goldstein couldn't blame them: He found that there wasn't much national policy to analyze.

Many civics teachers remain nonpartisan in the classroom and urge their students to do their own research and exploration to develop their views. But now they also have to underscore that children should not necessarily emulate or even repeat the talking points of certain candidates.

Teachers have cautioned their students against speaking disrespectfully about any group, whether it be copying Trump by calling Mexicans "rapists" and drug dealers or parroting Clinton, who called some Trump supporters "deplorables."

In a post on Palermo's blog, on which the Yorktown High teacher gave tips for how to teach the election, he said he would still treat a student chanting "Build a wall!" at a group of Hispanic students as bullying, even though it has become a regular chorus at Trump rallies.

"Just because it's part of the political discourse now doesn't make it any more acceptable," Palermo said.

Teachers cite Trump's stances on **immigration** as raising anxiety among **immigrant** students who fear they could be deported should he be elected president, and Palermo said what they're hearing related to the election is "trauma-inducing" to some students.

It was such a concern among teachers in Arlington - an overwhelmingly Democratic stronghold with a growing population of **immigrant** students - that the school system organized a professional development session on how to help teachers whose students might be unsettled.

Teachers aiming to elevate the conversation and focus on the issues are grappling, too, with whether to address comments by the Republican nominee that were captured in a leaked videotape in which he spoke of groping women.

Shannon Geraghty, a teacher at Forest Park High in Woodbridge, said she picked up a copy of the New York Daily News the day after the scandal broke and noted that the tabloid's headline - "GRAB THEM BY THE P---Y," with images of cats filling the space between the 'P' and the 'Y' - might be off-limits for the classroom.

"When I couldn't even bring in the newspaper to show my students, that's just a different level, a different low," Geraghty said.

Presidential politics has at times been too prurient for the classroom, but rarely during a campaign. Palermo started his teaching career just as news of President Bill Clinton's affair with a White House intern was unfolding. He found it difficult to ignore in class when Clinton faced impeachment, but he said he managed to avoid the racier aspects of the story, instead focusing on the mechanics of impeaching a president.

For other teachers, the election has proved too polarizing and too juvenile to turn it into an educational lesson. Mary Akeley, a fifth-grade teacher at Burgundy Farms Country Day, decided to shift from contemporaneous elections and instead focus on elections in the Iroquois nation.

Although Burgundy Farms had a schoolwide mock election in 2012, some classes are avoiding talking about the candidates this time, Akeley said.

Instead, a mock election in her classroom will feature three other well-known figures: suffragette Susan B. Anthony, abolitionist Frederick Douglass and environmentalist Rachel Carson.

And although the election has proved a challenging topic, some teachers admit that its unusual nature has had a positive side effect: Students are enthralled in ways teachers had not seen. Geraghty said one student hosted a debate-watching party for his classmates; another came to school early after the first debate, eager to dissect it with her. Osborne said even her most shy students have come out of the woodwork to share their views.

Goldstein said he thinks an educated citizenry is central to a functioning democracy, but he wishes there were a more civil presidential campaign on which to model it.

"It's not what I would want them to see from our political process, honestly," Goldstein said. "But it is captivating their attention."

moriah.balingit@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump, having disgraced the Republican Party, polluted the presidential campaign and shamed and embarrassed the nation, now wants to bring those talents to the federal government.

If his racist, misogynistic, narcissistic campaign does win, two unions representing thousands of federal law enforcement officers will be accomplices. Even as dozens of Republican stalwarts flee Trump, no longer able to stomach the latest vulgar demonstration of his character, the National Border Patrol Council and the National ICE Council remain in his throng.

That puts them at odds with their parent organization, the American Federation of Government Employees (AFGE), and its parent, the AFL-CIO, which strongly support Democrat Hillary Clinton.

It's ironic - make that disturbing - that organizations representing law enforcement officers would cling to a man who bragged about sexual assault and mused about jailing his political opponent if he wins.

Interviews with leaders of both organizations revealed no plans to dump Trump. Their one-issue tunnel vision allows them to ignore indications that a Trump administration, with Mike Pence as vice president, would push proposals that are anathema to unions, including those representing cops. Two prominent Trump advisers have urged him to push for civil-service law changes that would allow a Trump administration to fire feds faster.

The two unions are dissatisfied with the Obama administration's policy on border security, their sole focus. Yet their endorsement of Trump means they support a man whose **immigration** platform is best known for banning Muslims - or the current euphemism, "extreme vetting" - and getting Mexico to pay for a wall along the border. Do the police unions consider this good **immigration** policy? Do they care that a Muslim ban is illegal?

The National Border Patrol Council endorsement "came down to one issue, and that was border security," said spokesman Shawn Moran.

As the endorsement statement explains, "We don't need a person who has the perfect Washington-approved tone."

Their single-subject approach to candidate appraisal allows them to miss a number of other issues that would directly and negatively affect their members' interests. If Trump wins, he presumably will be guided by the Republican platform. And Pence has said and done a number of things as a member of Congress and governor of Indiana that are abhorrent to labor organizations and public employees.

Among other things, the platform calls for a 10 percent reduction in the federal workforce and a compensation system where pay and benefits "reflect those of the private sector," often code in conservative circles for compensation cuts.

The platform targets federal workers who are behind in their taxes, when the delinquency rate is twice as high for the general population, and calls for increased privatization of federal jobs. Regarding labor generally, the AFL-CIO called the platform "union-busting."

AFGE President J. David Cox Sr. noted the campaign walks, mailings and phone calls his labor organization is doing for Clinton but added that the AFGE is a democracy and its members can support whomever they want. He said about 70 percent choose Clinton.

In addition to the platform, Trump is getting counsel from high-profile advisers that can't please the two police unions.

Former House speaker Newt Gingrich (R-Ga.) urged Trump to do battle with federal labor organizations. According to a September New Yorker article, Gingrich recommended "getting permission to fire corrupt, incompetent and dishonest workers - that's the absolute showdown."

Gingrich predicted a fight with unions would lead to an "ongoing war" similar to the 2011 labor standoff with Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker (R) when he pushed restrictions on public employees' collective-bargaining rights. "You have to end the civil-service permanent employment," Gingrich told the magazine. "You start changing that and the public-employee unions will just come unglued."

In an email exchange about the federal workforce with The Washington Post, Gingrich said that "the absence of accountability is breathtaking."

Another top Trump adviser, New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie (R), also urged the candidate to propose changing federal civil-service procedures, which can be lengthy and cumbersome, to make it "a lot easier to fire those people."

The Trump-Pence campaign did not reply to a request for comment on the recommendations.

Speaking of Pence, his AFGE rating for his last term in Congress was zero. He did not support the union's position on any of 19 selected measures, covering issues that apparently are important to the Border Patrol and ICE rank and file. Beyond the federal workplace, the AFL-CIO complains, Pence supports "right-to-work" laws and opposes increasing the minimum wage and expanding workers' rights.

Pence has "a very strong record of being against any type of government employee," Cox said.

What the platform and Pence's record portend for federal employees apparently means little to the two police unions.

"We're law enforcement officers, so we put public safety first before anything and everything," said Chris Crane, president of the National ICE Council.

Despite organized labor's overwhelming support for Clinton, Crane said the Democrats "don't help unions." Morale at **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement is bad, according to Crane, who said that "the Obama administration has been horrible to our employees."

Views such as that make the two federal law enforcement unions oddities among the labor movement.

"Clearly," Cox said, "we believe that Hillary Clinton is the best choice for federal employees, with a demonstrated record of support for federal employees."

joe.davidson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS - As Europe reels from a historic rush of migrants, leaders are searching for new ways to reverse the flow by stepping up deportations.

The quest led to a deal with Afghanistan that envisions a whole new terminal at the Kabul airport to take deportees. It sent German Chancellor Angela Merkel last week on a whistle-stop tour of African capitals, where she promised an influx of euros in exchange for willingness to take back migrants. And it resulted in an agreement with Turkey that critics say means European nations are biting their tongues about Ankara's human rights abuses to halt the flow of **refugees** to Greece.

The efforts come amid a global backlash to **immigrant** flows, which have been increased by war and poverty. In the United States, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has built his fiery candidacy on an anti-Mexican, anti-Muslim message. In Britain, the government floated a plan to force businesses to declare how many noncitizens they employ following the June vote to sever ties with the European Union. And across Europe, populist anti-migrant parties are surging in the polls.

With the increased cross-border traffic, countries are struggling to deal with the people they have rejected for asylum. Until now, many people who are inside Europe illegally have been able to remain in a limbo that can stretch for years. But that old, lenient model - which has commonalities with that in the United States - is giving way to mounting anti-**immigrant** pressure.

The risks are significant. If Europe significantly steps up deportations to unstable nations, it could further destabilize those governments, setting off a reaction in which yet more people could flee for safer shores. But E.U. leaders are laying the groundwork to do it despite the fears.

"We had to find ways to stop illegal migration," Merkel said during a trip to Ethiopia, where she balanced criticisms of a fresh government crackdown on the opposition with bargaining over doing more to stop migrant flows to Europe. "That is why we said, 'We must speak to Turkey,' because many of these people came from there. We also have to speak with African countries to bring about legality."

European countries are increasingly making clear that their aid comes with strings attached. Merkel, who will face voters next year, is under pressure to show toughness against migrants after she threw open Germany's doors last year to a wave of **refugees** from the Syrian conflict. French President François Hollande is also gearing up for a campaign that is expected to turn on terrorism and migration issues.

The shift could blunt European soft power across the developing world; E.U. leaders had long prided themselves in being less transactional and more idealistic in dealing with development aid than their counterparts in the United States.

Among policymakers, "the idea is if we are spending all this money, why should we not have them also cooperate on deportations?" said Elizabeth Collett, director of Migration Policy Institute Europe, a Brussels-based think tank. "Over the last six to 12 months, the idea has gained a lot of ground."

In Africa, E.U. diplomats have been working to strike bargains with Mali, Senegal, Niger and Nigeria, which along with Ethiopia are major sources of economic migrants to Europe. Ethiopia recently declared a national state of emergency, spurring international concerns that the government is engaged in harsh retaliation against its opponents.

In Turkey, a springtime deal that all but halted migrant flows to Greece is imperiled following the government's harsh response to a July coup attempt. E.U. leaders pledged $6.7 billion in aid plus visa liberalization for Turkish citizens in exchange for Turkey's willingness to take back migrants who landed in Greece.

The agreements have sparked criticism from human rights advocates who say that the world's largest economic bloc is abdicating its responsibility to help other nations in need.

"The E.U. is pushing people back, keeping people out, instead of using its power to help legal returns and offer support," said Iverna McGowan, the head of Amnesty International's European Institutions Office.

But Afghanistan is the most unstable of the nations with which Europe has pursued migration-related deals, even as leaders have tried to paint a bright picture of the situation.

"It's a sense of partnership that provides us space for working together," E.U. foreign policy chief Federica Mogherini said last week of the E.U. deal with Afghanistan, which committed the war-torn country to accepting an unlimited number of deportees from Europe. The terms of the deal were announced the same day that the E.U. pledged Afghanistan $1.5 billion of development aid a year through 2020.

Mogherini said there was no connection, but Afghan officials said they had been pressured to make the deportation deal in exchange for financial support, and German Foreign Minister Frank-Walter Steinmeier said his nation's pledge of $470 million a year was indeed connected to migration issues.

"Both sides will explore the possibility to build a dedicated terminal for return in Kabul airport," according to the text of the agreement, which lays out tough terms for the Afghan government while offering few obvious benefits in return. Last year, 3,290 Afghans were deported from Europe, according to E.U. figures. Internal E.U. documents leaked in March suggest leaders would like to clear out as many as 80,000 more Afghans.

Defenders of the deals say that Europe's asylum system should be equipped to deal with these challenges. Under internationally practiced asylum law, people who would face danger at home should not be sent back. They would be able to make that case in court.

But there are obvious gaps in the system: In 2015, for example, 60 percent of Afghan asylum applicants in the E.U. were granted protection, according to the U.N.**refugee** agency. This year, that number has dropped to 35 percent, even though the situation in Afghanistan has deteriorated, suggesting that the courts are facing political pressures.

"If the bar is being raised and it's much harder for Afghans to get protection in Europe, that would be a concern," said William Spindler, a spokesman for the U.N. **refugee** agency. The agency has declined to issue a blanket warning that anybody leaving Afghanistan should automatically be considered a **refugee**. People who leave for economic reasons are not considered to have a right to stay in other countries.

On a more basic level, the Afghanistan deal has the potential to cast more Afghans back into a nation that is convulsing in a worsening conflict.

"It's not unlawful, but it makes no sense to do so if the E.U. wants to stabilize Afghanistan," said Gerry Simpson, a senior researcher on **refugees** at Human Rights Watch. "By doing this, they are fueling the flames for the situation on the ground and for more Afghan **refugees** to come."

michael.birnbaum@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IN AN editorial Tuesday, we described how Donald Trump is attacking both halves of a fundamental and long-standing equation of American democracy: that the loser recognizes the winner and that the winner lets the loser remain in the political arena. By claiming his loss could happen only as a result of cheating, and threatening to jail Hillary Clinton if he wins, Mr. Trump is rejecting a pillar of our republic.

But that is not the only pillar under assault: Mr.Trump's blanket indifference to truth is similarly an attack on democracy. All politicians fudge the truth at times. But their misrepresentations usually have at least some connection to reality. Without basic acceptance that facts and evidence matter, authentic debate becomes impossible, as does governance.

Put simply, both sides must agree that two plus two equals four before they can argue about budget numbers. Mr. Trump would not concur if he concluded it was in his interest for two plus two to equal five. He invents alternate realities and encourages his supporters to inhabit them.

For example: Thousands of New Jersey Muslims celebrated the Sept. 11, 2001, terrorist attacks. Or: Many people saw bombs all over the San Bernardino shooters' apartment and neglected to report them. Both claims are false; Mr. Trump nevertheless repeats them and uses them to justify unjustifiable policy, such as banning Muslim **immigration**.

His war on reality has escalated as his poll numbers have declined. After the recent firebombing of a North Carolina GOP building, he immediately and with no evidence accused Clinton allies of being responsible. If it emerges that the culprits had no connection to Ms. Clinton, he will no doubt invent one. His fables about illegal **immigrants** pouring across the border to cast illegal votes are equally reprehensible.

Over the weekend, Gov. Mike Pence (R-Ind.), Mr.Trump's running mate, tried to return the candidate to the territory of dishonest but tenuously connected to reality: Mr. Trump's insistence that the election is being "rigged" against him refers to biased media coverage, Mr. Pence maintained. Mr. Trump responded by doubling down on the ridiculous assertion that large-scale voter fraud is occurring.

On Wednesday, Mr. Trump and Ms. Clinton are scheduled to debate for the last time. We hope there will be discussion of real issues. But Mr. Trump's falsehood-per-minute tally in his last encounter with Ms. Clinton, from the size of the trade deficit to his position on the Iraq War, was astonishing. Given Mr.Trump's indifference to the truth, we are skeptical that the final meeting can be much of a debate either, in any conventional sense.

As with his threat to imprison his opponent if he defeats her, Mr. Trump's total dismissal of reality and wanton embrace of conspiracy theories should be disqualifying.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Whatever the outcome for the term-limits proposal on next month's Montgomery County ballot, neither supporters nor opponents are likely to be accused of trying to buy the contest.

The two political committees organized around Question B - Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits and No on B - raised a total of $12,000, according to state campaign finance reports filed late Friday.

A little more than $9,000 was collected by No on B, which opposes the charter amendment to limit the county executive and County Council members to three terms. About 70 percent of that amount is from incumbent council members, their family members or staff.

Council members Roger Berliner (D-Potomac-Bethesda), Marc Elrich (D-At Large), Sidney Katz (D-Gaithersburg-Rockville), George L. Leventhal (D-At Large), Nancy Navarro (D-Mid-County) and Hans Riemer (D-At Large) put up a total of $6,000 from their campaign treasuries. Casa de Maryland, the **immigrant**advocacy group, donated $1,000. Smaller contributions came from Leventhal's father, Carl Leventhal, and staff aides to Riemer, Elrich and Navarro.

The committee's major expense, $5,000, was the fee for attorney Jonathan Shurberg, who led an unsuccessful court fight to get the question removed from the ballot. The group had about $4,000 cash on hand through Oct. 9.

"This was not going to be a $50,000 or $100,000 campaign," said Tom Moore, chairman of No on B. He said most of the push will come on Election Day from other groups opposed to Question B, including the Montgomery County Democratic Central Committee and the Montgomery County Education Association, which are expected to recommend a no vote on sample ballots.

"I think we're in a pretty good position," Moore said.

Donations to Voters for Montgomery County Term Limits were minimal but suggest that an unusual coalition of real estate interests, neighborhood groups and Republican activists - all with various grievances against council incumbents - may be forming around the issue.

The committee reported donations of $2,890, nearly all of which was still on hand as of Oct. 9. The largest donation, $1,000, is from Charles K. Nulsen III, president of Washington Property, a Bethesda firm that owns apartment and office buildings throughout the county. Despite unhappiness in the real estate community with the council's decision to raise property and recordation taxes, Nulsen appears to be the sole developer presence in the report.

Smaller contributors included Paula Bienenfeld ($20), immediate past president of the Montgomery County Civic Federation, an umbrella group of neighborhood associations that recently endorsed Question B; Dwight Patel ($100), second vice chairman of the Montgomery County Republican Party; and Brad Botwin ($75), founder and director of Help Save Maryland, listed as a "nativist-extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center for its positions on **immigration**. Help Save Maryland has been critical of policies that have made the county more hospitable for illegal **immigrants**.

Another report is due Oct. 28.

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Oct. 2 front-page article "Hungary intends to stop migrants with 'hunters' near border wall":

Hungary's civilian border patrol - to call them "hunters" is an incorrect translation - provides additional protection on what has become one of Europe's most sensitive frontiers in the struggle against illegal **immigration** and human trafficking. The Western Balkan migration route, and specifically Hungary's southern border, became the busiest transit route for illegal **immigration** into the European Union in 2015, according to the European Union's border protection agency, Frontex. Yet Hungary is supposedly "instilling ... fear" and "mainstreaming racism."

The article failed to mention that last year, before the border fence was built, the Islamic State exploited the porous borders into the European Union.

If anyone would like a glimpse at a "world where the build-a-wall mentality to keep migrants out rules the land," the United States' southern border, which is reinforced in several places by a wall and other barriers, is a good place to start.

Zoltà¡n Kovà¡cs, Budapest

The writer is the spokesman for the Hungarian government.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump suggested without evidence Friday that the Obama administration was letting illegal **immigrants** into the country to vote - part of a series of unsubstantiated complaints by the GOP nominee that the election is "rigged" against him and that his backers should monitor polling locations in "certain areas."

Trump's allegations were a dramatic escalation of the usual partisan warfare over ballot access issues and came as Florida Gov. Rick Scott (R) denied a request by Hillary Clinton's campaign to extend voter registration because of Hurricane Matthew. The storm caused the extension of voter registration deadlines in South Carolina, while officials in Georgia have urged residents in storm-affected areas to register online instead of going to registration centers.

In Nevada, state Democrats also threatened Friday to file suit if the voter registration deadline is not extended beyond Saturday to comply with a federal law requiring deadlines to fall within the 30 days before an election.

Voting experts say they are increasingly troubled by Trump's tone amid fresh strain on voting systems nationwide, warning that his comments could undermine trust in an election system renowned as largely efficient and free of corruption.

"We've never seen anything like this coming from a presidential candidate," said Richard L. Hasen, a law and political science professor at the University of California at Irvine who is the co-author of a leading casebook on election law.

Hasen said Trump's comments about undocumented **immigrants** illegally voting is a continuation of his "irresponsible" pushing of the discredited idea that voter fraud is rampant and undetected, especially in poor and minority areas. Hasen said voter impersonation fraud is rare and that in his years of research, he has yet to find a single election where such cases compromised the results.

"It just doesn't happen in the United States," he said.

Daniel A. Smith, a political science professor at the University of Florida, added that Trump is "trying to undermine the election system, which is very decentralized, which has very good people."

"If anything, it's putting a damper on the ability to register and creating some paranoia that is unfounded," Smith added.

Trump's latest comments came during an event on border security held on the 25th floor of Trump Tower on Friday.

Art Del Cueto of the National Border Patrol Council, which represents U.S. Border Patrol agents and has endorsed Trump, claimed that agents were instructed not to deport undocumented **immigrants** with criminal records.

"Why?" Trump asked.

"So they can go ahead and vote before the election," Del Cueto responded.

Trump replied: "Big statement, fellas." Motioning to the small group of reporters, he added, "You're not going to write it. That's huge. But they're letting people pour into the country so they can go and vote."

The union later clarified that U.S. Citizenship and **Immigration** Services has authorized extra overtime for employees processing a higher volume of U.S. citizenship applications before Election Day. It also claimed in a statement to have "text messages from upper level managers" saying that criminal prosecution cases were being put on hold so that **immigration** judges could make rulings on citizenship applications.

The Obama administration has focused on targeting for deportation undocumented **immigrants** who have committed felonies. Marsha Catron, a spokeswoman for the Department of Homeland Security, said that "our borders are not open to illegal migration. We must and we will enforce the law in accordance with our enforcement priorities. Our actions reflect that commitment."

Only U.S. citizens can vote in federal elections. To apply for citizenship, an individual must be a legal resident for at least three to five years and meet other requirements.

Trump has repeatedly warned his supporters that he might lose the election because the system is "rigged" against him, and his campaign is recruiting election observers.

During rallies held in white suburbs of diverse cities, Trump has often urged his followers to go to neighborhoods other than their own and "watch" the voters there. Many voting rights activists have accused Trump of encouraging voter intimidation.

"You've been reading the same stories as I've been reading, so go to your place and vote, and then go pick some other place, and go sit there with your friends and make sure it's on the up and up," Trump said at a rally in the Detroit suburbs Sept. 30.

Because of Hurricane Matthew, South Carolina Gov. Nikki Haley (R) announced that the state plans to accept voter applications online and by email until Sunday and by mail until Tuesday.

The Clinton campaign began pressing Florida election officials to do the same.

"Our hope would be that a little more time will be given," Clinton campaign manager Robby Mook told reporters Thursday. "We certainly expect that the governor and local officials will make that possible."

But Scott declined, saying that "everybody has had a lot of time to register. On top of that, we've got lots of opportunities to vote: early voting, absentee voting and Election Day. So I don't intend to make any changes."

Scott's decision could keep thousands of Floridians from participating in the election, according to Smith, who is studying the voting habits of people who register to vote in the later months of an election season.

About 50,000 individuals successfully registered to vote in the final five days of Florida's registration period in 2012, according to state data analyzed by Smith. Thirty-nine percent of registrants were Democrats; 39 percent independents; and 22 percent Republicans. About 47 percent of the registrants were white; about 19 percent Hispanic; and 18 percent black.

Three out of four people who registered in the last five days of the registration period ended up voting, Smith said. "While they may have been last-minute in terms of registration, they certainly had the election on their mind."

Hasen said problems with registrations could lead to even bigger problems on Election Day and noted that after Superstorm Sandy in 2012, some jurisdictions in New Jersey relaxed the voting rules in ways that violated state law and might have even led to some fraudulent voting.

"Just imagine if any of this happens in Florida after Matthew," Hasen wrote in a column for Slate this week. "We already have Donald Trump telling voters that the election is rigged. Any attempt to try to accommodate, or fail to accommodate, voters will be second-guessed, challenged, and likely litigated."

ed.okeefe@washpost.com
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Sean Sullivan in New York contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NATIONALIST POPULISM often looks like a rising, even inexorable force in Europe, particularly in the formerly communist nations on the eastern edge of the European Union. Right-wing governments that base their appeal in part on Islamophobic attacks on **immigrants**, and liberal values more generally, are entrenched in Poland, Hungary and Slovakia. So it was striking, and heartening, to see a popular backlash in two of those countries this week that dealt the populists stinging rebuffs.

The first came in a referendum last Sunday in Hungary, where Prime Minister Viktor Orban appealed to voters to reject a European Union plan for distributing the **refugees** that have poured into Europe from the Middle East and Africa. The government spent tens of millions of dollars on a blatantly racist campaign describing all **refugees** as potential terrorists. Though the E.U. allocated only 1,294 **refugees** to Hungary, a country of about 10 million, Mr. Orban insisted they could destroy the country's "Christian" identity.

Opposition parties urged voters to skip the vote, or cast invalid ballots, to prevent the referendum from reaching the 50 percent turnout needed for legal validity. That is what happened: Only 43 percent of voters went to the polls, and 6 percent of those turned in spoiled voting sheets. The referendum, on which Mr. Orban was reported to have spent more than on any advertising campaign in Hungarian history, flopped. Though the prime minister vowed to press on anyway with new anti-migrant laws or a constitutional amendment, the anti-**immigrant** statement he hoped to send to the E.U. instead became a vote of no confidence in his toxic xenophobia.

Something similar happened in Poland, where legislators of the ruling right-wing Law and Justice Party were pushing a measure that would have turned what is already one of the West's most restrictive abortion laws into a near-absolute ban. The bill, which won initial approval last month, would have allowed abortions only when the life of the mother was directly threatened; doctors and women who carried out abortions in other circumstances would have faced prison terms of up to five years.

On Monday, tens of thousands of women and men dressed in black turned out in Polish cities to protest the measure. Central Warsaw was paralyzed. Three days later, the ruling party abruptly reversed itself, voting down the measure and withdrawing another that would have severely restricted access to in vitro fertilization. It was the first significant political retreat by Law and Justice, which has refused to give up an attempt to take control of the country's Constitutional Tribunal and curtail judicial checks on its power despite mass domestic protests and sharp criticism from the European Union.

Mr. Orban and his Polish counterpart, Jaroslaw Kaczynski, are far from vanquished; they still hold strong parliamentary majorities and use state-run television networks to bombard citizens with propaganda. Mr. Orban has endorsed Donald Trump for the U.S. presidency; if the American populist wins, his counterparts in Europe will get a big boost. However, this week's results showed that, even where the populists are now strongest, their extremist ideas are generating powerful resistance. In Europe as in the United States, liberalism still has its defenders.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**During the first debate with her Democratic challenger Thursday, Rep. Barbara Comstock (R-Va.) called herself an independent advocate for Northern Virginia in the Republican-controlled House, and never once uttered the name Donald Trump.

But Democrat LuAnn Bennett could not stop talking about Trump, hoping the GOP presidential nominee will sink down-ballot Republicans such as Comstock and turn the 10th Congressional District seat blue for the first time in a generation.

Bennett, 63, worked Trump into her answers on the economy, climate change and **immigration** - a strategy that sometimes elicited chuckles from the crowd at the debate, which was hosted by the Loudoun County Chamber of Commerce.

Comstock, 57, who has neither endorsed nor repudiated Trump, prioritized transportation funding, defense spending and tax cuts, and she seized on former president Bill Clinton's recent critique of the Affordable Care Act as "the craziest thing in the world" before he walked it back.

The 10th District includes all of Loudoun County as well as Manassas and Manassas Park and parts of Fairfax and Prince William counties. In recent years, the district has seen an influx of professionals - many of them women and minorities - who polls show are cool to Trump's candidacy. Both parties are pouring millions of advertising dollars into the district, which they consider among the most competitive this year.

In seeking a second term, Comstock has focused on constituent services and issues that she says are important to Northern Virginia, while Bennett has tried to paint the congresswoman as out of step with the district's moderate voters on national concerns.

On **immigration**, Comstock said she favors policies for which consensus already exists, such as visas for highly skilled workers, as opposed to wading into the more contentious effort to pass comprehensive reform.

"Some people want to have an issue instead of a solution. Let's get what we can, come together and compromise on today," she said.

In response, Bennett asked why the visa issue is unsettled if there is agreement and said that neither Comstock nor Trump can solve the problem.

"Donald Trump wants to build a wall and then convince you someone else is going to pay for it," she said.

Bennett again linked Comstock to Trump on the environment, saying Republicans will not acknowledge that climate change is real.

Comstock said that "Earth is warming" but that the Obama administration's Clean Power Plan, the subject of federal litigation, would hurt the economy, especially local data centers that rely on plentiful, cheap energy.

On transportation - a key issue in the congested Washington suburbs - Bennett noted that as a state delegate Comstock voted against then-Gov. Robert F. McDonnell's tax-laden 2013 transportation bill, which provided funding to expand Metro's Silver line.

"It was a vote taken because of ideological extremism," Bennett said. "She had signed Grover Norquist's no-tax pledge, and, because of that, it forced her to take a bad vote."

Comstock countered that she has gone to bat for the region even when it put her at odds with her caucus, and she took credit for restoring $75 million in Metro funding.

"When my own Republican Party tried to take it out, I worked with my Democratic colleagues to do that," she said.

Later in the debate, Comstock noted that she broke with House Republicans to prevent sequestration cuts from taking effect. The across-the-board federal budget cuts have been particularly harmful to Virginia's military-dependent economy, data show.

And she said she joined Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.), the vice-presidential nominee, and Gov. Terry McAuliffe (D) in fighting attempts to tinker with decades-old rules that limit flights at Reagan National Airport while benefiting Dulles International Airport.

On health care, Comstock said she agreed with Clinton's criticism of the Affordable Care Act and said the landmark law should be repealed and replaced.

Bennett said ACA although imperfect, made health care "more affordable" - drawing laughter from the crowd - and said Virginia should expand Medicaid, an action that the GOP-controlled General Assembly has blocked.

Comstock responded: "Affordable clearly it is not. That's exactly what Bill Clinton was talking about."

The congresswoman also targeted one of the main themes of Bennett's campaign - pay equity for women - saying her rival pays female employees of her real estate development firm and campaign less than men.

"I have women running my office and campaign," Comstock said. "I pay women on average more than men. LuAnn does not."

Asked after the debate about Comstock's claim, a Bennett spokesman said the 10th Congressional District has the highest pay disparity in the state.

"This is nothing more than an attempt by Barbara Comstock to paper over how she repeatedly voted against equal pay laws and believes that those of us fighting for equal pay are part of a 'left wing agenda,'" spokesman Robert Howard said in a statement.

Comstock twice voted against consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would have made it illegal for employers to retaliate against a worker who discloses their pay as part of an inquiry.

Elizabeth H. Mitchell, a former college administrator, said she supports Bennett - and Hillary Clinton for president - and rejected Comstock's argument that a region that is otherwise represented by Democrats needs an advocate from the party in power.

"I don't think saying, 'The House isn't going to turn over, therefore vote with the majority' is a reason to vote for a candidate," she said.

Scott K. York, a consultant and former chairman of the Loudoun County Board of Supervisors, said he expects voters who can't support Trump will still vote for Comstock based on her record.

"If they feel that Congresswoman Comstock - as I believe she has - has done a wonderful job, they're going to pull the lever for her," he said.

The next debate is Oct. 19 in Fairfax County.

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The original Tibetan village here was bulldozed five years ago. What has replaced it is Lulang Folk Village, a postcard-ready replica, a Disney-esque version of an age-old settlement in the high forest.

Grand, ornate buildings in Tibetan style, built by Chinese real estate developers but still vacant, are here, and an empty primary school, and a brand-new luxury hotel offering rooms for $150 to $1,000 a night. Soon Chinese restaurant owners will move in, and Chinese tour groups will follow.

"Lulang is paradise on earth, located on the roof of the world," said community volunteer He Yilin. This is Tibet sanitized for tourists from the rest of China, complete with Mandarin-speaking guides, Chinese food and a whitewashed view of Chinese rule.

While foreign tourists still face restrictions on travel to Tibet, domestic tourists are arriving in extraordinary numbers. The government is investing heavily and eagerly promoting tourism as a pillar of the economy.

"Tourism is the new engine for development in Tibet," Penpa Tashi, vice chairman of the Tibet Autonomous Region, told reporters shortly before the glitzy opening ceremony of the Third China Tibet Tourism and Culture Expo in the capital city, Lhasa, this September.

The aim, he said, is to create the tourism infrastructure and services that will turn Tibet into a "world-class tourism destination."

Yet critics say domestic tourism is being used in another way, as part of a grand economic and strategic plan to bind Tibet ever more tightly into China's embrace - in the process trivializing its culture, marginalizing its people and polluting its pristine environment.

"It is very similar to how the United States treated its developing West 100 years ago," said P. Christiaan Klieger, a cultural anthropologist, historian and author. "They are commodifying the native people and bringing them out as an ethnic display for the consumption of people back east."

Elliot Sperling, an Indiana University professor, says China has a narrow, materialist view of development as the solution to all Tibet's problems, and warned that tourism risks turning parts of Tibet into a "Lama Disneyland" where locals are outnumbered by Han Chinese.

Chinese troops moved into Tibet in 1951, two years after the Communist Party rose to power in Beijing. Many Tibetans, who say their land was largely independent from China, still fiercely resent that takeover and complain of religious, cultural and linguistic repression, as well as economic and social discrimination. Others, including Tibet's spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, have fled into exile abroad.

These days, large parts of Lhasa feel increasingly like any modern Chinese city, with hundreds of old buildings knocked down to make way for shopping malls and apartment houses for **immigrants**, drawn from China's ethnic Han majority.

Now Tibetans have to adjust to a new flood of arrivals, after China opened a train route across the high-altitude Tibetan plateau, from Xining to Lhasa, in 2006.

Chinese tourism statistics on Tibet are opaque and confusing, but one count suggests that around 8 million tourists will come this year. That's a roughly 12-fold rise since the first train arrived. Officials predict a further rise, of 50 percent, by 2020.

That will dwarf the permanent population of just over 3 million people, and attract even more **immigrants** from elsewhere in China to build infrastructure and support tourism, experts say.

The government has started to build another major train route, from the major western city of Chengdu to Lhasa, an ambitious project traversing 1,000 miles across some of the world's most mountainous terrain.

Multinational companies are arriving fast, too: Lhasa already boasts an imposing Intercontinental Hotel, as well as a Sheraton, a St. Regis and a Shangri-La. Officials predict 10 more luxury hotels there by 2020.

Foreign visitors are less welcome: They have to obtain special permits and visit on organized tours, and currently make up just over 1 percent of arrivals.

Penpa Tashi said the central government had ordered that Tibet should be "open to the world," and promised that restrictions on foreign visitors would be eased as soon as the region had upgraded its tourist infrastructure.

What he didn't say: Backpackers have been blamed by China for supporting the cause of Tibetan nationalism, and for informing the world about Tibetan uprisings in the late 1980s. Foreign journalists are completely barred, except on rare government tours.

The real reason for the restrictions, says the Tibetan government-in-exile in the Indian town of Dharamsala, is "to hide the actual reality in Tibet."

By contrast, domestic visitors are a much safer bet.

Some are inspired by a sense of patriotic duty, others by a renewed interest in Buddhism or increasingly by a growing fascination with an "exotic" people living in a timeless "Shangri-La."

"I am not Buddhist, but we have Buddha in our heart," said Zhu Chunhua, a young Chinese woman from the eastern province of Jiangsu, photographing a friend after turning prayer wheels outside a small temple in Lhasa. "The local people are very simple and pure."

Already, Tibetan Buddhism's holiest site, the Jokhang Temple in Lhasa, is bursting at the seams with Han tourists, who flock through its darkened shrine in droves before emerging onto the roof and into the light in a flurry of selfies. In the process, some of the temple's magic seems to dissipate.

Some are respectful of what they are seeing, but Tibetans on social media complain of cameras thrust in pilgrims' faces and of sacred prayer flags trampled underfoot.

At the landmark Potala Palace, a tourist stood beside a sign banning photographs, taking a photo, while a Tibetan tour guide expressed exasperation at how little Han tourists knew or understood.

"Lhasa has been turned from a holy place of pilgrimage into a tourist site," said Tibetan writer Woeser, who last visited the city three years ago. Most tourist shops in the Tibetan old town are owned by Han Chinese, she said, and many supposedly Tibetan artifacts are manufactured in other parts of China.

So is Tibetan culture being swamped?

Wang Songping, deputy director of the Tibet Tourism Development Commission, says tourism has both positive and negative effects everywhere in the world. But the influx of money will encourage people to protect "their intangible cultural heritage," he argues, and help transform the economy in places like Lulang "from cutting down trees to watching trees."

Tourism accounts for a fifth of the local economy and provides 320,000 jobs in Tibet, Wang said, with some 97,000 herders and farmers now involved in the industry. Hundreds of residents have been given government grants to convert their houses for tourist homestays.

Some Tibetans do benefit from tourism, and there is a growing number of small tour agencies offering "responsible," eco-friendly travel for foreigners and better-educated domestic tourists.

But mostly, critics say, Tibetans are neither consulted nor empowered as their land is transformed. The top jobs and most of the profits are being cornered by companies and people from elsewhere in China - fueling the kind of inequality and resentment that contributed to riots in Tibet in 2008.

One young man, who looked over his shoulder to check he was not being watched before speaking to a small group of reporters in Lhasa, said tourism was good for the economy - but then complained that Han Chinese visitors did not always respect sacred mountains and holy sites. "Many tourists move rocks and run anywhere inside temples," he said. "It's not good."

Lulang Folk Village sits at 12,000 feet above sea level in what officials have designated the "Switzerland of the East," a region of forested mountains in southeastern Tibet near the Indian border.

It has been built by some of China's biggest real estate companies, with help from the southern provincial government of Guangdong, ostensibly as part of efforts to spread the nation's wealth to its poorer hinterlands.

Yet Han Chinese construction workers have done most of the building. Local Tibetans, one worker claimed, simply do not have the skills.

Tibetans who lost their homes in the original village of Zhaxigang will be given new accommodation here, officials said, but their opportunities to make money may be limited. Restaurants in a nearby site are overwhelmingly run by Han Chinese.

"Some shops will be run by people from inland, but some will be run by local people," said Tu Hang, a Foreign Ministry official from Nyingchi prefecture, told reporters on a guided tour, adding, with unconscious condescension about Tibetans: "They will have shops to sell small things like biscuits and sweet tea."

But those modest opportunities may be scant consolation for many Tibetans, who worry that their land is drowning in the influx from the east.

There are two problems with the Han Chinese, one Tibetan said. "The first one is they're always brainwashing us. Always," he said. "And the second problem is they just keep coming here, more and more."

simon.denyer@washpost.com

Congcong Zhang, Gu Jinglu and Jin Xin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump and his allies signaled Thursday that he is ready to move past the controversies that have dominated the 10 days since the first presidential debate and that he will try to stay focused on policy, not attacks, at the second debate on Sunday.

The Republican presidential nominee appeared more controlled on the campaign trail on Wednesday and Thursday than he was last week, sticking with scripted speeches, mostly avoiding interviews and sending tweets that appeared to have been closely edited, if not entirely composed, by his staff. He denounced interruptions during debates, announced plans to campaign with House Speaker Paul D. Ryan in Wisconsin on Saturday and said he would avoid mentioning Bill Clinton's affairs during Sunday's town hall with Hillary Clinton in St. Louis.

In the moments that Trump went off-script, stumbles returned. At a rally in Reno, Nev., on Wednesday night, Trump bragged about being able to properly pronounce the state's name and proceeded to mispronounce it. In an interview with a local television station, he seemed unfamiliar with a pivotal state issue - the storage of nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain - and said that if China and the United States became engaged in a trade war that hurt Trump's hotel in Las Vegas and other tourism businesses, he would "cut off relationships with China."

Clinton's campaign manager, Robby Mook, told reporters Thursday that he expects Trump to be "much better prepared" on Sunday and not use "the kind of personal and harsh attacks that he has been threatening."

"We expect a more focused, more prepared Trump at this debate," Mook said. "What we're enthusiastic about is that this will be a town hall, that the candidates will be taking questions from voters. ... And so the real question for us is: Will Donald Trump come with any specific plans? Will he have a command of the issues such that he can really address people's questions and really explain to them how he will in fact make any difference."

Trump was off the campaign trail for most of Thursday, but he returned to stoke existing feuds and spark new ones at what was billed by his campaign as a town hall event in New Hampshire on Thursday evening. The event was staged before a friendly audience.

He attacked Clinton, alleging with no evidence that when she says she is preparing for debates she is actually "resting."

Trump also denied that he was using the event to prepare for Sunday night's debate.

Trump's first debate performance Sept. 26 was widely viewed as a damaging flop, and even many of his supporters have said they hope he is better prepared for the St. Louis town hall. His running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, provided a stark contrast at the vice-presidential debate Tuesday night, where many declared him the clear winner.

"I watched - he won. He won on the issues," Trump said of Pence at a campaign stop in Las Vegas on Wednesday, an apparent hint on where his own focus might be Sunday. "He won on - somebody said he won on style. The style doesn't matter. The issues, the policy matters."

Trump also told the New York Post's Page Six that he does not plan to bring up Bill Clinton's sexual history during the debate, something he had threatened to do if Hillary Clinton continues to bring up the disparaging comments he has made about women over the years.

"I want to win this election on my policies for the future, not Bill Clinton's past," Trump said in an email to the gossip column. "Jobs, trade, ending illegal **immigration**, veteran care and strengthening our military is what I really want to be talking about."

In another move typical for an ordinary campaign but not for his, Trump issued a somber statement Thursday urging those in the path of Hurricane Matthew to follow local evacuation orders because "nothing is more important than the safety of your family." He left it to the Republican National Committee to attack Hillary Clinton's campaign for running commercials on the Weather Channel during the storm's buildup.

Meanwhile, Trump's oldest daughter, Ivanka, campaigned for her father in southwest Ohio on Thursday, touring a manufacturing plant in the steel-mill town of Middletown.

Trump avoided national television interviews this week, allowing Pence to appear instead on Fox News on Wednesday night and several morning talk shows on Thursday. Pence insisted Trump has abandoned several of his most controversial positions.

During an interview Thursday on CNN's "New Day," for example, anchor Chris Cuomo asked Pence about two Trump positions that Pence had previously condemned: A temporary ban on Muslims entering the United States and Trump's assertion that an Indiana-born judge whose parents were from Mexico couldn't fairly rule in a federal fraud case involving Trump University.

"You condemned those comments," Cuomo said. "Why do you not condemn them now?"

"Well," Pence said, "because it's not Donald Trump's position now."

On MSNBC's "Morning Joe" the same morning, host Joe Scarborough asked Pence point-blank if the campaign still wants a "ban on all Muslims," and Pence replied: "Of course not."

Pence is one of numerous Trump surrogates to repeatedly say Trump no longer wants a religion-based ban and would instead focus on halting **immigration** from unidentified countries compromised by terrorism, many of which have large Muslim populations.

But Trump has yet to formally drop his call for a temporary ban on allowing most foreign Muslims into the United States, and his campaign website still contains a "statement on preventing Muslim **immigration**" that calls for "a total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States until our country's representatives can figure out what is going on."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Leaders of Donald Trump's transition team are slated to meet Friday with technology lobbyists to seek their input on policy, capping a string of sessions with the Washington establishment the Republican presidential nominee often rails against.

Lobbyists and representatives for the Consumer Technology Association, Uber, the Motion Picture Association of America and other tech trade groups were invited to a Friday morning meeting at the law firm BakerHostetler in Washington. New Jersey Gov. Chris Christie, chairman of the Trump transition team, is expected to attend.

It is the third policy-oriented meeting initiated in the last month by the Trump transition team to solicit input from industry lobbyists. The previous two focused on the financial services and energy sectors, according to people with knowledge of the meetings.

Many GOP lobbyists are planning to attend the meeting despite their personal distaste for Trump and plans not to vote for him - showing K Street is begrudgingly accepting the possibility of working with a Trump White House, a notion they scoffed at not long ago.

"It's the first time I'm not voting for a Republican," said one GOP lobbyist who was invited to a transition meeting but did not want to speak on the record for fear of **alienating** Trump's team. "But at the same time, I'm a Republican lobbyist. It's my job. I still have a job to do, to do due diligence and get to know these people."

Republican lobbyists expressed what could be termed as a resigned sense of duty in describing why they agreed to meet with the GOP presidential nominee's transition team. If Trump wins the White House, he will need to expand his small circle of advisers to more experienced hands who could help him implement his agenda in Washington.

Republicans are much less excited, however, about meeting with Trump's team than Democratic lobbyists seem to be about contact with former interior secretary Ken Salazar, chairman of the Hillary Clinton transition.

"You have Democrats clamoring to meet with Salazar," said another Republican lobbyist, who also did not want to speak on the record. "On the Republican side, it's like, 'I know I should, but should I really?' We have to come through these larger crisis-of-conscience decisions."

If Trump is serious about making policy changes, meeting with lobbyists is part of learning how the government operates, said GOP lobbyist Rick Hohlt, who's been involved in every Republican transition since 1980.

A number of lobbyists are involved in the Trump campaign and transition already. Mike Catanzaro, a partner at the lobby firm CGCN, is leading the transition's energy policy team. Christine Ciccone, a lobbyist who was a top official for Jeb Bush's 2016 campaign, was brought on by the Trump transition team in recent weeks, as was Eric Ueland, a top staffer for the Senate Budget Committee and former vice president of the lobby firm Duberstein Group.

Some GOP lobbyists are skeptical about how seriously their input on substantive policy issues will be considered by the unconventional candidate, noting that invites also included language soliciting donations of $5,000. Christie has said his goal is to raise $2 million for the transition, and is said to be about halfway there, CNN reported.

Trump has been vague on many policy issues, with his most high-profile proposal being building a wall to prevent undocumented **immigration** from Mexico.

Still, many Republican lobbyists are maintaining communications with the transition staff out of a sense of obligation to their party and their job - clients are pressing their hired guns to not just advocate for them on Capitol Hill, but also with the transition staff in case Trump wins.

"None of us particularly like [Trump], but this is a creature we may have to deal with," said one of the GOP lobbyists who was asked to attend a transition meeting.

The tech meeting, first reported in Politico, is expected to be well-attended despite many tech lobbyists' reservations about Trump. It "will be an inside look at the work underway on planning for the transition," according to an invite obtained by The Washington Post.

A spokeswoman for the Trump campaign did not return a request for comment.

In September, Christie met with former Minnesota governor Tim Pawlenty, president and chief executive of the Financial Services Roundtable, and Dean Sackett of the Investment Company Institute, the trade group that represents investment firms. The transition team also met with about 50 energy company representatives and lobbyists, according to a person with knowledge of the meeting. The meetings were held at BGR Group, the lobby firm founded by Ed Rogers and Haley Barbour.

catherine.ho@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The United Nations Security Council on Wednesday endorsed Portugal's António Guterres, a former prime minister and former head of the U.N. **refugee** agency, to be the world body's next secretary general.

The full 193-member General Assembly is scheduled to vote Thursday on the Security Council's recommendation that Guterres succeed South Korean Ban Ki-moon when he steps down at the end of the year after two five-year terms. Russia's U.N. Ambassador Vitaly Churkin, who is the council president for the month of October, said he hoped Guterres would win by acclamation.

All five permanent members of the Security Council with veto powers, including the United States, were among the 13 members voting to "encourage" Guterres - in effect a vote of support. There were two "no opinion" votes, and no nation voted to "discourage" him.

The victory of Guterres, once head of Portugal's center-left Socialist Party, came after five straw polls taken this year among General Assembly members. Guterres - who is fluent in English, French, Spanish and Portuguese and is often described as a consummate diplomat - came out on top every time.

His selection was still something of a surprise. Many observers expected Russia, which had stated its preference for an Eastern European, to veto the selection of a new secretary general from a NATO country. There also had been pressure to choose a woman.

The consensus around Guterres was widely applauded by groups that praised his political skills and his knowledge of one of world's most intractable hot spots, Syria. Guterres was the U.N. high commissioner for **refugees** for a decade until last year. He headed the agency when Syrian **refugees** began flooding across the Middle East and Europe to escape the war that still rages.

"Syria will be his number one challenge," said Michael Doyle, a former U.N. assistant secretary general under Kofi Annan and director of Columbia University's Global Policy Initiative. "This will be a job that won't be short of things to be done. He is walking into the storm. But he's a person who likes challenges."

In the past, selecting a new secretary general was done in private, with a lot of backroom brokering. This year, in a quest for transparency, more than a dozen candidates put their names forward, submitted résumés and publicly answered questions about what they would do in the job.

Guterres repeatedly promised to continue pressing the case of the oppressed.

Yvonne Terlingen, a steering member of 1 for 7 Billion, a campaign urging a better process for choosing a U.N. leader, said Guterres came to the interviews and public debates with a plan for achieving gender parity in choosing his leadership team.

"He said it would be a priority for him when he comes to office," she said. "He cited his own record as chief of the UNHCR, where he made senior appointments of women. There is a lot of talk now from people who expect his deputy will be a woman. That would be a sign of his commitment in achieving gender parity."

The more-open process may made it more awkward for Russia to reject Guterres, even though Churkin said his country thought it was Eastern Europe's turn to provide a U.N. head, preferably a woman.

"Russia decided it could live with Guterres," said Martin Edwards, a professor of international relations at Seton Hall University. "Arguably, they thought he's going to still try to be a mediator, not come across and say whatever [U.S. Secretary of State] John Kerry says."

carol.morello@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A friend of mine whose family emigrated from Argentina to the United States when he was a kid recently told me he could never have built his small business back home, because he wasn't born to the right class. No one in the United States cares about his background, he said. They cared about what he could do.

My friend isn't rich, but he is comfortable, with a full-time job and a robust furniture resale business. It's a tale worth telling as Forbes magazine on Tuesday released its annual list of the 400 richest Americans, a record 42 of whom are **immigrants**, from 21 countries.

The 42 have a combined net worth of nearly $250 billion, Forbes reports, and include New York City grocery mogul John Catsimatidis ($3.3 billion, Greece), Tesla founder Elon Musk ($11.6 billion, South Africa) and WhatsApp co-founder Jan Koum ($8.8 billion, Ukraine).

"There is no other country on the planet where you or your parents can show up and with a lot of hard work create huge wealth within one generation," said businessman Raul Fernandez, who was born in Washington to **immigrant** parents from Cuba and Ecuador.

Six of the 42 **immigrants** on the Forbes list are from Israel, five are from India, and four each are from Hungary and Taiwan. Moscow native and Google co-founder Sergey Brin, whose parents brought him to the United States when he was 6, leads the **immigrant** list with an estimated net worth of $37.5 billion.

Brin's "mathematician parents faced anti-Semitism in their homeland," Forbes staffer Jennifer Wang writes. "They were reportedly forced to sit in separate rooms during university entrance exams, and were limited in their choice of careers."

All but two of the Forbes 42 are self-made, and a third are richer than real estate baron Donald Trump, who has made **immigration** a central theme of his candidacy. The Donald fell 35 spots to No. 156. The billionaire still clocks in with a fortune of $3.7 billion, down $800 million from 2015.

Twenty-six people fell off the list, including Elizabeth Holmes, whose wealth has been lowered by Forbes to zero after the troubles of her medical testing company, Theranos. Another dropout is hedge fund manager Bill Ackman, who was burned by his investment in Valeant Pharmaceuticals.

According to a report on **immigration** and entrepreneurship by the Kauffman Foundation, there is "little debate about the economic contributions of **immigrant**entrepreneurs." The Kauffman report said that "**immigrants** are twice as likely to become entrepreneurs as native-born Americans."

"The risk-taking that defines an **immigrant**'s experience in starting anew in a new country often continues to benefit **immigrant** entrepreneurs as they channel a healthy appetite for risk in a way that leads to new business ideas," the report said.

Microsoft founder Bill Gates again leads the 400 - his 23rd consecutive year - with an estimated net worth of $81 billion. Although he still owns 13 percent of Microsoft, Gates has diversified his fortune into a wide range of investments, from Deere & Co. to Canadian National Railway.

The rocket-like rise of Amazon.com stock propelled founder and CEO (and Washington Post owner) Jeff Bezos past famed investor Warren Buffett (former Washington Post part owner) to the No. 2 spot on the Forbes list. Bezos's net worth is estimated at $67 billion. Buffett is now in third.

America's wealthiest are doing well, thank you. The era of low interest rates has boosted the stock market and the booming technology industry along with it. Facebook founder and CEO Mark Zuckerberg is worth $55.5 billion, surpassing Oracle founder Larry Ellison, who fell to No. 5 at $49.3 billion.

The youngest member of the Forbes 400 is Snapchat founder Evan Spiegel, who is 26 years old and already worth $2.1 billion. (The messaging-app company renamed itself Snap Inc. in late September.) The oldest is David Rockefeller Sr., 101, the only living grandchild of Standard Oil founder John D. Rockefeller.

The 400 have a combined net worth of $2.4 trillion and an average net worth of $6 billion. Those are the highest for both categories since Forbes started tracking America's richest people in 1982.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Now that the GOP is the Party of Trump, could Democrats become the party of . . . Reagan?

That's a stretch. But Democrats are making a bid for the title.

At Tuesday night's vice-presidential debate, the 40th president was name-checked twice - both times by the Democrat, Tim Kaine.

"Our plan is like Ronald Reagan's plan from 1986," Kaine said on **immigration**.

The Republican, Mike Pence, countered that "Ronald Reagan said a nation without borders is not a nation."

Kaine later said Reagan believed nuclear proliferation could mean "some fool or maniac could trigger a catastrophic event" and said Trump is exactly the type "Reagan warned us about."

Pence responded that "Reagan also said nuclear war should never be fought, because it can never be won."

Reagan did say that, but this only highlights his difference with Trump. Former GOP congressman Joe Scarborough, now an MSNBC host, reported in August that unnamed sources told him Trump had thrice asked his national security experts about nuclear weapons: "Why can't we use them?"

Both Trump and Pence, like most Republicans, routinely claim inspiration from Reagan. Pence even affects the Gipper's nod and tilt of the head, and on Tuesday he drew groans in the media filing center when he recycled one of Reagan's best lines - "There you go again" - when he scolded Kaine on Social Security.

Last month at the Reagan Library, Pence gave a full speech likening Trump to Reagan, saying they share "honesty and bluntness," and "toughness."

But the Reaganization of Trump suffered a serious blow on Monday when Reagan's son, the conservative commentator Michael Reagan, revoked his earlier endorsement of Trump in a series of tweets after Trump suggested in a speech, without basis, that Hillary Clinton was unfaithful to her husband.

"No way do I or would my father support this garbage," he wrote, saying Nancy Reagan would have voted for Clinton and that she was "appalled" before her death when people likened Trump to her husband. "Not the Party of Reagan," he tweeted, and, "If this is what the Republican Party wants leave us Reagans out."

The resounding rejection of Trump by one who has some authority to speak for the late president brought to mind the scene in "Annie Hall" when a loudmouth in a movie line pontificates about media theorist Marshall McLuhan - until the Woody Allen character brings over McLuhan himself, who says, "You know nothing of my work."

Ronald Reagan famously said that "I did not leave the Democratic Party - the Democratic Party left me." Though it's impossible to know how Reagan's views might have evolved, Republicans such as former GOP chairman Michael Steele speculate that Reagan couldn't win a Republican primary today. His record on **immigration**, taxes, the debt, gun control and abortion would disqualify him.

The most obvious difference may be style: Reagan was sunny and gentlemanly; Trump is gloomy and crude.

Trump talks of the American military as a "disaster," in "shambles," with generals reduced to "rubble." Reagan blamed civilian leaders but hailed the generals and their troops as "guardians of freedom, protectors of our heritage ... keepers of the peace."

Trump calls the Iraq War a "disaster" and a "huge mistake" with "absolutely nothing" to show for thousands of American lives lost. He suggested some U.S. troops stole cash in Iraq. Reagan, by contrast, hailed those who fought in another failed war, the "noble cause" of Vietnam, and said we shouldn't "dishonor the memory of 50,000 young Americans who died."

On **immigration**, Trump talks of building a wall, banning Muslims and Syrian **refugees** from entering the country and deporting all 11 million illegal **immigrants**. Reagan supported amnesty for illegal **immigrants** who put down roots in America, and he memorably called America home "for all the pilgrims from all the lost places who are hurtling through the darkness."

Reagan proudly updated Gen. George Patton's phrase that wars are "won by men" to "men and women." Trump, who declared that Patton is "spinning in his grave" because of the situation in the Middle East, derided the "geniuses" who "put men and women together" in the armed forces.

And Reagan, of course, spoke with great moral force about the "evil empire" of the Soviet Union and the "barbarism born of a society which wantonly disregards individual rights ... and seeks constantly to expand and dominate other nations."

Now, a Russian dictator, Vladimir Putin, is returning to these Soviet-era abuses, and Trump praises him as a strong leader he can work with, while disputing charges that Putin has killed journalists and meddled in the U.S. election.

Does Trump's abandonment of Republican internationalism and moral leadership give Democrats the Reagan mantle? Not necessarily. But as long as it's Trump's GOP, the mantle is for rent.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Robert E. Rubin, co-chair of the Council on Foreign Relations, was U.S. treasury secretary from 1995 to 1999.

The progress our economy has made since the financial crisis is real. So, too, is the sense that our country is adrift. Faith in institutions is eroding. Income inequality, job insecurity and sluggish wage growth - even with 2015's improved performance - are fraying our social fabric. Technological development and, to a lesser extent, globalization contribute to productivity and growth but also put pressure on wages and jobs. The poverty rate is unconscionably high. Many feel that the American promise of hard work leading to a better life is out of reach.

The United States, however, still holds the world's best long-run hand. The question is how we play our cards. We need a policy regime that effectively promotes growth, widespread income gains and greater economic security in the context of an economy undergoing transformation. These three objectives are interdependent and mutually reinforcing and, taken together, constitute one overarching goal: inclusive growth, which could, in turn, restore a sense of common purpose, confidence in our future and much-needed social cohesion.

An inclusive growth agenda would address three broad categories of challenges: first, public investment; second, structural reform and innovation; and, finally, our intermediate and longer-term fiscal outlook.

Public investment should begin with overdue action on infrastructure, including addressing deferred maintenance estimated at more than a trillion dollars. Repairing and expanding bridges, railways, airports and ports would create jobs immediately, tighten labor markets to improve wages and increase the productivity and capacity of our economy for years to come. Economic success also requires increased funding for basic and applied research, broadened access to high-speed Internet and other targeted investments in our future.

Next, we need structural reform in many critical areas, often in conjunction with public investment. Twenty percent of our children live in poverty - that's a moral disgrace and highly counterproductive economically. Breaking the intergenerational cycle of poverty through early family intervention, transitional public employment to provide jobs and workforce readiness, and other policy interventions could significantly reduce social costs and increase long-run productivity.

Likewise, our nation's criminal-justice policies fail us morally and harm us economically. Alternatives to incarceration for many nonviolent crimes, shorter sentences, better rehabilitation in prison and vastly improved re-entry programs could produce great direct cost savings, including from reduced recidivism, and substantial productivity gains from better equipping released prisoners for the workforce.

Reform should also include **immigration** measures that provide a fair path to citizenship and recognize the immense contribution of both high- and low-skilled **immigrants**. We also need to level the playing field for workers to opt for collective bargaining; apply a sensible balance of costs and benefits to regulation; address climate change; improve K-12 education; and develop innovative measures to address ongoing wage and job pressure from transformative technological development. Those measures might include public employment, free or low-cost lifelong learning, effective retraining and a substantially expanded earned-income tax credit.

Finally, to achieve inclusive growth, we must address our unsound and economically harmful intermediate and longer-term projected fiscal conditions. Our current trajectory is likely to increasingly undermine business confidence, both by creating uncertainty about future policy and by exacerbating concerns about Washington's ability to govern. And it diminishes our resilience in the face of another economic or geopolitical crisis; reduces our capacity to fund public investment and national security; crowds out private investment when it recovers; and, at some future point, could trigger financial market or economic destabilization. To a certain extent, some of these risks are already materializing.

A constructive fiscal regime would pair immediate public investment to boost current demand and future productivity with measures to effectively address our longer-term trajectory. That would require increased revenue, which should be raised progressively, and putting our social insurance and federal health-care programs on sustainable financial footing. We should also rigorously scrutinize both the defense and nondefense sides of the budget to improve programmatic efficiency and relevance. The longer we wait to address these challenges, the greater the effects and the harsher the measures that will be required.

But the fundamental challenge, upon which all else depends, is reestablishing a willingness among members of Congress to engage in principled compromise across policy and political divides, to make difficult decisions and to focus on facts and analysis, while recognizing that politics will always be involved. If they do this, we can achieve broadly shared economic success. If they do not, we languish.

For too long, we have been caught in a vicious cycle: Failure to achieve inclusive growth has undermined the public trust and Congress's commitment to governing that, in turn, is necessary to achieve inclusive growth. If we act on the policies that promote inclusive growth, we could restore support for governance and initiate a virtuous cycle, spurring further constructive policy. All of us can contribute to this positive outcome, even when we have very different policy views, by using all means available, from emails and social media to campaign contributions, to insist that our elected officials engage in making our system work.

Inclusive growth offers an economic vision that reflects and reinforces our country's broad values. The policies exist to achieve it. Now it's up to us to make it happen.

The writer, co-chair of the Council on Foreign Relations, was U.S. treasury secretary from 1995 to 1999.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It's Saturday evening and the wait for a table at Zenebech Restaurant is 45 minutes. A crowd forms outside on one of the restaurant's last weekends in business here as a waiter jots down the names of hungry patrons on a pad of paper.

Every seat is filled, crammed with middle-aged Ethiopian men speaking Amharic and 20-somethings dressed to hit the Shaw neighborhood's trendy bars after dinner.

The authentically folksy family-owned restaurant navigated the tide of rapidly gentrifying Shaw, keeping its longtime Ethiopian customers while introducing the neighborhood's new, deep-pocketed residents to Ethiopian cuisine. Zenebech Dessu and her husband purchased the building and opened the restaurant in 1998, back when storefronts stood vacant and the city hadn't yet invested in reopening the crumbling Howard Theatre nearby.

"When the area changed, it's been good for us," said Zenebech Dessu, 64, the restaurant's owner and namesake. "Most of my customers are American now."

In a neighborhood filled with residents who can pay more than $2,000 a month in rent, Dessu's family turned down offer after offer from interested developers over the years. But this year they decided to sell, and the restaurant, which is scouting out new locations, plans to close this month. It's a loss for the tightknit Ethiopian community and the restaurant's newer patrons who flock there for a $3.50 beer and a cheap sit-down meal.

The owners of this strip of four rowhouses and small commercial buildings - which Zenebech anchors at T Street and Florida Avenue NW - jointly decided they would sell to a developer, Monument Realty, which plans to transform the aging strip into an apartment building with retail on the ground floor.

Three of the four buildings are Ethiopian-owned, and the small plaza in front of the buildings, centered on a sculpture of Duke Ellington, has become a meeting place for residents and Ethiopian cabdrivers on break.

Dessu moved to the United States with her husband, Gebrehanna Demissie, in 1990 as a **refugee** and cleaned hotel rooms, living in an apartment building on 16th and R streets NW filled with other Ethiopian **refugees**. When they both were laid off from their jobs, Dessu started cooking injera - a spongy bread that is a dietary staple in Ethiopia - and sold it for 50 cents apiece to other Ethiopians.

Her reputation and business operation quickly outgrew their home, and Dessu rented a small kitchen nearby, distributing her injera to the area's Ethiopian restaurants.

In 1998, the couple purchased their current location and turned it into a takeout spot and grocery store that mostly sold injera. Over time, business slowed as more Ethiopian restaurants started making their own injera, so Dessu transformed her business into a restaurant, serving large vegetable and meat platters atop her signature bread.

Today, Dessu and her husband are still cooking in the back of the restaurant. Their sons and other relatives help manage the business and serve customers while Dessu's sisters cook alongside her in the kitchen.

"I'm not happy, but I decided I had to sell it," Dessu said. "With the three of us Ethiopian owners on this street, it feels like Ethiopia here."

Russell Hines, president of Monument Realty, said that the deal has not yet closed and that he couldn't comment on how much the company paid for the prime real estate. The D.C. Office of Tax and Revenue values each of the four properties at about $1 million.

About the same time Dessu and her husband purchased the restaurant, two other Ethiopians bought the buildings next door, which are mostly residential. Zenebe Shewayene said he paid about $120,000 for his building in 1996. Since then, he said, his property taxes have increased more than tenfold.

His building includes apartment units and a now-shuttered bodega, Smada Market, on the ground floor. Shewayene has long rented to Ethiopians who recently arrived in the United States in need of a cheap starter home. Dessu and Demissie also hire newly arrived **immigrants** from the Ethiopian community so they can gain their footing in their new city.

"We wish we had stayed, but in terms of money, we're doing okay," said Shewayene, who can often be found outside his building chatting with neighbors and friends. "I know I'm going to miss talking outside, doing what I'm doing right now. I've had a family thing here."

James Patterson, 80, has lived in the fourth building, which is African American-owned, since 1985. He is a former maintenance worker at the Howard Theatre and has been doing maintenance on the building where he lives for more than 50 years. He said his landlord has charged him $650 for a one-bedroom apartment and ground-floor office space since 1985, and in exchange, he helps around the building.

"I'm good with changes about 75 percent of the time," said Patterson, who plans to move to a house he purchased years ago in Southeast Washington. "But there are so many people who don't have the finances to deal with the changes."

Ethiopians began streaming into the United States after the fall of Emperor Haile Selassie in the 1970s, and many Ethiopian entrepreneurs are credited with breathing life into neglected strips of the city, including Adams Morgan and later Shaw. About a decade ago, the local Ethiopian community unsuccessfully lobbied the city to recognize the Ninth Street NW area between U and T streets in Shaw as "Little Ethiopia" because of its many East African-owned establishments.

Belainesh Araia, who originally is from Eritrea, has purchased injera from Zenebech for more than 20 years. She said she's frustrated to see Africans who have helped to revitalize neighborhoods leave once the areas become too pricey and more desirable to others.

"I feel bad. I come here every day. What am I going to do now?" she said. "The city should do more to keep us here, to keep this as a multinational area. You have to keep everyone together."

Dessu said she plans to reopen Zenebech and is looking for a new space. She said she received a fair price for her building, but it's still hard to purchase another storefront in the booming neighborhood within her price range.

Renderings of Monument Realty's building that will replace the restaurant show that it will keep portions of the original facades on the ground floor, though it will resemble many of the newly built, glass-heavy luxury buildings in the neighborhood.

"I'll open another place, but where, I don't know yet," Dessu said. "I don't want to be far away from this area."

Until that happens, customers say they'll miss one of the last remaining no-frills restaurants in an increasingly upscale neighborhood.

"I'll miss it," said James Tetrick, who drives from Rockville a few times a year to dine at Zenebech. "It's a great place to eat."

perry.stein@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The head of the Catholic diocese in Raleigh, N.C., has been tapped by Pope Francis to lead the Diocese of Arlington, a center of theologically and politically conservative Catholicism that spans 21 counties in Northern Virginia.

Bishop Michael Burbidge, 59, is replacing Bishop Paul Loverde, who is retiring after 17 years in the role. During his tenure, Loverde's challenge was to keep the many conservatives among his 600,000-member flock satisfied while not **alienating** more-liberal parishioners.

The diocese - which counted Supreme Court Justice Antonin Scalia a member until his death earlier this year - required Catholic schoolteachers to sign "fidelity oaths" submitting to church teachings as part of a larger churchwide push to revive orthodoxy, a move that sharply divided Catholics. It was also the second to the last in the nation to accept altar girls.

Burbidge, who was born and raised in the Philadelphia area, is a cautious conservative with a Pope Francis-like pastoral touch and a desire to bridge divides, according to some observers of the Catholic Church.

Earlier this year, he published a statement distancing himself from the North Carolina Catholic conference's support of the state law restricting transgender people from using restrooms of their preferred gender. Instead, Burbidge urged "another remedy."

"The bottom line was no one should feel unwelcome," said Rocco Palmo, a Philadelphia-based writer who blogs on the inner workings of the Catholic Church. "That was very striking. That was not the governor's line. Burbidge's conservatism is cautious by nature."

Burbidge's move reflects the growing influence of Cardinal Donald Wuerl of the Archdiocese of Washington, who has emerged as a leading force in reshaping the hierarchy of the U.S. church to better align with Francis's call for bishops to dispense mercy and not to "take **refuge** in rigidity" or launch "vain crusades."

In Raleigh, Burbidge had a reputation as a pastoral administrator who enjoyed spending time with church members and traveling to events such as Catholic school opening Masses and antiabortion prayer vigils. The Diocese of Raleigh stretches over 32,000 square miles, from the center of the state to the Outer Banks. The Diocese of Arlington, while populous, is only a fifth that size.

The Rev. Michael Clay, associate dean for seminary and ministerial studies at Catholic University, served as a priest in the Diocese of Raleigh under Burbidge. Clay said he expects the extroverted Burbidge to be highly engaged with people.

"He has boundless energy," he said. "He's not the kind of person who would be sitting behind a desk."

When he arrived in Raleigh, Burbidge did not know how to speak Spanish, but he worked with a tutor every week to learn the language and now can celebrate Mass in Spanish, Clay said.

Burbidge spent much time with North Carolina's prominent Hispanic community, which is heavily Catholic. The Arlington diocese also has a growing Hispanic population, and Catholic Charities there is the largest nongovernmental provider of services for **immigrants** and **refugees**.

Before his appointment in Raleigh, Burbidge served as the rector of Philadelphia's St. Charles Borromeo Seminary and was named an auxiliary bishop of the archdiocese by Pope John Paul II in 2002.

Burbidge was popular during his time in Philadelphia, Palmo said - so much so that he would sometimes go incognito to the Jersey Shore with his family, wearing a hat and sunglasses so he could have time away.

Burbidge said he plans to continue some of the priorities of his predecessor, focusing on evangelization, charitable outreach, service and bridging political, cultural and other divides.

"What unites us are not the political issues," he said. "You could one day be in a parish that's more traditional. The next day, you're in a parish that's more vibrant in its praise or worship. The church has room for all of that."

A sports fan, Burbidge wakes up at 5 a.m. most days and spend the first part of his day exercising on either the elliptical, rowing machine or bike in his garage. He is a lifelong Eagles fan whose father had season tickets.

"I'll be rooting for the Nationals, but I can't give up my allegiance to the Eagles yet," he said. "This is dangerous territory to say this, isn't it?"

Loverde said he will retire in Annandale and continue to help Burbidge in the diocese.

Part of Loverde's legacy was managing to engage more liberal Catholics without **alienating** conservative ones, said Brian Doyle, chairman of the theology/religious studies department at Marymount University, which is in the Arlington diocese. And Doyle is hopeful that Burbidge, who has mostly avoided high-profile involvement in the culture wars, can do something similar.

"Someone who's been in Philly and Raleigh is going to have a good handle on a mixture of Southern heritage and cosmopolitan character," Doyle said.

He notes that the long-term impact of Pope Francis's tenure will hinge on who he appoints and elevates within the church hierarchy.

"My hope is Burbidge will be able to walk the line between pastoring all the people in his diocese," Doyle said. "Bishops like to make names for themselves. He does not seem to be one of them, and I think Francis likes that."

sarah.bailey@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Sen. Tim Kaine (Va.), the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, the Republican nominee, held a debate Tuesday night at Longwood University in Farmville, Va. Here's a selection of suspicious or interesting claims, drawn from a longer online list fact-checked with my colleague Michelle Ye Hee Lee.

As is our practice, we do not award Pinocchios when we do a roundup of facts in debates.

"She worked a deal with the Russians to reduce their chemical weapons stockpile."

- Tim Kaine

Kaine surely meant to say nuclear weapons, but it came out as chemical weapons. Even so, Kaine overstates the impact of the 2011 New START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty) agreement, which Hillary Clinton helped negotiate as secretary of state.

New START does place tighter limits on deployed nuclear weapons than any past treaty. But Russia was actually already meeting the treaty's limits, for the most part, when treaty implementation began, and had increased deployed nuclear weapons from 1,537 in February 2011 to 1,796 in September 2016. Also, the treaty does not restrict either country from stockpiling weapons and does not require them to destroy any existing weapons.

Russia's total nuclear warhead arsenal has been on a steady decline, from 40,000, since 1986. During the Obama presidency, Russia's nuclear warhead total has hovered around 4,500 since 2012.

Clinton and Kaine "have a plan for open borders."

- Mike Pence

Pence exaggerates Clinton's stance on border security and **immigration** enforcement.

Clinton has said she would expand President Obama's executive actions on **immigration** and has advocated comprehensive **immigration** reform including a path to citizenship. But she also has supported enhanced border security. And her **immigration** plan includes "humane, targeted and effective" enforcement and focusing **immigration** resources on detaining and deporting those "who pose a threat to public safety."

Kaine: "You've got to be tough on Russia. Let's start by not praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader. Donald Trump and Mike Pence have said he's a great leader."

Pence: "No, we haven't."

Maybe the GOP ticket did not precisely use the word "great," but Kaine pretty much hits the target here.

Pence told CNN just a few weeks ago: "I think it's inarguable that Vladimir Putin has been a stronger leader in his country than Barack Obama has been." Pence said this just after Trump asserted that Putin has "been a leader far more than our president has been a leader."

"Richard Nixon released tax returns when he was under audit."

- Kaine

This is correct. A key difference here is that Nixon did not release his taxes while he was a presidential candidate; he did so in 1973, a year after he was reelected.

Presidential candidates have no legal obligation to release their returns, but there has long been a tradition to do so for the sake of transparency. Trump has cited a pending Internal Revenue Service audit, even though the first president to release his taxes, Nixon, did so in the middle of an audit. Moreover, Trump has not released his tax returns from before 2009, which are no longer under audit, according to his attorney.

"The second component of the plan is massive tax breaks for the very top, trillions of dollars of tax breaks for people just like Donald Trump. The problem with this, Elaine, is that's exactly what we did 10 years ago and it put the economy into the deepest recession - the deepest recession since the 1930s."

- Kaine

Kaine repeats a line that recently earned Hillary Clinton Three Pinocchios. But no credible analyst would cite the Bush tax cuts as playing a key role in causing the economic crash.

Kaine puts it even more starkly than Clinton did. The Clinton campaign tried to suggest that income inequality, exacerbated by tax cuts, led to the stagnation of the middle class and spurred excess borrowing and leverage - key components of the crash along with lax regulation. But that's a stretch, given that a housing bubble was the key trigger. The causes of the Great Recession are complex and debatable, but there's no debate that it is wrong to put the Bush tax cuts at the top of the list.

Clinton "worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot."

- Kaine

Kaine leans way over on his skis here.

The Iran nuclear agreement was actually negotiated by Clinton's successor, John F. Kerry, although Clinton helped tee up the talks by increasing sanctions on the Islamic republic. The deal, which has been sharply criticized by Republicans, did increase the amount of time that Iran would need to build a nuclear weapon by reducing its centrifuges for uranium enrichment and its stockpile of enriched uranium. But the deal expires in 15 years, and Iran's nuclear infrastructure remains in place.

While Iran has insisted it has no interest in building nuclear weapons, the deal does not eliminate the risk that it will obtain nuclear bombs.

"When Donald Trump spoke in Phoenix, he looked at the audience in the eye and said ... quote, 'They will all be gone. They will all be gone.' "

- Kaine

This isn't a direct quote about deporting all undocumented **immigrants**, but Trump did say that all "criminal illegal **immigrants**" (likely referring to undocumented **immigrants** convicted of crimes) "are going to be gone. It will be over."

"More than half of the private meetings when she [Clinton] was secretary of state were given to major donors of the Clinton Foundation."

- Pence

Pence misconstrued the Associated Press report here, similar to the way Donald Trump did earlier in the campaign.

The AP analyzed State Department records and looked specifically at Clinton's meetings on the phone or in person with 154 people who were not federal employees or foreign government representatives. This narrowed down the denominator to a small subcategory of people Clinton met with as secretary of state, since the majority of her diplomatic work would involve representatives of foreign governments.

The AP found that 85 of those 154 people, or "more than half" of 154, had donated to the Clinton Foundation or "pledged commitments to its international programs." The 85 donors collectively contributed as much as $156 million, the AP reported. There were representatives from at least 16 foreign governments, which donated as much as $170 million to the charity, but those representatives were not included in the 154 number, the AP reported.

The AP focused on 85 out of 154 people who met with Clinton but were not foreign government representatives or federal employees.

The count is based on partial records released by the State Department so far and does not reflect the full scope of people with whom Clinton met as secretary of state.

glenn.kessler@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. - Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton weren't on the stage at the vice-presidential debate here Tuesday night, but it didn't really matter. They were still front and center.

Stripped of the overpowering personalities of Trump and Clinton, the debate between Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.) and Indiana Gov. Mike Pence (R) offered the possibility of a more civil and sober conversation about issues that divide the two national party tickets. At times it was just that, whether on the economy, **immigration**, the chaos in the Middle East or abortion.

But for much of the evening, it was a boisterous proxy war by a pair of running mates whose goal was to take down the other's presidential nominee. They squabbled, they disagreed, they interrupted one another, they rolled out canned lines, and they feigned indignation.

It was bad enough almost from the start that, barely a third of the way through the 90-minute debate, moderator Elaine Quijano of CBS News admonished the candidates to back off. "The people at home cannot understand either one of you when you speak over each other," she said.

Overall it was an unsatisfying, disjointed debate, as the two candidates brushed past specific questions to open up other arguments at will. It probably changed few minds and no doubt brought some encouragement to the bases of the two parties. In that way it was a typical vice-presidential debate.

Both Kaine and Pence understood their objectives. Kaine's was to hurl Trump and everything he has said in Pence's face and force him to respond. He began by using an opening question about preparedness to be president, pivoting to a series of attacks on Trump.

Pence's role was to do what Trump could not do consistently during the first presidential debate, which was to prosecute a case against Clinton - highlighting both her policy vulnerabilities as secretary of state and questions about her private email server and the Clinton Foundation. He was more effective by far than Trump, but he struggled to fully defend everything Trump has said and done.

Kaine accused Trump of running an "insult-driven, selfish, me-first" campaign. Pence took umbrage at that. "You and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult-driven campaign," he said, and then launched into a catalogue of complaints about Clinton, President Obama and the state of the world under the two of them.

With that, the evening on the campus of Longwood University seesawed back and forth; occasionally there was serious policy discussion, but then it was quickly back to barbs and insults. Kaine was by far the more aggressive debater, overly so in the opening as he appeared almost too eager to make the entire evening about Trump.

Pence appeared taken aback by the assault, though he surely understood that it would be coming. More disciplined than Trump, and with a baritone voice that evoked a sense of seriousness, he battled back.

Were it not for the land mines Trump had left for Pence to tiptoe through, it might have been a different debate. Pence pressed at every opportunity to raise questions about Clinton, questions that Trump failed to raise at the first debate.

But Kaine kept returning to Trump, daring Pence to defend his decision not to release his taxes; to praise Russian President Vladimir Putin; or to explain Trump's comments about women, Mexicans and others.

Throughout the campaign, Pence has walked a line between being loyal to the man who put him on the ticket and protecting his own political future. That was the case again Tuesday night, though it's likely he did more to help himself than to absolve Trump of the charges Kaine kept leveling.

At times he simply sought to deny that Trump had said or done things Kaine brought up, whether in calling for the deportation of the roughly 11 million undocumented **immigrants** or praising Putin as a stronger leader than Obama.

Kaine was far more ready, even eager, to take on criticism of Clinton, jumping at the chance to compare the Clinton Foundation with Trump's charity. Whether his style sat well with undecided voters, those few who are still making up their minds, is another question.

In Pence and Kaine, the public got a glimpse of two politicians - though of different parties and ideologies - who bear more resemblance to one another than any comparison of Trump and Clinton. Both are lawyers, and both have served in Congress and in governor's mansions.

Both have low-key personalities, and neither is known for slashing, negative politics, though the traditional role of a vice-presidential candidate is to carry the attack against the other party's presidential nominee. They were little known nationally when chosen as running mates to the two least-popular major-party nominees in the history of polling.

Pence had the more difficult task Tuesday night, forced to take the stage after Trump suffered through one of the worst weeks of his candidacy - a week that began with the Hoftstra debate, where polls declared Clinton the winner, and that spiraled downward from there.

The damage to Trump was mostly self-inflicted, starting the morning after the debate with insults of a former Miss Universe and followed by an early-morning tweet storm that extended the controversy. Then came a New York Times exclusive that revealed that Trump had claimed $916 million in losses on his tax returns during the 1990s and, that same night, a rambling, off-script performance at a rally.

Trump's week was his worst since immediately after the Democratic convention, when he got into a verbal exchange with a Gold Star family; that, combined with Clinton's convention bounce, put the Republican ticket behind in the polls by the end of August. The effect of the past several days was that Trump appeared to arrest the gains he had been making in the polls before the first debate, if not begin to reverse them.

Four years ago, Vice President Biden had to follow a weak performance by President Obama, who lost his opening debate against Mitt Romney. Biden's challenge, however, was not as difficult as Pence's. Biden needed only to reenergize a Democratic base demoralized by Obama's performance.

He did that with a display of aggressiveness - some critics judged it over the top - that contrasted with Obama's laconic posture against Romney in Denver. Biden did not have to answer for or defend controversial behavior on the part of the president.

Still, it was left to Obama to produce the real rebound in the second of the three presidential debates, just as it will be Trump's challenge to deliver a more consistent and focused performance against Clinton when the two meet at Washington University in St. Louis on Sunday night for a town-hall debate.

Vice-presidential debates rarely matter. They can produce memorable video clips, as several have over the years, but they don't move the polls. Pence played his prescribed role Tuesday night, delivering what Trump hoped for. But so did Kaine, as he kept Trump's vulnerabilities front and center.

Given the damage Trump did to himself over the past seven days, that will put much greater pressure on the Republican nominee Sunday to show that he learned from his mistakes in the first debate and to show the voters a more disciplined candidate.

dan.balz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. - Indiana Gov. Mike Pence sought to stabilize the Republican ticket by accusing his Democratic opponents of the same kind of insults and raw partisanship that have been a hallmark of Donald Trump's candidacy as he faced off against Sen. Tim Kaine here Tuesday night in a combative and at times grating vice-presidential debate.

With Trump reeling from self-inflicted controversies at a critical juncture in the campaign, Pence projected a steadier temperament than Trump and largely ducked Kaine's demands to answer for the GOP nominee's incendiary actions and statements.

But Pence made numerous statements that conflicted with positions taken by Trump. He suggested that Trump would not immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants**, that he believes military action is warranted to help the besieged Syrian city of Aleppo and that Russia is a dangerous country that the United States must deal with aggressively.

Pence on several instances denied statements that Trump had made in the past, including his assertion that NATO is "obsolete" and his suggestion that Putin is a "stronger" leader than President Obama. Pence repeatedly accused Kaine and Clinton of running "an insult-driven campaign."

Kaine's retort: "I'm just saying facts about your running mate."

The first and only debate between the vice-presidential nominees, a 90-minute forum on the campus of Longwood University in historic Farmville, showcased the two tickets' vastly divergent plans, from illegal **immigration** to foreign policy.

Pence injected a number of traditional conservative priorities - abortion, taxes and entitlements - to help reassure Republicans who have misgivings about Trump's populist agenda, which they see as out of step with GOP orthodoxy.

Kaine and Pence sparred vigorously over Trump's avowed affinity for Russian President Vladimir Putin. Pence called Putin "a small, bullying leader," but Kaine repeatedly reminded viewers that Trump has praised the Russian's leadership style.

"If you mistake leadership for dictatorship," Kaine said, "you can't be commander in chief."

Kaine sought to put Pence on the defensive by bringing up Trump's attacks on Mexican **immigrants**, dismissive comments about prisoners of war and years of questioning whether President Obama was born in the United States.

"If you want to have a society where people are respected or respect laws, you can't have a person at the top who demeans every group he talks about," Kaine said.

Kaine repeatedly mentioned Trump's comments in his 2015 campaign announcement speech that some Mexicans were "rapists" and "criminals."

"Senator, you whipped out that Mexican thing again," Pence said.

Kaine countered, "Can you defend it?"

"I couldn't be more proud to be standing with Donald Trump," Pence said.

Unlike Trump's response to Clinton's aggression on the debate stage last week, Pence refused to be baited into a point-by-point discussion of Trump's controversies. Rather, Pence drove a pointed contrast between the economic policies and worldviews of Trump and Hillary Clinton, arguing that she and Kaine "want more of the same."

Responding to Kaine's comments about the improving economy, Pence said: "Honestly, Senator, you can roll out the numbers and the sunny side, but I've got to tell you: People in Scranton know different. People in Fort Wayne know different. People are struggling."

Pence also excoriated Clinton's record at the State Department, and he blamed her "weak" and "failed" foreign policy for the humanitarian crisis unfolding in Syria.

"In the wake of Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration's foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control," Pence said.

The two men, who sat around a table with moderator Elaine Quijano of CBS News, displayed different strategies and mannerisms. Kaine was aggressive, interrupting and hurling rehearsed insults at Pence, while the Indiana governor was calmer, spoke in homespun language and counterpunched with an edge of disdain for Kaine's tactics.

A number of times, Kaine delivered the kind of catchy one-liners commonly delivered at debates. "Do you want a 'You're hired' president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a 'You're fired' president in Donald Trump?"

Pence replied: "I appreciated the 'You're hired,' 'you're fired,' thing, senator. You use that a whole lot. And I think your running mate used a lot of pre-done lines."

Tuesday's debate came at a critical juncture in the presidential race. With five weeks until Election Day, Trump has been reeling from his rocky performance during the first presidential debate last week in Hempstead, N.Y. In the days that followed, he took a combative posture and at times displayed erratic behavior.

Trump continued a bitter feud with former Miss Universe Alicia Machado for a full week, lashing out at her for gaining weight as a beauty pageant winner two decades ago and urging his supporters to view her "sex tape," although it was not evident that one existed.

Trump also attacked Clinton in strikingly personal terms at campaign rallies, including imitating her unsteadiness at a public appearance during a bout with pneumonia, and he suggested without evidence that she had been disloyal to her husband, former president Bill Clinton.

Trump has slipped in polls nationally and in nearly every battleground state. In Pennsylvania, a vote-rich state in which Trump is competing aggressively, Clinton has widened her lead against Trump to 10 percentage points, according to a Monmouth University survey released Tuesday.

On stage in Farmville, the No.2s showed different styles than the candidates at the top of their tickets. Both talked movingly about their personal faith, something Clinton and Trump rarely do, for example.

Tuesday's forum was marred by so many interruptions that Quijano interjected: "Gentlemen, the people at home cannot understand either one of you when you talk over each other." Kaine's impulse to interrupt and rattle Pence was so strong that he interrupted Quijano just as she was trying to force Pence to answer a difficult question about police bias.

Kaine and Pence clashed over criminal justice policies in light of the recent spate of police shootings of black men. Waxing about his uncle, who was a career cop in Chicago, Pence called for unity behind law enforcement and accused Clinton and Kaine of politicizing shootings.

"We ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy," he said. "Enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit violence every time a tragedy occurs."

Kaine responded by saying, "If you're afraid to have the discussion, you'll never solve it." He added, "I can't believe that you are defending the position that there's no bias."

Pence took the debate stage here under intense pressure to shift the campaign's narrative in a way that benefits Trump. Last week, Trump missed several opportunities to put Clinton on the defensive.

Pence tried to correct his running mate's errors. He fired barbs at Kaine over Clinton's use of a private email server as secretary of state and her comment at a fundraiser last month describing half of Trump's supporters as "a basket of deplorables."

"If Donald Trump had said all of the things that you've said he said in the way you said he said them, he still wouldn't have a fraction of the insults that Hillary Clinton leveled when she said that half of our supporters were 'a basket of deplorables,'" Pence said. "She said they were irredeemable, they were not American. I mean, it's extraordinary."

Pence was asked about a New York Times report, which relied on leaked pages from Trump's 1995 tax returns, which showed that Trump had claimed a $916 million loss - and might have been able to avoid federal income taxes for up to 18 years. Pence did not make any claim that Trump had paid federal income taxes.

"His tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code the way it was meant to be used, and he used it brilliantly," Pence said.

Kaine challenged Pence repeatedly to say why Trump had not released his tax returns, as other nominees have for 40 years. Pence repeated what Trump has said - that he would release the tax returns but only when an Internal Revenue Service audit is over. The IRS has said that there is no legal prohibition on releasing taxes while they are under audit.

The vice-presidential candidates also clashed over entitlement spending, something the presidential candidates have not often discussed. Kaine argued that Pence and Trump would hurt the middle class by privatizing Social Security, calling Pence the "chief cheerleader" for such a plan during his time in the House.

"There they go again," Pence responded curtly, echoing a line made famous by former president Ronald Reagan.

Clinton was expected to watch the debate from her home in Chappaqua, N.Y., aides said, while Trump had planned to watch and tweet about it from Las Vegas, where he is staying during a Western campaign swing.

philip.rucker@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A child's stained clothes fluttered from a clothesline, polka-dotted pants swaying above muddy, trash-strewn puddles. Inside a tattered tent, a weary-looking man pointed to a mound of sticks piled in the corner, and a teenage girl in a purple sweatshirt turned to follow his gesture.

"This is our only source of heat," the man said, and the girl's eyes widened - even though the man wasn't really talking to her, because she wasn't really standing in this room with him.

A raging sea, an orange raft bobbing on its swells, crowded with people. A tangled web of exposed wires snaking through the squalid Shatila **refugee** camp in Lebanon. These images - projected in 360 degrees - bombard visitors to a new Doctors Without Borders exhibition on the Mall with a piercing look at the global **refugee** crisis.

"We left everything behind," a bearded man says sadly, his face larger than life against the wall. "We were hoping to come back soon."

When the international medical charity created its new "Forced From Home" exhibition - which runs through Sunday on 15th Street Northwest, across from the Washington Monument - it aimed to do more than educate visitors about the plight of **refugees**. It wanted them to feel it, to the extent possible within a one-hour tour.

"People don't leave their home unless they absolutely have no other choice," said Jason Cone, executive director of Doctors Without Borders in the United States. "It's really an attempt to put people in the shoes of these people - what would you do if you only had a matter of moments to decide what you could take with you?"

As visitors arrived Saturday morning - the free exhibit's first day open in Washington, after opening last month in New York - they were handed cards assigning them a country of origin and a status: **refugee**, internally displaced person or asylum seeker.

Then they were shown a wall of plastic cards, each displaying something essential or valuable - prescription drugs, water, blankets, children's toys, a passport - and given 30 seconds to choose which five items they would take if they had to flee their homes.

"Faster, hurry!" said Ahmed Abdalrazag, a tour leader and physician with Doctors Without Borders. "Ten seconds left."

As the clock ran out, one woman was still clutching six cards.

"I decided at the last minute I needed medicine," she explained. Abdalrazag shook his head sternly.

"No," he said. "You can only have five. I have to take one."

"Okay," she said glumly. "Then I won't have my medicine, and I'll die."

Abdalrazag just nodded.

By the end of the exhibit, they would have only one item left. At various points in a tour meant to replicate a **refugee**'s journey, they would be asked to exchange these mock belongings to pay for their passage or safety.

The number of displaced people worldwide reached 65 million last year, according to the Office of the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees** - surpassing the 60 million mark for the first time since World War II.

But it is the individual faces and stories that have resonated more intensely than the hard-to-comprehend numbers. Photos of Omran Daqneesh, a 5-year-old Syrian boy left covered in blood and ash after an airstrike that killed his brother, sent a wave of grief rippling across social media, prompting one American boy to write to President Obama, asking whether the wounded child could come live with him.

So "Forced From Home" focuses on the details: a crumpled plastic bottle fashioned into a child's toy. A ramshackle latrine, just a hole in the ground shielded by a plastic curtain. A fake life jacket, like the ones human traffickers sell to unknowing **refugees** fleeing Syria by sea.

"These people are just like you and I," said Vito Castelgrande, project coordinator for the exhibit. "We hope the primary takeaway is just to humanize them. We talk about millions and millions of people displaced, but they are millions and millions of individuals, with names and stories."

As he guided his group through, Abdalrazag shared bits of his **refugee** story. He was displaced twice, he said: first, when his family left their home in Iraq during the 1990-1991 Gulf War; then when they were driven from their new home in Tripoli, Libya, after the eruption of the Arab Spring and fled to Tunisia's Shousha **refugee** camp.

He stooped slightly inside a "family-size" tent, the sort of shelter that might actually be shared by a couple of families. "I lived in a tent like this for four or five months," he said. "The thing that I missed all the time was just a wall, a wall to lean my back against."

The tent made a profound impression on 14-year-old Dan Beckstrand of Springfield, Va., who came to the exhibit with his parents and his 16-year-old sister.

"I'm a very private person," Dan said. "I love to go to my room and close the door. Not having that would really wear me down."

His father nodded. At the end of the tour, Scott Beckstrand said he was struck mostly by the helplessness of living in such a place. "The total lack of control, over anything," he said softly. "And how hard it would be to maintain hope."

But Africa Stewart, an obstetrician and gynecologist with Doctors Without Borders and one of the exhibit's tour leaders, has seen hope persist through unfathomable trauma and loss. Former **refugees** and displaced people have visited the exhibit, she said. Stewart noticed that when they must choose which theoretical belongings to keep, they always grab the plastic card with an image of house keys. And it's always the final card in their hands at the end of the tour.

"If you have your keys, there is a chance you'll come back," she said. "And to them, just the possibility of going home again, that is worth everything."

caitlin.gibson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**FARMVILLE, Va. - Since joining the Democratic ticket, Tim Kaine has proved to be a workmanlike campaigner, ably touting Hillary Clinton's agenda and throwing punches at Republican Donald Trump without damaging his own nice-guy reputation.

At the vice-presidential debate here Tuesday, however, Kaine turned in a performance that threatened to undermine the image of authenticity that has been one of his greatest strengths.

The senator from Virginia came across as over-rehearsed, often interrupting his Republican opponent, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, with points Kaine had already made several times earlier in the debate. At times, Kaine simply seemed to be trying too hard.

At one point in the 90-minute encounter at Longwood University, Kaine accused Trump of being someone who "loves dictators" and then unloaded one of many canned lines of the evening, accusing Trump of having "a kind of personal Mount Rushmore: Vladimir Putin, Kim Jong Un, Moammar Gaddafi and Saddam Hussein."

Pence, who maintained the calmer demeanor through much of the debate, was able to easily parry, asking Kaine: "Did you work on that one a long time?"

Some other Kaine lines fell flat as well. "You are Donald Trump's 'Apprentice,'" Kaine said to Pence early in the debate, referencing the hit NBC show in which contestants sought to earn a position working alongside Trump in his business enterprises.

In other ways, Kaine accomplished what the Clinton team was looking for.

He highlighted key differences between the two tickets on issues including **immigration**, and he recounted many of the controversies that have done damage to Trump in recent weeks, including his public spat over the weight gain of a Latina beauty queen and his assertion that avoiding income taxes makes him smart.

"I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we're stupid," Kaine said, ticking off the government services funded by taxes, including the military.

Often at the pressing of Kaine, Pence also made numerous statements that conflicted with positions of Trump. Pence, for example, suggested that Trump would not immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants** and that Russia is a dangerous country that must be dealt with aggressively by the United States.

Kaine's sometimes awkward performance Tuesday night brought back memories of the last time millions of Americans watched him on television - his speech at the Democratic National Convention. On that night, Kaine unleashed a cringe-worthy impersonation of Trump, repeating the phrase, "Buh-leave me" to mock the GOP nominee.

But those prime-time moments stand in stark contrast to the impression he has made on much smaller audiences as he travels among presidential battleground states on Clinton's behalf. The difference suggests that Kaine, who draws on skills honed over a long political career starting on the Richmond City Council, is still more comfortable in more intimate settings.

On the campaign trail, Kaine has proved versatile, demonstrating an ability to relate with a variety of audiences.

Speaking to African American groups, Kaine has recalled his days as a civil rights lawyer and discussed his membership in a predominantly black Catholic parish in Richmond.

When addressing Latino audiences, Kaine frequently breaks into Spanish that he picked up while taking a break from law school to work with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras.

And the Clinton campaign has also sent him into largely working-class pockets of battleground states, in the hope that his appeal to fellow white men will allow him to vouch for Clinton in a demographic with which she has struggled.

Kaine has a long political résumé that includes stints as Richmond's mayor, Virginia's governor and chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

But the role that has in some respects best prepared him for his current venture was the four years he served as his state's lieutenant governor - another job where his profile was overshadowed by a more prominent political partner, in that case venture-capitalist-turned-governor Mark R. Warner.

During Tuesday night's debate, Kaine also repeatedly vouched for his running mate, who he referred to most often simply as "Hillary."

"My primary role is to be Hillary Clinton's right-hand person and strong supporter as she puts together the most historic administration possible," Kaine said at the debate's outset. "And I relish that role. I'm so proud of her."

Clinton has said she chose Kaine for the ticket because of his ability to help her govern. In addition to his focus on domestic issues as governor, Kaine has gained foreign policy experience through his seats on the Senate Armed Services and Foreign Relations committees.

On the campaign trail, Kaine comes across as more authentic than Clinton, to whom many voters, including those who support her, say seems very distant.

Audience members at Kaine rallies have held signs referring to him as "America's Dad." His joint appearances with his wife, Anne Holton - who has referred to the vice-presidential candidate as "my hubby" in front of audiences - has bolstered that image.

Holton, until recently Virginia's education secretary, is spending plenty of time on the road promoting the Democratic ticket on their own. But when the couple travel together, Kaine has told audiences it feels like they are on vacation together.

The couple have three children, all young adults now, including one whom Kaine confessed last month to an audience in Iowa had voted for Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, Clinton's rival in the Democratic primaries. It was a line that might not have been good for Clinton but reinforced that notion that Kaine is honest.

Kaine was tagged by some with the "boring" label at the time of his selection in July. But there have been moments on the campaign trail where he's come across as nothing of the sort.

Three weeks into his service, he whipped out a harmonica during a visit to an Asheville, N.C., brewpub and joined a male-female guitar-and-vocal duo for a rousing rendition of "Wagon Wheel" followed by "My Home's Across the Blue Ridge Mountains." After finishing, Kaine bellied up to the bar and ordered a locally brewed White Zombie beer.

john.wagner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SANTA FE, N.M. - For state lawmakers here who used to work with Gary Johnson, something is familiar about the former governor's baffled looks, which have turned into an embarrassment for his third-party presidential campaign.

Longtime state Sen. Stuart Ingle (R) recalled how Johnson, soon after taking office in 1995, mostly shrugged and stared during their first meeting together. As Ingle asked Johnson questions about his agenda, Ingle said, Johnson's most common refrain was, "I don't know."

At the end of the meeting, Ingle said, Johnson revealed the one position on which he would hold firm: The state's budget should not grow. And if legislation to do so passed, the new governor added, "I will veto it."

Over the next eight years, New Mexico lawmakers would struggle to work with a governor who paid little attention to details. Those who worked closely with Johnson, then a Republican elected as a political novice vowing to shake up the established order, recall a chief executive who would speed through meetings and often preferred to discuss his fitness routine than focus on the minutiae of policymaking.

Today, people here are not surprised that Johnson's lack of interest in the fine points of governing has led to some high-profile stumbles in his Libertarian candidacy for president, such as his inability to name his favorite foreign leader, or when a question about the war-ravaged city at the center of the Syrian **refugee**crisis prompted him to ask, "What is Aleppo?"

Johnson dismisses the notion that a president must be immersed in the particulars.

"It's amazing that somehow because you dot the i's and cross the t's that somehow you're immune," Johnson told The Washington Post in a recent interview, "and judgments are being made on me that I'm not qualified because I didn't know something that could be answered in five seconds on an iPad."

In a year of widespread discontent with the major-party contenders, Johnson pitches himself as a logical alternative who can bridge divisions by embracing conservative fiscal policy and left-leaning social policy.

That pitch has proved attractive to a small but significant sliver of voters, particularly young people, peeling support away from Democrat Hillary Clinton and Republican Donald Trump. Both campaigns fret that Johnson's presence on the ballot could tilt a tight race.

At the center of Johnson's candidacy is his tenure in Santa Fe, where he was quick to use his veto pen and argued that government should provide only the most basic of services, such as building highways.

But Johnson ended up unnerving lawmakers on both sides of the aisle, who complained that he rarely took their ideas seriously.

When the vetoes started to pile up that first year, legislators tried to make amends by inviting him to participate in discussions about how they should spend money, according to legislative notes in the state Capitol. Johnson's reply, again, was "no."

"It is easy to make simple decisions when you don't spend time learning about the nuances of policy," said state Sen. Mimi Stewart (D), who joined the legislature in 1995, when Johnson was elected.

Stewart said Johnson was never vindictive or mean, but he just did not focus when she sought to talk with him about policies such as improving education. Knowing that Johnson was a triathlete and extreme-sports enthusiast, Stewart hoped to build a rapport with him through running. Twice, she participated in the same local marathon as the governor and hoped she would slip in some talk about the job. It was fruitless.

"He would just nod his head and change the subject," Stewart said. "If I saw him in the halls, he'd ask, 'How's the running?' "

Johnson's seemingly dismissive approach garnered him the nickname "Governor No." In his first year in office, he vetoed 47 percent of the bills the legislature passed. Lawmakers took Johnson to court at least three times for overstepping his bounds - and won.

"A know-it-all dictator," is how the late state representative Jerry Lee Alwin, a conservative Republican, described Johnson to the news media at the time. "He just doesn't listen."

Johnson shrugged off the criticism. He said that any lawmaker was able to come speak with him during his "Open Door After Four" sessions, which offered any member of the public - not just politicians - a chance to make an appointment.

Those sessions were held once a month. Meetings lasted no longer than five minutes - a sufficient amount of time, Johnson said, for him to grasp the issues.

"I can figure things out; I have good instincts," he told The Post. "I think I was born with an overdose of common sense."

Johnson, 63, the son of a public school teacher and a government worker who built a construction company that made him a millionaire, jumped into politics largely as an experiment, say people who worked with him at the time.

The question he told friends he wanted to answer: Could an honest man enter politics and remain honest?

So one night in 1994, he drove his Datsun 280Z to the Albuquerque home of Kelly Ward, a 26-year-old entrepreneur Johnson had met at a banquet. He told Ward he wanted to run for governor - and he wanted her to be his campaign manager.

"I don't know anything about government," Ward recalled saying.

"That makes us perfect for it," Johnson said, Ward said.

Johnson spent about $500,000 on his campaign. In a one-day blitz, he bought advertising on the sides of all the buses in Albuquerque with a close-up of his face and the words "JOHNSON" to build name recognition. Then came radio and television. His slogan was "People Before Politics." He promised to run government like a business, pulling a checkbook out of his pocket during campaign appearances and telling voters, "You'll have a lot more money in here if you vote for me."

As governor, he imposed schedule discipline. His Cabinet would meet precisely at 8 a.m. every Monday, power bars and water at the table. Each member had only two minutes to deliver a report.

"If you can't explain it in two minutes, it doesn't need to be done," said Diane Kinderwater, Johnson's former communications director.

The approach was a stark difference from that of the previous governor, a cowboy-boot-wearing, backslapping Democrat who loved to linger. Some lawmakers appreciated it.

"With [Johnson], it was always, 'Yes,' 'No' or 'I'll think about it,' " said Ingle, the state senator. "It would take five or six minutes. He had an agenda and he knew what he wanted to figure out."

The first time the legislature sent a budget to Johnson's desk, Ingle said, lawmakers thought they had done well by allotting only "a couple hundred-thousand dollars" more than Johnson's goal of $2.8 billion.

Johnson vetoed it.

"We couldn't believe it," Ingle said. "But I said, at least he told us what he was going to do. This man is honest."

Annual summaries compiled by nonpartisan legislative aides during that time describe Johnson's relationship with the legislature as "rocky" and "strained." Over eight years, he vetoed more than 700 bills.

Steven Neville was a Republican county commissioner in rural San Juan County, in the state's upper northwest corner, when the legislature agreed to spend $1 million in preparation for a national rodeo competition being held there. Johnson vetoed the measure. As a result, the county had to find money on its own.

"We actually did what we needed to do to have a good rodeo," said Neville, now a state senator. "It was annoying, but he was fair."

An examination of eight years of legislation showed that Johnson vetoed a bill to create specialized license plates because he thought it was too costly. He vetoed the formation of an African American affairs committee and a task force examining how to get equal pay for women because he thought they were a waste of time and money.

Although he describes himself as a social liberal, Johnson angered many on the left when he ended collective bargaining for state employees and cut off Medicaid funding for abortions that doctors deemed medically necessary. Johnson now says he regrets the Medicaid decision.

In his second term, Johnson became more comfortable with the limits of his executive power, his staff members said. And the legislature got accustomed to his frequent vetoes, state Rep. Larry Larrañaga (R) said.

But Johnson **alienated** his fellow Republicans with a push to legalize marijuana use. He referred to the war on drugs as a "miserable failure."

It was a rare break from tradition for Johnson.

Rather than simply issuing directives, he had to work with the legislature to try to get his way. He could not get legalization through the legislature, but persuaded lawmakers to increase funding for drug treatment. He also won approval for a measure that allowed the release of nonviolent, low-level drug offenders if prisons became overcrowded.

By the end, Johnson praised himself for delivering a tax cut worth at least $60 million, expanding the highway system and repealing a gas tax. He left with a $1 billion state surplus and, according to the Albuquerque Journal, a 45 percent approval rating.

Johnson is now armed with endorsements last week from the Detroit News and the Chicago Tribune, but his New Mexico record remains his biggest boast. Looking back, he seems to have satisfied his big question about how an honest man could fare in politics.

"I was really naive. I didn't realize politics would be so partisan," he said.

"But I don't think you would find anyone who would say I wasn't thoughtful about every decision I made," he added. "I gave a reason, I had logic and a process. Would I be any different as president? No."

robert.samuels@washpost.com

Alice Crites and Emily Guskin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Is the notoriously litigious Donald Trump afraid of getting sued by ... Donald Trump?

If so, the plaintiff could have a pretty strong case.

This weekend, Americans learned that Trump reported losses in 1995 so yuge that he may not have paid any federal income taxes for 18 years. The Trump campaign has apparently decided that the best defense for this jaw-dropping behavior is a perversion of Judge Learned Hand's famous ruling on tax planning. Hand determined that there was no legal obligation to maximize one's payments to Uncle Sam; the Trump campaign is now insisting that its candidate has a legal obligation to minimize his payments to Uncle Sam.

Trump has "a fiduciary responsibility to his business, his family and his employees to pay no more tax than legally required," the campaign said in a statement.

Likewise, campaign surrogate and former New York mayor Rudy Giuliani explained that Trump faced a serious legal liability had he not minimized his tax liability.

"If he didn't do it, he'd get sued," Giuliani said on ABC's "This Week." He made this claim about Trump's risk of a lawsuit seven times on that show. He made it thrice more on NBC's "Meet the Press."

Of course, even if you buy the argument that Trump had a "fiduciary duty" to investors to minimize the tax obligations of his corporations, partnerships and LLCs, the leaked documents in question were portions of Trump's personal income tax returns, not any corporate or partnership income tax returns. So there were no investors to let down.

Whose wrathful litigiousness, then, compelled Trump to stiff the tax man? Who could have possibly sued Trump for wantonly dispensing too much of his own money to the feds?

Why, it must've been Trump himself, the only entity whom Trump has ever felt any "fiduciary duty" to enrich.

Maybe it seems ridiculous to suggest that Donald Trump might sue Donald Trump. How could he play both plaintiff and defendant? But recall that his confidants, and at times even the candidate himself, have argued that there are at least two of him to go around.

Plus, he has already sued or been sued by seemingly every other man, woman, child and corporation on earth, having been embroiled in more than 4,000 federal and state lawsuits. At the rate he's going, he'll eventually run out of legal adversaries who are not Donald Trump. Perhaps he knows he's destined to one day sue the only man truly worthy of his legal jujitsu (i.e., himself).

Even without tax-planning shenanigans, mind you, Plaintiff Trump would have a nearly bulletproof case to make against Defendant Trump for breach of fiduciary duty. Defendant Trump is, through his **alienating** rhetoric, likely irreparably impairing the goodwill value of the gilded Trump name.

Already there are clues that his sexist, racist, vulgar and generally uncouth remarks have repelled customers from the Trump brand.

Bookings at Trump hotels seem to be down, according to a report from travel site Hipmunk. Foot traffic to Trump businesses appears to have also declined significantly during the presidential campaign, according to data from Foursquare. Trump-branded condo prices have lost the premium they enjoyed last year, according to an analysis from Redfin.

There have also been reports that his children are privately worried about the negative impact his erratic behavior is having on the family business.

Trump's boorishness alone isn't the only way he's endangering his future income streams. His populist policy proposals, if successfully enacted, could also cripple many of the business strategies he has relied on to build his wealth.

Over the past year, Trump has whetted the public's appetite for punishing business leaders who:

lOutsource production to factories abroad, as Trump does for shirts, suits, eyeglasses, crystal, vodka and hotel furnishings, among other Trump- branded paraphernalia.

lEmploy undocumented workers, like those who have worked on Trump's own construction projects.

lRig the game against regular hardworking Americans, as he has done by stiffing small businesses for services fully rendered.

lDonate money to politicians in exchange for favors, as he has boasted he does.

lEngage in aggressive tax avoidance, as available tax documents now definitely prove he has engaged in.

He's also advocated barring Muslim **immigrants**, some of whom have been known to stay at his own hotels.

If he continues to employ all these behaviors that he so vocally condemns, surely his supporters won't tolerate the hypocrisy. Surely they'll demand that such business practices be put off-limits to everyone, including Trump himself.

And Trump will only have himself to blame. It's only a matter of time before that famous legal counterpuncher can consider himself self-served.

crampell@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Supreme Court will not reconsider President Obama's plan to shield undocumented **immigrants** from deportation and denied the Washington Redskins' bid to get its trademark case on this term's docket.

With oral arguments postponed for a day because of the Rosh Hashanah Jewish holiday, the first Monday in October that marks the beginning of the new Supreme Court term became a day of rejection. The court issued a thick stack of cases that had accumulated over the summer that the justices decided not to hear.

Among the other losers: the NCAA, which had asked the court to review an appeals court ruling about its policies involving the amateur status of college football and basketball players. The issue remains alive in other court proceedings.

The administration's request was a long-shot bid to salvage what had been the biggest legal defeat of Obama's presidency. In June, a deadlocked court failed to revive his stalled plan to shield millions of undocumented **immigrants** from deportation and give them the right to work legally in the United States.

The justices' votes at the time were not announced, but the court's liberals and conservatives were split at oral argument last spring. The tie meant that a lower court's decision that Obama probably exceeded his powers in issuing the executive action kept the plan from being implemented.

The court's action affected about 4 million illegal **immigrants** estimated to be covered by Obama's plan, which would have deferred deportation for those who have been in the country since 2010, have not committed any serious crimes and have family ties to U.S. citizens or others lawfully in the country.

The Supreme Court rarely grants motions for rehearing. But the administration's lawyers made the request in hopes that by now the vacancy created by the death of Justice Antonin Scalia would be filled. Instead, Senate Republicans have blocked consideration of Obama's nominee to the court, appeals court judge Merrick Garland. They say the next president should fill the election-year opening.

The fate of the program now awaits the election. Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton has said she will revive and expand the program; Republican nominee Donald Trump has said he would end it for good.

Washington Redskins

The football team's request was something of a Hail Mary pass, as well. The club's decades-old registration of its iconic nickname was canceled by the U.S. Patent and Trade Office, which said it violated the ban on disparaging trademarks.

But the team has appealed that and a lower court's agreement to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 4th Circuit. The Supreme Court does not usually take up cases before proceedings in the lower court are completed.

The issue, though, will be covered in the court's term. The justices last week said it would consider the similar case of an Asian American rock band called the Slants, who were denied trademark registration.

A majority of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit said the law - which calls for the rejection of trademarks that "may disparage ... persons, living or dead, institutions, beliefs, or national symbols, or bring them into contempt, or disrepute" - violates the First Amendment's free-speech guarantee.

NCAA

The justices decided not to review an appeals court decision that gave both the NCAA and the former college athletes something to be unhappy about.

U.S. District Judge Claudia Wilken said the NCAA could not prevent universities from offering money to athletes beyond scholarships to cover the "full cost of attendance." She also said they should be able to provide them with $5,000 a year that they would receive after leaving college.

A divided panel of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit agreed on the full cost of attendance, but upheld the organization's ban on paying athletes. It said the NCAA's amateurism rules carried some benefits.

After the trial court ruled, the organization decided to let colleges pay the full cost of attendance.

The suit was filed by former UCLA basketball player Ed O'Bannon on behalf of himself and other former athletes.

Wisconsin probe

The court also declined to revive an investigation into alleged campaign finance improprieties in Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker's 2012 battle against recall.

The justices decided not to review a Wisconsin Supreme Court decision that shut down the John Doe probe into whether Walker (R) illegally coordinated with outside conservative groups.

Walker defeated the recall effort and won reelection in 2014.

The questions in the case concerned whether Walker's campaign coordinated with the Wisconsin Club for Growth and other conservative groups on advertising during the 2012 recall without reporting the groups' contributions.

An investigation was conducted under the state's John Doe law that allowed secret probes into public misconduct by public officials. The judge halted the investigation, and conservative justices on the Wisconsin Supreme Court agreed. One of the challenges was whether those justices, who also received contributions from Club for Growth, should have recused themselves.

robert.barnes@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON - British Prime Minister Theresa May said Sunday that her country would begin withdrawing from the European Union by the end of March and suggested that she would seek a clean break that makes limits on **immigration** a priority.

The announcement eased the anxieties of Brexit backers, who had feared that May might delay the start of Britain's withdrawal by a year or more and that she would seek only modest changes in her country's relationship with the 27 remaining members of the bloc.

It disheartened Europhiles who had hoped that the country's exit might somehow be avoided.

May's comments - first to the BBC in a Sunday morning interview and later in the opening speech of the Conservative Party's annual conference - were the most specific she has given on her plans for Britain's post-E.U. future.

The country voted in June to leave the bloc, 52 percent to 48 percent. Previously she had said only that the country would not trigger Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for an E.U. exit, this year.

The early 2017 timetable is roughly in line with what European leaders who have met with May have said they expected.

But some British advocates for sticking with the E.U. had suggested that the process should be put on hold until after France and Germany - the two most important European voices in the negotiations to come - have held national elections slated for next year.

May on Sunday firmly rejected those calls, a decision that was praised by E.U. leaders, who are pressing Britain to get on with its departure. European Council President Donald Tusk tweeted that May's words had brought "welcome clarity."

Even after Britain triggers Article 50, it will remain an E.U. member for some time. The rules call for a two-year negotiation on the withdrawal terms, although that time limit could be extended if all sides agree.

If Britain does leave two years after triggering Article 50, a departure in spring 2019 could allow May to claim victory on her oft-repeated pledge that "Brexit means Brexit" with a year to go before scheduled national elections.

May again refrained Sunday from saying exactly what she will ask for in her negotiations with Europe, insisting that she won't give "a running commentary" on British bargaining.

She also rejected the idea that Britain must choose between "hard Brexit" and "soft Brexit," saying it's a "false dichotomy" to suggest that Britain must decide between "some form of continued E.U. membership and ... a conscious decision to reject trade with Europe."

But European leaders have said that is exactly the choice Britain faces, with one after the next arguing that Britain will not be allowed to retain the trade benefits of E.U. membership without accepting the rights of E.U. citizens to move freely across national borders.

May left no doubt Sunday that she will not accept that free-movement principle, saying that voters had made clear that they want reduced **immigration**. She was far less resolute in defending Britain's single-market membership, and she specifically ruled out a Norwegian-style arrangement that grants trade benefits in exchange for acceptance of the free movement of workers.

"The process we are about to begin is not about negotiating all of our sovereignty away again," she said. "It is not going to be about any of those matters over which the country has just voted to regain control. It is not, therefore, a negotiation to establish a relationship anything like the one we have had for the last 40 years or more."

Leading Brexit advocates cheered May's announcements. Former Conservative Party leader Iain Duncan Smith, a longtime Brexit proponent, told Sky News that he hoped her stand would signal that Britain was moving "quickly to the exit door and out."

But those who had backed "remain" in the referendum took the prime minister's words as further indication that Brexit is unavoidable and that it will shock the British economy.

Anna Soubry, a former Conservative minister, said triggering Article 50 by spring is too soon. The timeline "really concerns me, troubles me hugely, because we won't have had the French elections, we won't have had the German elections, and, I'm sorry, it is going to take a lot of time and effort to disentangle ourselves and get the right deal," she told Britain's ITV .

May backed the remain campaign in the referendum. But after Prime Minister David Cameron resigned, she quickly pivoted and ran to succeed him on a platform of implementing the voters' will.

griff.witte@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Explaining Donald Trump's appeal sits at the heart of understanding not only this election cycle but also, more broadly, the electorate that has produced this most unlikely of presidential candidates.

The easy answer - and the one favored by many Democrats - is racism. Racial animus, they argue, is the thread that ties all of Trump's support together. I do not buy that. Sure, Trump employs an element of racially coded language, and, without a doubt, avowed racists support him. But is everyone who supports Trump a racist? I find that very hard to believe.

On MSNBC's "Morning Joe" on Friday, Chris Matthews gave the best explanation of what's behind Trump's appeal that I have heard during the entire election cycle.

Here's the key segment:

"A lot of this support for Trump, with all his flaws, which he displays regularly, is about the country - patriotic feelings people have. They feel like the country has been let down. Our elite leaders on issues like **immigration**, they don't regulate any **immigration**, it seems. They don't regulate trade to our advantage, to the working man or working woman's advantage. They take us into stupid wars. Their kids don't fight, but our kids do.

"It's patriotic. They believe in their country. ... [There is a] deep sense that the country is being taken away and betrayed. I think that is so deep with people that they're looking at a guy who's flawed as hell like Trump and at least it's a way of saying, 'I am really angry about the way the elite has treated my country.' And it's so deep that it overwhelms all the bad stuff from Trump. It's that strong. It's a strong force wind."

Yes - to literally all of that.

The most important thing about Trump that Matthews gets is that the Republican presidential nominee's appeal is fundamentally an emotional one. It is heart, not head. Spending time wondering why all of the fact-checking in the world does not change people's minds about Trump misses that point entirely. It is about a gut feeling that things are really messed up and that this guy is the only person who gets it. No fact-check changes how people feel.

The other key element to Matthews's analysis of Trump is the revulsion against elites. The ever-widening economic and cultural disconnect between coastal elites - which includes the leaders of both political parties - and many Americans sits at the heart of Trump's appeal. It's a classic us-vs.-them message. They think you are stupid. They think they are better than you. They think they can tell you what to think and how to act.

A tweet from Trump on Friday morning speaks to that very sentiment: "The people are really smart in cancelling subscriptions to the Dallas & Arizona papers & now USA Today will lose readers! The people get it!"

The distance between the financial circumstances and policy views of elites and many Americans has never been wider. On trade. On **immigration**. On what the proper role should be for the United States in the global community. On almost everything.

So every time a newspaper advises against Trump, a celebrity says how dumb the candidate is or a member of the Republican foreign-policy establishment condemns him, it cements many people's belief that what Trump has been saying all along is right. If the elites think that Trump is stupid or out of touch (or both), then those same elites think the same things about the average Joe. About you.

The resentment and anger those feelings fuel are why, at some level, it does not matter what Trump says or does. It is beside the point for many of these people. The point is that he is channeling all of their distaste for the state of the country - and the elites they think created it.

Those emotions are why Trump is still within shouting distance of Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton, despite his running one of the least-strategic campaigns in modern memory. And it is why he still has a shot at winning the election despite everything that he has done wrong over the past many months.

Matthews understands that in a way that few other people - and especially pundits - do.

chris.cillizza@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**DONALD TRUMP has telegraphed his intentions, if not always consistently, to radically shift **immigration** policy and, in so doing, subvert America's vitality and international standing as a beacon of diversity and tolerance. While he cannot unilaterally undertake every change he proposes, there is plenty he can do, on his own, to overhaul America's approach to **immigrants**. His program would undercut the nation's economic prospects, its values and the vibrancy of its neighborhoods and communities.

A President Trump could slash the number of **refugees** allowed to enter the country, including from Syria, downgrading President Obama's goal of admitting 110,000 in the fiscal year that started Saturday. Federal law gives presidents the power to bar any "class of **aliens**" they deem "detrimental to the interests of the United States," so Mr. Trump could as promised ban **immigrants** from Muslim-majority countries. The effect would be to undercut Washington's standing with allies as well as America's relations with its own Muslim citizens - a blow to America's capacity to fight terrorism.

In the same category of feasible but self-defeating policies, Mr. Trump could revoke work permits and the protection from deportation granted by Mr. Obama to nearly 1.5 million young undocumented **immigrants** brought to the United States as children by their parents. Just as Mr. Obama has used executive orders to shield those "Dreamers," Mr. Trump could remove the shield and thereby expel from the country a generation of promising, American-educated young **immigrants**, most of whom have little or no memory of their birth countries.

As president, Mr. Trump could also unilaterally broaden the categories of undocumented **immigrants** targeted for accelerated deportation; they would include, as he has pledged, visa overstayers. Together, they amount to more than 5 million people.

True, it would be staggeringly expensive to find, detain, process and remove so many migrants in those categories. Yet considering the pride of place his campaign has given to accelerated deportations, it is likely Mr.Trump could exert his will to a significant extent.

A study by the American Action Forum, a conservative group, estimates that deporting all illegal **immigrants**, as Mr. Trump has threatened, would require more than 90,000 federal deportation agents; there are fewer than 5,000. The nation's 34,000 detention beds would have to increase tenfold, and more than 30,000 additional federal lawyers would be needed to process the throngs that would jam **immigration** courts.

The price of carrying out such a mass expulsion (along with the wall Mr. Trump would build) would not be limited to the estimated budgetary expense ($400 billion to $600 billion), nor even the blow to the economy of depleting the labor force by more than 10 million workers. The most lasting and damaging cost would be to America's prestige globally and to its founding principles. A nation that expels millions of long-standing residents with deep roots in their communities is not a leader; it is a fearful, mean and meek place, heartless and spiritually crabbed. This is not the America envisioned by the Founding Fathers; it is certainly not a home of the brave.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The man who would be in charge of guarding a wall with Mexico if Donald Trump is elected president isn't so sure the strategy would keep undocumented **immigrants** out.

Instead, Mark Morgan - the first outsider to lead the 21,000 uniformed agents who make up the U.S. Border Patrol - has had another priority in the three months he's been on the job: changing the agency's culture.

The force on the front lines of U.S. border security has faced allegations of an overly confrontational approach that's resulted in multiple fatal shootings, long unaddressed internal corruption and a lack of accountability in investigating misconduct.

Morgan has never arrested an illegal **immigrant**. But Customs and Border Protection Commissioner R. Gil Kerlikowske turned to him - overlooking others who came up through the ranks - to change course in what is, even by law enforcement standards, an insular culture.

"It was a culture of not getting out and talking about issues, not being transparent about the process that drove the perception there was a culture problem," Morgan, a career FBI official and former Los Angeles police officer, said in his first interview since his appointment in June.

Besides meeting with line agents at almost half of the 20 outposts that cover 6,000 miles along the Southwest and Canadian borders, Morgan, 51, has spent his first weeks in the job ensuring that new use-of-force policies in the training academy curriculum are encouraging recruits to turn to other strategies to defuse encounters that could get violent.

He's devising strategies to help agents develop better intelligence on the drug cartels and smugglers behind so many illegal crossings. He's coordinating multiple law enforcement authorities so that if agents do fire their weapons, there is a system to review whether the action was appropriate.

"The border patrol comes into contact with a lot more people than the FBI," he said in his Washington office, dressed in the green Border Patrol uniform and black boots, his graying hair in a crew cut.

"The piece we need to get better at when a shooting happens is, what happens now?" he said. "I don't think we were very good at all about making decisions like whether the use of force was within our guidelines."

When it comes to enhancing border security, the wall the Republican presidential nominee has proposed to keep out illegal **immigrants** does not top Morgan's list, however hotly debated it has been. As a civil servant and not a political appointee, Morgan will be in the job whether Trump or Hillary Clinton is elected.

"A simplistic answer to an immensely complex problem," is how Kerlikowske describes the wall. He notes that the government "spends a tremendous amount of money repairing what we have now" on the Southwest border - 600 miles of very intermittent fencing - from damage from erosion, flooding and holes when migrants break through.

"Does infrastructure play a role? Of course," Morgan said. "It's one element of a multifaceted approach. It isn't the answer."

He quipped, "I try not to be in the business of sound bites."

Morgan is, however, in the business of educating himself about the agents who patrol the border solo in scorching desert heat and frigid winters. He commutes an hour each way along Interstate 95 from his home in Stafford County, Va., where he spends most weekends poring over research and policy on training tactics, high-tech sensors and other border security strategies.

Morgan's varied FBI résumé includes leading a Hispanic gang task force in Los Angeles and senior roles in Baghdad, New Haven, Conn., and El Paso. He was in charge of agency-wide training when Kerlikowske tapped him for the Border Patrol post, passing over several inside candidates.

Morgan was not new to border security. Two years ago, Kerlikowske brought him in to run the internal affairs office at the larger Customs and Border Protection agency after removing the longtime official in the job. That official was criticized for failing to investigate multiple allegations that Border Patrol agents had used excessive force on migrants.

A review in March by the Homeland Security Advisory Panel, an oversight board, criticized the system of discipline for abusive or corrupt Border Patrol agents as "deeply flawed."

Morgan is credited with bringing more accountability to these cases.

His appointment was criticized by the powerful Border Patrol union, which said an outsider could never gain agents' trust. Today, union spokesman Shawn Moran says agents "understand they're going to give the new chief a feeling-out period."

Moran said the public has "a lot of misconceptions that the Border Patrol is a trigger-happy organization rife with corruption."

Asked to describe the state of border security at a time when Trump supporters decry a massive lack of it, Morgan said, "Everybody has a different perspective on that." Some will say that the border is not secure unless you catch everyone who tries to cross illegally.

He acknowledges that it's hard to know how large this group is.

"How do you measure something you're preventing?" he said. "We're constantly trying to improve the way we measure this."

lisa.rein@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**GYOR, Hungary - During a recruiting fair at a police proving ground here, a gaggle of teenagers ogled a display of machine guns, batons and riot gear. A glossy flier held out the promise of rugged patrols in 4x4s, super-cool equipment to detect body heat, night-vision goggles and migrant-sniffing dogs.

Because that's how Hungary's new "border hunters" roll.

This nation that once sat behind the Iron Curtain is offering a rare glimpse into a world where the build-a-wall mentality to keep migrants out rules the land. On Sunday, Hungarians will cast ballots in a national referendum on European Union quotas for accepting asylum seekers, with polls showing an overwhelming majority of likely voters poised to reject them.

They may as well hang a sign at the border, critics say: Welcome to Hungary - the migrant's dystopia.

Donald Trump may want a wall, but Hungarian Prime Minister Viktor Orban - a vocal fan of Trump's **immigration** plan - has built one. Now, the nation is launching a massive recruitment drive for 3,000 "border hunters." Their mission: beef up an already formidable migrant blockade, turning Hungary into a global model of how to prevent even the most determined asylum seeker from slipping through.

"Hungary does not need a single migrant for the economy to work or the population to sustain itself or for the country to have a future," said Orban, who likened migration to "poison." He added, "Every single migrant poses a public security and terror risk."

Yet in a country where the Gestapo once hunted Jews and Cold War-era secret police ferreted out dissidents, some here say that the government is in danger of instilling a different kind of fear.

Orban's government is fueling the public rebellion against the mostly Muslim migrants, critics say, by financing a multimillion-euro campaign asking voters to reject E.U. quotas. Opponents call it the rise of state-sponsored hate speech.

In a widely distributed flier, the campaign is echoing Trump's claim last year that aggressive Muslim migration has turned some European neighborhoods into "no-go zones." In one series of national ads, billboards in cities, towns and villages asked Hungarians, "Did you know?" before answering their own question:

l"Since the beginning of the migration crisis more than 300 people died in terrorist attacks in Europe." l"Since the beginning of the migration crisis, harassment against women in Europe increased dramatically." l"The Paris attacks were carried out by migrants."

Critics concede it is within the limits of freedom of expression for anti-migrant supporters to make such blanket claims. But what is extraordinary, they say, is the zeal with which the government itself has become a mouthpiece for ethnic and religious caricatures.

The Orban government, they argue, is mainstreaming racism.

"They have launched this extremely vile campaign to portray migrants as rapists and terrorists who can only be stopped if we put up walls to protect our Christian identity," said Mà¡rta Pardavi, co-chair of the Hungarian Helsinki Committee. "To them, it doesn't matter that it's not true what they're saying. They have created a great opportunity for racists."

'Setting the agenda'

Europe's migrant flood of last year has slowed to a trickle, in part because of a tenuous E.U. deal with Turkey as well as a move by Balkan nations to shut their borders.

But hundreds of migrants are still slipping through, and more than 100,000 are stranded in the entry countries of Greece and Italy. All nations in the bloc, E.U. officials say, must share the burden and resettle a certain number of migrants determined by country size, population, economy and other factors.

But Hungary - along with Poland, the Czech Republic and Slovakia - is suing the E.U. to avoid taking in the 1,294 migrants the bloc says it must resettle. Sunday's referendum is ostensibly to block future quotas. But it has effectively become a referendum on migrants themselves.

Orban this week suggested one solution: setting up a "giant **refugee** city" in lawless Libya to process asylum seekers.

Balà¡zs Hidvéghi, a spokesman for Orban's Fidesz Party, defended the "no" campaign and the hiring of border hunters, rejecting criticism as political correctness.

A former anti-communist activist turned populist nationalist, Orban last year took heat from his European peers for throwing up a fence to block the path of asylum seekers streaming into Europe from the war-torn Middle East. Yet Hidvéghi bragged that, for instance, the leader of Austria - who criticized Orban's hard-line stance - is out of a job, while Orban is stronger than ever.

"We are setting the agenda," Hidvéghi said.

One thing is relatively clear: Hungary's migrant blockade seems to be working.

From a peak of more than 13,000 migrants a day, Hungary has more or less snuffed out illegal migration. About 30 legal migrants a day are allowed into transit centers for processing, and even the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees** (UNHCR) concedes that very few illegal migrants appear to be getting through.

That is partly because since July, Hungarian police and soldiers - about 8,000 of them - have begun "escorting" back behind the fence any migrant found within five miles of Hungary's side of the border. Because the fence rests a few feet within Hungarian territory, the government says it is not technically expelling asylum seekers, a violation of international law.

The new border hunters will augment their efforts, officials say, by pairing with more experienced officers to spot migrants from towers and vehicles, track them and ultimately put them back behind the fence.

The UNHCR, however, says the policy appears to violate the Geneva Conventions. In addition, the UNHCR and Doctors Without Borders have documented allegations that the Hungarian police in more than 100 instances used excessive force to return migrants. Some interviewed migrants showed investigators dog bites, severe bruises and other injuries.

"It is a basic right that if a person wants to ask for asylum, they have the right to cross the border in an irregular manner and make such a request," said Ernö Simon, a senior spokesman for the UNHCR in Hungary.

Most migrants are simply seeking to transit Hungary to get to more generous nations such as Germany. But even some migrants who are permitted into Hungary are "treated like animals," according to a report released by Amnesty International.

In early August, according to Amnesty, more than half of the 1,200 asylum seekers residing in Hungary were under official detention. Former detainees reported beatings and threats of violence by Hungarian police and security guards.

Hungarian officials call such claims unfounded. Asked about allegations of mistreatment by migrants, Hidvéghi shrugged.

"Migrants have also said they came from Syria and turned out to be terrorists," he said.

Opponents think the government may move to pass more anti-migrant legislation based on the outcome of Sunday's vote. Polls show a large majority of likely voters set to reject the quotas - although turnout must exceed 50 percent to make the referendum valid. Some critics are calling for opponents to cast invalid ballots to try to nullify the results.

But whether because of the government campaign or not, many Hungarians seem to echo the sentiments of Daniel Kiss, a 17-year-old at the border hunters recruitment drive in this midsize city. He is eager to graduate high school next year, he said, and then become a border hunter to "defend my country."

"There are some migrants with goodwill, but the majority are aggressive," he said. "They just want to get across our border, and we can't allow that."

anthony.faiola@washpost.com

Gergo Saling in Budapest and Stephanie Kirchner in Berlin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Jon Willis

One day in October 1961, a young astronomer named Frank Drake scribbled a string of symbols on a blackboard at a radio observatory in Green Bank, W. Va. Drake's specialty was detecting and interpreting the natural radio waves that emanate from clouds of interstellar gas and from the cores of so-called active galaxies, among other cosmic locations. But he also was intrigued by the idea that **alien** civilizations might be broadcasting artificial radio signals into space, and that we might be able to detect them with the huge dish antennas he and his colleagues used for more conventional research.

The existence of **aliens** was mostly a fringe idea at the time. Science still hadn't recovered from claims by astronomer Percival Lowell in the early 20th century that he could see canals on Mars, built by enterprising Martians - claims that later proved embarrassingly wrong. It also didn't help that the flying-saucer craze, which had begun after World War II, was still in full swing.

Before the 20th century, however, the notion that life existed beyond Earth wasn't nearly so controversial. The idea, which dates as far back as the ancient Greeks, was championed by, among others, the astronomer William Herschel, the philosopher John Locke and the polymath Benjamin Franklin.

And in the 1960s - largely as a result of the bold vision laid out by Drake and a small group of colleagues, including a young Carl Sagan - the idea once again began entering the scientific mainstream. Just how firmly reestablished it has now become is richly evident in "All These Worlds Are Yours: The Scientific Search for **Alien** Life," by Jon Willis. In it, Willis, a cosmologist at the University of Victoria, in Canada, lays out the current state of astrobiology - the broad, interdisciplinary field of science that has drawn some of the most talented astronomers in the world.

The rigorous scientific enterprise Willis describes made talking about **aliens** respectable again, but that didn't keep UFO believers from dropping their own convictions about visitations, abductions and other fringe ideas as Ben Mezrich's "The 37th Parallel: The Secret Truth Behind America's UFO Highway" makes clear. It's a breathless, gripping - and credulous - tour through the wacky world of E.T. enthusiasts.

In his much more mainstream book, Willis explains that Frank Drake was afraid right from the start that he'd be lumped in with the saucer people. He needn't have worried: His approach to this risky topic was rigorously scientific. Drake guessed that **alien** civilizations probably existed (although he didn't believe they were visiting), but he didn't know if enough of them were sprinkled around the Milky Way to make the search for their radio broadcasts worthwhile. If the **aliens** were few and far between, he might have to look for a thousand years before he stumbled on one. If they were a dime a dozen, by contrast, one of their broadcasts could pop up in his radio receiver at pretty much any time.

So Drake, preparing for a small conference he'd convened to discuss the matter, stepped up to a blackboard and wrote down what is now known as the Drake Equation to help astronomers figure out whether there was any point to the enterprise. The equation takes the number of sun-like stars in the galaxy and whittles that down by asking how many of those stars have planets, how many of those planets are Earth-like, how many Earthlike planets give rise to life, how many life-bearing planets evolve intelligent life, and so on.

The catch: The only number Drake and the others had a clue about was the frequency of sun-like stars in the Milky Way. The rest was pure guesswork. So the scientists made their best guesses, multiplied all the factors and calculated that there were probably a million detectable civilizations in the galaxy. That meant it was clearly worth listening. Drake, along with a handful of others pursuing the search for extraterrestrial intelligence, have been listening ever since. They haven't had any luck.

But astronomers and planetary scientists have had plenty of luck in filling some of the other numbers in the Drake Equation. In 1961, for example, nobody knew whether any star beyond the sun had planets. Now, largely because of the Kepler space mission, we know of thousands, and it's almost certain that the Milky Way is home to many hundreds of billions. Tens of billions of these are probably Earthlike. We also know that some Earthlike planets orbit stars that aren't like the sun at all, which greatly expands the possibilities. And we know that a world doesn't necessarily have to be like Earth to be habitable. Several of the moons in our solar system have oceans of water hidden beneath their frozen surfaces, and where there's liquid water, there's at least the possibility of life.

In "All These Worlds Are Yours," Willis covers all the bases, from the origin of chemical elements to the formation of planets to the origin of life on Earth to the current search for life in the solar system - and onward to the search for signs of life in exoplanet atmospheres, which is just now gathering steam.

The book's great strength is Willis's meticulously detailed explanations of the science. As you read, you'll truly understand what we know about life in the universe, and what we're likely to find out in coming decades. The one exception is his overly bold answer to the question of whether there actually is **alien** life, at least in microbial form, in other worlds. "Well, yes, there is," he declares early on. "Probably lots of it."

In fact, he knows no such thing. Although Willis devotes an entire chapter to the several unproved theories about how life might have emerged on the young Earth, nobody really knows what happened. That means we don't know if life is virtually certain to arise under the right conditions, or whether it's a quadrillion-to-one shot. If it's the latter, we might truly be alone in the cosmos and, despite the fond hopes of most astrobiologists, Willis's certainty is a step too far.

The book's greatest weakness, unfortunately, is the same as its strength. Willis explains things in such exhaustive detail that only the most devoted of space geeks will be willing to slog through his mostly dry prose. He does make occasional attempts at reader-friendliness, but this usually comes across like a professor awkwardly trying to jolly the students along as they mostly roll their eyes. "Please tell me," he writes, imagining his readers' thoughts, "this isn't one of those 'life in the universe' books that just drones on about the solar system and leaves out all the neat stuff I am interested in. No, it isn't. But thank you for your patience in sticking with me so far." It does require patience, and many readers might have already given up by now.

Dry prose isn't even remotely a problem with "The 37th Parallel." Mezrich has written no fewer than eight New York Times bestsellers (his first, "Bringing Down the House," was on the list for more than a year), and several have been made into movies. He writes vividly and grippingly about the adventures of Chuck Zukowski, a longtime amateur UFO investigator whose relentless investigations of Area 51, cattle mutilations, the Roswell affair and other mainstays of X-Files subculture have turned him into a True Believer.

It all makes a terrific story, but while Mezrich's writing is light-years ahead of Willis's, his grip on science falls just as far behind. He seems to swallow without question the classic UFOlogical reasoning that if science doesn't have a ready explanation for your experience, it's perfectly reasonable to blame it on **aliens**. He accepts so many nonsensical claims that it would be impossible to list them all. One of my favorites is that the now-defunct "National Institute for Discovery Science," a UFO investigation unit founded by aerospace entrepreneur Robert Bigelow, was made up of "the top researchers in the fields of biology, geology, astrophysics, and chemistry." Impressive if true. But Mezrich names just one of these researchers, a biochemist who wasn't at the top of anything, or even close. There's a reason you've never heard of this institute - and it isn't because there's a government conspiracy to suppress it.

The publicity blurb for "The 37th Parallel" says that Mezrich did extensive research for this book, and that it turned him from a skeptic into a believer. Because nearly all of his sources were believers, too, however, it probably would be more accurate to say he drank the Kool-Aid. But it will make a heck of a movie.

I won't go to see it, though. The real science of astrobiology is exciting enough, and a long list of new telescopes and new planetary probes, already in the pipeline, guarantees that it will only get better over the next decade or two. Humans have been wondering whether we're alone in the universe for thousands of years, at least. We could know the answer very soon.

Michael D. Lemonickis the opinion editor at Scientific American magazine. His book "The Perpetual Now: A Story of Amnesia, Memory and Love" will be published in February.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

habitatpwc.org.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

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

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

.

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Compiled by Sarah Lane
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Email: pwliving@washpost.com

Fax: 703-392-1406

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 20 front-page article "Suspect's family life shadowed by financial troubles, violence" characterized the suspected New York City and New Jersey bomber as living the "typical life of an **immigrant** son." One hopes this is not now the norm.

Millions upon millions of **immigrants** entered the United States in the mid- to late 1800s and helped shape this country into what made it great. My father - and scores of others in this country - represent the true definition of the typical **immigrant**'s son. This particular **immigrant**'s son was one of the very first volunteers for the U.S. Navy Seabees (an honored unit that exists today). He married shortly after Pearl Harbor, spent a brief time with his new bride and entered the military service of the United States one month to the day after they wed.

He spent more than a year and a half in North Africa during World War II, immediately after the Torch Landings of 1942. Upon return to the United States a few days after D-Day, he spent a year on a Rhode Island naval base and from there was mobilized to Guam in preparation for the invasion of Japan. However, two days after my father crossed the International Date Line in the Pacific Ocean on the attack transport USS Sitka, the United States dropped an atomic bomb on Nagasaki, averting the planned invasion.

After three years and 13 days of service, my father returned to his bride on Nov. 6, 1945. He spent the rest of his life disabled from his service to our country, and never once did I hear him complain about his injuries. He worked seven days a week for 40 years in the restaurant he built, creating a future for his children. He died 20 days into the new millennium of complications from his service injuries, as the veins in his legs finally failed to function.

He, and millions of others, are typical **immigrants**' sons. Please do not insult me, my father or the rest of this country by suggesting that the suspected bomber is anywhere near the caliber of my dad.

Frank Calcagno Jr., Herndon

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Robert Kanigel

My copy of "The Death and Life of Great American Cities" is marked with stars and smiley faces in the margins. When I first read it in my mid-20s, I was ecstatic about discovering this woman, Jane Jacobs, who shared every one of my biases. Suburbs are monotonous and dull! Cars have strangled American cities! It's so true, as she understood, genuinely good bookstores never open in newly constructed buildings.

The godmother of all urbanists has had this effect on 50 years of readers - city-dwellers whose radical ideas she helped legitimize. Jacobs gave voice, even moral and intellectual high ground, to a particular kind of nonconformist, the person who didn't get the appeal of suburban malls or want the solitude of cul-de-sacs at a time when the American dream was reorienting around both. In the 1960s, she perceived order and value in what looked to others like urban decay. And she insisted that neighborhoods like her own Greenwich Village, with its aging buildings and busy sidewalks, embodied the vitality that suburbia could never possess. Her proposition was all the more remarkable because at the time, big American cities such as New York were shedding population and beginning a long decline. The suburbs were ascendent, and cities, to survive, were trying to copy them. Today, Jacobs's counternarrative has become its own conventional wisdom (and many suburban town centers are now trying to mimic Greenwich Village).

But although Jacobs spent a lot of time pondering what could make urban economies succeed - the theme running across several of her books - she devoted much less attention to the possibility that success might create its own complications. And where she made us rethink the built material of cities - streets, buildings, blocks - she said little about the people who fill them.

Two new books tug Jacobs's ideas into the 21st century - and explore what she missed - as her 1960s-era battles to keep highways and wrecking balls out of cities have been replaced by fears of the gentrification and inequality settling in. In "Eyes on the Street," Robert Kanigel has written the definitive Jacobs biography, illuminating how her ideas rankled, spread and then garnered her such devotion. In "The Well-Tempered City," developer Jonathan F.P. Rose loyally cites Jacobs but considers how cities must evolve in an interconnected and troubling world.

Kanigel appraises the work and life of Jacobs in prose that is as lively as her own. "Maybe you thought you didn't want to march off to the suburbs like everyone else, that it was satisfying, or fun, or fascinating, to live amid a million strangers in an anonymous city," he observes, "and here was a lady who thought so, too, who understood, and who helped you see your city, and maybe yourself, in a new and liberating way."

It is a ripe moment for a new Jacobs biography, because the eccentrics she spoke for have now become culturally dominant. The new narrative says that Americans want to move back to cities. The kinds of dense neighborhoods Jacobs prized - near transit, heavy with foot traffic, their housing and commerce all jumbled together - now have the fastest-rising property values in the country.

Even in Detroit, according to census data, the white population is growing for the first time since 1950. In cities such as Washington, long-vacant plots of land have all been earmarked by developers. Bike lanes are proliferating (Jacobs was a bike commuter). If anyone is under siege, it's the suburban commuter. The war on cities has become the war on cars.

But in this post-Jacobs world - she died in 2006 and would have turned 100 this year - her once-outlandish ideas feel both timeless and insufficient. She did not dwell much on the future of cities, a preoccupation of many authors today, given that she was writing in a time when their imperiled present was more urgent. Kanigel's book invites the question of how this woman who forced so many of us to see cities differently might help us interpret their state today, and whether she's up to that task.

Jacobs did not become a public intellectual until her late 40s, with the publication of "Death and Life," making her an unlikely icon, a "pudding-faced old lady in ill-fitting jumper and sneakers." She had no formal education in planning, economics or architecture, or even a college degree. But she elbowed her way among experts by staring more intently at problems others studied in the abstract. Among the many gems Kanigel unearths is this perfect reaction from the Wall Street Journal to her book "Death and Life": "In another age, the author's enormous intellectual temerity would have ensured her destruction as a witch."

Kanigel's story of how her ideas took hold is more interesting than her life itself (Jacobs always insisted she was quite ordinary). Even her fiercest critics were in awe of the woman, and the rightness that she claimed.

Time did, repeatedly, prove her right about both the value of cities and the threats to them. The highways she opposed were supposed to revive cities but helped speed their decline. The modernist public housing high-rises she disdained were dynamited in her lifetime. Monocultures, as she warned, did endanger whole economies, as happened when Detroit collapsed with its auto industry. Even transportation engineers eventually concurred: You can't make traffic disappear simply by paving ever more lanes.

But where cities that followed her prescriptions have thrived, new problems have arisen. San Francisco's booming economy has been accompanied by skyrocketing rents. Washington's newly coveted "walkable" neighborhoods threaten to displace their longtime residents. Jacobs's own Greenwich Village couldn't accommodate today the working-class "sidewalk ballet" of baby carriages, fruit sellers, longshoremen and housewives she observed in the 1950s.

Jacobs is sometimes unfairly blamed for encouraging gentrification. If she helped fan the demand for neighborhoods like her own, she is not responsible for restricting the supply of such places, which is the real problem. For decades, while we overbuilt suburbia, we effectively stopped creating the kinds of neighborhoods Jacobs loved. But she did give us formulas for shaping lively streets and strong urban economies that don't quite tell us how to resolve their side effects in 2016.

And she was remarkably mute about an urban problem of her time that we still live with today - what her editor called "the Negro question." Jacobs wrote extensively about the importance of "diversity," but she meant the diversity of uses in a neighborhood (offices, factories, restaurants, apartments), and the diversity of building types that allow those uses to coexist. Economic diversity may be implied in that picture, but racial diversity - or racial inequality - was never her subject.

Kanigel reveals a fascinating exchange of letters between Jacobs and her editor, Jason Epstein, in the weeks before she finished the manuscript for "Death and Life." He begged her to tackle race, lest she publish an ambitious book on the problems of cities that said nothing of the particularly acute problems of blacks in cities.

"I don't think that you can proceed as though the question didn't exist," Epstein wrote.

Jacobs responded, with the confidence that characterized all her other arguments, that this was "a poor idea for my book."

Her view was narrow. She did not concede that others might value the kinds of neighborhoods she did not. And although she championed cities for people (as opposed to cities for cars, or bureaucrats, or master planners), she actually wrote little about the people in them. Repeatedly, critics accused her of overstating the power of physical environments over social context to shape us.

Despite its blind spots, "Death and Life" set a standard that urbanist authors have been nipping at since: the classic that alters how we understand cities, whose relevance could stretch across decades. And she left ample space for others to fill in. Economist Edward Glaeser's 2011 "Triumph of the City" comes the closest of late to matching and complimenting Jacobs (Glaeser took her to task for enshrining old buildings that would, through historic preservation today, make it much harder to add new housing in expensive cities).

In his book, Rose, a longtime developer of affordable, mixed-income and green projects, picks up many of the topics Jacobs did not touch: income inequality, racial unrest, the hardship of growing up in poverty. And where she was certain about every one of her pronouncements, Rose has written a book that is largely about uncertainty: how cities will thrive in a "VUCA future," using a military acronym for the simultaneous condition of volatility, uncertainty, complexity and ambiguity. Cities present wicked problems, he writes: "Every wicked problem is a symptom of another problem. And every intervention changes the problem and its context."

Wicked problems have no clear solutions. Answers that help some wind up harming others. And so investments in poor neighborhoods invite gentrification. Economic growth exacerbates inequality. Rising property values (good for homeowners) mean unaffordable housing (bad for renters). Greater density (which could lower housing prices) taxes public transportation. Aggressive policing tactics that may make cities safer **alienate** the minority communities that bear the brunt of them.

This is a more useful frame for thinking about modern cities in which success is part of the challenge and threats come in more menacing forms than the hubris of Robert Moses, the New York master builder who devised much of the city's earlier urban renewal. Today's big cities, Rose points out looking across the globe, must also contend with population growth, climate change, resource depletion, widening inequality, **refugee** crises and terrorism. "The tide of megatrends is moving against our best intentions," he warns, "and we are not working at a scale that is meeting the challenges of our times."

Rose's answer is a "well-tempered city," a place where nature and man coexist in greater harmony, where every solution targets multiple problems at once (building weatherization creates jobs, cuts energy use, reduces housing costs and makes cities more resilient to disaster). In getting there, Rose tries to cover too much ground, from Mesopotamia to Freddie Gray, with too many overlapping analogies drawn from military jargon to musical theory to ecology. Where Jacobs had her sizable blinders, he wraps his arms around too much and draws too little on his own surely fascinating experience as a developer.

But his contribution is useful for defining the problems of cities in a world more complex than in Jacobs's time.

The well-tempered city already exists, sort of. Imagine a city, Rose suggests, with Singapore's social housing, Austin's smart grid, Copenhagen's biking culture, New York's arts scene, Hong Kong's subway, San Francisco's recycling program, London's congestion pricing and Tokyo's public health. All these pieces haven't come together in one place yet. If they ever do, that would be a modern ideal that would speak to more people than Jacobs's 1950s Greenwich Village.

Emily Badger covered cities and urban policy for The Washington Post.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Eric Zhou grew up in China's Fujian province watching his father, an accomplished chef, whip up banquets of intricate Chinese dishes. But when Zhou moved to the United States and started working in a Chinese restaurant, he saw that his native cuisine was mostly considered cheap in this country, confined to greasy takeout counters and $7.95 lunch buffets.

So Zhou edged his way into a much more lucrative industry: Japanese food. Years later, he owns four Japanese and Asian fusion restaurants in the Washington area. With Chinese food, he says, "the price in America is too low. Japanese restaurants don't have this problem. To us, it's more suitable. It's a better life."

Zhou, 44, has joined thousands of other Chinese **immigrants** in the United States in seeking a leg up the economic ladder through Japanese food. From Ames, Iowa, to Lancaster, Pa., Chinese Americans have opened many of the sushi joints that dot suburban malls and city blocks across the country. It's the result of what experts describe as a striking convergence between America's ethnic food preferences and the economic pressures facing a new wave of Chinese **immigrants**, whose population in the United States has tripled in the past 25 years.

Which cuisines sell well and which don't may seem to be a combination of chance and cultural tastes. But the outsize role of Chinese Americans in the Japanese food business, according to academics who've studied it, sheds light on deeper forces. The influx of low-wage Chinese **immigrants** - the country has recently eclipsed Mexico as the largest source of **immigrants** to the United States - has created fierce competition to provide cheap food. At the same time, Japan's wealth and economic success helped its cuisine gain a reputation as trendy and refined. So for those Chinese **immigrants** looking to get ahead, Japanese food has often become the better opportunity.

"Chinese entrepreneurs have figured out that this is a way to make a slightly better living and get out of the ... world of $10, $5 food at the bottom-end of the market," says Krishnendu Ray, who leads New York University's food studies program.

Ray has collected data from Zagat, the restaurant guide, to underscore the point. In 1985, the average cost of a Chinese dinner for one in New York, Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco was $24.20 when adjusted for inflation, compared with $31.88 for a Japanese dinner, a difference of just $7.68. By 2013, a Chinese dinner cost only a little more - $32.78 - while a Japanese dinner had nearly doubled, to $62.73, a difference of nearly $30.

"Japanese food has more prestige and seems to, if you just look at a menu, have greater economic opportunity attached to it, because people are conditioned to pay more for rice and protein when it's presented as sushi than rice and protein when it's presented as a stir-fry," said Sasha Issenberg, author of "The Sushi Economy."

Some of the difference in the price of Japanese and Chinese has to do with food itself - but not all. Ray argues Chinese food has earned a reputation for being cheap in large part because of the historic poverty of the country and its **immigrants**. "Foods we associate with poor **immigrants** tend to be cheap, and we are generally not willing to pay a higher price for it," he says.

He argues the cuisine's reputation could change as China's economy surges ahead and its people grow wealthier. Already, more upscale Chinese restaurants are popping up to cater to a new wave of wealthy Chinese **immigrating** to the United States. But others are skeptical that Americans will ever pay top dollar for Chinese food.

Kin Lee, the owner of Love Sushi in Gaithersburg, Md., came to the country when he was 11 from Guangzhou, a massive city in southern China. His father owned a Chinese restaurant. His wife, however, had worked in Japanese restaurants and advised him it was a better business.

"I can tell you it is easier to do than a Chinese restaurant," he says. "And the profit margins are better."

Patterns in **immigration**

Since China loosened its restrictions on emigration in the 1970s, the total number of Chinese **immigrants** in the United States has gone from just 384,400 in 1980 to 2 million in 2013, according to the Migration Policy Institute. Some Chinese have arrived legally, aided by U.S. laws designed to help them escape religious persecution, democracy crackdowns or forced abortions. Others paid tens of thousands of dollars to be smuggled.

Like many migrant groups, they clustered in specific industries where language skills were less important and where there were well-established networks of job opportunities. According to the best estimates, there are more than 40,000 Chinese restaurants in the country, more than the number of U.S. post offices. On the East Coast, many Chinese **immigrants** arrive in New York and from there ride the network of long-distance buses that runs from Chinatown to kitchens all over the country. Like Zhou, many are from Fujian province, where entire villages emptied out in the 1990s as people sought opportunity in the United States.

David Wank, a professor of sociology at Japan's Sophia University who has studied Chinese ownership of Japanese restaurants, says that Japanese, Vietnamese and Korean **immigrants** began opening Japanese restaurants outside of major cities in the 1980s to take advantage of Americans' growing appetite for the food. But it was the Fujianese who greatly expanded the reach of inexpensive Japanese restaurants, he says, first opening sushi restaurants in New York in the 1990s, then pushing across the East Coast.

It's impossible to say how many of the roughly 25,000 Japanese restaurants in the United States are owned by people of Chinese origin. The Japanese Ministry of Agriculture estimated in the past that only about one-tenth of Japanese restaurants in the states were run by people of Japanese descent. A survey of 33 Japanese restaurants in the Washington area revealed that 12 were owned by Chinese Americans and 12 by Korean Americans. Only six were Japanese owned.

Wank says Chinese **immigrants** abandoned Chinese food restaurants because of fierce competition. Many Chinese **immigrants** were poor and willing to work punishing hours to send money home to their relatives or give their children a better life in the United States. That led to a crowded industry and low wages.

By contrast, Japanese food offered a much clearer economic opportunity. As Japan's economy roared in the second half of the 20th century, its food became associated with a new class of business travelers. The cuisine's healthful reputation, its embrace by Hollywood stars and the invention of Americanized classics such as the California roll helped its popularity grow. Americans expected to pay high prices for Japanese food. But incomes in Japan were already so high that it didn't make economic sense for a Japanese chef to emigrate to work anywhere but the priciest U.S. restaurants, often in major cities.

That created an opening for Chinese Americans.

"Often the margins look better on sushi than they do on Chinese food," Issenberg says. "If I could be selling egg rolls for $3 each or cucumber rolls for $5 each, why am I not in that business?"

Kazuhiro Okochi, a chef and owner at KAZ Sushi Bistro in the District, who trained as a chef in Japan, said that he has seen many non-Japanese chefs cook good Japanese food, and that Japanese cuisine actually borrows a lot from other culinary traditions, including China's. But he says he worries that the quality and the reputation of some Japanese restaurants in the United States might be suffering because new restaurant owners are trying to compete on price and expand quickly.

"Japanese food and, particularly sushi, has grown so fast in the past few decades, and a lot of people just try to copy and open the restaurants, without getting much [training]," Okochi says.

Big dreams

Zhou loves Fujianese food; he talks fondly of the big pot of soup that his wife keeps bubbling on the back burner at home nearly all hours of the day. But he's happy to have specialized in Japanese cooking.

"I wanted to earn money," he says, "so I studied the industry that had the higher salary."

Zhou (pronounced like "Joe") is the owner of Masa Hibachi Steakhouse and Sushi, a spacious Japanese restaurant in Silver Spring that features flat, iron teppanyaki griddles where chefs cook and perform tricks for customers. At 5:30 p.m. on a Wednesday in August, a birthday party of young women shrieked with delight as their chef - also from Fujian - flipped vegetables, squirted sake into their mouths and sent flames shooting across the grill.

Zhou now owns four restaurants in the Washington suburbs that serve a mix of hibachi, sushi and Asian fusion. He owns a house in Bowie and pays for family vacations and piano lessons for his two middle-school-age children. But he is still striving to improve his business and dreams of building a network of eight to 10 hibachi and sushi restaurants.

"In terms of family, I think I've achieved the American dream," he says. "Professionally, I'm still working toward it."

For the past few decades, the Japanese restaurant business has offered people like Zhou the clearest path to success. Yet if China's economy continues to grow, that could gradually set its emigrants and its cuisine in the United States on a new path.

Ray says that as China gets wealthier, its cuisine may move upmarket, just as Japanese food did. He says he thinks Americans may soon discover what a remarkable cuisine China possesses - and has possessed throughout recorded history.

"If you go to any of the major Chinese cultures 1,000 years ago, they have a foodie culture like Brooklyn and Manhattan has today," Ray says. "I think my son's generation, when he grows up, is going to look at Chinese culture with totally different eyes."

But for now, Zhou and other Chinese American entrepreneurs are still following local tastes. "If Americans really wanted to eat the authentic food, it would exist," Zhou says.

He recalls a Chinese-style dish, a duck breast, that he added to the menu at his restaurant after it opened. Zhou thought was delicious, but it sold poorly.

"When you open a restaurant, you need to follow local appetites, then you can earn money," he says. "You can't just say, 'Oh, I like this.' The customers have to think that."

ana.swanson@washpost.com

ï…ŒMore at washingtonpost.com/news/wonkblog

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Supreme Court's new term begins Monday with the focus not on the court's docket but on the court itself and a future that will be defined by the presidential election.

For the first time in decades, there will be only eight justices, not nine, to begin the new term. Also absent are the kind of big-ticket cases - involving **immigration**reform, affirmative action, abortion, same-sex marriage and the Affordable Care Act - that in recent years have catapulted the Supreme Court to the fore of American civic life.

Instead, the short-handed court has assembled a docket of more-modest cases - albeit ones that touch on contemporary controversies such as the role of race in criminal justice and politics; free speech; and perhaps the treatment of transgender students.

Of far greater consequence is the fate of the court's ideological balance. And on that question, the court finds itself like the rest of the country: waiting to see what happens on Nov. 8.

It has been nearly a half-century since a presidential election promised such an immediate impact on the court. Senate Republicans have refused to take up President Obama's choice of Judge Merrick Garland for the seat of the late Justice Antonin Scalia, arguing that a newly elected president should fill that vacancy.

As of Sunday, Garland has been waiting 200 days for the Senate to act on his nomination. Obama tapped Garland a month after Scalia's death in February. But Senate Majority Leader Mitch McConnell (R-Ky.) has been adamant that the Senate will not even hold a hearing on Garland, the chief judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit.

The next president's impact on the court could go well beyond that one choice and be felt for decades. Three of the current justices are now older than other members who recently retired from the court, suggesting more departures to fill.

A victory by Donald Trump would continue the modern tradition of courts dominated by Republican-appointed members. But Hillary Clinton's success could upend the status quo at the Marble Palace, producing nominees who would cement abortion rights, affirmative action and gay rights, and challenge hard-won conservative victories on gun rights, strict voting laws and campaign finance.

Any discussion of the Supreme Court these days, Stanford law professor Pamela S. Karlan said at a recent preview session at William & Mary Law School, can be summed up in two words: "It depends."

If the procedural precedent for Republican resistance is thin, the political imperative is clear.

"I really don't think there can be any doubt that if Chief Judge Garland is in fact the next justice on the Supreme Court, it is going to lead to a sea change in the direction of the court on many of the most consequential issues of the law," said Kannon Shanmugam, a Washington lawyer and former Scalia clerk who regularly represents clients before the court.

Garland's fate depends not only on whether Clinton is elected but also which party comes to control the Senate. A Republican-majority Senate might finally welcome Garland, perhaps even in a lame-duck session before the end of the year. Republican senators in the past praised Garland as the most moderate nominee a Democratic president might offer.

But a Senate controlled by Democrats might want a more liberal nominee or a younger one, who would probably get to serve longer on the court than the 63-year-old Garland. That would present Clinton with a tough choice as she put together a Cabinet and a legislative agenda.

"The political capital that a President Clinton would have to exert to nominate someone else, unless she has a filibuster-proof Senate, might not be worth it," Karlan said.

Trump has promised that his nominee would come from a list of 21 possibilities - all but one are judges - that has drawn respect from the conservative legal establishment. But Democrats probably would not make it easy for him to fill an opening that occurred during a Democratic president's term.

"Whatever the outcome of this, the damage to the court has been done," said David Strauss, a law professor at the University of Chicago. "Because it's hard to imagine the Democrats in the foreseeable future, should they be in the position Republicans are now, unilaterally disarming."

The current divide on the court has led to more liberal outcomes than conservative ones. The four justices on the left need draw only one vote from the right to prevail, and Justice Anthony M. Kennedy has sided with them on several.

"A lot of the big things are actually ones on which the court already has a so-called liberal majority. Abortion and affirmative action, now that Justice Kennedy has voted that way, are two recent examples," said Neal Katyal, who was acting solicitor general under Obama.

But it is clear that the court itself recognizes it is split. Three cases accepted before Scalia died - disputes involving class actions, a government "taking" of private land and subsidies for a religious organization - have not yet been scheduled for oral argument, while others granted months later will be argued this week.

The court found itself deadlocked four times last term - including over the propriety of Obama's ambitious order to shield some longtime undocumented **immigrants** from deportation. Other times, it reached agreement by avoiding fundamental questions.

The justices mostly have been silent about how the vacancy has affected their work. But Justice Sonia Sotomayor recently told a group of lawyers and judges in Colorado that it eventually will keep the court from doing its job.

"There are a few cases where you can see that we ruled very, very, very narrowly, and it doesn't take a genius to figure out why," Sotomayor said. But she added the court's job is to take on the most vexing questions, ones that have divided lower courts.

"If we do rule narrowly on every case we take," Sotomayor said, "the resolution of those important issues will continue to elude us and elude you."

The court will begin oral arguments on Tuesday, instead of the traditional first Monday in October, because of a Jewish holiday. Race in the justice system will be a prominent topic.

In one case, the court will consider Duane Buck's assertion that his right to a fair hearing in Texas was compromised during the death penalty phase of his conviction for two murders in 1995. His lawyers put on the stand a state expert who said black men are more likely to present a risk of future violence.

In another case, Miguel Angel Peña Rodriguez wants to show that the jury in his trial on sexual assault charges was improperly swayed by the prejudicial statements of one of the jurors. The former law enforcement officer was outed by fellow jurors who said he argued for convicting Peña Rodriguez because he was Mexican, and "Mexican men take whatever they want."

The Colorado Supreme Court said rules protecting the secrecy of jury deliberations prohibited a judge from considering the man's remarks.

And the court will again confront the role of race in politics. For the third straight term, the justices will consider whether state legislators improperly relied on race when drawing electoral districts. The current cases come from Virginia and North Carolina.

Later this month, the court will decide whether to accept the case involving Gavin Grimm, a transgender boy, who is barred from using the boys' bathroom at Gloucester High School in Virginia. Lower courts have deferred to the Obama administration's directive that schools must allow students to use the bathroom that corresponds with their gender identity.

But Gloucester County received a stay from complying with the ruling, which the Supreme Court granted until it decided whether to hear the case.

If accepted, said American Civil Liberties Union legal director Steven Shapiro, it would "immediately become the highest-profile case" on the court's docket.

robert.barnes@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CALAIS, France - So far, Donald Trump's plan to build a wall along the Mexican border is all talk. Last week, France and Britain actually began building one along theirs.

Construction started here on a roughly mile-long concrete barrier intended to separate a sprawling migrant camp from the tunnels that offer passage to Britain, the latest attempt in what has become a global effort to throw physical barriers in the way of historic streams of human migration.

From a razor-wire-topped border fence in Hungary to the sealed border of Macedonia and Greece to Trump's proposed wall, polarized societies across the world are finding that they can unite around keeping others at bay.

The "Great Wall of Calais," as the project is informally known, is considerably shorter than Trump's proposed partition of the United States and Mexico, but its message is much the same: Keep out. The concrete wall, which will rise to 13 feet, extends a fence near the sprawling Calais migrant camp known as the "Jungle," where more than 7,000 migrants have been stranded as they seek to enter Britain by all means possible. The concrete will be specially formulated to make it difficult to scale.

The camp here has become one of the most visible symbols of Europe's migration crisis: a squalid no man's land nestled between London and Paris, two of Europe's wealthiest cities. The victorious British campaign to leave the European Union was partly fueled by concerns over **immigration**, while candidates for France's presidential election next year are already competing over being tough on migrant flows. Opponents of French President François Hollande have tried to turn the camp into a symbol of his weakness.

"It's something scary, this resignation, this lack of authority," former French president Nicolas Sarkozy said while visiting Calais last week. Sarkozy's campaign to recapture the presidency has pulled anti-**immigrant** rhetoric from the surging far-right National Front party, which has vowed to reestablish controls at France's borders.

So far, the only sign of the wall is an anonymous, unmarked construction site at the edge of the highway, far from the center of this small, working-class city. Late last week, a small squadron of construction workers laid small foundation slabs into ditches cleared alongside the highway as cars and trucks sped by.

The aim is to keep migrants from stowing away on ferries and trucks. The barrier follows portions of the highway leading into the port, which passes directly in front of the encampment's entrance. Britain has contributed most of the money for the project, which will cost about $2.5 million, according to leaked reports in the British media. The British Home Office refused to confirm the price tag. In total, London has pledged $22 million to France for assistance with border security.

British Prime Minister Theresa May has taken Britain's exit referendum as a mandate to toughen **immigration** policies, working hand-in-hand with French authorities to try to discourage migrants from pooling in Calais. Both nations have taken an increasingly hard-line approach. The moves come as many European countries have pursued national policies to discourage migration, while campaigning against German-led efforts to share asylum seekers among the 28 nations of the E.U.

The wall will "prevent illegals trying to get to the U.K.," British Home Secretary Amber Rudd told the House of Commons in September, defending the initiative against critics who called it a waste of money.

In France, the wall's construction comes at a tense political moment, as the country prepares for the 2017 presidential election. The rise of Marine Le Pen - the outspoken leader of the far-right National Front Party - has pulled the political mainstream toward her agenda, which is firmly opposed to France becoming a haven for migrants and **refugees**.

In the aftermath of three devastating terrorist attacks in the past two years, contenders in the forthcoming presidential election are increasingly engaged in a debate focused on **immigration** and Islam rather than economics or domestic policy. The camp in Calais has become a flash point.

"The attacks have considerably changed the climate in France," said Bruno Cautrès, a political analyst at the Center for Political Research at Paris's Sciences Po. "The desire for many is to have a president who can bring security back."

Local authorities in Calais oppose Paris's decision to construct the wall, preferring instead only the dismantling of the Jungle camp, whose existence has placed considerable strain on the town of 126,000.

"The beginning of the solution begins with the demolition of the Jungle," said Faustine Maliar, the chief of staff for the mayor of Calais, a Sarkozy ally. "The moment the Jungle is destroyed, there is no need for a wall," she said.

Hollande, who is seeking reelection next year, has vowed to demolish the camp by the end of the year.

"From now on our objectives are clear," Hollande told reporters in Calais on Monday. "To guarantee the security of the people of Calais, maintain public order and ensure that conditions for the migrants and **refugees** are dignified."

Migrants who wish to claim asylum in France will be shipped to other shelters across the country, Hollande said. But because the vast majority of Calais' migrants want to travel onward to Britain, the plan's chance for success is unclear. Previous attempts to squeeze the size of the camp have failed.

From a practical perspective, the short, easily defendable French wall - combined with the formidable obstacle of the 22-mile-wide English Channel - may be more successful at preventing passage than any Trump-built wall on the long U.S.-Mexico land border, said Alexander Betts, the director of the **Refugee** Studies Center at the University of Oxford. But the political symbolism is more important than any practical purpose, he said.

"The wall is an idea that public audiences can understand as a tool of exclusion," he said.

With both governments agreeing that they want to deter migrants from coming to Calais, "they can agree on strong deterrence. So if building a wall solves that, or building an asylum center in Paris solves that, then that's fine, even if it's not in the best interests of the **refugees** and migrants in Calais," he said.

If the wall is intended to deliver a message of deterrence, so far it does not seem to have accomplished its mission. Few migrants in the camp appear to have heard about its construction - but they were much more worried that they would soon be pushed out of their temporary home.

"The wall is not important," said Tariq Shinwari, a 26-year-old business administration graduate from Afghanistan who said he had lived in the Jungle for six months. "People in here do not care about the wall - they care about the demolition. We have minors in here. If they demolish the camp, where will they go?"

james.mcauley@washpost.com
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Birnbaum reported from Brussels.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**EL CAJON, Calif. - In a turnabout, police here Friday decided to release the full video taken by a taco-stand employee showing the minutes leading to the fatal shooting by police of an unarmed black man.

Police on Tuesday night had released a still photo taken from the video showing the police killing hours earlier of Alfred Olango, 38, an **immigrant** from Uganda. But backed by the district attorney, the police chief had refused until Friday to release the full video.

The fuller release was made to try to avoid a repeat of the violence that erupted at the Thursday night protest march on a downtown street in this suburb east of San Diego. Two men were arrested after the rally of 50 to 75 turned violent, with car windows broken, bottles thrown at police and a rider pulled from his motorcycle.

Police used "pepper balls" and flash-bang grenades to disperse the crowd after the protest was declared an unlawful assembly.

A protest march is set for Saturday, and an additional protest was expected Friday night.

Police had responded Tuesday to a call from Olango's sister that he was mentally ill and acting erratically.

The two officers at the scene - one who shot Olango with his service weapon, one who used a stun gun to try to disable Olango - were not wearing body cameras.

Olang arrived in the United States as a **refugee** with his family in 1991, according to a statement released by U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement.

An **immigration** judge ordered him deported in 2002 after he was convicted of transporting and selling drugs. That order was renewed in 2009, when Olango left prison after serving a sentence for being a felon in possession of a firearm.

In both instances, Uganda refused to issue travel documents that would have permitted Olango to return to his homeland, according to a statement issued by ICE. Olango and his family had fled Uganda for fear of becoming victims of political violence, according to court documents.

The **immigration** system was required to release Olango from custody in compliance with a U.S. Supreme Court ruling that **immigrants** ordered deported cannot be held in custody indefinitely if their native country refuses to allow them to return, officials said.

After being released from federal custody, Olango was ordered to appear regularly before officials of the customs agency. He followed that requirement for several years but stopped reporting in February 2015 and "had not been encountered by the agency since," according to the statement.

On Tuesday afternoon, when the two El Cajon officers confronted Olango in a strip-mall parking lot, police said, Olango refused their commands and reached into his pocket for a metallic-looking object and then assumed a "shooting stance," aiming the device at an officer. The object turned out to be an electronic smoking device.

That officer fired his service weapon, fatally striking Olango. The other officer fired a stun gun.

national@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Woody Allen has made a TV series for Amazon - or rather, he's taken what might have been a passably mediocre Woody Allen movie and chopped it up into six little parts, each clocking in at a little more than 20 minutes, and called it "Crisis in Six Scenes," which began streaming on Amazon on Friday.

The result, while generally weak compared with the best of Allen's many films, says more about the uncertainty of both the movie and TV business than anything else. Everyone's still figuring out how digital streaming and viewing on-demand will pay off both financially and creatively; this ongoing experiment has legendary filmmakers (such as the 80-year-old Allen) making new deals with outfits like Amazon. After all, the multiplex is as endangered as the cable box.

In this riff on ideological seduction set in the late 1960s, Allen stars as frustrated writer Sidney J. Munsinger, whose life is upended when Lennie Dale (Miley Cyrus), a radical militant wanted by the FBI, seeks **refuge** at the suburban Connecticut home Sid shares with his therapist wife, Kay (played by the absolutely adorable Elaine May).

Kay, who knew Lennie as a child and is secretly thrilled by the young woman's activism, welcomes her in and fixes up a guest room for her, while Sid has one classic Allen-style conniption after another, worried that they'll be caught for harboring a fugitive: "I'm the type that gets sodomized in prison," he whines. "I'm fair-skinned and rather shapely."

Lennie's coolly charismatic presence begins to radicalize everyone around her (except Sid), including the talkative gaggle that is Kay's weekly book club, who, on Lennie's recommendation, read Chairman Mao's "Little Red Book" and are soon plotting nude sit-ins and bombings. These scenes are the most entertaining of the series; the rest, especially when it involves Allen, often feels like a padded-out remake of his flaky 1993 caper "Manhattan Murder Mystery," especially when Lennie asks Sid and Kay to perform an act of subterfuge on her behalf.

"We talk the talk, but we never walk the walk," Kay says, urging her husband to help.

"Well, I don't want to walk the walk," Sid replies. "Or shoot the shoot, or bomb the bomb."

It's never quite clear whether Allen's intention here is to send up radical chic in a Tom Wolfe way or if he's simply finding a sort of creative **refuge** by dialing things back 50 years, so that his characters are free to speak in broad stereotypes and still have it play as humor. It may just be that he's trying a little of this and a little of that, all from his usual bag. There's a hypochondriacal visit to a doctor, just when the viewer is wondering why there yet hasn't been a scene with Allen complaining about his health.

"Crisis in Six Scenes" is the lightest possible treatment of '60s cultural tumult, and, to the show's credit, the period details and costumes are delightful, down to the girlish flip of May's hairdo. The series also offers one more piece of evidence toward an overall theory that Cyrus will wind up being the 21st century's Katharine Hepburn. (Discuss.)

What "Crisis" is not is a TV series. The fact that you'll have to click down to the next episode and press play will seem less like an enthralling binge-viewing experience and more like an excuse for extra bathroom breaks. You'll still be finished with it in about two hours.

hank.stuever@washpost.com

Crisis in Six Scenes(six episodes)available now on Amazon. (Disclosure: The Washington Post is owned by Amazon's chief executive, Jeffrey P. Bezos.)

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You could say that Ryan Fu's feelings about his heritage are complicated. The openly gay son of Chinese **immigrants**, the New York fashion stylist can't even cross paths with an Asian deliveryman without shooting him a look of disdainful superiority. Because that happens during the first scene of the romantic comedy "Front Cover," it's clear that the character's notions about cultural identity are going to play a big part in what's to come.

It doesn't take long. Ryan (a charming Jake Choi) gets an assignment to style an up-and-coming Chinese actor, Ning (James Chen), who's visiting from Beijing while preparing for a big magazine spread. At first, the two don't get along. Ning jokes to his entourage that Ryan is ABC - short for "American-borrowed Chinese." ("Like the pandas," the actor helpfully explains to his unamused stylist.)

Things get worse before they get, predictably, better: The pair's tenuous alliance very nearly falls apart after Ning tells Ryan that they can work together only if Ryan doesn't show his "homo side" so openly.

Doth he protest too much? You bet.

Meanwhile, the guys end up learning a thing or two from each other. Ning becomes more open-minded, and Ryan finds a new appreciation for his roots. The movie, which tends to lack surprise and subtlety, only really finds its groove once Ryan's parents (Elizabeth Sung and Ming Lee) show up, demonstrating both how shabbily their son treats them - he's constantly embarrassed by their **immigrant** ways - and how devoted they are to him. His mother still harbors feelings of guilt over trying to toughen up her son during childhood, when he was constantly bullied.

That subplot, not to mention Sung's moving performance, makes the movie more complex. Otherwise, "Front Cover" is weighed down by heavy-handed dialogue and a melodramatic score. The second feature from writer-director Ray Yeung ("Cut Sleeve Boys"), the film's examination of the first-generation American experience feels fresh. The delivery, however, is hardly original.

stephanie.merry@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The guard searched the line of undocumented **immigrants**, placing each in shackles in the basement of a Homeland Security building in Northern Virginia. Then he came to a young woman in a blouse and blue pants that July day, and he paused.

"I know you," the guard told her, she remembered later. Months earlier, Wendy Uruchi Contreras had come to the same facility under much different circumstances - as an **immigration** rights activist.

That day, she had helped a Mexican woman bring her husband his belongings before he was deported. Uruchi and the guard had struck up a conversation, quickly realizing they lived near each other in Fredericksburg. Now she was on the other side of the plexiglass divide.

"What are you doing here?" the guard asked.

"I'm not a U.S. citizen," Uruchi answered. "And I got a DUI."

"I can't believe it," he said.

Uruchi's sudden fall - from **immigrant** advocate to undocumented inmate - has stunned many who knew her. At Casa, the **immigrants** rights organization where Uruchi worked, colleagues were caught by surprise. Two weeks before pleading guilty to drunken driving, she had led a demonstration outside the Supreme Court urging the justices to support undocumented **immigrants**, but she never hinted she was one of them. She had spent three years helping others fight deportation. Now she faces that very fate.

Her arrest has exposed her husband's undocumented status and upended her children's lives. Any day now, Uruchi, 33, could be sent back to Spain. Under Obama administration guidelines, her DUI conviction makes her a priority for deportation. And under the visa waiver program she used to enter the country 14 years ago, she forfeited her right to legal appeal. Her only chance is a plea to **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officials for a stay of deportation, citing her otherwise clean record, community service and two American-born kids.

"These stays are not commonly granted," said Kim Propeack, communications director for Casa, which is helping Uruchi. "And they are not granted without a fight."

Uruchi's case comes at a time of intense national debate over **immigration**, including what to do about mixed-status families like hers - parents who are in the country illegally but have children who are U.S. citizens. President Obama's efforts at **immigration** reform, which could have opened a pathway to legal status for Uruchi and her husband, have been repeatedly blocked by Congress and the courts. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, meanwhile, has pledged to deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants** if elected, regardless of whether they have children born here.

Uruchi's situation isn't likely to generate much public sympathy. A recent CNN-ORC poll found that 83 percent of Americans favor deporting undocumented **immigrants** who have been convicted of a crime while living in the United States.

Uruchi knows she put everything at risk by getting into her car after drinking. "Driving that night," she acknowledged, "was the worst decision of my life."

In the Homeland Security complex many **immigrants** refer to as "Prosperity," after the avenue on which it sits in Fairfax, the guard waved a handheld metal detector up and down Uruchi's body. Then the man she had once befriended put her in shackles and loaded her into a van bound for jail.

'Pray for me'

Earlier this month, Uruchi's husband, Giovani Jimenez, stood in the doorway of their small house and tried to corral his children toward the car. It was a Sunday morning, and they were late to visit Wendy in jail in Williamsburg, 100 miles away.

"You're not taking anything?" Jimenez asked Alex, a quiet, gangly 13-year-old. Alex slunk inside and emerged with a thick library copy of "Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince."

Lucia, a bubbly 7-year-old, clutched an iPad and a stuffed panda in a pink dress. She sat next to Alex in the back of the family's beige 1991 Honda Accord, its mismatched hood and Ron Jon Surf Shop window sticker vestiges of a previous owner.

Jimenez held a manila folder. Inside were printouts of the kids' grades, which had plummeted since Uruchi's May 28 arrest. Alex, an eighth-grader, was suddenly getting D's in English and algebra. He had begun to talk back to his father. Lucia, in second grade, was also struggling in math. She could only fall asleep while holding on to her father's wrist. She woke up most nights crying for her mother.

Jimenez, 37, was coping as well as he could. Along with the lawyer's fees and court fines, mortgage and car payments, there was the cost of a tank of gas for every Sunday visit, 15 cents per minute for every call from jail, $30 to print and mail photos of the kids' pool visits and birthday parties because the jail didn't allow Jimenez to email or hand them to Uruchi.

On Sunday night, after spending all day driving his children to see their mother, he would climb behind the wheel of a delivery truck and drive to New Jersey and Pennsylvania, hopefully returning home in time to welcome his kids from school on Monday.

His wife's arrest had been like a bomb landing in their precariously built lives. Jimenez had come to the United States in early 2001 from Bolivia. He met Uruchi online. She, too, was born in Bolivia but was raised in Madrid. She told him about her abusive stepfather in Spain. He told her to come to America. When they met at Dulles International Airport in October 2002, they had never even seen a photo of each other.

As a Spanish citizen, Uruchi entered the country under the United States' visa waiver program, which allows visitors from 38 countries to stay for up to 90days without a visa.

She and Jimenez got married, had kids and settled in Virginia. He worked as a trucker; she cleaned hotel rooms. When her back began to hurt, she took food safety courses and managed the hotel's kitchen.

In 2013, Uruchi began to get involved in activism. Deportations had reached an all-time high of more than 409,000 the previous year. But Uruchi's adolescence in Spain, where she saw women say and do what they wanted, had left the 4-foot-11 **immigrant** unafraid of speaking out. After meeting Casa employees at an event at the Salvadoran Embassy in D.C., she began attending the group's events. Soon, she was organizing them. In 2014, she was hired full time as a Virginia community organizer.

"She was banging off the walls with excitement," said Propeack, her Casa co-worker. Propeack recalled Uruchi organizing a Jan. 14 event in Richmond. It was the middle of winter, but Uruchi persuaded several dozen people to show up to the state capitol to lobby for **immigrants**' rights. "Wendy got all these undocumented moms to come," Propeack recalled.

Uruchi also helped undocumented **immigrants** fight deportation. Liliana Mendez, a 26-year-old Salvadoran woman from Falls Church, was about to be deported after a traffic accident when she came to Casa for help. Uruchi organized a news conference with a congressman. Within days, Mendez's deportation was stayed, and her ankle monitor was removed. "Wendy helped me so much," Mendez said.

Uruchi's activism took a toll on her marriage, however. She would often come home at 9 or 10 at night, only to spend more time on the phone guiding **immigrants**through health care sign-ups or school applications. The couple was considering a divorce when Uruchi was arrested.

She had attended a Casa event in Woodbridge, then gone to a restaurant with a colleague for dinner. They drank margaritas and discussed Uruchi's marital problems. As Uruchi drove them back to Fredericksburg, a Stafford County sheriff's deputy pulled her over.

Uruchi was on the phone with Jimenez when she saw the flashing lights behind her. She knew an undocumented **immigrant** could be deported over something as small as a fender-bender.

"Pray for me," she told her husband before hanging up.

Her blood alcohol level was twice the legal limit for driving of 0.08.

On July 8, Uruchi and her husband went to Stafford County court. Their DUI attorney had negotiated a deal with the prosecutor: just one day in jail if she pleaded guilty to the misdemeanor. Only then did they tell the attorney Uruchi was undocumented. They say he told them not to worry: Stafford wouldn't alert federal officials.

Jimenez said he begged his wife not to take the deal, telling her it would be better to challenge the Breathalyzer results in court. But Uruchi pleaded guilty. She wanted it to be over, she said. "I screwed up, and I needed to face it."

She prayed she would be released after a day. Instead, she was sent from Stafford to "Prosperity," where ICE officials asked about her husband. He, too, was undocumented, she admitted.

"They have all my information: Wendy gave it to them," Jimenez said. "They might come for me now."

After two days of questioning, ICE officials told Uruchi she would be deported. The Obama administration began more aggressively deporting illegal **immigrants**with DUI convictions after a string of deadly, high-profile incidents. One of the most notorious occurred in 2010 in Prince William County, when Carlos A. Martinelly Montano drunkenly hit another car head on, killing Sister Denise Mosier and injuring two other nuns. Montano, an illegal **immigrant** from Bolivia, had been arrested for drunken driving on two earlier occasions but released.

Corey A. Stewart (R-At Large), chairman of Prince William's Board of County Supervisors, the head of Trump's Virginia campaign and a longtime critic of illegal **immigration**, said there was "no question" Uruchi should be deported.

"Otherwise, eventually, people tend to graduate in the severity of their crimes," he said, citing the 2010 case. Uruchi "shows how entitled illegal **immigrants** feel: Here is somebody who is so brazen that they're here illegally, and they are out there as a crusader trying to keep people from being deported."

Almost 24,000 undocumented **immigrants** from Virginia and the District have been deported over the past 10 years, ICE figures show.

Had Uruchi not pleaded guilty, she might have been able to admit to a lesser charge and avoid ICE altogether. Had she entered the country illegally, rather than on a visa waiver, she would have been entitled to a hearing in front of an **immigration** judge. And had she been an American citizen, her DUI would have cost her $300 and her license for a year. Instead, she is now filing an application for a stay of deportation.

"It's the one shot we have left," said her lawyer, Enid Gonzalez.

"She is a woman who [has been] fighting to stop deportation and now is in danger of getting deported herself," wrote Pamela Benavides-Barahona, 12, who said in a letter of support that Uruchi drove her to school events when her mother could not. "She never gives up and we should not give up on her."

'I'll be home soon'

"Hello," Jimenez said in English to the woman behind the desk at the Virginia Peninsula Regional Jail in Williamsburg. "I'm here to see Wendy Uruchi."

"I thought I recognized you," the woman said.

As his father signed in, Alex paced back and forth in the lobby. Eventually, the woman at the desk directed them to visitation room 111.

On either side of a large plexiglass window sat a metal stool. The door opened. Lucia gasped.

"Mama," she said, jumping onto the table, putting her small hand to the window and wiggling her fingers. Dressed in a dark blue jumpsuit, Uruchi put her own hand to the glass, revealing broken nails.

"Como està¡s?" she asked Alex.

"Soy bien," he said into a metal speaker, botching his Spanish. While his younger sister is fluent, Alex has lost much of the language, leading his parents to worry how he will adapt if Uruchi is deported and the family has to follow her to Spain.

"You look chubby," Uruchi told her daughter with a smile. Lucia, dressed in a sparkly new school outfit, now wore size 10, Jimenez said.

Had they been brushing their teeth, taking their vitamins, doing their homework, Uruchi asked. Had they been to the pool?

"It's closed," Jimenez said.

"I guess it's not summer any longer," she replied.

She asked them what books they had been reading, scolding Lucia when Jimenez reported she had been playing games on the iPad instead. From time to time, Uruchi would say something to Alex in Spanish that he didn't understand.

"I feel like there is a fly stuck inside my head," he said after one misunderstanding.

"You're my son," Uruchi told him. "You are strong, Alex. This won't last. I won't be here forever. One of these days, I'll come home."

"Are you going to be in here for all of second grade?" Lucia asked. "And third grade?"

"No, mi amor," Uruchi said. "I'll be home soon."

She told Alex she was sorry she had missed his birthday, three days earlier.

"When I get out, we'll celebrate it," she said.

"No, it's better if we don't," he replied.

A female jailer opened the door behind Uruchi, signaling the end of the visit.

"Keep your head up, Alex," Uruchi told her son as he walked out of the small room.

Lucia ran back to the plexiglass. Mother and daughter kissed the window at the same time. Then Uruchi was led away.

michael.miller@washpost.com

Emily Guskin and Jennifer Jenkins contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SALZBURG, Austria - The 5:08 p.m. to Munich pulled into Salzburg Central Station, and four German police officers boarded the train. This was a migrant sweep, and the cops moved quickly past the fair-skinned passengers, questioning a group of Saudi tourists and a Chicano from Chicago.

In the last seat of the last car, the patrol found Shakira Sarwari. Eight months on the road from war-torn Kandahar, the young Afghan mother clung tightly to her 17-month-old son. Her 7-year-old daughter huddled close, nervously eying the officers. They were now one station away from their final destination: Germany, the promised land of **refugees**.

But they were not there yet - and after more than a million arrivals in 2015, the German welcome is no longer so warm. In fact, a crackdown at the border is giving those migrants who make it this far the worst odds of crossing since the height of the crisis last year. It is more evidence, some say, that as Europe's migrant crisis stokes a mounting voter backlash, even generous Germany is quietly closing its door.

"Your passport," asked one of the officers, who now have permission from the Austrians to stop migrants on trains bound for Germany.

Sarwari replied with a pleading look, holding up an empty palm.

"Where are you going?" the officer asked slowly. Sarwari tugged nervously at her pink headscarf. In her arms, her son squirmed and whined. Her daughter, terrified, was on the verge of tears.

"To Germany," Sarwari said. "To Germany."

The officer shook his head.

"You'll have to come with us," he said.

In September 2015, as thousands of migrants a day were converging on Europe, German Chancellor Angela Merkel issued an astounding pledge. In the face of raging wars in the Middle East, she said there was "no limit" to the number of **refugees** Germany could accept. That promise - along with some of the most generous **refugee** benefits in the world - made the same country that sparked World War II an asylum seeker's paradise.

But that has already begun to change. Since March, tougher controls in the Balkans, Greece and Turkey have sharply reduced the number of new arrivals. But hundreds of migrants each week - mostly from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and Africa - are still attempting to enter Germany.

Yet the nation that took in more migrants last year than the rest of Europe combined is making it harder to get in. In August, Germany refused entry to 1,070 of the 2,300 migrants - or 46 percent - it stopped on its side of the Austrian border. In January, when arrival numbers were far higher, only 7 percent of migrants were turned back.

The smaller number of arrivals now, German officials say, has allowed them to more rigorously question migrants and apply rules meant to weed out economic migrants and opportunists. But critics say the policy is too sweeping and that there's a good chance that people who qualify for German asylum are not being given a chance to apply. A large portion of those coming now also already have family in Germany and are trying to skirt years-long waiting periods for family reunions.

Yet the German message to migrants is clear: It's not so easy anymore.

"The reality of today's Germany is a different one than the **refugee** fairy tale of last summer," said Karl Kopp, spokesman for the migrant aid group Pro Asyl.

It happens as Germany is drowning in a backlog of hundreds of thousands of asylum requests. Last year, it paid $5.91 billion in aid and shelter, more than double the cost in 2014. A violent standoff last week between migrants and right-wing Germans became the latest sign of rising tensions. Germans are investigating 60 cases of migrants allegedly conspiring with Islamist militants.

Perhaps the most important factor: The chancellor's Christian Democratic Union is suffering steep political losses because of her **refugee** stance, losing ground in a string of local elections and surrendering voters to the anti-migrant Alternative for Germany party only a year before Merkel's possible reelection bid. After another bitter defeat in liberal Berlin, Merkel this week offered a mea culpa.

"If I could, I would turn back time many, many years in order to be able to better prepare myself, the whole government and all those responsible, for the situation that hit us rather unexpectedly in late summer of 2015," she said.

Germany is now rejecting more than a third of all asylum applications for those already there, and it is trying to negotiate mass returns to countries such as Afghanistan. The tough-talking interior minister, Thomas de Maizière, has even suggested that Germany wants to send many **refugees** back to bankrupt Greece, where most of them first entered Europe.

In the graceful city of Salzburg - the birthplace of Mozart that last year turned into the main gateway into Germany for migrants - German police are going further. Since June, they have been boarding trains here to pull off irregular migrants with Austria's blessing. Some migrants are briefly detained in Austrian jails. Most get 14 days to leave the country or apply for asylum in Austria. Still others could get pushed back by the Austrians to Italy or Slovenia.

It is all part, observers say, of Europe's closing door.

As the German police led Shakira Sarwari off the train in Salzburg, her daughter, Setayesh, dressed inpink sneakers and an Elsa shirt from Disney's "Frozen," broke down in tears. In the busy terminal, and flanked by officers, they walked past gawking passengers as Sarwari tried to comfort her crying son.

"Shh, shh," she said softly, cradling Mohammed in her arms.

The German police showed the three of them into an industrial-looking room fitted with a computer terminal, a few wooden desks and a bench behind a partial fence. She went behind the fence with a male officer, who did a cursory check. She placidly complied when he asked her to remove her headscarf. Mohammed cried as the police took his mother's digital fingerprints.

As requested, she emptied her possessions onto a table - the most important being a plastic bag with a few hundred euros, all that she had left. She flushed as she was presented with, and asked to sign, a document in her native Pashtun language stating that she was being denied entry to Germany. She would later tell an interpreter that she could not read or write.

Via a telephone interpreter, she was able to communicate with the police, telling them that her husband was already in Germany and she was trying to join him there.

"I want to go to Germany," she said.

"You cannot go," an officer explained. "Because of European law." She was told she would need to stay in Austria.

"I do not want to stay here," she said, shaking her head. "My husband is in Germany."

Her girl could not stop crying now. One of the German officers, Horst Auerbach, gave her daughter a gentle look and a glass of water.

"It gets to you," he said, a lump in his throat.

Within two hours, the family was handed over to the Austrian police. A sturdy female cop with plastic gloves took Sarwari away for a more thorough search. Afterward, the family spent the night at the main Salzburg police station.

The next morning, like most migrants taken off the trains here, she was issued an order to leave the country or apply for asylum in Austria. Some Austrian politicians are bitterly complaining that the German policy is leaving more migrants on Austria's doorstep - although Austria, too, is trying to send some migrants back to Italy and Slovenia. Officials in Vienna say both they and the Germans are simply following European rules.

It remains unclear how efficient the German measures are at thwarting migrants. All the migrants in Salzburg are indeed being stopped. But farther north, at other border crossings, more asylum seekers are managing to get across the German border, where German officers decide whether to push them back. Almost half are refused. Decisions, officials say, are made on a case-by-case basis.

As Sarwari prepared to leave the police station, she said she had no real plan. She did not speak German or English. She did not know which way to go.

"I made it this far by myself, with the kids, and I am going to go to Germany," she said, determined. "I will manage to find a way."

anthony.faiola@washpost.com

Stephanie Kirchner contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Only 19 percent of Americans trust the federal government to do what's right most of the time, according to the Pew Research Center. And it's hard to blame them, given that our Congress has just extended a 25-year-old visas-for-investment **immigration** scheme that has accomplished essentially nothing except to foster corruption, risk national security - and subsidize real estate developers.

The EB-5 program reserves up to 10,000 permanent residency slots each year for foreign nationals who invest in the United States. Congress enacted it in 1990 on the superficially plausible theory that trading green cards for capital would boost the economy, as a similar plan in Canada had reportedly done.

Before 2008, however, EB-5 produced more than 1,000 investor **immigrants** per year only once, due to competition from Canada, bureaucratic hassles and a lack of business opportunities fitting the program's minimum requirements - $1 million invested and 10 jobs created. When admissions did go above 1,000, in 1997, the program was temporarily suspended amid concerns that fraud caused the spike.

Subsequent Congresses, and administrations of both parties, responded - by relaxing standards. Now visa seekers may invest passively in existing U.S. firms rather than start their own. They get credit for "indirect" job creation. They may put up as little as $500,000 if they do so in needy "targeted employment areas" - gerrymandered to include hot urban real estate markets. The government empowered an army of politically connected promoters, known as "regional centers," to guide investors through the U.S. market for a fee.

EB-5 applications have surged; in fiscal 2015, 9,764 investors and their family members got visas. Much of their money flowed into developments such as Hudson Yards, a $25 billion office, retail, residential and park project in Manhattan that has so far attracted $600 million via EB-5. The program enables developers to raise "mezzanine" financing (the portion not accounted for by a mortgage or the developer's own equity) at the equivalent of a 10 percent discount, according to Gary Friedland of the NYU Stern School of Business. EB-5 investors are in it for the visa, not the rate of return.

Most projects could have proceeded without the subsidy, Friedland argues, but if not, so what? There'd be less market distortion.

Some 85 percent of EB-5 investors in fiscal 2015 were from China, which is problematic, given the risk of money laundering: It's hard to establish the ultimate source of investible funds emanating from that notoriously nontransparent economy. A 2015 Government Accountability Office report found that the Department of Homeland Security lacked the capacity to vet EB-5 applicants from China and elsewhere. DHS has detected people with possible intelligence connections to Iran attempting to access EB-5.

Alert Trump Tower: Inadequately vetted foreigners and their U.S.-based enablers are exploiting our porous **immigration** rules!

Then again, Donald Trump's son-in-law and adviser, Jared Kushner, may be an expert on EB-5 already: His company is building a luxury, Trump-branded apartment building in Jersey City with $50 million raised in large part from Chinese EB-5 applicants.

In Vermont, meanwhile, the Securities and Exchange Commission has recently accused developers of bilking EB-5 investors out of hundreds of millions supposedly destined for a ski resort and other projects. A similar scandal erupted in Chicago in 2013.

EB-5 expansion spawned an EB-5 lobby, spreading campaign donations and boosterish information around Capitol Hill - such as a study commissioned by the "regional centers" showing that EB-5 investors contributed $3.58 billion to U.S. output and created more than 41,000 jobs in fiscal 2013.

Even if not hyped, these figures amount to less than 0.1 percent of gross domestic product and 1.9 percent of all jobs created that year. More to the point, they do not account for growth and jobs that might have occurred if all the American resources being poured into EB-5-stimulated projects had been deployed elsewhere.

"EB-5 costs taxpayers nothing!" the lobby cries. True - it amounts to a valuable gift to the private sector, in the form of influence over the government's heretofore exclusive authority to admit **immigrants**.

For the government, EB-5 isn't an unseemly business - selling visas - as critics sometimes protest. It's a stupid business - giving them away and letting someone else sell them.

For the past year, Sens. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa) and Patrick Leahy (D-Vt.) tried to reform the EB-5 program or kill it, using as leverage the impending Sept. 30 expiration of the overall federal spending law to which EB-5's key legal authorities had been attached.

But the lobby and its Capitol Hill allies successfully resisted, and the legal authorities were extended as part of the must-pass spending measure that passed Wednesday and expires on Dec. 9. EB-5 could well survive via similar maneuvering for years.

This might not happen in a country that legislated according to regular procedure, and on merits - a country like, say, Canada, which in 2014 terminated the investor visa program upon which Congress patterned EB-5.

It "provide[d] limited economic benefit," an official statement noted, demonstrating that Canada's government possesses yet another quality ours lacks: an ability to admit its mistakes.

lanec@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I take issue with Robert J. Samuelson's statement in his Sept. 26 op-ed, "The wrong **immigration** debate," that "we need an **immigration** system that gives priority to skilled over unskilled workers."

My maternal and paternal grandparents were unskilled and uneducated **immigrants** to the United States from Poland and Ireland, respectively. They came in the wave of **immigration** in the late 1800s and early 1900s. Many of their children fought for the United States and led productive lives as public servants or in business. The same is true in my generation and that of my children and grandchildren.

Thus, literally hundreds of productive citizens (and, from Mr. Samuelson's standpoint, consumers) resulted from the ability of my grandparents to **immigrate** to the United States. There were more than 20 million others during that same period. Do the math. Clearly their contribution and that of their offspring to society far exceeded any drain on society.

Let us not forget, particularly during this time of **immigration** debate and anti-**immigrant** fervor, that

all of us are **immigrants** or descended from them.

William E. Kennedy, New Market

Robert J. Samuelson concluded his generally positive op-ed with the words "But the underlying realities will not retreat no matter how much we wish they would. If we cannot maneuver **immigration** to our advantage, it will almost certainly work to our disadvantage." He was writing solely in terms of our economy. There are other considerations.

In 1960, when I was in college, the population of the United States was 180 million; teachers could afford to live near the schools where they taught; police officers and firefighters could likewise afford to live near where they worked; and almost no one outside Los Angeles was required to endure frustrating commutes on packed roads. Now the opposite is true because of population growth driven largely by legal **immigration**. And it's going to get worse, much worse. The Census Bureau projects our 2060 population to be 417 million - 237 million more than when I was in college.

There is a terrible quality-of-life cost with such population growth. When do we stop?

Edwin Stennett, Montgomery Village

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Looking on the bright side, perhaps this election can teach conservatives to look on the dark side. They need a talent for pessimism, recognizing the signs that whatever remains of American exceptionalism does not immunize this nation from decay, to which all regimes are susceptible.

The world's oldest political party is an exhausted volcano, the intellectual staleness of its recycled candidate unchallenged because a generation of younger Democratic leaders barely exists. The Republican Party's candidate evidently disdains his credulous supporters who continue to swallow his mendacities. About 90 percent of presidential votes will be cast for Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump, refuting the theory that this is a center-right country. At the risk of taking Trump's words more seriously than he does, on some matters he is to Clinton's left regarding big government powered by an unbridled presidency.

His trade policy is liberalism's "industrial policy" repackaged for faux conservatives comfortable with presidents dictating what Americans can import and purchase at what prices, and where U.S. corporations can operate. Trump "wouldn't approve" Ford manufacturing cars in Mexico. He would create a federal police force to deport 450,000 illegal **immigrants** a month, including 6.4 percent of America's workforce in two years. Yet the 25 million jobs he promises to create would require more than doubling the current rate of legal **immigration** to fill them, according to economist Mark Zandi. Of the Supreme Court's 2005 Kelo decision diluting property rights by vastly expanding government's powers of eminent domain, Trump says, "I happen to agree with it 100 percent." Even Bernie Sanders rejects Kelo.

When Trump says "people are not making it on Social Security," he implies that people should be able to "make it" on Social Security for a third or more of their lives, and that he, like Clinton, is for enriching this entitlement's benefits. He will "save" the system by eliminating - wait for it - "waste, fraud and abuse." Trump is as parsimonious with specifics regarding health care ("Plans you don't even know about will be devised because we're going to come up with plans - health-care plans - that will be so good") as regarding foreign policy ("I would get China, and I would say, 'Get in [North Korea], and straighten it out.'").

"Charismatic authority," wrote Max Weber in 1915, seven years before Mussolini's march on Rome, causes the governed to submit "because of their belief in the extraordinary quality of the specific person. ... Charismatic rule thus rests upon the belief in magical powers, revelations and hero worship." A demagogue's success requires a receptive demos, and Trump's ascendancy reflects progressivism's success in changing America's social norms and national character by de-stigmatizing dependency.

Under his presidency, Trump says, government will have all the answers: "I am your voice. ... I alone can fix it." The pronoun has unlimited antecedents: "I will give you everything. I will give you what you've been looking for for 50years. I'm the only one."

Urban without a trace of urbanity, Trump has surrounded himself with star-struck acolytes (Mike Pence marvels at Trump's anatomical - "broad-shouldered" - foreign policy) and hysterics (Rudy Giuliani: "There is no next election! This is it!"). When Ferdinand VII regained Spain's throne in 1813, he vowed to end "the disastrous mania of thinking." Trump is America's Ferdinand.

The American project was to construct a constitutional regime whose institutional architecture would guarantee the limited government implied by the Founders' philosophy: Government is instituted to "secure" (the Declaration of Independence) preexisting natural rights. Today, however, neither the executive nor legislative branches takes this seriously, the judiciary has forsworn enforcing it, and neither political party represents it because no substantial constituency supports it.

The ease with which Trump has erased Republican conservatism matches the speed with which Republican leaders have normalized him. For the formerly conservative party, the Founders' principles, although platitudes in the party's catechism, have become, as former senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan said, "a kind of civic religion, avowed but not constraining."

The beginning of conservative wisdom is recognition that there is an end to everything: Nothing lasts. If Trump wins, the GOP ends as a vehicle for conservatism. And a political idea without a political party is an orphan in an indifferent world.

Pessimism need not breed fatalism or passivity. It can define an agenda of regeneration, but only by being clear-eyed about the extent of degeneration, which a charlatan's successful selling of his fabulousness exemplifies. Conservatism's recovery from his piratical capture of the conservative party will require facing unflattering facts about a country that currently is indifferent to its founding.

georgewill@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Steve Case, a co-founder of America Online, is chairman and chief executive of Revolution and author of "The Third Wave: An Entrepreneur's Vision of the Future."

I've been involved in policy for three decades, since AOL played a pivotal role in getting the nation online in the early days of the Internet. Initially, my focus was on commercializing the Internet, expanding access and putting appropriate rules of the road in place. In the past decade, my focus shifted to encouraging pro-growth policies that foster innovation, generate jobs, help start-ups and create opportunity. I was proud to work with a Democratic president and a Republican House to help get the Jumpstart Our Business Startups (JOBS) Act passed four years ago, and I have spent countless hours meeting with members of both parties on **immigration** reform, patent reform and pro-start-up economic ideas.

Despite my active engagement on policy, however, I've tried to steer clear of politics. I've avoided endorsing candidates or making big contributions to campaigns. I've wanted to be nonpartisan, able to work with people on both sides of the aisle. Indeed, I've been troubled by the hyper-partisanship that has defined our politics of late, and by the resulting gridlock that has set in. The United States faces many challenges, but in my view our greatest threat may not be external forces but rather our inability to work together to move our country forward.

So my inclination is to continue to stay out of politics and continue to quietly build working relationships with both Republicans and Democrats. I'd prefer to be positioned as a builder of bridges and consensus.

But I've decided to make an exception this election. I have concluded that I cannot sit on the sidelines this year. At this pivotal time, the choice is too important.

I've decided to back Hillary Clinton for president for four reasons.

First, I think she'd be better for our economy, especially with respect to innovative technology and start-ups. Donald Trump knows business, but his campaign has been backward-looking on the economy and oddly absent of ideas to spur creation of the jobs of the future. Clinton understands what we need to help start businesses and will invest in education, advanced manufacturing and basic research. She's not promising a return to a bygone era - she's focused on making our economy strong for our children and their children. These forward-leaning policies are essential to ensure continued U.S. economic leadership.

Second, Clinton is right on **immigration**. To win in the global economy, our country must win the global battle for talent. **Immigrants** don't take U.S. jobs; they create them. More than 40 percent of Fortune 500 companies were started by **immigrants** or their children: Think how many fewer jobs we'd have in the United States if these entrepreneurs and their parents had been kept out by a wall. Trump's harsh policies will cost us jobs, and his even harsher rhetoric will chase away **immigrant** families whose children could grow up to be the next Steve Jobs (whose father was a Syrian **refugee**) or Sergey Brin (an **immigrant** himself).

Third, while Trump has been largely silent on technology issues facing the new economy, Clinton has put forward an agenda that has won considerable acclaim among technology leaders. She wants to appoint a chief innovation adviser, expand science, technology, engineering and math, or STEM, education and more. And she shares my view that it's not enough to support a booming Silicon Valley - we need policies that promote the "rise of the rest": a spread of start-ups to all parts of our country. We need to level the playing field so anybody, anywhere, has a shot at the American dream.

Fourth, I agree with Clinton on the need to control the deficit. Despite his populist rhetoric, Trump wants to give huge tax breaks to people like me, the very folks who have benefited greatly from the innovation economy, while many others have been left behind. In the process he would blow up our deficit and make the economy more unequal. I agree we need to simplify the tax code, but if we are going to give tax relief, let's make sure it is in incentives for start-ups to grow and create jobs.

I think I get why Trump has been such a potent political force this year. I am well aware that millions of people are angry about their prospects and fearful that the forces of globalization and digitization have left them behind. I also recognize many are frustrated by politics and feel we need an outsider to shake things up. But I don't think Trump is the answer, for those people or for the country.

I don't agree with everything Clinton has said and done. I take issue with some aspects of her platform, and I worry about her inclination to all too often view the government as the solution to problems. If she becomes president, I'm sure there will be plenty of times I will disagree with her. But for 2016, I believe Hillary Clinton represents the best choice for the United States - and our best hope to remain the most innovative and entrepreneurial nation in the world.

Steve Case, a co-founder of America Online, is chairman and chief executive of Revolution and author of "The Third Wave: An Entrepreneur's Vision of the Future."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 23 news article "Migrant flow into U.S. again soaring" was correct. Numbers appear to be rising again this year, compared with last year's. I'm a social worker at a school that serves Langley Park, where there is a high concentration of Central American **immigrant** youths.

Our students were willing to take the dangerous journey because it was perceived as worth the risk over staying in their more dangerous communities back home. Survival is a basic human instinct. As long as the youths in these countries are intimidated by gang violence, extortion, narco-trafficking and corruption, they will continue to choose the dangerous journey north over the dangerous journey to school in their home towns. The vast majority of these youths are indeed **refugees**, fleeing violence to save their lives.

Beth Hood, Silver Spring

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The United States has admitted 12,500 **refugees** from war-ravaged Syria over the past year, surpassing President Obama's target, and expects to admit even more next year, a State Department official said Tuesday.

The Syrians are among 85,000 **refugees** from all over the world who have been resettled in the fiscal year that ends late this week, said Ann Richard, the assistant secretary of state for population, **refugees** and migration. That is up from 70,000 in the previous year. The White House aims to admit 110,000 **refugees** over the next 12 months.

Though goals are typically set for regions rather than specific countries, Obama last September asked the State Department to admit 10,000 Syrians in response to the humanitarian crisis consuming the country after five years of conflict.

"This administration has been clear it wants more Syrians," Richard told reporters. "My guidance is we want to bring even more than we brought this year, without having a target."

At the United Nations last week, Obama hosted a summit in which the leaders of 49 countries pledged more humanitarian aid, education opportunities and legal jobs for Syrian **refugees** in their midst.

In addition, the State Department said Tuesday that it will provide an additional $364 million in humanitarian aid to Syrians affected by the war. Richard said about three-quarters of that would be directed inside Syria, with the rest going to agencies working elsewhere in the region.

Since the conflict broke out following anti-government protests in 2011, the United States has provided $5.9 billion in humanitarian aid for Syrians, including the latest contribution.

Secretary of State John F. Kerry has been frustrated by his inability to secure a cease-fire in the war so that humanitarian supplies can be delivered and U.N.-mediated peace talks can eventually resume in Geneva. State Department deputy spokesman Mark Toner said that Kerry considers it "diplomatic malpractice" to close the door to diplomacy even as Russian and Syrian warplanes pummel Aleppo and that he intends to keep pursuing a truce in the four remaining months of his term.

Admitting **refugees** has been one of the most controversial aspects in the administration's management of the Syrian crisis, even though the vast majority are women and children.

More than 30 Republican governors have said they are not welcome in their states, fearful that terrorists could be in their ranks. Presidential candidate Donald Trump has called for a suspension of **immigration** from countries where terrorism is prevalent.

The Syrians have been resettled in 180 cities and towns across the United States, usually in places with plentiful jobs and low-cost housing. Richard said local officials have expressed interest in accepting Syrians for resettlement.

"**Refugees** tend to be very successful once they get to the U.S.," Richard said. "Not in the short term, but definitely in the medium and longer term."

In countries neighboring Syria, where millions have sought safe haven, Syrians are referred to the United States by the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**. It can take one or two years to complete several rounds of security checks. State Department officials say the process is comprehensive and lengthy to discourage would-be terrorists.

carol.morello@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MONDAY NIGHT'S debate told the story of this year's presidential race. The Republican primary process failed, producing a nominee who cynically or ignorantly sells a warped view of reality, disqualifying himself with practically every overheated sentence. The Democrats, meanwhile, nominated a flawed but knowledgeable, confident and even-tempered politician.

Donald Trump seemed incapable of moving beyond his slogans which, as ever, were based on his bleak view of the United States. Foreigners are "using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China," he said. "We have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us." He made little effort to respond to moderator Lester Holt's point that the economy is growing and wages are, in fact, improving. Nor did he really answer Hillary Clinton's point that the country has had to climb out of a deep economic ditch caused by a variety of forces unrelated to free-trade agreements.

For her part, Ms. Clinton also pandered a bit on trade, advertising her votes against certain trade agreements and unconvincingly attempting to defend her unprincipled waffling on the Trans-Pacific Partnership. But when Mr. Trump ludicrously described NAFTA as "the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere," Ms. Clinton refused to take the bait, instead reminding voters of the income and job growth of the 1990s.

Though Ms. Clinton's economic proposals are hardly visionary, she could at least point out that her plans would not cause a trade war or recession, as many experts believe Mr. Trump's would. Meanwhile, while Mr. Trump railed about the size of the federal debt, he had no response to Ms. Clinton's point that his plan would make the debt much bigger. Similarly, when the candidates discussed tax policy, Ms. Clinton noted that the sort of supply-side economics Mr. Trump favors has not produced the economic miracles its proponents often forecast. Mr. Trump's response? "The wealthy are going to create tremendous jobs."

Again, on race and criminal justice, Mr. Trump offered a dark portrait of a scared nation: "We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal **immigrants**. And they have guns. And they shoot people." His main "solution" was to reinstate a controversial "stop and frisk" policy that served to **alienate** more than to protect. Ms. Clinton offered a balanced view favoring reduction in mandatory minimum sentences that have locked some people up for unreasonable amounts of time, community policing, training and other constructive proposals.

The contrast on transparency and character was also extreme. Mr. Trump once again offered bogus excuses for refusing to release his tax returns. Ms. Clinton, meanwhile, admitted she was wrong to use a private email server and offered no excuses. Mr. Trump attempted to pin his racist "birther" campaign on Ms. Clinton, even though, as Mr. Holt pointed out, Mr. Trump carried it on well after President Obama produced his birth certificate. Mr. Trump claimed the better temperament even as he petulantly hectored and interrupted Ms. Clinton through most of the debate.

None of this should have been a surprise to anyone who has paid attention to this presidential race. When the debate turned to foreign policy, Mr. Trump spewed ignorance, claiming the rise of the Islamic State could have been prevented if "we had taken the oil" and that Iran should have been obliged by the deal on its nuclear program to somehow rein in North Korea.

"I haven't given lots of thought to NATO," Mr. Trump said, quoting himself from an earlier interview. By the end of the evening he had made clear you could end that sentence with just about any matter of policy and be as accurate.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The conversation - or argument - we've been having on **immigration** has been remarkably skewed. It's been all about the estimated 11million illegal **immigrants**, otherwise known as the "undocumented." Actually, what counts far more are the estimated 31million **immigrants** who are here legally and the roughly 1 million who gain legal entry every year.

Of course, the question of undocumented **immigrants** is important. As a society, it's intolerable to have so many people living in a legal twilight zone, often despite years of responsible and law-abiding behavior (two-thirds of illegal **immigrants**

have been in the United States for 10 years or more, reports the Pew Research Center). Still, one powerful reason for settling this issue - to legalize most of those already here and to suppress new illegal flows, even with a wall - is to move on to larger subjects.

We need an **immigration** system that gives priority to skilled over unskilled workers, rather than today's policy that favors family preferences for green cards. This sort of system would promote assimilation (because skilled workers have an easier time integrating into the workforce and society), increase economic growth (because skilled workers have higher "value added" than unskilled labor) and reduce poverty (because many unskilled **immigrants** have incomes below the government's poverty line).

Although we can't easily quantify these benefits, they would promote the greater good for an aging society with a sputtering economy. Anyone who doubts **immigration**'s pervasive influence should examine a massive report issued last week by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine. It's titled "The Economic and Fiscal Consequences of **Immigration**." Here are some highlights.

l **Immigration** is no longer a side issue. From 1995 to 2014, the number of **immigrants** increased from 24.5 million (9percent of the population) to 42.3 million (13percent). When the children of **immigrants** are added to the total, nearly 1 in 4Americans is of **immigrant** stock. **Immigrants** are increasingly shifting from traditional "gateway" states (California, New York, Florida) into nontraditional states (North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee and Nevada).

l The number of illegal **immigrants** has stabilized at about 11 million since 2009. The number of Mexicans illegally in the United States declined from 6.4 million in 2009 to 5.8 million in 2014. Others have taken their place. All these figures represent "net changes" - illegal **immigrants** entering the United States minus those leaving. Although these flows now roughly balance, they're still huge, averaging about 300,000 to 400,000 annually.

l Poor **immigrants** - heavily from Latin America - have increased U.S. poverty. In 2011, the poverty rate (the share of the people below the government's poverty line) was 35 percent for Mexican **immigrants** and their children and 22 percent for El Salvadoran **immigrants**; by contrast, the poverty rate was 11.1 percent for Korean **immigrants** and their children and 6.2 percent for Indian **immigrants**. The poverty rate for all native-born Americans was 13.5 percent.

l **Immigrants** and their children impose costs on government, mainly for local schooling, which the Supreme Court has decreed must be provided for all **immigrant** children. By contrast, Congress has barred even legal **immigrants** from receiving some federal benefits. In 2013, the study estimated, **immigrants**' costs to government exceeded their taxes by $388 billion, slightly more than 2 percent of gross domestic product.

What justifies **immigration** if it generates more in government costs than in taxes? The answer is that the benefits of **immigration** can - and, in this case, do - go beyond taxes. By one estimate, **immigrants** (including their entrepreneurial activity) have increased the size of the U.S. economy by 11 percent or about $2 trillion. With baby boomers retiring, all the projected growth in the U.S. labor force from 2020 to 2030 stems from **immigrants** and their children, the study reported.

The gains from **immigration** would be magnified if we emphasize high-skilled workers. Productivity would be higher, poverty lower. Interestingly, this also would help low-skilled Americans, both natives and recent **immigrants**. They wouldn't have to compete against new low-skilled **immigrants**, who would vie for their jobs and depress wages.

Whether we have the political competence and courage to face these issues candidly is an open question. The study deliberately steered away from policy prescriptions; it was mainly a fact-finding exercise, reflecting (presumably) the subject's controversial nature.

The presidential campaign offers little ground for optimism. Donald Trump has used **immigration** as a wedge issue and shows little understanding of the underlying substance. Hillary Clinton seems intent on placating her Hispanic supporters, many of whom surely support family preferences for **immigrating** legally to the United States.

But the underlying realities will not retreat no matter how much we wish they would. If we cannot maneuver **immigration** to our advantage, it will almost certainly work to our disadvantage.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ISLAMABAD, Pakistan - Saeed Hamid's restaurant is covered with touristic murals from Afghanistan - blue-tiled shrines and aqua lakes, ancient Buddhas carved into cliffs, and an enormous scene of horses and riders scrimmaging on a muddy field, trying to capture the carcass of a goat.

Hamid's nostalgia stops right there. His parents fled their conflicted homeland before he was born, and he grew up in Pakistan's capital. He learned English, married and raised his own children here, and built a flourishing bakery and kebab house that employs 20 people and is packed every evening.

So it is easy to understand his anxiety about the future. In the past year, more than 250,000 undocumented Afghan **refugees** have returned to their impoverished, insurgent-plagued country under pressure from Pakistani authorities. Now, the population of 1.5 million long-settled, registered **refugees** has been given six months to leave as well.

"No one has bothered us yet, but everyone is worried," Hamid said on a recent afternoon, as the smell of newly baked bread filled his eatery. "We are happy and busy here. If we had to go back, there would be nothing to do and no one to welcome us, only the Taliban and Daesh," he said, using the Afghan term for the Islamic State militants.

For decades, neighboring Pakistan has provided a safety valve for Afghans who fled successive periods of conflict and repression, hosting up to 5 million at a time. The reception has not always been enthusiastic, but it has been heavily subsidized by the United Nations, and most **refugees** have easily blended into the large population of ethnic Pashtuns that historically straddled the border.

They have also been a headache for security agencies, who often complained that some **refugee** camps and communities harbored thieves, drugs and armed militants, and that it was impossible to police a population that flowed loosely across the border and whose members often held no official IDs.

The **refugee** population has also become hostage to tensions between Pakistan and Afghanistan, with both countries accusing each other of harboring militants in the porous border regions. In late 2014, when terrorists invaded a Pakistani military school, killing 141 students and teachers and enraging the public, authorities vowed to start sending the **refugees** back.

The push took many forms, from police harassment to a government publicity campaign, endorsed by officials in Kabul, that urged Afghans to return with the slogan, "My home is my flower." After **refugee** leaders protested, departure deadlines were postponed several times, but the trickle of returnees swelled to tens of thousands early this year, especially after the United Nations added an extra cash bonus for each family once they resettled in Afghanistan.

The surge intensified in June, when Pakistan erected a large gate at Torkham, the major border crossing near Peshawar, and announced that no Afghans could reenter without a passport and visa. That was tantamount to social death for **refugees** used to visiting relatives back home and then returning to the safety and prosperity of Pakistan. Riots and shootings broke out at the border gate, but the passport policy stood.

"Torkham gate was the biggest factor. It sent out a very clear message that this was not going to be business as usual," said Imran Zeb Khan, Pakistan's chief commissioner for Afghan **refugees**. He said the cash incentives, as well as public encouragement from Afghan diplomats here, added to the push. By early September, more than 260,000 Afghans had been formally repatriated.

So far, most of the returnees have been undocumented **refugees**, those who had never registered with U.N. officials and lived in Pakistan illegally for years. Many were poor families without job skills and little to show for their years abroad; 70 percent were younger than 24, and 75 percent had been born in Pakistan. Of an estimated 1 million unregistered **refugees**, officials said 700,000 still remain here.

One day last week, hundreds of Afghan men, women and children waited outside a government center near Peshawar, where officials registered them as **refugees** for the first time and approved them for repatriation subsidies. Some said they were reluctant to leave and fearful of what awaited them. Others said they had been harassed by police and pressured for bribes to cut their waiting time.

"Last month some of my relatives went back, and the Afghan government claimed it would provide them with rations and housing, but they are living in a tent," said Meera Jan, 89, who had waited in line for hours. "They have urged me not to leave, but the police and other officials won't let us live here anymore. I am an old man and I can die in either country. What can I do?"

Officials at the center seemed overwhelmed, saying that the number of applicants was far higher than expected and that many were confused or had problems proving their identity. Even so, Shabbir Nawaz, a supervisor, said the center is handling about 700 people a day. "We are trying our best, but most of them are uneducated and have no understanding of the process," he said.

Faced with a raft of complaints and a crush of applicants, the government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has already repeatedly extended the deadline for "voluntary repatriation." This month, he ordered the latest departure date postponed from the end of November to next March.

"Afghans are our brothers and very dear to us," Sharif said in a statement announcing the reprieve. "We will not allow Afghan **refugees** living in Pakistan to be terrified in any way. They are our guests."

Sharif's gesture was small consolation, however, for hundreds of thousands of registered **refugees**, especially those who own property or businesses and believed their official status was a guarantee of permanence. Instead, they are suddenly vulnerable to financial cheating and pressure - unable to get a fair price for a car, legally barred from selling a house and worried that they will be unable to collect on debts or investments.

Khan, the commissioner for **refugees**, said the government is aware of such problems, as well as other family issues such as unfinished school semesters and college degrees. He said a meeting has been called with leaders of all Pakistani political parties to work out practical solutions. Individuals with special hardships, he said, are being allowed to apply for Pakistani identity documents.

Meanwhile, though, longtime **refugees** such as Mohammed Rauf Derrighel, 63, are fuming.

"I was a child when I came here. Now I am an old man, and suddenly I am being told to go. I feel helpless," complained the burly, gray-bearded businessman, who was commiserating with a friend at his tailor shop in Islamabad.

On the outskirts of the capital, hundreds of Afghans live in clusters of flimsy mud and straw-roofed huts, using car batteries to turn on lightbulbs and tending goats among campfires. Despite such precarious circumstances, some are registered **refugees** with long-standing jobs or investments in industries such as scrap metal that they now fear could be lost.

Babur Khan, who has lived in Pakistan since he was 2, squatted outside a hut on a recent afternoon, listening as his brothers and cousins talked about their concerns. Suddenly he went inside and came back out with a folder of legal documents, signed and notarized several months before. They certified that he had invested $2,000 in a scrap-metal business and that the Pakistani owner would pay him a few pennies' profit for each kilogram. It was his entire savings, and he now wondered whether he had made a mistake.

"Our dealings have always been smooth, but since the Torkham gate fight, everything has been disturbed," said Khan's older brother Hassan. "People were fair with us in the past, but now they know we have to leave, and they want to cheat us. We are like a flock of sheep. The owner kept us for 35 years, and then suddenly he went mad and threw all the sheep in a river."

pamela.constable@washpost.com

Aamir Iqbal in Peshawar contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HIGH POINT, N.C. - Donald Trump's week began in the wake of explosions in New Jersey and New York. It ended in the aftermath of shootings and riots. For a candidate whose strategy relies on painting a dystopian view of the nation - often based on inaccurate and questionable claims - the tragedies yielded a trove of political opportunities.

Shortly after the first bomb went off - Trump boasted that he had been ahead of newscasters in calling it a "bomb" - he seized upon the terrorism act as justification for some of the most disputed things he has said since announcing his presidential bid.

Terrorism would not have happened if others had opposed the Iraq War as he did, Trump said, even though he had said at the time in a radio interview he supported the war. The problem increased because Hillary Clinton has "been silent about Islamic terrorism for many years," Trump claimed falsely. Trump called for profiling people but insisted he "never" suggested targeting Muslims, even though he held an event specifically to propose a "total and complete shutdown of Muslims entering the United States" and has called for "surveillance of certain mosques."

Trump's campaign is hardly the first to spin things its way, and Clinton has made her share of questionable claims, but Trump has nevertheless revealed himself to be a candidate who at times seems uniquely undeterred by facts.

An examination by The Washington Post of one week of Trump's speeches, tweets and interviews shows a candidate who not only continues to rely heavily on thinly sourced or entirely unsubstantiated claims but also uses them to paint a strikingly bleak portrait of an impoverished America, overrun by illegal **immigrants**, criminals and terrorists - all designed to set up his theme that he is specially suited to "make America great again."

African American communities, he said, are in the worst shape they have "ever, ever, ever" been - notwithstanding the days of slavery and Jim Crow. The U.S. military is "the gang that couldn't shoot straight." Terrorists are winning, and the United States is losing, he said, because "all of these young people in our country and other countries are looking up to" the Islamic State, also known as ISIS.

Trump is expected to employ this approach, in both style and substance, at the first debate between the two major-party candidates Monday night. Expecting that the moderator, Lester Holt of NBC News, will serve as a real-time fact-checker during the debate, Trump has repeatedly said that Holt should not do so. (Trump initially criticized Holt, saying: "Lester is a Democrat. It's a phony system." But after reports surfaced that Holt has registered Republican, Trump said he thought the moderator would be fair.)

Trump's tactics, and his disregard for the truth in numerous cases, drove his primary opponents to fits earlier this year and last. An exasperated Jeb Bush said Trump was creating an "alternative universe."

But if there was any thought that Trump's Sept. 16 abandonment of his years-long effort to question whether President Obama was born in the United States would lead him to back away from other false or questionable claims, that idea was dismissed in the week that followed. Nor was Trump intimidated by the increasing practice of media outlets to bluntly call out statements as "lies" and "false" in headlines and news stories, not just in fact-checking columns.

To the contrary, Trump doubled down during the past week on some of his most controversial and debunked statements and made surprising new ones. It is a strategy Trump has long employed. In his 1987 book, "The Art of the Deal," he wrote that "I call it truthful hyperbole. It's an innocent form of exaggeration - and a very effective form of promotion." When the media questioned his claims, the former reality-TV star called them "dishonest" and "disgraceful" and said the reporters were "wacky" or "crazy" or "neurotic."

After criticizing Clinton for not holding news conferences, Trump held none himself. (His campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, said on CNN that "he gives press availability every day by doing these rallies," although that does not involve actually taking questions from reporters.)

In an effort to track Trump's words, The Post attended his events, reviewed transcripts and sought to compile every word uttered by him in a seven-day period beginning Sept. 18 and ending Saturday. During that time, Trump appeared at nine events in Florida, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia. He gave seven television interviews, all but one on Fox News channels. He tweeted more than 40 times, posted on Instagram and Facebook, and sent out daily news releases, many with the subject line "Crooked Hillary" (even as running mate Gov. Mike Pence criticized Democrats for "name calling").

Monday

After remaining relatively quiet Sunday - other than a pretaped interview that ran on Fox's "Media Buzz" program in which he called journalists "disgraceful" and "unbelievably dishonest" - Trump woke Monday and promptly dialed into the "Fox & Friends" show at 7:02 a.m. for an interview that lasted nearly a half-hour, uninterrupted by commercials. The bombings in New York City and New Jersey, and a knife attack in Minnesota, gave Trump issues that seemed to play directly into his campaign's theme that the nation is under attack because of a failure to screen **immigrants**.

"If somebody looks like he's got a massive bomb on his back, we won't go up to that person," Trump said. "If he looks like he comes from that part of the world, we're not allowed to profile. Give me a break."

In fact, there is nothing to stop police from questioning a person suspected of carrying a massive bomb, and the United States does allow certain types of profiling of airline passengers and **immigrants**.

Trump then spoke at a large rally in Fort Myers, Fla., at which he delivered some disputed claims. He said Clinton had "allowed thousands of criminal **aliens** to be released into our communities" and favors a 550 percent increase in Syrian **immigrants**, even though "law enforcement said there's no way" to vet them. He said it is a "plain fact" that the United States "makes no real attempt to determine the views of the people entering."

After the rally, Trump went on Fox News's "The O'Reilly Factor," where he issued his call for profiling people to detect potential terrorists. Host Bill O'Reilly was skeptical about spotting lone attackers inspired by propaganda. Trump responded by saying that officials didn't go after the alleged New York bomber because "they don't want to get sued," a claim for which there is no evidence. Trump then denied he was targeting Muslims: "You go in to profile people that maybe look suspicious. I didn't say they were Muslims."

Tuesday

Trump arrived at a midday rally at High Point University in North Carolina, where supporters packed a basketball gymnasium. Asked in interviews whether they were concerned about the veracity of Trump's statements, supporters variously said the comments were misinterpreted by the media or were nothing compared with Clinton's falsehoods.

"I don't think he means some of the things that come out of his mouth in the most derogative way," said Pam Guy, of Thomasville, N.C. "I think he says things sarcastically at times. If you listen, and you hear him clarify things later, the puzzle pieces start to come together and make sense." Guy, who said she has only been to two political rallies in her life - both of them for Trump - said her main concern is, "I need someone to come in and just explode the system."

The question of whether Trump's statements are true was a "non-factor" to John Clinard, of High Point. "I am definitely voting for the lesser of two evils. I'm not 100 percent for Trump, but I'm 200 percent against Hillary. I don't know what's true and what's not. I just try to listen and make my own opinion."

Observing it all was Brandon W. Lenoir, a High Point University professor of political communications and campaign veteran who said he was not surprised that Trump's supporters are undeterred by fact checks.

"When new information comes in, if it is consistent with your world view or your opinion of that particular candidate, you let it in; if it is inconsistent, you block it out," Lenoir said. "So what happens is, people who have already pledged their allegiance to Trump, when they hear this information, they basically discount it and say, 'Oh, that's just the other side trying to break him down.'"

Trump's next stop was Kenansville, N.C., population 850, where he made one of his most outlandish comments.

"Our African American communities are absolutely in the worst shape that they've ever been in before, ever, ever, ever," Trump said. Not only did the comment ignore the history of slavery and Jim Crow, but Trump delivered it in an area where blacks were once captives of slave plantations; indeed, the town of Kenansville was named after the family of a slave owner. Trump's statement was promptly called out on social media by reporters traveling with him, but the campaign made no effort to explain or defend it; indeed, no campaign official was made available to the press corps all day except for a travel coordinator.

Wednesday

The event in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, was billed as a Trump town hall to discuss issues facing African Americans. The audience was mostly white, and the forum was run by Fox News Channel's Sean Hannity, a conservative commentator who is one of Trump's most vocal supporters. Earlier in the week, he had appeared as a "TV personality" who backed the Republican nominee in a campaign video called "Heartland 4 Trump." The network told Hannity not to appear in any more such ads but allowed him to continue his role as on-air booster and let him proceed as host of the town hall - which came across much like another campaign video.

As Hannity introduced Trump, he said: "The Obama years have been disastrous for the country, especially for African Americans. But believe it or not, Democrats still feel entitled to their vote." Then, after Hannity said, "the left is stoking racial tensions," a video was shown of protesters chanting, "Black Lives Matter!"

Trump was then shown saying: "Vote for Donald Trump. I will fix it."

"And Donald Trump is the only candidate promising to bring about real change," Hannity said, according to the network's transcript.

The hour-long Hannity program marked the fourth time in four days that Trump appeared on Fox News.

A rare non-Fox interview, with an Ohio television reporter, was brief but revealing.

Asked why he had acknowledged that Obama was born in the United States, Trump said he just wanted to get on with his campaign, saying nothing about being convinced by the evidence.

Then Trump was asked about a Post report that he had used $258,000 from his charitable foundation to settle lawsuits related to his for-profit companies. Trump evaded the question, saying: "The foundation is really rare. It gives money to vets. It's really been doing a good job." Trump concluded by saying his campaign had put the story "to sleep just by putting out our last report." That appeared to be a reference to a statement by campaign spokesman Jason Miller, who attacked the story as inaccurate without providing any specifics and said it was the result of "a biased reporter who is clearly intent on distracting attention away from the corrupt Clinton Foundation." The campaign, meanwhile, put out news releases attacking the Clinton Foundation.

As it turned out, the Hannity town hall did not air Wednesday night as planned because the network coverage shifted to riots on the streets of Charlotte, where protests occurred following the police shooting of a black man, Keith Lamont Scott. Trump seized upon the riots as more evidence of his view of a shattered nation. "We need unity & leadership," he tweeted.

Thursday

As violence continued in Charlotte, Trump again called in to "Fox & Friends," his fifth appearance of the week on the network, which ran an image of the candidate superimposed over video of clashes between rioters and police. "It's very sad," Trump said, lamenting a "lack of spirit between the black and the white."

Trump's solution was "you have to have law and order. ... There has to be a unity message." And he repeated his call to allow police to "stop and frisk" suspects.

Trump later said in a Pittsburgh speech that there has been a 17 percent rise in violent crime in the largest 50 cities in the United States, and sharp spikes in homicides in Washington and Baltimore, to make the case that violence is a "national crisis." Violent crime rose 1.7 percent nationally in 2015, according to preliminary FBI data.

Trump also seemed to connect drugs to urban crime in Charlotte during the Pittsburgh speech, which many took to suggest that protesters in Charlotte were taking drugs.

"And if you're not aware, drugs are a very, very big factor in what you're watching on television at night," he said.

That led reporters to question Trump about why he was tying drugs to the protests. Trump denied it. "That was never said, you know that," Trump responded, adding, "Drugs are a big problem all over the country."

The unrest, Trump said, was partly Clinton's fault. "Those peddling the narrative of cops as a racist force in our society - and this is a narrative that is supported with a nod by my opponent, you see what she's saying, and it's not good - share directly in the responsibility for the unrest that is afflicting our country and hurting those who have really the very least," Trump said.

Friday

It was supposed to be an easy appearance for Eric Trump on the Fox News show "Outnumbered." With his father taking the day off the campaign trail to prepare for Monday's debate, Eric Trump was playing surrogate when he was asked a seemingly easy question about how his father could appeal to millennials.

Eric Trump said his father, in contrast with Clinton's political career, "has been an entrepreneurial guy. ... He's become the epitome of the American Dream. He's gone from just about nothing into a man who just - "

"Nothing?" one of the hosts interjected. "He got a million bucks, Eric!"

The host had correctly referred to a gift from Donald Trump's father to give his son a head start in business, among a number of gifts and loans that Fred Trump provided to his son. Donald Trump, nonetheless, went more than $1 billion in debt and put his businesses through six corporate bankruptcies, barely surviving financially before he reemerged as the star of "The Apprentice."

As for millennials, Eric Trump said they are largely uninformed except on issues that directly affect them, such as student debt. "I don't think millennials relate to policy very well because they haven't lived their lives long enough to understand so many of the issues," said Trump, who, at 32, is himself a millennial.

Saturday

Trump spent part of his Saturday morning on Twitter, urging people to come to rally later in the day in Virginia, and handing out accolades and insults. He tweeted a link to a Post story that quoted a professor predicting he would become president, said it was a "wonderful surprise" that archrival Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) endorsed him Friday and mocked "dopey Mark Cuban," the Dallas Mavericks owner who has become a leading critic of Trump and who plans to sit in the front row of Monday's debate. "Perhaps I will put Gennifer Flowers right alongside of him," Trump tweeted, referring to a woman who said she once had an affair with Bill Clinton. (It was a rare case of making a correction; Trump deleted an initial tweet that spelled her name as "Jennifer.")

Just before appearing at an evening rally in Roanoke, Trump's campaign sought to switch the focus to Clinton's veracity. "Hillary Clinton cannot stop telling lies," the campaign said in a news release. She "even lies about lying." Trump, introduced as a "truth teller," then delivered his most measured speech of the week, mostly sticking to his teleprompter but still taking sharp digs at his opponent.

Speaking in coal country, Trump said that "Hillary Clinton says she wants to put the miners out of work," which is close to what she said in March, albeit in the context of speaking about helping miners transition to new jobs. He also sought to portray himself as a better advocate for women and children than Clinton, who has spent much of her life promoting their welfare. Trump said Clinton has "provided no relief" to families in need of child care. In fact, both candidates have put forward plans to help working mothers.

Trump's success so far, even as he makes questionable claims about the state of the nation, is "very different" from most presidential campaigns, according to Lenoir, the High Point University professor.

"People are just upset with the way things are, and they are willing to go with that person who goes against the grain, and Trump represents that on the Republican side," Lenoir said. "If any other candidate said half of the things Donald Trump has said, they would be out of the race. But this is a unique election cycle, so we will have to see how it all plays out."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his final appearance before the U.N. General Assembly a few days ago, President Obama didn't have much to say about the civil war between Syrian dictator Bashar al-Assad and his enemies.

"There's no ultimate military victory to be won," he said, and so the United States would "pursue the hard work of diplomacy that aims to stop the violence, and deliver aid to those in need, and support those who pursue a political settlement."

Then he moved on to other matters.

Given that Syria is his greatest humanitarian and strategic failure, where even as he spoke his latest diplomatic initiative was about to collapse, the brevity wasn't surprising.

But, Obama being Obama, you can be sure he had given the issue a lot more thought than his few words would indicate. And if he'd been thinking aloud, here's what you might have heard:

"Of course Kerry's latest peace deal will collapse. Vladimir Putin is winning, why should he stick to a deal? And even if Putin wants to play nice, why would Assad go along? He's winning, too - if he wants to destroy the last human beings in Aleppo, who's going to stop him?

"So is it unfair to keep letting John head out on these doomed missions? Year after year, he promises to get a deal and swears we'll move to Plan B if the Syrians or Russians renege. Time after time, they double-cross him, and he goes back for more. There is no Plan B, because I won't approve a Plan B.

"But John gets praised for his tirelessness. And we all look like we're trying. If I can just pull it off one more time, the whole mess will be Hillary's. Or, God forbid, the other guy's.

"The truth is, no one should want Assad gone, as odious as he is. I can't say that aloud, of course, since I got roped into pronouncing him finished years ago. Yes, he's a mass murderer and a torturer. He's even showing me up by using chemical weapons again after Vladimir and I supposedly solved that problem. The chlorine loophole.

"But what's the alternative? The 'moderate' opposition? Don't make me laugh. Maybe I shouldn't have mocked them as 'farmers or teachers or pharmacists,' but honestly - al-Qaeda or ISIS would waltz into Damascus if Assad went down.

"Oh, I know what Hillary would say. If I had listened to her back in 2011 and 2012 - and to Petraeus, and Panetta, and the rest of them - the 'moderate force' would be stronger now. We should have trained them and carved out safe spaces for them and given them a chance against Assad. John tried the same argument on me when he started. He thought he could give it a new spin and sucker me in where Hillary had failed.

"Well, I know what the I-told-you-so crowd is saying. I wouldn't go for it, because I worried that if we sent troops terrorism would spread, the country would fall apart, you'd get millions of **refugees** and even Russia might get involved. So we didn't get involved, and, yes: Terrorism spread, the country fell apart, you got millions of **refugees**, and Russia got involved. And, yes, all of Europe is unstable because of Syria.

"But you know what? It could have been worse. You could have had all these bad things happen - hundreds of thousands killed, half the country driven from their homes - and U.S. troops in the middle of it all. That's the Bush way. I protected us from that.

"So now it's Putin's problem. Is that so bad? Maybe it hasn't turned into a quagmire for him yet, like I said it would, but wait. Syria isn't finished with him yet.

"And what will the next president do? There's a reason you're not hearing ideas from either of them. No-fly zones? A little late for that, with Russian air-defense systems blanketing the country. Safe zones? Who's going to keep them safe? Bad enough that I'm having to do an LBJ in Iraq, sending troops back in 500 at a time.

"It looks bad, I get that. I hate the whole mess. I'd rather talk about climate change or Burma or even Ukraine, for God's sake. And, yes, a generation from now some president may travel to whatever's left of Aleppo and express remorse, like I've done in Laos and Hiroshima and everywhere else.

"That's fine. Comes with the territory. I just hope they understand this much: It always looks easier in hindsight. There was no obvious right answer. Sometimes civil wars just have to burn themselves out.

"Now, where's John? I just need him to buy me four more months. Four more months, and it's somebody else's problem from hell."

fredhiatt@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A roller coaster of a campaign 18 months in the making arrives Monday at a huge moment for Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump: a 90-minute debate, with much of the nation expected to tune in amid great uncertainty about what they'll see.

Virtually tied in recent national polls, both Clinton and Trump enter the debate as the two most deeply unpopular presidential candidates in modern history. Both hope to discredit the other, and both hope to emerge from the debate having burnished the public's view that they are better qualified to be commander in chief.

A roiling disagreement over the role of the debate moderator flared up Sunday, with Democrats arguing that a more activist "fact-checker" role is needed to rein in Trump's well-established pattern of factual misstatements.

But Janet H. Brown, the executive director of the Commission on Presidential Debates, seemed to side with the Republican nominee, saying in a television interview that "it's not a good idea to get the moderator into essentially serving as the Encyclopaedia Britannica." She added, however, that ultimately it will be up to Monday's moderator, Lester Holt of NBC News, to do the job as he sees fit.

Underscoring the unique nature of the combatants, Clinton's debate preparations included a focus on Trump's personality as well as the substance of what will be discussed onstage at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y., according to several Democrats with knowledge of her campaign's approach.

Clinton's team convened a meeting last month at which longtime aide Philippe Reines, the stand-in for Trump in her mock sessions, deeply studied Trump's personality to be able to parry with her as Trump might.

The meeting was one of several during which Clinton aides conferred for hours with outsiders who had been asked to offer advice about Trump's temperament, according to people familiar with the gathering. The objective was to understand how a man who has spent most of his life in the business world and prides himself on being a dealmaker might behave in a debate setting.

The stakes Monday could hardly be higher for both candidates. A new Washington Post-poll released Sunday shows likely voters split nationally 46 percent for Clinton and 44 percent for Trump, with Libertarian Party nominee Gary Johnson at 5 percent and Green Party nominee Jill Stein at 1 percent.

With barely six weeks remaining until Election Day, Clinton's camp - after a prolonged focus on trashing Trump - sees the debate as a chance for her to present what she actually hopes to accomplish as president and to ease voters' deep concerns about her likability and trustworthiness.

For Trump, his first one-on-one presidential debate offers an opportunity to demonstrate a command of the issues and to persuade voters clamoring for change that he is a credible alternative, his advisers say.

One of the biggest unknowns remains which Donald Trump will show up. While Clinton has a lengthy record of meticulous preparation and formidable performances, Trump has been more unpredictable. Sometimes, he is the freewheeling showman prone to controversial utterances; other times, with help from his campaign team's repackaging, he is a more sober and scripted candidate.

The first of three scheduled debates between Clinton and Trump is likely to have a full agenda. It comes amid heightened fears of terrorism, unrest over police shootings of African American men and a slew of long-standing issues that sharply divide the major-party candidates, including **immigration**, trade, tax policy and foreign affairs.

Supporters of Clinton and Trump, including their running mates and campaign managers, fanned out across the Sunday television shows to put their spin on the tasks ahead and seek some psychological advantage.

Trump's campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, seemingly acknowledged on CNN's "State of the Union" that her candidate was trying "to get into the head of Hillary Clinton" when he suggested Saturday on Twitter that he had invited Gennifer Flowers, who has claimed to have conducted a long-running affair with Bill Clinton, to attend the debate.

Trump's tweet followed news that rival billionaire Mark Cuban, who supports Clinton, would be sitting in the front row.

Trump's running mate, Gov. Mike Pence of Indiana, later said categorically on CBS's "Face the Nation" that Flowers would not be there.

In their TV appearances, Clinton partisans said she has multiple goals Monday. Those include reminding voters of her long record of championing the interests of children and families and touting her agenda for helping the middle class - but also holding Trump accountable for assertions that independent fact-checkers have labeled false.

"She has a challenge because Donald Trump inveterately says things that aren't true," Clinton's campaign chairman, John Podesta, said on NBC's "Meet the Press." "She's got to be able to make that positive case but also not let Donald Trump get away with what he's likely to do, which is to make stuff up."

Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia, Clinton's running mate, said he expects the format to explore the truthfulness of both candidates' claims.

"There's a real opportunity to hear somebody say something and then get into whether is that actually true or not," Kaine said on "Face the Nation."

Trump's team continued to press its case Sunday that fact-checking shouldn't be the responsibility of the moderator, however.

"I really don't appreciate campaigns thinking it is the job of the media to go and be these virtual fact-checkers and that these debate moderators should somehow do their bidding," Conway said on ABC's "This Week with George Stephanopoulos."

She also disputed the notion that Trump makes more frequent misstatements, saying Clinton's "casual relationship with the truth is well-known to Americans."

Former House speaker Newt Gingrich, a Trump supporter, said he believes the moderators should remain a "modest" presence in the debates.

"They're not running for president," Gingrich said on "Fox and Friends Sunday." "It's pretty stupid to think we're going to have this third candidate called the moderator, and that they're going to double-team Donald Trump."

Brown, the head of the independent debate commission, did not issue a verdict on the controversy during an appearance on CNN's "Reliable Sources" but said that in the past, the role of the moderator has been to keep things moving and allow the candidates to call one another out for misstatements.

Clinton's camp also continued efforts of recent days to argue that the press and public shouldn't hold her to a higher standard than Trump because of Clinton's longer record in public service and more-detailed policy proposals as a candidate.

"I'm very concerned that Donald Trump will be graded on a curve," Clinton's campaign manger, Robby Mook, said on CNN's "State of the Union." "Just because he doesn't fly off the handle in the middle of this debate does not mean that he is prepared to be president of the United States. ... He needs to roll out specific plans about how he's going to make life better for Americans."

Aides to Trump, whose preparations by all accounts have been less meticulous than those of Clinton, are hopeful that the debate will help close what polls have shown to be a credibility gap with Clinton, a former secretary of state, senator from New York and first lady.

As part of an effort to appear more disciplined in recent weeks, Trump has put an emphasis on new policy proposals, which were sparse during the primary season, and on reining in his freewheeling style at campaign rallies. It remains to be seen whether those efforts will be maintained throughout Monday's 90 minutes on stage.

"A victory for Donald Trump tomorrow night is answering the questions and showing America that he's ready to be president and commander in chief on Day One," Conway said on ABC's "This Week."

Trump surrogates also sought to raise expectations for Clinton's performance, talking at length Sunday about her public service while repeatedly stating that Trump has never participated in a one-on-one debate.

"The expectations on Hillary are very, very high," said Reince Priebus, chairman of the Republican National Committee, on "Fox News Sunday." "She's been doing this for 30 years. I think people expect her to know every detail. ... He's never run before, let alone been in a presidential debate."

Trump's biggest challenge might be staying on message, as the episode over Flowers's possible appearance at the debate demonstrated. Heading into the debate, Trump's tweet on the subject not only risked distracting from the candidate's message but could further **alienate** women voters, with whom Trump has struggled.

On Sunday, Pence said that the real estate developer was just joking.

"Gennifer Flowers will not be attending the debate tomorrow night," Pence said on "Fox News Sunday."

Conway, speaking on CNN, said that Trump has no plans to bring up Bill Clinton's marital indiscretions during the debate, saying viewers "deserve and expect these candidates to be talking about the issues."

But, she added: "I'm not going to reveal what we have been doing in our debate conversations. But the fact is that he has every right to be defend himself."

Clinton aides, meanwhile, argued that the episode was a telling one about Trump.

"You saw his reaction, which is to do his favorite sport, which is to dive in the sewer and go for a swim," Podesta said on NBC. "He's kind of predictable: When you poke him a little bit, and he comes back and attacks whoever is doing it."

john.wagner@washpost.com

jose.delreal@washpost.com

abby.phillip@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Sept. 19 editorial "Today's nativism, and yesterday's" mischaracterized my position on **refugees** as intolerant. Before serving in Congress, I was an **immigration** lawyer and I have a long history of helping people from more than 70 countries lawfully **immigrate** to the United States. The United States has a generous legal **immigration** system and has been a safe haven for people fleeing persecution. We must remain compassionate, but we must also use common sense in this age of terror.

President Obama continues to unilaterally increase the number of **refugees** resettled here and ignores warnings from his own national security officials by planning to bring in even more Syrian **refugees** over the next year. The Islamic State has vowed to infiltrate Western countries through the **refugee** system. We should not take that threat lightly.

It's time for Congress to take up legislation that makes responsible reforms to the **refugee** program that maintain our nation's generosity while protecting national security. The editorial board's careless disregard of opposing points of view and lack of concern for our national security was intolerant.

Rep. Bob Goodlatte, Roanoke, Va.

The writer, a Republican, is chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WINCHESTER, Va. - At a drug-awareness rally in the rural swath of her Northern Virginia district, Rep. Barbara Comstock clasped hands with a recovering heroin addict as if they were old friends.

She suggested treatment options to teary moms and cooed over pictures of a caseworker's kids. As the park cleared out, she stayed to chat with a doctor treating three-pound babies born hooked on opioids.

"It's nice to see her out in the community," said James Thall, 41, a recovering addict. "Just talking to her, she seems like she really cares."

If Comstock (R) can overcome the anchor of the Donald Trump candidacy in her swing district, this is how she'll do it. With a focus bordering on obsession, the freshman congresswoman puts a premium on constituent services and has ingratiated herself with every rotary club, fire company and charity that will have her.

But it could still be close.

Comstock faces a vigorous challenge from LuAnn Bennett, a first-time candidate but longtime Democratic donor who is trying her hardest to yoke Comstock to Trump. The nonpartisan Cook Political Report has changed its prediction of the race from "likely Republican" to "lean Republican," signaling a more competitive race.

Although drawn five years ago to favor a Republican, Virginia's 10th Congressional District includes all of Loudoun County, the richest county in the United States and a suburban commuter haven that occasionally tilts blue thanks to an influx of educated professionals, many of them minorities and women.

Loudoun voters made history last November when they elected Phyllis Randall, a Democrat, to become the first African American woman to chair a Virginia county's board of supervisors.

These voters are cool to Trump's comments that Hillary Clinton "doesn't have that strength and stamina" to be president, his calls to deport illegal **immigrants** and plans to build a wall at the U.S. border with Mexico. Although Trump carried the state in the GOP presidential primary, he was beaten badly by Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) in Comstock's district.

Comstock has not endorsed Trump and still sports a Rubio bumper sticker on her car. Cautious to the point of inspiring opponents to dub her "No Comment Comstock," she has steered clear of anything Trump, hoping voters stick by her even if they can't vote for the top of her ticket.

Will she endorse him before the election?

"If I change my mind, I'll let you know," she said in an interview.

Is she going to vote for him?

"I'm watching."

Bennett says Comstock's attempt to distance herself from Trump belies their shared agenda.

Both Comstock and Trump want to overturn Roe v. Wade, oppose measures that would close the wage gap between men and women and hold extreme views on **immigration**, Bennett says.

Democrats have also linked the congresswoman to Trump through his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, and her deputy, David N. Bossie, who have worked with Comstock in GOP politics over the years.

A Georgetown-educated lawyer, Comstock, 57, was working for her predecessor, longtime congressman Frank Wolf, in the 1990s when a constituent complaint grew into Travelgate, a probe into what Republicans said was a plot devised by Hillary Clinton to replace seven staffers in the White House travel office with Clinton friends.

From there, Comstock built a reputation as an uber-prepared chief counsel on the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee and opposition researcher for the Republican National Committee. She won election to Congress in 2014 with 57 percent of the vote.

Comstock said she is committed to issues important to her constituents, including national security, Metro funding and the opioid crisis.

"Voters here are independent, and they look at people based on who they are," she said. "People have seen me in their community, at their local events, at their local schools, at their businesses where I visit every week. I've worked very meticulously with them on a whole host of issues that are priorities."

She argues that it's important to have a Republican representative in the GOP-controlled House, noting that as a member of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee she helped push to get $5.4 billion in formula funds for Virginia's highways inserted into a five-year transportation law.

Bennett, 62, has emphasized her background as a real estate executive and single mom. She owns the Bennett Group, a real estate development and management firm she started in the 1980s with her first husband, Richard, who died of leukemia. She is divorced from James P. Moran, the former Democratic congressman from a neighboring district.

A prolific political donor, she gave about $113,500 to Democratic candidates and causes in the past decade, according to the nonpartisan Center for Responsive Politics.

Bennett has shown some shakiness on the campaign trail and made a few missteps in an otherwise strong campaign, political observers say.

"She has a lot of mettle," said state Sen. Barbara A. Favola (D-Arlington), referring to the way Bennett built a business and raised her children as a widow. "A very savvy businesswoman. It took some doing when she was going along. It was harder to get loans from banks. She didn't have a lot of experience and here she is, the CEO of this company."

"She's a salt-of-the-earth, no-nonsense, get-the-job-done person centered on family values," Favola said.

Bennett said she will champion women's issues in Congress, focusing on equal pay, paid family leave and health care.

But she failed to win the Virginia AFL-CIO endorsement and, with it, labor's voter-turnout engine. It marked the first time in a decade that the union declined to endorse a Democrat running in the 10th District.

She has also lagged in the money race, raising $1.2 million to Comstock's $3.2 million, as of June 30.

A relative unknown, Bennett has outspent Comstock on television advertising so far, running spots to introduce herself to voters.

Both candidates are counting on a boost from national groups. Republicans have reserved about $5 million to help Comstock compared with about $2.6 million for Bennett from Democrats.

On a recent campaign stop, Bennett waded through swarms of people at a festival at the Eden Center, a Vietnamese strip mall. It was an unlikely venue - the Falls Church center is outside the district, and many of the people approached by Bennett lived in Maryland or elsewhere in Virginia.

In search of a connection, Bennett dropped Clinton's name. "I really support Hillary Clinton's small-business plan that aims to make starting a small business easier," she said.

Later, at the Haymarket Day Festival in Prince William County, Bennett greeted voters among the funnel-cake and corn-dog booths. She skipped the popular parade earlier in the day, missing a chance to show voters how she compares with Comstock, who was there.

Still, she got some support. Chalet Jean-Baptiste of Gainesville, 36, an English professor at Northern Virginia Community College, recognized Bennett and hugged her.

"I'm hoping you beat Barbara Comstock," she said. "We've got to."

Jean-Baptiste said she suspects Comstock is a closet Trump supporter because she won't say for whom she plans to vote. "If you can't answer that question, then I don't believe you," she said.

Bennett is counting on voters such as Jean-Baptiste and points out that Comstock and Trump align on several issues.

Comstock twice blocked consideration of the Paycheck Fairness Act, which would have made it illegal for employers to retaliate against a worker who discloses their pay or the pay of others in an inquiry.

She voted repeatedly with her caucus to defund Planned Parenthood and supported a bill that would ban abortions after 20 weeks of pregnancy; it was later blocked by the Senate.

Comstock said she voted to avoid a government shutdown in the interest of national security - and to keep an investigation running into covert videos of Planned Parenthood employees. No wrongdoing was uncovered.

Meanwhile, Comstock has painted Bennett as an interloper unfamiliar with the needs of the district who would blindly support Clinton.

In a district flush with federal workers, Comstock earned a 66 percent rating from the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, easily surpassing other Republican members of Congress.

Comstock says Bennett would cut military budgets, citing an endorsement the Democrat received from the Council for a Livable World, which said Bennett "believes that U.S. Pentagon spending is too high."

Bennett said all agencies can more efficiently spend taxpayer dollars and accused her rival of selectively highlighting her positions.

Comstock and Republicans also question Bennett's residency. They claim she lived in her Ritz-Carlton apartment in Washington, near her office, rather than her Delaplane, Va., farm 55 miles away, before she jumped into the race, to avoid the District's higher tax rate.

"Since she hasn't lived in this district for most of the past decade, she's really not familiar with the issues or the priorities of the district," Comstock said.

Bennett said she has lived in Virginia for 35 years and spent only "a night or two" in Washington, preferring to commute to Virginia.

"I listened to a lot of books on tape," she said, adding, "The residency issue for Barbara is like Donald Trump's birther issue. It's a red herring. It's a distraction."

It may not matter.

Comstock is popular in the conservative western parts of the district, where her message of faith and family resonates, but also among the wealthy business crowd.

Nearing the end of a long day, she ducked into a McDonald's and changed into a black suit to attend a gala at a therapeutic equestrian center in Loudoun. At the end of an unpaved road, the party was in full swing in a stable dotted with crystal chandeliers and white lights.

It was after 10 p.m. when she finally left.

At a police appreciation dinner earlier that night in Clarke County, she worked the room, telling the gathering she is trying to secure federal funds to combat heroin coming from Baltimore.

On her way out, a woman emerged from the kitchen to seek help for volunteer firefighters who experience respiratory issues on the job.

"Okay, well, let's figure out whether it's county, state, federal," Comstock said. "We'd be happy to look into it."

jenna.portnoy@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I thought she was beautiful, although I never understood why she plucked her eyebrows off and penciled them on every morning an inch higher. She had been captain of her high school basketball team in Japan, and she ran circles around us kids on a dirt court in our small town in Upstate New York. I can still see this Japanese woman dribbling madly about, yelling "Kyash! Kyash!" That's how she said Kath, or Kathy. She married my American GI father barely knowing him. She moved from Tokyo to a small poultry farm just outside Elmira, N.Y., and from there she delivered eggs all over the county and into Pennsylvania. My sister describes her as having a "core of steel." She raised us as determinedly as any mother could, and yet, looking back, I barely knew her.

Some people think the film I co-directed, "Fall Seven Times, Get Up Eight: The Japanese War Brides," is a paean to loving Japanese mothers. When one interviewer suggested as much to me and fellow director Karen Kasmauski, we exchanged a look that said, "Shall we tell him the truth?" The film, titled after a Japanese proverb, is about strong women, for sure. Warm and loving mothers? No.

So who are these women and what do we, their children, know about them?

They are sisters and daughters of the ferocious enemy that attacked Pearl Harbor in the "day of infamy," an enemy that surrendered four years later after waves of firebombing of Japanese cities and the dropping of atomic bombs. They married men who occupied their country and came to the United States. And then? They disappeared into America. There were tens of thousands of them, yet they vanished from public awareness - Japanese women who were barely a blip in **immigration** history, who married into families of North Dakota farmers, Wisconsin loggers, Rhode Island general store owners.

They either tried, or were pressured, to give up their Japanese identities to become more fully American. A first step was often adopting the American nicknames given them when their Japanese names were deemed too hard to pronounce or remember. Chikako became Peggy; Kiyoko became Barbara. Not too much thought went into those choices, names sometimes imposed in an instant by a U.S. officer organizing his pool of typists. My mother, Hiroko Furukawa, became Susie.

How did it feel to be renamed for someone in the man's past, a distant relative or former girlfriend? My mother said she didn't mind, and others said it made their lives easier to have an American name.

The brides, as many as 45,000, landed in the home towns of their husbands, places where Japanese people had been visible only on World War II propaganda posters. Was their skin really yellow? One war bride in South Carolina was asked to pull up her sleeve since no yellow was visible on her hands and wrists.

My mother, once a daughter of privilege, came to her in-laws' chicken farm. She has lived in the same two square miles of countryside ever since. It has been 64 years.

I read and reread the transcripts from interviews I had recorded with my mother when I was pregnant with my own daughter more than 20 years ago, when I realized I didn't have even a timeline of her life. Six hours of tapes and they didn't tell me what I now wanted to know. So I went back to her recently to try to understand what she could possibly have been thinking when she made the choice to marry an American soldier she barely knew. "I wasn't thinking. I just had to get out," was one of her succinct responses.

I didn't know other women like her, although I had two journalist friends who were also daughters of Japanese war brides. When they proposed making a film about our mothers, I readily agreed because I had always wanted to tell her story. And she's such an excellent raconteur that, sitting beside her in the film as her interviewer, I'm almost an unnecessary prop.

In making the film with Kasmauski and Lucy Craft, I began to understand that my mother's struggles as an **immigrant** woman who was alone in this country were mirrored in the lives of tens of thousands of other Japanese women of her generation who came as wives of Americans. As a journalist, I felt compelled to talk to some of them before it was too late. As a daughter, I wanted to know my mother's place in U.S. history and perhaps my own. I received a grant from my alma mater, Vassar College, to travel the United States and interview Japanese war brides and their families, to capture their voices in audio stories and scan their old photographs, to create an oral history archive. Over the course of a year I recorded some 60 conversations.

Sometimes the women, now in their 80s and 90s, were reluctant to be interviewed and were coaxed into being recorded by their families, especially their children, who wanted to hear the stories themselves. But once they started to talk, these women remembered some of the most startling details of their early lives - the small lies they told their mothers, the sudden glimpses of temper in the men they would marry, the sweetness or bullheadedness of American men trying to communicate with future Japanese fathers-in-law. They showed me albums with wonderful treasures - photos of striking young couples, of themselves in glamour poses perhaps influenced by the Hollywood films that were so popular in Japan, of beach outings with their soldier boyfriends.

These are the stories they and their families tell.

The bombs fell, the emperor surrendered, and hundreds of thousands of U.S. troops landed on the Japanese homeland by troopship and transport plane, to prevent starvation and social collapse while they remade the defeated nation.

Only families of wealth and elevated social status were able to insulate their daughters from the world of American soldiers. Those who had survived needed work, and the Americans provided it. They set up typing schools and English classes, hired secretaries, clerks, maids, babysitters. Nightclubs and cabarets sprang up for the occupiers, and Japanese women found work there, too.

My mother, the daughter of an Imperial Japanese Army officer, had a pampered childhood in Korea when it was ruled by the Japanese, with maids and dance lessons. An aide came every morning to polish her father's boots and chauffeur him to camp. But her father died of an illness, and the family came back to Japan during the war, reduced in circumstances.

After high school, she looked for a job. There was no money for her to go to college; it would be saved for her brother. The U.S. military operated a PX - or Army post exchange, a retail outlet for soldiers - in the Ginza area of Tokyo. She went for an interview and was hired as a sales clerk in the jewelry department, helping servicemen pick out gifts for their girlfriends.

Sometime in 1950, she was going home on a streetcar when a GI started talking to her. She told him she worked at the PX. He started showing up there to talk to her and ask her out. She turned him down, but he kept asking. Japanese men, the war brides recount, rarely pressed their luck after being rebuffed. American men? Extremely persistent.

These ardent Americans also brought presents the Japanese could not afford or had never seen before - chocolate, dresses from Sears Roebuck or Montgomery Ward and even Spam, a culinary oddity. And they seemed handsome. Tall, well-fed, wearing crisp uniforms. Japan had lost so many of its young men in the war, and the ones who came back were physically and mentally debilitated.

American chivalry, the notion of "ladies first," also enchanted Japanese women. War brides almost universally say "he was such a gentleman" to describe their American suitors.

There was, of course, bad behavior. A woman remembers seeing GIs in a train station with watches up and down their arms, taken from Japanese men. Others I spoke to witnessed physical abuse of Japanese civilians.

My mother liked Bill, the soldier from Upstate New York who spoke to her on the streetcar. Liked him well enough, that is; she wasn't head over heels. He was quiet and well-behaved compared with some of the American soldiers she had seen; he did not drink. She does not speak of romance, only of her desperation to get out of what she viewed as her hopeless situation in Japan. He was her opportunity.

I met a family whose story begins with a similar chance meeting in postwar Japan, and in their case led to rural Wisconsin. In a small ranch-style house with a large fenced garden, a deer blind and, across the road, an expanse of cornfields, Nancy Roberts, 84, recalls the day she met Don. Her name was Hiroko Yamamoto then.

Her girlfriend dragged her through a Kyoto department store where they worked to look at the Marine who she said resembled Montgomery Clift, the actor in their favorite movie, "From Here to Eternity." Hiroko was a sophisticated city girl and thought he was cute, in a country bumpkin kind of way. She brazenly spoke to him, and he invited her out for a meal. He began to call her Nancy, because she reminded him of the cartoon character in Nancy and Sluggo, with her button nose and black curly hair. She had no idea who that was.

It was 1953. Hiroko was 21, enjoying a life of movies, parties, going around with groups of other young people determined to have fun and not think about the future. There was a kind of recklessness about these young women who had seen their families and nation ruined by war.

"We didn't care about yesterday or tomorrow because we found out that everything we believed in wasn't true and we just lived for today - fun, fun, fun!" That's how Hiroko once described herself to her eldest daughter, Charmaine Roberts.

The Yamamoto family was respectable, and for a daughter to date a GI was a big blemish on its reputation. Some families disowned daughters, striking their names from family registries, the all-important record of ancestry.

Hiroko's father died when he was struck by a truck while riding a bicycle, and she hid her Montgomery Clift look-alike boyfriend, a Marine and cook for the officers club, from her mother for quite a while.

As for my family, my Japanese grandmother opposed my mother's relationship with Bill, and neighbors gossiped pointedly. My mother didn't care. Neither did she care when my grandmother warned her with an old proverb: "He's like the bones of an unknown horse." My grandmother was saying: Before you marry a man, you must know his family, his circumstances, his values. The soldiers were an unknown quantity in a society where lineage is all-important.

The U.S. government was not in favor of these liaisons, either. The men faced tremendous legal hurdles to bringing home Japanese wives. The **Immigration** Act of 1924, which limited **immigrants** through a quota system by nationality, also excluded any person who was not eligible for citizenship, and that meant Asians. Several temporary laws in the late 1940s allowed servicemen to marry their Japanese girlfriends and bring them home if they could complete the paperwork in time. The system was designed to make marriage difficult to accomplish, and easy for the young man to change his mind.

Passage of the McCarran-Walter Act in 1952 removed the legal obstacles, although the paperwork was still considerable. Commanding officers continued to discourage the relationships, not just out of bigotry but also because they anticipated the unions might be deemed illegal in the men's home states. In 1952, interracial marriages were still banned, at least on the books, in more than half the nation. The Supreme Court declared those laws unconstitutional in the 1967 decision Loving v. Virginia.

With their can-do American persistence, some men lobbied their congressmen for help. In 1947, Angelo Amato had just turned 20 and was determined to bring Kimiko Yamaguchi - "the most beautiful girl I had ever seen" - home to East Boston. That's how the young John F. Kennedy, his congressman, came to sponsor H.R. 8558, "A Bill for the relief of Kimiko Yamaguchi, May 18, 1950." Their son, Joseph Amato, treasures the sheaf of letters from Kennedy regarding the bill.

On Christmas Eve 1950, his father brought his fiancee home to a triple-decker in his Italian American neighborhood, where she has lived ever since.

It seems incomprehensible to me, as a mother, to let a daughter go so far away with a foreign man, knowing communication would be difficult and coming home almost impossible. But I also know that some families were large, and poor, and to send a daughter off with what they thought was a rich American was a tough but practical decision. America meant a brighter future.

The young women were ill-prepared for their lives in the United States. As one family liked to joke, their mother went from life in Tokyo with a maid to life in Florida with an outhouse. And women who married black GIs entered an America segregated to a degree they did not imagine.

"My husband told me about it. He mentioned to me before I left Japan," said Chizuko Watkins, 88, of Los Altos Hills, Calif. "He told me when you go to the States, you see something, funny things like that." But she didn't think much about it until she traveled by train to meet her husband in Atlanta, where she unknowingly checked into a "white" hotel and her husband, Clifford, couldn't join her, or even meet her there.

And what about the men? What did they expect? Probably wives who would be more submissive than American women, but also, paradoxically, wives who would run American-style households, cook American meals, raise American kids and impart American values to those children. The Red Cross in Japan ran popular "brides schools," where Japanese women were taught how to make beds, bake cakes, wear makeup and walk in high heels. Toyo Swartz, 92, of Vallejo, Calif., showed me glossy photographs of herself in those classes and recalled being taught how to make meatloaf. Such photographs were taken to show Americans that the Japanese women were going to fit right in.

In many cases the men were unprepared as well. After all, my mother knew she was going to a farm. My father probably never suspected he was bringing home an opinionated, strong-willed woman who could never be content as a chicken farmer's wife.

My mother remembers vividly her second day at the chicken farm. She was pregnant with me. Helen, her mother-in-law, took her into the hatchery to see the baby chicks. They were a blanket of yellow fuzz in large drawer-like trays under heating lights. A potbellied stove nearby kept the entire room warm. What happened next made my mother sick. Her mother-in-law reached into that peeping sea of yellow and pulled out a chick that was deformed in some way, a runt perhaps or exhibiting some other sign of poor health. And she opened the door of the stove and tossed the chick into the flames. It made a popping sound. She repeated this several times while my mother struggled to stay upright.

At this moment my mother realized that life on the farm was going to be like nothing she had experienced or expected. It's painful for me to hear her describe her shock at farm life - the dirtiness of the house, the crude, rough way of living. Her constant fights with my father over what she wanted - a life apart from the farm, for him to continue his education on the GI Bill. Her frustration with his lack of ambition.

The more my father wanted to settle for what he had - a house trailer and low-level farm work - the more my mother fought for what she wanted. And for years, that was the pattern. She says it made their marriage worse, and she blames herself as much as him: She wasn't the right wife for him. Not because she was Japanese, but because they were poorly suited for each other. In temperament. In outlook. After more than 30 years together, they got divorced.

He remarried and died more than 15 years ago. I wish I had asked him why he chose my mother, what made him think he should marry her and bring her home to the farm, whether he believed in the obedient Asian wife stereotype. I do know that as the years went by, he resented her ambition, her desire to expand the grocery store, build a new home, push her children to apply to the best colleges possible. And because of their personalities, she got her way.

Never once did she consider going back to Japan. No war bride I've interviewed felt they could go back to Japan. When they left, they recalled, they were warned: Don't come home crying. And certainly don't come home crying with children.

Some descended into bitterness and depression. Most simply moved forward as best they could - raising kids, finding solace in friendships or faith; reinventing themselves to fit their changed reality.

There were many exceptions, of course. Great love stories, solid partnerships, loving families; men who cared about their wives' Japanese roots. More than 12 years after his wife, Kiyoko, died, 82-year-old Joe Sexton of Philadelphia still sends a large box of gifts every Christmas to her relatives in Hokkaido, Japan's northernmost island, and calls them annually, using an interpreter. He treasures his favorite ramen broth that they send to him in return packages, and he shares the bounty with his children.

Women married to career military men more easily found other Japanese war bride families to form friendships. But they also endured husbands absent for long stretches - including duty in Vietnam in the 1960s and '70s. During that period, the Japanese wives left behind near the Aberdeen Proving Ground in Aberdeen, Md., formed a social group that continues to this day.

About a dozen of the women meet every month, often at the Golden Corral for the all-you-can-eat brunch, loading their plates with fried chicken, macaroni and potatoes. They trade Japanese books and magazines, teach each other how to make new origami ornaments, go to cheer the Japanese youth baseball team that comes to compete in the Cal Ripken World Series.

In the United States, work - any work - felt like a form of liberation and was often a necessity. The skills many of them brought from Japan were as seamstresses and barbers. Keiko Ingerson's Keiko's Family Hair Care in Lewiston, Maine, was an institution for many years. Most of her customers did not know of her hardships, her need to work to support her three children after her husband left. Yoko Breckenridge's abusive father made her learn barbering so he wouldn't have to pay for a shave. She married Roger to escape him, and she became a successful barber when she landed in Redwood Falls, Minn.

My mother worked at the family farm, processing eggs and delivering them. Then she and my father, Bill, ran a small grocery store after it was clear the farm was too small to survive.

When my parents divorced, my father offered my mother the choice of keeping either their house or the country store - assuming she'd take the home. It only went to show how much he still misjudged her. My mother took Tolbert's Store and made an unlikely success of it - also demonstrating a kind of feminism by employing only women, from Ellie, who worked the deli, to "Betty, my butcher."

In fact, Betty Maramack became my mother's closest friend and business confidante - teaching her how to control inventory and also persuading her to get her first flu shot. Betty advised my mother when to sell the store - a sale that made enough money to usher her into comfortable retired life.

The Japanese war brides were determined to raise what they imagined were all-American children. And they did. Their children are American, and they have little connection to Japan. Most do not have Japanese names.

I don't think of myself as Asian American. In my Upstate New York upbringing, there weren't other Asians, certainly not other Japanese Americans, with whom I might have felt some affinity. But I was surprised to find that even children of Japanese war brides on the West Coast - with its deeply embedded Asian communities - did not think of themselves as especially Japanese American.

I think that's partly because the Japanese war brides so rigorously suppressed their former identities to become American. Their departures on the arms of American men were viewed with sadness, by the women and their families alike, because they were probably leaving forever. And there was an underlying tinge of shame that they had turned away from Japan or that Japan could not provide for them.

The women don't view their families today as a branch on their Japanese family tree; they started from scratch. "I came here alone, and today I have 28 family members," one woman told me with quiet pride.

My mother didn't speak Japanese to us. Very few war brides used Japanese at home. Their husbands didn't want them to, fearing it would become a shared language that excluded them. And the women viewed it as counterproductive to their efforts to become real Americans and to have their children be seen the same as other kids.

Some of their children who later learned Japanese or who were able to spend time in Japan found it gave them unexpected insights into their mothers.

Rodney Yoder, of Boston, was a Harvard student spending a year at Doshisha University in Kyoto when his mother, Itsuko, came to visit. Decades later, sitting in his Back Bay apartment, he choked up at the recollection. "I could understand my mom for the first time. I could hear her speak, I could hear her sense of humor. My home-stay family told me how bright and cheerful my mother is. So in a way it was like getting to know her for the first time."

The women often stayed away from Japan - perhaps taking only one or two trips "home'' during 60 years. Sometimes it was because of the expense. But also, Japan had changed, become unrecognizably rich, and they themselves had become strangers there.

My mother enjoyed more regular visits to Japan - sometimes as a member of the local delegation in the "Sister City" exchanges between nearby Corning, N.Y., and the city of Kakegawa. Japan may have changed, but the food she loved was the same. Her mother, brother and sister always welcomed her. Her nieces took time off from work to go around with her. She was lucky.

But she never told her mother that she was divorced; she couldn't bring herself to undermine the picture of her American life that she had painted over the years, of a good marriage and wonderful family. She also didn't want to concede that her mother had perhaps been right more than six decades ago with her warning about the bones of an unknown horse.

She herself knew she did not make a mistake. She has said over and over that it was the right decision to leave Japan. She bounced back from a hard landing, made a life and is satisfied with how it turned out.

America has been perfect for her in that sense, because she was entrepreneurial and the harder she worked, the more she could get ahead. That brought her immense satisfaction.

And she raised four children, not with warmth or expressions of love, but with a fierce determination.

The language my mother used when we were growing up was always about hard work and studying, getting ahead. Like Japanese mothers in general, she was obsessed with education. She paid for tutors. She read my history chapters when I was in junior high so that she could ask me questions before a test.

She wanted us to succeed because that would mean she succeeded. That was extremely important to her. She said she didn't want people to say, "Look what happens when a Japanese comes to this country."

Her mothering didn't include saying to her children, "I love you." To this day she doesn't say it, although she now returns goodbye hugs, if stiffly.

I am the oldest child, the custodian of her story. I tell my mother's story, and those of other Japanese women like her, to give them recognition for what they endured and what they achieved. For their extraordinary resilience.

I have learned Japanese and taught it to my daughter. I also hug my daughter every time I see her, and I always tell her I love her.

kathryn.tolbert@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Danielle Allen is a political theorist at Harvard University and a contributing columnist for The Post. Richard Ashby Wilson is the Gladstein Chair of Human Rights at the University of Connecticut School of Law.

We've hit the home stretch of the election. The time has come to get serious, really serious, about understanding what's at stake with Donald Trump's proposal to deport 5 million to 11 million undocumented **immigrants** and his promise that 2 million will be deported in "a matter of months" if he is elected.

In May, former homeland security secretary Michael Chertoff told the New York Times: "I can't even begin to picture how we would deport 11 million people in a few years where we don't have a police state, where the police can't break down your door at will and take you away without a warrant." He also said, "Unless you suspend the Constitution and instruct the police to behave as if we live in North Korea, it ain't happening."

Trump's specific policy involves adding 5,000 Border Patrol agents, tripling the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement deportation agents, creating a special deportation force that he has described as a military unit and deporting not merely people who have been convicted of crimes but also **immigrants** on visa overstays and undocumented **immigrants** who have been arrested, even if not convicted. He has proposed expedited procedures that would, to ensure speed, presumably require setting aside the due process protections meant to safeguard rights and minimize error.

One of the last times the world saw such a major effort at mass deportations in a developed country was in the 1990s in the former Yugoslavia. That experience is instructive.

In 1989, after the fall of the Berlin Wall and four decades of peaceful ethnic and religious relations in Yugoslavia, post-communist politicians of all three communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina (Croat, Muslim and Serb) came to power on a surge of ethno-nationalist rhetoric. Starting in 1992, they promulgated official policies such as the "Six Strategic Objectives for the Bosnian Serb People" that included the forcible removal of other groups from towns and villages, using new "crisis staffs" made up of police and civilian paramilitaries.

The process spun out of control and, in many communities, neighbors turned against neighbors, driving them out of their homes and seizing their assets. It started with a small number of activists, fewer than a few thousand people who were extreme nationalists and members of fringe parties. But as the propaganda and fear spread, the wider citizenry participated in the campaign of persecution. With the cover of official policy, civilians took it upon themselves to hasten the expulsion of members of other ethnic or religious groups. The fratricidal conflict claimed 100,000 lives. The majority of fatalities were civilians murdered in the context of mass deportations.

The Bosnian deportations grew into a systematic policy termed "ethnic cleansing." The U.N. Security Council declared forcible removal based on ethnicity a crime against humanity in 1994. And eventually there was also accountability for political leaders who enacted deportation policies and incited their followers to hatred and violence. In March 2016, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia found former Bosnian Serb president Radovan Karadzic guilty of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The tribunal ruled that his speeches and official propaganda made a significant contribution to an overarching joint criminal enterprise to create an ethnically homogenous state of Bosnian Serbs.

The United States, of course, has its own history of mass deportations. There is the 19th-century Trail of Tears, when the U.S. government forcibly relocated members of Southeastern Native American tribes to land west of the Mississippi River. And in the 1930s and 1940s, under the pressure of the Great Depression, about 2 million Mexicans and Mexican Americans were deported; many lost their property. This was also the backdrop to the famous Zoot Suit Riots in Los Angeles in 1943, when U.S. sailors and Marines attacked Latino youths. The violence spread to San Diego and Oakland, and developed into broader racial violence that summer in Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, New York and Evansville, Ind. In the 1950s, the deportation of millions was attempted again with Operation Wetback; again people lost their property. Some died in the desert heat of Mexicali.

The notion that governments have learned how to conduct mass deportations in "humane and efficient" ways is ludicrous. The summary removal of millions of members of a minority ethnic or religious group from a territory has been accompanied, in nearly every historical instance, by assault, murder, crimes against humanity and, occasionally, genocide. It has involved armed roadblocks to check papers, the smashing down of doors in the night to drag people out of their homes. It has also involved unrestrained popular violence against a target population.

We might like to think that we're above all that sort of thing, that with the right kind of training a special deportation force and beefed-up ICE units would carry out an orderly removal. But we do have in our midst the elements that have historically made mass deportations so dangerous: heated rhetoric that slurs whole minority groups ("they're not sending their best ... they're rapists"); an activist minority of white nationalists; an armed minority of militiamen; and the ongoing militarization of our police forces.

Then there is the other deeper, more profound truth of the matter. Mass deportation policies give neighbors who are citizens the chance to take advantage of neighbors who are not. If due process is not going to be protected for undocumented **immigrants**, why would their property be protected? Or perhaps someone has a score to settle? These are the basic sorts of temptations that have, historically, led ordinary people to participate in programs that became uglier than ever expected.

Currently, we are seeing net outflows of **immigrants** across the Mexican border, as has been the case since 2009. In other words, we do not have an **immigration** crisis. But even if we did, history has shown that crisis rhetoric, coupled with a racially tinged aspiration to mass deportations, has repeatedly led to episodes that harm some severely, perhaps even mortally, and is likely to bring shame on us all.

Danielle Allen is a political theorist at Harvard University and a contributing columnist for The Post. Richard Ashby Wilson is the Gladstein Chair of Human Rights at the University of Connecticut School of Law.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**To fight the Islamic State terrorist group, Donald Trump would "bomb the s--- out of" their oil fields or "bomb the hell out of ISIS." Or maybe neither of those things.

The GOP presidential nominee has called for "very few troops on the ground," but also 20,000 to 30,000 troops. Or he might just let Russia handle the fighting.

He proposed banning all foreign Muslims from entering the United States until we "figure out what is going on" with terrorism. Or maybe just people from certain countries.

After two events last weekend - a bombing in New York that involved a suspect who praised the Islamic State and stabbings in Minnesota for which the Islamic State has claimed credit - Trump has revived his tough talk on obliterating the terrorist group - vowing to "utterly destroy ISIS."

But for more than a year, Trump has declined to lay out a coherent strategy for doing so. Whenever pressed for specifics, Trump insists that he has a plan but says it must remain secret to avoid tipping off the enemy.

The scattered ideas that Trump has offered publicly have often been contradictory, impossible or even illegal - alarming many national security and foreign policy experts in both parties.

"I don't think he has a well-thought-through position on anything," said Eliot Cohen, a top State Department official during the George W. Bush administration who helped organize an anti-Trump open letter earlier this year. "I don't think he's read much, I don't think he's studied these issues. I think, like with so many other topics, he's just emoting."

Plans all over the map

The fight against the Islamic State and how it should be waged is certain to be one of the central issues at Monday's presidential debate between Trump and Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton at Hofstra University, an event that will include a section focused on "securing America."

For Trump, the Islamic State and its escalating attacks on the West have been a central focus of his rhetoric since the GOP primaries.

He has accused President Obama of ignoring or even sympathizing with the terrorists.

Trump also frequently talks as if the United States and its partners are doing nothing to combat the group, which has been severely weakened by thousands of coalition airstrikes and other operations over the past two years.

"We are going to take a swift, strong action to protect the American people from radical Islamic terrorism," Trump said in Ohio on Wednesday. "In recent days, terrorists have attacked in New York City, New Jersey and Minnesota. And it's going to get worse - it's going to get worse. If Hillary is president, it would be disaster. If Trump is president, you will be very, very happy."

For months, Trump has skipped the usual foreign policy and national security briefings that are a traditional part of running for president, declaring at one point: "I know more about ISIS than the generals do. Believe me."

Trump approaches terrorism as he approaches many issues, saying that Democrats and the establishment have messed up everything through their stupidity - he once referred to foreign policy experts as "eggheads" - and that a savvy businessman such as himself would use common sense to quickly fix the problem.

The GOP candidate has said that he would "bomb the hell out of those oil fields" controlled by the Islamic State in a bid to cut off the group's wealth.

Sometimes Trump adds that he would seize the oil itself, which would both violate international law in stripping a country of its resources and take decades to accomplish, given the volume of crude.

Trump has also insisted that no civilians would be harmed in the destruction.

"I would bomb the s--- out of them," Trump said of Islamic State-controlled oil fields at a rally last year in Iowa. "I would just bomb those suckers. And that's right: I'd blow up the pipes, I'd blow up the refineries. I would blow up every single inch. There would be nothing left."

In terms of troop presence in Iraq or Syria, Trump has been all over the map.

He said he wants to send "very few" troops to the Middle East, while also saying during a primary debate that he would be open to sending 20,000 to 30,000 soldiers.

At other times, Trump has said the fight against the Islamic State should be left to Russia, which is allied with Syrian President Bashar al-Assad, who is opposed by the United States.

When it comes to the treatment of suspected terrorists in general, Trump has said he would bring back waterboarding - which is widely considered torture and forbidden under U.S. and international law - and use other interrogation tactics that are "much worse" because "torture works."

Trump has said that he would "take out" the relatives of suspected terrorists, also forbidden under international law.

At various times, Trump has proposed temporarily banning nearly all foreign Muslims from entering the United States or stopping **immigration** from countries with high rates of terrorism. He has promised to kick all Syrian **refugees** out of the United States and relocate them to a "safe zone" in their war-torn country that he would force the Gulf States to finance.

Trump has also said he would shut down parts of the Internet so that the Islamic State cannot recruit young Americans, an idea that he has yet to fully explain.

After a terrorist attack in France this summer, Trump said he would request war authorization from Congress - an unprecedented departure from long-standing practice for American military engagement that would grant the president sweeping powers not invoked since World War II.

Trump has also called for the United States to mobilize a NATO coalition against terrorists - which has already happened - even while calling the alliance obsolete and complaining about its cost.

Concerns by experts

Trump's inconsistent approach to the Islamic State challenge has prompted a wave of Republican foreign policy experts - many of whom rarely weigh in during a presidential election - to sign letters and op-eds warning of the danger of a Trump presidency.

Last spring, Cohen and more than 100 other Republican national security experts signed a letter denouncing Trump's candidacy and stating that his "vision of American influence and power in the world is wildly inconsistent and unmoored in principle." Last month, 50 Republicans, including former top aides and Cabinet members for the George W. Bush administration, signed a letter saying that Trump would be "the most reckless president in American history" and that none of them would vote for him.

And last week, 75 retired career Foreign Service officers - including ambassadors and senior State Department officials under Republican and Democratic presidents - signed an open letter stating they would vote for Clinton, not Trump, whom they accused of being "ignorant of the complex nature of the challenges facing our country, from Russia to China to ISIS to nuclear proliferation to **refugees** to drugs."

Trump has countered such missives with a letter signed by 88 former generals and admirals who argue that the United States needs "a long-overdue course correction in our national security posture and policy."

They describe a military that has been hollowed by "a series of ill-considered and debilitating budget cuts, policy choices and combat operations."

Trump is regularly joined on the campaign trail by Michael T. Flynn, a retired three-star general who was pushed out of his assignment as director of the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Flynn has embraced and promoted Trump's aggressive positions, adding a much-needed seal of approval.

"Political correctness kills. It will cause death, and we can't have that," Flynn said on Fox News earlier this week. "I'm going to be very candid here. You don't have a lot of people yelling 'Jesus Christ!' and putting a knife in somebody's body or putting a knife in somebody's head. This is a different enemy. It's an enemy that we have not, frankly, understood in a couple administrations, and we definitely don't understand them right now."

'Too great a risk for America'

Clinton, a former secretary of state under Obama, has proposed ways to intensify and expand the current fight against the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria short of sending U.S. combat forces, which she says would be shortsighted. Clinton speaks frequently of what she calls an "intelligence surge" that would seek to coordinate intelligence among several nations to better counter Islamic State recruitment and fundraising.

Her major departure from Obama's current policy would be to add a "no-fly" zone in northern Syria, to shelter civilians, and to allow better access for aid and relief supplies. Such a zone would have to be enforced from the air, which appears far more complicated now, with Russian and U.S. planes both flying over Islamic State-controlled territory, than when Clinton first raised the idea months ago.

Robert Gates, who was secretary of defense under George W. Bush and Obama, wrote in an op-ed in the Wall Street Journal last week that neither Trump nor Clinton have detailed approaches to dealing with terrorism that are dramatically different from what Obama is already doing.

But he questioned Trump's willingness to "walk away from the region and hope for the best," and accused him of being "willfully ignorant about the rest of the world, about our military and its capabilities, and about government itself" and unwilling to listen to experts.

"The world we confront is too perilous and too complex to have as president a man who believes he, and he alone, has all the answers and has no need to listen to anyone," Gates wrote. "In domestic affairs, there are many checks on what a president can do; in national security there are few constraints. A thin-skinned, temperamental, shoot-from-the-hip and lip, uninformed commander in chief is too great a risk for America."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

jose.delreal@washpost.com

Karen DeYoung and Anne Gearan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Mike Gonzalez is a senior fellow at the Heritage Foundation.

Should we build a Latino Smithsonian museum? Some Hispanic politicians think so. Piggybacking on the attention garnered by the opening this weekend of the National Museum of African American History and Culture, they have renewed a push for the creation of a National Museum of the American Latino.

It's an idea that sounds good - until you think about it for about three seconds.

This is not just because museums are for dead things ("The Louvre is a morgue; you go there to identify your friends," the French artist Jean Cocteau famously complained), but because it would breathe life into concepts from which we need to move away.

The Latino museum is being championed by Rep. Xavier Becerra (D-Calif.), who doesn't even bother to hide the "me-tooism." Just a couple of weeks before the opening of the African American Museum, Becerra introduced a bill calling for the Latino museum to be placed in the Arts and Industries Building on the Mall. Sen. Robert Menendez (D-N.J.) moved parallel legislation in the Senate.

"It provides inspiration, and it really does give you locomotion to try to move this forward," Becerra told The Post. "So many [of the African American Museum's supporters] have come to me and said, 'You're next.' It pumps you up."

And that's just it. Of all the reasons this is a bad idea, we can start with the fact that the experiences of African Americans cannot be compared to those of any other group - especially **immigrants** and their descendants.

That would include the vast majority of the 56 million people the Census Bureau instructs to identify themselves as "Hispanic" - who can't all be descended from the estimated 100,000 people who chose to remain in the Southwest at the conclusion of the Mexican War in 1848.

The notion that they constitute an ethno-racial pentagon along with African Americans, Asian Americans, Native Americans and non-Latino whites is a dubious social construct of very recent pedigree. That a museum would help perpetuate this division - literally cement it - is a second reason to oppose it.

Dividing the country along these cleavages - an official policy that began only in the late 1970s and quickly migrated to the academy, the labor market and the culture - has contributed to a degree of social fragmentation that is only now becoming apparent.

What started as a perhaps well-meaning concept stands behind much of today's palpable societal angst. Even liberals are starting to worry about what national fracturing is doing to social solidarity.

The multicultural dispensation that resulted depends on indoctrinating members of four of the groups into believing that they are historical victims of the fifth. This is on its face a nonsensical proposition for those who willingly came here, and for their descendants, and has led to misallocations of priorities and funds.

Many non-Latino whites are disadvantaged socially, as this year's runaway bestseller "Hillbilly Elegy" by J.D. Vance makes abundantly clear. As a very good review in last week's New Yorker explained, poor whites also face economic and cultural barriers to upward mobility.

At the same time, many members of the designated minorities also are very socially advantaged and do not need set-asides to get a government contract or be accepted into Harvard University.

Which is the third important reason the Smithsonian should not open a Latino national museum: Such an institution could only perpetuate the notion of victimhood.

This is a corrosive idea because it tells individuals, especially the young, that they lack agency, that their problems were created by others. We don't have to imagine what politicians would do with this - we see it every day.

There are small museums here and there for German Americans, Italian Americans and Jewish Americans, which is fine. There could be a repository for the definitive story of Cuban Americans, most of whom are here as a result of the traumatic dislocation caused by the Cuban Revolution; for Mexican Americans, whose incredible cultural imprint in the Southwest is at least as important as that of Vance's Scots-Irish in Appalachia; for Puerto Ricans, etc.

But, please, no Smithsonian museum for an ethnicity created by 1970s federal bureaucrats. Defenders of **immigration** make the case that today's **immigrants**will assimilate as members of previous surges did - which is what undoubtedly will happen, but only if they are treated as those earlier arrivals were.

That is, as **immigrants** on their way to being Americans, not as members of a permanent national minority.

The writer is a senior fellow at the Heritage Foundation.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**AURORA, Colo.

Here on the High Plains, where the deer and the antelope once played, Denver's suburbs roam toward the Rockies' front range and the nature of today's polyglot politics is written in the local congressman's campaign schedule. One day last week, Republican Mike Coffman went from a Hispanic charter school in a strip mall, to another strip mall for lunch at an Ethiopian restaurant with leaders of the Ethiopian American community, then to a meeting with the editor of the largest of two Korean-language newspapers serving more than 3,000 Korean Americans in the metropolitan area.

Coffman was elected to Congress in 2008 with 61 percent of the vote, replacing Tom Tancredo, a firebrand who that year ineffectually ran for president as a scourge of illegal **immigrants**. Coffman's thinking was somewhat congruent with Tancredo's. Then, however, the political market - a.k.a. democracy - began to work, with an assist from Democrats, who inadvertently made Coffman a better politician and person.

After he was reelected with 66 percent of the vote in 2010, his district was gerrymandered to make it more Democratic - 20 percent Hispanic, with a generous salting of other minorities. He won in 2012 with just 48 percent of the vote. In 2014, national Democrats recruited a formidable opponent, a Yale Universitygraduate who had taught, in Spanish, in Central American schools. So, Coffman learned Spanish well enough to do an entire debate in the language, and today banters in Spanish with the children at Roca Fuerte Academy.

The pastor who founded it in 2008 says this charter school is anathema to, and underfunded by, the local school district, which is obedient to the teachers union, which dislikes charters that are not obedient to it. The district's schools have just a 61 percent graduation rate. Roca Fuerte Academy does better.

Some of the academy's pupils in their school uniforms are antecedents of the pronoun in Donald Trump's four-word **immigration** policy: "They have to go." They were brought here by illegal **immigrants**. Trump wants to send them "home" to countries they do not remember. Coffman has co-authored legislation that would provide legal status and a path to lawful permanent resident status to those who came before age 16, have lived here five consecutive years, and who have been accepted to a college or vocational school or have demonstrated an intent to enlist in the military, or have a valid work authorization.

At the Nile restaurant, Coffman's cowboy boots go beneath a table groaning under the weight of trays laden with Ethiopian food that is eaten without utensils, scooped up with bits torn from rolls of bread as thin and flexible as fabric. Coffman sits next to an Ethiopian Orthodox bishop who is wearing a cassock and a glittering pectoral cross. As guests arrive, several kiss a crucifix he holds. He speaks scant English but draws 1,500 to Sunday services. Many of those around the table have been in the United States for at least a decade and are citizens and small-business entrepreneurs. Ethiopians are Colorado's second-largest **immigrant** community and are grateful for Coffman's attempts to pressure Ethiopia's authoritarian government to stop using violence against protesters. Coffman attends the annual "Taste of Ethiopia" festival here in America's Mountain West and "Ethiopians for Coffman" might matter in November. As might the Korean American community, which continues to honor those Americans who, like Coffman's father, fought in the Korean War.

Coffman, 61, enlisted in the Army before receiving his high school diploma, which he earned while serving. After leaving the Army and graduating from the University of Colorado, he went to Marine Corps officer training. When he left the Corps he became a state legislator until called back into uniform in 1991 for the Gulf War. In 2005, he resigned as state treasurer to serve a tour of duty with the Marines in Iraq. There he helped organize elections in a place where diversity is rather more problematic than in Colorado's 6th Congressional District.

His opponent this year, who dislikes charter schools and school choice, does not speak fluent Spanish and, unlike almost all candidates challenging incumbents, does not seem to want many debates - she even declined the Denver Post's. Coffman thinks she does not want anything to distract from her theme, which is: Trump is a Republican and so is Coffman.

In early August, however, Coffman acted preemptively with a television ad that began: "People ask me, 'What do you think about Trump?' Honestly, I don't care for him much." Spoken like a Marine who does 10 sets of 50 push-ups daily.

georgewill@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**l The Beet Gazpacho recipe in this weekend's Washington Post Magazine, which was printed in advance, omits adding the cooked beets to the blender, along with other ingredients. The corrected recipe appears online at washingtonpost.com/recipes.

l An article about low-tech living spaces in this weekend's Washington Post Magazine gives an incorrect manufacturer for the rug in the Esber family's living room. The rug came from Kravet Couture Rugs, not Couture Knots.

l A Sept. 20 Page One article about President Obama rallying world support for **refugees** misidentified the source of a study on the scale of the **refugee** crisis. It came from the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**.

l A Science Scan review of the book "Cat Wars" in the Sept. 20 Health & Science section omitted a reference to "high priority areas" in this quote from the book: "In high priority areas there must be zero tolerance for free-ranging cats."

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Obama administration's efforts to stem the flow of Central American migrants illegally crossing into the United States have largely failed two years after a border crisis prompted President Obama to order an emergency response.

The number of families and unaccompanied minors arriving in 2016 is on pace to exceed the total in 2014, when U.S. Border Patrol stations were overwhelmed along the Rio Grande Valley in Texas. They are coming primarily from Guatemala, Honduras and El Salvador, an area sometimes called the Northern Triangle.

Vice President Biden is expected to tout progress on strengthening border security and deepening economic ties when he meets Friday with the leaders of the Northern Triangle nations at the Inter-American Development Bank in Washington.

But human rights advocates said the continued influx from the region has demonstrated that the administration's deterrence policy has misdiagnosed the root causes and failed to adequately address the humanitarian needs.

Overall, 122,132 families and children, mostly from Central America, have been apprehended at the U.S. border with Mexico with a month remaining in fiscal 2016. That compares with a total of 132,259 in fiscal 2014, according to statistics from U.S. Customs and Border Protection. The renewed surge this year comes after a significant drop in 2015.

"Clearly, at this point, the deterrence strategy has failed," said Kevin Appleby, director of international migration policy at the Center for Migration Studies. "There needs to be a paradigm shift here, with more of a focus on protection and less on the enforcement side. They need to treat this as a real **refugee** crisis. They've been in self-denial for a year or two on this issue."

Unlike the situation in Syria, where millions have been displaced by a devastating civil war, the Obama administration has been reluctant to label the Central American exodus a **refugee** crisis. Under international legal standards, **refugees** are defined as those who flee government persecution. U.S. officials said the Central American migrants are primarily escaping economic hardship in societies with rampant violence and crime perpetrated by drug cartels and organized gangs.

In the aftermath of the 2014 border crisis, Obama initiated a government-wide response that included additional temporary shelter space and $750 million in economic development aid for the migrants' home countries. Most of those funds, however, have not been delivered to the region.

Under mounting pressure from advocates, the administration announced plans this summer to expand a State Department program launched in 2014 that allows Central Americans to apply for **refugee** status in the United States from within their home countries.

The administration also won a commitment from Costa Rica to accept 200 gravely endangered Central American minors while U.S. officials examine their cases.

So far, only a few thousand children have won **refugee** status under the new programs.

"We are committed to protecting Central Americans at risk and expanding resettlement opportunities in the region," White House spokesman Peter Boogaard said in a statement. "The steps taken over the past year are another example of the creative solutions being taken across the federal government to make progress on this issue, consistent with existing statutory law, which limits who is admissible and eligible for humanitarian relief. While these efforts will not solve this challenge alone, they are a further example of the United States' continued commitment."

But the administration's central focus has been on deterring Central Americans from attempting what Obama called a dangerous journey north under the guidance of human smugglers. The administration ramped up the number of **immigration** judges to adjudicate asylum requests and made clear, in advertisements in the Northern Triangle countries, that migrants who lose in court can be returned to their home countries.

Obama and Biden also pressured Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto to tighten his country's borders with its southern neighbors and intercept migrants attempting the journey to the United States. In January, as the numbers of Central American migrants surged again, the Department of Homeland Securityconducted raids to round up several dozen of those who had outstanding deportation orders.

"The federal government has really tried to push the story in Central America that it's just criminal gangs and general violence, but the evidence on the ground, if you look at news reports, is that gangs have gained a huge political dimension," said Bryan S. Johnson, a New York-based **immigration** lawyer who has represented hundreds of Central Americans in court.

At a special U.N. **refugee** summit this week, Obama announced plans for the United States and 18 other countries to increase the number of **refugees** they will accept next year from across the world. The president specifically thanked Mexico for "absorbing a great number of **refugees** from Central America."

But advocates emphasized that Mexico has deported many and granted **refugee** status to relatively few. In 2015, for example, Mexico granted **refugee** status to 1,013 migrants from the Northern Triangle, including 57 children, while deporting 175,000.

Appleby said the Obama administration's strategy of enlisting Mexico to block the Central Americans "is part of the things we're seeing around the world - externalizing the border. Extend the border, but don't extend the protections."

david.nakamura@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HARLOW, England - He went down with a single punch.

Arkadiusz Jozwik - shy, devoted to his mother and an **immigrant** to Britain from his native Poland - was out with friends late last month enjoying pizza and drinks when they were set upon by a group of teens, some reportedly shouting anti-Polish slurs.

The punch knocked Jozwik to the ground, the back of his head slapping the concrete of the run-down pedestrian plaza in this hardscrabble London suburb. The 40-year-old was taken off life support days later.

Now Jozwik's violent death is reverberating throughout Britain, and across Europe, as the latest evidence of a post-Brexit surge in suspected hate crimes directed at **immigrants**.

When anti-**immigrant** assaults first started rising after the June 23 vote to leave the European Union, authorities expressed hope that the spike would prove temporary.

But three months later, the rate of such crimes remains sharply higher than it was last year, generating fears that the xenophobic passions unleashed by the Brexit vote have created a new normal of fear and intimidation for the country's approximately 8.5 million foreign-born residents.

It may get worse: Those who backed Brexit, expecting that the vote would yield mass deportations and a ban on new **immigrant** arrivals, are bound to be disappointed by the years-long bureaucratic slog that lies ahead, which could lead to even more violence as frustration sets in.

Eric Hind, a Polish-born friend of Jozwik's, said that the day after the vote he had received messages on Facebook: "What time is the next bus back to Poland?" His mother and his sister were told by their factory manager: "Now you Poles need to pack up your bags and go back home."

The vote mandated no such thing. But the threat of violence may force them out just the same.

"People are scared and horrified. I'm scared and horrified," Hind said. "My wife wants to move back to Poland. I keep saying, 'Let's not panic.' Arek's death was one case. But it could have been me."

Such is the depth of concern that the Polish national police sent two officers to Harlow last week to patrol the town, which was largely built in the 1950s as a concrete-clad socialist utopia for London residents who were bombed out during the Blitz.

In more recent decades, Harlow has struggled with closed factories and wide income disparities, even as **immigrants** have moved in to launch businesses and get a foothold in their new land.

"A lot of people here feel like they've been left behind. Britain's moving on at a huge pace, but their situation is getting worse and worse," said Owen Jones, senior organizer for the anti-extremism group Hope Not Hate. "Then they see **immigrants** driving around in nicer cars and living better lives than they do. It creates even more resentment."

In the pedestrian plaza where Jozwik died - its storefronts dominated by liquor shops, betting parlors and faded pubs - officers with "Policja" stamped on their blue uniforms are walking the beat alongside those bearing the more familiar bulbous black caps of a British bobby.

The Polish officers have no formal police powers in Britain. But their highly unusual assignment was intended to help "engage with members of the Polish community who do not speak English as their first language," according to the local Essex police force.

The arrival of the officers followed days after a visit to London by Polish Foreign Minister Witold Waszczykowski, who cited Jozwik's death and other attacks in arguing that the Brexit vote had spawned an eruption of violence against **immigrants** who "deserve to be respected and secured."

Last week, European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker used his annual state-of-the-E.U. address to speak out about Jozwik's killing and the rising British nativism it has come to represent.

"We Europeans can never accept Polish workers being harassed, beaten up or even murdered on the streets of Essex," Juncker said.

British leaders, too, have strongly condemned the rise in hate crimes. Prime Minister Theresa May has addressed the issue from the floor of the House of Commons and phoned her Polish counterpart to express her "deep regret" at crimes such as the attack on Jozwik.

Here in Harlow, his death has spawned a reckoning over the town's problems with anti-**immigrant** prejudice.

"This isn't a town where everyone has pitchforks and is outright racist," said Emma Toal, deputy leader of the Harlow Council. "There's a big portion of the community that is shocked by this and doesn't want any Polish person to have to fear violence."

But Toal acknowledged there were some in Harlow who are hostile toward **immigrants**, and who had been deceived by pro-Brexit politicians into thinking that a vote to leave would force foreigners to head home.

"People thought they were voting to take back control, and that many **immigrants** wouldn't be allowed to stay," she said.

Those with such views may be a minority in Harlow. But they aren't difficult to find.

The tree-shaded spot where Jozwik was attacked is strewn with flowers, candles, Polish soccer jerseys and messages of peace. "Down with racism!" reads a hand-lettered sign in black ink.

A man with a buzz cut walking past the site, his pit bull tugging at the end of a short leash, explained to a young child one recent day that the tribute was "a memorial for something that happened to scum."

Others here vehemently deny that the town has a problem with prejudice, and say Jozwik was killed not because he was a foreigner but because he was unlucky - chosen randomly by teens looking for trouble.

"It had nothing to do with racism, but it's become politicized," said Sue Keningale, a local resident who puffed on an electronic cigarette as she waited outside a laundromat. "Yeah, it was a Polish guy who died. But what would have happened if it was an English guy?"

Keningale said the real problem in Harlow is that young people have nothing to do, and police do little to disrupt violent behavior. "There's been trouble here before with the kids. It's not a new thing," she said.

Hind said he does not believe the attack was random. He said he had spoken with another friend who survived the assault by the teens who told him that "the whole atmosphere changed when they said they were Polish."

"It was a hate crime," Hind said of the killing of the burly factory worker. "It's because of where he came from."

Police have confirmed they are investigating that possibility.

Hind, an information technology manager who organized a peace vigil in his friend's honor, said he worries that for all their rhetoric, authorities are not taking the rise in hate crimes seriously. He described the presence of the Polish officers as "a joke," and said it would do nothing substantive to address **immigrants**' concerns for their safety.

That makes him nervous, even as he resists his wife's pleas to move the family away from the hostility they feel in Harlow and back to their homeland.

"I'm not going to let this destroy everything I've worked for," Hind said. "I came here to achieve something."

griff.witte@washpost.com

Karla Adam in London contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PITTSBURGH - Donald Trump has amplified his focus this week on a strident nationalist and law-and-order message, emphasizing rhetoric that has fueled his popularity among white working-class voters but that also threatens to antagonize the centrists likely to decide the November election.

In speeches and interviews in recent days, Trump has called for "American hands" to remake the country rather than those of foreigners. He has portrayed Syrian **refugees** as a cultural threat, not just a security risk. He has also embraced controversial "stop-and-frisk" policing - a tactic championed by some conservatives but opposed in minority communities as a form of racial profiling - and suggested on Thursday that drugs were a major factor in anti-police protests.

Trump's hard-edged message is at odds with more traditional nominees who tend to use the final weeks of the race to shore up support among voters in the middle of the political spectrum. It also comes at the same time that Trump has been attempting to reach out to minority communities with visits to black churches and charter schools, making for some awkward interactions and scenes.

With less than seven weeks until Election Day, polls show Trump is steadily chipping away at Democratic nominee Hillary Clinton's once-wide lead. But the electoral math still favors Clinton, putting pressure on Trump to improve his standing in diverse battleground states such as Pennsylvania, which Democrats have claimed in the last six presidential elections.

Trump's supporters say his "America first" message applies to minorities, **immigrants** and moderate voters as much as it does to conservative whites.

"It is many of those voters who need the jobs. It's many of those voters who want to walk the streets in Chicago and feel safe," said Rep. Chris Collins (R-N.Y.), a Trump backer.

He acknowledged, however, that it's a provocative pitch. "There's some controversy in it, but you can't be afraid of controversy when you're putting America first," Collins said.

At a Wednesday rally in Toledo, Trump expanded on his usual security-focused objections to letting in **refugees** fleeing the Syrian civil war, saying that the migrants - most of whom are Muslims - should be blocked for cultural reasons as well.

"This isn't only a matter of terrorism, but also a matter of quality of life," said Trump, who has proposed an unspecified vetting procedure to screen out **immigrants**whose views are incompatible with American values. "We want to make sure we're only admitting those into our country who support our values and love - and I mean love - our people."

Trump received loud cheers from the predominantly white crowd.

During the same rally, Trump proclaimed that under a Trump presidency, "American hands will rebuild our nation. Not the hands of people from other nations."

Trump has held up sweeping trade deals as job-killers in Rust Belt states and parts of the South that once thrived with manufacturing jobs but have experienced severe economic decline.

"We can't continue to be the suckers that allow thousands of companies, millions of jobs to be lost by moving their manufacturing plants and factories to other countries. We can't do it," he said in Kenansville, N.C., on Tuesday.

While he has spoken to concerns of many white blue-collar voters this week, Trump has also made a concerted effort to show that he is reaching out to minority communities, promising to devote himself to rebuilding inner cities and saying his economic stewardship would elevate black neighborhoods. The message is aimed in part at reassuring white suburban voters concerned about his history of racially incendiary rhetoric, particularly regarding Mexicans and Muslims.

But the attempts have hit speed bumps. A town hall in Ohio this week hosted by Sean Hannity of Fox News was supposed to be focused on issues facing the black community, but the audience was largely white. Trump continues to speak to mostly white audiences on the campaign trail.

During a Wednesday campaign event at the New Spirit Revival Center in Cleveland Heights, Ohio, several high-profile Trump surrogates - including famed boxing promoter Don King - sought to combat the impression among many voters that Trump is racist.

However, as King introduced Trump, he inadvertently said the n-word while discussing black assimilation, drawing immediate outrage on social media and from black rights groups.

"If you're a dancing and sliding and gliding n-----, - I mean Negro!" King said, catching himself abruptly. "You're a dancing and sliding and gliding Negro. So dare not **alienate** because you cannot assimilate. You know, you're going to be a Negro till you die."

Trump also faced a swift backlash Tuesday after he declared that blacks are "in the worst shape they've ever been" during the event in Kenansville - a town named after a man whose family owned a slave plantation.

Such botched outreach attempts have fueled accusations from critics that Trump lacks the historical and cultural awareness of the struggles minority voters have faced.

Trump's championing of "stop-and-frisk," a controversial policy in which police officers are empowered to stop, question and search individuals they deem suspicious, has also alarmed many African American leaders.

"The policy of 'Stop & Frisk' (aka Detain & Dehumanize) is simply profiling for communities of color," tweeted NAACP President Cornell William Brooks on Thursday.

During the Hannity event, Trump said "stop-and-frisk" worked "incredibly well" in New York. But a 2014 New York Civil Liberties Union report found that as the number of stops increased dramatically from 2002 to 2011 during Michael Bloomberg's tenure as mayor, the number of guns recovered, shooting victims and murders only "changed modestly."

In an interview on "Fox and Friends" on Thursday morning, Trump said that he was "really referring to Chicago with stop-and-frisk," drawing questions about how widespread he believes the policy should be in practice.

Here in Pittsburgh later Thursday, Trump condemned violent protesters and called for national unity in the wake of the unrest in Charlotte following a deadly police shooting. But he did not directly confront concerns about systemic discriminatory policing nationwide.

"We honor and recognize the right for all Americans to peacefully assemble, protest and demonstrate, said Trump at the start of a speech on energy policy. "But there is no right to engage in violent disruption or to threaten the public safety and peace of others."

He added that such disruption disproportionately hurts African Americans "who live in these communities where the crime is so rampant" and said that drugs are a "very, very big factor in what you're watching on television at night."

jose.delreal@washpost.com
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Sullivan reported from Washington.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Of all the absurdities in Donald Trump's rapid political rise, none is more puzzling than his reputation for toughness in the war against terrorism.

Trump is a real-estate developer who takes any domestic terrorist attack - whatever the actual circumstances - as confirmation of his views on a lax **immigration**system, as evidence of a law- enforcement system hobbled by political correctness and as cause for more aggressive profiling of Muslims, Arabs or whomever he is currently defining as the threat. Some of his followers seem particularly pleased when he edges toward declaring Islam itself to be the enemy. "Frankly," Trump has said, "we're having problems with the Muslims."

This is complete madness. No serious counterterrorism expert (Trump may have unearthed some unserious ones to provide cover) believes that the task of confronting domestic radicalization - of working with communities to identify threats and prevent attacks - is helped by declaring a war on Islam. Those who regard Trump's use of the words "radical Islamic terrorism" as a counterterrorism victory are engaged in magical foreign-policy thinking - the deployment of incantations in a global conflict.

Trump has hardly distinguished himself in reacting to that conflict, fed by the radiating disorders of the Middle East. As the Islamic State (also known as ISIS) rose, the GOP nominee said, "That's not our fight." And: "Let Syria and ISIS fight. Why do we care?" And: "Let Russia fight ISIS, if they want to fight 'em." But also: Bomb the oil and "take the oil" - which would seem to require a choice between the two. Incantations are preferable to such gibberish.

Trump's instinct is to lead from behind - the intensification, not repudiation, of Obama-era policy in the Middle East. But one of the leading critics of this policy is also Donald Trump. "If [Obama] had gone in with tremendous force," he has argued, "you wouldn't have millions of people displaced all over the world."

Those who believe that preening bluster makes up for willful ignorance and dangerously poor policy judgment have found their man. But this is not the worst of it. Anyone who has spent time working in the White House would attest that the single most important presidential attribute is leadership in times of crisis. We have no idea what challenges the next president may face - an outbreak of deadly pandemic flu, the collapse of order in nuclear Pakistan, a cyberattack on the U.S. electrical grid. All we know - or try our best to know - is the character, stability and credibility of the president himself (or herself).

On current and consistent evidence, Trump would jump to conclusions, entertain conspiracy theories and lash out in rhetoric that seems tough but actually complicates the task of leadership. Conservatives trying to justify a vote for Trump argue that the presidency itself would somehow mature him. Yet the Republican nominee has provided little reason to believe he is truly capable of learning or benefiting from good counsel. "My primary consultant is myself and I have a good instinct for this stuff," Trump has said.

When I asked a former official of George W. Bush's administration (who wanted to be unnamed in order to speak more freely) about the requirements of presidential leadership in a time of national testing, the list was not a match with the GOP nominee. "It is really important to project a sense of calm," the official said. "A leader understands that people feed off his emotions in a moment of crisis. If he uses wild or frantic rhetoric, it will risk creating a psychological tsunami."

The president may face simultaneous crises, the official went on, forcing him "to rely on others in the team to give good advice." And: "If the ego is central to a leader and a crisis occurs, it could lead to rash decision-making." And: "One cannot solve a crisis by blaming other people. This tone makes it harder to rally the whole nation." A leader has to "articulate a credible strategy" and honor the "American values that unite us."

By all of these measures, Trump represents an extraordinary risk to the nation. On foreign policy, he is the worst of all worlds - extreme and **alienating** in his rhetoric, confused, erratic and weak on matters of policy. When some of us talk about presidential temperament, this is what we mean. Trump has not shown the stability, prudence and judgment the presidency requires in moments of national testing. This is not only disturbing; it is disqualifying.

michaelgerson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For years, Boise, Idaho, has welcomed large numbers of **refugees** from strife-torn countries, in the past year accepting twice as many Syrians as New York City and Los Angeles combined. And so Jodi Larson-Farrow of Boise's Agency for New Americans holds a cultural orientation for about 30 new arrivals about every two weeks, and she asks them what comes to mind when they think of the police.

"Fear," was a frequent response, Larson-Farrow said. "Rapist." "Power." "No trust." "Corruption." "Intimidation." "Run from them."

Then she introduces them to a police officer, Dustin Robinson, assigned full time to the Boise **refugee** communities, which include numerous Somali, Congolese and Burmese natives. And Robinson resumes a task now becoming commonplace in police departments across the United States, reaching out directly to burgeoning **refugee** populations to establish trust - and reduce fear - before crime or terrorism can take root.

"Terrorism is the white elephant in the room," said Lt. Sasha Larkin of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department, speaking Wednesday in Washington at a national gathering of police and **immigrant** community leaders brought together to share ideas about integrating **refugees** into American cities. In many cases, Larkin said, **refugees** "are isolated, so radicalization is the easy path."

Police are also concerned about **refugees**' reluctance to report crime, because of their mistrust of police, and the possibility of gangs evolving out of **refugee**communities where young people seek a sense of belonging. Police leaders talked about mentoring **refugee** teenagers, hiring them as interns and simply spending time in their neighborhoods to understand their hopes as well as their fears.

With the United States admitting more than 70,000 **refugees** a year, including more than 10,000 this year from Syria, American police are not only responding to the needs of brand-new residents but also addressing the fears of long-term residents. "We need to learn to dispel some of the bad news" about **refugees**, said Assistant Chief Scott Hoffman of Missoula, Mont., which has been receiving **immigrants** from Russia and Vietnam since the 1980s. "If there's fear among the community, we're not doing our job. We need to help them understand that they are vetted, they go through a process. We're there as an educator."

The word "outreach" was tossed around a lot at the seminar, organized by the Police Executive Research Forum and the Carnegie Corp., as police commanders shared their most effective strategies for building relationships with **refugees** who may have spent years in dehumanizing camps and suffer from post-traumatic stress disorder.

"Trust is a main issue," said Christopher Coen, head of Friends of **Refugees**, a nonpartisan watchdog group that monitors **refugee** admissions. Police need to "explain the system, let them know they're wanted here." He said the recent stabbings by a Somali man in St. Cloud, Minn., may have been motivated by harassment. "That's how these young men get disaffected," Coen said. "They have a hostile relationship with the authorities."

So police forces are trying to be proactive. In San Diego, a unit of specially trained patrol officers is assigned to one small area with large groups of Laotian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Chinese and Thai **refugees**, and a Multi-Cultural Community Relations storefront is staffed by nine bilingual "police service officers" 12 hours a day during the week. Within a 3.4-square-mile area, 102 languages are spoken, acting lieutenant Paul Yang said.

There are citizens groups for each nationality, Yang said, and they all meet regularly with San Diego Police Chief Shelley Zimmerman. Abraham To, chairman of an Indochinese community advisory board, said Zimmerman attends community meetings and festivals each week, often speaking a few words of greeting in Hmong or Vietnamese to break the ice. Her interest in **refugees** has filtered down to better service from the officers on the street, To said.

Officers in Portland, Ore., and Las Vegas have launched programs for **refugee** women, who are often deferential and unwilling to call police. Officer Natasha Haunsperger of the Portland police said she tells women: "You didn't survive 10 years of atrocities to have your sons or daughters come here to join ISIS. Right now, we are in this together."

The Las Vegas department's "Female Engagement Team" does things such as show women what happens, or doesn't, when they call 911. "We need to create the environment that they're comfortable to tell us things they truly need," said Sgt. Ivan Chatman.

In Boise, "having someone they trust is huge as the trust is built," said Robinson, the full-time **refugee** liaison officer. "We get a lot of information" about potential crime and terrorism threats, he said.

Police acknowledged that things are not perfect.

In San Diego, **refugee** support groups pointed to officer-involved shootings, sometimes involving **refugees** with mental health issues and a lack of available translators. Wendy Gelernter, an advocate for the San Diego Burmese community, noted that the American Civil Liberties Union has requested an investigation into San Diego police shootings.

"The police will tell you that they are overwhelmed with the number of languages, cultures and mental health problems presented by **refugees**, and no one can dispute the difficulties they face," Gelernter said. "But the SDPD has also shown no interest in improving police training, inviting community input or changing the culture that produces such unnecessarily rapid, violent responses."

Yang said San Diego police are increasing their mental-health training for street officers and trying to use more interpreters, though the number of languages they face is daunting.

Local attitudes toward the new arrivals remain a concern for police.

"Over the last year, the climate in **refugee** resettlement has changed," Boise's Larson-Farrow said. "I've had Syrian clients ask, 'Am I safe here?'" she said, because of a rock thrown at a Muslim woman or a finger pointed like a gun. "I've never been asked that before. And that has broken my heart."

tom.jackman@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**For the second time in four years, the maker of the sweet candy Skittles found itself unwittingly dragged into a bitter news story, playing a role in a political narrative in which the brand surely didn't want any part. Yet its overall performance - a simple statement, a tweet from its corporate parent, an explicit reference to not doing any marketing - has managed to get rave reviews from corporate communication experts.

For anyone who missed it, a Twitter post on Monday by Donald Trump Jr. included a picture of a bowl of Skittles with the caption "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 Republican presidential nominee's son added his own comment: "This image says it all. Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2106." The tweet was met with a viral uproar.

It's important to note that Wrigley, the division of Mars that makes the candy, didn't respond with a tweet from the widely followed Skittles account. Rather, it shared its response with a Hollywood Reporter writer, whose post with the firm's comment was retweeted about 27,000 times. Mars also posted a statement on its Twitteraccount.

Wrigley's statement said: "Skittles are candy. **Refugees** are people. We don't feel it's an appropriate analogy. We will respectfully refrain from further commentary as anything we say could be misinterpreted as marketing."

"They were prompt. They were pragmatic, and they used the right voice," said Carreen Winters, who leads the corporate reputation practice at the public relations firm MWW. "They didn't inappropriately use humor in the way some brands do for a story that's not funny. It really was the trifecta of getting it right."

The response was viewed as pitch-perfect for several reasons. First, the response came out quickly. It made a simple statement, calling the comparison "inappropriate," even if it wasn't technically an analogy.

And the company explicitly said Skittles was not trying to do any marketing with its comment, issuing the response from the more serious Twitter handle of the corporate parent instead of the more playful Skittles account, helping to distance it from any semblance of brand-building. "There's a fine line between saying something that changes your role and saying something that exacerbates the situation," Winters said.

Skittles has had practice with the social-media maelstrom. In 2012, the candy brand suddenly found itself an emblem of the race debate and protests that followed the death of Trayvon Martin, who had been carrying a packet of Skittles when he was fatally shot in Florida.

Bags of Skittles were held up in protests, resold to raise money for Martin's family and piled into temporary memorials for the black teenager, the New York Timesreported in 2012. "Like the hoodie sweatshirt he was wearing, the candy has been transformed into a cultural icon, a symbol of racial injustice that underscores Trayvon's youth and the circumstances surrounding his death," the newspaper wrote.

Many questioned on social media whether Skittles was benefiting from the attention with higher sales, prompting Wrigley to make a statement offering condolences. In phrases that echoed the latest response, the company said it felt that it was "inappropriate to get involved or comment further as we would never wish for our actions to be perceived as an attempt of commercial gain following this tragedy."

That time around, not all reviews were glowing. Some people suggested that the company should offer to invest in black communities; the response was called "subdued." An AdWeek columnist wrote that "this isn't business as usual, and running out a few predictable lines vetted by the legal department won't cut it."

Yet had Skittles offered to do more or donate more, it could have been seen as capitalizing on the moment by trying to earn good publicity at precisely the wrong time. Other brand advisers suggest that a limited, humble response is the better route.

"Risk is often greater than reward," Anthony Johndrow, an adviser on corporate reputation, said in an email to The Washington Post. "Emotional, negative public events or issues are best avoided or treated with humility if your brand is somehow dragged in."

When companies have engaged on social media after getting unwittingly pulled in to a big story, they've been met with mixed reviews. Recall when McDonald'ssent out a tweet - and later offered a free year of food - to Charles Ramsey, the man who helped rescue Cleveland kidnapping victim Amanda Berry in 2013. Ramsey had casually mentioned he was eating McDonald's when he heard Berry trying to escape, and many people thought McDonald's should do something in response.

But after the fast-food chain sent a tweet commending the girls' courage and adding "way to go Charles Ramsey - we'll be in touch," some smelled a whiff of marketing amid a horrific tragedy. One public relations adviser called it "news-jacking," or "taking advantage of a situation to help their brand." Another column writer said the company "seems content to piggyback on his sensation." Even if well-intentioned, such comments can be misconstrued.

That's why Winters said that Wrigley's remark that it would "respectfully refrain from further comment, as that could be misinterpreted as marketing" - indeed, a company spokeswoman declined to comment when sent questions for this story - could be something more brands imitate in the future. "I think you will probably see a lot of mimicry of that approach going forward," she said. "It's worked for Skittles more than once. I think you'll see other brands follow their lead."

jena.mcgregor@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Before she cracked open her new book, "This is Me: A Story of Who We Are & Where We Came From" in the Youth Readers Center of the Library of Congress, Jamie Lee Curtis had to clarify a few things.

"How come you're here if you were in the movies?" asked one curious child seated on the floor. Another girl had recognized Curtis as "Shelly," the funeral parlor makeup artist in "My Girl." And, Curtis told the kids, they might also know her as Aunt Viv from "Beverly Hills Chihuahua."

"I get to pretend to be other people all the time, and it's great," Curtis said. But she explained that she was there to reprise a lesser-known role: children's book author. "Everyone here can be a writer. As long as you know your letters, and have an imagination in your head, you can be a writer."

Curtis's 11th book, "This is Me," released this week by Workman Publishing, is aimed at sensitizing children to the anxieties, fears and excitement of being an **immigrant**. It aims to inspire them to think about what they would take with them if they had to leave their homes forever and had just a small suitcase for their most treasured belongings. The book was illustrated by Laura Cornell, whom Curtis has partnered with on several books.

Carla D. Hayden, who was sworn in last week as the 14th librarian of Congress, introduced Curtis and spoke glowingly of the book, saying it is important for children's literature to reflect the diversity of young readers. Hayden, who is the first woman and the first African American to serve in the role, recalled her favorite book when she was a child, "Bright April," about a young African American girl.

"Just seeing myself reflected in a book was so important," Hayden told Curtis.

"This is Me" opens with a teacher telling the story of her great-grandmother's travels to the United States, flashing back to when the great-grandmother was a little girl, forced to fit only her most beloved possessions into a small suitcase. The little girl looks pained in the illustration. Her cat, too, looks distraught.

"Tomorrow we leave for a place far away," her parents tell the little girl. "So fill up this case with the things you LOVE best. Sadly you'll have to leave all of the rest."

Then, the teacher in the book asks the students what they would take for such a journey. For a character named Roberto, it's "abuelo's beret, my ukulele, my St. Christopher medal to look out for me." For another character named Ali, it's "Legos, a camera to film what I leave. If this really happened, it would be hard to believe."

The closing page of the book features a pop-up suitcase that opens so that readers can stash their own items.

Curtis turned to the audience of young readers - nearly 40 first- and second-graders from Moten Elementary - and asked what they would bring. Their answers: Ninja Turtles, stuffed bears, a Star Wars robot figurine. One girl was particularly ambitious: "I would take Justin Bieber!"

"I don't think he would fit in the suitcase," Curtis said skeptically, as adults in the audience chuckled.

The book was released in the midst of an election cycle that has featured hotly debated **immigration** policies, with some **immigrants** saying they feel demonized by the heated rhetoric. Curtis said she conceived of the idea long ago and that her book has no political bent.

But Hayden said adults often look to children's literature to help them talk about difficult topics like **immigration**.

"This is the perfect book for children at this point," Hayden said. "Now we have a book to help children understand it."

moriah.balingit@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A Syrian teenager who saved fellow **refugees** from drowning and then swam for the **refugee** team at the Olympics was among those honored at the first Global Goals Awards in New York City.

Yusra Mardini, 18, who fled Syria with her sister in 2015 and now lives in Germany, received the Girl Award at the ceremony on Tuesday night.

The awards honor champions for women's and girls' rights and were organized by UNICEF, a children's humanitarian program run by the United Nations.

Mardini, who had to swim for her life when her overloaded boat broke down in the Mediterranean Sea on the way to Europe, captured headlines when she competed at the Games in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

At a U.N. summit on migrants and **refugees** this week, she told world leaders that she wanted to change perceptions of those displaced from their homes.

"It is not a choice to flee your home," she said, "and **refugees** can achieve anything."

- Thomson Reuters Foundation

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Who was more uncomfortable during the exchange Tuesday between CNN senior United Nations reporter Richard Roth and actor George Clooney?

Clooney and his wife, human rights lawyer Amal Clooney, were participating in the U.N. roundtable on the Syrian **refugee** crisis convened by President Obama. Roth was doing his usual beat coverage of high-level international issues and interviewing the star for CNN. But the biggest news of the day - no, not Syrian airstrikes, but the divorce of Clooney's old pals Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie - dictated that their interview take a tabloidy turn.

"Don't shoot me on this last question," Roth says to the actor in a clip of the exchange that CNN posted. He doesn't sound sheepish, exactly, but the preface indicates that he's about to divert from the serious issues at hand and he's not exactly thrilled about it. "It's a big story," he adds by way of justification. "You're friends with both of them."

Then it's Clooney's turn to look uneasy - when it becomes clear that he hasn't yet heard the news, and Roth is breaking it to him. "I didn't know that - wow." The typically unflappable Oscar winner looks like he might need a moment. "I feel very sorry for them," Clooney finally says. "That's a sad story and unfortunate for a family ... I feel very sorry to hear that."

In an interview with us Wednesday, Roth, a veteran journalist who is the network's second-longest-serving employee, said he thought the celebrity divorce was a legitimate news story, and not beneath him - especially given that Jolie has been involved in U.N. **refugee** efforts, too. "I know what news is ... and I still think both stories [**refugees** and the divorce] are news in this multimedia world," he said. The interview took place in a crowded hallway, where Clooney recognized him from previous interviews and stopped to talk. Roth held on to the Brangelina question for last, he said, because it simply best fit the "flow" of the conversation.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The total population of undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States has remained largely unchanged since 2009, although it has risen in Virginia and a few other states, according to an analysis of U.S. Census Bureau data released Tuesday.

The report, by Pew Research, said an estimated 11.1 million **immigrants** who were living in the country illegally in 2014, compared with 11.3 million in 2009.

"The recent relative stability in the estimated size of the U.S. unauthorized **immigrant** population is a contrast to previous periods," Pew said. The number rose through the 1990s and early 2000s, peaking at 12.2 million in 2007.

Virginia had an estimated 300,000 undocumented **immigrants** in 2014, an increase of 20 percent, while Maryland had 250,000 undocumented **immigrants** and the District had 25,000, both populations essentially unchanged.

Other states where the number rose included Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Washington state. Only Louisiana's increase could be traced to a rise in the number of undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico.

Nationwide, the number of undocumented **immigrants** from Mexico declined about 8 percent in 2014, to 5.85 million. "The decrease in the Mexican unauthorized **immigrant** population since 2009 indicates that departures have exceeded arrivals," the report said.

The population of undocumented **immigrants** from sub-Saharan Africa jumped 35 percent to 275,000, while the number from Asia jumped 10 percent to 1.45 million, and the total from Central America rose 6.8 percent to 1.7 million.

Mexicans still made up the majority of the undocumented **immigrants** in the United States in 2014.

Virginia and Maryland were among the top one-third of states for the largest populations of unauthorized **immigrants**, ranking 10th and 12th, respectively, the report said.

The District, Maryland and Virginia each ranked among the top one-third in the nation for highest percentage of undocumented **immigrants** within their populations.

Maryland tied for sixth place, with 4.2 percent; the District tied for ninth, with 3.9 percent, and Virginia tied for 13th, with 3.5 percent, which matched the national average.

Individuals from El Salvador made up the largest percentage of undocumented **immigrants** in the District, Maryland and Virginia, with rates of 37 percent, 28 percent and 25 percent in those jurisdictions, respectively.

Mexico was the second-largest country of birth for undocumented **immigrants** in Maryland and Virginia, representing 11 percent and 14 percent in those states, respectively. In the District, Guatemala was the second-largest, with 7 percent.

Pew said the undocumented-**immigrant** population continues to become more settled, with such individuals living in the United States for a median of 13.6 years in 2014 compared with a median of eight years in 2005.

Also, new arrivals make up a smaller share of the undocumented population. Fourteen percent of undocumented **immigrants** had lived in the United States for less than five years in 2014, compared to 31 percent in 2005.

josh.hicks@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Dale Koontz, a Hillary Clinton supporter in Arlington, Va., knew without asking that certain family members disagreed with her about the election. Her mother and grandmother were posting articles on Facebook supporting Donald Trump and excoriating Clinton. "I actually had one or two friends text me about it because they were concerned - 'Is your mom voting for Trump?'"

Koontz, 23, a staff assistant at a public-affairs firm, called her mother in North Carolina, and the discussion became heated. "She's like, 'Well, you're not going to vote for [Clinton], right?' - and it came out that I was. ... It's really difficult, because I've always been very, very close to both my mom and my grandma, rarely disagreeing with them. I've always looked up to my mom and respected her opinions."

But it got to a point where Koontz was afraid to open her emails "because I was scared it would be another article," she said.

Welcome to Election 2016. Americans are backed into their political corners, rarely encountering people in the flesh who do not think like them, except, for many, in one conspicuous place: their families.

Sometimes the dissenting relatives went to college and then moved far away from their home states, landing in different political waters. Sometimes it's a case of generations divided. There also can be more political disagreement in white families, because they are more apt to include Trump and Clinton supporters.

Yet bridge building even between family members is rare during what is arguably the most contentious presidential campaign in recent memory. Instead, dissenting relatives frequently avoid talking politics in person to keep the family peace.

In such a divisive campaign, with its heavy themes of racial and ethnic bigotry and the candidates' perceived character flaws, a family member's political disagreement can easily begin to sound like a personal attack, said Andrew Christensen, a UCLA psychology professor.

For example, said Christensen, who researches conflicts within couples, "if the family member is supporting Trump and that implies that maybe they're not so smart, or that they're racist ... then it becomes more fraught because they're not just explaining why they support Trump but defending themselves."

"And it's the same for someone who supports Hillary, who might be seen as elitist or a victim of political correctness," he said.

Koontz said she objects to Trump's inflammatory rhetoric and his views on **immigration** and race. Her mother and grandmother think Clinton represents corrupt politics as usual.

"I talked to my mom about that, about how she can be okay with the things that he says," she said. "The issues that I care about are clearly less important to her, and they have issues that they're maybe more worried about that I'm not."

Social media makes relatives' dissenting views more apparent than they might have been in the past.

Patricia Greene, 81, of Powdersville, S.C., plans to vote for Trump but does not talk about it with her son, a Clinton supporter. On the other hand, she said, "he's very vocal on Facebook. ... Sometimes I'll look at his page, and there will be 15 entries about the sorry, rotten Republicans and things like that. I want to see a picture of maybe a garden he's planted or maybe his grandchildren."

When they get together, the family avoids political discussions. "I don't think either side talks about their leanings, whether they're conservative or liberal," Greene said. "Probably we might would if there weren't so many differences in the family."

For his part, her son, Raymond Myers, 65, a lawyer in Nashville, said he believes Trump is a "con man" who is "part of the Republican Party's proto-Nazi arm."

"I post exactly those things on Facebook, and my sister has literally posted things like that the Clintons are having people murdered," he said.

The differences run deep. Myers deplores Trump's statements about **immigrants** and minorities, and said he believes they reflect poorly on those who would vote for him. "I think a large percentage of Trump supporters are out-and-out racist."

Including his mother and sister? "Let's say that I certainly have a concern about racism affecting who supports Trump and who supports Hillary," he said. "In my Facebook posts, I say that Trump supporters are racist, so in that regard, yes."

In turn, his sister posts items calling Clinton supporters racist. But when they meet face to face, they avoid the topic.

"It might be a cop-out, but I will say that nobody's perfect," Myers said. "I love my sister and mother - there are many good things about them, and I love those good things. So, I just compartmentalize those things."

Turning liberal

Melanie D'Evelyn, 33, an education-policy consultant in Ann Arbor, Mich., grew up in a conservative family in Colorado - her uncle is a state co-chair for the Trump campaign. But she "went to the dark side in college, in their view, " she said. Now, she is in the uncomfortable position of having to reconcile her love for her relatives with political positions she abhors.

"I don't think the stakes have ever been higher for a presidential election, and I have a feeling that my family members feel similarly," she said. "My father-in-law is a Trump supporter. That conversation has been pretty traumatic for me, because he is by far one of the kindest, gentlest people I know."

Her husband, James Arnott, is used to disagreeing with his father on politics. "But it is more difficult when I see someone like Trump," said Arnott, 29, a researcher at the University of Michigan. "I almost feel like he's getting snookered or something, so that makes me feel bad. It also makes me feel bad that the moral values that Trump represents are so different from what he represents and what they raised me to represent."

Arnott said he is troubled by Trump's comments about **immigrants** and race, his elevation of wealth as a worthy goal, and his "complete and utter disregard to truth." So, how does he reconcile someone he loves supporting him?

"I don't think that supporting Trump makes my dad a bad person," he said. "It's a very noisy landscape out there, and it's very difficult to get clear messages. I think he's hearing different things from what I'm hearing, and he's kind of building this architecture of ideas around what he's hearing."

Still, when Arnott's mother-in-law pointed out a smugness in his reasoning, it made him reconsider whether it is productive to talk about it with family members who disagree.

"I've always felt like dialogue is really important," he said. "But in this instance I feel like being respectful of something that's totally repugnant - what do you do in that situation, especially when you have family mixed up in that? I think taking a chill pill is probably the way to go."

His father, Rocky Arnott, 70, a building construction specialist in Grand Junction, Colo., said he is mystified by his children's liberal turn, which he said happened when they went away to college.

"I don't try to change their minds; I'm not very good at that," he said. "Let's see in the next few weeks if some people in my family will come around. ... If they change their minds, I guess it will be because Trump changes."

In the meantime, they use humor to take the edge off: D'Evelyn teases her mother about being responsible for a Trump presidency, and her mother jokes about getting together this Thanksgiving, when the world as her daughter knows it will have ended.

But a degree of strain persists.

"I find it perplexing, because we have so many shared values in the rest of the way that we live our lives," D'Evelyn said. "It's so confusing for me that something I care so much about, that we could be so diametrically opposed."

For groups who feel targeted by Trump's proposals, that sense of bafflement can be particularly pronounced. Christian Garcia, a Mexican American teacher and business owner in San Diego, said he believes that a Trump presidency would be a disaster. Garcia, 29, cites the candidate's plans to deport 11 million people and build a border wall, rhetoric that he says "demonizes Latinos."

So it galls him that his brother Alfredo plans to vote for him.

Alfredo Garcia, 42, sees Trump's antipathy toward political correctness as a refreshing antidote to "the sissification of America." He admits to ribbing his brother about Trump's rise in the polls. "He says, 'Man, you can't be serious - I'm going to disown you.'"

The two spar three or four times a week, with the younger brother trying to change the older one's mind.

"I'm obviously frustrated," Christian Garcia said. "It usually ends with me saying he's an idiot, and then we get past it."

So what happens in a few weeks, when one side of the family is celebrating and the other side is reeling in horror?

If Clinton wins, Koontz plans to play it cool in front of her mother and grandmother. "They're going to be upset, and I'm not going to be able to act happy or excited around them. And the same if Trump wins, I'll be upset. So I think there may be some tension afterward, but we'll all be glad that it's over with."

tara.bahrampour@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**UNITED NATIONS - President Obama, in his final speech to the United Nations Tuesday, made an impassioned plea on behalf of a liberal world order that he admitted was under growing threat from wars in the Middle East and rising nationalism at home and in Europe.

Speaking to the U.N. General Assembly for the eighth and last time as president, Obama sought to rise above the conflicts of the moment and outline a future of international cooperation, stressing the importance of the global liberal institutions formed after World War II, including the United Nations.

"The world is by many measures less violent and more prosperous than ever before," Obama said. But he acknowledged a growing global unease, fueled by terrorism and economic anxiety, which has led some Western politicians, including Republican nominee Donald Trump, to call for tough, new restrictions on **immigration** and global trade.

Obama often seemed to be speaking simultaneously to history and to an American electorate facing a historic choice.

The problems plaguing the world called for a "course correction," the president said. He then catalogued the crises that have exposed "deep fault lines in the existing international order," describing the financial disruptions caused by globalization, chaos in the Middle East and the massive **refugee** flows into Europe.

"Our societies are filled with uncertainty and unease and strife," he said. "Despite enormous progress, as people lose trust in institutions, governing becomes more difficult and tensions between nations become more quick to surface."

Obama rejected the strongman, top-down model pushed by many of his international rivals, including Russian President Vladimir Putin and Chinese President Xi Jinping. In the same breath he criticized those who push religious fundamentalism, aggressive nationalism and a "crude populism" that promises to return citizens to a "better and simpler age free of outside contamination" - a not-so-veiled reference to Trump's campaign promise to "Make American Great Again."

"We cannot dismiss these visions," Obama said. "They are powerful."

Throughout his presidency, Obama has stressed the importance of diplomacy and international organizations, such as the United Nations. From his earliest days as a presidential hopeful he has preached the importance of reaching out to long-standing enemies.

Obama used his speech Tuesday to try to cement that legacy, pointing to his administration's efforts to restore relations with Cuba and Burma, and its historic agreement with Iran last year.

"When Iran agrees to accept constraints on its nuclear program, that enhances global security and enhances Iran's ability to work with other nations," Obama said.

The days leading up to Obama's last United Nations address, like much of his presidency, were dominated by concerns about war and terrorism. Obama's remarks came one day after a manhunt led to the capture of a suspect linked to bombings in New York and New Jersey and hours after a tenuous cease-fire in Syria seemed to have collapsed. There were reports that Syrian or Russian aircraft had struck an aid convoy near Aleppo, just days after planes from the U.S.-led alliance mistakenly struck Syrian troops.

Obama steered clear of these topics in his speech, focusing on his broader vision for preserving the international order.

The president spoke of the economic unease caused by globalization, which has manifested itself during the presidential race in widespread opposition to international trade deals. Such agreements, Obama said, could bolster labor unions in the developing world and ensure that profits of the global economy are more evenly distributed.

"A world in which 1 percent of humanity controls as much wealth as the other 99 percent will never be stable," Obama said.

He called for more vigilance to eliminate tax havens, fight climate change and curb the "excesses of capitalism."

"A society that asks less of oligarchs than ordinary citizens will rot from within," he said.

At times, Obama's remarks were directed at his rivals in Russia and China who have in recent years forcefully pressed an alternative to his vision.

Obama dismissed suggestions by Russia that the West had played a role in the uprisings in Ukraine, insisting that the Ukrainians were fighting for universal principles and a more responsive government.

"They took to the streets because their leadership was for sale and they had no recourse," Obama said.

He called for more work to resolve the Israel-Palestinian conflict, an unfulfilled goal of his presidency, and for more diplomacy to try to halt the bloodshed in Syria. He insisted China's buildup in the South China Sea - which he dismissed as the "militarization of a few rocks"- could not provide a lasting solution to the territorial disputes there.

In other moments, Obama seemed to be addressing the American electorate and the deep divisions that have been revealed by the presidential election. He rejected the idea that a border wall could block the spread of disease, in the form of the Zika virus, or terrorism.

"The world is too small for us to be able to build a wall and prevent it from affecting our own societies," Obama said. The president's references to the futility of walls drew some chuckles in the General Assembly hall among world leaders who picked up the reference to Trump.

Near the end of his remarks and in a U.S.-sponsored **refugee** summit following his speech, Obama challenged his fellow leaders to do more to help the growing diaspora of **refugees** across the globe.

"We are facing a crisis of epic proportions," Obama said. "I am here today, I called this summit because this crisis is one of the most urgent tests of our time."

Many of the world's **refugees** come from three countries - Syria, Afghanistan and Somalia - besieged by long wars with no end in sight. "The mentality that allows for violence with impunity is something we cannot excuse, and collectively we continue to make excuses," Obama said. "We all know that what is happening in Syria, for example, is unacceptable and we are not as unified as we should be in pushing to make it stop."

The White House said it had secured $650 million in pledges from the private sector and Obama has promised to boost the number of **refugees** the United States accepts next year to 110,000, a 30 percent increase from 2016.

The president concluded his U.N. General Assembly speech by returning, as he often did in the earliest days of his presidency, to his remarkable personal story. "My own family is made up of the flesh and blood and traditions and cultures and faiths from a lot of different parts of the world," Obama said.

Obama cited his story as evidence of the existence of universal ideals and principles that are increasingly under assault in a globalizing world.

"I can best serve my own people; I can best look after my own daughters by making sure that my actions seek what is right for all people and all children," Obama said.

greg.jaffe@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**With 42 words, a hashtag and a bowl of Skittles, Donald Trump Jr. set out to illustrate what he saw as the danger of letting Syrian **refugees** into the United States. Instead, he set the Internet ablaze with controversy.

In a tweet, the Republican presidential nominee's eldest son equated **refugees** with a bowl of the colored candy that included some pieces that had been poisoned. The blowback was immediate and widespread Tuesday, as many critics said the message belittled **refugees** and was bigoted. Even the maker of Skittles rebuked him.

The reactions highlighted a recurrent subplot in this year's presidential campaign: Trump Jr. has repeatedly sparked controversy by associating himself with ideas, themes and people seen as racially or culturally charged.

In some cases - such as when he did a radio interview with a white nationalist and posted a symbol used by white supremacists - Trump Jr. claimed ignorance. Still, some have found his actions nearly as troubling as the blunt attacks his father has launched against individuals and groups he dislikes.

Fergus Cullen, a New Hampshire-based Republican strategist who does not support Donald Trump's campaign, said he was "disgusted" at the way Trump Jr. and others have spoken disparagingly about **refugees**. "Talk about a politically powerless group with no public defenders," Cullen said. He also decried the "frat boy" culture around Trump, which he said stems directly from the candidate.

In a statement Tuesday, Trump campaign spokesman Jason Miller defended Trump Jr., calling him a "tremendous asset" to the team.

"Here's the reality: this is a family that's passionate about changing America by bringing real positive change to Washington," Miller said. "They're not political insiders, and their honesty and connection with real people is what's made them so popular with voters also seeking change."

The flap over Trump Jr.'s tweet could further complicate his father's intensifying effort to appeal to centrist Republicans, independents and Democrats. Word this week that Republican former president George H.W. Bush plans to vote for Hillary Clinton also made things more difficult. Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, a Democratic former lieutenant governor of Maryland, said Bush told her of his choice Monday.

The GOP nominee has been a vocal critic of Clinton and President Obama's welcoming of Syrian **refugees** into the United States, voicing alarm that doing so could bring in terrorists determined to attack Americans. Trump has made halting the flow of Syrian **refugees** into the country a centerpiece of his campaign.

On Monday afternoon, Trump Jr. opined on the subject by tweeting the image of the candy and an accompanying question that he argued "said it all": "If I had a bowl of skittles and I told you just three would kill you. Would you take a handful?"

The answer to the question was: "That's our Syrian **refugee** problem." Trump Jr. added: "Let's end the politically correct agenda that doesn't put America first. #trump2016"

The tweet drew a swift and intense backlash.

"Skittles are candy. **Refugees** are people. We don't feel it's an appropriate analogy," Wrigley, the parent company of Skittles, said in a statement sent by its vice president of corporate affairs, Denise Young. "We will respectfully refrain from further commentary as anything we say could be misinterpreted as marketing."

Clinton campaign spokesman Nick Merrill retweeted Trump Jr.'s message, calling it "disgusting."

Some noted problems with the scale of the analogy embraced by Trump Jr. The Cato Institute, a libertarian think tank, published a report last week finding that, each year, the risk to an American of being killed by a **refugee** in a terrorist attack is 1 in 3.64 billion - a far cry from the three-in-a-bowl notion expressed in Trump's tweet.

The analogy does not appear to be a Trump Jr. creation. Former congressman Joe Walsh, an Illinois Republican, wrote on Twitter that he made the same point in August. The candy meme has also been used before to make different points.

Last week, Trump Jr. told WPHT radio in Philadelphia that the media has been Clinton's "number one surrogate," letting her slide "on every indiscrepancy, on every lie, on every DNC game trying to get Bernie Sanders out" of the way. He added, "If Republicans were doing that, they'd be warming up the gas chamber right now."

For that remark, he faced criticism from the Anti-Defamation League and the campaigns of Clinton and independent candidate Evan McMullin. McMullin took to Twitter to call it an "unsurprising Nazi reference from the 'alt-right' movement's presidential campaign," referring to the name adopted by many white nationalists online. Trump Jr. told ABC News he used a "poor choice of words."

In March, Trump Jr. drew scrutiny when white-nationalist radio host James Edwards aired an interview with him. Trump Jr. told Bloomberg he did not realize that Edwards was going to be looped into an interview he was doing with another host.

Earlier this month, Trump Jr. posted an image on Instagram he said he got from a friend that was meant to draw attention to Clinton referring to "half" of his father's supporters as "a basket of deplorables." The image included Trump and a number of his supporters. It also included Pepe the Frog, a cartoon figure that has been appropriated by white supremacists. He told ABC News he did not know about the association.

Trump Jr. plays an active role in his father's campaign. The 38-year-old father of five is also executive vice president at the Trump Organization.

During a breakfast event hosted by the Wall Street Journal on the sidelines of the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, Trump Jr. expressed openness to one day following in his father's footsteps and running for public office.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**President Obama's support for Syrian **refugees** is to be commended ["Today's nativism, and yesterday's," editorial, Sept. 19]. However, his administration's enforcement-based policies toward thousands of Central American women and children arriving at our border, seeking compassion and safety, are inhumane and a disgrace.

By any reasonable standard, these women and children from Honduras, El Salvador and Guatemala, fleeing violence and danger, are **refugees**. Yet they are treated as criminals. First, they are held in overcrowded Border Patrol cells, nicknamed "hieleras" (iceboxes), where they sleep on cold cement floors. Then they are jailed, sometimes for months or years, in a network of for-profit family detention prisons, causing or worsening emotional distress and suffering. Due process is dubious at best and includes unannounced deportations in the middle of the night. Those released to live with family often must wear electronic monitoring devices while living in fear of roundups by **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement officers.

These Central American women and children are the **refugee** crisis of our time on our border. While preaching to the world about compassion toward **refugees**, the president would be well-served to remember what is happening in our own back yard.

Allen S. Keller, New York

The writer is director of the Bellevue/NYU Program for Survivors of Torture.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK - Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton warned Monday that anti-Muslim rhetoric by opponent Donald Trump is "giving aid and comfort" to the Islamic State as both candidates sought to position themselves as better qualified to combat terrorism in the aftermath of a spate of violence over the weekend.

"We know that a lot of the rhetoric that we've heard from Donald Trump has been seized on by terrorists, including ISIS, because they are looking to make this a war against Islam," Clinton said, using an acronym for the Islamic State. She insisted that the United States is up to the challenge of combating terrorism on its shores and that only she has a detailed plan to meet that challenge.

Trump said current anti-terrorism efforts are insufficient at home and abroad. He blamed President Obama and Clinton, who served as Obama's first secretary of state, and he suggested that profiling is necessary to counter the threat.

"We have to lead for a change. Because we're not knocking them," Trump told Fox News Channel. "We're hitting them once in a while. We're hitting them in certain places. We're being very gentle about it. We're going to have to be very tough."

A week before Clinton and Trump are scheduled to face off in their first televised debate, bombings in New York and New Jersey and a mass stabbing in Minnesota have refocused the presidential race on concerns about domestic terrorism and national security. With the nation rattled Monday in the wake of the three attacks, both candidates made the case for why they are better prepared than the other to step into the Oval Office.

The two candidates' responses aptly reflected what each sees as a winning argument - for Clinton, an appeal to steady leadership and presidential bearing, and for Trump, a get-tough message.

At an airport news conference, Clinton stood somberly at a lectern and repeatedly sought to encourage Americans to go about their lives, to not be deterred by fears of terrorism and to rest assured that the United States is well positioned to address the threat at home and abroad.

In his interview, Trump said the United States is too tentative in its efforts against terrorism overseas. The better approach would be to "knock the hell out of them" and possibly introduce profiling as a counterterrorism tactic, he added.

"Our local police, they know who a lot of these people are," Trump said in the Fox interview. "They are afraid to do anything about it, because they don't want to be accused of profiling. And they don't want to be accused of all sorts of things."

He concluded: "Do we have a choice? Look what's going on. Do we really have a choice? We're trying to be so politically correct in our country."

In a second interview with Fox News that aired Monday night, Trump said "we have to profile," but skirted specifics about what his proposal would look like in practice.

"I'm saying you're going to profile people that maybe look suspicious. I didn't say they were Muslims or not," said Trump, whose campaign website still includes the ban on Muslims entering the country that he proposed last year.

It's not the first time Trump has suggested that profiling could be an effective tactic.

At a campaign rally in Estero, Fla., Monday afternoon, Trump took sharp and repeated aim at Clinton, accusing her of embracing plans on **immigration** and **refugees** that are too lax. He blamed the attacks over the weekend in part on **immigration** laws he cast as too weak and linked them to radical Islam.

Authorities have not confirmed any connection between the suspects and terrorist groups, although a news agency linked to the Islamic State claimed that the Minnesota attacker was "a soldier of the Islamic State."

"There have been Islamic terrorist attacks in Minnesota and New York City and in New Jersey," Trump said. "These attacks and many others were made possible because of our extremely open **immigration** system, which fails to properly vet and screen the individuals or families coming into our country."

Trump also said the authorities should use "whatever lawful methods are available to obtain information" from the suspect. He called on Congress to pass measures ensuring foreign enemy combatants are "treated as such." He has in the past voiced support for bringing back waterboarding as an interrogation tactic.

The Republican nominee also lamented that the suspected New York and New Jersey bomber - a U.S. citizen - is likely to receive modern medical treatment and access to a lawyer.

"Now we will give him amazing hospitalization. He will be taken care of by some of the best doctors in the world. He will be given a fully modern and updated hospital room, and he'll probably even have room service, knowing the way our country is," Trump said. "And on top of all of that, he will be represented by an outstanding lawyer. His case will go through the various court systems for years. And in the end, people will forget and his punishment will not be what it once would have been. What a sad situation."

Later Monday, Clinton met with Egyptian President Abdel Fatah al-Sissi in New York for talks that were likely to include discussion of terrorism and prospects for peace in the Middle East. Trump also met with him, "focusing on political, military and economic cooperation between the two countries," according to his campaign. Sissi, a former military chief who seized power in the 2013 toppling of Mohamed Morsi, Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood-backed president, is in the United States for the annual U.N. General Assembly.

In addition, Clinton planned to use the gathering of world leaders to hold a session with Ukraine's leader Monday. Ukraine and Russia are at odds, and skirmishing nearly daily, over Russia's annexation of Crimea two years ago. Clinton's meeting with Petro Poroshenko, which Ukrainian officials said was at the country's invitation, is a finger in the eye of Trump and Russian President Vladimir Putin, the autocratic leader for whom Clinton has accused Trump of having a dangerous affinity. (During an episode of NBC's "The Tonight Show" that aired Monday, Clinton referred to their relationship as "the most famous bro-mance going.") Ukraine said it also invited Trump to meet Poroshenko in New York.

Clinton, who also served as a U.S. senator from New York, quickly pointed to her experience, in a direct contrast to that of Trump, the New York businessman who has never held elective office. Clinton sought to reassure Americans that law enforcement and other authorities are up to the task - a clear message to voters worried about how the next administration will confront security challenges.

Her comments came during a manhunt for Ahmad Khan Rahami, 28, a naturalized U.S. citizen born in Afghanistan who is a suspect in connection with bombings Saturday in Manhattan and in Seaside Park, N.J. He was taken into custody several hours after his name was made public.

"This threat is real, but so is our resolve. Americans will not cower. We will prevail," Clinton said. "We will defend our country, and we will defeat the evil, twisted ideology of the terrorists."

Republicans have recently had an edge in voter trust when it comes to dealing with terrorism. But recent Washington Post-ABC News polls find that Clinton holds a three-point edge over Trump among registered voters on handling terrorism and a 24-point lead on handling an international crisis.

"I am the only candidate in this race who has been part of the hard decisions to take terrorists off the battlefield," Clinton said.

She added that she had laid out "a comprehensive plan to meet the evolving nature of this threat and take the fight to ISIS everywhere they threaten us, including online."

Trump, she insisted, has no real plan.

Trump offered a vague strategy for combating the Islamic State and other terrorists overseas.

"Maybe we're going to be seeing a big change over the last couple of days," Trump warned. "I think this is something that maybe will get, you know, will happen perhaps more and more over the country."

Clinton spoke at a hastily called news conference as she was headed to Philadelphia for a speech aimed at young voters, many of whom are cool toward her candidacy and are helping to buoy the third-party runs of libertarian Gary Johnson and Green Party candidate Jill Stein. Her schedule also included an afternoon fundraiser in Philadelphia.

The events of the past few days are "a sobering reminder that we need steady leadership in a dangerous world," she said at the start of her Philadelphia speech.

The emphasis on steadiness and calm, as well as experience, has been Clinton's main national-security argument in a year in which voters have sought outsider candidates and a message of change. She is constrained somewhat by the imperatives to defend Obama's foreign policy as his designated successor and not alarm liberal Democrats still suspicious of her reputation as a hawk.

In touting her credentials, Clinton pointed to the endorsements she has received from Republican national-security leaders who have voiced grave concerns about the prospect of Trump as commander in chief.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK - With record numbers of people fleeing trouble in their homelands, the Obama administration is struggling to confront what Secretary of State John F. Kerry on Monday described as a "global humanitarian crisis, in some places a catastrophe."

The scale of that emergency has intensified dramatically over the past decade, with an estimated 65.3 million people forcibly displaced by war, sectarian conflict and persecution in 2015, up from 37.5 million in 2005, according to the U.N. Commission on Human Rights.

On Tuesday, President Obama will convene a special summit here on the sidelines of the U.N. General Assembly aimed at rallying global support for the victims of the worst **refugee** crisis since World War II.

Obama is expected to announce new commitments from world leaders and business executives to help relocate and provide economic aid to **refugees** - including a vow to welcome 110,000 into the United States next year, a 30 percent increase from 2016.

But critics said the summit also highlights Obama's failings on the issue, including his refusal to use U.S. military power to carve out safe areas for those fleeing the Syrian government's barrel bombs and artillery attacks.

The war between President Bashar al-Assad's regime and an array of rebel forces, including the Islamic State, has produced an exodus of 4.8 million Syrians, many of whom have massed in Turkey and spread into Europe.

"The bitter truth is this summit was called because we have been largely failing - failing the long-suffering people of Syria in not ending the war in its infancy," Zeid Ra'ad al-Hussein, the United Nations' human rights chief, said Monday as world leaders gathered in New York.

Images of injured and dead children have highlighted the humanitarian disaster in Syria, but rising strains of nationalism in Europe and the United States have blunted appeals from human rights advocates for the admittance of a greater number of **refugees**.

The Obama administration announced in August that it had met its goal of welcoming 10,000 Syrians this year, a number that officials said is expected to rise in 2017. Yet Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump has cited terrorism fears in his call for a temporary ban on Muslim **refugees** from Syria and elsewhere.

Over the past year, Obama has tried with increasing urgency to counter Trump, lambasting his proposals as contrary to American values and counterproductive to fighting terror.

This year, the United States had accepted 28,957 Muslim **refugees** through early August, the highest number since data on religious affiliation became available in 2002, according to an analysis from the Pew Research Center.

But the bombing attacks that injured 29 in New York and New Jersey over the weekend underscored Obama's challenge in calming public anxiety. The initial police investigation focused on a 28-year-old Afghan **immigrant**, and the president urged the public not to "succumb to that fear."

Terrorists, Obama said in a brief public statement, "want to inspire fear in all of us, and disrupt the way we live, to undermine our values."

Human rights advocates praised the president's summit, calling it a small first step in a process that will require sustained, long-term engagement from the United States and other nations.

Of the world's estimated 65 million **refugees**, 41 million have fled their homes but remained in their own nations, and 21 million have fled their countries, the U.N. report found. An additional 3 million are awaiting decisions on asylum.

Obama's efforts are "still just a tiny drop in the bucket," said Margaret Huang, interim executive director of Amnesty International. "The United States does accept more **refugees** than any other country in the world, and there are reasons for this administration to be proud of its record. ... But it's not enough."

The U.N. summit will seek to address a crisis that goes well beyond Syria and the broader Middle East. Most **refugees** today are trapped in camps in relatively poor nations such as Thailand, Jordan, Kenya and Pakistan. Burma and Congo have sent the most **refugees** to the United States this year, followed by Syria and Iraq.

In all, eight countries host more than half the world's **refugees**, and 75 percent of the U.N. budget for migrants and **refugees** comes from 10 nations, according to the world body.

"We need to give them basic succor," said Michel Gabaudan, president of **Refugees** International, an aid group based in Washington. "And the money has not matched the rise in need."

Nor has the political will. In Germany, Chancellor Angela Merkel's decision to accept tens of thousands of Syrians last year prompted massive protests. On Sunday, her ruling coalition suffered major losses in the Berlin state election to the far-right opposition party that campaigned on an anti-**immigrant** platform.

In Hungary, public polling has shown that voters are likely to reject a **refugee** quota mandated by the European Union in a national referendum early next month.

"People around the world are frightened by things they see happen, acts by extremists, but it's very important to understand **refugees** are not the perpetrators of this kind of violence," said Chris Boian, spokesman for the U.N. **refugee** agency. "They're fleeing that same violence."

In the United States, a bipartisan coalition in the House, including 47 Democrats, approved a bill in November that would require stringent new screening procedures for Syrian and Iraqi **refugees**. That same month, Obama toured a Malaysian **refugee** center during a trip to Asia, kneeling on the floor to chat with schoolchildren.

"The notion that somehow we would be fearful of them, that our politics would somehow leave us to turn our sights away from their plight, is not representative of the best of who we are," Obama said then.

The House legislation, opposed by the White House, was defeated in the Senate.

Yet human rights advocates have criticized the administration for not doing more to resettle the tens of thousands of children fleeing violence in Central America who have illegally crossed into the United States from Mexico in recent years.

The Obama administration has said those migrants are subject to deportation if they fail to qualify for political asylum. Under pressure from advocates, the administration expanded a **refugee** program for the Central American minors in July, but only a few thousand have been granted **refugee** status.

"It's a massive failure on the Obama administration's part to not deal with this issue," Huang said.

david.nakamura@washpost.com

greg.jaffe@washpost.com

Nakamura reported from Washington. Carol Morello in New York contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**They were a busy couple in their 30s, a Unitarian minister and a social worker, with a 2-year-old daughter, a 7-year-old son and plenty of duties in their congregation. In January 1939, the Rev. Waitstill Sharp and his wife, Martha, could have turned down the request from a senior leader of their faith to leave their children and home in Wellesley, Mass., and head to Prague to aid persecuted people in a country on the brink of Nazi takeover.

Seventeen others had declined the mission. But the Sharps said yes.

Their willingness to confront the Nazis, first in Czechoslovakia and a year later on a second mission to France, set an example of humanitarian outreach for an isolationist America not yet at war and reluctant to open its doors to **refugees**. Working with various aid networks, the Sharps rescued an estimated 125 people - Jews, political dissidents and others under threat as fascist armies spread across Europe. They also helped get food and other assistance to hundreds more in urgent need.

These exploits are recounted in a new documentary co-directed by Ken Burns and the Sharps' grandson Artemis Joukowsky, with Tom Hanks providing the voice of Waitstill and Marina Goldman the voice of Martha. "Defying the Nazis: The Sharps' War," airing Tuesday evening on PBS, portrays the courage and sacrifice of an ordinary couple caught in extraordinary times. The story takes place more than 75 years ago, but the questions it poses seem timely now.

"The Sharps are the better angels of America," said Deputy Secretary of State Antony J. Blinken last week at a White House screening for scholars, diplomats, Holocaust survivors and other dignitaries. (The Obamas did not attend.) The film, Blinken said, humanizes relief work at a time when the world needs to do far more to aid **refugees** from war-torn Syria and elsewhere.

That screening and another at the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum brought together numerous relatives of the Sharps - including me, a cousin of Waitstill's through a maternal great-grandmother - and individuals whom the couple helped rescue.

Alex Strasser, 82, a doctor from Rochester, N.Y., was 6 years old when he and his 8-year-old brother, Joseph, boarded a ship to the United States after Martha Sharp wrangled permission for them to leave from French authorities in Vichy. Strasser declared it "wonderful" and "amazing" to see the film spotlighted in the nation's capital.

"The world should know," he said, that the **refugees** simply wanted "to escape persecution and to start a new life. We became Americans."

The Sharps' saga plunges rapidly from the tranquility of New England to chaos and suspense in Europe.

Sometimes the couple took major risks, providing currency exchange on the black market or smuggling targeted individuals across borders. One night in March 1939, just after the German occupation of Prague, Martha Sharp escorted a hunted man she called "Mr. X" through the city streets, dodging the Gestapo, to deliver him to the British Embassy.

In September 1940, Waitstill Sharp shepherded the German Jewish author Lion Feuchtwanger, a renowned anti-Nazi, and others on a clandestine journey from Marseille to Lisbon. The minister and the novelist hopped off one train to elude authorities, and Feuchtwanger crossed into Spain on foot via mountain paths. On a ship to the United States, Feuchtwanger asked Sharp why he did what he did.

"I'm not a saint," Sharp replied, according to a book that Joukowsky wrote to go with the film. "I'm capable of any of the many sins of human nature. But I believe the will of God is to be interpreted by the liberty of the human spirit."

"You get enough reward out of that?" Feuchtwanger asked.

"Yes, I do," Sharp said.

The Sharps proved expert navigators of international bureaucracy, securing coveted visas and departure tickets, including transatlantic passage for 27 imperiled children. They often worked apart, traveling solo to one city or another on the increasingly hazardous continent in a race to save lives.

"They had moral imagination," said Sara J. Bloomfield, the Holocaust Museum's director. "They could imagine the human capacity for evil, and they could imagine the possibilities for action."

For their efforts, the Sharps are two of five Americans honored at Yad Vashem, the Holocaust remembrance center in Israel, as "Righteous Among the Nations." The title is reserved for non-Jews who risked life or liberty to save persecuted Jews.

A couple of years ago, my wife took one of our daughters to see Waitstill's and Martha's names engraved on the walls of the Garden of the Righteous in Jerusalem. In recent years, we cousins have marveled to learn through the extended-family grapevine about the Sharps, an unexpected revelation of our shared link to two admirable figures from a perilous era.

The story might never have emerged but for the persistent curiosity of the Sharps' grandson. After the war, the couple found that their lives had been reshaped. They divorced in 1954 and afterward rarely spoke about their work in Europe.

"It was almost a secret," said Joukowsky, of Sherborn, Mass. Both Sharps were by nature modest, he said, and he suspects that they also grieved for the many they were unable to save, including eight Jews who ran their Prague office and died in concentration camps.

Joukowsky got the first inklings of the story in 1976, when he was 14. That year, a ninth-grade teacher gave him an assignment: Interview someone who had shown moral courage. He asked his mom for suggestions. "She said: 'Why don't you talk to your grandmother? She did some cool things during World War II,' " recalled Joukowsky, 55. "Little did I know."

Joukowsky's mother, also named Martha, was the Sharps' daughter. Conversations with his grandmother led to a great history paper - "The only A I ever got," Joukowsky said - and whetted his appetite to learn more.

It took many years. Waitstill died in 1984, and Martha in 1999. Each left behind oral histories and unpublished manuscripts. But the wider world knew little about the couple's service in Europe. Nor did the Sharps' extended family. My aunts and uncles can't recall ever hearing any tales in childhood about their Holocaust-fighting kin.

For Joukowsky, a breakthrough came after his grandmother's death. He discovered a trove of documents in her basement - letters, photos, hotel bills, ticket stubs and more. The papers included hundreds of names of people the Sharps had sought to help. Using these sources and consulting with the Holocaust Museum and other experts, Joukowsky and his research team, including private detectives, tracked down dozens of people who knew something of the tale.

Interviews with witnesses, including his mother and her brother, Hastings (who died in 2012), became the genesis of the film. The years-long project reached a milestone when Yad Vashem bestowed the posthumous honor on his grandparents in 2006. "Suddenly we had validation from the most important Holocaust agency in the world," Joukowsky said.

Word of the Sharps spread, and Joukowsky circulated versions of his film in churches and synagogues. He also sought advice from Burns, the famed documentarian and a fellow graduate of Hampshire College.

"Three years ago he sent me a rough cut," Burns said at the White House. "It was a good story. It was a hell of a good story." Burns decided to team with Joukowsky and roped in megastar Hanks, guaranteeing wide exposure. But Burns deflects credit. "This is, in every sense of the word, Artemis's film," he said.

Joukowsky's family turned out in force for the Sept. 12 screenings: his parents, his four daughters, ages 17 to 29, and an array of other relatives. For we cousins, it was moving to meet the Sharps' daughter, grandson and great-granddaughters in person here in Washington, bringing the story even closer to home. Joukowsky was all smiles and hugs as he, too, relished the moment of film and family.

The Sharps will also be featured in a planned 2018 exhibit at the museum on the American response to the Holocaust. Daniel Greene, curator of that show, said that significant aid networks sprang not only from the Unitarians but also from groups such as the YMCA and the Quakers. The Sharps were rare but not solitary U.S. activists.

"The question that hangs so heavily over this history is, 'Why did they do this?'" Greene said. "Why did they feel it was their obligation, or their responsibility, to take these risks, when it's so much easier not to act?

"It's a great question to ask, and a really hard one to answer."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A man in a security guard uniform strode into a shopping mall in St. Cloud, Minn., just after 8p.m. Saturday, somewhere near the Sears. He flashed a knife "big enough to hurt someone," police said, and asked his would-be victim a question: Are you Muslim?

Over the next few minutes, nine people were stabbed in a terrifying rampage that authorities described as a "potential terrorist attack." In addition to asking at least one victim whether he was Muslim, the assailant, who was shot and killed by an off-duty police officer, made a reference to Allah, police said.

On Sunday, the Islamic State asserted responsibility for the attack through the Amaq Telegram Agency, a service linked to the terrorist group, calling the assailant "a soldier of the Islamic State [who] carried out the operation in response to calls to target the citizens of countries belonging to the crusader coalition."

St. Cloud police declined to identify the attacker, saying the investigation is ongoing. However, leaders of the local Somali American community identified him as Dahir Aden, a student at St. Cloud State University who worked as a private security guard at Electrolux, a home appliance store located near the mall.

"We are, beyond words, shocked that this incident has happened in St. Cloud," said Abdul Kulane, executive director of the Central Minnesota Community Empowerment Organization, which provides support to local **refugee** and **immigrant** communities.

Kulane said he was contacted by Aden's parents, who did not know of a motive for their son's attack. Aden moved to the United States from Kenya at age 2, Kulane said, grew up in St. Cloud and graduated from Apollo High School. Kulane said Aden's parents described him as smart, quiet and interested in soccer.

Kulane said he does not think Aden had taken any recent trips abroad. Aden's family could not be reached.

The attacks shattered a sedate evening at Crossroads Center mall, the largest shopping center in Minnesota outside the Twin Cities, Minneapolis and St. Paul. St. Cloud is a town of 67,000 people about an hour north of the Twin Cities.

Three of the stabbing victims were hospitalized, but none suffered life-threatening injuries, police said.

The incident occurred at approximately the same time a mysterious explosion injured 29 people in New York City. Hours earlier, a pipe bomb exploded near a charity race in New Jersey. Authorities do not think those incidents are related to overseas terrorism.

The FBI is involved in the St. Cloud investigation but declined to comment on potential links to the Islamic State.

"We are working in concert with the St. Cloud Police Department," said Minneapolis FBI field office spokesman Kyle Loven. "Right now we're trying to ascertain the facts."

Witnesses described a chaotic scene that unfolded in that most mundane of American environments, the local shopping mall. Danny Carranza was watching his children at the play area when the attack began, he told the St. Cloud Times.

"People came running around the corner, and I freaked out because I thought it was a terrorist attack or something because I saw a lot of people, so I grabbed my kids," he told the newspaper.

"I ran as much as I could, and I heard someone yell, 'Stop! Stop!' As soon as the door shut, I heard gunshots."

Sydney Weires, Maggie Gelke and Jenna Remmele, students at the College of Saint Benedict and Saint John's University, had decided to head to the mall Saturday. The women had visited J.C. Penney and Victoria's Secret and were on their way to Target when Weires said she heard screams and saw two men "just dripping with blood."

"One guy had blood dripping down his face," she said. "The other guy, it looked like he had just been stabbed in the back and his whole back of his shirt - it was gray, but it was covered in blood."

The men were staggering, Gelke said, but they were yelling that "there's a guy running around the mall with a knife."

Gelke said the only thing she and her friends heard clearly was the men's urging to get out of the mall.

Local officials praised off-duty officer Jason Falconer - who works part time in nearby Avon, Minn. - for preventing further injury. Falconer "was there at the right time and the right place," said St. Cloud Mayor Dave Kleis.

A gun instructor and former police chief in Albany, Minn., Falconer owns Tactical Advantage, a gun store and range that also offers classes for people to qualify for Minnesota's conceal-and-carry permit.

One of the classes Tactical Advantage offers deals with the use of deadly force against armed subjects, according to its website. The classes help students practice their skills and become "ready for the real world."

Kleis said the final altercation between Falconer and the attacker was captured on a mall surveillance camera.

Falconer "identified himself as a police officer, and you actually see [the assailant] going down by command, then immediately lunging toward the officer," Kleis recounted.

"The officer then fired a few rounds," Kleis said. "You see [the attacker] fall, you see him get back up, three times. Even after [the attacker was fatally shot], he was still attempting to get back up."

Authorities said it would take time to fully understand the attacker's motivations and to determine whether he had genuine ties to the Islamic State or another terrorist group.

But at a midnight news conference, St. Cloud Police Chief William Blair Anderson said the attack closed "an awful day. Starting tomorrow, things won't be the same."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Lagging support among Hispanic voters for Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton and congressional candidates in crucial races has stoked deep concern that the party and the presidential campaign are doing too little to galvanize a key constituency.

While Clinton holds a significant lead over Republican rival Donald Trump in every poll of Hispanic voters, less clear is whether these voters will turn out in numbers that Democrats are counting on to win. Clinton trails President Obama's 2012 performance in several Latino-rich states, including Florida, Nevada, Colorado and Arizona. In those same states, on which Democrats' prospects of retaking the Senate hinge, some down-ballot Democrats remain unknown to many Hispanic voters.

That reality has prompted a flurry of criticism of Clinton's and the party's Hispanic strategies. Despite a uniquely favorable environment with Trump's repeated attacks on undocumented **immigrants**, Democrats are increasingly worried that the opportunity is slipping away to meet a long-standing party goal of marshaling the nation's growing Hispanic population into a permanent electoral force. The concerns are compounded by Trump's recent surge in several battleground states.

"We're not seeing the Democratic Party take advantage of this moment in time, really looking to leverage more engagement in a more strategic way with our community," said Janet Murguia, president of the National Council of La Raza.

One top criticism is that Clinton waited until this month to launch a sustained campaign of traditional, Spanish-language ads in key markets. Previously, the campaign's Hispanic strategy centered on reaching millennial voters through new media such as Facebook and YouTube. Its television outreach was produced primarily in English and aimed at bilingual households. According to critics, Clinton missed a chance to deploy a broader effort to target the Hispanic electorate such as the one that Obama pioneered four years ago.

"This approach may end up being vindicated on Election Day," said Fernand Amandi, a veteran strategist who led Obama's research, messaging and paid media operation for the Hispanic vote in 2012. "I just find it to be more risky than replicating what we know worked, which is the sustained approach that the Obama campaign put in place."

Clinton aides and her allies insist that they are facing a very different opponent than Obama's, along with new challenges posed by a Hispanic electorate that grows younger and less reliant on traditional modes of communication with each passing cycle.

The dispute goes to the heart of a debate among Hispanic operatives about how much emphasis should be placed on newer ways of reaching younger Hispanics, who like millennials overall are more resistant to backing Clinton than older Latinos.

"A lot of it has evolved to include outreach that isn't obvious to people who are used to doing it old school," said veteran Democratic strategist Maria Cardona. "The Clinton campaign and the DNC are very strategically focused on Latino millennials."

Much of the upset is also focused on down-ballot House and Senate races. Even Clinton has said any hope that Democrats can retake majorities rests on Hispanic turnout. Yet neither the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee nor the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee employ Hispanic outreach coordinators, according to Albert Morales, who held that job until March for the Democratic National Committee.

"The DSCC has never really had a robust or a Hispanic engagement effort that I ever coordinated with, and that's saying a lot being at the DNC under three different chairmen," Morales said. "I couldn't name one. If you were to ask me, name a Hispanic staffer who's been at the DSCC, I couldn't name it. That's pretty sad."

As a result, critics say, the party is failing to capitalize on anger at Trump in a way that would help down-ballot candidates.

For instance: According to recent polls, just 40 percent of Hispanic voters say they believe that Trump will make good on his campaign pledge to deport all 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. That means that a key argument of the Democrats' case against him isn't sinking in.

"What really scares me is the non-motivation down-ballot of targeting Latinos for Senate and congressional races," said Chuck Rocha, a Democratic political consultant who worked on the presidential campaign of Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont.

In Florida, Republican Sen. Marco Rubio has a seven-point edge among Latinos against Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy, according to a poll released by UnivisionNews last week. Rubio's Cuban American heritage may be Murphy's biggest hurdle, but Murphy is also widely unknown among Hispanics: 6 in 10 said they didn't know enough about him to register an opinion, the poll said.

Arizona tells a similar story. Democratic Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick, who is hoping to unseat incumbent Republican Sen. John McCain, is unknown by 4 in 10 Hispanics, even though she leads 50 percent to 35 percent among them, according to the same Univision survey.

In Nevada, where former Democratic attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto hopes to become the first Latina elected to the Senate, she's leading Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) among Hispanics 58 percent to 24 percent - but 38 percent of Hispanics don't know enough about her to register an opinion.

"You can never do too much, there's more to be done, yes," said Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.). "I think there's more to do around the country, but it's just expensive."

DSCC spokeswoman Lauren Passalacqua said the committee is rolling out a more focused strategy in the closing weeks in key states. She also noted that Cortez Masto and Kirkpatrick are already airing Spanish TV ads.

According to the DCCC, which coordinates House races for Democrats, Spanish-language television and radio ads are on the air in a House race in Texas and another in Florida, with more likely to go up soon. The committee's biggest effort this cycle has been to hire local, Spanish-speaking organizers earlier than ever to register and turn out voters in key districts.

"This is a new approach that we believe will work," said Rep. Ben Ray Lujà¡n (D-N.M.), the first Latino chairman of the committee.

Also of concern to Rocha and others is the lack of messaging on bread-and-butter topics beyond **immigration** such as the economy, education and health care - issues that are important to most voters, including Hispanics.

In contrast, Obama's first Spanish-language ads in 2012 were focused on health care and education, including Head Start and Pell Grants, which provide aid to poor students who attend college.

"Being part of the Bernie team for so long and seeing how the message of free college and raising the minimum wage resonated, I just don't see that out there now that I'm working on these races where there's a lot of Latinos," Rocha said.

Obama also targeted the intricacies of the Latino community, according to Freddy Balsera, a Miami-based political consultant who crafted much of Obama's Spanish-language advertising campaign in 2008.

"When we were talking to a Latino voter in Colorado, we were discussing issues that mattered to them there. We did the same thing in Florida and took it a step further by talking to South Florida Hispanics with an announcer who was more Cuban-sounding. It was a more Puerto Rican-sounding voice in Orlando," Balsera said.

Veterans of Obama's 2012 race said the campaign determined in early 2011 that they needed an aggressive strategy to turn out minority voters - especially Hispanics - in anticipation of a drop-off in support among white voters. It involved early, heavy advertising on Spanish-language television, including one voiced in Spanish by Obama.

Clinton aides said they began putting Latino organizers on the ground in May, both in Hispanic-rich battlegrounds and in other states with smaller but potentially pivotal Latino populations, including Wisconsin, Iowa, Georgia, Ohio and Nebraska.

The effort includes programs targeting various groups within the Hispanic community, including undocumented **immigrant** children, or dreamers, and their families, small-business owners, and a program targeted at Latino faith leaders.

Soon, the campaign plans to bus Puerto Rican supporters from New York into Pennsylvania, where they will canvass in towns and neighborhoods, including Bethlehem, Lancaster and North Philadelphia, that are full of Puerto Rican transplants. Also under consideration is flying Puerto Ricans from the island to knock on doors in Florida.

But in the general election, the campaign's investment in the kind of targeted advertising that was pioneered in 2012 has been smaller and has come later. And the question of language has been a key spark in the debate.

Until recently, much of Clinton's television advertising to Hispanic voters has been in English, a concerted decision aimed at reaching bilingual households.

"All of these tactics complement each other. One part of course is Spanish-language ads. But the other part targets English-dominant Hispanics," said Lorella Praeli, Clinton's director of Latino Outreach. "We're also very comfortable spending time in the Spanglish space - that's the way that we communicate."

A new Spanish-language radio ad released this week and airing in Florida, Nevada and Ohio, is voiced by Clinton's running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.). In Spanish, Kaine touts his work as a Jesuit missionary in Honduras - part of the senator's backstory that Clinton campaign aides believe will resonate with Hispanics, who are predominantly Catholic and who generally revere Pope Francis, the first Jesuit pontiff.

That kind of Spanish delivery can matter, said Federico de Jesus, who served as Obama's Hispanic communications director during the 2008 campaign, noting that they received positive feedback in 2008 when Obama's Spanish ads included him approving the ad in Spanish: "Soy Barack Obama y yo apruebo este mensaje."

This year, Clinton's Spanish ads only have her saying, "Soy Hillary Clinton and I approve this message."

"It's fine that she did only part of it, but it's different," de Jesus said.

Amandi, the veteran strategist of Obama's 2012 campaign, questioned the wisdom of waiting to engage in Spanish until the end.

"The question I would ask is what message does that send to the Spanish-dominant Hispanic voters?" Amandi asked. "That they're not as important as the English-language Hispanic voters by waiting this late in the cycle to engage with them?"

abby.phillip@washpost.com

ed.okeefe@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**THE OBAMA administration's goal of accepting 110,000 **refugees** in the fiscal year starting Oct. 1 - a nearly 30 percent increase from the current level and a nearly 60percent jump from the three previous years - is an amply justified response to the world's worst **refugee** crisis since World War II, and it prompted predictable snarls from congressional Republicans. Sen.Jeff Sessions of Alabama said the president's new target ignores "the common sense concerns of the American people," and Rep. Bob Goodlatte of Virginia, the House Judiciary Committee chairman, said the influx of **refugees**, including from Syria, disregards "how it will impact local communities."

The Sessions-Goodlatte impulse fits a xenophobic historical pattern of U.S. antipathy toward foreigners - especially those fleeing war and persecution - that clashes with the cherished image of an open-hearted nation greeting the poor, huddled masses.

One can well imagine with what warmth, or lack of it, Mr. Sessions and Mr. Goodlatte might have welcomed previous waves of unwashed and desperate **refugees**from, say, Hungary in 1958; Indochina in 1979; Cuba in 1980; or, for that matter, the European Jews who urgently sought **refuge** here in the late 1930s. Today, of course, they might celebrate those **immigrants** and their successful assimilation, yet when those **refugees** were knocking on this nation's door, large majorities of Americans opposed their admission.

Survey data gathered last year by the Pew Research Center provide a picture of Americans' past hostility. In 1958, soon after the Soviet Union squashed a liberation movement in Hungary, 55percent of Americans disapproved of a plan to admit 65,000 Hungarian **refugees**. In 1979, 62 percent of Americans disliked an initiative to absorb 14,000refugees per month, double the existing number, from Indochina following the end of America's military engagement there. And in 1980, more than 70percent of Americans opposed the Mariel boatlift, when the Castro dictatorship in Havana allowed tens of thousands of Cubans to set off for Florida.

In each case, **refugees** resettled in the United States in large numbers, defying predictions that their admission would trigger social upheaval and economic disaster, much as previous **immigrants** from Ireland, Italy and Eastern Europe overcame the antagonism of those who had preceded them to U.S. shores.

The long history of fear and hatred directed toward **refugees** in the abstract - tempered by the warm-hearted embrace with which many have been greeted in real life by their new American neighbors, churches and communities - is often swept under the historical rug because it is so blatantly disgraceful. Politicians like Mr. Sessions and Mr. Goodlatte would no doubt decry America's failure to rescue more Jews from Europe immediately before Hitler unleashed the Holocaust. Yet in 1938, on the eve of World War II, two-thirds of Americans opposed the admission of **refugees**, including children, from Germany and Austria.

The current hostility of many Americans toward admitting Syrian Muslim **refugees** is based on ostensible concerns about terrorists mingling among the migrants. Yet it fits the pattern of historical nativism, justified by different arguments at different times. To his credit, Mr. Obama grasps the prejudice at the root of the opposition, and has the courage to disregard it.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**LONDON - "Brexit means Brexit."

So said Prime Minister Theresa May over and over this summer as she vaulted herself out of the hurricane-strength political wreckage of Britain's vote to leave the European Union and into the nation's top job.

But two months after May took the keys to 10 Downing Street as her predecessor sped away without glancing back, Britain is none the wiser as to what "Brexit means Brexit" actually means.

Instead of a unified position ahead of what are sure to be lengthy, contentious and ultra-high-stakes divorce talks with its 27 erstwhile partners in the European Union , the British government has instead treated the public to a near-daily display of mixed signals and evasive maneuvering.

Will Britain seek a clean break with the European Union , forswearing membership in the world's largest common market so it can also slam the door on European **immigrants**? Will it seek an exit in name only, formally leaving the bloc but carving out enough opt-ins that the departure is felt only gently? Or will it seek a bespoke deal that blazes a new path, tempting others in Europe to do the same?

In recent weeks, there have been nearly as many answers to those questions as there are ministers in May's cabinet.

The government's three leading Brexit advocates - the "Brexiteers" - have suggested they want a speedy and complete departure from the clutches of the bureaucracy in Brussels, in line with the will of the 52 percent of Brits who voted for an exit in the country's June 23 referendum.

Boris Johnson, the country's bombastic foreign secretary, has even gone so far as to record a video supporting an advocacy group that seeks to press May - Johnson's boss - to fully liberate Britain from its Brussels shackles.

Meanwhile, David Davis, the country's newly minted minister for Brexit, has said a continued presence in the bloc is improbable if Europe insists, as it has, that membership comes with the free movement of workers.

But May, who reluctantly backed the "remain" side in the June vote, has found ways to remind her countrymen that leaving will not be easy and that there is a clear downside to departure.

Recently, a close May ally and fellow "remain" supporter, Home Secretary Amber Rudd, told the BBC that Brits hoping to vacation on the golden sands of the French coast or in the refined air of the Italian Alps could be forced to apply for a visa and pay a fee once the country is out of the European Union . For years, travel to the continent has been as simple as hopping on a Eurostar train or booking a flight on a budget airline. But new barriers, Rudd said, could be the price Britain pays if it wants a clean break.

"I don't think it's particularly desirable," Rudd said, "but we don't rule it out."

May herself has sworn off any direct indications of what Britain wants from Europe, saying that to give "a running commentary" on the country's negotiating strategy would put it at a disadvantage.

Asked at Prime Minister's Questions on Wednesday how the government would safeguard its financial-services industry - which has much to lose from continental rivals if it's not protected in the talks - May delivered what has become her standard non-answer when pressed about any of the details of Brexit.

"This government will be working to ensure the right deal for the United Kingdom," she said, prompting groans and jeers from Parliament's green benches.

It's unclear how long she will be able to get away with such vague responses to questions that cut to the core of what could ultimately be Britain's biggest transformation in decades.

May is under pressure from her European counterparts to quickly trigger Article 50, the never-before-used mechanism for a country to leave the European Union .

But May has stalled, saying it will not happen until at least the start of the new year. Once Article 50 has been invoked, Britain will have two years to negotiate the terms of its departure. Many experts regard that as an unrealistically rapid timeline for such a complex untangling and say it is one that could put Britain at a disadvantage because it has more to lose than Europe does if no deal materializes in time.

With her government divided over what to ask for, May is thought to be seeking clues from her fellow European leaders about what Britain can realistically expect to get. The strategy, according to Eurasia Group analyst Mujtaba Rahman, is to "turn the Article 50 process on its head: first get a sense of the final framework, and only then trigger official notification and proceed with exit negotiations."

But European leaders have resisted this dessert-before-vegetables approach, with several top continental officials telling Britain that there will be no pre-negotiations before the main event. That, Rahman wrote in a recent briefing note, will make May's goal over the coming months "very difficult to achieve."

If there is a silver lining for Britain in its thus-far-incoherent approach to Brexit, it's that Europe itself has been divided over how to approach the talks. European Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker insisted Wednesday that Britain will not be allowed "a la carte" access to the bloc without accepting the free movement of people across national borders, which is a core E.U. principle.

But others have advocated taking a softer line: using Brexit as an opportunity to address concerns about the European Union that extend far beyond British shores. Limiting mass migration and cutting down on Brussels bureaucracy, for instance, are goals shared by countries outside Britain.

"Brexit was not just a British issue," said Stephen Booth, co-director of the London-based pro-business think tank Open Europe. "There are a lot of people in Europe who are unhappy with the status quo."

But Booth said that anyone expecting a quick answer to the question of what Britain will look like outside the bloc is bound to be disappointed.

Two of the simplest solutions - either a clean break from the bloc or a Norway-style deal that allows Britain to maintain access but end its membership - will not work for Britain, he said.

The former, he said, will impose World Trade Organization -level tariffs on Britain's trade with Europe, forcing businesses to reckon with "costs that they're not sure they can cope with." The latter does nothing to address voter concerns over **immigration**, a key driver of Brexit.

"We're not looking at the Norway option. It's going to be something else," Booth said. "But what that is exactly is very much up for grabs."

What's left, Booth said, is a "shades-of-gray" deal that gives Britain more market access in some areas than in others, along with some sort of limit on **immigration**. But that will take years of painstaking negotiation, followed by a long period in which Britain seeks to find its way in its new outside-the-E.U. world.

"The U.K. has to reshape its future," Booth said. "It's not as though everything will be completed on the day we leave the E.U."

griff.witte@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BRUSSELS - European leaders gathered Friday to discuss the torrent of challenges facing their continent after Britain's decision to leave the European Union, offering broad new defense efforts amid growing concerns that they are too dependent on the United States for security.

Deeply divided about how to keep the bloc from further spiraling apart, leaders found little unity on a specific vision for a Europe without Britain. But there was more agreement that Europe should increase military coordination, after a tough push from both President Obama and Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump over their lagging defense spending.

The proposals, including a Franco-German idea to create a centralized European military headquarters in Brussels, were part of a wide-ranging conclave held in Bratislava, Slovakia, on how to combat a rising tide of public skepticism about the European Union's value. Security has become a central focus, but military spending in most E.U. nations also falls below the levels desired by NATO: Only four NATO countries apart from the United States meet the bar, and the United States spends more than twice as much as all the other nations combined.

Although E.U. nations have mustered other joint military efforts in recent years, they have often been criticized for being slow to move during crises, reflecting the difficulty of mobilizing members of a 28-nation bloc on an ad hoc basis.

Stronger coordination among European countries could bolster militaries that have relied on American firepower as a crutch, reducing duplication among countries in the name of creating a continent-wide force to defend the bloc of 500 million citizens.

"Let everyone know that if the United States makes a choice to pull back, Europe must be able to defend itself," French President François Hollande said Friday as he entered the talks.

The endeavors could offer a retort to both Democrats and Republicans, who have questioned Europe's reliance on the United States for defense. But critics say resources could be better spent in partnership with NATO, the existing military alliance that includes the United States and most E.U. countries. A Europe that is more independent militarily would also be more capable of pursuing a foreign-policy path more distinct from the United States, potentially widening cracks in Western unity, although few experts believe that is likely.

The attempt to improve security was a rare spot of unity for a summit of 27 leaders - British Prime Minister Theresa May was not invited - with seemingly 27 different plans for Europe. The discussion comes after the migration crisis swept millions of asylum seekers into Europe last year, fueling worries from Paris to Prague that the borderless E.U. was a burden, not a boon.

"We are in such a critical situation in Europe after the referendum in Britain," German Chancellor Angela Merkel told reporters after the day-long meeting that was held in part on a pleasure boat that cruised down the Danube. She said leaders had agreed to put together a reform plan by March of next year.

The leaders made little secret of their disagreements, from the virtues of economic austerity to Brussels' role in handling threats from Russia and the Islamic State. The discord left little room for an older, loftier view of the E.U., rooted in its post-World War II history as a project to bring peace to Europe.

"I am not going to follow a script to show that we are all united," Italian Prime Minister Matteo Renzi said after the meeting broke up. The summit accomplished "too little," he added on Twitter. "Without changing policies on the economy and **immigration**, Europe risks a lot."

Ahead of Friday's meeting, France and Germany unveiled a proposal for increased cooperation that would create a permanent headquarters to run E.U. military operations. Those military efforts currently include an anti-people-smuggling operation in the Mediterranean and an anti-pirate campaign off the coast of Somalia.

European nations would also team up to bolster capabilities in areas where they lag, such as air-to-air refueling. In the past, they have been forced to turn to the U.S. military for assistance. E.U. nations would also share aerial reconnaissance information and work to make combined European military battalions more ready to deploy into combat at short notice.

Other E.U. leaders have proposed jointly owned drones and other commonly held equipment that could supplement European deployments.

The discussions about bolstering defense cooperation are supported by an unusual coalition of leaders. Central European leaders who have been some of the most strident opponents of taking in migrants have embraced the idea of a full-fledged E.U. military force, warning that Britain's exit from the E.U. will significantly sap the continent's defense capabilities.

Britain, which has Europe's most powerful military, long blocked any discussion of centralizing European military might, in part because the E.U. was so unpopular domestically. The dissolution of the Soviet Union also left many E.U. nations feeling that they faced no obvious military threat.

But Russia's annexation of Crimea renewed fears along Europe's eastern flank. And the migration crisis forced a recognition that Europe's borders were being defended by some of its weakest countries.

The efforts to pool European defense would touch one of the core aspects of national sovereignty, the military, years after many European countries agreed to share a single currency and rely on one another for border controls.

In those fields, many European citizens feel stung after the euro crisis highlighted sharp differences in how best to spur growth and the migration crisis ushered a stream of **refugees** into Europe amid disagreements about how and whether to house them.

E.U. leaders warn that if the bloc fails to ensure security for its citizens, it could rapidly fall apart. The Syrian conflict may once have seemed far away to European citizens, but not after last year's flood of migrants and a cascade of Islamic State-inspired terrorist attacks.

"The borders between internal and external security have simply evaporated," said Jo Coelbart, a retired Belgian general who works on European defense policy at the Brussels-based Egmont Foundation.

That challenge has spurred the new defense proposals.

"It was a sad moment for Europe when the British people decided to leave, and so it requested an honest diagnosis," said European Council President Donald Tusk, summing up conversations that extended beyond security to issues of prosperity, migration and a host of other challenges. "People are concerned about what they see as a loss of control."

Despite the range of views, defense cooperation may be among the least-divisive projects for Europe's future, particularly with American commitments to European security the most questionable since the end of World War II. Trump has said that he would not automatically come to the defense of other NATOalliance members but would first review how much those nations have done for their own defense. Democratic candidate Hillary Clinton, like Obama, has encouraged European nations to bolster defense spending but has said she will hold firm to U.S. defense commitments.

"With Trump jumping up and down saying he'll tear up the NATO treaty if the Europeans don't shape up, there's a desire to show progress," said Nick Witney, a fellow at the European Council on Foreign Relations who ran the European Defense Agency, an E.U. institution whose efforts face strict limits because of the European reluctance to hand over security powers to Brussels.

"There are plenty of things that could be done to get more bang for the euro by avoiding the endless national duplication," he said.

michael.birnbaum@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You can't watch all of it, but you're certainly welcome to try. Here's my curated list of a whole lot of other broadcast, cable and streaming programs that premiere between now and the end of the year, including some dramas (Netflix's splendiferous-looking "The Crown" on Nov. 4) and comedies (TBS's "People of Earth" on Oct. 31) that weren't available for review yet. Plus the usual raft of new reality shows (E!'s "Chasing Kelce" on Oct. 5), documentaries (HBO's "Marathon: The Patriots' Day Bombing" on Nov. 21) and specials, such as NBC's "Hairspray Live!" (Dec. 7) and Fox's new take on "The Rocky Horror Picture Show" (Oct. 20). Let's do the time warp again, but let's also not leave this couch. ïfi®= Worth a look

In Progress

Shows that have already premiered.

"Abandoned" (Fridays at 9 on Viceland) Skateboarder Rick McCrank explores empty malls, schools, racetracks and even an entire abandoned town in this traveling docuseries. Premiered Sept. 2.

ïfi® "Loosely, Exactly Nicole" (Mondays at 10:30 on MTV) Comedian Nicole Byer ("Girl Code") stars in this dramedy about a young woman who moves to West Hollywood. Premiered Sept. 5.

"Mary + Jane" (Mondays at 10 on MTV) Comedy about two best friends who look for ways to improve their weed-delivery business in Los Angeles. Premiered Sept. 5.

ïfi® "Atlanta" (Tuesdays at 10 on FX) Donald Glover created and stars in this flawlessly detailed dramedy about a man trying to get by in an impoverished Atlanta suburb, where he offers to manage his cousin's fledgling rap career. Premiered Sept. 6.

ïfi® "Queen Sugar" (Tuesdays at 10 on OWN) Drama series from producer/director Ava DuVernay, Oprah Winfrey and Melissa Carter about estranged siblings who inherit their family's Louisiana sugar cane farm. In her review, The Post's Bethonie Butler called the show "a rich and powerful portrait of a black American family." Premiered Sept. 6.

ïfi® "StartUp" (Crackle streaming) Ten-episode drama about three Miami tech entrepreneurs who create a controversial digital currency - and a crooked FBI agent ("Sherlock's" Martin Freeman) who is intent on taking them down. Premiered Sept. 6.

"A Season With Florida State Football" (Tuesdays at 10 on Showtime) Weekly docuseries chronicles the team's season. Premiered Sept. 6.

ïfi® "Better Things" (Thursdays at 10 on FX) "Louie" writer and co-star Pamela Adlon's well-written series about a single L.A. mother of three daughters and the awkward situations she endures, particularly as an aging actress in Hollywood. Premiered Sept. 8.

"One Mississippi" (Amazon streaming) Tig Notaro's dry wit and personal experiences make for a little too dry dramedy about a breast-cancer survivor who returns to her coastal Mississippi home town after her mother's sudden death. Premiered Sept. 9.

"The Contenders: 16 for '16" (Tuesdays (check local listings) on PBS) Eight-episode documentary looks at past presidential bids over the past 50 years, including campaigns of Howard Dean, Shirley Chisholm, Mitt Romney, Michael Dukakis, Jesse Jackson, John McCain, Pat Buchanan, Ross Perot and so on. Premiered Sept. 13.

"Taking Fire" (Tuesdays at 10 on Discovery) Five-part docuseries recounts, in soldiers' own words and helmet footage, deployment and combat in a Taliban-held valley in northeast Afghanistan. Premiered Sept. 13.

"Legends of Chamberlain Heights" (Wednesdays at 10:30 on Comedy Central) Animated comedy about three high school freshmen - Grover, Milk and Jamal - who dream of basketball superstardom even though they're stuck benchwarming. Premiered Sept. 14.

Sunday, Sept. 18

ïfi® "68th Primetime Emmy Awards" (ABC at 8) Jimmy Kimmel hosts the increasingly competitive awards show. Looks good for FX's "The People v. O.J. Simpson," but will "The Americans" also at last get some love? Sunday Sept. 18

ïfi® "The Case Of: JonBenét Ramsey" (CBS at 8:30) Two-part docuseries re-examines the shocking (and still unsolved) murder of the child beauty-pageant competitor who was found dead in her family's Boulder, Colo., home the day after Christmas 1996. Part 2 airs Sept. 19 at 9 p.m. (You're not seeing things - this is the third JonBenét-related program to air this month.) Sunday Sept. 18

"WWII's Most Daring Raids" (Smithsonian Channel at 9) Six-part docuseries looks back at some of World War II's most dangerous commando raids, using first-person testimony, historical expertise and video-game-style graphics. Sunday Sept. 18

Monday, Sept. 19

ïfi® "Three Days of Terror: The Charlie Hebdo Attacks" (HBO at 8) Documentary recounts the horrifying ISIS attacks in January 2015 that began at the editorial offices of the satirical Paris-based newspaper Charlie Hebdo and continued as police hunted the assailants. Monday Sept. 19

"Capital" (Acorn TV streaming) From the makers of "Broadchurch" and "Humans," a British drama about the lives of neighbors who each begin to receive menacing postcards. Monday Sept. 19

Tuesday, Sept. 20

ïfi® "Defying the Nazis: The Sharps' War" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Documentary from Ken Burns and Artemis Joukowsky III about a couple who rescued children during World War II. Tuesday Sept. 20

"Strut" (Oxygen at 9) Reality series produced by Whoopi Goldberg about transgender models. Tuesday Sept. 20

Thursday, Sept. 22

ïfi® "Easy" (Netflix streaming) Eight-episode anthology series about an array of Chicago residents and their daily lives. Cast includes Hannibal Buress, Orlando Bloom, Malin Akerman, Marc Maron, Gugu Mbatha-Raw, Aya Cash, Dave Franco and more. Thursday Sept. 22

"Debate Wars" (Seeso streaming) Michael Ian Black hosts a competition that pits comedians/improvisers against each other to debate some pressing issues. Thursday Sept. 22

Friday, Sept. 23

"Audrie & Daisy" (Netflix streaming) Documentary examines the ripple effects on schools and communities when a sex crime is caught on camera in a world of social-media bullies and other modern forms of shame. Friday Sept. 23

"Iliza Shlesinger: Confirmed Kills" (Netflix streaming) Stand-up special from a comedian who sees endless absurdity in modern gender roles and mating rituals. Friday Sept. 23

"Van Helsing" (Syfy at 10) Horror-action drama set in the near future about vampire hunter Vanessa Helsing (Kelly Overton), who has the unique genetic ability to turn vampires back into humans. Acclaimed playwright Neil LaBute serves as showrunner. Friday Sept. 23

Saturday, Sept. 24

"Gringo: The Dangerous Life of John McAfee" (Showtime at 9) Documentary about tech entrepreneur John McAfee, who developed a successful computer-security software company and later started living a quasi-gangster lifestyle in Central America. Saturday Sept. 24

Monday, Sept. 26

ïfi® "Vice News Tonight" (HBO at 7:30) A new half-hour nightly newscast, only this time done the Vice way. Monday Sept. 26

"Agatha Christie's 'And Then There Were None'" (Acorn TV streaming) Three-episode adaptation of the beloved novel about a dinner party on an island at which the guests begin disappearing. Monday Sept. 26

Tuesday, Sept. 27

ïfi® "Frontline: The Choice 2016" (PBS at 9, check local listings) The venerable news-documentary series turns its attention to the causes and symptoms of this most unusual election year. Tuesday Sept. 27

"Channel Zero" (Syfy at 9) Horror anthology series based on stories that are published and passed around online (a.k.a. "creepypasta"). This tale is about a man's obsession with a kiddie TV show in the 1980s and the frightening influence it may have had on him. Tuesday Sept. 27

"Aftermath" (Syfy at 10) Drama starring Anne Heche follows a family through a series of post-apocalyptic events that wipe out most of the planet. Tuesday Sept. 27

Wednesday, Sept. 28

"Big Brother: Over the Top" (CBS All Access at 10) As part of its streaming subscriber service, All Access, CBS launches this new, more interactive version of "Big Brother" with 10 new houseguests. Wednesday Sept. 28

Friday, Sept. 30

ïfi® "Crisis in Six Scenes" (Amazon streaming) Woody Allen tries his hand at a miniseries, about a suburban family in the 1960s. In addition to Allen, the cast includes Miley Cyrus, Elaine May, Lewis Black, Joy Behar and Becky Ann Baker. Friday Sept. 30

ïfi® "Marvel's Luke Cage" (Netflix streaming) Another piece of Netflix and Marvel's master plan to build out the Defenders team (along with Daredevil, Jessica Jones and Iron Fist), this 13-episode season tells the story of Luke Cage (Mike Colter), a man who is trying to rebuild his life in Harlem after a failed experiment left him with superhuman strength and impenetrable skin. Friday Sept. 30

"Amanda Knox" (Netflix streaming) Documentary about the closely watched trial of an American college student who was accused of murdering her roommate in Italy. Friday Sept. 30

ïfi® "America Divided" (Epix at 9) Five-part docuseries produced by Norman Lear, Shonda Rhimes and Common looks at inequality across the country in housing, education, health care, labor, criminal justice and the political system. Friday Sept. 30

"29th annual Hispanic Heritage Awards" (PBS at 10, check local listings) Telecast of awards show scheduled to be held Sept. 22 at Washington's Warner Theatre. Honorees include Supreme Court Justice Sonia Sotomayor; author Junot Diaz; actress/singer Angelica Maria; and Latin music star J Balvin. Friday Sept. 30

Saturday, Oct. 1

ïfi® "Versailles" (Ovation at 10) George Blagden (dear, departed Athelstan from History's "Vikings") stars as King Louis XIV in this rich, 10-episode treat for Francophiles. It opens in 1667, when Louis, facing betrayal and danger, decides to relocate his court to a luxe hunting lodge outside Paris - the future palace of Versailles. Saturday Oct. 1

Sunday, Oct. 2

"Regina Spektor: A Soundstage Special" (WETA at 11) The singer-songwriter, whose music shows up in a lot of prestige television shows (including the "Orange Is the New Black" theme), performs in Chicago. Sunday Oct. 2

Monday, Oct. 3

"Class Divide" (HBO at 8) Documentary zeros in on gentrification and inequality in New York on a West Chelsea neighborhood block where a private school sits across from low-income public housing. Monday Oct. 3

ïfi® "Independent Lens: Best of Enemies" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Documentary revisits the legendary televised 1968 debate over politics and the election between two leading public intellectuals who were also bitter rivals: William F. Buckley Jr. and Gore Vidal. Monday Oct. 3

"Yours, Mine or Ours" (Bravo at 10) Reality series features L.A. real estate expert Reza Farahan ("Shahs of Sunset") and interior designer Taylor Spellman counseling couples who are about to move in together and don't know whose house and furnishings to keep. Monday Oct. 3

"Hotel Impossible: 5-Star Secrets" (Travel at 11) Reality/travelogue series visits famous five-star properties and looks at the details that make them so exceptional. Monday Oct. 3

Wednesday, Oct. 5

"Total Bellas" (E! at 8) Reality series about the WWE's twin sister sensations, Nikki and Brie Bella. Wednesday Oct. 5

ïfi® "Catching Kelce" (E! at 9) Icky but irresistible reality series in which Travis Kelce, the dashing tight end for the Kansas City Chiefs, romances 50 eligible women (yes, FIFTY, but he quickly eliminates 30 of them) in hopes finding one who suits him. There's a pretty rich moment in the first episode when he accuses one of the women of being too focused on her "brand." (She forgot his is the only brand that matters here.) Wednesday Oct. 5

"Clash of the Corps" (Fuse at 11) Eight-part docuseries goes behind the scenes of Drum Corps International and the heated competitions on the junior drum corps scene. Wednesday Oct. 5

Thursday, Oct. 6

"I Heart Radio Music Festival" (CW at 8) Part one of a scheduled Sept. 23-24 concert in Las Vegas, featuring U2, Drake, Sia, Twenty One Pilots and more. Continues Friday night with Sting, Usher, Ariana Grande, Florida Georgia Line, Tears for Fears and more.

Wednesday Oct. 6

Friday, Oct. 7

ïfi® "The 13th" (Netflix streaming) Documentary from Ava DuVernay (also opening in select theaters today) focuses on the 13th Amendment, which abolished slavery and involuntary servitude except as a punishment for a crime and contrasts that with the mass incarceration of black Americans in the present day and an ever-growing prison industry. Friday Oct. 7

"The Swap" (Disney at 8) A teenage girl and boy who are friends (Peyton List and Jacob Bertrand) find that they've switched bodies, "Freaky Friday"-style, after mutually kvetching about how the opposite gender has it easier. Friday Oct. 7

ïfi® "Dream On" (PBS, check local listings) Documentary from comedian/commentator John Fugelsang sets out to examine the history and present-day status of the American Dream. Friday Oct. 7

ïfi® "My Life Is a Telenovela" (We TV at 10) Reality series follows a group of Miami actors and actresses who work in the demanding and competitive world of telenovelas. Friday Oct. 7

Saturday, Oct. 8

"Autumn in the Vineyard" (Hallmark at 9) Movie about a man and a woman who each have a legal claim to a vineyard and attempt to split it down the middle - when really the answer to their dilemma lies in romance. (Duh.) Saturday Oct. 8

Monday, Oct. 10

"Freakish" (Hulu streaming) Teen drama about a bunch of high school students serving Saturday detention who are trapped at school when a fire at a nearby chemical plant becomes deadly - and changes the town in frightening ways. Monday Oct. 10

Tuesday, Oct. 11

"Ben & Lauren: Happily Ever After?" (Freeform at 8) Reality series further plumbs the post-"Bachelor" life and relationship of Ben Higgins and Lauren Bushnell. Tuesday Oct. 11

ïfi® "The Letter" (Freeform at 9) Reality series encourages participants to anonymously tell their best friend, in a letter, all the things she or he really needs to hear. Tuesday Oct. 11

"The Gary Owen Show" (BET at 9:30) Reality series about a comedian dubbed "America's honorary black comedian." (He's white.)

Tuesday Oct. 11

Thursday, Oct. 13

"Money, Power, Respect" (We TV, check listings) Another reality series about the "glamorous yet cutthroat" business of making hip hop music. Thursday Oct. 13

Friday, Oct. 14

ïfi® "Haters Back Off" (Netflix streaming) Dramedy by and starring Colleen Ballinger-Evans as Miranda Sings, an untalented pop star whose baffling rise originates with her belief that she was born to be famous and it's up to the rest of the world to realize it. Co-stars "The Office's" Angela Kinsey as Miranda's mom. Friday Oct. 14

ïfi® "Goliath" (Amazon streaming) Drama from "Boston Legal" creator David E. Kelley about a washed-up lawyer (Billy Bob Thornton) who tries to come back from the bottom. Co-stars William Hurt and Maria Bello. Friday Oct. 14

"Wolf Creek" (Pop at 10) Six-episode horror series based on a hit Australian film about a 19-year-old American tourist who finds herself targeted by a serial killer. After she survives his attack, she decides to get revenge. Friday Oct. 14

Saturday, Oct. 15

ïfi® "Southwest of Salem: The Story of the San Antonio Four" (Investigation Discovery at 8) Documentary re-examines the 1994 conviction of four women for sexually assaulting two girls. Twenty years later, the women say they were falsely accused in a wave of homophobia and rumors of witchcraft. Saturday Oct. 15

"Pumpkin Pie Wars" (Hallmark at 9) Movie that's probably not as violent as it sounds, given that it's Hallmark. Actually it's about rival bakery owners who've competed in the county's pumpkin-pie contest for years. Now their adult children are falling in love. Saturday Oct. 15

Sunday, Oct. 16

ïfi® "Masterpiece: The Durrels in Corfu" (PBS at 8, check local listings) Drama series (six parts) based on Gerald Durrell's "My Family and Other Animals." Sunday Oct. 16

ïfi® "Killing Reagan" (National Geographic Channel at 8) Another dramatization of one of Bill O'Reilly's assassination books, this time about the 1981 attempt on President Reagan's life by John Hinckley Jr. Tim Matheson stars as Ronald Reagan; Cynthia Nixon co-stars as Nancy Reagan. Sunday Oct. 16

ïfi® "Eyewitness" (USA at 10) Ten-episode drama about a violent crime as seen from the perspective of those who witnessed it. Based on the Scandinavian series "à˜yevitne." Sunday Oct. 16

Wednesday, Oct. 19

ïfi® "Chance" (Hulu streaming) "House M.D." star Hugh Laurie's new drama, a 10-episode series based on Kem Nunn's novel about a San Francisco neuropsychiatrist, Dr. Eldon Chance (Laurie), who finds himself in a violent and dangerous (and mentally unbalanced) world. Wednesday Oct. 19

"CMT Artists of the Year" (CMT at 8) How on Earth do country music stars find time to attend all these awards shows? Wednesday Oct. 19

Thursday, Oct. 20

ïfi® "The Rocky Horror Picture Show: Let's Do the Time Warp Again" (Fox at 8) Laverne Cox ("Orange Is the New Black") stars as Dr. Frank-N-Furter in this exuberantly faithful remake of the campy 1975 movie musical about a young couple who are stranded on the road and wind up meeting a bizarre array of sexually ambiguous **alien** visitors and their debaucherous friends. Tim Curry, who played Frank-N-Furter in the original, returns as the Narrator. Thursday Oct. 20

Friday, Oct. 21

ïfi® "Great Performances: Hamilton's America" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Documentary follows the creation of the mega-smash Broadway musical that you'd still like to see someday. Friday Oct. 21

"One & Done" (Showtime at 9) Documentary about basketball prodigy Ben Simmons, who was drafted this year by the Philadelphia 76ers. Friday Oct. 21

"Joe Rogan: Triggered" (Netflix streaming) Another stand-up comedy from the guy who used to get people to eat bugs. Friday Oct. 21

Saturday, Oct. 22

ïfi® "Dirk Gently's Holistic Detective Agency" (BBC America at 9) Drama series adapted from Douglas Adams's novels, in which a murder case pairs a loner (Elijah Wood) with an unconventionally absurd detective (Samuel Barnett) who believes they are cosmically destined to solve cases together. Saturday Oct. 22

ïfi® "Weiner" (Showtime at 9) Television premiere of the acclaimed documentary about the former congressman with the sexting problem and his attempt to run for mayor of New York a few years ago. "Engrossing, almost shamefully entertaining," Post film critic Ann Hornaday wrote earlier this year. Saturday Oct. 22

Sunday, Oct. 23

"Jean of the Joneses" (TV One at 7) Original movie about a young woman who grew up in a multigenerational family of strong-minded women who've kept some secrets that are revealed after a tragedy. Sunday Oct. 23

Monday, Oct. 24

ïfi® "The Hate Card: Jorge Ramos Reporting" (HBO at 9) Documentary from Mexican-born journalist Jorge Ramos, who examines what it means to be an American, particularly in light of how he was treated while covering the Donald Trump campaign. Monday Oct. 24

Tuesday, Oct. 25

ïfi® "American Masters: Norman Lear - Just Another Version of You" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Documentary portrait of the legendary TV writer and producer. In her review of the film during its July theatrical release, Post critic Ann Hornaday gave it two out of four stars, noting that Lear's "contributions are duly celebrated in [a] profile of a man who, at 93 [now 94], still has it gratifyingly together." Tuesday Oct. 25

"Adam Ruins Everything Election Special" (TruTV at 10) The host of "Adam Ruins Everything" turns his eye to the 2016 campaign, to see if he can make it just that much worse for us. Tuesday Oct. 25

Wednesday, Oct. 26

"Hamilton's Pharmacopeia" (Viceland at 10) Travelogue based on the Vice docuseries in which host Hamilton Morris travels the world to check out unusual psychoactive drugs. Wednesday Oct. 26

ïfi® "Everest Air" (Travel at 10) Six-part docuseries follows Mount Everest expert, adventurer and rescue medic Jeff Evans and his crew up the 29,029-foot peak. Wednesday Oct. 26

Friday, Oct. 28

"American Humane Association Hero Dog Awards" (Hallmark at 8) An awards show for really, really good dogs. Friday Oct. 28

"Paranormal Lockdown" (Destination America at 9) Two-hour special in which ghost hunters lock themselves in a Yorkshire, England, house believed to be rife with violent poltergeists. Friday Oct. 28

ïfi® "Bill Murray: The Mark Twain Prize" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Telecast of the Kennedy Center's Oct. 23 salute to the actor who starred in "Groundhog Day," "Caddyshack," "Ghostbusters," "Lost in Translation" and more. Friday Oct. 28

ïfi® "Tracey Ullman's Show" (HBO at 11) Six-episode sketch comedy series marks Ullman's return to HBO, portraying an array of characters across the pond, including Dame Judi Dench and Angela Merkel. Friday Oct. 28

Monday, Oct. 31

ïfi® "People of Earth" (TBS at 9) Comedy about a support group for people who've been abducted by **aliens**. Stars Wyatt Cenac ("The Daily Show"). Monday Oct. 31

"Brief Encounters" (Acorn TV streaming) British dramedy about four women who get an eye-opening experience when they go to work for a company that sells lingerie and sex toys.

Monday Oct. 31

Wednesday, Nov. 2

ïfi® "Stan Against Evil" (IFC at 10) Horror-comedy series stars John C. McGinley ("Scrubs") as a disgruntled former sheriff of a New England town who reluctantly teams up with his successor (Janet Varney) to fight a plague of demons. Wednesday Nov. 2

Friday, Nov. 4

ïfi® "The Crown" (Netflix streaming) From "The Queen" writer Peter Morgan comes this 10-episode drama about young Queen Elizabeth II ("Wolf Hall's" Claire Foy), her marriage to Philip Mountbatten ("Doctor Who's" Matt Smith) in 1947 and the events leading to her ascension to the throne in 1952.

Friday Nov. 4

"Dana Carvey: Straight White Male, 60" (Netflix streaming) Comedy special from the SNL alum who used to delight us with Church Lady and "choppin' broccolayyyyy." Friday Nov. 4

Saturday, Nov. 5

"Karen Carpenter: Goodbye to Love" (Reelz at 9) Documentary about the sister half of the chart-topping 1970s sibling duo, and her death in 1983 after struggling for years with an eating disorder. Sunday Nov. 5

Monday, Nov. 7

ïfi® "Deep Water" (Acorn TV streaming) Four-part Australian crime thriller starring Yael Stone ("Orange Is the New Black") and Noah Taylor ("Game of Thrones") as a pair of detectives assigned to a brutal murder case.Monday Nov. 7

Monday, Nov. 14

"Soundbreaking: Stories From the Cutting Edge of Recorded Music (PBS at 10, check local listings) Eight-episode docuseries explores the impact of recorded music on the modern world. Monday Nov. 14

ïfi® "Close to the Enemy" (Acorn TV streaming) Cold War drama (an original series from Acorn) about a retiring British army captain (Jim Sturgess) whose last assignment is to oversee a captured German scientist (August Diehl) who is working on a new engine for the royal air force. Monday Nov. 14

Tuesday, Nov. 15

ïfi® "Black America Since MLK: And Still I Rise" (PBS at 8, check local listings) Two-part, four-hour documentary (Nov. 15 and 22) from Henry Louis Gates Jr. looks at the past 50 years of African American history, charting the progress made and obstacles that remain. Tuesday Nov. 15

ïfi® "Good Behavior" (TNT at 9) In a wild departure from Lady Mary, "Downton Abbey's" Michelle Dockery stars in this drama about a thief and con artist trying to get regain control of her life and her ill-advised actions - but not for long. Tuesday Nov. 15

Wednesday, Nov. 16

"Nightcap" (Pop at 8) Ten-episode comedy series stars Ali Wentworth as a booker on a late-night talk show. Wednesday Nov. 16

Thursday, Nov. 17

ïfi® "Undercover" (BBC America, check listings) Six-episode drama about a lawyer who is about to become England's top public prosecutor, right as she's struggling with a death-row case and worrying that her husband's sordid past will become news. Thursday Nov. 17

Friday, Nov. 18

ïfi® "Beat Bugs" (Netflix streaming) Animated children's series about singing insects answers the question of how else to further exploit the Beatles' vast catalogue of beloved songs. Friday Nov. 18

"Colin Quinn: The New York Story" (Netflix streaming) Stand-up comedy special from yet another SNL alum. Friday Nov. 18

Saturday, Nov. 19

ïfi® "Zero Days" (Showtime at 9) Television premiere of Alex Gibney's well-reviewed documentary about the frightening outcomes of an all-out cyberwar. Saturday Nov. 19

Monday, Nov. 21

ïfi® "Marathon: The Patriots' Day Bombing" (HBO) Documentary about the 2013 Boston Marathon bombing, as told through the individuals whose lives were affected. Monday Nov. 21

ïfi® "Search Party" (TBS at 11) Week-long marathon premiere (through Nov. 25) of the entire season of this new dark comedy about four self-absorbed 20-somethings who get involved in the search for a college friend who has gone missing. Monday Nov. 21

Friday, Nov. 25

ïfi® "Gilmore Girls: A Year in the Life" (Netflix streaming) Lauren Graham and Alexis Bledel return to fictional Stars Hollow, Conn., as fans of the original "Gilmore Girls" (which ran from 2001 to 2007) lose their minds. Four 90-minute episodes update and put the official finishing touches on Amy Sherman Palladino's beloved series. Friday Nov. 25

ïfi® "Michael Che Matters" (Netflix streaming) Stand-up comedy special from the co-host of SNL's "Weekend Update." Friday Nov. 25

"Savage Kingdom" (Nat Geo Wild at 9) Nature docuseries about wild predators in Africa. Narrated by Charles Dance ("Game of Thrones"). Friday Nov. 25

Wednesday, Nov. 30

ïfi® "Dolly Parton's Christmas of Many Colors: Circle of Love" (NBC at 9) The cast from last year's warmly received "Coat of Many Colors" returns for another tale drawn from Dolly's girlhood memories - this time about a devastating event that affects the Parton clan, and the seeming miracle that follows as Christmas arrives. Wednesday Nov. 30

ïfi® "Incorporated" (Syfy at 10) Futuristic thriller about a corporate drone (Sean Teale) who gets a revolutionary bent. Dennis Haysbert and Julia Ormand co-star. Wednesday Nov. 30

Sunday, Dec. 4

ïfi® "Mariah's World" (E! at 9) On the one hand, it's just another reality show that follows a celebrity around through what is supposedly her daily life. On the other hand, it's Mariah Carey. Sunday Dec. 4

Monday, Dec. 5

"The Level" (Acorn TV streaming) Six-part British crime drama from Acorn and ITV about a reputable detective (Karla Crome) who secretly covers for a drug trafficker (Philip Glenister) she has known since childhood. Monday Dec. 5

Tuesday, Dec. 6

"Reggie Watts: Spatial" (Netflix streaming) Comedy special from CBS's "Late Late Show" bandleader. Tuesday Dec. 6

Wednesday, Dec. 7

ïfi® "Hairspray Live!" (NBC at 8) This year's live musical from NBC is the Broadway hit about teenagers and integration in Baltimore in the early 1960s, based on the 1988 John Waters film. Harvey Fierstein reprises his Tony-winning role as Edna Turnblad. Other cast members include Martin Short, Kristin Chenoweth, Ariana Grande and Jennifer Hudson.Wednesday Dec. 7

ïfi® "Shut Eye" (Hulu streaming) Drama series about storefront psychics in Los Angeles and the organized crime syndicate that controls their lives. Wednesday Dec. 7

Friday, Dec. 9

"Captive" (Netflix streaming) Docuseries examines true-crime stories that involved hostage taking. Friday Dec. 9

Sunday, Dec. 11

"Critics' Choice Awards" (A&E at 8) Awards show for the best TV shows and movies, as picked by broadcast critics. "Silicon Valley's" T.J. Miller hosts. Sunday Dec. 11

ïfi® "Great Performances: The Hollow Crown - The Wars of the Roses" (PBS at 9, check local listings) Three-part film adaptations of Shakespeare's "Henry VI" (I and II) and "Richard III." Sunday Dec. 11

Tuesday, Dec. 20

"Tony Bennett Celebrates 90: The Best Is Yet to Come" (NBC at 9) Musical salute to the singer, who turned 90 in August. Tuesday Dec. 20

"Gabriel Iglesias: I'm Sorry for What I Said When I Was Hungry" (Netflix streaming) Stand-up comedy special. Tuesday Dec. 20

Tuesday, Dec. 27

ïfi® "The 39th Annual Kennedy Center Honors" (CBS at 9) Telecast of the Dec. 4 ceremony, which will honor pianist Martha Argerich; actor Al Pacino; rock legends the Eagles; blues/gospel singer Mavis Staples; and singer-songwriter James Taylor. Tuesday Dec. 27

hank.stuever@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Anthony Sadler, Alek Skarlatos, Spencer Stone and Jeffrey E. Stern

Before they thwarted a gunman on a Paris-bound train, collected France's highest honor and shook President Obama's hand, the three friends from Northern California bonded in the principal's office.

They were troublemakers. Spencer Stone and Alek Skarlatos grew up next door to each other, roughhousing with pellet guns in their northeast Sacramento neighborhood. They both struggled at the public elementary school, so their mothers - who also happened to be best friends - sent them to a private Christian one. That's where they met Anthony Sadler, another new kid, who had an athletic scholarship and a tendency to curse loudly on the basketball court.

They felt like outsiders in a place where everyone, a strangely obedient bunch, had known one another since kindergarten. So they stuck together.

"The 15:17 to Paris" details the trio's journey from unremarkable childhoods to chance heroism to international fame and the complicated aftermath. Journalist Jeffrey E. Stern weaves together the friends' stories with intimate detail, giving readers a more nuanced portrait than what emerged in the global news coverage (which initially and incorrectly labeled them U.S. Marines).

After high school graduation, they took different paths: Stone sold smoothies for a living until he decided to join the Air Force, Skarlatos opted for the Oregon National Guard, and Sadler went to college. They reunited last summer on a loosely planned, credit-card-funded Eurotrip, which was supposed to start in Italy and end with a clubbing spree in Spain. The adventure climaxed instead with a bloody fight for their lives at 185 miles per hour.

On Aug. 21, 2015, Ayoub el-Khazzani boarded Train 9364 in Brussels. He carried an AK-47, a Luger pistol, a box cutter and 270 rounds of ammunition. He slipped into a bathroom, removed his shirt, slid his backpack around his chest - making it easier to reload - and slung the assault rifle over one shoulder. He waited until the train, hauling more than 500 passengers, crossed the Belgian border into France. Then he stepped into the aisle.

Khazzani, Stern reports, first tussled with a Frenchman on his way to the toilet. The terrorist broke free, continuing down his narrow path of would-be destruction, shooting another man through the neck. (The victim would later recover.)

Enter Stone, who snapped awake from a nap and spotted the gun-wielding shirtless man. He charged the attacker, who pointed the assault rifle in his direction. The weapon miraculously did not fire, because of an uncharacteristic jam. Stone tackled Khazzani, who slashed him repeatedly with the box cutter. Skarlatos and Sadler rushed to their friend's defense.

"Metal tearing into flesh, but it doesn't hurt," Stern writes from Stone's perspective. "He feels no pain, he feels it as muted percussion waves coming off the terrorist's body. Thumps. Spencer sees he's not being hit, the terrorist is being hit - Alek is driving the rifle into the gunman, furiously."

These up-close moments, flashbacks throughout the chronological memoir, make for a compelling ride, especially once we get to know the protagonists.

Stern dives into the minds of our three heroes, all in their early 20s, and the chain of events that put them in position to stop what could have become one of the West's deadliest terrorist attacks. (Not exactly spoilers: Khazzani ends up hog-tied. No passengers die. French President Francois Hollande gives each American the Legion of Honor.)

Stone, Skarlatos and Sadler are revealed to be, well, regular guys. They get lost. They choose a McDonald's meal over more exotic fare. They don't have fancy résumés, and their imperfections make them relatable.

The book risks losing readers, however, when Stern mixes their personal tales with modern history lessons. He notes, for example, that the 1984 Schengen Agreement largely ended Europe's internal border checks, making early-adopter countries such as France and Belgium more appealing to **immigrants** such as Khazzani.

References to the European Union's **immigration** landscape and various Muslim populations pop up throughout the book, with a focus that could come off as relevant context or off-putting politics, depending on who's reading. ("If ISIS wanted a place away from the Middle East ... they could hardly do better," Stern writes. France, with its large Muslim minority, "presented itself as an obvious new theater of war.")

Geopolitics aside, it's a relief when the narrative shifts back to the protagonists, who despite their newfound celebrity had trouble readjusting on American soil. They felt a nagging responsibility to stop evil and, simultaneously, a powerlessness against it. Less than two months after they foiled Khazzani's plan, a gunman killed nine people at the Oregon community college Skarlatos had attended. They also experienced symptoms consistent with post-traumatic stress disorder, including sensitivity to loud noises and outsize, adrenaline-cranked responses to mild threats.

"In the months after it was over, there was this feeling. That they had disrupted something large, used up all their good luck in those few moments, and had none left to spare," Stern writes from Sadler's perspective. "The feeling Anthony had was their luck, their parents' prayers, might, therefore, be extinguished."

Weeks after the fateful ride, Stone recalled the weight of it all hitting him after a little girl asked: Are you a superhero? "Then she said she wanted to hug me. But she was afraid to, because I still have the cast, and the stitches. ... And it just all came out. I just bawled, man."

It's a reminder that celebrated feats of heroism can bring personal anguish. Stone drove off in a free car. Skarlatos boogied through "Dancing With the Stars." Sadler met one of his favorite singers. Beneath the glamour, though, the friends quietly tried to make sense of what happened on the train and what it would mean for their lives beyond it.

Danielle Paquetteis a policy reporter for The Washington Post.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump listened skeptically as his labor consultant bragged in early 1981 about connections to New York's underworld.

Daniel Sullivan, who dealt with labor problems at Trump's construction sites, was a 42-year-old giant of a man with great charm and a criminal record. He told Trump he was tight not only with leaders of unions, some of them fronts for the mob, but also with the FBI.

Trump was dubious.

"He was ... a big storyteller," Trump recently told The Washington Post. "He portrayed himself to be the closest person on earth to the FBI."

It turned out Sullivan was telling the truth. One day in April 1981, he walked into Trump's Manhattan office with two men in suits. They were FBI agents, and they wanted to talk to Trump about organized crime.

Trump welcomed them in.

That meeting came at a pivotal time early in Trump's career, when he was trying to establish himself as a Manhattan developer and Atlantic City casino operator.

Trump soon deepened his interactions with Sullivan, who turned out to be an FBI informant, and cultivated a friendship with one of the FBI agents, a young investigator named Walt Stowe, who was one of Sullivan's handlers at the agency.

Over the next few years, Trump, Sullivan and Stowe forged a triangle of mutually beneficial interests as Trump sought to grow a casino and real estate empire.

The story of the entrepreneur, the informant and the FBI offers new insights into the man who would be president.

"It tells people he's a tough, tough, tough businessman," said Stowe, long retired from the FBI, who recently sat for two days of interviews with a Washington Post reporter at his vacation home in Utah. "New York was so totally corrupt and so controlled by the mob in the '80s that in order to be a successful businessman, you had to have some way to work that world."

During his run for the White House, Trump has maintained that he always operated aboveboard as a real estate developer and casino operator, at a time when corruption and organized crime were rampant in New York and Atlantic City. But the details of Trump's relationships with Sullivan and Stowe show that he worked with men with underworld connections to further and protect his business interests. In doing so, Trump risked his reputation and his dream of becoming a tycoon.

He entered into a land deal with Sullivan and an organized crime figure who was later targeted for a hit. He agreed to finance Sullivan's purchase of a company under FBI investigation for racketeering. And he collaborated on a plan with Stowe and other FBI agents to allow an undercover operation at his first casino.

In speaking in court and to journalists over the years, Trump has minimized his relationship with Sullivan, who died of a heart attack in 1993, saying he briefly used him as an unpaid consultant and playing down his role.

Trump did not respond to detailed questions from The Post about his interactions with Sullivan.

In an earlier interview with The Post, Trump said he continued working with Sullivan only after Stowe and another agent vouched for him as "100 percent clean."

"You know, that solves a lot of problems for me," Trump told The Post. "I mean, it's hard to say, 'Gee whiz, you shouldn't have been working with him.' "

But FBI reports at the time along with recent statements by Stowe contradict that assertion.

A report from Sept. 22, 1981, said that agents "have repeatedly told TRUMP that they were not references for [Sullivan] and cannot speak for source's business dealings."

Though Sullivan once described Trump as "an old friend," the two had a falling-out in the mid-1980s. Sullivan later testified in a civil case that Trump used illegal **immigrants** as laborers in Manhattan. Trump denied Sullivan's claims.

Trump has spoken little about his interactions with the FBI or his friendship with Stowe. Trump told The Post that Stowe was a "high-quality guy" but "not a pal."

Stowe said he remains fond of Trump and never saw him do anything illegal. He said he considered both Trump and Sullivan to be "professional friends."

For this account, The Post examined thousands of pages of legal documents from the National Archives, casino regulatory reports obtained through open-records laws, news articles and books, along with previously undisclosed FBI records obtained and shared by journalist William Bastone, co-founder of the Smoking Gun website.

The Post also conducted interviews with lawyers, former federal investigators, gaming regulators and others who knew Trump, Sullivan and Stowe.

The paths of Sullivan and Trump crossed in 1979, when Sullivan worked as the chief labor negotiator on the construction site of the Grand Hyatt Hotel in Midtown Manhattan. The hotel project was a partnership between Trump and the Hyatt Corporation.

Trump, then 33, was a brash, wealthy scion of a family real estate empire based in New York's outer boroughs. He was intent on making a name for himself as a developer in Manhattan.

One of the challenges facing him was the mob's stranglehold on the city's construction unions. This was Sullivan's purview. A longtime union member and activist, Sullivan represented three different contractors at the Hyatt. He was responsible for striking deals between management and the unions - including their masters in organized crime.

Sullivan always stood out. At 6 feet 5 inches tall and closing in on 300 pounds, he was by turns loud, outspoken and boastful. Friends and associates recall Sullivan as the embodiment of a gregarious Irishman. He portrayed himself as a labor crusader and testified in court he had been a member of dozens of different union locals and had once advised Congress on labor legislation.

But Sullivan had a shady side. He was arrested on weapons and assault charges and served time for larceny, court records show. Behind the police record were ominous rumors, some fueled by Sullivan himself. He told stories about his early career as a truck driver and union activist, working on the docks of New York. One day, after a milk delivery man declined to follow union rules, an irate Sullivan decided to send a message. He drove the man's truck into the river.

Sullivan earned dark renown as the last person to see a labor lawyer named Abraham Bauman before he disappeared off the streets of New York in 1966. Sullivan declined to cooperate with police in the sweeping investigation that followed, according to a 1967 account in the New York Times. Later, he openly discussed his ties to Teamsters president Jimmy Hoffa, who disappeared in 1975. He told friends he knew where Hoffa was buried.

One day in late 1979 or early 1980, while working on Trump's Hyatt project, Sullivan visited Theodore Maritas, president of the District Council of Carpenters, a union that represented some 25,000 laborers in the New York region.

At the time, Maritas and the owners of drywall companies across in the region were under investigation by the FBI for racketeering, including bid-rigging and extortion.

As part of the investigation, the FBI had placed bugs in Maritas's office. One of the agents reviewing the transcripts was a young undercover specialist named Walt Stowe. He wondered about the identity of the man with the big personality on the other end of the wire. Stowe and his partner soon made the ID, Stowe told The Post.

When they checked the FBI's internal records, they found that Sullivan had been a bureau informant in the 1960s and early 1970s. The records said he was intimately familiar with LCN, better known as La Cosa Nostra, or Our Thing. It was the name some Italian mobsters used for themselves.

Stowe and his partner decided to drive to Sullivan's home early one morning.

They knocked on the door.

"Can we talk to you?" Stowe asked, according to the account he gave to The Post.

Sullivan opened the door wide.

"Come on in, guys," Sullivan said. "Whatever you want to know."

Stowe began meeting with Sullivan at all hours in obscure bars and diners in Manhattan. Sullivan proved himself to be a fountain of information about unions, the mob and, before long, Donald Trump. In confidential internal FBI reports, Stowe and his partner referred to Sullivan by a code number, NY18904.

Stowe, 31, was a tough guy himself, a former rugby player with a bushy mustache, a law degree from William & Mary and big ambitions. He had arrived in New York in 1975 and began working as an undercover agent. It was an era notable for mob investigations and corruption stings. Sources and informants were crucial to such cases - and to an agent's career.

In February 1980, Sullivan told Stowe about a pending property deal in the middle of a proposed casino site near the boardwalk in Atlantic City.

Sullivan knew the property owner through a trash-hauling business Sullivan owned. He told the FBI that the financially beleaguered owner of the property, which was $800,000 in arrears, wanted Sullivan's help to stave off foreclosure.

Sullivan said he had given the owner $325,000 for a share of the property, and he told Stowe he planned to buy it outright in partnership with two others. One was Kenneth Shapiro, a man later publicly identified by authorities as a financier and agent in Atlantic City for a Philadelphia mobster named Nicodemo "Little Nicky" Scarfo.

Trump also happened to be interested in the property for the location for his first casino. In April, Trump's attorney contacted Shapiro and soon entered into lease negotiations with him, Sullivan and their partner, even though they did not yet have title to the property.

On June 26, the three partners closed on the property, paying about $2.7 million. Just days later, Trump signed off on a 98-year lease with the partners that could cost him tens of millions. The transaction was one of several Trump had to make to cobble together parcels of land for the casino.

The deal put Trump in contact with a mob associate, who would later play a central role in a mob scheme to secretly influence Atlantic City's mayor. It also put him close to an FBI informant whose shady past would imperil Trump's casino plans.

After the lease was signed, Sullivan celebrated it as a business triumph. With typical bluster, he told the Bucks County Courier Times, which published an article about the transaction, that Trump was "an old friend from New York."

"It's nice being friends with a billionaire," Sullivan told the Pennsylvania newspaper.

Trump's relationship with Sullivan seemed odd to some observers.

"I have always wondered, why did Trump get involved with Sullivan in the first place?" Susan Singer, one of Sullivan's attorneys at the time, recently told The Post. "It was just a puzzle to me, given the rumors about Dan's underworld connections."

Trump and Sullivan quickly became better acquainted. As the land deal progressed, Trump recommended Sullivan to business associates who needed to negotiate with hotel workers.

"I was always satisfied with Dan," Trump would later say in the late 1980s under oath in a civil lawsuit. "I was always satisfied with his services as a consultant."

In June 1980, Trump confided in Sullivan about a problem he was having at a construction site on Manhattan's East Side. Trump was tearing down the iconic Bonwit Teller building to make way for Trump Tower, his most ambitious project up to then.

Trump told Sullivan that his demolition subcontractor was relying on illegal Polish workers and that the workers were unhappy about their nonunion wages and hours, according to testimony Sullivan gave later in the lawsuit. Trump worried that the building was not coming down quickly enough, according to Sullivan, and said he faced heavy real estate taxes if the demolition was not finished soon.

Several days later, Trump called Sullivan at his home and asked him to come to New York immediately to help tamp down growing trouble at the Bonwit Teller site, court and FBI documents show. The Polish **immigrant** workers were now threatening to harm the Trump organization's construction manager.

Sullivan rushed to Trump's office and began looking into the problem. Scores of Polish men were getting paid only $4 per hour, far below union wages, and they were working seven days a week in 12-hour shifts, sometimes longer, court documents show.

The Polish **immigrants** were required to use jackhammers and wheelbarrows to take down the building by hand, in "almost a Stone Age fashion," as Sullivan described it.

Sullivan testified during the lawsuit that he could not have been more direct with Trump about the implications of using illegal **immigrants** and flouting the union contract. Sullivan testified that he had told Trump, "Don't exploit them like that. ... Don't try to f--- these poor souls over."

Trump has disputed Sullivan's account and said under oath that he did not know that any illegal Polish **immigrants** were used for the demolition work. He said a subordinate and a demolition subcontractor mismanaged the project and testified he did not even visit the worksite. "I was no different than anybody walking up and down the sidewalk," Trump said.

Trump portrayed Sullivan as a rogue who got involved in the demolition without his permission. "He would do things that I wouldn't even know about, that, frankly, were not authorized by me or anybody else," Trump testified in the civil lawsuit, which was brought by union workers against the subcontractor, Trump and others.

Trump thought Sullivan "looked like a little bit of shady character" and wondered whether he should keep working with him, Trump recently said in his interview with The Post. But Sullivan began telling Trump he had friends at the FBI. Trump was incredulous but intrigued, he said.

"I just want to tell you I'd like to bring FBI agents up just to give me a reference," Sullivan said, according to Trump.

One day early in April 1981, Sullivan arrived at Trump's office, accompanied by FBI agents Stowe and Damon Taylor, a supervisor of organized crime investigations.

"They were legitimately FBI agents," Trump told The Post. "And I say, 'Well, what do you think of him?'

"They say, 'Mr. Trump, he's 100 percent. He's working with the FBI. He's a tremendous guy, et cetera, et cetera.'"

But Trump knew that Sullivan operated in a murky world. At the time, Trump told the FBI agents that he understood Sullivan was "in a very rough business" and "knows people," some of whom "may be unsavory," the report said.

Trump told the visiting agents about his casino plans and his concerns about Atlantic City, according to an internal FBI report posted on the Smoking Gun website. Stowe and his colleague told Trump he "should carefully think over his decision to build in Atlantic City, and carefully prepare not only methods of securing employees' honesty, but also corporate integrity," their internal report said.

Trump said he wanted to "cooperate with the FBI" if his casino plans came to fruition. Before long, Trump met with them again and said he was moving forward.

"TRUMP stated in order to show that he was willing to fully cooperate with the FBI, he suggested that they use undercover Agents within the casino," an FBI report said.

It is clear that the agents and Trump were courting each other.

Trump invited Stowe to play golf at a private club in Westchester and took him to lunch at the famed 21 Club in a chauffeur-driven limousine, Stowe said. Trump broached the possibility of hiring Stowe.

"Here I am, like I said, I'm 31 years old or so, and I can see people looking all around to see who is this guy having lunch with Donald," Stowe said. "It's not like we became really good friends, but whenever I saw him, he was pleasant."

Stowe welcomed the attention, but it was not primarily a friendship he was seeking at that time. Having a contact like Trump was a valuable asset for a rising star at the FBI. Trump was "a guy who knew people," Stowe said.

On May 1, 1981, Trump applied for his first casino license. Gaming authorities began scrutinizing his background, in part to look for any links to organized crime figures.

Around that time, Trump took a step that would complicate the gaming review. He agreed to finance Sullivan's purchase of Circle Industries, a drywall manufacturer that employed Sullivan.

Sullivan told Stowe and another agent about the Circle acquisition plans, according to a report they wrote on May 7, 1981. It said that Sullivan, Trump and a third man, then president of Circle, "will be equal, one-third partners," with "Sullivan overseeing labor relations and Trump financing the enterprise."

Circle Industries was among a group of some 20 drywall makers that secretly referred to themselves as "the club." The companies held significant power in New York's construction industry because of the importance of their product in so many projects.

Trump's decision to invest in that industry came at an extraordinary time.

The industry was under FBI investigation, and in two years, Circle was among the firms implicated in a racketeering scheme involving the carpenters' union and the Genovese crime family. One of those indicted was union president, Theodore Maritas, who disappeared and was presumed murdered. As it happened, Trump's attorney, Roy Cohn, also represented Genovese leaders.

On Sept. 21, 1981, the FBI got a strange call from Trump. He said he had traveled to Trenton the previous week to meet with Mickey Brown, the director of New Jersey's Division of Gaming Enforcement. Trump was worried about the status of his application for a casino license. Brown told Trump that everything was on track except for "one problem" that might draw out the investigation - his ties to Sullivan, according to an FBI report.

Brown said that Sullivan had not been candid with investigators about his background and his business activities.

To defend himself and "nip things in the bud," Trump said he told Brown that Sullivan had introduced him to two FBI agents and was close to the agency.

"TRUMP stated that he talked with BROWN about nothing of a substantive nature, particularly involving any proposed undercover activity," the report states.

In a call with Sullivan that same day, Stowe and Taylor learned that Sullivan had been asked by gaming investigators specifically about his association with the FBI. "Source declined to answer this question," the report said.

Trump's meeting with Brown put into peril the undercover operation to ferret out organize crime proposed at Trump's planned casino, documents and interviews show.

By late September, the FBI proposal was in a "thoroughly finished state," but, Stowe said, it apparently never came to fruition.

Three weeks later, investigators with the Division of Gaming Enforcement spelled out their findings about Trump in a 97-page report. It provided an overview of Trump's biography, his business activity and financial circumstances.

The report devoted more than 10 pages to Sullivan, underscoring his arrest record and recounting questionable episodes from his past, including the disappearances of Bauman, the labor lawyer, and Hoffa, the Teamsters leader.

Under pressure from regulators, Trump "advised the Division that he would not have any future personal, social or business dealings with Sullivan other than in the context of their Atlantic City lessor-lessee relationship."

Trump would eventually pay $8 million to cancel the lease and buy the property outright from Sullivan and his partners. He also backed out of his investment in the drywall company, Circle Industries.

Sullivan felt betrayed and thought that gaming enforcement officials had mischaracterized his past. Sullivan privately threatened to sue both Trump and the Division of Gaming Enforcement and even make his FBI role public, FBI reports show.

This troubled Stowe. Sullivan was advised "that his life might well be endangered by revealing his relationship with the FBI to LCN figures and other members of the criminal element."

Despite what he told gaming officials, Trump stayed in touch with Sullivan. In early 1982, he tentatively offered Sullivan a job as his organization's chief labor negotiator, with a $75,000 salary, according to a civil lawsuit Sullivan filed against New Jersey authorities in 1983.

Trump also used Sullivan as a labor consultant in an aborted effort to buy the New York Daily News, according to the lawsuit and Stowe's account.

The continuing relationship with Sullivan and his land partner, Shapiro, now put Trump uncomfortably close to a mob plot to rig the 1982 mayoral election in Atlantic City and take control of city hall.

Candidate Michael Matthews had made a deal with Scarfo, the Philadelphia crime boss, and corrupt union officials associated with him, to provide favors in exchange for secret financial support, $125,000. Matthews was directed to communicate through Shapiro, Scarfo's financial agent in Atlantic City, who raised an additional $65,000 in cash and checks, court records show.

Throughout this time, Trump was pushing forward with his casino and meeting with Sullivan, Shapiro and Matthews on issues related to its construction and parking. Trump also discussed the election with them, according to investigative journalist Wayne Barrett in his 1992 book "Trump: The Deals and the Downfall."

"According to Shapiro and Sullivan, Trump then suggested that Shapiro put up the $10,000 and indicated that he would eventually pay him back," Barrett wrote. "Shapiro made the contribution, according to the two, but was never reimbursed."

Trump has denied those claims.

Under New Jersey's Casino Control Act, casino operators and those seeking licenses are prohibited from giving political donations to candidates.

The scheme between Matthews and Scarfo exploded into public after Matthews was caught on tape accepting payments from an undercover FBI agent. A federal grand jury investigating the case wanted Shapiro to testify. But he balked because he was worried about being killed, Stowe told The Post. He was right to worry.

"When Scarfo feared that Shapiro was going to cooperate with the federal government, he plotted his murder," a New Jersey State Commission on Investigation report said.

At Sullivan's urging, Stowe called Shapiro and persuaded him to testify.

"I said, 'Kenny, look. If you're subpoenaed and you don't testify, they're going to put you in jail,'" Stowe told The Post.

Shapiro became a key witness, and Matthews was indicted on charges of extortion, bribery and conspiracy. Matthews pleaded guilty to accepting a $10,000 bribe and was sentenced to 15 years.

Trump was questioned by FBI agents about whether he made campaign contributions through Shapiro, according to Barrett's book. Trump denied it and was not implicated in any wrongdoing.

In the coming years, the paths of Trump, Sullivan and Stowe continued crossing. But the unusual triangle they had formed would never be the same.

Trump and Stowe stayed in touch, even after Stowe moved on to other assignments. Trump invited Stowe to a New Jersey Generals football game and called Stowe now and then to chat or announce his latest endeavor, such as the purchase of a yacht. He attended Stowe's bachelor party, at a favorite FBI haunt on Manhattan's East Side. Later, Trump and his wife, Ivana, hosted Stowe and others at a Michael Jackson concert, introducing them to celebrities.

Sullivan, for his part, ran into legal troubles. Federal prosecutors in Philadelphia claimed he had evaded taxes for several years. He was convicted, and on Aug. 1, 1985, Sullivan was sentenced to two years in prison for tax evasion.

Sullivan filed lawsuits against the New Jersey Division of Gaming Enforcement, officials in the state attorney generals office, Donald Trump and others. In a tangle of claims - some relating to the division's report about him and Trump's decision to back out of the Circle Industries deal - Sullivan said he lost millions of dollars in potential income. The suits were eventually dismissed or settled.

In the late 1980s, Sullivan and Trump found themselves at odds one more time.

At issue was a lawsuit related to the demolition of the Bonwit Teller building. Workers from Local 95 of the Housewreckers Union alleged that Trump and his subcontractor, in conjunction with union leadership, had failed to submit payments to the union's pension and welfare funds for each worker - union members and Polish laborers alike.

In a deposition on April 12, 1988, Trump said he did not oversee the demolition. He repeatedly said he could not recall the details. "The only thing I did was sign checks when they were sent to me," he said under oath.

Trump said he could not recall asking Sullivan for help in June 1980. "I know that Mr. Sullivan was somebody that would constantly try and ingratiate himself. I know that I didn't pay him anything for this," Trump said. "But I think there was some kind of involvement in this."

Sullivan was a witness and gave damning testimony.

He said Trump had reached out to him in anticipation of the 1990 trial.

"Donald called me up and asked me to help him settle his case, so I told him that he should settle this case by paying these people what they should have gotten in 1980, and I was quite direct about it. And I told him, 'Donald, your mother's an **immigrant**, your wife's an **immigrant**, mine is, about 60 percent of the American public is.' "

Sullivan went on.

"And I said, 'Donald, if you don't pay these people, you are going to piss everybody in the world off.' You cannot allow the public to have an attitude that you don't give a s--- about this."

In 1991, a federal judge in Manhattan ruled that Trump and others conspired with Local 95's president to withhold $325,000 from the union funds. Both sides appealed, and the case ended with a sealed settlement in 1999.

In October 1993, Sullivan, 54, died of a heart attack. In an obituary, one of his Bucks County political pals was quoted describing "the source of Sullivan's strength."

"Excitement makes him tick; a challenge makes him tick; being in the thick of things makes him tick," the man told the Bucks County Courier Times.

Stowe, now retired, became a gaming executive after rising through the ranks of the FBI. He said Daniel Sullivan remains an enigma to him.

"Donald would say to me, 'What do you think about Dan?' "

"And I'm like, 'I don't know.' "

But Stowe said he understood why Trump turned to Sullivan in the first place.

"So, if you're going to be dealing with very tough, somewhat corrupt mob-dog guys on the labor side, you're going to want a junkyard dog on your side. Now, I never sat in negotiations with Dan, but he was a physically imposing guy. I don't think he was afraid of anybody."

robert.oharrow@washpost.com

Alice Crites contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS - In the midst of the greatest migration upheaval since the end of World War II, world leaders will gather Monday in New York for a major U.N. summit on the global **refugee** crisis.

While the summit's main agenda item will be the 22-page proposal drafted to strengthen protections for migrants - by ensuring "a people-centered, sensitive, humane, dignified, gender-responsive and prompt reception" - the situation in the Mediterranean Sea, the transit zone where more than a million people passed into Europe last year, is anything but safe.

After the landmark agreement between the European Union and Turkey signed in March, the traffic along the eastern Mediterranean route - from the Middle East through the Aegean Sea, used by most of the migrants and **refugees** who arrived last year - has generally slowed, although the United Nations' **refugee** agencyreported an uptick in the first week of September, with more than 1,000 migrants crossing into Greece from Turkey.

Meanwhile, traffic along the less-regulated central Mediterranean route, typically with migrants from North Africa and sub-Saharan Africa headed to Italy and its outer islands, has increased after a long summer of warmer weather and improved travel conditions. Although the overall flow of migrants across the Mediterranean has fallen this year, the number of deaths at sea has risen by about 15 percent, according to the most recent statistics collected by the International Organization for Migration.

Through the end of September 2015, the organization reported that 470,000 migrants and **refugees** had arrived in Europe and that an additional 2,900 had died while attempting the journey. By comparison, through Sept. 14 of this year, the IOM reported that 297,000 have arrived on the continent, while 3,200 have died en route.

"We already know the U.N. summit is doomed to abject failure," Salil Shetty, Amnesty International's secretary general, said in a statement in advance of Monday's assembly. "Faced with the worst **refugee** crisis in 70 years, world leaders have shown a shocking disregard for the human rights of people who have been forced to leave their homes due to conflict or persecution."

In geopolitical terms, analysts say that a continued flow along the eastern Mediterranean route, even a small one, risks upsetting the E.U.'s deal with Turkey, especially given tense relations after the attempted coup against the Turkish government in mid-July.

In August, approximately 3,400 migrants arrived in Greece by sea, the highest number since April, the month that immediately followed the signing of the deal. The reason for this increase remains unknown.

According to Elizabeth Collett, director of the Brussels-based Migration Policy Institute Europe, it is not the numbers that present an issue. Rather, the potential problem lies in the pressure the constant influx will place on Greece, where, she said, detention centers are overcrowded, few adequate facilities have been prepared, and migrants are "underserved by overstretched services."

These difficult conditions could force Greek authorities to transport migrants from outer Aegean islands to the mainland. But according to the E.U. agreement with Turkey, that country will take back migrants only from the outer islands, not from mainland Greece.

"There's this children's game called Jenga," Gerald Knaus, a member of the European Council on Foreign Relations and a founding member of the Berlin-based European Stability Initiative, said in an interview. "If you pull out the wrong block, the whole thing might come crashing down."

"The paradigm in Europe has been making sure the Turks don't walk away from the deal," he said, "but that's not the danger. The danger is that nobody does anything. It's not the numbers themselves that are the problem, it's the potential for mistakes they create."

james.mcauley@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Michael Higgs wanted to pump some fight into the 50 or so Donald Trump supporters who packed the second floor of an office rowhouse in Rockville, the Republican Party's outpost in deep-blue Montgomery County.

"We have a lot of angry people on the left. A lot of anger out there these days," said Higgs, chairman of the county GOP. That makes it tempting, he said, to avoid talking politics with friends or neighbors, or even planting a yard sign.

But don't be cowed, he urged.

"It's more important than ever for people to see that they're not alone, especially here in this liberal stronghold of the People's Republic of Montgomery County," said Higgs, a genial telecommunications lawyer whose work on Larry Hogan's 2014 gubernatorial campaign helped him land a post as deputy director of the state Department of Assessments and Taxation.

"Never forget: There's 124,000 registered Republicans in this county. So anytime you think you're the only guy in your neighborhood, you're not."

It's actually 121,474 on the rolls of the registered, according to the latest Board of Elections data, surrounded by 376,934 Democrats (not to mention 142,004 independents) who have thrived over the past quarter-century as the GOP shifted rightward and the county grew more diverse.

No Republican presidential candidate has carried Montgomery since Ronald Reagan, who eked out 50.1 percent in 1984. Rep. Connie Morella (R-Md.) was gerrymandered out of office by Democratic state lawmakers in 2002, and Howard Denis, the last Republican on the County Council, was unseated four years later.

On this recent evening, though, in this room, an enthusiastic cross section of the Trump coalition came together: largely white, north of 40, and voicing a mix of disillusion, anxiety and anger over the direction of the country.

They took different paths to supporting Trump, but most converge around illegal **immigration** and border security as well as the beliefs that Democrat Hillary Clinton must be stopped and that their candidate is the prescriptive for a political establishment rotten with insiderism and corruption across both parties.

The meeting drew from right-wing movements that have found a harbor in Trump's candidacy. There was John O'Malley, 62, a 9/11 "truther" who believes that the attacks were the work of rogue elements inside the U.S. government. He said he is drawn to Trump because the New York billionaire has indicated a willingness to reopen the investigation into the events of that day.

O'Malley, a retired Pentagon and Food and Drug Administration research analyst who ran for the Montgomery County Council in 2014, was also there to represent Maryland 20/20 Watch, an offshoot of the Tea Party. He distributed applications for election judge posts in Baltimore City, saying there could be massive voter fraud at the polls.

Seated off to the side was Brad Botwin, by day a senior official in the Commerce Department's Office of Technology Evaluation. On his own time, he is founder and director of Help Save Maryland, listed as a "nativist extremist" group by the Southern Poverty Law Center for its history of hostility to illegal **immigrants**. He has said the listing is baseless.

In a July blog post, Botwin assailed Montgomery Police Chief Tom Manger for what he called lax enforcement of **immigration** laws that he said has led to a surge of gang-related violence in "the unnaturally diverse communities of Montgomery Village and Gaithersburg."

His site carries commentary calling Casa, the **immigrant** advocacy group, "Maryland's Number 1 Illegal Entity" and sells stickers with a bright red slash across the Casa logo.

Botwin enlisted volunteers to staff campaign booths at county events this fall. "We don't take any crap from anybody, right?" he told a couple of interested high school students. "We're Trump people."

Higgs, whose nomination to Maryland's Public Service Commission stalled last year after Democratic lawmakers objected to some old tweets ("newsflash Illegal **alien immigrants** now to be referred to as #UndocumentedDemocrats"), said that although the party has no formal relationship with Help Save Maryland, the organization is a welcome presence.

"Brad has a great group. Those guys do good work," said Higgs. "We have a lot of the same stances on a lot of the issues."

Although Trump won 55 percent of the statewide vote in Maryland's Republican primary, he captured only 39 percent in Montgomery, edging Ohio Gov. John Kasich by about 1,700 votes. A few people at the recent meeting in Rockville reflected some of that ambivalence.

Dwight Patel hopscotched from Wisconsin Gov. Scott Walker to Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and then to Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.) before making his peace with Trump. Even now, he says he would be happier with Indiana Gov. Mike Pence at the top of the ticket.

"Like Donald Rumsfeld said, 'You go to war with the Army you have' and not the one we wish we had," said Patel, 44, an architect and the county party's second vice chair.

Larry Eisenberg, a tax and pension lawyer who lives in Gaithersburg, said he had long been uneasy about speaking out on politics, repelled by the sense of "moral superiority" he encountered from Democrats.

But he attended the meeting with his wife, Jessica Brede, a CPA and tax partner in a wealth-advisory firm, as "curious conservatives" who believe it is important that Clinton be defeated. Trump's raw rhetoric is not a concern.

"Gaffes don't matter," said Eisenberg, 58. "I know exactly what he's trying to say. ... I think it is very important that we have a rational **immigration** system. That's not a racist comment. We have a constitutional right to determine who becomes a citizen, and that includes those who support our Constitution and whose primary allegiance is to the United States."

Ruth Melson, a fixture in the 65-year-old Montgomery County Federation of Republican Women, was there also, none too pleased that Hogan, the state's increasingly popular governor, has declared Trump unfit for office and has vowed not to vote for him this fall.

"I think it's terrible. The Republican leader of the state saying he's not supporting his presidential candidate. No excuses for it, " said Melson, a retired Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation official and longtime Trump admirer who lives in Garrett Park. "New York City would be slums without Donald Trump," she said.

For about 90 minutes, Higgs walked through some of the basics for the fall campaign, including phone banks and the Sept. 26 debate watch party, which he promised would be "Huuuuge." He also put out a call for surrogate speakers - volunteers "who have the gift of gab" but can also "sort of keep it in check."

As the session wound down, he addressed the elephant in the room - that barring an astonishing reversal, Maryland's 10 electoral votes will not be a factor in Trump's strategy. A Washington Post-SurveyMonkey poll of the state's likely voters shows him trailing Clinton by 30 points.

"Talking candidly here, Maryland may not be on their final vote strategy," Higgs said, meaning that the group should not count on heavy support from the national campaign.

Higgs tried to end on an upbeat note, telling the faithful on Crabbs Branch Way that they could still have an impact by making calls and bus trips into such bona fide battleground states as Pennsylvania, hooking up with other county organizations and going door-to-door.

"We're going to do everything we can to get Maryland in play," he said, "and move those polls in the right direction."

bill.turque@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has made empowering local police to enforce federal **immigration** law a key part of his campaign. He has said that local agencies know where violators are and that they would be "so happy" to get them out.

But Trump apparently hasn't been paying attention to what local jurisdictions have been doing over the past 10 years. A great many law enforcement agencies - including those covering large **immigrant** populations - have sharply restricted their cooperation with federal enforcement, even for violators arrested for local crimes and in the face of a formal federal request.

The reasons for this stance reveal much about the counterproductive effects of "enforcement-first" policies. But they also indicate what must be done to achieve stable and sustainable **immigration** enforcement.

There are two strands to this local resistance: First, police in **immigrant**-heavy areas are justifiably concerned that being closely linked to **immigration**enforcement will hamper community policing. They need good relations with the **immigrant** community to sustain cooperation as they focus on their primary mission: public safety. This tension has always existed but is now more pronounced because of the historically high percentage of unauthorized **immigrants** who have been living in the United States for a long time. (Sixty percent of adult unauthorized **immigrants** have been here more than 10 years.)

Second is the changing character of the public debate. The failure to enact a federal legalization program for long-term residents has generated many dramatically sympathetic cases of people facing removal. Anti-deportation activists have used these stories effectively to oppose virtually all deportations - a more extreme stance than localities had heard before.

Seen in this light, the hard-line enforcement camp's success in blocking legalization, through 11 years of serious legislative proposals, has actually eroded public acceptance of **immigration** enforcement - evidenced by the resistance from many states and localities. Finally, adopting legalization would counterintuitively empower and legitimize enforcement by definitively assuring that federal officers focus on more recent arrivals. Effective enforcement against that group is the key to long-term deterrence of violations and also is far more likely to rebuild sustained public support.

What would a broad legalization program mean for the future role of local law enforcement? Certainly not a return to the street sweeps that Trump envisions. They almost always ensnare both citizens and lawful **immigrants**. Experienced **immigration** officers, not local police, need to be the ones who determine **immigration** status and apply consistent nationwide enforcement priorities.

Local police will always have an indispensable role, particularly in helping federal officers learn of **immigration** violators involved in crime. But they should concentrate on enforcing their own criminal laws, without regard to **immigration** considerations, under locally implemented (and federally monitored) safeguards against racial profiling. After legalization, local cooperation should become routine.

Could this more focused connection to **immigration** enforcement still undercut community policing? That tension would still exist, but as many police executives recognize, it would be greatly eased if Congress assured **immigrants** that the federal government would concentrate enforcement on recent violators.

If elected, Hillary Clinton would certainly press for early legalization. But to have a meaningful and enduring **immigration** legacy, she must also make resolute use of the full enforcement potential of such a move.

The writer is professor emeritus at the University of Virginia School of Law. He served as principal deputy general counsel of the Department of Homeland Security during the first two years of the Obama administration.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If you are the status quo candidate in a change election in which the national mood is sour and two-thirds of the electorate think the country is on the wrong track, what do you do? Attack. Relentlessly. Paint your opponent as extremist, volatile, clueless, unfit, dangerous. Indeed, Hillary Clinton's latest national ad, featuring major Republican politicians echoing that indictment of Donald Trump, ends thus: "Unfit. Dangerous. Even for Republicans."

That was the theme of Clinton's famous "alt-right" speech and of much of her $100 million worth of ads.

Problem is, it's not working.

Over the past month, Trump's new team, led by Kellyanne Conway, has worked single-mindedly to blunt that line of attack, on the theory that if he can just cross the threshold of acceptability, he wins. In an act of brazen rebranding, they set out to endow him with stature and empathy.

Stature was acquired in Mexico, whose president inexplicably gave Trump the opportunity to stand on the world stage with a national leader and more than hold his own. It's the same stature booster Sen. Barack Obama pulled off when he stood with the French president at a news conference in Paris in 2008.

That was part one: Trump the statesman. Part two: the kinder gentler Trump.

Nervy. Can you really repackage the boasting, bullying, bombastic, insulting, insensitive Trump into a mellow and caring version? With two months to go? In a digital age in which every past outrage is preserved on imperishable video?

Turns out, yes. How? Deflect and deny - and pretend it never happened. Where are they now - the birtherism, the deportation force, the scorn for teleprompters, the mocking of candidates who take outside money? Down the memory hole.

Orwell was wrong. You don't need repression. You need only the sensory overload of an age of numbingly ephemeral social media. In this surreal election season, there is no past.

Clinton ads keep showing actual Trump sound bites meant to shock. Yet her numbers are dropping, his rising.

How? Trump never goes on the defensive. He merely creates new Trumps. Hence:

1. The African American blitz. It's a new pose and the novelty shows. Trump is not very familiar with the language. He occasionally slips, for example, into referring to "the blacks." And his argument that African Americans inhabit a living hell and therefore have nothing to lose by voting for him hovers somewhere between condescension and insult.

But, as every living commentator has noted, the foray into African American precincts was not aimed at winning black votes but at countering Trump's general image as the bigoted candidate of white people.

Result? A curious dynamic in which Clinton keeps upping the accusatory ante just as Trump keeps softening his tone - until she finds herself way over the top, landing in a basket of deplorables, a phrase that will haunt her until Election Day. (Politics 101: Never attack the voter.)

2. The **immigration** wobble. A week of nonstop word salad about illegal **immigration** left everyone confused about what Trump really believes. Genius. The only message to emerge from the rhetorical fog is that he is done talking about deportation and/or legalization. The very discussion is off the table until years down the road.

Case closed. Toxic issue detoxified.

Again, that's not going to win him the Hispanic vote. But that wasn't the point. The point was to soften his image in the Philadelphia suburbs, pundit shorthand for the white college- educated women that Republicans have to win (and with whom Trump trails Romney 2012 by 10 points). Which brings us to:

3. The blockbuster child-care proposal. Unveiled Tuesday, it is liberalism at its best, Big Government at its biggest: tax deductions, tax rebates (i.e., cash) and a federal mandate of six weeks of paid maternity leave. The biggest entitlement since, well, Obamacare.

But wait. Didn't Trump's acolytes assure us that he spoke for those betrayed by the sold-out, elitist GOP establishment that for years refused to stand up to Obama's overweening mandates, Big Government profligacy and budget-busting entitlements?

No matter. That was yesterday. There is no past. Nor a future - at least for Ivankacare. It would never get through the GOP House.

Nor is it meant to. It is meant to signal what George H.W. Bush once memorably read off a cue card. "Message: I care."

And where do you think Trump gave this dish-the-Whigs cradle-to-college entitlement speech? Why, the Philadelphia suburbs!

Can't get more transparent than that. Or shameless. Or brilliant.

And it's working.

letters@charleskrauthammer.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CANTON, Ohio - Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump said in an interview here that he remains unwilling to say that President Obama was born in the United States, that he is more bullish than ever on his chances to win and that he is not exploring the launch of a new media company in case he loses the race.

Trump also made a far-from-subtle push - in the interview and in a letter from his doctor released Thursday - to be seen as vigorous and healthy as his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton, returned to the campaign trail after being treated for mild pneumonia.

In the interview, conducted late Wednesday aboard his private plane as it idled on the tarmac here, Trump suggested he is not eager to change his pitch or his positions even as he works to reach out to minority voters, many of whom are deeply offended by his long-refuted suggestion that Obama is not a U.S. citizen. Trump refused to say whether he believes Obama was born in Hawaii.

"I'll answer that question at the right time," Trump said. "I just don't want to answer it yet."

When asked whether his campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, was accurate when she said recently that he now believes Obama was born in this country, Trump responded: "It's okay. She's allowed to speak what she thinks. I want to focus on jobs. I want to focus on other things."

He added: "I don't talk about it anymore. The reason I don't is because then everyone is going to be talking about it as opposed to jobs, the military, the vets, security."

Late Thursday, campaign spokesman Jason Miller said in a statement that Trump no longer doubted Obama's birth in Hawaii and had done "a great service to the President and the country" by prompting Obama to release his long-form birth certificate in 2011. But Miller also repeated the widely debunked claim that Clinton and her campaign had questioned Obama's birthplace in 2008, which is false.

Miller is among three Trump associates who have recently claimed a change of heart, but the candidate has yet to say so himself. Trump has repeatedly raised questions about Obama's heritage over the past five years.

In the interview, Trump defended his wife's **immigration** history; attacked targets including CNN host Anderson Cooper and Senate Minority Leader Harry M. Reid (D-Nev.); and said he had been "respectful" since Clinton fell ill but "that doesn't mean that I'm going to stay there."

Sitting in his plush, cream-and-gold cabin as his top aides looked on, Trump began by repeatedly recounting his poll numbers, which have ticked up nationally and in some key states.

Trump said a possible turning point in the race came last week when Clinton said that "half" of his supporters belonged in a "basket of deplorables" - a remark she has since said she regrets.

"It's the single biggest mistake in this political cycle, a massive comment, bigger than 47 percent," Trump said, a reference to Mitt Romney's controversial 2012 statement at a fundraiser about voters who receive government benefits or pay little in taxes. "When I first heard it, I couldn't believe that she said it."

Clinton and her campaign argue that some Trump backers are racist and misogynistic and have sought to link him to the "alt-right" movement of self-avowed white nationalists, many of whom have rallied around his candidacy.

"The alt-right. You know they came up with the term 'alt-right,'" Trump said, blaming Clinton and her allies, although the term has been used within the movement for years. "I think the term itself is ridiculous. The alt-right. When did it come into existence? It was just made up."

Trump was a leading and vocal proponent of the debunked conspiracy theory that the nation's first black president was born overseas and thus not eligible for the White House. Obama released his Hawaiian birth certificate in 2011, but Trump has never disavowed his earlier claims.

The Republican nominee said he still believes he can win significant support from black voters. "I've come up with African American voters like a rocket ship," he said.

There have been rumors and scattered media reports for months that Trump has been considering founding a media company with his friend Roger Ailes, former Fox News chairman, should he lose the presidency. But Trump said he has never had a conversation about launching a venture with Ailes or other prominent right-wing media figures.

"No, never did," he said. "I want to win the presidency, and I want to make America great again. It's very simple. I have no interest in a media company. False rumor."

Trump characterized Ailes, who resigned from Fox News after a series of sexual-harassment allegations, as a trusted friend more than a formal adviser. "He's certainly been very successful at what he does and on occasion, we'll talk," Trump said. "I love the benefit of his experience and knowledge. He's had an amazing experience. But there is no role."

Trump said Ailes has told him "some interesting things about past debates" during conversations they've had over several weekends at Trump's golf club in Bedminster, N.J.

"Debate skills are either something you either have or don't have. You have to prep. You have to have knowledge," he said. "But when people say you have to be nice or not nice, well, I won't really know until it begins. Because if she treats me with respect, I'll treat her with respect. If she doesn't, I'll reciprocate. If she's respectful of me, I'll be that way with her."

Trump said he was unconcerned that moderators may decide to fact-check during the forums.

"I don't care. My facts are good. My facts are good. I don't get enough credit for having my facts right," Trump said. "They'll say I'm wrong even when I'm right."

Trump took an unprompted shot at Cooper, who is one of the moderators selected by the nonpartisan Commission on Presidential Debates. Trump said he would take part in the debate moderated by Cooper but remains unhappy with his selection.

"I don't think Anderson Cooper should be a moderator, because Anderson Cooper works for CNN and over the last couple of days, I've seen how Anderson Cooper behaves," Trump said. "He'll be very biased, very biased. I don't think he should be a moderator. I'll participate, but I don't think he should be a moderator. CNN is the Clinton News Network and Anderson Cooper, I don't think he can be fair."

On Wednesday, Trump's wife, Melania, released a letter from her attorney, who attested with "100% certainty" that she had **immigrated** legally from Slovenia, following several news stories scrutinizing how she entered and worked in the United States before gaining citizenship.

With the letter, Trump said, there is no longer a need for his wife to hold a news conference on the topic, as the campaign once promised. He also reiterated his refusal to release his tax returns, as Clinton and all other presidential candidates have done for decades, citing an Internal Revenue Service audit that he says is ongoing.

Briefly discussing foreign affairs, Trump bristled at the idea that he had "embraced" Russian President Vladimir Putin with positive comments about him, including his contention last week that Putin was superior to Obama in leadership skills.

"I simply said that Putin is a stronger leader than Obama," he said.

Trump on Thursday released a letter from his longtime doctor, Harold N. Bornstein at Lenox Hill Hospital in New York, that summarized the candidate's latest physical and discussed it on "The Dr. Oz Show." It said he takes a statin drug to lower his cholesterol and has a body mass index in the overweight range but is in "excellent" condition.

Trump defended Bornstein - who has come under scrutiny after acknowledging that he rushed writing a previous hyperbolic statement on Trump's health - as "very, very professional."

Trump said Bornstein's letter will be the final document that he will release on his health before the election. He does not plan to share a trove of medical files as other presidential candidates, such as Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), have done during previous campaigns.

"There is nothing else to release," Trump said.

He took a swipe at Clinton, whose campaign on Wednesday released a two-page letter from her doctor that said she had been treated for "mild" bacterial pneumonia but is in overall good health and "fit to serve as president."

"She didn't give this. She didn't give all of these EKGs," Trump said, referring to an electrocardiogram test result included in the letter. "I took EKGs. She said her cholesterol is okay, I say what my cholesterol is. I give the good, the bad and the other cholesterols. I give all three cholesterols."

When asked directly whether he has ever had a major illness or a heart attack, Trump said he has not. "No," he said. "I've never had a scare."

Trump shrugged off a question about whether he could use more exercise.

"I guess. But that's exercise," he said of his raucous rally speeches. "When you're up there soaking wet, the room is 90 degrees because there are so many people. ... It's warm. It's like that in a lot of rooms."

Told that Reid had said that Trump is "not slim and trim," Trump grimaced and waved his hand dismissively.

"Harry Reid? I think he should go back and start working out again with his rubber work-out pieces," an apparent reference to the exercise band that snapped last year and caused Reid to fall and break a number of ribs and some facial bones.

Since Clinton fell ill Sunday at a memorial service marking the 15th anniversary of the 9/11 terrorist attacks, Trump has been mixed in his responses. He has sounded taunting in some of his recent remarks, such as when he wondered aloud at his rally Wednesday whether Clinton "would be able to stand up here for an hour and do this."

"I don't think so," Trump told the cheering crowd.

"I asked a question," Trump said in the interview soon after. "Everyone screamed 'No!' I want to be respectful. I'm a respectful person. That doesn't mean that I'm going to stay there. But right now, she's in bed recuperating and I want to be respectful."

Trump also said that he resisted weighing in on Clinton's illness Sunday on Twitter because "I thought it would be inappropriate to tweet when I saw her in serious danger."

But was he tempted?

"No," Trump said quickly. "No. I was not tempted. Not even a little bit."

robert.costa@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Our **immigration** system must serve the interests of all Americans.

And the vast majority of Americans - Republicans and Democrats - recognize that our **immigration** system is broken and support replacing our outdated laws with new processes. One key area in need of change is our visa programs: Rather than reduce visas significantly, as some politicians and policymakers have proposed, we should update these programs in a careful way that helps our economy.

The last update to the number of permanent-worker visas allotted took place in 1990, the year Germany reunified. As a result, our current legal **immigration**system does not meet our economic needs because our inflexible visa system constrains businesses, undermining the competitiveness of the American worker and the livelihood of our families.

America's dairy industry is a unique example: Farmers regularly report labor shortages and raise concerns about availability of reliable year-round labor. More than half of dairy laborers are **immigrants**, and 79 percent of the U.S. milk supply comes from dairies using **immigrant** labor, according to a 2015 Texas A&M report paid for by the National Milk Producers Federation.

But here's the rub: We have no effective visa for the legal entry of such workers. The H-2A visa covers temporary, seasonal agricultural workers, but there is no milk season; milking cows is a year-round endeavor. The H-1B visa program covers temporary, highly skilled workers, and dairy jobs do not meet those requirements either.

People often seek progress on **immigration** reform by calling for Congress to pass a stand-alone E-Verify bill that would guarantee a legal workforce. But without visa reform, such an enforcement program would gut the dairy industry, decrease milk production and increase dairy prices across the board.

That's just one example. A proper work visa program would control **immigration** and minimize the incentive to skip the legal **immigration** process. Frankly, the smartest way to secure our border would be to have a 21st-century **immigration** process that advanced the social and economic interests of all Americans.

Here are other components of a visa process that works:

First, visa numbers should be aligned with labor and workforce needs to make it easier for employers to hire **immigrants** with documentation. Sourcing labor in this way would help create upstream and downstream jobs in the United States, instead of outsourcing entire industries.

Second, a reformed visa system should allow foreign students educated at U.S.colleges and universities to obtain work visas and contribute their talents here after graduation. We should be stapling green cards, not plane tickets, to diplomas.

Finally, visa reform must keep the family at the core of our **immigration** process. American families with loved ones abroad face a growing wait for a visa allotment process that has not changed in a generation. Employment- and family-based visa reform should go hand in hand.

Congress, with leadership from our next president, can address our economic needs in a way that benefits American workers and businesses alike. Visa reform may not electrify the electorate, but it is crucial that we get it done.

The writer is executive director of the National **Immigration** Forum.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The Obama administration will seek to accept 110,000 **refugees** from around the world in fiscal 2017, officials announced Wednesday.

Secretary of State John F. Kerry briefed lawmakers Tuesday on the new goal, which is an increase from 85,000 in fiscal 2016 and 70,000 in each of the previous three years. It represents a 57 percent increase in **refugee** arrivals since 2015, as ongoing conflicts in Syria, Iraq and elsewhere have spurred an exodus of migrants seeking asylum in Europe, Canada and other regions.

"That does represent a substantial increase in our commitment to addressing the **refugee** problem around the world," White House press secretary Josh Earnest said Wednesday, adding that the United States is the world's largest humanitarian donor when it comes to **refugees**. "But I think what we need to see around the world is a greater commitment to not just shunting this burden off to a handful of countries."

Asked why the United States was not admitting more **refugees**, Earnest noted that the vetting process is "not cheap" and that President Obama's commitment to taking in displaced people was not shared by "a lot of people in Congress, including by a lot of people in the Republican majority in Congress. And that has an impact in terms of the resources that are dedicated to this effort."

"So I'm sure the president would be willing to consider increasing this commitment further if Congress were prepared to provide the resources necessary to get it done," he added.

The increase comes even as the question of **refugees** remains an issue in the presidential election. Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump initially called for a halt to Muslims' seeking to enter the United States but later modified that stand to say the ban should apply to any applicants coming from countries with a history of terrorism. Democratic presidential nominee Hillary Clinton has called for the United States to take more **refugees** from Syria, which has been at war for more than five years.

The Wall Street Journal first reported the new **refugee** goal Tuesday evening.

House Judiciary Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte (R-Va.) criticized the decision.

"We must remain compassionate toward **refugees** but we also need to make sure that we use common sense," Goodlatte said in a statement. "Unfortunately, President Obama unilaterally increases the number of **refugees** resettled in the United States each year and gives little thought as to how it will impact local communities. The president also continues to ignore warnings from his own national security officials and plans to bring in even more Syrian **refugees** over the next year."

Bill O'Keefe, Catholic Relief Services' vice president for advocacy, said in an interview that although his group and others welcomed the administration's resettlement pledge, neither that nor the upcoming U.N. summit was sufficient to address the needs of "the 65 million globally displaced people around the world right now."

The country that sent the most **refugees** to the United States in 2015, according to an analysis by the Migration Policy Institute, was Burma, which has a long-standing ethnic conflict and sent 18,386 **refugees** that year. That figure accounted for more than 26 percent and surpassed Iraq, which sent 12,676 **refugees**.

O'Keefe noted that procedures established by Congress help account for why Burma has an "outsized" role in admitted **refugees**, since the formulas for admitting applicants is based in part on what region of the world they are fleeing. But, O'Keefe added, "Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq are special cases, given our experience and history there, and we should be taking many more people from there."

juliet.eilperin@washpost.com

Carol Morello and David Nakamura contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump made what his campaign billed as two major disclosures on Wednesday. First, an attorney provided a timeline of his Slovenia-born wife's **immigration** status. Then, amid questions about his health during a television interview, Trump pulled some medical test results out of his blazer pocket.

Yet despite these high-profile gestures, Trump remains the least transparent major presidential nominee in modern history. He is the first since 1976 to refuse to release his tax returns. He has declined to provide documentation of the "tens of millions" of dollars he claims to have donated to charity. He has yet to release a comprehensive accounting of his health. And, while Wednesday's letter about Melania Trump's **immigration** from her home country offers a few new details, there is no documentation to back up the claims.

At the same time, Trump and his aides are criticizing rival Hillary Clinton as secretive and demanding more information from her about her emails and health. Many Democrats also see Trump's refusal to release basic information as hypocritical since for years, he was one of the loudest voices demanding that President Obama release his birth certificate to prove he was born in Hawaii and qualified to be president. Trump also called on Obama to release his college applications, school transcripts and passport applications.

Trump's campaign manager, Kellyanne Conway, played down Trump's need to release health records on MSNBC on Tuesday: "I don't know why we need such extensive medical reporting when we all have a right to privacy."

In the same TV interview, Conway criticized Clinton for not immediately disclosing that she had been diagnosed with mild pneumonia last week, a decision that came to a head on Sunday when she left a 9/11 memorial service after feeling overheated. "Why in the world did Hillary Clinton lie to everyone and conceal such an important fact for two days?" Conway asked.

On Wednesday, Clinton's campaign released a letter from her doctor describing her treatment for "mild, non-contagious bacterial pneumonia" and noting that she received a CT scan confirming the illness and that she is halfway through an antibiotic regimen. In July 2015, Clinton released a two-page letter from her doctor that contained several lab results and more information than what Trump has thus far released.

Clinton also recently made public the past nine years of her tax returns, showing that she and her husband, former president Bill Clinton, had an income of $10.7 million for 2015 and paid about $3.6 million in federal taxes.

Most voters say they want transparency from candidates. In May, a Washington Post-ABC News poll found that 64 percent of registered voters said Trump should release his taxes, while 31 percent said it is okay that he has not done so.

Clinton supporters say Trump is creating the illusion of being transparent by releasing bits of information and saturating the airwaves with interviews. Instead of a full medical history, Trump released a four-paragraph letter from his personal doctor in December that declared he had "no significant medical problems" and would be "the healthiest individual ever elected to the presidency." At the time, Trump was taking aspirin daily and "a low dose of a statin." The campaign said he plans to release more soon.

Trump, 70, would be the oldest president ever elected to a first term. He loves fast food from McDonald's and KFC and, according to media accounts, told the host of "The Dr. Oz Show" that his main exercise is the vigorous hand gesturing he does during his political rallies. Yet for months, Trump has said that Clinton, 68, does not have the "strength" or "stamina" for the presidency and has accused her of being "exhausted" and sleeping too much.

On Monday - the day after Clinton fell ill at the memorial - Trump announced on Fox News that he underwent a physical last week and would release the "very, very specific" results this week. He spoke of his health with great confidence and said he finds the campaign trail "very invigorating."

During a taping of the interview with Dr. Mehmet Oz scheduled to air Thursday, Oz asked Trump why he has not released his medical records.

"Well, I really have no problem in doing it," Trump said, according to a brief clip released by the show Wednesday. "I have it right here. Should I do it? I don't care. Should I do it?"

Trump then pulled out what he called a "report" and a letter from Lenox Hill Hospital in New York, which Oz examined - then the 30-second clip ended.

With the show and the campaign refusing to release any data, members of the audience shared details that they remembered with reporters, though the accounts varied. MSNBC interviewed Daniel Sinasohn, who struggled to remember exactly what Trump said he weighed. "I thought he said 267. My boyfriend said that maybe it was 230," Sinasohn said. " ... I am not 100 percent sure."

Also on Wednesday, Trump's wife, Melania Trump, posted a letter on Twitter from an **immigration** attorney that included new details about her **immigration** to the United States from Slovenia. But it also raised more questions, and no documentation was provided to confirm the claims.

Michael J. Wildes, an attorney who has worked for Donald Trump but was not involved in his wife's **immigration** case, wrote that Melania Trump first entered the United States on Aug. 27, 1996, using a B-1/B-2 visa.

Wildes said that on Oct. 18, 1996, the U.S. Embassy in Slovenia issued her first H-1B work visa and that she got a total of five visas between 1996 and 2001, when she received her green card. Wildes said she got the card - which provides legal permanent residence - under the "extraordinary ability" category but did not outline how.

The federal government defines the "extraordinary ability" designation "for people who are recognized as being at the very top of their field." Experts say the category is used by people with exceptional and renowned talent, including those who win Nobel Prizes. In 2000, Trump was a working model best known for her relationship with Donald Trump, but she was not a top international model.

**Immigration** attorney Bruce Morrison, who wrote the federal law including the "extraordinary ability" provision when he was a Democratic congressman from Connecticut, said it was known as the "Einstein category."

"It wasn't always good enough to be a player in the starting lineup of Major League Baseball; you had to be the most valuable player. The expectation was that you had to be truly extraordinary in your field," Morrison said, adding: "If someone came to me with her ability, I would be dubious that she would get it."

Wildes, the Trump attorney, also used his letter to rebut news reports that Melania Trump had posed for nude photos in New York in 1995, thereby raising questions about whether she was working as a model illegally before getting her visa in 1996. Wildes said Trump was not in the United States at all in 1995.

In late July, the New York Post ran the nude photographs on its cover and reported that they were taken in 1995. Marc Dolisi, former editor of the now-defunct men's magazine Max told The Washington Post in August that the photos were published in the magazine's February 1996 edition and been shot in late 1995.

But when contacted again recently, Dolisi said he had made a mistake and that the photos were published in the February 1997 edition.

jenna.johnson@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**T

he German government's prediction spread quickly: 1 million **refugees** were expected to reach the country by the end of 2015, Vice Chancellor Sigmar Gabriel announced on Sept. 14 last year. Only a month earlier, official estimates had put the number at 450,000 at most.

Virtually overnight, Germany had become the Western world's main destination for **refugees**.

At the time, tens of thousands of people - most escaping the war in Syria - were stranded in Hungary, which had taken measures to stop the flow of **refugees**. A decision by Austria and Germany to open their borders to relieve the pressure was supposed to be a short-term solution. But the borders remained open.

Week after week, European Union governments revised their estimates upward as more people streamed in.

At first, the mood in Germany was generally welcoming. But tension and uncertainty soon replaced the initial excitement as Germans realized the challenges involved with absorbing so many people.

On Sept. 14, 2015, during a special E.U. session, German officials pressured other European countries to share the responsibility of accommodating **refugees** - without much success. World leaders will discuss the issue next week at a U.N. **refugee** summit in New York, the first of its kind, as governments deal with a global **refugee** crisis. While Germany will probably be publicly applauded for its commitment, the country's recent experience might also provide arguments to those opposed to welcoming more **refugees**.

In the past year, Germany has changed. It has seen terrorist attacks on its soil and attacks against **refugees**. But has Germany's experience with **refugees** been a success story or a failure? There are more than a million ways to see it.

Here are the stories of three Syrians who are trying to adjust in a country that is still coming to terms with the massive influx. For more stories and video, visit wapo.st/germanyrefugees.

She fled Syria, anda new home in Germany

Tamara Nahar, 26

Tamara Nahar smiled as she stood in front of the painting that decided her fate.

It was of a shirt hanging upside down, with blood appearing to drip toward the lower end of the frame. She painted it in 2013 when she was still living in Syria, after a friend told her that soldiers had hung him upside down and beaten him.

Tamara paid a price for turning those memories into art: She was arrested and briefly detained.

But standing next to that painting this spring in Berlin, Tamara said she had no regrets.

When Syria tumbled into civil war, her work started to become more political - and that brought more risks. Her professors at Damascus University, where she was pursuing a master's degree, grew hostile toward her. But Tamara continued to organize art exhibitions.

She finally decided to flee, but her problems weren't over when she reached Germany.

Germans who live in the country's formerly Soviet east tend to have different attitudes about **refugees** than Germans in the west. Protests against more **immigration** and **refugees** have mostly taken place in the east. It has also been in eastern Germany where most physical attacks against **refugees** have occurred and where asylum centers have been burned down.

Tamara has experienced those regional differences. When she lived in Chemnitz, a city of 240,000 in eastern Germany, "it was really hard to speak to other people," she said. Then she moved to the southwestern city of Tübingen. "When I came here, I had friends," she said.

But attitudes have changed in some parts of the west, as well, since several attacks and sexual assaults allegedly by **refugees**, Tamara said in an interview this month. Now when she enters a tram, she said, passengers look at her with fear.

Tamara held her first art exhibition in April in Berlin. It was the moment she felt at home in the country for the first time - and the moment her journey out of Syria truly ended.

Her paintings have changed over the past year - they are no longer mostly red and black.

Her latest work, "Memory," shows flowers and butterflies. It looks like spring in Germany.

Feeling like an outsiderin both countries

Enana Asr, 21

"When did you know you were homosexual?"

"How did your parents react?"

"Why didn't you stay in Syria?"

Her interviews at Berlin's asylum agency seemed like interrogations, "and I felt like the criminal," Enana said.

She thought she had left those kinds of attitudes behind when she fled Syria, where homosexuality is illegal.

In January 2015, Enana told her closest family members in Damascus that she was gay, and they seemed to accept her. But their attitudes changed when other relatives and neighbors reacted negatively. Enana soon stopped talking to her father, and her relationship with her mother became strained.

But even as the war raged, she was determined to stay in Syria and continue her studies in English literature.

One day, two soldiers on motorbikes followed her while she was riding a bicycle. Enana says they knew her, and they knew about her sexuality.

The bruises they left on her body would hurt for weeks.

It was the moment Enana decided to leave.

She traveled to Turkey with her mother and teenage sister, and then by boat to Greece. "The hardest thing was that I had to worry about not just myself but also about two other people. It added responsibility," Enana said.

A month later, they were in Germany.

Relations with her mother slightly improved after they risked the journey to together. But then Enana sang at an LGBT festival in Berlin - an event that was supposed to mark for her the end of her oppression in Syria. In a text message following the event, her mother wrote that she was "tarnishing the family's name," Enana said.

Enana has lost contact with her father and with her mother, who is still in Germany. "My family didn't accept me as I am, so I gave up on them," she said in an interview. Enana found a place to stay in Berlin after approaching an LGBT association.

Enana now has a residency permit but is still waiting for one of the most important people in her life - her girlfriend, who is still in Damascus.

Trying to cometo terms with the past

Tarek al-Wawi, 34

When the German officer asked for his passport, Tarek had only his military ID to show him. He feared that German authorities would decide he had been on the wrong side of the war and not let him in.

An army deserter, Tarek had fled to Germany hoping to escape memories of the fighting and violence. Shortly after he arrived in the city of Tübingen, he sought psychological treatment.

Estimates of how many **refugees** have come to the country with mental health issues vary, but a German association of psychotherapists said last year that at least half who flee war zones may need psychological support.

Tarek had studied media and communication at Damascus University and founded a theater project. But in 2010, the year the Arab Spring started, he was drawn into compulsory military service.

Tarek's loyalty to the president weakened soon after the uprising began. Tarek said he was repeatedly arrested by regime forces for refusing to participate in operations carried out in areas where civilians were present. In 2013, he was one of about 300 soldiers who defected to Turkey, driving to the border in a dangerous three-day journey, he said.

For more than two years, he worked for a radio station in Turkey that broadcast in Syria. But his work became increasingly risky as Islamist radicals started to send Tarek and others death threats.

He decided to escape to Germany in May 2015.

But Syria continued to haunt him. At night, he dreamed of his friend whose head "shattered like glass" when it was hit by a sniper's bullet.

In an interview in July, Tarek said he had stopped attending therapy sessions, which the German government provided. He said that there were many reasons for his decision but that "the language barrier made it hard for me to express my emotions in a language that I had been learning for less than one year."

Tarek said he tries to keep busy. He organized a Syria-themed evening for local Germans to share food, listen to music, dance and watch a movie. He also set up a photography workshop for other **refugees**.

rick.noack@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In his Sept. 13 op-ed, "Build the wall," Robert J. Samuelson came out in favor of building the Trump wall, though it might cost as much as $25 billion. A $20 billion fund for industrial development in Central America could eliminate the stream of illegal- **immigrant** job-seekers, help stabilize those countries and create a mass of Central American consumers of U.S. goods and services. Also, the jobs created "back home" might just persuade a lot of the 11 million illegal **immigrants**already here to "self-deport."

Details such as the need for corruption prevention might seem a bit neo-colonialist, but well-cultivated popular support should overcome objections to that and other necessary controls.

Bob Lindsey, Callao, Va.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was late afternoon on Monday when the Great Falls family of five piled into their minivan and headed for the Virginia countryside and an experience that Mohamed Elsanousi and his wife, Hanane Elabbassi, hoped their children would carry with them forever.

They had gone to a huge Eid al-Adha prayer service at the Dulles Expo Center and then a lavish holiday brunch with friends, and now they were going to roll up their sleeves and reenact a centuries-old religious tradition - sacrificing a sheep in the way that Islam prescribes.

Past the horse farms, cornstalks and the occasional Trump sign they drove, and then, suddenly, there it was: the "Halal Farm" sign, with another one beside it that said "Eid Mubarak" - a blessed holiday - in hand-painted Arabic. Behind the farmhouse, near the gravelly road, there were dozens of cars, the smoke of a few barbecue picnics, a pen full of sheep and goats, and a wooden shed where one family at a time could lead their selected animal. With the help of the farmer and butchers, they would perform the rite that commemorates Ibrahim (also known as Abraham) following God's command to sacrifice his own son, only to have God replace the boy with a ram at the last minute.

As the country's Muslim population grows, so too do the opportunities for Muslims to establish new faith traditions, blending ancient rituals with the latest American ways. The observant now can opt to slaughter their sheep for the holiday on a growing roster of farms; they can purchase organic, grass-fed meat for their feast from a green halal grocer, send money to a charity that will hand out food to the poor in inner-city Baltimore or attend an LGBT holiday barbecue in New York.

For **immigrants**, the trip to the country to slaughter the animal is a means of establishing authenticity to heritage as they assimilate into suburbs and cities, send their kids to public schools and soccer camps, and go through the daily rituals of being American.

Elsanousi and Elabbassi's brood is the embodiment of that hybridization. They're a multiracial, multilingual family with **immigrant** roots and a deep commitment to the melting pot.

Elsanousi grew up in Sudan; Elabbassi in Morocco. They met as students at the University of Indiana. He now runs a nonprofit group in the District that promotes interfaith peace-building around the world; she's been the den leader of their 11-year-old son's Cub Scout troop. At home they speak a mix of English and Arabic with their three American-born children; the Arabic, too, is a hybrid of the distinctive Sudanese and Moroccan dialects.

Being part of a religious minority carries challenges; Eid is not a national holiday here, so parents and children often take just one day for a festival that can stretch to several in their homelands. But many say that status also inspires an appreciation of customs that can seem at risk of extinction after **immigration**.

"We took it for granted growing up," Elabbassi said. Rituals here take special effort. "As Muslims in the West, I want them to build childhood memories that help them to identify as Muslim Americans."

'So many people want camel'

There have long been American farms willing to sell their sheep and space to Muslims to perform the sacrifice on Eid, ranging from large-scale slaughterhouse operations like the one Elsanousi's family visited last year, to Amish farms in western Pennsylvania. Muslims and religious leaders say the number is growing to accommodate a growing Muslim population.

But finding one can still feel daunting. "You have to call a farm, and say you want to do this. It's sort of like, 'You want to do what? But you have to call the Jewish guy,' " said Oz Sultan, who lives in Harlem in New York. If the farm agrees, you still "have to go and catch the animal, subdue the animal," he said.

Or, he joked, "you can hire a thousand artisanal hipsters to do it for you."

Sensing a need, Mian Ajmal Shah, a Pakistani **immigrant** with no previous farming experience, opened his halal farm in Catlett, Va., six years ago, catering to a Muslim clientele that needs sheep and goats for holidays, births, weddings and other celebrations.

Day one of the holiday, Shah and his team helped customers slaughter sheep and goats. On days two and three, he's offering cows as well. And customers are clamoring for more. "So many people want camel," he said. "It's very tender - but we don't have camel."

Technically, it's not necessary for Muslims - or anyone - to travel to a farm to kill a livestock animal. Federal law provides that individuals can slaughter their own animal on their own property, if they so desire. In Muslim-majority countries, courtyards and rooftops are often equipped for such events with drainage holes and faucets.

But with Muslims making up only around 1 percent of the U.S. population, at a time when verbal and physical assaults on Muslims are spiking, and with many Americans squeamish about animal slaughters in general, a farm can seem like the safest option.

Halal, like kosher slaughter, requires that the animal be subdued, but not stunned, before its death. The butcher makes a swift cut through the major artery and vein in the neck, and then the animal is meant to bleed out before being carved, according to both customs. There is a lot of blood, and sometimes the animal kicks involuntarily near the end.

"Uninitiated, it's not something that you would want to have done on your property and have neighbors see it," said Edward Mills, an associate professor of meat science at Penn State University.

That's how Elabbassi felt about her two youngest, Anas, 5, and Jude, 4, when it was finally the family's turn to lead their sheep into the shed. "Come on," she said, leading them away. Nabeel, 11, who his parents said had dissected a squid with his fifth-grade class last year, got to stay behind with his two older cousins to watch.

The parents believe in introducing their kids to the customs slowly, and with consideration of age. "Later, inshallah, she's cherish these memories," Elabbassi said as Jude stuck a hand through the pen's fence to pet a goat. "I just want her to remember that this is a special day, not an ordinary day."

Options for observance

Charitable giving is a crucial part of Eid observance, but not everyone's practice is the same.

At the farm, where everyone seemed to be sharing, Elsanousi and Elabbassi's family munched on barbecued kebabs and watermelon slices while they waited for Shah's staff to carve up their sheep, and planned to give their own meat - which they later packed into a cooler full of ice for the ride home - to a couple of single mothers they know and to host a dinner party next weekend.

There are also a huge number of people, religious leaders say, who observe the holiday in different ways, and their options are growing too.

"There's a mix for sure," Rizwan Jaka, outreach director of the All Dulles Area Muslim Society Center, said of family Eid practice and celebrations. Some pay a charity overseas to slaughter an animal on their behalf and distribute the meat to the poor. Some purchase meat from a halal butcher, sometimes relying on their mosque to distribute the portion to the needy.

Syed Saboor and his wife in Westchester, N.Y., have removed animal sacrifice from their holiday tradition entirely, although the Saboors have gotten in the habit of throwing a massive annual potluck.

While Eid in Pakistan was always a family affair growing up, in New York, it has become a festival to share with friends - 120 on this year's guest list. The children decorate the house and help prepare traditional Pakistani fare. "It's kind of nice to know that others feel that our open house is a tradition for them, too," Saboor said.

By nightfall on Monday, the first of Eid's three days, Elsanousi and Elabbassi finally were ready to head home. They needed to stop first at another cousin's barbecue in Gainesville, Va., where a relative declared "You're late!" as they walked up to a cluster of picnic tables in the dark.

And then finally it was back onto Interstate 66 and up their quiet driveway. It was a school night, after all, and time for bed.

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ASHEVILLE, N.C. - As thousands of Donald Trump's supporters left his rally here this week, they were greeted by protesters who accused them of being, among other things, racist, hateful and uneducated.

"Grow a brain, b----!" one protester shouted at a Trump backer. Another pointed at rallygoers and yelled: "Racist a------s!" A third held a sign that read: "Make racists afraid again."

Then they chanted in unison: "Love trumps hate! Love trumps hate! Love trumps hate!"

"They have these vulgar signs, yet they're screaming about love," said Lisa Jones, 51, a Trump supporter from Hendersonville, N.C. "And we're the ones that are intolerant? We're deplorable and intolerant? Well, we just found out that we're deplorable. We thought that we were just intolerant."

Many rallygoers here in this mountain town Monday evening shrugged off Hillary Clinton's controversial remark that "half" of Trump's supporters belong in a "basket of deplorables" because they are "racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic, you name it." While the Democratic candidate has expressed regret for using the word "half," she has not abandoned her assertion that some of Trump's supporters are truly deplorable.

"It made me feel real little," said John Warren, 72, of Asheville, who wore a camouflage "Make America Great Again" cap. "That she was downplaying us. I mean, we are voters and, you know, we respect her. But not in the position she is running for."

Many Trump supporters say they have been called much worse for their views on same-sex marriage, abortion, transgender rights, Syrian **refugees**, illegal **immigration** and race relations. Like the Republican nominee, they say they aren't afraid to say politically incorrect things and no amount of name-calling from liberals is going to change that.

"One man's steak is another man's baloney," said a 62-year-old salesman from Tennessee who said he was proud to have sold 14 Confederate flags outside the rally but did not want his name published. "Just like a woman: I mean, I might say she's beautiful. The next guy might say she's ugly. You know what I'm saying?"

A 43-year-old construction project manager dressed up as a "deplorable," putting a laundry basket over his head. Another man carried a sign reading: "Deplorable lives matter." As two young men left the rally, one turned to the other and said, "Okay, Dan, let's go be deplorable."

During the event, former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani joked that Clinton had mentioned "some phobics I've never heard of" and that "maybe the claustrophobics are for Trump." Trump pulled supporters on stage to share their thoughts, concluding: "These are not deplorable people. That I can tell you."

The Trump campaign has focused heavily on the "deplorables" theme as a way to paint Clinton as elitist and out of touch, but it has also stumbled into its own problems with the issue.

Trump's eldest son, Donald Trump Jr., posted a picture labeled "The Deplorables" on Instagram over the weekend that placed his father and several Trump surrogates alongside conspiracy theorist Alex Jones and a cartoon character, Pepe the Frog, associated with the online white nationalist alt-right movement. Trump's running mate, Mike Pence, has refused to use the word "deplorable" to describe former Ku Klux Klan leader and Trump supporter David Duke, though he said Tuesday that he and Trump disavow Duke.

The Clinton campaign points to such incidents, as well as polls showing that many Trump supporters harbor prejudiced views of nonwhites, as evidence that many Trump backers are indeed deplorable.

At the Monday night rally, one protester held a sign that read "Deplorable Trump misleads good people."

Some here acknowledged that a small fraction of Trump backers could be seen as having deplorable views, but they added that every movement has a fringe.

"Some of them are, but I am a common-sense, logical person," said Joe Pruden, 26, a plumber from Asheville, whose girlfriend's weight was mocked by a protester.

He continued: "Trump supporters, they're on the defense, and I've been talking to other conservatives and saying, 'Hey, we need to start standing up, man.' We are done being bullied into a corner by these liberal, left-wing, progressive Nazi foot soldiers."

Kathy Campbell, 40, said Trump could avoid some of the criticism by more carefully choosing his words.

"Trump has a way about him that comes off sounding mean and hateful," said Campbell, who lives in North Carolina's Rutherford County and originally supported Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.). "I don't care for his tone sometimes because I think you catch more flies with honey."

Campbell likes that Trump would crack down on illegal **immigration** and the public aid undocumented workers receive. She said her children were on Medicaid for a total of 20 years and, as a single mother, she needed the assistance of food stamps for five years, even though she was working full time.

"The women who are sitting on their asses at home that can work, and they keep having baby after baby after baby just so they can keep getting more and more food stamps? They're abusing the system," Campbell said.

She added: "I'm a deplorable. Whatever. I'm also called narrow-minded. You know what? There is so much talk about tolerance. Where's the tolerance for me as a Christian? Where's the tolerance for me as a Republican? There's none."

This sentiment is common among conservatives here in North Carolina, where Republican lawmakers sparked a national backlash by enacting legislation that weakened anti-discrimination protections for gays and lesbians and that requires transgender people to use public restrooms that correspond to the gender on their birth certificates.

Shannon Niven, a 40-year-old nursing student and mother of two from Transylvania County, said Trump supporters like her are educated and accepting - but tired of having the values of others forced upon their lives. She said the debate over the rights of transgender people, who she believes have a "mental illness," shows how much society has changed in the past decade or two.

"Let a man come into the bathroom with my little girl, and he may not make it out," she said. "North Carolina - we're conservative, we're Christian, but we're also a little crazy, and we will defend ourselves."

The supporters and protesters who showed up to the rally had mostly made up their minds about the election, but each side tried to sway the other anyway. Brenda Lilly, a Clinton backer who teaches in Asheville, chatted with a young couple outside the event and tried to warn them about Trump.

"He is a racist. He's a racist. What makes you think that he's not?" Lilly said, giving a few examples, including Trump's proposed ban on Muslims.

"It's only temporary," the teenage girl, who will not be old enough to vote in November, said as she held a Trump flag over her head.

"Temporary! That's what they said about Jews in Germany," Lilly responded. "Please, read your history. I beg you."

Lilly also debated with Michelle Visconte, 47, who says Trump was right to label illegal **immigrants** as rapists and criminals.

"I dated Hispanic men all of my life, and now I'm just like, I'm done. I'm done," Visconte said. "Because you know what? They're here to bleed us and take advantage of whatever they can get."

"No, they're not," said Lilly, who lived in California for 27 years before recently returning to North Carolina. "Were all of your boyfriends rapists and criminals?"

"Not every one. I had a couple good ones," Visconte said.

"Were they all criminals?" Lilly asked.

"No," Visconte replied. "Wait a minute, wait a minute: Yes, they were criminals if they came over to the United States illegally. That's a criminal."

Conversations like this exasperated Lilly and confirmed what she had suspected.

"Quite frankly, I think 50 percent could be a small percentage," she said of the size of the "basket of deplorables." "These people are nuts. And I don't think they all are. I think there probably are some fine people."

After the rally, arguments between supporters and protesters continued. Two younger demonstrators got into a yelling match with an older man wearing a profane pro-Trump T-shirt; they all took videos of one another saying or doing unkind things. Friends intervened and a police officer begged, "Please, just be nice."

Later, as a young man wearing an "Obama can't ban these guns" tank top flexed his muscles for a photo, a young female protester threw a cup of water on him and ran away. As he pulled the wet shirt off, he yelled, "That f---ing b----!"

As the two sides exchanged nasty words, an older activist took the lead in denouncing the Trump backers, while a motherly woman leaving the rally urged the young men to go home before a fight broke out. She then turned to the gray-haired protester and asked why he was trying to incite a fight.

"They need to be called out," he said. "They need to be called out for their racism."

jenna.johnson@washpost.com

Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton holds wide leads among Latino voters in four battleground states and enjoys an edge on questions of temperament and who's best equipped to solve the nation's problems. But Donald Trump is not faring as poorly as some might think, amid doubts about Clinton's trustworthiness.

Clinton is far ahead among Latino voters in Arizona, Colorado, Florida and Nevada, with her biggest lead at 50 percentage points in Arizona and smallest in Florida, where she's ahead by 24 points, according to a new poll for Univision News by Bendixen & Amandi and the Tarrance Group.

Clinton's advantages over Trump among Latino voters are similar to President Obama's advantage over Republican Mitt Romney in 2012 in Nevada, Florida and Arizona, while her 45-point lead in Colorado is smaller than Obama's 52-point edge there four years ago.

The results underscore how Latino voters are poised to fuel Clinton's support in key battleground states where they make up a significant and growing share of the electorate. Turnout remains a critical question, and it is unclear whether this year's election will energize Hispanic Americans to vote at higher rates than in previous years, when fewer than half cast ballots.

The poll also measured support for Libertarian presidential candidate Gary Johnson and Green Party candidate Jill Stein. Johnson earned support from 5 or 6 percent of voters in each state, while Stein didn't earn more than 3 percent.

Roughly three-quarters of respondents say they're unlikely to change their minds before Election Day. Clinton is viewed as the most favorable among Latino voters in all four states, while even larger majorities there have negative views of Trump.

In recent weeks, Trump floated the idea of revamping his **immigration** strategy in a bid to revive his standing among Hispanics, who factor **immigration** policy into their support for a potential candidate but do not consider it their top issue of concern. Trump last month announced that he would give a major policy address and then delayed it several times before scheduling the speech on the same day as a trip to Mexico to meet with that country's president, Enrique Peña Nieto. But when he returned to the United States, he doubled down on his long-held **immigration** views, prompting a handful of prominent Hispanic business and religious leaders to cut ties to his campaign.

Trump is seen unfavorably by 81 percent of Hispanic voters in Colorado, 79 percent in Nevada, 78 percent in Arizona and 68 percent in Florida. At least 6 in 10 likely Hispanic voters in each state think Trump will continue making insensitive remarks despite his recently expressing regret for sometimes saying "the wrong thing."

But only 40 percent or fewer of the respondents in each state believe that as president he would deport all undocumented **immigrants** in the United States. In all but Nevada, a larger share of Hispanic voters believe that he would allow at least some undocumented **immigrants** to stay in the country.

The poll results contradict Trump's recent claims that he enjoys broad support among minority voters. On Monday, he told the National Guard Association conference in Baltimore that he is doing "amazingly well with African American and Hispanic workers." Just 5 percent of black voters support Trump, and 91 percent back Clinton, according to an average of August and September Post-ABC polling data.

Clinton, meanwhile, is widely favored in each state on the issue of who would do a better job improving the lives of Hispanics and is seen as being closer to most Hispanics' opinions on major issues. She leads Trump on questions of who is best prepared to handle the economy, terrorism and **immigration** reform; of who has the better temperament to serve as president; and, by a slightly narrower margin, of who is more honest and trustworthy.

But many Hispanics distrust Clinton, with more than 4 in 10 voters in each state saying she is a liar - including 49 percent in Nevada.

Other national polls show that Clinton is viewed unfavorably by a majority of all American voters. Her campaign has acknowledged that she must do more to present a more positive message and explain what she would do as president.

The Democrat earned swift condemnation from Republicans over the weekend for suggesting that half of Trump's supporters fit into a "basket of deplorables." Clinton later expressed regret for the remark, but she blasted Trump again for feuding with the family of a Muslim Army officer killed in Iraq, attacking the judgment of a Hispanic judge hearing two cases against him, and promoting the theory that Obama was not born in the United States.

The Univision poll finds a significant gender gap among Latino voters, with Clinton's support at least 10 points higher among women than men in Nevada, Florida and Colorado. In Florida, Clinton also wins 24 percent of self-identified Republicans, while Trump garners 59 percent.

Among Hispanics in all four states, the top issue remains jobs and the economy. **Immigration** reform ranks second, with education, health care and terrorism generally ranking lower.

With most of the focus squarely on Clinton and Trump, their running mates remain widely unrecognized by most Hispanics. Sen. Tim Kaine (D-Va.), the Democratic vice-presidential nominee, and his Republican counterpart, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, were unknown by more than 50 percent of Hispanics in Arizona, Colorado and Nevada. In Florida, 59 percent of respondents didn't recognize Kaine; 60 percent didn't recognize Pence.

A separate set of surveys released last week found Clinton with an even larger advantage over Trump among Hispanic voters in key states. The surveys, conducted by **immigration** reform advocate America's Voice and polling firm Latino Decisions, found Clinton leading by 56 percentage points in Nevada, 55 points in Colorado and 35 points in Florida, each wider than the new Univision poll. She held a 52-point edge in Arizona, similar in size to the Univision poll. Latino Decisions is also conducting polling of Hispanics for the Clinton campaign this year.

The Univision News surveys also examined the state's competitive U.S. Senate races - a growing concern for Democrats who believe the party is failing to capitalize on Clinton's commanding leads among Hispanics to the benefit of down-ballot candidates. In Colorado and Nevada, Democrats are hoping to hold on to their seats, while Republican incumbents are defending seats in Arizona and Florida against well-funded Democratic challengers.

In Florida, Republican Sen. Marco Rubio has a seven-point edge among Latinos, 46 percent to 39 percent, against Democratic Rep. Patrick Murphy. That's a far better performance among Hispanics for the Cuban American senator than Trump, his onetime presidential rival, who trails 24 points behind Clinton. Rubio earns a 52 percent favorability rating, while 42 percent express an unfavorable view; Murphy earns a 29 percent favorable mark, while 13 percent express an unfavorable opinion. Nearly 6 in 10 Hispanic voters said they didn't know enough about him to register an opinion.

In Arizona, Democratic Rep. Ann Kirkpatrick leads incumbent Republican Sen. John McCain among Hispanics, 50 percent to 35 percent. That's a much smaller edge than Clinton's 50-point margin over Trump and Obama's 49-point win among Arizona Latinos in 2012, making Kirkpatrick's challenge to McCain more difficult in a Republican-leaning state. When asked their overall opinion of the candidates, poll respondents gave McCain a 52 percent favorability rating and Kirkpatrick 36 percent. Four in 10 respondents did not recognize Kirkpatrick.

In Colorado, Sen. Michael F. Bennet (D) holds a comfortable lead over his GOP challenger, retired Air Force Lt. Col. Darryl Glenn, 65 percent to 19 percent, similar to Clinton's margin over Trump in the state.

In Nevada, former Democratic attorney general Catherine Cortez Masto leads Rep. Joseph J. Heck (R) 58 percent to 24 percent, a 34-point edge that is smaller than Clinton's 46-point lead in the state. But 38 percent of Hispanics don't know enough about Cortez Masto to register an opinion; 41 percent don't know enough about Heck.

Those results signal why outside liberal interest groups, including the Senate Majority PAC and Democracy for America, have begun airing several millions of dollars' worth of advertising for Masto in Nevada and Deborah Ross, the Democratic Senate challenger in North Carolina, who is hoping to unseat Sen. Richard Burr (R-N.C.). Similar campaigns are being prepared for other Democratic Senate candidates. In Florida, a group backed by the industrialist Koch brothers is airing Spanish-language advertising in support of Rubio.

The poll of 1,600 Hispanic registered voters - 400 in each state - was conducted Aug. 24 to Sept. 3 by Bendixen & Amandi International and the Tarrance Group. The poll has a margin of sampling error of plus or minus five percentage points in each state.

ed.okeefe@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Just because Donald Trump isn't qualified to be president - and just because much of his agenda is hateful and undesirable - doesn't mean that everything he says is automatically wrong. Some of his ideas deserve consideration and enactment. One of these is building a wall across our southern border with Mexico.

It has been ridiculed as a monstrosity and a colossal waste of money. The theory of the wall is that it keeps out low-wage workers and, thereby, raises the wages of U.S. workers, including earlier Hispanic arrivals. They are most vulnerable to additional Hispanic workers, because their skills generally overlap.

Just what a wall would cost is unknown. Guesses vary. Trump has said $8 billion. A detailed report by AllianceBernstein, a research firm, estimated between $15 billion and $25 billion. These sums seem (and are) large, but within a $4 trillion federal budget, they're modest.

The crucial question is: If we had a wall, what would we get for it? The answer: A wall probably represents our best chance of reaching broad agreement on **immigration** policy, a subject that has frustrated Congress and the two most recent presidents.

Let's be clear on one issue: Trump's insistence that Mexico pay for the wall is absurd. No self-respecting Mexican president would accept it. If one did, the wall would become a subject of endless bickering between the two countries as to who actually owned and controlled it. The fact that Trump made this so central to his proposal suggests that he's simply grandstanding.

Still, in the hands of someone serious, a wall could be a catalyst for a comprehensive overhaul of U.S. **immigration** policy. "It's hard to understand opposition [to a wall]," as my colleague Charles Krauthammer recently noted. "It's the most venerable and reliable way to keep people out." He argued correctly that the outlines of a deal have long been apparent. It would:

l Change legal **immigration** criteria to favor employability (a.k.a. skills) over family connections. The emphasis would be on stimulating the nation's economic growth.

l Require most businesses to belong to E-Verify, the government system that allows employers to check on the **immigrant** status of potential workers.

l Create a path to legality - and ultimately to citizenship - for the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** in the country.

l Embrace policies - including a wall - that would credibly and dramatically reduce illegal **immigration**.

Without a wall, it's doubtful that Republicans would enter meaningful negotiations on **immigration** policy - and without Republican participation, the stalemate would continue. In a recent Pew Research Center poll, 63 percent of Republicans and Republican-leaning voters supported a wall and only 34 percent opposed it. The distrust is deep. Republicans think Democrats don't truly care about stopping illegal **immigration**; they mainly want "amnesty" for existing undocumented **immigrants**. In the same Pew poll, 84 percent of Democrats and those who lean Democrat opposed a wall.

There are two standard objections to a wall - both true but politically irrelevant. The first is that it might have once been justified but isn't now because the inflow of undocumented Mexican **immigrants** is slowing and maybe reversing. Mexico's birthrate - which affects its labor force - has declined, and its economy has improved. It can more easily absorb new workers. A 2015 Pew study found that the number of undocumented Mexicans in the United States had dropped by 140,000 between 2009 and 2014.

But this is a net figure: people entering minus people leaving. There are still hundreds of thousands of Mexicans and Latinos trying to cross the southern border illegally every year. A wall would make this harder and reinforce the natural trend. Some people wouldn't try to enter; of those who did, fewer would make it. Tragedies - dying in the desert, being exploited by "coyotes" - would decline.

The second objection is that the southern border isn't the only way people become illegal **immigrants**. Many arrive legally and overstay their visas. Indeed, according to a study in the Journal on Migration and Human Security, these **immigrants** now outnumber those breaching the southern border. But if E-Verify were widely adopted, these **immigrants** would have a harder time getting work.

If we could buy an **immigration** bargain for $25 billion, or even a bit more, it would be a fabulous deal. That's the opportunity facing the next president. But we won't make it any easier by stigmatizing the one change - a wall - that could be the foundation for compromise.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The symbolism was obvious: A rich presidential candidate turns a mothballed government relic into a palatial hotel steps away from the White House. But for Donald Trump, not one for subtlety, even that wasn't enough. It had to be "one of the great hotels of the world."

When Trump International Hotel Washington, D.C. hosted its soft opening Monday, it capped the transformation of a century-old post office building into one of Washington's most expensive and ostentatious new hotels - and a monument to Trump.

But its main draw, the gilded name out front, might also be its biggest obstacle. What began as merely a prominent real estate project has morphed into a political landmark, where polarizing ties to the blustery mogul could influence its business through November and beyond.

Trump and his surrogate, former New York City mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani, visited the hotel Monday as workers rushed to cut stone and apply mortar in preparation of the afternoon's soft opening, tweeting a picture thanking "all of the tremendous men & women for their hard work!"

At the same time, two dozen protesters amassed outside the hotel's soaring arches with signs declaring, "**Immigrants** & Muslims are welcome here - Trump hotel is NOT!" Yasmina Mrabet, of the advocacy group Act Now to Stop War and End Racism, said the hotel marked another example of what the "billionaire class represents, which is the reaping of profits at the expense of hardworking people."

Some rough edges were on display when guests were first let in Monday afternoon, including construction crews out back, loose wiring poking through the lobby carpet, and confusion about when certain entrances would open to the public.

Among the first guests allowed in were Blake and Elanie Yturralde, who were in town for business from Boca Raton, Fla., and enjoying complimentary drinks on a lobby couch.

"We like to stay at fine hotels around the world. We've stayed at other Trump properties and they are always really nicely done," Blake Yturralde said. They said they appreciated Trump's attention to detail and planned to vote for him in November. "It's that businessman's sensibility," he added.

Trump has pointed to the project as a symbol of his ability to lead a global superpower. And, indeed, the hotel reflects many of the contradictions at the heart of Trump's campaign: a 1 percenter fortress built alongside a populist campaign by a self-described billionaire, whose blue-collar rallygoers couldn't afford a spoon of wine at his newest high-class masterwork.

While Trump was shouting across middle America that Mexicans were drug-smuggling rapists, Hispanic men were building his luxury hotel for him on one of the national capital's ritziest blocks.

Before Monday's opening, Trump's campaign comments about Mexican **immigrants** drew a rebuke from Mayor Muriel E. Bowser (D), set off angry sidewalk protests and prompted the exodus of celebrity chefs José Andrés and Geoffrey Zakarian, whom the Trumps have since sued.

Should that pattern continue, it could be a problem for the ultimate success of the hotel, one analyst said.

"If he remains high-profile and a thorn in the side of the political elite, and on television the way he has been, I think that's a problem," said David Loeb, managing director at the investment giant Robert W. Baird & Co. "A lot of this is about the Trump brand and what the Trump brand represents, and when you damage that, it's hard to go back."

The $212 million ultraluxury hotel boasts many of Trump's signature extravagances: $1,000-a-night rooms, gold-encrusted bathrooms and Washington's largest suite - called, of course, the Trump Townhouse. A crystal-chandelier bar in the nine-story atrium serves wine by the spoon and offers daily champagne saberings, in which bottles are opened by sword.

The 263-room giant's formal grand opening is scheduled for next month, just days before the election. But its most pivotal moment probably won't come until Inauguration Day, when either a newly elected President Trump parades past the gleaming Pennsylvania Avenue icon - or a President Hillary Clinton strides by the newest showpiece of her vanquished foe's empire. During inauguration weekend, a night in the Trump Townhouse costs $100,000, with a five-night minimum.

"This building is a national treasure," said Ivanka Trump, Trump's daughter and a company executive leading the project. "It is a great honor and privilege to begin an exciting new chapter in its storied history after having transformed it into one of the finest hotels in the country."

Rooms start at an average of $895 a night, a company spokesman said, pricier even than the Four Seasons in Georgetown - some of the highest rates in the city, and critics have charged that the rates could hurt the hotel's chances to attract enough guests and stay afloat.

Those price tags are far loftier than some of the Trumps' early projections. When a Washington Post columnist calculated in 2012 that the hotel would need to charge $750 a night to cover its costs, Ivanka Trump called those numbers "pure speculation and, simply put, wrong." Trump representatives now say the prices are more expensive than first estimated because of higher-than-expected demand.

"There are people in the world who are looking for super luxury - the nicest hotel - of a kind D.C. does not presently have," said Loeb, the analyst.

Completed in 1899, the Old Post Office Pavilion is one of the capital's tallest and most historic buildings, a glimpse of vintage Washington tucked within the drab government boxes of the Federal Triangle.

A failed government push to demolish the underused building in the 1970s stirred outrage and sparked the District's historic preservation movement. But after a series of disastrous redevelopment efforts, fed-up members of Congress pushed authorities to open the site to private developers.

General Services Administration officials awarded Trump's company the 60-year lease in 2012, swayed by his pledge to spend more than $200 million to painstakingly restore the 117-year-old masterpiece - and pay $3 million a year in rent. In doing so, the company beat out Hilton Worldwide and Marriott International, both hospitality giants headquartered in the D.C. suburbs.

The Trumps broke ground in 2014 at a ceremony filled with local Democrats wielding golden shovels, and the project opened two years before the contract's deadline, leading Trump to take a familiar victory lap.

At a March news conference in the hotel's lobby, Trump said, "It's a great thing for the country, it's a great thing for Washington."

Trump has often cited the hotel on the campaign trail as an example of how he'll run the country, with accomplishments ahead of schedule and under budget. In recent weeks, hotel laborers have worked nearly around the clock, cutting stone for the ballroom's sweeping entryway.

But the hotel's development has routinely presented an awkward counterpoint to Trump's fiery campaign rhetoric. Trump's hired architect, Egypt native Hani Hassan, stuck with the project through the **immigration** controversy. The hotel's general manager, France native Mickael Damelincourt, is shepherding his third Trump property.

Damelincourt said he was confident that all 150 rooms made available in the first week would be booked. He said he already has more total business booked in the District than he had in the first six months of Trump's luxury hotel in Chicago, including a dozen weddings.

The controversies might have even helped business, he said: "I don't have to work as hard to let everybody know about the hotel."

The hotel has kept its Romanesque Revival design, including the iconic clock tower housing the Bells of Congress. But the inside appears dramatically new, with a ritzy bar and lounge, a BLT Prime steakhouse and an Ivanka Trump-brand spa. For shopping, the hotel offers a boutique by Italian men's fashion house Brioni, which sells $395 cotton T-shirts and suits starting at $6,000; Trump is a known customer.

The former postmaster general's office in the building was remodeled into a 4,000-square-foot, $15,000-a-night Presidential Suite, with a fireplace and marble "hand-selected from an Italian quarry" - a selling point carried over from Trump Tower. The 6,300-square-foot Trump Townhouse offers a private office and exclusive Pennsylvania Avenue entryway for $20,000 a night.

The hotel has also advertised that its 13,200-square-foot Presidential Ballroom is the "largest luxury ballroom in D.C." - seven hotels offer larger ballrooms in Washington, though the company argues they don't stand on the same level of luxury.

Former GSA officials said the government did its job in awarding the project to the best proposal. But they worry that Trump's political campaign could turn away the deep-pocketed guests, diners and corporate bookers needed to turn a profit.

"As an American I would like to see the building succeed," said Dan Tangherlini, the former GSA administrator who oversaw lease negotiations. "It would be a disappointment if this endeavor fails because of one person's views. However, I do think there will be some impact on the project because of this decision to run for political office."

Robert Peck, the former GSA public buildings commissioner who informed the Trumps of their selection, said he believed the hotel would have no trouble drawing high-end customers due to its "pretty spectacular" location. He will not be among them, though. He said he wouldn't give Trump "a penny from his personal account."

To cover the massive remodeling, the Trump Organization invested $42 million and took out a $170 million loan from Deutsche Bank. Trump's company has also applied for a federal historic-preservation tax credit that would cover about 20 percent of the rehabilitation, or roughly $40 million.

To save money, the Trumps have also pushed for lower taxes at a hotel portrayed as the peak of opulence. District officials agreed last year to trim the property's tax assessment by $7 million, to $91 million. But Trump sued after an appeals board rejected another attempt to lower the bill even further.

In a legal complaint filed in D.C. Superior Court, Trump attorney William Bosch said the District's tax assessments were "unreasonable" and "discriminatory" against Trump's company. Bosch called the lawsuit "a routine and customary practice that thousands of property owners ... have used to ensure that their tax assessments are fairly established."

The opening is bittersweet for the District's congressional delegate, Eleanor Holmes Norton, a Democrat who pushed the government for years to redevelop the property.

"The Trump name we've come to grips with, and I think Ivanka Trump recognizes it's not in their best interest to have politics and business intersect," Norton said. "It doesn't benefit them for this hotel to become a lightning rod."

As for when she'll be able to enjoy the hotel? She laughed and said, "I'll never be able to afford to stay at the Trump hotel."

jonathan.oconnell@washpost.com

drew.harwell@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**TAMPA - Farooq Mitha's friends, seated in a tight circle at a mosque here on a recent evening, told it to him straight.

"This would be the easiest election to take Muslims for granted," said Mohammad Mubarak, a lawyer, as several of the other Muslim American political activists nodded.

The prospect of a Donald Trump presidency may frighten plenty of Muslim voters, the group told Mitha, but Hillary Clinton isn't particularly popular, either. In the Democratic primaries, many Muslim voters backed Bernie Sanders. Clinton was too hawkish for them - and may still be even if she earns their votes.

And then there are voters such as Oz Sultan, a counterterrorism analyst and commentator in New York who calls himself "a lifelong conservative."

"I don't think Hillary Clinton has the ability to keep our country safe," he said Wednesday from his home in Harlem, after watching Trump speak at a national security forum. Sultan's biggest concern is the Islamic State, and Clinton "has gone on a destabilizing spree," he said, noting the Obama administration's military offensive in Libya.

Registered Muslim American voters are a starkly diverse and growing constituency, and Mitha, 34, who was named Clinton's Muslim outreach director last month, is trying to woo them all.

Back in this Gulf Coast city where he grew up, he expected a tough crowd. He already had held roundtable discussions in Michigan, Ohio and Virginia, and he knew that some Muslims in his home town viewed Clinton as too right-wing or centrist on issues of domestic spying and Middle East policy.

His counter: "I don't think a presidential campaign has ever hired anyone to do Muslim outreach," Mitha told his friends. The campaign has looked at the numbers and embarked on an unprecedented outreach to a voting bloc that has the potential to decide elections in several swing states, where support for Clinton has been ticking downward since the Democratic National Convention.

Take Florida, where Clinton remains locked in a tight race with Trump. In a state where the 2000 presidential election was decided by a 537-vote margin for George W. Bush, there are about 180,000 registered voters who are Muslim, Arab and South Asian, the civic nonprofit group Emerge USA estimates.

Two years ago, Muslims made up just under 1 percent of the U.S. population, according to the Pew Research Center's 2014 Religious Landscape Study. But the population is growing; Emerge USA, which collects data on Muslim voters and has a political action committee to support candidates, puts the number at closer to 2 percent of the population.

Florida, Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Virginia "alone add up to almost 1 million Muslim voters," said Khurrum Wahid, a Miami-based lawyer and the organization's founder. "With a decent voter turnout in those states, Muslims will be the swing vote in both the presidential and many close House races."

Most Muslim Americans now lean Democratic, according to the Pew study. In past decades, many were fiscally conservative, profamily and eager to see their cities get tough on crime. Surveys conducted by the Council on American-Islamic Relations (CAIR) and the American Muslim Alliance in the aftermath of Bush's 2000 election found that between 72 percent and 80 percent of Muslims polled said that they had voted for him. But after the attacks of Sept. 11, 2001, and Bush's rhetoric on religion and the decision to invade Iraq and Afghanistan, the majority began voting Democratic.

At the same time, Muslims are generally less politically active than the larger American population; only 62 percent of those who were U.S. citizens were certain that they were registered to vote, compared with 74 percent of adult U.S. citizens overall, according to Pew.

To reach those voters, the Clinton campaign has appointed two state-level Muslim outreach coordinators to work with Mitha, and the campaign also has dispatched Rep. Keith Ellison (D-Minn.), the first Muslim elected to Congress, and Huma Abedin, Clinton's close adviser and deputy campaign manager, to key swing states across the country.

Ellison estimates that he has met with at least 10 Muslim groups since the July convention. One recent Monday morning, he showed up in a tiny Orlando doctor's office where the campaign was holding its kickoff phone bank for Muslim volunteers and rattled off reasons Muslims should vote for Clinton.

She has fought for children's rights, he said. She stood up for Abedin when the Trump campaign attacked her. And she has gone out of her way to meet with Muslims, Ellison said, stopping in his home district of Minneapolis to meet with Somali American community leaders.

"The Clinton campaign is more inclusive of the Muslim community than any presidential campaign that I've ever seen," he told the group of phone bank volunteers that included doctors, lawyers, college students, Palestinian Americans, Guyanese Americans, Kenyan Americans and others.

Sheer diversity

One of Clinton's challenges is the population's sheer diversity. Nearly a third of all Muslim Americans are black, according to Pew, some of them with deep roots in a distinctly American sect, the Nation of Islam. About 8 in 10 Muslim Americans are **immigrants** or the children of **immigrants**. Muslim Americans come from different ethnic, linguistic and cultural backgrounds; span the economic spectrum; and have policy opinions and priorities that can be just as divergent, community leaders say.

Some, like Sultan, are even likely to vote for Trump, who has called for a ban on Muslim **immigrants** and surveillance of mosques.

"I know, personally, three doctors" who are voting for him, Azhar Subedar, an Islamic scholar, told Mitha in Tampa.

The Trump campaign did not respond to questions about whether it is trying to attract Muslim voters or considers the constituency a potential tipping point in any swing states.

This cycle, get-out-the-vote efforts are surging in Muslim communities. The Clinton campaign, Emerge USA, the Washington-based Arab American Institute, CAIR and a variety of smaller, local organizations, including mosques, have held voter registration drives, candidate forums and phone banks.

The most common arguments for Clinton offered by her Muslim advocates tend to revolve around Trump.

"Obviously, this election has a sense of urgency that we haven't felt before," said Muna Jondy, a Syrian American activist and lawyer from Flint, Mich. "Because it's not just an option between a Republican and a Democrat. It's between a fascist and another person."

"Never before in the history of America has a major party had someone who was screaming bigotry into a megaphone," Ellison told the phone bank volunteers in Orlando. "No Muslim can sit around and let this happen."

The Trump factor "doesn't work with everyone," said James Zogby, the president of the Arab American Institute, who served as a campaign adviser to Sanders.

Support for Sanders among Muslim voters was "huge," said Ellison, who also backed Sanders. A Muslims for Bernie 2016 Facebook page, with 7,523 likes, still exists. A Muslims for Hillary 2016 Facebook group has 820 members. Muslims for Trump has 428.

Sanders's supporters say that, unlike Clinton, the senator from Vermont spoke out about key Muslim voter concerns, such as the Israeli occupation of Palestinian territory.

"It was an issue that always existed in our community," said Nuren Haider, 31, who is running for Orange County commissioner in Florida. "But he brought it to the limelight," said Mohammad Shair, a 23-year-old Florida law student who now plans to vote for Green Party candidate Jill Stein.

Ellison tries to remind the disenchanted Muslims who supported Sanders that Clinton has done a lot of good. He tells them that she regrets her vote in favor of the Iraq War - and that there are congressional votes he regrets, too.

"I also tell them: 'There's going to be a president, and it's not going to be one of these third-party candidates. It's going to be the Democrat or the Republican. ... So understand the clear and present danger presented by the alternative,' " he said.

'We've been burned before '

That binary choice makes some Muslim voters "feel like they have no choice," Amina Spahic, the Tampa Bay regional director for Emerge, told Mitha and the others who gathered at the mosque in Tampa.

Mubarak, the Tampa lawyer, said he regretted his votes for President Obama and what he considers the administration's hawkish drone policy and increased federal surveillance of Muslims. He wants to believe that Clinton would be different. But "the problem is we've been burned before so many times," he said, "and frankly we're tired of it."

To those voters, Clinton's statements on the issues provide little reassurance.

The campaign website's explanation of her stance on combating terrorism starts with the words "radical jihadists" - a term that some Muslim activists say stigmatizes Islam. Her national security page makes prominent reference to "protecting Israel" but no similar reference to Palestinians and Syrians, which some voters say they'd like to see. In a March speech to the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, a lobbying group that aligns with the Israeli right and is opposed by many liberal American Jews, she twice referred to "Palestinian terrorists."

Ghazala Salam, a Clinton delegate at the Democratic National Convention in July who chairs the American Muslim Democratic Caucus in Florida, said the former secretary of state is simply the most qualified to do the job. Whether you like all of her policies or not, Salam said, she knows how to deal with the outside world.

Skeptical Muslim voters are "coming around," she said, and what they do next will be critical to the future of Muslim participation in U.S. politics.

Had Muslims been more politically engaged before the 2016 campaign, "we would have not really heard a person like Trump come out and say openly the things he did about Muslims," Salam said. "For it not to happen again, we have to have proactive engagement in every level of government."

abigail.hauslohner@washpost.com

Emily Guskin and Jenna Johnson in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**NEW YORK - For Fashion Week, Tommy Hilfiger constructed a carnival that was open to the public. Rebecca Minkoff shut down part of SoHo's Greene Street and gave passersby a chance to see what fashion's inner circle has long been privy to. Tracy Reese showed her collection to friends and friends-of-friends at New York Marble Cemetery.

Jason Wu had his models winding through a series of offices filled with mid-century-modern furniture, the aisles so narrow that the glorious, fluorescent floral-embroidered gowns almost brushed your knees as they passed. And designers Carol Lim and Humberto Leon presented their Opening Ceremony collection against the backdrop of a Model U.N./Miss America pageant extravaganza starring the likes of Whoopi Goldberg and Natasha Lyonne.

Every designer here seems to be trying to find a way to speak directly and intimately to the consumer. What do shoppers want? What do women want? Some designers are trying to speak to the logistics of consumption. Others are grappling with bigger concerns, such as the role fashion plays in the midst of fractured politics, social upheaval and debates about our ability to be inclusive - not just in fashion but in the broader cultural dialogue.

In short, fashion is having a crisis of communication, one that is terribly familiar: How do we talk to one another? The first few days of Fashion Week have been a bit like the Tower of Babel. Everyone is speaking with their own distinct vocabulary. No singular message is coming through.

For example, which season is on the runway? It depends on who the designer is.

Minkoff sent her fall 2016 collection down an outdoor runway on a day that was so hot and steamy that just the action of breathing was enough to make you break into a dripping sweat. The models were dressed in wool overcoats trimmed in fur, leather jackets emblazoned with slogans about love and peace, cozy sweaters and a thin layer of perspiration. Hilfiger put his collaboration with model Gigi Hadid - a collection featuring leather jackets with military flourishes, cable-knit sweaters with giant logos and wool capelets - on his carnival midway. It was also part of the see-now-buy-now craze, which is splendid news for customers motivated to buy cable-knit sweaters and fleece hoodies on a night so humid that one could actually see the air. But pity the models who had to strut from one end of Pier 16 at the South Street Seaport to the other. Hiking the Sahara might have been more comfortable.

Is this what the consumer wants? After Minkoff's first in-season show six months ago, the company reported having one of its biggest sales days ever. So who knows what might end up on the runway this September: Cotton shirting or cashmere sweaters? Slip dresses or fur-trimmed overcoats?

In some ways, designers are not simply looking to make a quick sale, wonderful as that might be. They're also attempting to build a relationship with customers. They are aiming to create a sense of empathy and goodwill, emotions that would, perhaps, sustain them through tough times.

At Diane von Furstenberg, where female power and independence have always been subtexts, there was a new energy sparked by the arrival of Jonathan Saunders, the brand's first chief creative officer. He has brought a renewed vigor to the house, retaining its signature bold femininity with colorful botanical prints and antique kimono patterns but giving the collection a jolt of sleek tailoring and a bit more of a modern, urban edge with dresses covered in micro paillettes that look like liquid silver.

It's a collection that aims to appeal to a wide range of women, not just on matters of aesthetics but on pocketbook issues, too. "We're at a much more democratic price point," Saunders says. "And that relates to Diane's values. She is a very modern woman." And modern women do not want to have to pay thousands of dollars to get a dress that fits well, looks good and makes them smile.

As designers think about the demands in a woman's life, they are also, by default, contemplating our current politics. They have been inspired to strive for clothes that speak to a more accomplished woman, a more diverse group of women and a generation of women who embrace fashion not just as clothes but as a tool for social change.

At Opening Ceremony, "Portlandia" stars Fred Armisen and Carrie Brownstein emceed a long, long evening that combined a runway show with a wry civics class about the importance of voting, **immigration** reform, Syrian **refugees**, LGBT rights and gender equality. It was alternately entertaining, thoughtful and ponderous - an earnest attempt to use the excitement surrounding fashion as an opening to address the serious issues of the day. Fashion and politics are an unlikely couple, but both are about "the ability to express one's identity freely," said the designers in their show notes.

A similar philosophy underscored the Hood by Air show, a bawdy display of ideas, attitude and subversive theatrics, all daring the observers to not judge but simply accept.

The collection was filled with oversize trousers and jackets, with shirts - folded neatly and still in their just-purchased sterility - displayed rather than worn. The models wore double-footed cowboy boots - the toes pointed in both directions so that the wearer looked like he was walking, or in many cases, skidding, in two directions at once.

Those shoes were a metaphor of sorts for fashion - for a lot of things. Which way are we going? Backward or forward? Or are we simply paralyzed by indecision - tripping over our own feet?

Fashion is trying to have a conversation. And now, more than ever, it seems ready to talk to anyone willing to listen.

robin.givhan@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**BARROW, ALASKA - Here in the northernmost municipality of the United States, 320 miles above the Arctic Circle, people are facing the idea that they may soon be among the world's first climate-change **refugees**.

Warming air, melting permafrost and rising sea levels are threatening their coastline, and researchers predict that by midcentury, the homes, schools and land around Barrow and its eight surrounding villages will be underwater. This despite decades of erecting barriers, dredging soil and building berms to hold back the water.

"The coastline is backing up at rates of [30 to 65 feet] per year," says Robert Anderson, a University of Boulder geomorphologist who has studied Alaska's landscape evolution since 1985 and who first noticed in the early 2000s how alarming the erosion was becoming. "It's baffling."

When the sea ice melts, the coast becomes exposed to waves, wind and storms that slam into the shore, causing erosion. As ice moves farther from shore, waves can be as high as 20 feet when they reach land, Anderson says.

"The only thing we can do, as far as I'm concerned, is move our towns inland," says Mike Aamodt, the former acting mayor of Barrow and its surrounding villages of the North Slope Borough, which stretches over 89,000 square miles, an area larger than Utah.

Pointing out a window in his second-floor office, Aamodt isn't joking when he declares that the sole **refuge** from erosion and rising seas is the Brooks mountain range - more than 250 miles south.

Barrow, with a population of just over 4,000, is as remote as it gets. There are no roads leading in, and it's accessible only by air and, during the summer months, by sea. There's a post office, a police station, a fire station and a high school with an indoor track and a swimming pool for its 200 students, plus a rec center, a 14-bed hospital, a few churches and a handful of mom-and-pop restaurants. There's no movie theater for 1,000 miles, no bars (or legal alcohol sales), no nightlife to speak of.

There are oil fields 200 miles to the east in Prudhoe Bay, but aside from a few corporate logos on buildings, there's no sign of Big Oil in town. Most visitors come here to experience the stark beauty and power of nature - seas so iced-over in winter that you can walk on them for miles, tundra brown and green in summer, and the stunning variety of animals, including whales, seals, caribou, polar bears and walrus.

Scientists flock here to study climate change. Low temperatures average nearly 20 degrees below zero in winter; summer highs are mostly in the 40s, though it reached 79 once in 1993. Locals - and hard data - say there's less snow and ice now than ever before.

The area has long been home to Inupiaq natives who have lived off the abundant marine life. Modern Barrow was built on commercial whaling in the late 1800s, but there's evidence of indigenous settlements going back as far as 800 A.D. The giant bowhead whales native to this part of the Arctic are actually prospering with warming seas here. But it's a different question for the humans.

A stroll along one of Barrow's handful of roads shows just how tenuous civilization's perch is. Bulldozed mounds of sand and soil more than 20 feet high are all around town. But these sea walls are frequently penetrated as swells and storms overtop the walls, sometimes sending houses, built on stilts because of the impenetrability of permafrost, floating inland for miles.

With ocean to the north and half a dozen major lagoons and lakes to the south and east, Barrow's residents face danger on all sides. Yet the biggest worry may be from the ground itself.

"Sometimes I have that eerie feeling - I'm, like, 'Oh gosh, we're on the permafrost,'" says Diana Martin, a Barrow-born Inupiaq who works in the town's museum, over a bowl of caribou soup at her sister's home about a mile from the coast. "What if we start floating away?"

Science backs up her concern: This year is on pace to be the hottest on record.

As air and sea temperatures have notched up, there has been a warming of the permafrost, the thousands-of-years-old subsurface layer of frozen soil, rocks and water. That layer can be as much as 2,000 feet deep in parts of this area.

Gary Clow, a U.S. Geological Survey geophysicist who has spent 30 years measuring temperature here, says permafrost has warmed about five degrees since 1990. That makes soil soften, rise and shift, which Aamodt says affects everything that has been built on it: utility systems, roads, airports.

It's a change Aamodt fears: If fuel dumps or sewage lines leak into freshwater sources, major pollution ensues. With hundreds of miles of coast not many feet above sea level, the potential impact on health and lives is great.

When cyclones came through in 2000 and 2004, knocking out Barrow's power supply, the result was flooded and contaminated drinking water. States of emergency are common occurrences here, and given the rising seas and coastal erosion, every year brings the threat of a storm that could wipe the town off the map, Aamodt says.

Barrow's climate-change problem has been years in the making, says Anne Jensen, an ethnographic archaeologist who arrived in Barrow in 1983 and has been excavating some of the earliest human settlements found in this frigid area.

The increasing floods and erosion have made her job a scramble against nature. By the time she secures funding and gets ready to enlarge a dig, a site that is often now at water's edge, surging oceans washes everything away. It's a frustrating way to make a living, she says. "The entire north coast of the North Slope - most of the sites are already gone. We have a big knowledge gap up there."

Faced with what they see as the inevitable, some people have begun relocating inland. Aamodt has moved his hunting cabin six times since the 1970s. When we speak, he shakes his head, wishing that it would be as easy and affordable to pick up and move Barrow and its neighboring communities.

Moving any one of these towns, though, would require more resources than the state or federal government would be willing to provide, he says. Relocation is already being planned in other parts of Alaska, including one town 400 miles south of here on the Bering Sea. And although President Obama has earmarked hundreds of millions of dollars to help communities facing the impact of the changing climate, that won't be enough, Aamodt says.

At $403 million, the Borough's annual budget - much of it funded by a tax on oil and gas development in Prudhoe Bay - sounds enormous, but it's only enough to keep these far-flung hamlets going in their harsh environment.

One of Barrow's nearby villages, Point Lay, "is [a mere] 400 people, 40 houses, big buildings, an underground utility system, pipes," he says. But it's "probably $500 million to move that town. Then we have Wainwright: We need to move that town, too. It's on a bluff right against the ocean. That's 700 people, so I imagine $700 [million] to $800 million."

Aamodt takes off his glasses, then stares out the window toward the sea, quite calm on this afternoon. There's no magic rescue, he says. There's not even a Coast Guard outpost here should watery disaster strike: The closest is 1,000 miles away. Locals, known for extreme self-reliance, feel as if they are being left on their own to face a future as **refugees** from climate change.

Can these towns be saved? Aamodt fidgets in his seat, looking down. "It's fruitless to even think about it," he replies. "Our turn is coming. That could happen this year. It's inevitable."

health-science@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A reservation at the new Trump International Hotel in the nation's capital will carry lots of baggage this fall - and not just the kind you would need to haul around the $700 (at least) a night it is going to cost to stay at the swish new place.

Emotionally and politically, the hotel that bears Donald Trump's name and opened Monday inside the Old Post Office Pavilion is already sparking fireworks. And protests right in front of the place.

Stay at a Marriott. Book a Hyatt. So what? But consider a reservation at a Trump place - Hotels.com has the D.C. property just down the street from the White House on Pennsylvania Avenue at $761 for Saturday night - and it gets all kinds of complicated. Endorse the Republican presidential nominee's hotel?

"Never. Nope. Not a chance," said Becky Acton, who raised her middle finger at the place as she biked by Sunday night, on the eve of its soft opening. "I would never stay there. No matter what it costs."

What about its bar, where wine is sold by the spoon? Or the daily Champagne sabering, where bottles are opened by sword?

"No interest," she said.

Acton is visiting the District from Columbia, Mo. And she stopped to gape at the Trump hotel as construction workers - many of them Latinos who have been on the receiving end of Trump's slurs against **immigrants** - rushed around in the dark, tile saws screaming when they cut marble outside the front doors in the final, frantic preparations.

She shook her head as she pedaled away.

The Klyder family had a different take.

"It's beautiful, like a castle," said Emily Klyder, 11, as she photobombed her mom's numerous pictures of the hotel Sunday night.

The hotel, for them, is a symbol of what Trump can do for America - bring jobs, glamour and decadent elegance to a mothballed government building.

The family, in town from Gaylord, Mich., said they opted for a cheaper place outside the District on their trip to see the sights.

But once they saw the Trump hotel, they rethought everything, despite the crazy expensive room rates.

"I might spend that, to make a statement," said John Klyder, a hotel owner who said he is voting for Donald Trump in the November election.

"He's better than the alternative," said his wife, Christa Klyder.

Of course, they did not know about all of the controversy already surrounding the palatial, Romanesque Revival landmark, with a bell tower that is one of the tallest structures in the capital.

Trump is suing the city over the tax bill for the building, which he does not want to pay. (Now there's a surprise.) He and the two chefs who pulled out of their opening restaurants at the hotel because of Trump's ugly rhetoric on **immigrants** are suing and countersuing one another. And a free-speech advocacy group is suing the District because a valet traffic-pattern exception that the city allowed for the hotel may also give Trump staff members license to curb protesters on Pennsylvania Avenue, which is America's boulevard, according to my colleague Colbert King.

The hotel is full of baggage. Which is the business-as-usual part of the Trump empire that some folks often forget.

But not Pedro Olaniyan. The 62-year-old **immigrant** from Nigeria was somber as he took pictures of the hotel on its final night of construction.

"This man, Trump. He says he wants to make America great again. He says, 'We've got to take our country back.' From whom?" said Olaniyan, who left Nigeria more than 30 years ago. "This country has been great to me. What does he mean?"

Olaniyan's oldest son was a linebacker on UCLA's football team. Full ride.

His daughter is getting her PhD at Temple University.

And his younger son just got a scholarship to the University of Connecticut.

He has worked as a night security guard in downtown Washington for more than 20 years. His longtime co-worker is a Muslim who never fails to say "Merry Christmas" to him.

He does not see the problems with America that Trump sees. And looking at the Trump hotel construction, day after day, with that giant sign - Trump 2016 - has been difficult for him to watch.

"I don't hate [Trump] as a person," Olaniyan said. "I hate what comes out of his mouth."

Would he stay there, even if he got a free night?

"Never," he said.

Same for a homeless woman who was going from bench to bench Sunday, looking for a place to bed down for the night. She would not consider staying there, either.

"Not in his place," she said.

Other #NeverTrumpers who passed by said the place looked nicer than they had expected.

"It doesn't look like some of his other places," one woman said, who said she would consider staying at the posh hotel after the election. Then she clarified: "After he loses."

petula.dvorak@washpost.com

Twitter: @petulad

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**WOODS HOLE, Mass. - The air at the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution was thick with the tang of salt water as nearby Buzzards Bay glittered. This was late summer on Cape Cod - our ocean world at its most inviting.

But inside a bay-view conference center, 80 scientists were conjuring up very different ocean worlds: the distant moons Europa and Enceladus, whose icy surfaces conceal watery interiors, and the seething cracks at the bottoms of our own seas that are home to organisms as **alien** to humans as anything in outer space.

These forbidding places could hold the keys to the origins of life. Scientists believe life on Earth first evolved underwater. If life exists elsewhere in our solar system, it's probably in an ocean as well.

Yet for decades, astronomers and oceanographers have been separately studying their respective ocean worlds without much contact.

Last month, in a rare union of two very different scientific communities, the Ocean Worlds meeting brought ocean and space explorers together. Their goal: guiding the search for life beneath **alien** seas.

The man responsible for the conference is geologist Chris German. Last fall, he attended a National Geographic Society planetary sciences meeting to discuss exploration of ocean worlds beyond Earth - and quickly realized he was one of the few scientists there who had actually been to sea.

Further piquing his interest, the most recent NASA appropriations bill instructed the space agency to establish an "Ocean Worlds Exploration Program." The mandate meant NASA would be spending money on the technology needed to find life in remote oceans - tools that could also be useful for oceanographers' work on Earth.

"There could be a beautiful convergence in breakthroughs in ocean science and space science," German said. "We just have to get them together in the same room."

About half the scientists at Woods Hole were oceanographers and the other half studied space, with a smattering of engineers and computer scientists.

"Probably no one in this room will get to see the real fruition of this meeting," German said in kicking off the conference. Finding life in a foreign ocean is like the generations-long project of building a medieval cathedral, he continued: "The grandparents lay the foundation, the grandchildren build the steeple. The people who lay the cornerstones never get to worship inside."

The foundation of ocean world exploration is understanding deep-sea life on Earth. In 1977, hydrothermal vent systems were discovered by the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution's submersible Alvin. The discovery fundamentally changed how scientists defined the parameters for life. Before then, it was assumed that living communities needed sunlight to survive. Yet here were scores of strange creatures - bacterial mats, two-foot-long tube worms, eyeless shrimp - thriving in total darkness.

Colleen Cavanaugh, a graduate student working at Woods Hole at the time, came up with an explanation: chemosynthesis. Undersea microbes can harness the energy from chemicals to produce their own food, much as more familiar organisms use photosynthesis to harness the energy of the sun.

In the past four decades, scientists using Alvin and remotely operated submersibles have explored scores of other deep ocean systems, each completely different from life as we know it - and from one another. German estimates that a new species has been found in one of these systems at a rate of roughly two per month over the past 40 years.

"They are out there in the bazillions in our oceans, and we still have a very rudimentary understanding of what they are doing," said Julie Huber, a scientist at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole.

Strange creatures have been found in other unlikely places. In 2013, a team led by Montana State University polar microbiologist John Priscu drilled into a subglacial Antarctic lake and uncovered thousands of tiny organisms dwelling in total darkness. Like their deep-sea counterparts, the Antarctic microbes made their living off minerals dissolved in the water - which hinted at the potential for life beneath extraterrestrial ice.

"You'd be in denial, I think, to believe there isn't life out there," Priscu said.

The very same year that Alvin uncovered the first deep-sea life, 1977, NASA launched its two Voyager probes on an unprecedented tour of the planets in the outer solar system.

That mission delivered the first detailed images of Europa, a moon of Jupiter - and they were astonishing. Europa's surface was fractured into sections that fit together like the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle. Much like Earth, Europa seemed to have plate tectonics driven by the motion of continents over a liquid interior. But this mantle was made of water, rather than molten rock.

The Galileo mission in the 1990s confirmed the theory: Europa has the magnetic signature of an interior ocean full of salt water. It stays liquid so far from the sun because of a phenomenon called tidal heating: Jupiter's gravity sloshes it around so much that friction keeps the interior warm.

Enceladus, a moon of Saturn, is practically screaming to be searched for life. In 2005, during a series of close flybys, NASA's Cassini orbiter snapped photos of huge plumes of water vapor, carbon dioxide, nitrogen, methane and some organic molecules surging hundreds of meters above Enceladus's atmosphere. Last year, scientists reported that the jets are coming from a vast, watery reservoir in the moon's interior; like Europa, Enceladus has a subsurface global ocean. And like Earth, Enceladus has a rocky sea floor that is almost certainly volcanically active - what else could be sending geysers of water surging into the sky?

"We're in the position with Enceladus to go back and sample the moon and start asking whether the ingredients are there to support a habitable environment and to search even for life," said Carolyn Porco, a planetary scientist at NASA and the head of the Cassini imaging team. "And the best part is, you have to dig, you don't have to scratch, you don't have to drill, you just have to let the stuff fall on you."

The dwarf planet Ceres, which sits in the asteroid belt between Mars and Jupiter, harbors a huge amount of ice, and perhaps some liquid water. It seems to have formed a towering ice volcano on the planet's surface. Jupiter's giant moon Ganymede is thought to be a club sandwich of oceans layered between rock and ice. Another moon of Saturn, Titan, has an ocean as salty as the Dead Sea and a surface covered in lakes of liquid methane.

"Hearing some of the details ... about these oceans in our solar system is captivating," said Peter Girguis, a deep-sea biologist at Harvard. He left the Oceans World meeting with "all these little kernels of inspiration" for technologies he wants to develop - tools that could be used for his research as well as on other ocean worlds.

Much of the talk at the meeting was about the robots, real and imagined, that are needed to explore remote and hostile places.

Bill Stone, an aerospace engineer who has built tools to explore beneath Antarctic ice, screened a video of his latest "cryobot." In a matter of seconds, the torpedo-shaped drill blasted through a thick layer of ice, using super-hot water warmed by a laser to melt its path.

"We would be at the bottom of any ice sheet on Earth in under six hours," Stone said.

On Europa, a robot would have to drill through 60 miles of ice at temperatures lower than minus-180 degrees. On top of that, all the instruments would have to fit into an average spacecraft's payload, and all the research would have to follow planetary protection procedures to ensure that Europa wasn't contaminated with earthly life.

"This is what we're up against," Priscu said.

He is skeptical that subsurface exploration on Europa could happen in his lifetime - the technology for such a project simply doesn't exist.

Here's what the future does hold: In 2022, NASA plans to launch a spacecraft dubbed the Europa Clipper into a long, looping orbit around Jupiter, allowing the craft to perform multiple flybys of the planet's icy moon. The Clipper will carry magnetic sounding instruments to remotely probe the contents of Europa's ocean and thermal imaging tools to look for signs of recent eruptions of warmer water. An array of other gadgets will snap images of the moon and search for plumes of ice and gas like those seen on Enceladus. If they exist, their contents might hint at the chemistry of the oceans from which they erupt. From orbit, the Clipper will assess whether the moon might host life and where the best places to search for it might be.

On Earth, oceanographers are doing research that will help the Europa scientists figure out what to look for. Last week, the two conference organizers, German of WHOI and Kevin Hand of NASA's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, left for a two-month mission in the Arctic, where they'll use a remotely operated sub to explore an underwater volcano hidden beneath several feet of ice.

Hand will be scouring the sea ice - both the surface and the side that abuts the ocean - for chemical traces of the organisms living below. These biosignatures could point to a way to detect living organisms on other worlds without having to send a submarine out in search of them.

German thought back to 1977, when he was a college student and Hand was only 2. "It was a golden age of discovery," he said. Voyager had just launched, Alvin had just made its first visit to the hydrothermal vents. All of the discoveries that would set the course of their careers were in the midst of being made.

The subsequent 40 years of ocean research and space exploration wound up converging on a single, unifying principle: Where there is water, there is almost certainly life. It's been found in the deep ocean, it's been found under the ice. Scientists think we can find it in space.

"It feels like that golden age is coming around again," German said. "The intellectual stars are aligning in a way they haven't for decades."

It's a pretty good time to be building a cathedral.

sarah.kaplan@washpost.com

ï…ŒMore at washingtonpost.com/blogs/

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Donald Trump is elected, he's promised to move quickly to suspend Muslim **immigration**, or maybe even stop people from entering the United States "from any nation that has been compromised by terrorism." We'll withdraw from NATO unless all other members pay their fair share, either renegotiate or shred NAFTA and begin "extreme vetting" of **immigrants** to make sure they aren't sneaking in any "hostile attitudes toward our country or its principles." Before you can say "Geneva Conventions," he'll order the waterboarding of suspected terrorists and approve interrogation techniques "a hell of a lot worse than waterboarding," too, including the killing of the families of terrorism suspects. He might (or might not, or might) deport 11 million undocumented **immigrants**. But "on Day One," he insists, we will definitely "begin working on an impenetrable, physical, tall, powerful, beautiful, southern border wall."

Only, Washington has some pretty high walls in place, too, and electric fences that might shock any newcomer naive enough to believe Trump's line about "criminal **aliens**": that on "Day One, my first hour in office, those people are gone." In a real sense, this town exists to serve the liberal, constitutional order, and President Trump would face fierce and sustained resistance to his "because I say so" threats to that order - not only from the other party but from his own, and from the nonpartisan civil servants who run the government day to day.

Should he try to make good on his most controversial promises, he'd find, as President Obama has, that the judiciary can block executive action with injunctions that there is no way around. Congress would have to agree to fund his proposals, almost all of which would require more government spending rather than less. And he'd be up against executive-branch workers who, even without staging an open revolt, can slow-walk implementation just about indefinitely.

The most reliable action to block those Trump proposals that so many in both parties find unconstitutional would come from the courts, which would prevent the United States from walking away from international norms and treaty obligations. A flurry of lawsuits would surely answer Trump's opening gambit, and injunctions could jam, say, an executive order on "extreme vetting." Trump could likewise order that we cut our contribution to NATO, but because that, like NAFTA, involves a treaty obligation, this move, too, would be challenged in court.

"There really is no way to stop him from issuing a whole series of unconstitutional and illegal orders and rolling the dice," says Leon Panetta, who served in Congress, as CIA director and defense secretary under Obama, and as President Bill Clinton's White House chief of staff. "But they would be immediately contested in court."

Panetta added: "I can't think of one thing he's recommended that, without some serious compromise on his part, would be enacted. No matter which way he turns, he's going to run into a wall - not one that he's built, but the one that's been in place since the beginning of the republic." The Constitution, in other words.

Obama learned that lesson after issuing his 2014 order that the Department of Homeland Security would not deport some undocumented parents of U.S. citizens or permanent residents, and would expand a program shielding millions of undocumented **immigrants** who came to the United States as children. Texas argued that not deporting some undocumented **immigrants** would raise the cost of issuing driver's licenses. A court in that state blocked Obama's order, and in June, a 4-to-4 split on the Supreme Court allowed the Texas ruling to stand.

If lower courts similarly hindered Trump's proposals, it's theoretically possible that he could eventually get his way by packing the Supreme Court. But even that's not a sure thing. As Robert George, a professor of jurisprudence at Princeton and a Republican critic of both Trump and Hillary Clinton, puts it: "If Trump picks the judges he claims he's going to pick - which, like all Trump's claims, is not a claim I trust - then he'd have problems in the courts with some of his edicts, just as Obama has had. But there is always the possibility that his judges will not be the brilliant, distinguished conservative jurists on the list he got from the Federalist Society but rather his cousin's divorce lawyer in Teaneck, the guy who handled zoning permits for him for one of his golf course developments in South Carolina, and his sister who is already a federal judge."

Congress also has a significant role to play. Because "extreme vetting" would require additional funding to screen **immigrants** for bad thoughts, lawmakers would have to alter the way the entry process works now. They could stop the Trump train just by neglecting to fund the extra work Trump would be making for the already understaffed **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agency. Trump has vowed that "we are going to triple the number of ICE deportation officers. ... We're also going to hire 5,000 more Border Patrol agents." But he couldn't do anything of the sort without congressional action. If control of the Senate shifts to Democrats, such a thing is even less likely.

The fact that all Cabinet secretaries and other high-level appointees, including to the federal judiciary, have to be confirmed by the Senate gives the legislative branch considerable leverage, as Obama has also seen. And as for the wall along our southern border, Congress may not see this massive infrastructure project as a priority, since illegal **immigration** is at its lowest ebb in 20 years.

Then there are the civil servants of the executive branch, who - as John F. Kennedy complained in calling the State Department "a bowl of Jello" - can effectively kill policy by failing to implement it. Richard Nixon accused federal bureaucrats of resisting any and all change, because they "have a vested interest in the chaos in which they exist."

Federal workers are in a strong position to resist. One scientist who has spent 35 years at the Environmental Protection Agency (and who asked to speak on the condition of anonymity to discuss political matters) said that after the "hostile takeover" of the agency under Ronald Reagan, career folks initially tried to work with political appointees. But when they concluded that they were really being asked to break laws on water, air and waste, they began complaining to Democrats on Capitol Hill, who held oversight hearings. "And there was a certain amount of setting the political people up,'' the scientist said, by telling House staffers preparing the hearings what questions to ask and then watching Reagan's appointees get "slaughtered."

Although he's seen many direct confrontations over the decades - and stretches when the EPA softball league was more active than the workplace - the civil servant said he had never seen anyone pushed out for pushing back, especially since political appointees can be personally sued in cases of retribution. At any rate, civil-service protections require a whole series of administrative proceedings to remove an intransigent bureaucrat.

And when the political operatives find ways to circumvent the dissenting civil servants? "If they're doing things that are illegal, it's your responsibility to advise them of that, and if they don't listen, then you resign or you spill the beans." During the George W. Bush administration, Sylvia Lowrance and Eric Schaeffer resigned from the EPA's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance to protest the administration's insistence that they play down their enforcement actions.

Sometimes even the appointees disagree with the White House: In 1996, when Bill Clinton made good on his promise to "end welfare as we know it" without also creating the programs that were supposed to help move poor single moms into well-paying jobs, the president's old friend Peter Edelman, then an assistant secretary at the Department of Health and Human Services, resigned in protest, along with his colleague Mary Jo Bane, who like Edelman had advocated a very different kind of welfare reform. An order from Trump approving waterboarding or other "enhanced interrogation" methods would almost certainly prompt high-profile resignations as well.

The purely practical difficulties President Trump would face in trying to accomplish such amorphous goals as assuring that "those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people" are yet another check on his proposed agenda. He is in such a hurry, and routinely promises to move so quickly, that just watching him would give the rest of us vertigo. ("That wall will go up so fast, your head will spin.") But even if "The Exorcist" was set in Georgetown, this is a city best known for gridlock. And Trump's impatience, more than anything else, is the best reason to doubt that his resolve would outlast official Washington's resistance.

Twitter: @MelindaDC

is a visiting fellow at Catholic University's Institute for Policy Research & Catholic Studies.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Jim Hoagland is a contributing editor to The Post.

The surge of populist right-wing parties in Europe has now damaged the standing of the continent's most important leader, German Chancellor Angela Merkel. Worse, the rise of movements fueled by nationalistic and racist programs signals that a core ethos of the European-American alliance vital to global stability for seven decades is threatened by extremist politics on both sides of the Atlantic.

There are many tangible factors in the lurch to the narrow nationalism reflected in Britain's vote to quit the European Union, the defeat of Merkel's conservative forces by the three-year-old Alternative for Germany party in a key state election last Sunday, and the earlier rise of such movements in Poland, Hungary, France and elsewhere.

These factors include a backlash to economic dislocation caused by globalization, the floodtide of **refugees** coming from Syria and other failed states on Europe's southern periphery, and the terrorist outrages committed by the Islamic State and other jihadist forces.

But there is an intangible factor as well that merits close attention in this turbulent U.S. political season. It is the waning of the cohesion and steadying influence brought by the large U.S. military, commercial and cultural commitment to a vulnerable Europe since 1945 - the steady weakening of an American ideal of engaged internationalism that was absorbed into the intellectual bloodstream of post-war Europe as the Old and New Worlds joined to rebuild a devastated continent and confront a clear Soviet menace.

That internationalist ideal was clearly imprinted on the still-war-damaged Europe I first saw in 1961 and which I was to study and work in, or frequently visit, since.

The United States was, after all, originally a nation that proudly stated as its purpose the absorbing of the world's "tired ... poor ... huddled masses yearning to breathe free." It supported with troops, defense spending and active public diplomacy the spirit of a broad internationalism that was the opposite of the European chauvinistic hatreds that had triggered two world wars. The founders of what is today the European Union saw the United States as a model for the community they wanted to build.

The European idea of a certain America helped discourage the breeding of bitter nationalistic politics and anti-**immigration** stances, as did of course the memories of the recent conflagrations.

This is not to claim that the United States itself ever fully lived up to the ideal that, for a time at least, helped Europe find its way. American disasters abroad, running from Vietnam to Iraq, and continuing racial and social strife at home, have left the United States in no position to lecture other nations in moralistic terms or tones.

That is to my way of thinking Europe's misfortune as well as America's. This year's stomach-turning U.S. presidential campaign threatens to remove us as a model for anybody else's politics. By the standards set by Donald Trump, the Alternative for Germany's fear- mongering nativism is politics as usual, not an evil to be quashed.

The right-wing party finished ahead of Merkel's Christian Democratic Union in elections for the legislature of the Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania, a northern state known for its shipyards and quiet beaches and for being the chancellor's political home base.

The AfD - its initials in German - won 20 percent in the state, and is polling around 14 percent nationally. The incumbent Social Democratic Party maintained its leadership of the state legislature, making Merkel's defeat largely symbolic. But that will handicap her ability to fill the appalling leadership vacuum that exists today in Europe's major capitals.

Meanwhile, Trump would have us believe that the American ideal is fading globally solely because of President Obama's "weak" foreign policy. Obama's strategic retrenchment and initial benign neglect of Europe did contribute to the problem. But the long-term redistribution of economic power globally, to America's detriment, and the American public's fatigue with distant wars and entanglements weigh much more heavily on history's scales than do Obama's policies.

In any event, Trump's remedies would only accelerate the erosion of alliance cohesion. The enthusiastic wheeler-dealerism he promises to establish with Russian President Vladimir Putin - a hero to France's Marine Le Pen and other European ultra-rightists who subscribe to notions of racial and national superiority - will force politically volatile European nations to scramble to strike their own bargains with Russia.

Count on a European stampede toward Moscow - and an even more precipitous swing to the nationalistic right in European politics - if Trump is declared the winner here in November. That moment would also mark the final burial of that American ideal of internationalism that helped to make Europe a more prosperous and peaceful continent for the second half of the 20th century.

The writer is a contributing editor to The Post.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Americans are estimated to check their smartphones a collective 8 billion times per day, and Nielsen says we spend an average of one hour and 39 minutes on our smartphones each day - up 60 percent from last year. But while many of us consider our smartphones to be an essential part of our lives, there are many misconceptions about how we use them and how they affect us.

Myth No. 1

Smartphones give people cancer.

The World Health Organization (WHO) set off a small flurry of panic in 2011 when it classified the radiation from cellphones as "possibly carcinogenic." And worrywarts for years have been concerned about the "radiation" from handheld devices. Gwyneth Paltrow's lifestyle site, Goop, asks, "Are Cell Phones and WiFi Signals Toxic?" The city of Berkeley, Calif., passed a "Right to Know" measure in 2015 that requires all cellphone stores to warn buyers that the devices emit radiation. "Even if the science isn't firm, if there's a risk, we should proceed with caution," Berkeley City Council member Max Anderson told the New York Times at the time.

But scientists have never established a direct link between cellphones and cancer, as even the WHO admitted. The group's fact sheet, issued at the same time as its classification, says, "To date, no adverse health effects have been established as being caused by mobile phone use." Researchers have yet to definitively rule out suggestions that phones can increase cases of two types of brain cancer, a malignant form called glioma and a benign form called acoustic neuroma, but a definitive causal link has never been found. And the National Cancer Institute says there has been no significant increase in brain cancers in the past decade as cellphone use has increased.

Myth No. 2

Smartphones are a luxury

that poor people don't need.

The perception that smartphones are beyond the reach of the poor surfaces in political debates about government-subsidized phones. Critics of the Lifeline program - incorrectly nicknamed the "Obama phone" program - that provides subsidies for cellphone service have been particularly shocked that it can be used to reimburse smartphone use. "The federal government should only be providing services for emergencies. You and I, taxpayers, shouldn't be paying for cellphones so someone can have a social life," then-Rep. Tim Griffin (R-Ark.) told the Daily Caller in 2012. "I just don't think it's appropriate." More recently, critics of aid to Syrian **refugees** have pointed to photos of them holding their smartphones, asking how dire their situation could be if they still had a means to snap selfies.

But the dropping price of smartphones has put these devices in reach of many more people. Companies such as Motorola and Chinese manufacturers Huawei and OnePlus have focused on selling affordable phones, particularly in the international market. The Pew Research Center reported that, as of last year, 54 percent of people across 21 emerging and developing countries "reported using the internet at least occasionally or owning a smartphone." In Malaysia, for instance, where the median monthly income is about $1,130, Pew found that 65 percent of people had a smartphone.

Smartphones have become a daily necessity, not just a perk for the middle class. For many low-income families, as the Commerce Department found, the devices provide the only reliable access to the Internet - which they need to apply for jobs or do homework, among other things. This spring, the department reported that "29 percent of online households with family incomes below $25,000 only used mobile Internet service at home, compared with 15 percent of those households with incomes of $100,000 or more."

What's more, in crisis situations, smartphones have become the most reliable way to get information, apply for aid and find a place to live. Time magazine, which called smartphones a "lifeline" for **refugees**, asked a man from Syria which was more important, food or power? He answered without hesitation: "Charging my phone."

Myth No. 3

Smartphones make you more productive.

How does your smartphone make you feel? "Productive" was the most common answer (followed by "happy") among respondents asked to link their phones to an emotion in Pew's 2015 study on smartphone use. Productivity is a big selling point for smartphone makers. Samsung's ad campaign for its latest smartphone trumpets the virtue of being "busy, busy, busy" and explains how the device can help buyers stay that way.

But tapping away at your smartphone all day doesn't necessarily mean you're getting things done. A study released in August, commissioned by the security firm Kaspersky Lab, found quite the opposite. Researchers from the Universities of Würzburg and Nottingham-Trent asked 95 participants to perform tasks with their phones placed in their pockets, on their desks, in a locked drawer or outside the room. As the phones got farther away, productivity levels went steadily up. Overall, those whose smartphones were outside the room performed 26 percent better on the tests than other participants did.

Myth No. 4

Smartphones make usdumb and antisocial.

It seems intuitive, especially considering the glazed, vacant-eyed stares on most people's faces when they use their phones. And think of all those selfie-related fatalities. Researchers at Microsoft grabbed headlines when they found that the average human attention span had dropped from 12 seconds in 2000 to eight seconds in 2015 - less than that of a goldfish - and that digital media use helped contribute to that decline. The coverage practically writes itself: "Are smartphones making us dumber?" asked one from the Huffington Post. "Butterfly brain: why smartphones are making us stupid," read another from the Telegraph.

But there's nothing inherent in smartphones that turns us into dunces. When it comes to actual intelligence, some studies suggest that they in fact make us smarter. Researchers studying the "Flynn effect" - a trend that suggests IQ overall has been improving over the years - in people older than 50 say mobile phones and computers seem to contribute "considerably" to people's ability to stay in intellectually demanding jobs for longer periods of time. "On average, test scores of people aged 50+ today correspond to test scores from people 4-8 years younger and tested 6 years earlier," researcher Valeria Bordone told Science Daily.

There are certainly cases in which digital media can prompt isolating behaviors; more and more researchers treat excessive smartphone and Internet use as an addiction. But that doesn't necessarily make users antisocial. In fact, smartphones enable us to speak more with close friends and relatives than ever before, as well as to meet new people and organize social events. A 2015 Pew study showed that coordinating plans and talking to family and friends were the second and third most common uses for smartphones, behind finding information.

Myth No. 5

Smartphones are killing retail stores.

For many pundits, it's a foregone conclusion: Online sales will supplant brick-and-mortar shops. "Retail guys are going to go out of business, and ecommerce will become the place everyone buys," tech investor Marc Andreessen said in 2013. "You are not going to have a choice." When Amazon announced that it was making a smartphone with special shopping features in 2014, Salon said it was chief executive Jeff Bezos's path to "kill off brick-and-mortar retail, once and for all." (Bezos also owns The Washington Post.)

There is no denying that smartphones have altered the way we shop and that online shopping provides competition for the traditional storefront. But about 90 percent of purchases are still made in stores. Often, stores and smartphones have developed a symbiotic relationship, as retailers experiment with ways to incorporate mobile shopping into in-person shopping. One example is the rise of in-store pickup programs, which give customers the convenience of mobile shopping and the immediacy of real-world shopping - all without the shipping times. Meanwhile, Amazon's smartphone, which was designed so that shoppers could bypass stores altogether, was discontinued after about a year.

Mobile shopping is on the rise - up 30 percent between the holiday seasons of 2014 and 2015, according to IBM - but brick-and-mortar stores are also popular with young people. An August report from eMarketer found that teens prefer shopping in a real store for just about everything apart from games. Perhaps shopping in a store will become the next hipster trend.

Twitter: @htsuka

covers consumer technology for The Washington Post.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Birmingham Green adult-care service needs volunteers who speak Vietnamese. 703-257-6252.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

habitatpwc.org.

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

703-221-2218.

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

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

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

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

Prince William Area Agency on Aging needs Meals on Wheels drivers Monday-Friday. 703-792-4583.

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

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

.

Prince William County Office of Elections needs student volunteers to participate in its electoral page program. pwcvotes.com.

Prince William Health District is seeking volunteers to implement hypertension and diabetes initiatives in Manassas, Manassas Park and Prince William County. No prior community-health experience necessary. Training provided. Lesha Spencer-Brown lesha.spencer-brown@vdh.virginia.gov.

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

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

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

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

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

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

- Compiled by Sarah Lane
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hillary Clinton maintains a lead over Donald Trump, but lagging interest among some of her supporters poses a potential turnout challenge for Democrats with less than nine weeks before Election Day, according to a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

Clinton holds a 46 percent to 41 percent edge over Trump among likely voters, followed by Libertarian candidate Gary Johnson at 9 percent and the Green Party's Jill Stein at 2 percent. Clinton's lead swells to 10 percentage points among the wider swath of registered voters, 45 percent to 35 percent, similar to her 45 percent to 37 percent edge last month.

The findings come at a time when the margins between Clinton and Trump have narrowed in some battleground states and when some national polls also have shown a tightening in the competition. Heading toward the first presidential debate on Sept. 26, though, Trump still appears to have the more challenging route to victory.

Both candidates' reputations have been battered by the campaign, with more than 6 in 10 voters saying each candidate is not honest and trustworthy, and with majorities critical of Clinton's ethics as secretary of state as well as Trump's qualifications and his behavior toward women and minorities.

Asked about major campaign issues in the past month, almost 2 in 3 voters disapprove of Trump's explanation of his policy for handling undocumented **immigrants**, while nearly 6 in 10 say Clinton granted special favors to donors of the Clinton Foundation.

Both candidates' coalitions are united more by antipathy toward their opponent than enthusiasm for their own candidacy. Fewer than half of Trump's supporters - 46 percent - say they are "very enthusiastic" about his candidacy, while that number drops to 33 percent for Clinton's supporters. Meanwhile, 8 in 10 Trump supporters feel Clinton would do real damage to the country as president, while 83 percent of Clinton supporters feel the same way about Trump.

Trump's supporters report greater interest in the campaign and voting, which could factor into turnout. More than 6 in 10 registered voters who support Trump say they are following the campaign very closely, and 93 percent say they are absolutely certain to vote. By contrast, 45 percent of Clinton backers are paying close attention to the race, and 80 percent are certain to vote, while one-fifth say they will probably or are less likely to cast a ballot.

Clinton is relying on an extensive ground operation in the competitive states to turn out every vote possible, mindful that some of her supporters are not enthusiastic. Trump has gotten a late start in organizing in the battleground states and appears to be well behind Clinton in this aspect of the campaign. He will rely heavily on efforts by the Republican National Committee to reach his voters.

Seven in 10 voters say they have "definitely" decided which candidate to support, but a sizable 3 in 10 say they are undecided or might change their mind in the last two months. The share of persuadable voters is similar to that in 2008 but higher than Post-ABC polls in 2004 and 2012 conducted at a similar point. Roughly 8 in 10 Trump and Clinton supporters say they are committed to each candidate, while less than half of those who support Johnson or Stein are certain of their choice.

Other national polls have found Clinton's wide advantage after the party conventions shrinking in the past month to low single digits. The Post-ABC poll finds no slippage in Clinton's advantage among registered voters during that period, but her narrower advantage among likely voters, just beyond the poll's 4.5 percentage-point margin of error, could reflect weaker engagement among her supporters.

The Post-ABC poll finds 58 percent of Americans expect Clinton will prevail, though only 18 percent think she will do so easily. Nearly 9 in 10 Clinton supporters think she will win, while just under 7 in 10 Trump backers are similarly confident about him.

The poll finds Trump continues to face significant challenges to expanding his support. Trump's 50 percent to 36 percent lead among white likely voters is smaller than Mitt Romney's 20-point edge in the 2012 exit poll, driven by weaker support among white women and college graduates. Trump and Clinton are actually nearly even among white men with college degrees, a sharp change from recent elections when Republicans carried those voters easily.

Clinton's double-digit lead with white college-educated women would mark Democrats' largest margin since exit polling began covering the topic in 1980.

Clinton's 75 percent to 13 percent lead among the growing share of nonwhite voters is similar to Barack Obama's four years ago. That comes despite efforts by Trump over recent weeks to appeal more directly for support among African Americans, which so far appear to have produced no tangible results.

Trump does benefit from more unified Republican support, with 86 percent of likely GOP voters supporting him, ticking up from 80 percent in early August. Clinton receives 90 percent support among fellow Democrats, similar to 93 percent in August. In this poll, independents split 39 percent to 37 percent between Clinton and Trump. A month ago, they were tilted in Trump's favor.

The poll finds no clear advantage for Trump across a range of issues and personal attributes. Clinton holds a nine-point advantage among registered voters on being closer to them on the issues, a 12-point advantage on "the problems of people like you" and a 26-point edge on having the better personality and temperament to be president.

The two are closer when asked which candidate is more honest and trustworthy - 45 percent choose Clinton, while 43 percent pick Trump.

More than one-third of voters say the economy is the most important issue in their vote, and Clinton holds a narrow 50 percent to 44 percent edge over Trump in trust to handle the economy. Terrorism ranks second on a list of voters' concerns, with Clinton and Trump trusted about evenly on the issue among registered voters (47 percent to 44 percent). Clinton has a slight 49 percent to 44 percent advantage on trust to handle **immigration**, which is ranked by 7 percent as the most important issue in their vote.

Clinton holds a double-digit advantage over Trump on trust to handle taxes and a more than 20-point edge on trust to handle international trade agreements, a signature issue of the GOP nominee's candidacy.

Trump appeared to ease off his previous call to immediately deport all undocumented **immigrants**, although his position is still not entirely clear. His support for building a wall along the southern border and forcing Mexico to pay for it has not changed.

The Post-ABC poll finds broad skepticism of Trump's overall approach, with 78 percent of voters saying they prefer offering undocumented **immigrants** who pass background checks a path to citizenship, which is Clinton's position. Just 16 percent support full deportation. Six in 10 voters oppose building a wall along the country's southern border, and nearly three-quarters say Trump would not be able to get Mexico to fund the barrier. Among Trump's supporters, roughly three-quarters support building a wall, but 62 percent say they prefer a path to citizenship over deportation.

In general, more than 6 in 10 voters say Trump has been inconsistent about the policies he would pursue as president, and 46 percent say this makes them think less of Trump. More than 4 in 10 voters say Clinton has been inconsistent, with 31 percent saying this makes them think less of her.

Beyond their policy differences, both Trump and Clinton continue to face widespread skepticism over questions of ethics and personality.

Just over 7 in 10 voters say Clinton is "too willing to bend the rules," including a striking 55 percent of fellow Democrats. Meanwhile, a 57 percent majority of voters say Trump is biased against women and minorities. Neither sentiment has softened much in recent months.

Voters are also skeptical of how Clinton and Trump would manage conflicts of interest with their ties to nonprofit organizations and business, respectively. Almost 6 in 10 voters say they are very or somewhat concerned about conflicts with Trump's business interests, while a similar portion are concerned about conflicts between Clinton's work as president and the Clinton Foundation.

Concerns about Clinton's use of a private email server have peaked in the two months after the FBI recommended against criminally charging her. Fully 64 percent of voters say they disapprove of her handling of questions about her use of personal email while secretary of state, up slightly from 59 percent in June to the highest level in Post-ABC polling since last year. Half of voters, 50 percent, say they "strongly disapprove" of her handling of questions.

Amid Clinton and Trump's struggles, the Post-ABC poll finds 58 percent of Americans overall approve of President Obama's job performance, the highest since July 2009 and continuing the positive movement since December when he stood at 45 percent. Underscoring the passionate negative views that voters have of the candidate they oppose this year, nearly 8 in 10 Americans who disapprove of Obama say he has done real damage to the country.

The Post-ABC poll was conducted Sept. 5-8 among a random national sample of 1,002 adults reached by cellular and landline phones. Overall results have a margin of sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 percentage points; the error margin is four points among the sample of 842 registered voters, and 4.5 points among the sample of 642 likely voters.

scott.clement@washpost.com

dan.balz@washpost.com

Emily Guskin contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**If Campaign 2016 needed some shorthand to capture the way many Americans see the competition between the two major-party candidates, Hillary Clinton may have unintentionally supplied it this weekend. For much of the electorate, this could be remembered as a deplorable election.

Candidates are often stamped by seemingly offhand statements. Mitt Romney never escaped his "47 percent" comment in 2012, and President Obama found the same when he said many culturally conservative voters "cling" to their guns and religion. Donald Trump has a laundry list of them. After Friday, Clinton now has hers to regret.

Clinton stumbled as Romney and Obama did, seemingly with her guard down and before the friendliest of audiences, an LGBT fundraiser in New York. If there isn't a page in campaign manuals labeled "Beware of Fundraisers," there should be. It's where mistakes are easily made and not so easily undone.

Unlike Romney and Obama, Clinton spoke at a fundraiser that was open to the media, which should have made her more careful. Although she has said similar things in the past, she clearly went further than before, raising the question of whether this was intentional.

Here's what she said that caused the uproar: "You know, to just be grossly generalistic, you could put half of Trump's supporters into what I call the 'basket of deplorables.' Right? The racist, sexist, homophobic, xenophobic, Islamophobic - you name it. And unfortunately, there are people like that, and he has lifted them up."

She went on to talk about others who support Trump, saying they are worthy of empathy and understanding. She described them as people who feel "that the government has let them down, the economy has let them down, nobody cares about them, nobody worries about what happens to their lives and their futures, and they're desperate for change."

That latter characterization aptly captures an important part of the dynamic of the 2016 campaign, and it is one important reason Trump became the Republican nominee and remains competitive in the general election. But Clinton so muddied the focus on the grievances of many Americans who feel left behind with the first part of what she said that she has landed on the defensive, and understandably so.

The word "deplorable" no doubt captures how many Americans see the overall competition between Clinton and Trump. Last week's 50-state survey by The Washington Post and SurveyMonkey underscored the concerns that voters have about both major-party candidates. Nationally, 55 percent of registered voters say Clinton would threaten the country's well-being, while 61 percent say Trump would threaten the country's well-being. Overall, 95 percent say either Trump or Clinton - or both - would do so.

These attitudes come after a campaign of insults and petty, personal attacks as well as a clash over some of the most fundamental questions facing the country. This is a campaign that could be about big issues but instead often has been fought at the most base level.

On that score, Trump has led the way. He started his campaign by branding illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and criminals. He has never let up, denigrating people of all kinds. In addition to Mexican **immigrants**, his targets have included women, Muslims, a Vietnam POW named Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), the disabled, a federal judge of Mexican heritage and a Gold Star family. At NBC's commander in chief forum last week, he inexplicably beat up on the generals advising the president.

There has been a truism about this campaign. Trump has taken his opponents down to his level, and they have paid a price for it. Throughout the Republican primaries, he insulted any political rival he deemed a threat, such as "low-energy Jeb" Bush, "Little Marco" Rubio and "Lyin' Ted" Cruz. When they tried to play his game, they ended up scarred.

Bush never could find the formula to fight back effectively and was diminished and eventually destroyed politically by it. Rubio's campaign unraveled when he descended into a round of petty insults that mimicked Trump. He, too, never recovered and has found himself in an awkward embrace with Trump since he got out of the race.

Cruz could not find the right calibration between initial chumminess with Trump (when he believed he could inherit the Trump coalition) and his eventual indignation at what Trump said about his wife and father as he was losing the nomination. Cruz's ultimate refusal to endorse Trump during his speech in July at the Republican convention brought a chorus of boos from the audience and possible long-term problems.

Trump has never recanted his birther campaign against Obama in 2011. In the past week, surrogates have claimed that he now accepts that Obama was born in the United States. He has yet to say so himself. When asked recently, he simply said he doesn't like to talk about the issue anymore.

Trump has the support of white supremacists and the alt-right of the conservative movement. House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) said Trump's attacks on U.S. District Judge Gonzalo Curiel amounted to "the textbook example of a racist comment."

What is also known about some of Trump's supporters is their discomfort with changes, whether cultural or demographic, that are reshaping the country. This is part of what has so divided the country and made this campaign a dialogue about what it means to be an American.

Clinton has sought to make Trump an unacceptable candidate, arguing that his temperament and views should disqualify him in the eyes of a majority of voters. Those attacks have been tough and relentless and unsurprising.

Why Clinton concluded there was something to be gained by shifting her focus from Trump to some of his supporters with her shorthand characterization is inexplicable. Attacking symptoms is one thing, but branding an entire class of voters is another, as Romney and Obama learned.

This was a self-inflicted wound. Her supporters might cheer her, and those at the fundraiser laughed as she made her comment. Ultimately it might have little effect on the polls. But it is a damaging moment that Republicans will use to sow even more distrust about her candidacy.

Trump and his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, seized on Clinton's comment. Trump called it "SO INSULTING" in a tweet. Speaking Saturday at the Values Voter Summit, Pence said, "No one with that low opinion of the American people should ever be elected president."

By Saturday afternoon, Clinton was trying to clean up from Friday. She issued a statement saying she regretted saying that "half" of Trump's supporters were deplorables. But she did not back down on her criticism of Trump and added, "I won't stop calling out bigotry and racist rhetoric in this campaign." She clearly thinks that, ultimately, is a winning position.

At various stages, Campaign 2016 has been waged in ways that have left voters with a sense of despair at their choice. Based on the first week of campaigning in September, it threatens to stay there. Perhaps the debates will take the campaign back up to a different level, but that seems doubtful.

Eventually, one of these two candidates will be elected president. Unifying the country will be exceedingly difficult, to say the least. Clinton has talked about wanting to find common ground with Republicans where possible. She also has been urged repeatedly to find a more positive message, to give people an affirmative reason to vote for her.

In her Saturday statement, Clinton focused again on Americans left out or left behind and said, "I'm determined to bring our country together." But her comments Friday have provided her opponents with fresh ammunition to distrust her desire to work across party lines and could cause them to resist those overtures in the future. If she becomes president, she has made the job of governing all the more difficult.

dan.balz@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**I'm something of a logophile, so it was interesting to see two columnists - one on the left, the other on the right - use the word "anodyne" on the Sept. 1 op-ed page: E.J. Dionne Jr., elucidating on Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump's "evasively anodyne" **immigration** babble after a quick trip south of his proposed wall (would he be able to slip out of the country so quickly were his wall already erected along the border?) ["Trump's **immigration** circus act"], and George F. Will's "anodyne manifestation" of expanding presidential prerogative ["'Slush fund' by any other name"].

According to Wordsmith.org, "anodyne" is "from Latin anodynos, from Greek anodynos, from a- (not) + odyne (pain). Ultimately from the Indo-European root ed- (to eat, to bite), which also gave us edible, comestible, obese, etch, fret, postprandial, esurient and edacity." There couldn't be a more apt description for political speech today: mumbo-jumbo aimed at taking away our pain, words lulling us into a haze of meaning anything the listener wants them to.

Perhaps we are all being anesthetized by the anodyne speech of our political class. Still, kudos to these columnists for attempting to wake our minds by expanding the lingua franca.

Robin Payes, Rockville

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a holding cell below New York City's Chinatown one night last year, I spent four hours curled in a ball, balancing on a narrow wooden bench. I was trying to avoid the freezing cinderblock walls and cold cement floor, splattered with cigarette butts and rotten food. The NYPD had taken my shoes, in case I tried to hang myself with my laces.

An hour earlier, I was quietly riding the A train home from a folk-music show in Brooklyn. My earbuds were plugged in, my feet propped on the seat in front of me. Sometime around 2:30 in the morning, the train paused at the Canal Street station. A uniformed and armed New York police officer popped her head through the door and beckoned me off the subway car. Within a few minutes, I was handcuffed, ID'd and marched upstairs by two police officers.

That night, I became one more victim of "nuisance laws," regulations that criminalize small misbehaviors that don't hurt anyone. These policies have been enacted by cities across the country. In New York, for example, it's against the law to take up more than one subway seat or even put a foot up. It's illegal to be in most parks after dark or to drink beer on your stoop. People can be fined for asking someone else to swipe them into the subway. (Washington's Metro system does not criminalize putting your feet up on the subway or taking up two seats.)

This type of zero-tolerance policing has been adopted around the country. In Texas, minors can be tried as adults and jailed for missing more than 10 days of school in a six-month period. In Arkansas, a woman was arrested after a $1.07 check she wrote for bread bounced. In Washington, police can arrest residents for minor offenses such as letting a dog off its leash or fishing with the wrong equipment. A D.C. 2-year-old was even cited recently for littering. (Officials later dropped the case.)

On its face, this might not seem like a big deal - everyone wants clean subways and orderly cities. But criminalizing small acts can have major consequences for nonwhite and low-income people, who are disproportionately arrested and convicted for these infractions. A USA Today report, which examined data from across the country, found that "blacks are more likely than others to be arrested in almost every city for almost every type of crime. Nationwide, black people are arrested at higher rates for crimes as serious as murder and assault, and as minor as loitering and marijuana possession." In New York in 2014, 43,000 people were arrested on public transportation; just 3,600, or 8 percent, were white, even though whites make up 37 percent of public transit riders. The most recent numbers, from the first six months of 2015, show a similar trend: Of the more than 20,000 arrests, fewer than 1 in 10 people were white.

Those caught misbehaving are often arrested, booked and arraigned in criminal court. They might, as a result, lose their jobs or have to scramble for child care. They might be asked to pay a bail they can't afford. And a criminal record could cost them assets from subsidized housing to student loans.

As Scott Hechinger of Brooklyn Defender Services told the New York Times, a minor arrest can derail a person struggling to make ends meet. "Most of our clients are people who have crawled their way up from poverty or are in the throes of poverty. Our clients work in service-level positions where if you're gone for a day, you lose your job. People in need of caretaking - the elderly, the young - are left without caretakers. People who live in shelters, where if they miss their curfews, they lose their housing. Folks with **immigration** concerns are quicker to be put on the **immigration** radar."

In other words: A tiny mistake could ruin your life.

Criminalizing small infractions is part of a larger law-and-order effort known as "broken windows" policing. Popularized by two criminologists in 1982, this theory encourages law enforcers to arrest people for low-level offenses including loitering, public drinking and littering. Creating a semblance of order in a neighborhood discourages more serious crimes, the scholars argued.

This method was implemented in New York under Mayor Rudy Guiliani in the 1990s; during that time, the city saw violent crime drop by more than 56 percent and property crime by about 65 percent. Outgoing New York Police Department Commissioner Bill Bratton credits broken windows policing for the declines, saying the method makes neighborhoods cleaner and safer by stopping even the tiniest violation.

But opponents see it differently. They say the practice leads to unwarranted aggression against low-income people and minorities. "The kinds of things that [people of color] get arrested for, these innocuous acts, have been virtually decriminalized among white communities," said Robert Gangi, director of the Police Reform Organizing Project, which raises awareness of racial profiling by New York police.

This is something Timothy Middleton knows all too well. Middleton, who is black, was arrested on the subway last fall for assault in the third degree - the most minor assault charge - for what he called a "shouting match."

"The police were very derogatory and disrespectful ... and I spoke up for myself, and they didn't like that too much," he said. Middleton spent a few hours in a cell, received his court date and went home.

That's when he found out that, because he had a charge pending, he'd been automatically suspended from his job without pay. Middleton worked as a peer specialist at a social-service nonprofit helping people with mental disabilities.

He survived three months of unemployment, borrowing money from friends and waiting for his charge to be resolved. He even went on welfare. When his case was finally resolved (a judge gave him a verbal warning to stay out of trouble), his employer let him know: His job had been filled by someone else. "And it was the perfect job and perfect hours," he said. "I was enjoying what I was doing, helping people. ... I was just on a roll, you know?"

Others have similar stories. In 2009, Juan Castillo was arrested for putting his foot up on a subway seat so he could inject himself in the thigh with insulin. Castillo, a diabetic, was arrested and jailed for 30 hours, and the police refused to give him access to insulin. He ended up in a hospital. (Castillo later sued the city; he was awarded $150,000.) Flavio Uzcha, an Ecuadorian line cook, was brought in for standing too close to the door in a packed subway car in 2011. When he was arraigned, authorities discovered a 2002 deportation order, and he was forced to leave the United States.

Though there's no comprehensive data on how many New Yorkers are arrested for "broken windows" violations, the data that exists suggests that nonwhite residents disproportionately bear the burden of arrest. In 2015, for example, about 153,000 people were arrested or given tickets for sneaking onto the subway. Ninety-two percent were people of color.

The NYPD has denied allegations of racial profiling and defended its "broken windows" practices, arguing that they make the transit system and the city much safer. But in recent months, the police have begun to move away from making arrests for minor offenses. In March, officials announced that officers in Manhattan would no longer arrest people for such crimes as riding between subway cars or drinking in public. Instead, an offender will get a criminal summons. In May, the New York City Council passed a measure creating a civil process for some common low-level infractions, including littering and excessive noise. "We pledged to reduce unnecessary arrests while protecting the quality of life of all our residents," Mayor Bill de Blasio said at the time, "and this legislation is an important step toward this essential goal."

For my arraignment, I had to report to the New York City Criminal Court in downtown Manhattan, where I spent a few hours sitting in a pew behind a man in handcuffs. Eventually, a judge called me up and gave me a light punishment: probation.

"You didn't have a collateral consequence," Legal Aid Society spokeswoman Pat Bath told me later. She was right. I didn't risk my job or my family to appear in court.

The two teenagers I was arrested with were not so lucky. They had been busted for walking between subway cars - a constant sight, but still illegal. One had been arrested three times in the past year, the other two times for putting his foot up on the subway and for panhandling and interfering with "the movement of passengers."

He didn't show up in court, common among teenagers. "So now" - for putting his feet up - "he's a fugitive," Gangi said.

Twitter: @SamanthaSunne

is a freelance journalist based in New Orleans.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A 28-year-old gang member charged in the brutal stabbing death of a Maryland teenager had been deported twice to El Salvador in the past two years, according to U.S. **immigration** officials and Montgomery County prosecutors.

Oscar Delgado-Perez was ordered held without bond during his first court appearance Friday in a killing that detectives suspect was over gang bragging rights.

On June 16, Delgado-Perez and at least two other members of the MS-13 gang stabbed Cristian Villagran-Morales, 18, more than 40 times in a park in Gaithersburg as he begged for his life, according to authorities. Delgado-Perez "directed" the attack, detectives wrote in an affidavit filed in court. Police had been searching for him for more than two months and found him Wednesday at a Red Roof Inn in Rockville.

Parked nearby was a car with Texas license plates, belonging to an associate ready to take him from the area, said Robert Hill, a prosecutor with the Montgomery State's Attorney's Office.

"He was just about to leave that day for Texas to flee the area. He knew that there was a warrant out for his arrest," Hill said.

After officers apprehended Delgado-Perez, he allegedly told them they'd caught a break. "He said to police: 'If I hadn't been drunk this morning, you guys would never have caught me,'" Hill said.

Delgado-Perez, charged with first-degree murder, had been living in the Montgomery Village area and working as a roofer to support his 6-year-old child, according to Stephanie Ferner, a public defender who represented him in court Friday.

She questioned the strength of the case against Delgado-Perez, saying it rests on the word of two co-defendants. "Once they were charged, then they pointed the finger at my client," Ferner said.

At the county jail, according to Friday's court hearing, officials said they'd found no previous adult convictions for him.

In the case that led to the murder charge against Delgado-Perez, a 19-year-old named Vanesa Alvarado allegedly used the promise of sex to entice Villagran-Morales into Malcolm King Park in Gaithersburg.

Once they arrived, MS-13 members came up to Alvarado and Villagran-Morales and asked him whether he wanted to go into the woods to smoke marijuana, police said. He agreed to do so.

"It was a trap," Montgomery State's Attorney John McCarthy said Friday.

How Delgado-Perez repeatedly entered the United States, and why he was deported twice, remain unclear.

On Sept. 16, 2014, an **immigration** judge in Batavia, N.Y., ordered him removed from the country, according to spokesman for the Justice Department's Executive Office for **Immigration** Review. Delgado-Perez was removed to El Salvador the next month, according U.S. **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement, also known as ICE.

After entering the United States again, he was removed to El Salvador on Feb. 26, 2015, according to ICE. At some point, he returned.

While the challenges of illegal **immigration** are part of the national political debate, they confront local police every day in complicated ways.

The Montgomery County Police Department supports ICE's efforts to deport violent offenders, said Police Chief Tom Manger. But on the streets, Montgomery officers and detectives also must have the trust of **immigrant** communities, he said. That means being able to talk with undocumented residents and not ask about their **immigration** status, he said, so they are willing to report crimes and help solve them.

"We have to strike that right balance," Manger said. "We've got to be able to go into those communities and have trust and cooperation."

In Montgomery, the challenges are playing out in the context of a rise in homicides linked to MS-13, the violent gang with ties to Central America.

In July, police arrested Alvarado and one of the alleged gang members who approached Villagran-Morales at the park: Juan Gutierrez-Vasquez, 16, who was charged as an adult. He told detectives that the victim was thought to be a rival gang member, according to court records. But authorities said they found no evidence of that and said the attackers may have made up the claim to gain street credibility.

The victim, Villagran-Morales, was born in Guatemala and arrived in Montgomery this year from New Jersey to live with relatives, police said. He had been doing landscaping work. He sent money home to his father in Guatemala, according to friends.

"Even though there is still tremendous pain in all of our hearts, we feel a bit more calm that justice is being served and that the culprits are being caught," Jennifer Torres, a girlfriend of one of Villagran-Morales's cousins, said Friday. "We are still hoping that the other or others will be found."

Police said they continue to look for suspect Jose Coreas Ventura, 20, who also goes by the name Josue Corea.

dan.morse@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was late July when voters last heard from the potential first lady of the United States. Melania Trump delivered her speech at the Republican National Convention in Cleveland and then later stood with her husband, balloons dropping, waving to the crowd in what is starting to feel like a premature farewell to the campaign trail.

Since then, she has not spoken publicly and has largely vanished from view, leaving a trail of questions and voids in her personal biography.

It was only Wednesday night - after a seven-week absence - that Melania Trump appeared at a campaign event, sitting in the audience as her husband addressed a national security forum.

Her long silence followed the fiasco over her convention speech, parts of which turned out to have been plagiarized. Then she took her website down after revelations that there was no record of her having obtained a college degree, as her site had claimed. And although the issue of illegal **immigration** is central to her husband's platform, neither Melania Trump nor the Trump campaign has produced documentation to prove how the Slovenian **immigrant** got a visa to work in the United States or how she obtained her green card in 2001. Melania Trump has said she has been "at all times in full compliance" with **immigration** laws; Donald Trump has said his wife is "so documented."

Even as the campaign declines to fill in details of her life story, Melania Trump has deployed an attorney to beat back news reports probing her past. Last week, the former fashion model filed a libel suit against a blogger and a British newspaper over reports, since retracted, suggesting that she once worked as an escort.

Otherwise, the woman who could oversee a White House staff and command a global platform on behalf of the United States has said almost nothing. A news conference at which her husband promised to address **immigration** questions has yet to happen. And there is no sign that Melania Trump will play a significant role in the final stretch of her husband's campaign - a striking departure from tradition in which candidates' spouses serve as key surrogates in the effort to turn out voters.

The Trump campaign did not respond to multiple requests for comment, nor did it respond to specific questions about her past or her future involvement in the campaign.

In many ways, Melania Trump's approach to campaigning is in keeping with a paradoxical pattern in her life - one in which she has both sought the spotlight and recoiled from its glare. The 46-year-old has been comfortable with public exposure on her own terms, posing nude at times and once even talking on Howard Stern's radio show about her sex life with Donald Trump. And yet, as a model and as a political spouse, she has also remained private to the point of reclusiveness.

<blockquote class="twitter-tweet" lang="en"><p lang="en" dir="ltr"><a href="https://twitter.com/MELANIATRUMP/status/330440766054866944"></a></blockquote[https://twitter.com/MELANIATRUMP/status/330440766054866944">

Her official Twitter account - once a stream of Manhattan sunrises, Dover sole lunches at the Ralph Lauren Polo Club and Melania Trump lounging on a piano, a beach or a private jet - has become a series of statements pushing back against what is being written about her.

"Not a lot of people know me," she told The Washington Post in an interview in April. "Only I know my story, and I see people who want to have maybe five, 15 minutes of fame, and they say, 'Oh, I met her for five minutes.' ... I read a lot of stories, and they are not correct stories."

Several people who have known Melania Trump over the years say she has often been a solitary figure, cultivating few close friendships outside of her immediate family as she moved from the concrete apartment blocks of the former Yugoslavia in the late 1980s to Trump's gold-leafed penthouse in Manhattan in the late 1990s.

She left Slovenia as communism crumbled, joining a wave of young Eastern European women headed for Milan and Paris. It was a startling change for many young women who grew up in small and rural areas, according to people who worked in fashion.

"It was like, 'Wow!' It was a chance to go out with a guy with a Porsche," said Vincenzo Di Sarli, an Italian working in the international fashion business. "Many of them got married with these guys."

Melania Trump, born Melanija Knavs, began calling herself Melania Knauss as she started her modeling career. She kept trying to make a name for herself, albeit with limited success at first, according to people familiar with her career at the time.

Bernarda Jeklin, who ran a Slovenian women's magazine, met Melania Trump when she was 22 and entered the magazine's Face of the Year contest. Jeklin said Melania Trump did not stand out in the crowd of so many promising models.

"She was really quite anonymous," said Jeklin. "She was very, very introverted. She didn't talk to other competitors. She preferred to be in her own world."

Melania Trump placed as a runner-up, which helped her get more work when she returned to Milan. For several years, she modeled for catalogues and walked runways in Paris and other European capitals. During that time, she also met a wealthy Italian businessman, Paolo Zampolli, who said he saw enough potential in her to invite her to join a modeling agency he was financing in New York. Zampolli said he arranged her work visa and she said she moved to New York in 1996.

By then, she was 26 and stood out from other recruits, who were typically 18- or 19-year-olds dressed in jeans and T-shirts, according to others who worked at Zampolli's Metropolitan agency. By contrast, Melania Trump showed up at the agency already polished, always dressed exquisitely and expensively and carrying herself with a certain remove.

Michele August, a former booking agent for Metropolitan, said that Knauss was a "very kind, gentle soul" and was "nothing but professional." Still, August said, it was difficult to rebook her because she was "kind of icy looking, not approachable."

"She was sexy, she wasn't high fashion," August said. "You didn't book her for Vogue. She was more commercial lingerie."

The 1990s nightlife of New York models was full of parties and invitations to nightclub openings where booze, cocaine and wealthy men were plentiful. According to August and others who worked at Metropolitan at the time, Melania Trump was ambitious about making a name for herself but largely stayed away from the party scene. Her roommate from those days said that Melania Trump often just stayed home.

"She would come out in her bathrobe and her glasses and slippers and watch 'Friends,'" said Matthew Atanian, a photographer who shared a Union Square apartment with her in Manhattan. "She kept pretty quiet and to herself," he added. He also said she talked by phone to her mother and sister in Slovenia every day.

An exception came in 1998, when she attended a Fashion Week event hosted by Zampolli - and met Donald Trump.

The same year, when she was 28, Melania Trump made another leap into the spotlight by holding her own news conference in Paris. Journalists from Slovenia were flown in free of charge for the day to meet her, according to two of the journalists who made the trip.

The journalists said they had never heard of Melania Knauss, but Dusan Nograsek, one of the journalists at that meeting, recalls her describing herself as one of the world's top 50 international models.

"It was very unusual for models to do such a thing," said Nograsek, who, along with others, wrote about Melania Trump. "She was beautiful, likable, nice, natural. She acted as if she'd be standing on the red carpet in no time."

At the same time, Melania Trump's association with Donald Trump was leading to higher-profile assignments, including the January 2000 cover of British GQ, for which she famously posed nude on a fur rug on Trump's plane. She was in the 2000 swimsuit edition of Sports Illustrated, and when she married Trump in 2005, she was photographed wearing a $200,000 gown on the coveted cover of Vogue.

The transition to political wife was clearly not easy.

Earlier this year, Melania Trump had seemed willing to give campaigning a try - and got good reviews. In February, she surprised people when she took the microphone at a primary victory party in South Carolina and told cheering supporters in her accented English that her husband "will be the best president."

She went on MSNBC and CNN and addressed a crowd in Milwaukee after Donald Trump heralded the "exciting" presence of his wife on the campaign trail, saying, "She's never done this before."

At the same time, she seemed reluctant, telling The Washington Post in April, "I am not part of the campaign" and that her 10-year-old son, Barron, was her main priority.

Recently, Melania Trump's absence has become conspicuous enough to spawn such Twitter hashtags as #WhereisMelania and #FreeMelania as people try to figure out where she was and how she was doing.

On Wednesday night, she finally appeared, sitting in the crowd at the Intrepid Sea, Air & Space Museum in New York as her husband spoke at an NBC forum. Television viewers could only catch glimpses of her as cameras panned across the audience.

mary.jordan@washpost.com
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Rosalind S. Helderman, Alice Crites and Nejc Trusnovec contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**As the presidential campaign nears its crescendo, the American University Museum at the Katzen Arts Center offers something of a **refuge**: Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump are entirely missing from the six exhibitions that just opened. Yet the place is hardly free of ideological tumult.

Although quite different in form and content, all of the shows are as politically charged as the latest campaign reports. Included are illustrations by the Black Panther Party's former minister of culture; a commemoration of a Chilean exile who was assassinated in Washington 40 years ago; and a survey of work by a noted American artist who learned her craft in Mao's China.

The centerpiece of that show, Hung Liu's "Daughter of China, Resident **Alien**," is a pile of some 200,000 fortune cookies atop tracks that evoke the role of Chinese labor in building American railways. In a large painting based on the artist's green card, she takes the name "Cookie, Fortune."

Many of Liu's paintings are derived from photos or propaganda-film stills and dissolve realism into abstraction to represent the evaporation of Marxist-Leninist China and her memories of it. But Liu also gazes further into the past to imagine the lives of Chinese Americans long before she arrived here in 1984. One of her pictures is derived from an anti-Chinese cartoon from a 19th-century newspaper.

More than a century later, in 1966, Emory Douglas began drawing cartoons for the Panthers' posters and newspapers. He's still active as an artist, but it's his 1960s work that triggers "It Takes a Nation: Art for Social Justice With Emory Douglas and the Black Panther Party, AfriCOBRA, and Contemporary Washington Artists." The show's title echoes that of the 1988 album by the political hip-hop group Public Enemy, "It Takes a Nation of Millions to Hold Us Back."

Douglas's work is stark and confrontational, and many of his and the other artists' concerns seem entirely timely in the era of the Black Lives Matter movement. Warns one piece about 1960s confrontations with police: "Caution: Surviving Is Criminal."

Although based on a photo of an incident in South Africa, Hank Willis Thomas's "Raise Up" is equally pertinent. The stark bronze sculpture shows, partially but powerfully, a group of black men with their hands in the air.

AfriCOBRA, which began in the 1960s and stands for African Commune of Bad Relevant Artists, includes several members who taught at Howard University. Their work combines the political, the folkloric and the psychedelic, yielding some images that could have been Jimi Hendrix album covers.

The selection flows into the gallery of the Alper Initiative, which promotes scholarship of D.C. art. This section includes the work of younger artists such as Holly Bass, whose recent video about African American sharecropping dovetails with Simmie Knox's 1976 painting of fieldworkers under a sky that's as neon-orange as anything in the AfriCOBRA section.

Another show of African American artists, "Silos," was only partly installed at the time of a media preview. It includes a striking piece by Wesley Clark (whose work also appears in "It Takes a Nation"): He deconstructed an image of the American flag into chunks of battered red, white and blue wood, each shard prickly with barbed wire. (Not yet in operation at the time of the preview was "Portal Screens: Connecting Northwest, D.C. to Milwaukee's Amani Neighborhood," a live video link to the Milwaukee area with the highest rate of incarceration for African American men in the United States.)

The political is personal in all of these shows, but especially in "Todas las Manos" ("All Hands"), a series of five mural-style paintings on canvas. These depict Orlando Letelier, Ronni Karpen Moffitt and Rodrigo Rojas, all killed by agents of the former Chilean government. The artist, who worked on the project with children from the District's Latin American Youth Center, is Francisco Letelier, Orlando Letelier's son.

To Washingtonians, these are not distant events. Moffitt and the senior Letelier were killed by a car bomb detonated at Sheridan Circle 40 years ago. Rojas, who died in Chile 30 years ago after being set on fire, grew up in the District, where he was friends with the younger Letelier. Yet the painter recalls these crimes without anger. The mural prominently features a bloom known in Chile as "the flower of reconciliation."

The smallest of the six shows, Suzanne Brennan Firstenberg's "Updraft America," also has an optimistic vibe. The local sculptor, a former Senate aide, folded pages from the Congressional Record into paper airplanes, in hopes that a stalled Congress might take flight. The simple flying machines are spray-painted red or blue, but some feature both colors at the center. Firstenberg, who also has inaugurated a letter-writing campaign via updraft america.org, hopes to inspire a blur of productive purple.

goingoutguide@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Hari Kondabolu is a comedian of color who will talk about white people. Or, to be more exact: whiteness. Openly.

If the subject makes the little hairs on your neck stand up, feel free to move along. Kondabolu expects discomfort. He even has a joke called "White People Don't Like Being Called White People."

If you're still here, maybe it's because you've heard of Kondabolu, whose comedy album, "Mainstream American Comic," debuted this summer at the top of the iTunes comedy chart and at No. 2 on the Billboard equivalent.

On it, Kondabolu dives into his favorite subject at length, with jokes such as "All Lives Don't Matter," and another titled "#BobbyJindalIsSoWhite." That's also a hashtag he started about the Indian American former governor of Louisiana that pinged like a virus from his Twitter feed to India and back again.

To most comedians, material touching on race, racism, sexism or a culture of privilege - material about whiteness - is the equivalent of radioactive waste: It's untouchable. But for Kondabolu, it's the sweet spot. In this tumultuous period in American race relations and anti-**immigrant** sentiment, he's the voice of, well, what exactly?

Maybe much-needed levity?

The comic is among the hosts tapped to take over John Oliver's podcast, "The Bugle," and he'll soon make his debut as a documentarian on TruTV with a film about the lasting legacy of Apu, the (some say stereotypical) Indian shopkeeper on "The Simpsons." With his longtime friend and frequent collaborator, W. Kamau Bell, he launched the podcast "Politically Re-Active," bringing in a roster of progressive voices, including feminist author Lindy West and New York Daily News columnist Shaun King.

In many ways, Kondabolu sounds more like Jon Stewart than Aziz Ansari, like Oliver, or Paul Mooney, or a slightly less smug Bill Maher.

"There aren't a lot of political comedians like us, especially of color. Political comedy is a white man's art," says Bell, who met Kondabolu years ago at a show in a high-school auditorium in Santa Rosa, Calif.

"I'd never seen him before, and he was, at that point, dressing like a TA from a liberal-arts college," Bell says. "But he was spitting hot fire."

The game changer

"All lives matter? Really? Really?" Kondabolu asks wryly on "Mainstream American Comic," in a bit poking fun at those who would shout down Black Lives Matter activists.

A pause.

Snickers from the crowd as it dawns on them where this is going.

"The Kardashians?" he prods.

Peals of laughter now.

"All three of them? Really? Realllllly ?"

Ask Kondabolu, 33, how he became woke, and he doesn't miss a beat.

"9/11. That's the game changer," he says. "I'm a different person."

Most Americans have heard the narrative that the terrorist attacks of 2001 united us. But Kondabolu (pronounced cone-da-BOWL-ooh) recalls that "people were turning on brown people. I remember people saying racist things to me. I remember the fear-mongering. All those things shaped me."

Of the fine line between lightheartedness and seriousness that has come to define his sense of humor, he says: "I believe in justice, and my jokes are coming from a place of shooting upwards."

"He's not taking the easiest path," says J.P. Buck, a supervising producer for "Conan" who scouted Kondabolu a decade ago and has watched his star rise.

"If you're going to take a sociopolitical view of things, not everybody is going to love you," Buck says. Kondabolu is "choosing to push the envelope. To make people think."

<iframe width=560 height=315 src=https://www.youtube.com/embed/7t7OiqpFLkA[https://www.youtube.com/embed/7t7OiqpFLkA] frameborder=0 allowfullscreen></iframe>

Speaking from New York before his sold-out performance Saturday at the District's Sixth & I Historic Synagogue, Kondabolu suggests that if you're looking for a place to begin his story, start with his parents, who married in South India in 1981 and moved to New York shortly after. Kondabolu was born in the famed South Asian enclave of Jackson Heights, Queens, and raised in some of the borough's most multiculti neighborhoods.

For his sense of humor, he credits his mother, who helped him "recycle pain into something that's good for you." A doctor in India, she gave up her career to raise her two children (Kondabolu's brother, Ashok, had a turn in the trailblazing but short-lived hip-hop group Das Racist), while his father worked long days in the medical field.

As a teenager, Kondabolu took the train into the city to see comics perform. But his own career blossomed in Seattle, where AmeriCorps dispatched him after college to work with communities on issues surrounding hate crimes and **immigration**. At night, onstage, "I was able to release tension," he says. "I was making people laugh, something I couldn't really do in the same way at work."

But back to inspiration for a moment: He wants to talk about Margaret Cho, a pioneer among Asian American comedians.

"I'd never seen somebody who wasn't black, white or Latino be onstage and take charge like that," Kondabolu says of Cho. "It opened up my mind to the possibility, like, 'Could I do this?'"

<iframe width=560 height=315 src=https://www.youtube.com/embed/MIBYXkqz1I0[https://www.youtube.com/embed/MIBYXkqz1I0] frameborder=0 allowfullscreen></iframe>

Buck has gauged hundreds, if not thousands, of comics. Kondabolu's point of view, he says, "was something I hadn't seen before." Buck steered the comedian to his national television debut, on "Jimmy Kimmel Live," in 2007.

And then, for Kondabolu, some deep-rooted sense of pragmatism kicked in.

He went back to school. Not in Los Angeles, where he could still audition. He enrolled in a master's program in human rights studies at the London School of Economics. It helped him sharpen his voice into something more cutting, more informed.

While he was in London, he was invited to New York to tape a Comedy Central special. When he was done, he hopped a flight and went right back to his studies.

Going mainstream

Deep into Kondabolu's new album, you finally get a clue about where the title came from.

"I don't like being niched as a South Asian comic, man," he says. He seethes over it, really. Kondabolu would prefer it if the world stopped tossing him into the growing pile of funny people of South Asian descent, including Aziz, Mindy Kaling and Kumail Nanjiani. "I'm a mainstream American comic."

If anything, says his friend Bell, Kondabolu "disrupts the narrative" that there's a particular kind of Indian American comedian.

Evidence: Other comedians of similar descent will mine their parents' accents for comic effect - sage-like South Asian parents are practically a pop-cultural trope.

Kondabolu refuses to do the same.

"My parents are **immigrants** with accents," he explains in one joke. "I'm sure they have it hard enough, people questioning their intelligence, making fun of them behind their backs."

Statements like these resonate with his audiences, Bell says. Young Indian Americans and Asian Americans are behind some of the comedian's YouTube-and-podcast-fueled fame, texting links to their friends, ponying up to $10 a ticket to see Kondabolu in the rock clubs where he has frequently performed, packing them out.

"Black people needed Richard Pryor. We needed Chris Rock. We needed Dave Chappelle," Bell says. "When I go to Hari's shows, you can really feel a group of millennial South Asians who are like, 'We need this. This is critical.'"

The Internet, Kondabolu says, has given comedians outside the mainstream a way past club bookers and agents, a way to avoid being beholden to the masses. Owning your particular niche will do.

And Kondabolu's niche - talking about race, and social justice, about whiteness - is what may finally bring his voice to the masses.

"Hari got there early," Bell says. "And when you get there early, you have to be the most strident voice. He's not going to let you, even if you're his fan, be comfortable in the things he says onstage."

Does he ever feel like he'll be a mainstream American comic?

"I'm getting there," says Kondabolu, who adds that he can talk about social issues and make cracks about the male anatomy with equal fluidity.

What he does, he says, is parse "a distinctly American experience, of being an outsider within your country because your parents are **immigrants**.

"The values I have, the search for justice, that's not a niche thing," he says. "These are mainstream issues. I want my work to be framed as part of the larger conversation, because it is. It is."

lavanya.ramanathan

@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Fifteen years after one of the most vivid and violent days in American history, there is still a debate over what the events of Sept. 11, 2001, actually mean.

For some individuals, it is clear enough. They experience horrible, continuing and unrecoverable loss - the immense absence of friends and family chosen for death at random or led there by duty.

But the place of these events in our national life remains disputed in a way that, say, Pearl Harbor was not. No one accused President Franklin D. Roosevelt of overreacting to the Imperial Japanese threat. This charge, however, is routinely made in assessing the war against terrorism - that the United States overreacted in the surveillance of citizens; in the pursuit, interrogation and killing of enemy combatants; and in the use of the military to confront emerging threats. After the killing of Osama bin Laden in particular, some in the Obama administration seemed to regard the threat of terrorism as diminished, contained and manageable.

This viewpoint - while offering important corrections - has become dramatically less credible with the collapse of sovereignty at the heart of the Middle East; with ongoing mass atrocities against civilians in Syria; with a **refugee** crisis that incubates resentment and now shakes the foundations of the European Union; and with the establishment of a physical place - a quasi-state - that claims to be the Islamic caliphate. The second-largest city in Iraq has been controlled by a terrorist organization for more than two years. And the existence of this faux caliphate, according to security expert Juan Zarate, has "rejuvenated [terrorism] networks in Europe, in Southeast Asia, in the Middle East and elsewhere that were previously suppressed."

Clearly, national passivity - as a matter of conviction or indecision - can also invite serious strategic and moral challenges.

Yet this argument against inaction is becoming dated in some respects. President Obama has returned military advisers to Iraq and slowly escalated the U.S. commitment to the defeat of the Islamic State. (There are several thousand U.S. troops now in Iraq and Syria.) Progress is being made in significant increments. Obama is attempting to shape an American role that offers intelligence, coordination and air power while building up the capabilities of allies and proxies. The effort has been limited and late - perhaps too late in Syria - but developing this sort of capacity is the correct goal dictated by the correct question: How does the United States exercise maximum military influence without the risks of invasion and occupation?

And the Obama administration has devoted increasing, useful attention to the ideological battle against Islamist extremism. In one respect, the propaganda produced by the Islamic State has a narrow goal - produce volunteers to fight for, operate and populate its sad excuse for a caliphate. The effort, at its height, produced perhaps 40,000 foreign recruits. As the likelihood of dying on terrorist vacation has increased, recruitment has slowed. And efforts to counter Islamic State propaganda have skillfully employed defectors who describe menial work, desperate conditions and disappointed expectations.

One response by the Islamic State to military reverses has been to call for terrorist attacks in place - claiming that Muslims can demonstrate their fidelity by shooting up a local nightclub or running a truck into a crowd. This approach is not new. But the Islamic State, according to Zarate, has made it "a core part of their strategy."

In some ways, fighting a geographic caliphate is the kind of thing the United States does best, applying deadly force with great precision. But disputes about theology and identity are unfamiliar terrain for the U.S. government. Violent Islamists don't require mass appeal. They set out, via social media and the Deep Web, to exploit the angry, damaged and vulnerable. Identifying the radicalized involves attention to individuals by family members, peers and imams. And it requires an atmosphere of trust between the FBI and the Muslim community.

In this context, the argument by the Republican presidential nominee that America is too engaged in the world and too soft on Islam is utterly, dangerously wrong on both counts. When he proposes a religious test at the border, or demonizes Muslim **refugees**, or calls for the murder of the families of terrorists, he feeds social division, **alienates** important allies, materially complicates the war on terrorism and puts our country at additional risk.

Fifteen years on from 9/11, the main task remains the ideological and religious isolation of the enemy - placing them on an island of unholy cruelty. A war of civilizations - the war they want - will not be won.

michaelgerson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**When dining out is your profession, you learn to spot the warning signs of a restaurant more interested in survival than staying true to its roots: The Korean barbecue joint that dabbles in all-you-can-eat sushi. The Chinatown spot that allocates menu space for crab puffs stuffed with cream cheese. The Mexican establishment that caters to the pupusa crowd.

Right or wrong, knee-jerk or not, I tend to avoid restaurants that behave like pop stars who adopt new personas to remain, you know, "relevant." So when colleagues and readers suggested I visit Zabver in Mount Pleasant, I studiously steered clear of the (mostly) Thai spot for one reason: Among its chef's specials is a plate of General Tso's chicken, the cloying cornstarch king of Chinese American carryouts.

Let me get this off my chest before I say anything else: I was wrong to take my prejudices out on Zabver.

I don't remember now why I decided to ignore my instincts and walk into the tiny storefront on a blisteringly hot July evening, but when I did, I made sure to order the General Tso's chicken. Each bird part was covered in a sauce that shimmered like river water on a cloudless summer day. My reaction was visceral, a silent inward drool, as if some previously unknown craving was about to be satisfied.

The tempura coating had not yet surrendered its crispiness. It still had serious crunch, that mysterious source of pleasure at the dining table. The chicken, sprinkled with a handful of scallions, included a dense hedge of broccoli florets at one end of the plate. The vegetables were easy to ignore in favor of the sweet, salty crackle of the boneless breast meat. This was chicken candy, and I was a 10-year-old again, trying to hoard every last piece for myself.

The chef behind this unexpected delight is Piwat Laosiri, a Bangkok native who owns and operates Zabver with his wife, Thitiporn "Mai" Sankom. With only six seats and virtually no ability to combat the heat inside the colorful, cramped dining area, Zabver is best treated as a carryout, not a sit-down restaurant. (The couple, incidentally, hope to expand into an upstairs space later this year.) I say this with trepidation, since takeout containers inevitably degrade Laosiri's best work. Plus, the husband and wife are charming, courteous hosts, quick with a quip or just a cup of chili flakes for an extra kick to your dish.

Carryouts are not exactly temples of authenticity. They tend to specialize in speed and cheap, late-night calories. Zabver is an exception: It's a carryout that trades in genuine Thai flavors, is fearless in its use of fish sauce and is not shy about making you wait. Best order ahead and save yourself from the self-basting humiliation of roasting in the ovenlike dining room during the last days of summer.

One taste of Laosiri's chicken larb salad, and you understand that the chef's not interested in peddling the sweet, starter-kit fare that has characterized Thai eateries aimed at an undifferentiated American palate. Served in a large outer leaf ripped from a head of iceberg lettuce, the salad radiates heat, sourness and the fetid funk of fish sauce. BASE jumping won't generate this kind of adrenaline rush.

As the General Tso's chicken suggests, Zabver's owners identify as Thai but embrace the freewheeling spirit of their American locale, occasionally adopting the dishes of Asian **immigrants** who came before them. The menu skips easily between an unconventional wonton soup (the dense, matzo ball-like dumplings float in a clear-and-complex chicken broth seasoned with soy) and a traditional tom ka gai (the coconut milk can't begin to tame the soup's jungle elements). Even Zabver's soundtrack has an American heartbeat: In between spoonfuls of soup, I bobbed my head to Michael Jackson, Prince and Maroon 5, which claimed to have absorbed the moves of an Englishman named Jagger.

None of the fresh noodles at Zabver are made in-house, which gives you a sense of where the boundaries are drawn at this mom-and-pop operation. As open-ended as Laosiri's menu can be, time remains a fixed commodity. There aren't enough hours in the day to prepare fresh strands for the selection of noodle dishes here. Despite this, I never sucked down a noodle that showed signs of age, whether mold or stickiness, which would have forced me to send up an emergency flare, seeking fresh reinforcements.

The flat, wide ribbons used for the drunken noodles tasted almost caramelized, which balanced the dish's traditional slap of sobering heat. The stir-fry noodles in the pad Thai still had plenty of chew left in them, providing a solid base to ferry the flavors inherent in the dish (tamarind and fish sauce) and those added (like a generous squeeze of lime). But my most ticklish experience was reserved for the **refugee** noodles, a pile of spongy steamed rice noodles topped with fried tofu and a variety of rough-cut vegetables, all tied together with a sweetened soy sauce. It was like a dim-sum dish ripped on 'roids.

Laosiri has a knack for renewing your faith in dishes that have let you down in the past. It might be his crusty re-examination of General Tso's, or it might be his uncompromising green curry, built with a paste as pointed as a bayonet. Laosiri doesn't seem to have a cruise setting. He puts the pedal to the metal no matter what the dish - or its country of origin. I'm thinking specifically about his moo ta-kite, a lemon grass pork preparation that comes with rice, not vermicelli. I'm not convinced a Vietnamese cook could make it much better.

The couple's commitment to their native cuisine - and to any dish that wanders into their field of vision - makes me think they adopted the right name for their place. They tell me Zabver translates into, "Oh, my God, it's so delicious!" The journalist in me has basically verified the translation with a Thai-speaking friend, who says the term is slang for "over-the-top delicious." If the couple's version is tinged with hyperbole, that's okay. The critic in me knows the truth of it.

tim.carman@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Asteroids could help scientists learn how our planet and life itself evolved, and NASA is about to rope a prime candidate for study.

An Atlas V rocket set to launch from Cape Canaveral, Fla., on Thursday evening will carry the Origins, Spectral Interpretation, Resource Identification and Security-Regolith Explorer (OSIRIS-REx) into space for a rendezvous with an asteroid called Bennu. OSIRIS will return to Earth in 2023 bearing samples of the **alien** rock.

"The primary objective of the mission is to bring back 60 grams of pristine carbon-rich material from the surface of Bennu," principal investigator Dante Lauretta of the University of Arizona said in a statement. "We expect these samples will contain organic molecules from the early solar system that may give us information and clues to the origin of life."

Scientists are interested in these samples for the same reason they like to study comets and outer-solar-system objects like Pluto and the dwarf worlds beyond: Planets close to the sun have enough warmth and energy to change.

Geological processes have turned the basic molecular building blocks of our formative years into new compounds. Rocks flung farther from the sun's embrace have stayed cold, allowing them to preserve more pristine relics of the solar system's infancy. The more objects of this nature we study, the more we can infer about the conditions under which our solar system first formed.

By understanding the formation of our own solar system, which for now at least is the only star system where life is known to have evolved, we can better evaluate the potential habitability of other planets and the likelihood of life in general.

"OSIRIS-REx will return the most extraterrestrial material to Earth since the Apollo missions to the moon," Alessondra Springmann of the University of Arizona told New Scientist magazine.

Scientists will also use the mission to study the Yarkovsky effect, which is the slight shift in trajectory that occurs when an asteroid absorbs sunlight and emits the energy as heat. The effect is small, but over time, it can significantly alter the path of a big space rock. When calculating the risk of an asteroid colliding with Earth, scientists have to factor in Yarkovsky forces.

"When that happens, it acts like a thruster and changes the trajectory of the asteroid," Lauretta told Space.com. "If you want to be able to predict where an object like Bennu is going to be in the future, you have to account for this phenomenon, and we're going to provide the best-ever scientific investigation of this fascinating concept."

In fact, the 1,640-foot-wide asteroid Bennu made headlines several weeks ago when scientists projected that it might hit Earth one day, pending Yarkovsky-related trajectory tweaks. There's a 1 in 2,700 chance of Bennu plunging to Earth 150 years from now.

OSIRIS won't really be hitting Bennu. The spacecraft will make a maneuver that scientists describe as "a safe, smooth, slow high-five," barely touching down on the asteroid while using gas to push 60 grams of debris into its clutches. Bennu is thought to be more of a plastic foamlike cluster of rubble than a solid rock, so OSIRIS should not have too much trouble kicking up enough dust and pebbles to take home.

But it's got a long way to go: After launching Thursday, OSIRIS will spend about a year orbiting the sun. When it passes by Earth again, our planet's gravity will help "slingshot" the spacecraft toward its rocky target.

OSIRIS is scheduled to arrive in orbit around Bennu in August 2018. It will use its instruments to create a three-dimensional map of the asteroid's surface and select an optimal target for sample retrieval.

Its "high-five" is planned for July 2020, and in 2021, when Bennu and Earth are in relatively close proximity again, the spacecraft will begin a 2½-year journey back home. The spacecraft itself won't touch down on our planet, but the samples should eject and land in Utah in 2023.

rachel.feltman@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS - British authorities confirmed Tuesday that construction will begin this month on a concrete wall in Calais intended to keep migrants and **refugees** from the city's port, where they frequently attempt to stow away on U.K.-bound trucks and ferries.

"This measure is intended to further protect the Rocade from migrant attempts to disrupt, delay and even attack vehicles approaching the port," the British Home Office said in an emailed statement. The Rocade is an access road leading into the port.

On Monday, French truck drivers and local residents protested against the large migrant camp outside the city, blocking traffic and insisting that migrants and **refugees** have increasingly resorted to violence to gain passage to Britain, 20 miles across the English Channel.

Tuesday's update from U.K. **Immigration** Minister Robert Goodwill on what local residents immediately began calling on social media the "Great Wall of Calais" came days after the French government pledged, again, to close the "Jungle" encampment outside Calais. Goodwill declined to comment further.

In the camp, 7,000 to 9,000 **refugees** and migrants - mostly from Afghanistan and Sudan - live in squalid conditions and legal limbo. Nearly equidistant from London and Paris, the Jungle has become an arresting symbol of Europe's migrant crisis, no longer confined to the continent's periphery.

The wall, a crucial part of a $22.65 million Franco-British security package agreed to in early March, is slated to be about 13 feet high and made of smooth concrete, a material that is difficult to scale.

A pro-**immigrant** segment of the British government almost instantly voiced concerns, saying the Calais wall could send the same message of exclusion commonly associated with the controversial proposal by U.S. presidential nominee Donald Trump to build a wall between the United States and Mexico.

Alf Dubs, a member of the House of Lords and the lead sponsor of a recent amendment to welcome into Britain more unaccompanied migrant children, called the idea "stupid." Dubs was once a child **refugee** in Britain, brought there as part of the famous Kindertransports that saved the lives of nearly 10,000 Jewish children in World War II.

Meanwhile, the city of Paris announced Tuesday the details of its plan to become the first densely populated European city to create a space within city limits to welcome and house migrants. Anne Hidalgo, the city's Socialist mayor, told reporters that a new facility would open in mid-October in the French capital, initially for 400 and with room to expand to 600.

james.mcauley@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY - President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday replaced his finance minister, widely seen as the architect of Donald Trump's trip to Mexico, after the U.S. presidential candidate's visit caused a firestorm of protest here.

Peña Nieto offered no explanation for the resignation of Luis Videgaray, one of his closest aides and the protagonist of some of the government's signature economic reforms. But it came a week after the Mexican leader appeared to deferentially greet a politician who has antagonized Mexicans with his harsh criticism of **immigrants** and his vow to build a huge border wall.

Peña Nieto's decision to host Trump has provoked one of his most severe political crises since he took office in 2012, with even his own cabinet deeply divided over the move.

"The political cost [of the visit] was extremely high for Peña Nieto, and he was obliged to find someone to blame," said Alberto Arnaut, a political science professor at the College of Mexico, explaining the minister's departure.

The Trump visit, he said, "was a monumental failure."

Political leaders around the world have expressed concern about a possible victory by Trump, who has threatened to slap new tariffs on key U.S. trading partners, reevaluate current NATO commitments and lessen the protections provided by the U.S. nuclear umbrella.

But Mexico's leadership has been particularly unnerved by the unconventional Republican nominee. Mexico is heavily dependent on the United States for trade and investment; 1 in 10 Mexican citizens lives north of the border, part of a diaspora that sends home billions of dollars in remittances each year.

Videgaray, who had served as the Mexican government's behind-the-scenes liaison to the Trump campaign, and his allies advocated the visit as a chance to defend Mexican interests and calm financial markets worried about how a possible Trump victory in November might harm Mexico's economy, according to Mexicans familiar with the deliberations. But Trump followed his Mexico City trip with a defiant speech in Phoenix vowing to crack down on illegal **immigrants** and build a massive border fence - while forcing Mexico to pay for it.

A recent poll found that 85 percent of Mexicans thought it had been a bad idea to bring the U.S. presidential candidate to their country. Trump's visit prompted opponents in Mexico City to plan a protest march for Sept. 15, the eve of Mexico's independence day, calling on Peña Nieto to step down.

Speaking at a news conference Wednesday in the presidential palace, flanked by Videgaray and other ministers, Peña Nieto praised his close ally for his four years at the helm of the Finance Ministry, saying he had been committed to "further the transformation of Mexico." Videgaray's work has "strengthened public finances and increased tax revenue in an unprecedented way, with less dependence on oil revenue," the president added.

The Mexican leader was losing not just a key minister but also a trusted aide. Videgaray, an MIT-educated economist, had worked with Peña Nieto when he was a governor and later ran his campaign for president. But the Mexican president's approval ratings had been languishing even before the Trump visit, and he has been pilloried relentlessly in recent days.

Peña Nieto appointed José Antonio Meade, Mexico's social development minister and a popular former foreign minister, to take over as finance minister.

At the start of the Peña Nieto administration, Videgaray was perhaps the best-known member of a group of young, hotshot technocrats around him who pledged to reboot Mexico's economy and society and bring a reform-minded agenda to the Institutional Revolutionary Party, which had ruled for much of the past century.

But during Videgaray's tenure as minister, Mexico's economy has been characterized by plodding growth and a weakening peso. A steep drop in world oil prices has hurt the country and dampened enthusiasm for a bold plan to open up the country's crucial oil industry to foreign investment. Videgaray helped craft some of the key economic reforms, including restructuring the tax system with an aim to expand the number of contributors.

His supporters described him as a capable financial mind who kept the economy stable during a turbulent time. "I believe, in general, Videgaray has delivered well," said Gabriel Guerra Castellanos, a consultant and media analyst.

But government deficits and the public debt grew during Videgaray's tenure, and critics saw him as arrogant. Many Mexicans opposed his tax increases.

The driving force behind Videgaray's abrupt departure appeared to be the Trump visit. Many here felt humiliated that Peña Nieto would host the candidate.

The trip also divided Peña Nieto's government. Some cabinet members, such as Foreign Minister Claudia Ruiz Massieu, had argued against inviting the candidate.

The government is expected to present its 2017 budget on Thursday. Peña Nieto said that the government would be "tightening its belt" but that there will "not be new taxes nor increases in existing ones."

"The adjustments will fall on the government, and not on the people," he said.

joshua.partlow@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The smell of fresh paint greeted lawmakers reacquainting themselves with their workplace after their seven-week break.

The scaffolding was coming down, revealing a gleaming dome and, underneath it, restored friezes, oil paintings and statues. The Capitol has been returned to its former glory.

If only they could do the same to Congress.

After their seven-week recess, which included both party conventions and was the longest break since at least 1960, the people's representatives in the House are back for just four weeks before recessing again until the election - and there has been talk of cutting those four weeks of work to three or even two.

They might as well go home, because the House to-do list could end up looking something like this: Impeach the IRS commissioner. Punish the Democrats. Sue the Saudis.

This is how Donald Trump happened.

Americans are worried and angry about the big issues: stagnant wages, **immigration**, trade deals, health care, entitlement programs, the tax code, the Zika virus, tainted drinking water. Yet the best Congress can do for the moment is to keep the government running on autopilot for a few more months, and even this isn't guaranteed.

With three weeks to go in the fiscal year, Congress has enacted not one of the 12 annual appropriations bills (the House has passed six). While leaders struggle to pass a temporary "continuing resolution," Republicans fight among themselves about how long it should last and hard-liners threaten to derail it by adding language banning Syrian **refugees**.

As Republicans sat down for their caucus meeting Wednesday morning, the conversation wandered - this member's new grandchild, that member's engagement, various anecdotes and talking points. GOP leaders held a news conference after the meeting, at which they voiced enthusiastic support for ... a new soapbox that had appeared over the recess to help shorter members of the caucus be seen behind the lectern.

"You could put three people on that thing," House Speaker Paul D. Ryan said upon entering the room and spying the new piece of furniture.

"Gee whiz!" exclaimed Rep. Lynn Jenkins (R-Kan.), trying it out. "There's room for all of you on the box," she told the assembled reporters.

With so little happening, House Majority Leader Kevin McCarthy tried to create the illusion of activity, asserting that in this Congress "a total of 219 bills have been enacted into law. That's an increase over the 25-year average."

Actually, the average number of bills enacted into law in previous Congresses going back to 1991 is 435 - double the current output. McCarthy's spokesman said the claim was based on when Congress went on its long summer holiday. But as of now, McCarthy's 219 bills are well below the 25-year average of 257 enacted at this point by previous Congresses. And, as House Democrats point out, 195 of those 219 bills have been minor "suspension" bills, such as post-office namings.

"People want a positive vision and a clear direction for solving the country's big problems," Ryan declared at his news conference.

They do. But instead, they're getting:

lAn attempt to impeach the IRS commissioner. Some hard-liners, still angry about the IRS's treatment of conservative groups, are using a "privileged resolution" to force leaders to hold a vote to impeach the current commissioner, John Koskinen, who took over after the alleged wrongdoing occurred.

lA bid to punish two dozen House Democrats, led by civil rights icon John Lewis, who staged a sit-in on the House floor in June to protest Republicans' refusal to bring up gun-control legislation.

lLegislation allowing the families of 9/11 victims to sue Saudi Arabia in federal courts. The bill has no chance of surviving an expected veto.

Instead, House Republicans could spend their fleeting time at work resolving an impasse blocking funds to fight the Zika infection. The Senate reached a bipartisan deal in May to provide $1.1 billion for the effort, but the agreement fell apart when House Republicans added a provision restricting funds from going to Planned Parenthood.

At Wednesday's news conference, CNN's Manu Raju asked Ryan why he wouldn't accept a "clean bill" without the poison pill.

"Look, give me a break," Ryan said, blaming the Senate.

But even some of Ryan's Republicans aren't giving him a break. Rep. Richard Hanna (R-N.Y.) told Bloomberg's Billy House that "we become obstructionists" with the Planned Parenthood gambit.

And Rep. David Jolly (R-Fla.) carried a jar full of Florida mosquitoes onto the House floor. "During the seven weeks ... that we were gone, cases of Zika rose from 4,000 to by some estimates over 16,000 in the country," he said. His constituents "are demanding action and they are seeing inaction, and in that inaction they are angry."

Yes, but have they seen that new soapbox for members of Congress? Gee whiz!

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**It was the early 1960s, and 9-year-old Eliseo Pérez-Stable was at home in Miami with the chickenpox, dreading his return to the third grade.

Nearly a year had passed since his parents in Cuba - fearful of the Communists' rise to power - had sent him out of that country with his grandparents, and he still couldn't grasp English. At school, his teacher had resorted to yelling at him in Spanish.

The boy panicked. Scabs were forming over his blisters, but if they didn't heal, he rationalized, perhaps he could stay home. One by one, he began to pick at them. It was a month before he was forced to return to class.

His experiences as a young **immigrant** proved pivotal for Pérez-Stable, who grew up to become a doctor and scientist, and whose research has documented the impact of language barriers and other issues on the health of Latinos. At 64, he leads the National Institutes of Health's division to fund and guide minority health research.

"From this stage, I can see the opportunity to shape the field and promote the development of the next generation in minority health and health disparities," he said last week as he marked his first year as director of the National Institute on Minority Health and Health Disparities.

Some of his motivation dates to childhood. At that first school, he never learned English but excelled in math because numbers were their own familiar language. He moved to Pittsburgh once his parents arrived, where he was called racist nicknames, asked whether he knew about refrigerators and teased about his favorite baseball player, Roberto Clemente.

"I think my experiences as an **immigrant** child, my efforts at assimilation and the experiences of the external world in the late 1960s, shaped my perspective on society," he said.

Yet his homeland continues to shape him. He has returned to Cuba nearly 10 times in the past few decades to recapture his language and "connect to the Latino American reality." His most recent visit was in March.

Pérez-Stable began doing research in the 1980s, when he was a professor at the University of California at San Francisco. The city's racial and ethnic disparities were clear to him; certainly, there was no empowered Latino community, as he had known growing up in Miami and attending college and medical school there.

"You'd walk into UCSF, and the only people of color you would see would be behind the desk or the custodians," he said. "There were very few physicians who were minority."

He studied tobacco use among Latinos and the effectiveness of smoking-cessation policies, minority aging, cancer prevention among Latinos and the impact of informal translators on Latino health.

"At the time, people were saying you quit smoking for your own health," he said. "And what we discovered in working with Latinos ... was that the big motivator was going to be not just for their own health but also for [their family and] others around them."

His research on interpreters found that communication barriers made it difficult for doctors to understand a patient's symptoms and therefore treat their diseases. And ad-hoc interpreters, such as family members or office assistants who happened to speak the language, were being used instead of professional interpreters.

"Documenting empirically that it was better to not do that, I think was an important step to provide evidence for policy changes," Pérez-Stable said.

Pérez-Stable had been in the Bay Area 37 years, treating patients and conducting research, when he received a call for applicants to head the National Institutes of Health's lead organization on minority health. The outgoing director, John Ruffin, was retiring after nearly a quarter-century at NIH.

As part of the hiring process, Pérez-Stable outlined his vision. He wanted to bring the social sciences more under the umbrella of the medical sciences, he told them. He envisioned research to show how people's socioeconomic status and everyday lives affect their health. He wanted to know whether being a victim of abuse, for example, or struggling with food insecurity, poverty or family tension has a biological impact on long-term health.

"Being stressed out as a baby for whatever reason or having bad events happen to you as a young child may trigger changes in biology that may lead to disease when you're 40 or 50," Pérez-Stable explained recently in his sunlight-flooded office in Bethesda, about 15 minutes from NIH's main campus. A map of Cuba decorates the wall behind his desk.

"We're now beginning to see that that's not just theoretically possible, but it's actually a plausible biological mechanism of what happens with chronic disease," he said. "We should always be asking that question."

Pérez-Stable started his new job last September. Created in 2010, his institute is the newest at NIH, and its second-smallest, with a $281 million budget for research, training and public education. Some of the grant money is set aside to target under-researched institutions. For example, in 2014 the institute funded a $15.5 million grant to Morehouse School of Medicine in Atlanta to expand its capacity to conduct research on minority health and health disparities.

Similarly, in 2016, a $9.5 million grant was awarded to Florida International University to conduct community-based research to reduce high rates of HIV.

Pérez-Stable is planting roots in Washington. In August, he and his wife, Claudia Husni, purchased a home in Columbia Heights, a neighborhood that he describes as having some of the "grit" of the Bay Area.

In his role at NIH, he's intent on advancing causes he has long supported.

"I would like to ... establish a greater depth and credibility and acceptance of the science of minority health and health disparities," he said. "So that people say, yeah, this is important to know what happens in the human behavior, human biology, to understand what the factors of race, ethnicity and socioeconomic status are on how the brain functions, or how childhood experiences affect adult health."

kimbriell.kelly@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A MONTH ago, Donald Trump and officials in his campaign assured voters they would organize a news conference to clear up questions about the legal means by which his Slovenian-born wife, Melania, entered the country in the mid-1990s and obtained a green card several years before they were married in 2005. Those questions persist, the Trump campaign has refused to answer them, and no such news conference has occurred.

Ms. Trump insists she violated no **immigration** laws; that may prove to be the case. Yet her own sketchy and not-quite-consistent account of her initial **immigration** status, along with the publication of nude modeling photos of her taken in New York the year before she says she entered the country, have combined to stoke doubts that she played entirely by the rules.

If she didn't, some sympathy may be in order. U.S. **immigration** laws are so abstruse, so dysfunctional and so out of step with the demands of the American labor market that - well, it's no accident that 11 million people live in this country without proper documentation, and that many or most of them have been here for 15 years or longer.

Less sympathy would be due Mr. Trump, who, having built his campaign around vilifying illegal **immigrants**, looks like a Grand Wizard of Hypocrisy. And having spent months as the most prominent exponent of the detestable "birther" movement, badgering the president to release his plainly valid and unexceptional birth certificate, the Republican presidential nominee now can't be bothered to come clean on legitimate questions about the terms under which his wife entered the country and remained here.

Mr. Trump's two-facedness on **immigration** doesn't end there. As a developer, he employed and may have exploited undocumented **immigrants** to work on at least one of his most prominent projects, Trump Tower in New York. He has attacked the United States' main visa program for high-skilled workers, calling it a job killer and vowing to end it with "no exceptions," but his own companies have used it liberally to import hundreds of foreign workers, including fashion models.

Of course, Mr. Trump and hypocrisy have long been on intimate terms. Although he has invested overseas in an array of businesses and projects, he thinks nothing of bashing other U.S. companies for launching plants and operations abroad. A champion of "traditional" marriage, he has tried it three times. And then there are his claims about charitable giving, which, upon close examination by The Post, look wildly inflated.

Melania Trump, like many an **immigrant**, may be reluctant to delve too publicly into the details of her earliest days in the United States. Yet it is Mr. Trump's own double standards, on **immigration** and other issues, that invited questions - questions he himself said publicly would be addressed. The country is still waiting.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The new poll of voters in all 50 states revealed a variety of interesting dynamics across the country, including wide-ranging support for third-party candidates, the consistent role of Obama's popularity and how Utah may be the most interesting state to watch this election.

The new poll of voters in all 50 states revealed a variety of interesting dynamics across the country, including wide-ranging support for third-party candidates, the consistent role of President Obama's popularity and how Utah may be the most interesting state to watch this election.

Johnson wins a slice

Third-party candidates Gary Johnson and Jill Stein are positioned to garner significant support across the country in a year in which the major-party candidates have broken records for unpopularity. The Post-SurveyMonkey poll finds the Libertarian Party's Johnson supported by an average of 13 percent across all states, ranging from a low of 4 percent in Mississippi to a high of 25 percent in New Mexico, the state where he served two terms as governor.

Johnson's second-best showing comes in neighboring Utah, where the state's heavily Republican and Mormon electorate has been especially resistant to Trump. Johnson also fares well in several Midwest and Western states, receiving 19 percent support in South Dakota, Idaho and Alaska, 17 percent in Kansas and 16 percent in Colorado, Iowa, North Dakota and Washington.

The Green Party's Stein receives less support than Johnson, averaging 5 percent across all states in the new poll. Her best showing is 10 percent in Vermont, home to Sen. Bernie Sanders, the runner-up for the Democratic nomination. She also receives 8 percent in Maine and 7 percent across a range of heavily Democratic or Republican states, including Oklahoma, Idaho, Oregon and California.

Utah is most uncertain state

An average of 10 percent of registered voters reported "no opinion" when asked whether they would vote for Hillary Clinton or Donald Trump, but the share of uncommitted voters is nearly twice as high in Utah at 19 percent, the most of any state. Even when third-party candidates are offered as options, Utah's 11 percent undecided is the most in the nation.

Utah has long been loyal to Republicans, supporting the party's presidential candidates by double digits in presidential contests for over four decades. But Trump came in third place in the state's Republican caucuses this March, earning only 14 percent of the vote. He performed particularly poorly in areas of the state with a larger share of Mormons, who account for a majority of the state's population, according to a 2015 Pew Research survey.

Trump is still a favorite to win the state, leading Clinton by 46 percent to 35 percent. His edge shrinks to 34-27 when third-party candidates are mentioned, with Johnson's significant 23 percent only four points below Clinton. Mitt Romney's 73-to-25 percent victory in 2012 marked Republicans' largest margin since President Ronald Reagan's 1984 run, with Romney probably benefiting from his leadership in the Mormon church. Compared with the 2008 race, while Clinton's current standing in a two-way contest is nearly identical to Obama's 34 percent support, Trump's support today is well below Sen. John McCain's 62 percent support that year.

Room on Obama's coattails?

Obama's approval rating has been above 50 percent in national polls, an above-average popularity that figures to benefit Clinton this fall. The Post-SurveyMonkeypoll underscores the close connection between Obama's image and Clinton's fate this fall.

Across all 50 states, Obama averages 48 percent job approval, and Clinton's support against Trump differs from his rating by an average of only four percentage points. On average, Obama's approval rating is three points higher than Clinton's support, exceeding her support at least narrowly in 48 states. The two exceptions are strongly Republican Wyoming (Obama approval 26 percent, Clinton support 27 percent) and Arkansas, where Clinton served as the state's first lady and garners 41 percent support against Trump, compared with Obama's 36 percent job-approval mark.

Home state favoritism also appears to play a role in the state where Clinton falls short of Obama the most. In Obama's home state of Hawaii, his 70 percent job-approval rating far surpasses Clinton's support by 12 percentage points. The gap is smaller but more consequential in more politically divided Colorado, Florida, Michigan and Iowa, where Clinton's support falls four points short of Obama's approval mark.

While Clinton has not united all of Obama's supporters, Trump has even more work to do in galvanizing Obama opponents. His state-level support is six points below Obama's disapproval rating, on average, with sizable underperformance across many states. Obama's disapproval mark exceeds Trump's vote share by 13 points in Vermont, and by 11 points in Delaware. Among battlegrounds, Trump trails Obama's disapproval mark by eight points in New Hampshire and Pennsylvania, and by seven points in Ohio and Iowa.

**Immigration** lower-tier issue

Trump's promises to deport undocumented **immigrants** and build a wall along the U.S.-Mexico border have put the issue of **immigration** at the center of this year's campaign, but the 50-state poll finds **immigration** is a second- or third-tier issue for voters across the country.

Asked which issue matters to them most, an average of 32 percent across all 50 states picked the economy and jobs, followed by health care and terrorism at 16 percent each, education at 10 percent and the environment at 8 percent. **Immigration** came fifth at 7 percent, exceeding only foreign policy at 4 percent.

The importance of **immigration** peaked in some states near and far from the U.S.-Mexico border, including 13 percent in North Dakota, 12 percent in Idaho, and 10 percent in Texas and in California. But in each of these states, **immigration** ranked behind the economy and terrorism.

scott.clement@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Our stomachs eventually conquer our worst politics, it seems. Just look at the food courts across America.

Pizza, hamburgers, lo mein - the foods of people America once tried to kick out.

The latest gastronomic absurdity in politics came last week, after Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump gave another grim speech about the impact of **immigrants** on America, and the co-founder of Latinos for Trump, Marco Gutierrez, underscored Trump's hard-line views.

"My culture is a very dominant culture, and it's imposing - and it's causing problems," Gutierrez said on MSNBC. "If you don't do something about it, you're going to have taco trucks on every corner."

They're worried about taco trucks on every corner?

Bah. Look at what all that anti-Italian **immigration** legislation of the 1920s did to stop the folks coming over from Italy.

Today we've got more than 73,000 pizza joints in America. The horror.

This ridiculous routine - hate them, fear them, fight them, accept them - has happened to all of the food-court **immigrants** in our nation's history. (You know, the folks who freaked everyone out when they got here but now dominate every food court in the country - Italians, Chinese, Germans.)

And the food court is a great way to see how absurd our **immigration** stances - from anti-Italian legislation to the taco-truck affair to growing waves of Islamophobia - are.

Let's start with Mexican food, because taco trucks have been all the rage this weekend.

Osiris Hoil has shown how menacing these taco trucks can be.

Born in Yucatan, Mexico, Hoil came to America on a visitor visa and - after working in a restaurant, getting married and working in construction - opened a taco stand in an office-heavy part of Virginia, parked right between a Chipotle and a Baja Fresh in Rosslyn. Talk about every corner.

That was the beginning of District Taco, a local chain that now has multiple restaurants and is about to employ nearly 400 people.

"Remember, I was laid off in 2008, that's how I started this business," Hoil said. "And now we're a big corporation."

When he was starting out with the taco stand, he got up at 4 a.m. and went to bed at 10 p.m. Every day. It was a lot of hard, honest work. Now, as an executive, he gets up at 5 a.m. - but still doesn't make it to bed until 10 every night.

He said Gutierrez's taco-truck comment was so funny, so absurd, he could hardly be angry at it.

"I had to laugh," he said. "A taco truck on every corner? Why not!"

This is what Gutierrez and Trump are afraid of?

The sentiment wasn't so different when waves of Italian **immigrants** were coming to America. The Emergency Quota Act of 1921 and the **Immigration** Act of 1924 were written to minimize the number or **immigrants** - especially Italians - coming.

Before that, 11 Italians were lynched in New Orleans in 1891, and hundreds were arrested, after a police chief was killed and some of the Italians charged in his assassination were acquitted. After that, the Ku Klux Klan began targeting Italians.

As for pizza and pasta jokes, they were everywhere (most too nasty to print).

And now, can you imagine a football season without a pizza party? It's as American as a hot dog.

Oh, wait. That brings us to Germans.

Think America embraced the forefathers of hot dogs and hamburgers?

"Unless the stream of their importation could be turned they will soon so outnumber us that all the advantages we have will not be able to preserve our language, and even our government will become precarious," Benjamin Franklin warned of the waves of Germans coming to Pennsylvania in the 1750s. He called them the "most stupid of their nation."

Well, we forgot about that one quickly.

How about Chinese food?

Sure, General Tso's chicken is an Americanized take on the food of people who helped with the backbreaking labor of building a nation.

But when Congress authorized the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 - which aimed to curb Chinese **immigration**, citizenship, and business and land ownership - did the worst fears that prompted that law come true?

Not really. The threat was called "the Yellow Peril," and a people who were deemed "unassimilable" have become an integral part of the nation.

Any real complaints about the Chinese takeout on every corner?

Our stomachs do our smartest thinking. Our tables are the true indicators of the state of our nation's diversity.

Salsa, after all, has outpaced ketchup in sales in America for years, Hoil reminded me.

"This is still a country of great opportunity," Hoil said while driving between meetings over the weekend. "You can work hard. You can succeed. And that's part of the entrepreneurial dream. A taco truck is what all that hard work is about. How can this be bad?"

petula.dvorak@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CLEVELAND - On a holiday devoted to American workers, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump converged Monday on this Midwestern city built on manufacturing and made starkly different pitches to blue-collar voters about where their allegiances should lie.

In a bid to boost turnout among a traditionally Democratic constituency, Clinton ticked off a list of policy proposals aimed at lifting working-class families and warned that Trump does not have their best interests in mind, citing what she characterized as a long record as a businessman of "stiffing" contractors he employed.

"Just look at Donald Trump's track record when it comes to hard-working men and women," the Democratic presidential nominee told a crowd of about 3,000 people at an annual festival in a park here that has long been a gathering place for African Americans. "There may be people you know who are thinking about voting for him. And you know, friends don't let friends vote for Trump."

Clinton was joined by a trio of national union leaders, all of whom touted her as the best choice for workers, and by her running mate, Sen. Tim Kaine of Virginia. Kaine called Trump "a guy who's been sitting up in the penthouse and doesn't even understand the everyday lives of working folks."

Trump made a lower-key pitch, holding a roundtable discussion with local labor leaders and union members at a suburban American Legion post and mingling with patrons at a city diner before heading to a county fair near Youngstown.

The Republican nominee was joined at both Cleveland-area stops by Tom Coyne, mayor of the suburb of Brook Park and a former Democrat. Trump showcased Coyne as a model of his ability to reach across party lines, including to working-class voters who like his anti-free-trade message and tough anti-**immigration**stands.

"These are the big union folks here," Trump said as he sat with several workers and Coyne at a back table at Goody's Diner.

"I think the mayor is just one example that's happening across this country where voters who traditionally haven't voted Republican or haven't voted in a very long time seem to be coming out to support this messenger and this message," Kellyanne Conway, Trump's campaign manager, told reporters.

Conway added that she is bullish about Trump's prospects for luring union workers to cross over and vote Republican in other industrial states, including Pennsylvania.

At the diner, Trump gestured to reporters to take note when he met a supporter named Maria Hernandez.

"Mexican American supporter [of] Trump. Mexican American. It's so nice," Trump said. Polls show the Hispanic demographic breaking heavily in Clinton's favor.

Monday's events marked the traditional transition to the final leg of the campaign - the "mad dash" to November, as Clinton described it to her traveling press corps.

The importance of Ohio was evident from the runway at the airport here: When Clinton touched down in her newly acquired jet - emblazoned with her "Stronger Together" slogan - Trump's personal plane and the campaign jet used by his running mate, Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, were already parked on the tarmac.

Besides Clinton and Kaine, other high-profile Democrats fanned out across the Midwest and beyond Monday to reinforce the ticket's message. Those joining the two nominees or campaigning on their own included former president Bill Clinton, Vice President Biden and Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont, the runner-up for the Democratic nomination. Sanders was making his first campaign stops for Clinton since the party's convention in July.

At her stop here, Clinton unveiled a new book that compiles policy proposals put forward by her ticket, many of them geared toward helping the middle class. Among them: making college more affordable, raising the minimum wage, an increase in child-care tax credits and requiring equal pay for women for equal work.

Clinton's appearance was marred by a coughing fit just as she took the stage. Her voice never fully recovered, despite several gulps of water and what appeared to be a lozenge.

"Every time I think about Trump I get allergic," Clinton joked.

Conway, Trump's campaign manager, later suggested on Twitter that it was actually the media that had caused Clinton's allergy.

That was a reference to the fact that Clinton was aboard a new plane Monday, flying with reporters in the back for the first time during her campaign.

Previously, reporters followed the candidate around the country in a separate chartered jet.

Before the flight left the airport in the morning in Westchester, N.Y., Clinton ventured back to greet about three dozen members of the media traveling with her. On a flight after the stop in Cleveland, she came back again, making herself available to take questions from the group for the first time in several months.

Over the course of more than 20 minutes - interrupted by more coughing and the landing - Clinton fielded questions on an array of subjects, including a Washington Post report that U.S. intelligence and law enforcement agencies are probing what they see as a broad covert Russian operation in the United States to sow public distrust in the upcoming presidential election.

"We are facing a very serious concern," she said. "We've never had a foreign adversarial power be already involved in our electoral process."

Upon landing, her motorcade headed to another Labor Day celebration in the Quad Cities area that straddles the Iowa-Illinois border.

In Ohio, throngs of supporters greeted Trump and Pence at the Canfield County fair. Fairgoers waved, shouted "Trump, Trump, Trump" and clamored to shake Trump's hand as the two candidates walked.

En route to the fair, Trump attacked Clinton on **immigration** and took a firm stand against offering undocumented **immigrants** a path to citizenship.

Trump, who has publicly wrestled with the issue in recent weeks, told reporters that Clinton has "no plan" and favored "total amnesty."

"Ask her about **immigration**, because it's a very difficult subject," Trump said. "No matter what you say, there are going to be a group of people that are very unhappy with you."

Asked if he would support giving noncriminal undocumented **immigrants** a path to legal status, Trump said his campaign would revisit the issue in the future.

Meanwhile, Sanders gave three speeches Monday in New Hampshire, where he defeated Clinton in February by the largest margin in the history of that state's primary.

While polling suggests that 90 percent or more of Sanders's supporters back Clinton, Democrats worry that disaffected but anti-Trump voters might go for a third-party candidate instead.

At an AFL-CIO breakfast in Manchester, Sanders thanked New Hampshire voters for proving "radical ideas" like a $15-an-hour minimum wage, universal health care and paid family leave could win votes.

An hour later, at a sloping park in the small town of Warner, Sanders spoke to a crowd of at least 250 people for 30 minutes before mentioning the Democratic ticket. When he promised to "do everything I can" to elect Clinton, a dozen or so supporters of Green Party presidential nominee Jill Stein booed, yelled "Jill" or waved signs with the slogan "Jill, not Hill."

"Trust me, I understand!" said Sanders. "You're talking to the longest serving independent in the history of the Congress. I understand there are people who may not agree with me. And I respect that. But I feel like at this point in history, a candidate like Trump, who is running on reactionary economics, tax breaks for the wealthy and cutting programs for the very poor - who rejects the science of climate change - is running on a core of bigotry."

After asking supporters to make sure that Clinton, if elected, enacted the progressive Democratic Party platform, Sanders headed north to Lebanon High School. Flanked by banners that read "Stronger Together" - but made no specific mentions of Clinton's name - Sanders told a more amenable crowd to focus one more time on the issues.

"We have got to be a little bit smarter than the media," said Sanders. "A campaign is not about the candidates. Not about Hillary Clinton. Not about Donald Trump. Not about Bernie Sanders. A campaign is about you and your needs."
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DelReal reported from Washington. Weigel reported from Manchester, Warner and Lebanon, N.H.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**SOACHA, Colombia - In the nation with more internal **refugees** than any other, you won't find the uprooted and the dispossessed huddled in tent camps or fleeing in long caravans. Colombia's war doesn't look like that, at least not anymore.

The United Nations counts about 7 million "internally displaced people" here, more than in Syria, Iraq or any other war zone. Forced to flee their farms and villages, they have resettled at the edges of Colombia's cities, finding **refuge** in places like this treeless, teeming slum on the outskirts of the capital, Bogota.

"Every time you leave, you have to start all over again with nothing," said Isaac Valencia, 33, who was displaced by the war as a boy and again as an adult, when commandos from a drug gang torched his home and took his land.

Valencia is waiting, like everyone here, for the outcome of the Oct. 2 referendum asking Colombians to approve or reject the government's peace agreement with the leftist FARC guerrilla group, which it has been fighting in Latin America's longest-running war. The pact promises to bring the rule of law to Colombia's most backward, hyperviolent rural fringes, where so many have fled the crossfire of communist rebels, government troops, right-wing militias and cocaine warlords.

Under the accords, the government promises to significantly enhance programs to help the victims recover their farms or receive land elsewhere. But resolving the displacement crisis is likely to be a long, thorny process.

Over the course of the half-century war, rural residents have poured into Colombia's cities to escape bombings, land mines, massacres, kidnappings, death threats and land seizures. They see peace with the FARC - or the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia - as a remedy for one source of violence, but they know that many regions are still threatened by other armed groups. They also don't trust the government to protect them.

Valencia, who lives alone on a steep hillside above Soacha, with no running water and a zinc roof, wants to go back to his farm. But he insists he must have "guarantees" that he won't be victimized again.

"If they do what they say they're going to do [in the peace accords], I'll be the first one to pack up my things," he said. "Until then, I'm staying right here."

Nearly 15 percent of Colombia's population has been displaced, but that doesn't quite capture the scope of the conflict. This is a country derailed by war, its economy slowed and its potential development sapped by the fighting.

For the displaced and others who bear the war's worst scars, the peace deal is a beginning, not an end, said Alan Jara, director of the government agency tasked with registering and caring for those officially recognized as victims of the war.

"They want to overcome what happened and they want to know the truth," Jara said. He was abducted by the FARC in 2001 and spent more than seven years in captivity, much of it chained to a tree - "2,760 nights," he said. "I counted."

The peace accords pledge to make the displaced whole again by returning their lost property, or assign them farmland in other parts of Colombia with better security. They will be eligible for cash assistance and technical help to make sure their farms are economically viable.

But the reality Colombia must face, said Jara, is that many **refugees** will stay in cities. Some don't want to relive the trauma of their flight. They have raised urban-minded children with no interest in farming.

"Some of the older ones may want to return because they are nostalgic for the places they left behind," Jara said. "But when they go back to their communities, they see those places don't exist anymore. The lives they remember are gone."

A new beginning?

Gritty Soacha is one of the places with the highest concentrations of displaced people in Colombia, according to U.N. officials, with more than 50 percent of its half-million residents migrants from somewhere else. Unemployment runs high, and crime and drug-related killings are on the rise.

Shacks and illegally built homes cram the hillsides, blanched by dust from a nearby sand quarry.

Jose Erasmo Yate, 68, a shaman from a Pijao indigenous village in the department of Tolima, fled more than a decade ago after an offensive by right-wing paramilitaries against the FARC turned the area into a war zone. He lives in a small rowhouse beside a loud, busy street, performing cleansing rituals and healing ceremonies in a tiny back room with an altar and a portrait of Jesus.

Yate said being displaced is a kind of "sickness of the heart and soul." He has asked the government to resettle him with other scattered Pijao in an indigenous reserve where they can farm again if the peace accords succeed.

"If we have our own land, we can start a school and recover our ancestral customs," he said. "It would be so beautiful to go home."

The Colombian government has provided housing for some of the displaced in a sprawling complex of apartment blocks in Soacha's center. They contain a volatile mix of old foes. Demobilized FARC guerrillas, former paramilitary fighters and victims of both groups are sometimes assigned apartments side-by-side, Ruben Dario Quevedo said. Death threats from paramilitaries forced him to flee Tolima 10 years ago with his wife and four children.

Quevedo, 46, received a small apartment two years ago, but to reach it he must limp up five flights of stairs. He has two ruptured discs in his back from a workplace accident.

He has no desire to start over again back in the countryside. "We suffered so much when we first arrived in Bogota. We didn't have any way to pay rent. Sometimes we went two or three days without food," Quevedo said. "You feel so humiliated."

"I don't ever want to go through that again," he said.

Continued displacement

Martin Gottwald, the country representative of the U.N. High Commissioner for **Refugees**, says Colombia has come a long way toward facing up to its crisis of displaced citizens. And unlike many war-ravaged nations, Colombia is not a basket case, he said, but a middle-income country with a legal framework to recognize the status of internally displaced people, or IDPs, and help them.

"Colombia has the most sophisticated registration system in place for IDPs," Gottwald said. "The fact that it has such a high number of IDPs may be a consequence of that system, because it allows them to be counted."

Gottwald cautioned, however, that the peace accords will not mean the end of forced displacement in Colombia. The country's conflict is "metastasizing, like a cancer," he said, as it morphs into a battle for control of rural Colombia's illegal economies, especially the drug trade.

Last year, more than 200,000 Colombians were forcibly displaced. A disproportionate number are indigenous people and Afro-Colombians living in remote coastal areas that have high strategic value for traffickers and contain little to no government presence, Gottwald said.

Valencia, the farmer living on Soacha's hillsides, grew up with 13 siblings in the impoverished Choco department along the Pacific Coast. It was a FARC stronghold until 1997, when the Colombian army moved in and right-wing paramilitary gunmen followed.

Valencia's 18-year-old brother was stopped by troops one day while coming home from a soccer game. Valencia said they handed him to the paramilitary forces, who accused him of helping the FARC. His dismembered corpse washed up on the riverbank a few days later.

When the paramilitaries left, the FARC guerrillas came back and accused Valencia's other older brother of being a government snitch. They shot him. He was 16.

That was the first time Valencia's family fled, and the first time he learned to be wary of the government.

"How can I trust them after they did that to my brother?" he asked.

Valencia, who is unemployed, said he tried to plant a small garden in the dust outside his house this year. It didn't work. A hard rain fell and washed his plants away.

nick.miroff@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**CALAIS, France - French truck drivers and farmers began a massive demonstration on Calais' roadways on Monday, threatening to block the northern French port until the city's major migrant camp is dismantled.

The blockade was largely symbolic, with columns of large trucks and tractors arranged on a major access road into the port, the busiest passenger port in France. On Monday, the Port of Calais confirmed that harbor traffic continued without impediment, with the ferry service for Dover operating as usual.

Monday's protest was the latest escalation in the long-brewing political drama over the "Jungle" camp outside Calais, one of the most visible symbols of Europe's ongoing migrant crisis, nestled between two of the continent's wealthiest capitals. In squalid conditions seldom seen in Western Europe, thousands of migrants and **refugees** - no one can agree on exactly how many - live in stateless limbo, outside the authority of any government.

Last month, local authorities here said that 6,900 migrants and **refugees** live in the Jungle, but humanitarian aid organizations such as Help **Refugees** and Auberge des Migrants place the figure much higher, about 9,000. Whichever is correct, Monday's protesters say the number of migrants outside their city is far too high, and they are demanding an immediate solution to what they are describing as a recent spike in violence on nearby roads.

Even after the United Kingdom's Brexit vote to leave the European Union in June, a majority of the migrants and **refugees** in the Jungle are still desperate to reach Britain, just 20 miles from Calais across the English Channel. Truckers complain that in recent weeks, the migrants' desperation has translated into staging dangerous barricades and other diversions on major thoroughfares in order to climb aboard British-bound vehicles before they enter the Channel Tunnel.

"We are determined to show that we are not happy with the situation," Jean-Pierre Devigne, an official with France's largest trucking union, the National Federation of Road Transport, told the BBC's Radio 4 on Monday. "We [will] stay for the time we need."

In advance of Monday's protest, Bernard Cazeneuve, France's interior minister, said Friday that France would pursue demolishing the Jungle "with the greatest determination." He also said the government would create shelter spots for an additional 8,000 **refugees** and migrants, to be followed by thousands more in 2017.

But the government's partial demolition of the Jungle's most populous area six months ago led to few material changes. Since that initial demolition, the Jungle's population has grown, according to the government and aid organizations. Thousands of migrants and **refugees** are still living on the outskirts of Calais, and the squalid conditions they inhabit have hardly improved.

In the French and British media, some drivers have reported individuals with knives and other weapons waiting by the sides of roads, but aid organizations insist that these are most often people-smugglers, not migrants themselves. Demolition of the Jungle, they argue, would only exacerbate a general situation that has worsened in the past year.

In a statement, Clare Moseley, the founder of Care4Calais, a nongovernmental aid organization, said that "demolitions do not act as a deterrent. The **refugees**come because they have no choice - they are fleeing war and persecution. Destroying their homes achieves nothing more than making living conditions so much more inhumane."

Despite Monday's demonstration in Calais, the Jungle's frequent invocation in talks between French and British leaders belies its actual significance in Europe's migrant crisis. It is merely the largest migrant camp in France, where only about 70,000 of the 1 million migrants and **refugees** who arrived in Europe in 2015 have claimed asylum, according to Eurostat, the E.U.'s statistical agency.

As Greece and Italy become front lines for processing arrivals, nations such as Germany, Hungary and Sweden have all welcomed tens of thousands of migrants - or in Germany's case, hundreds of thousands more than France. But increasingly vocal French officials - including the former president Nicolas Sarkozy, now eyeing a second term in office - have insisted that the Jungle's demolition be a priority.

Last month, Cazeneuve met in Paris with Britain's home secretary, Amber Rudd, and they issued a joint statement pledging to strengthen their border cooperation and beef up security. "We are committed to working together to strengthen the security of our shared border, to strongly diminish the migratory pressure in Calais and preserve the vital economic link supported by the juxtaposed controls in Calais," the statement read.

But the issue has been raised repeatedly in the run-up to next year's French presidential election. "Since most of these foreigners come to Calais to enter the U.K., I want our British friends to now assume the processing of applications from those who want asylum," Sarkozy told a northern French newspaper.

In Britain, most parties involved have rejected these calls out of hand. "The French know just as well as we do that this would be a disaster for both nations," Charlie Elphicke, a Conservative member of Parliament representing Dover, wrote in the Mail on Sunday.

Instead, he said, it is "critical to smash the people-traffickers. These modern-day slavers must be caught and jailed - put behind bars for at least 20 years and have all of their assets seized."

In the Jungle on Monday, a misty fog kept most migrants in their makeshift tents and shelters, structures typically meant for three or four people now often made to house eight or more.

Among them was Kumar Youns, 36, who has been in the camp for three months, having traveled from his native Sudan through Libya, the central Mediterranean and, finally, France. Like so many others here, he wants to enter Britain, where he hopes his wife and two young children will be able to join him. Youns said his first reaction when he arrived in Calais was one of surprise. "France is a big country that has power," he said, sitting in a tent littered with clothes, food and dirt. "This is not the first world."

And as Calais citizens and truck drivers report violence on the roadways, Youns said he also sees violence - such as the time a car stopped as he was walking on the street and a man threw a bottle of rum at him, the night of the France-Germany soccer game during the Euro 2016 finals. "They refuse to treat us like we're human," he said, noting that he never tells his family any of these stories during their weekly phone calls. "I won't tell them the truth," he said.
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Adam reported from London.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Regarding the Sept. 1 front-page article "Trump meets Mexico leader":

With his trip to Mexico, Republican presidential nominee Donald Trump, probably unwittingly, came closest to the core reason behind illegal **immigration**. For 100 years, the United States has been a dominant figure in the governance and way of life of Mexico and Central America. The United States has trained police and military, provided endless weapons and military materiel, thrown out democratically elected leadership, supported dictatorships and provided everything necessary to sustain a status quo that provides little in the way of opportunity, justice, fairness or any of the freedoms we like to believe we support.

People are leaving their countries, churches, families and towns, risking life, arrest and all levels of danger all because of the inability of their governments to provide the basic needs everyone craves. These "illegal **immigrants**" are in a life- and-death struggle. Securing our border will not be determined by the size of "the wall," but by what happens when we use our foreign aid and considerable influence to change the horrible inequities of these countries. We have to stop supporting corrupt governments and instead support significant changes to their long-standing ways of operation.

John Creasy, Arnold

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**HONOLULU - An update to the International Union for the Conservation of Nature's Red List of Threatened Species, which assesses the extinction risk of the world's plants, animals and fungi, was released here Sunday - and it moves a key gorilla subspecies, Congo's Grauer's gorilla, to "critically endangered" status.

Just 3,800 Grauer's gorillas remain - a sharp decline in numbers for the world's largest gorilla, and one largely driven by geopolitical upheaval as the Rwandan genocide drove large numbers of **refugees** into the gorillas' habitat.

The sharp decline of the Grauer's gorilla meant that the larger species to which it belongs, the eastern gorilla -which also includes the mountain gorilla - was listed as "critically endangered."

The international meeting, which convenes every four years, is the world's largest environmental decision-making forum, bringing together heads of state and other government officials, civilians, indigenous people, business leaders and academics to address the world's biggest conservation challenges. More than 8,000 delegates from 184 countries are in attendance.

The IUCN uses the Red List to classify organisms according to the severity of their extinction risk. In descending order of threat, the categories are "critically endangered," "endangered," "vulnerable," "near threatened" and "least concern." The list also includes categories for extinct and data-deficient species. Of the 82,954 species assessed, more than a quarter are threatened with extinction.

Arguably the biggest update to the Red List on Sunday was the report on the decline of the Grauer's gorilla, one of two subspecies of the eastern gorilla. The subspecies was moved from "endangered" to "critically endangered" after a report the Wildlife Conservation Society and Flora & Fauna International released this year found devastating population declines because of illegal hunting and civil unrest.

John Robinson, a primatologist and chief conservation officer at the Wildlife Conservation Society, cites the Rwandan genocide as a major driver of the decline in Grauer's gorillas. The exodus of Rwandan **refugees** had ripple effects: As people moved into eastern Congo, other people in the region were displaced. "Big populations ended up in some of the protected areas, which were relatively uninhabited," Robinson said. This opened up the protected areas to artisanal mining, charcoal extraction and bush-meat hunting.

Over the past 20 years, 77 percent of Grauer's gorillas have been lost; a 2015 assessment found just 3,800 Grauer's gorillas remain, compared with 16,900 in 1994.

Four of the six great ape species - the eastern gorilla, western gorilla, Bornean orangutan and Sumatran orangutan - are now listed as "critically endangered," while the chimpanzee and bonobo are listed as "endangered."

There were other dismaying updates, as well, on Sunday.

The plains zebra has moved from "least concern" to "near threatened" after a 24 percent population decline over the past 14 years - down from about 660,000 to 500,000 animals. The zebras are found only in protected areas in many of their range countries, yet many range states still report population declines. They are threatened by hunting for their meat and skins.

Three species of African antelope - the bay duiker, white-bellied duiker and yellow-backed duiker - also have moved from "least concern" to "near threatened." Populations within protected areas are relatively stable, but elsewhere they are threatened by illegal hunting and habitat loss.

Koalas have moved from "least concern" to "near threatened," as well. Habitat destruction and fragmentation, brushfires, disease and drought have taken a toll on the Australian marsupial. Management plans are in place but need improvement; a parliamentary inquiry concluded that Australia's conservation and management strategy was largely ineffective.

The latest IUCN assessment also shows that of the 415 endemic Hawaiian plants assessed, 87 percent are threatened with extinction. Thirty-eight plants have been listed as extinct, and four are listed as extinct in the wild. Invasive species of animals, including pigs, goats, rats and slugs, and non-native plants have imperiled Hawaii's flora, and the IUCN Species Survival Commission Hawaiian Plant Specialist Group anticipates that the remaining species to be assessed also will be highly threatened.

The IUCN Red List "has to drive imperative and important conservation action or we will lose these species forever," IUCN Director General Inger Andersen said. "Once they are gone, they really are gone."

Amid this bad news, there are signs of hope. Two endemic Hawaiian plants thought to be extinct - Mark's cyanea and the hairy wikstroemia - were rediscovered during the most recent assessment. And several other species have been down-listed, indicating that conservation actions are working.

The giant panda was moved from "endangered" to "vulnerable," as its population has grown as a result of effective forest protection and reforestation efforts by China. "We've kept it in the vulnerable category because there are concerns about climate change," said Craig Hilton-Taylor, head of the Red List Unit.

Wilkinson is an independent multimedia journalist specializing in science, technology and the environment.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**ONE POPULAR view of this unedifying election cycle is that it's an instance of working people - oppressed, underemployed, underpaid - rising up against the Establishment, whatever that might be. Polling shows that supporters of the insurgent leader in this drama, Donald Trump, are not in fact an impoverished peasantry in revolt - their household income is above the national average. Still, those who labor for a living do have reason to worry about the future. That's why they deserve a presidential contest in which the candidates deal seriously with the problems that face them, in this country and elsewhere.

A century after it began its rise to power and comparative prosperity, aided by a burgeoning union movement and a raft of progressive legislation, American labor is in many ways confounded. Unions are diminished, and the social pact by which large corporations provided good wages and benefits in return for loyal and reliable service has been eroded by technological change and international competition on an unprecedented scale. A website called Global Labor Strategies states it thus: "Today's trade unions are a product of a particular historical period when markets and the nation state [were] inextricably bound together. Now globalized capital easily outflanks national labor movements."

A hundred years ago, American workers faced some of these same anxieties. Assembly line production revolutionized manufacturing and brought prosperity to many. (All of those automobiles from Henry Ford's plants now were within reach of the workers.) But it also brought great discontent and disruption among huge numbers of people engaged in the production of goods and services that were becoming obsolete - as well as among craftsmen compelled to abandon well-honed skills for the repetitive work of the factory floor. The changes were accompanied by widespread social conflict, including numerous acts of terrorism. Meanwhile, waves of **immigrants**, who contributed much to the country's industrialization, were seen as a threat by native workers, a situation that finally led to a major reduction in **immigration** in the mid-1920s. Then followed the Depression and a world-altering war and the new economic order that is today undergoing rapid and unpredictable change.

How the United States deals with complex challenges of productivity, technology and globalization is a central question of 2016. No one has all the answers to the problems brought by rapid change, any more than they did in 1916 (though some loudly claim to). It's likely that whatever strategies are discussed for improving the situation of American workers won't be simple, and they're likely to cause as much disruption to existing institutions and arrangements as Mr.Ford's innovations once did. Surely, though, the candidates ought to be talking more about such things as coordinating better with business and industry to produce much-needed skills in the workforce, about reforms in education, about aid to workers displaced by trade, about new arrangements among labor, capital and government.

Right now, both candidates simplistically signal a retreat from free trade, as if that would make the problems with globalization go away. Mr. Trump blames foreigners and **immigrants** for the United States' ills, offers a vision of a fiscal magical kingdom where everyone gets everything they want, and insults, in the most vile terms, any who oppose him. Hillary Clinton offers a far more civilized vision for the country, but one that promises many things to many interests and seems to offer little in the way of new thinking. Workers - all Americans - deserve a more productive debate.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**You would have thought that Labor Day 2016 would bring us a serious conversation about lifting the incomes of American workers and expanding their opportunities for advancement.

After all, we have spent the year talking incessantly about **alienated** blue-collar voters and a new populism rooted in the disaffection of those hammered by economic change.

But this is not the discussion we are having. Instead, we are enduring an attack-fest between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton. Their strategies are entirely rational. Voters are understandably skeptical about politicians getting anything done, and both candidates know they have a better chance of encouraging negative votes than securing a positive mandate.

I'm sorry to say the media make things worse by preferring spectacle and confrontation to digging deeply into whether this plan to promote manufacturing or that idea for raising incomes will actually work. Clinton gave a very serious speech about mental-health policy last week, but the coverage flowed to whether Trump was "softening" or "hardening" on **immigration**.

The truth is that Clinton has offered many more serious policy proposals for raising workers' incomes than Trump has. Her website is full of ideas on expanding profit-sharing, a "Make it in America" initiative to promote manufacturing, and plans on family leave, child care, cutting student debt and much more.

One of the banes of this campaign is the media's temptation toward false balance: If a reporter says that Trump is not offering a lot of plans, he or she feels obligated to say either that Clinton is short on specifics, too, or that she may have a lot of plans but is not packaging them very well. But if the media don't want to cover them, all the bright bunting in the world won't matter.

In the meantime, Trump has effectively reduced his campaign to **immigration** and trade (plus "law and order"). He's arguing that the problems faced by U.S. workers will be magically solved if we throw millions of **immigrants** out of the country and if he gets a chance to negotiate much tougher trade deals.

It would be good to have a sane, fact-based debate about how **immigration** and trade affect incomes and job opportunities. But Trump's vicious tone toward **immigrants** and his breathtaking lack of specificity about trade show that he's more interested in exploiting these issues than thinking about them.

In the meantime, voices outside the campaign are trying to interject practical ideas that might help Americans whose incomes are lagging. The Opportunity Nation campaign will release a middle-of-the-road plan at the end of this week. Its main architects, Republican John Bridgeland and Democrat Bruce Reed, draw on ideas that have won support from both parties on expanding early-childhood programs, increasing high school graduation rates, creating much broader opportunities for national service, and finding new ways to connect the 5.5 million Americans ages 16 to 24 who are disengaged from both school and work.

That there is nothing radical in the plan may be a virtue given how hard it will be to get anything through Congress if the voters again produce divided government.

Well worth more attention is the "10-20-30" initiative from Rep. James E. Clyburn (D-S.C.). He would mandate that at least 10 percent of spending on federal programs go to counties where at least 20 percent of the population has lived below the poverty line for 30years or more. Clinton has endorsed it, and House Speaker Paul D. Ryan(R-Wis.) has spoken favorably about it.

When it comes to both politics and our nation's divisions around race, the plan has important virtues. The 488counties include many that are predominantly white, as well as many that are predominantly African American, Latino or Native American. Clyburn notes that the vast majority of counties that would benefit are represented by Republicans in Congress.

It's also a brute fact that workers' wages have declined or stagnated because the bargaining power of employees has been drastically undercut. A just-released study by the Economic Policy Institute showed that the weekly wages of non-union men without college degrees employed in the private sector would have been 8 percent higher in 2013 if union density had remained at 1979 levels.

And if older union models are out of date in some sectors, we need new ones such as those proposed by Sen. Elizabeth Warren (D-Mass.) to strengthen the rights of Americans who work in the gig economy.

This was supposed to be the election in which the interests of the non-elite finally got a hearing. We still have two months to make it happen.

ejdionne@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**First he was a cross-wearing Christian. Then he billed himself as an Italian from New Jersey with slicked-back hair and a fondness for "The Godfather." After that, he tried to pass himself off as a Mexican who drank Corona and cooked carne asada.

But it was Joseph Farrokh's last transformation - into a radical Muslim with plans to join the Islamic State - that has landed him in prison for the next 81/2 years. He was among seven young men from Northern Virginia prosecuted on similar charges this year alone, raising concerns about both a potential rise in radicalization and a policing approach that relies heavily on undercover agents or informants posing as radicals.

Another, Mahmoud Elhassan, a student and licensed cabdriver, is accused of pushing Farrokh toward terrorism. Haris Qamar was a gamer with aspirations in banking when he was accused of helping to make a propaganda video urging attacks on the U.S. Capitol. Mohamed Jalloh had been a Virginia National Guardsman before he allegedly bought a gun in preparation for a Fort Hood-style massacre. Others charged were a police officer, a man who studied justice administration and a pot-smoking drifter.

Together, their cases are a stark example of the challenges law enforcement officials face in uncovering those sympathetic to a terrorist group skilled at reaching out online to attract supporters - some of whom may seem unlikely converts - then sorting out which of those people are actually a danger.

"ISIS has done a good job projecting that they are not just about violence," said John Horgan, an expert in terrorism research at Georgia State University. "They know that they're going to appeal to the young person who's just pissed off and has had a bad deal. But they also want the dreamer, the North American converts who are virtually clueless about Islam but are beguiled by this fantasy that they've bought into."

Several of the young men arrested in Virginia have been described in court as struggling to find work or finish school. Farrokh, who discussed traveling to Syria to fight for the Islamic State, ultimately wrote to a judge that he was attracted to the terrorist group because its propaganda gave him a "sense of belonging."

None of the arrestees in Virginia was caught planning a definitive violent attack, according to court records. But experts say there is no real way to know who will act and who will merely posture as a radical.

Most grew up in Washington's Virginia suburbs, with families and friends who now express despair and bafflement. A least four of the defendants went to Northern Virginia Community College, according to online records. All but one are **immigrants** or the children of **immigrants**.

"Not a day goes by that I don't think about my brother and wonder how everything got to this point, how my sweet, adorable and loving baby brother could have become so lost and confused," Farrokh's sister Jaleh Skeath wrote in a letter to the court.

Friends also were shocked to see the funny, helpful Qamar described as an obsessive Twitter promoter of the Islamic State, also known as ISIS or ISIL, who said slaughter made him "giddy." Qamar's parents had confiscated his passport, according to court documents, and hoped that his finding a steady job and a wife would end his infatuation with the Islamic State.

"I was blown away," said Christopher Sutton, who worked at a cafe where Qamar used to play computer games. "He was a good guy; just your average guy that worked at the bank and played PC games in his free time."

The FBI and the Justice Department say that there is no new focus on or rise in terrorism-related activity in Northern Virginia, merely a dovetailing of several investigations.

"I don't think Northern Virginia is unique. This is happening around the country," said Andrew Ames, spokesman for the FBI's Washington Field Office.

He noted that some investigations, such as the probe into Metro transit officer Nicholas Young, go back years. Young, who worked as a police officer in the D.C.-area transit system for six years, allegedly bought phone cards for use in Islamic State communications. Other cases came together in a matter of months.

Officials do say the area's large Muslim community, the proximity to the nation's capital and an aggressive U.S. attorney's office help explain the high number of cases. A Syracuse University study recently found that 1 in 5 terrorism prosecutions over the past two decades took place in Northern Virginia. One in 10 Islamic State-related cases originated in the state; close to a third of Islamic State cases this year were brought in Virginia.

"Sometimes we feel like they are trying to justify their employment," Ehsan Islam, president of Manassas's Muslim Association of Virginia said of the numerous FBIoperations. "It goes on both sides though. ... In a way, maybe it is good that they're a little aggressive, [for] prevention."

Rizwan Jaka, chairman of the board at the Muslim ADAMS Center in Dulles, Va., said that while he understands concerns about informants monitoring whole communities of Muslims, "there is no excuse for criminal behavior."

"Everyone is trying to be more preventative, especially after the horrific attack in Orlando," Jaka said. "It's the reality of law enforcement being vigilant and the community being vigilant."

When a suspect partners with someone in a criminal plot, he said, "if it's an informant or an actual extremist, it doesn't matter," he said. "The person arrested thought it was a violent extremist."

At his Dar Al-Noor mosque in Prince William County, Islam said, leaders regularly tell members to "get involved with your kids, know what they're doing, be involved with their Internet activities." **Immigrant** parents, he said, often do not communicate openly with their children or understand what they're doing online.

The mosque is also trying to start more activities, such as soccer and weekly discussion groups, for young people who may have too much time on their hands.

Yusuf Wehelie was a drifter, his attorney says, when authorities say he talked about attacking a military installation. Mohamed Khweis, a graduate in justice administration with a taste for designer shoes, said he followed a girl to Syria before surrendering to Kurdish forces in Iraq.

Of the seven Virginia defendants, only Farrokh has pleaded guilty. The other cases are pending.

Farrokh's parents were initially pleased to see him become religious. Ever since his family's move to California when he was in middle school, he had clashed with his family and acted out. They suspected what he had hidden from them for years - an addiction to prescription opiates.

While they were surprised by his sudden marriage last year to a co-worker he met at a local mall, they were pleased to see him sober and committed to a new job as a nurse's aide. His lectures on Islam, delivered to a Christian mother and a moderate Shiite Muslim father, they took as merely the zeal of a recent convert.

Farrokh, meanwhile, felt he finally belonged. He had found a cause worth believing in and even dying for: the fight against Syrian President Bashar al-Assad.

Muslim legal advocates say that while FBI tactics probably do not rise to the level of legal entrapment, the use of undercover operatives or informants in six of the seven cases is concerning.

"It does seem problematic that you have seven out of one district," said Abed Ayoub, legal and policy director at the Washington-based American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. In area mosques, he said, "there is a concern that these tactics are focusing in on folks they know may have mental-health issues, may have trouble at home or coming from a certain socioeconomic background, and they take these kids and try to push them to do something."

Advocates also argue that a prosecution-only model **alienates** those whose help authorities need most. And it leaves no option in situations where the FBI is unable to make a case - as happened with Orlando shooter Omar Mateen, who had been under investigation for 10 months.

"The belief in the Muslim community at large is that they're overwhelmed with spies," said Charles Swift of the Constitutional Law Center for Muslims in America. "What you've accomplished is fear and loathing on both sides."

Although law enforcement authorities have no clear alternative, former officers say they would often interview a suspect before an arrest in hopes of warning him or her away from criminal behavior.

"The FBI doesn't have a lot of tools available ... that allow [an] intermediate step," said Don Borelli, a former FBI agent who led the Joint Terrorism Task Force in New York. "The FBI is not meant to be a social service organization. But maybe there is some kind of an outlet program that would allow some branch of government to intercede."

In Montgomery County, Md., a nonprofit organization called the World Organization for Resource Development and Education has developed a community-led anti-extremism model. A federal court in Minneapolis is experimenting with a post-prosecution de-radicalization program as an alternative to prison.

Farrokh's attorney, Joseph Flood, petitioned for the de-radicalization expert who consulted in Minneapolis to help prepare an intervention plan for his client.

"There are no services available in the [Bureau of Prisons] designed to de-radicalize even the most willing participants," Flood wrote.

The request was denied.

Farrokh, meanwhile, appears to have turned away from the terrorist group he once planned to join. He listened to the news of the Orlando massacre from jail, on a handheld radio. In a letter to a federal judge, he said he wondered "what kind of sick person could do such a thing."

"I am disgusted by it," he wrote, "but I am also disgusted by myself."

rachel.weiner@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's ungainly back-and-forth on **immigration** has a parallel in Britain, which is struggling to make sense of its own impetuous resolution to take control of its borders. Indeed, if Britain after the Brexit referendum is anything to go by, a Trump presidency would be dominated by zigzagging: sometimes to dilute past promises, sometimes to double down. In the terrifying event that Trump actually became president, you'd hear supporters grumbling bitterly about treachery - even as critics wondered furiously why impractical campaign pronouncements were so seductive for so long.

More than two months after their vote to leave the European Union, the British are no closer to understanding what they have done. Theresa May, the sensible prime minister, assures the public firmly that "Brexit means Brexit," much as parents tell their children that bedtime means bedtime. But May stoutly refuses to specify what she means by this. On Wednesday, she summoned her cabinet for a special off-site meeting, and her spokeswoman declared afterward that Britain wanted the right to curb migration from Europe - but also a "positive outcome" on trade. What if these goals are incompatible? The prime minister does not say.

May's problem is that the Brexit referendum, like the Trump phenomenon, was largely an expression of hostility to **immigrants**. A survey of more than 12,000 voters on the day of the referendum found that the most common reason to support Brexit was an urge to assert sovereignty; second came the desire to control national borders. Although May herself was a quiet Brexit opponent, she understands the public's view on **immigration**. And that makes it almost impossible to envisage a "positive outcome" for trade.

In the European Union, the principle of free movement is nearly as sacrosanct as the commerce clause in the United States. This is not necessary or logical: For members of the euro zone, there is an argument that a common currency requires a single labor market; but for E.U. countries outside the euro, you could imagine a union with borders and passports. Yet Norway, which is not in the E.U. but is a member of the E.U. single market, is required to accept unlimited numbers of E.U. migrants as a condition of its trade access. Switzerland, another E.U. outsider that enjoys many of the advantages of single- market membership, wants to control its border but faces similar constraints.

Because the Norwegian and Swiss trade models are incompatible with the Brexit mandate on migration, British politicians have become instant experts on Canada's free-trade deal with the E.U. But this has its own problems. Aside from the fact that its ratification is uncertain, Canada's deal mostly excludes services, which account for a hefty four-fifths of British gross domestic product. A copy-Canada deal would not help Britain's chief exports: financial services, legal advice, architecture and so on.

Faced with no attractive way forward, May is shuffling sideways. She has cannily appointed three leading Brexiteers to cabinet positions dealing with Europe and invited them to propose a solution to their mess. The Brexiteers dislike one another and are generally clueless, so progress has been glacial - the more so because the British civil service has yet to recruit the trade experts and lawyers necessary to make Brexit happen. If the 3.5 million other Europeans in Britain all suddenly applied for permanent residence, it would take the existing **immigration** staff 140 years to deal with the onslaught.

Before the Brexit referendum, Britain's Trump-like fantasists assured voters that it would be easy to negotiate a great trade deal with Europe. Now that reality is dawning, there is delicious speculation that Britain might postpone Brexit - perhaps indefinitely. Before formal negotiations begin, Britain must trigger Article 50 of the Treaty on European Union, and May has always said that this won't happen before January. But the combination of confusion in London and elections next year in France and Germany makes further can-kicking quite plausible. Much as Turkey has been negotiating E.U. accession for years without joining, Britain could proclaim that Brexit means Brexit but not actually leave.

Of course, the prime minister denies this. "There's no second referendum; no attempts to sort of stay in the E.U. by the back door," she reiterated Wednesday. But the embarrassing fact is that more than three-quarters of her cabinet opposed Brexit, and for excellent reasons. More than 40 percent of Britain's exports go to the E.U. The country benefits from collaboration with its neighbors on everything from scientific research to counterterrorism.

However things turn out for Britain, the lesson for Americans is stark: Refuse to be seduced by campaign pledges that could not possibly be implemented without damaging the nation. Whatever the glib talk of post-truth politics, the truth still matters when it comes to governing.

Sebastian Mallaby is a Post contributing columnist and the Paul A. Volcker senior fellow in international economics at the Council on Foreign Relations.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Arlie Russell Hochschild. The New Press.

The white working class is so hot right now.

When we look back on the 2016 presidential contest, we'll recognize a moment when the beliefs and material conditions of low-income white Americans were deemed worthy of popular fascination, cable-news hits and nonstop cultural deconstruction. Are these people prejudiced or just frustrated? Economically victimized or culturally ostracized? Anti-elites or anti-everything? Let hot takes roll down like waters, and condescension like an everlasting stream.

Three new books - works that were set in motion long before Donald Trump declared his love for America's poorly educated - try to go deeper, with varying success. "White Trash," by historian Nancy Isenberg, explains how poor whites have been mistreated and disparaged over some 400 years, the blame for their plight invariably falling elsewhere. "Hillbilly Elegy," by lawyer J.D. Vance, admonishes the poor to shape up and take responsibility for their fate; it's less an elegy than an assault, though one bubble-wrapped in a bootstraps memoir of the author's American Dream, from Appalachian destitution to the Gothic arches of Yale Law School. And now "Strangers in Their Own Land," by sociologist Arlie Russell Hochschild, is the latest and most frustrating of this trilogy.

Hochschild made 10 trips to southwestern Louisiana from 2011 to 2016, extended forays away from her perch at the University of California at Berkeley, to delve into her "keen interest in how life feels to people on the right - that is, in the emotion that underlies politics. To understand their emotions," she writes, "I had to imagine myself in their shoes."

She interviewed some 60 people, including 40 professed tea party supporters, visiting their homes, communities and workplaces. It is the same technique Hochschild employed in "The Second Shift" (1989), a well-reviewed look at how couples manage duties at home when both work outside of it. In this case, however, Hochschild arrives with so many preconceived ideas that they undercut the insight she claims to desire.

Hochschild preps for her conservative immersion by reading "Atlas Shrugged," because we know tea party types are into that. "If Ayn Rand appealed to them, I imagined, they'd probably be pretty selfish, tough, cold people, and I prepared for the worst," this acclaimed sociologist writes. "But I was thankful to discover many warm, open people who were deeply charitable to those around them."

When she lands in Louisiana, Hochschild realizes, "I was definitely not in Berkeley, California. ... No New York Times at the newsstand, almost no organic produce in grocery stores or farmers' markets, no foreign films in movie houses, few small cars, fewer petite sizes in clothing stores, fewer pedestrians speaking foreign languages into cell phones - indeed, fewer pedestrians. There were fewer yellow Labradors and more pit bulls and bulldogs. Forget bicycle lanes, color-coded recycling bins, or solar panels on roofs. In some cafes, virtually everything on the menu was fried."

Dear God, no yellow Labs or solar panels? How do you live?

Through Hochschild's time in Lake Charles, La., and nearby cities and small towns, readers meet people who complicate our oversimplified "whither white America" moment. Especially memorable are Lee Sherman, who repaired pipes carrying lethal chemicals and drained toxic waste illegally into nearby waterways before becoming an environmentalist and, yes, a tea party supporter; and the Areno family, disagreeing over the benefits and risks of local industries, even as they watched turtles go blind and cows die from drinking polluted water. They are the strength of the book, yet Hochschild interrupts their stories to place everything in a formulaic big-picture context, a capitalized and italicized theory of the right. The author, we learn, hopes to scale the Empathy Wall and learn the Deep Story that can resolve the Great Paradox through a Keyhole Issue. These contrivances guide, and ruin, this book.

"An empathy wall," Hochschild lectures, "is an obstacle to deep understanding of another person, one that can make us feel indifferent or even hostile to those who hold different beliefs." The author has traveled to the South to conquer that wall, and she constantly refers to it. "As I was trying to climb this slippery empathy wall, a subversive thought occurred to me," she says at one point. Or when she doesn't quite get another person's thinking, she feels "stuck way over on my side of the empathy wall."

Beyond the wall awaits the deep story. "A deep story is a feels-as-if story - it's the story feelings tell, in the language of symbols," Hochschild writes. "It removes judgment. It removes fact." The deep story she unearths in Louisiana is that tea party supporters - "my Tea Party friends," she always calls them, because only liberals rate pure, modifier-free friendship - see the American Dream as a line that they're patiently waiting in, only to see others cut in front. "Blacks, women, **immigrants**, **refugees**, brown pelicans - all have cut ahead of you in line," Hochschild writes. "But it's people like you who have made this country great. You feel uneasy. ... You've heard stories of oppressed blacks, dominated women, weary **immigrants**, closeted gays, desperate **refugees**, but at some point, you say to yourself, you have to close the borders to human sympathy."

The deep story helps Hochschild unpack the great paradox: that is, why people living in a region with such poor economic, educational and health indicators - and Louisiana struggles with all of them - still support politicians who call for reducing federal help in those arenas. Hochschild peers at the paradox through a keyhole issue: environmental protection. "Everyone I talked to wanted a clean environment," she writes, and she spends much of the book chronicling the harm the oil and gas industry has wrought in the area. We learn of the industrial contamination of the Bayou d'Inde waterway, where the Areno family lived for generations, and of the massive Bayou Corne Sinkhole, which swallowed up 37 acres as earthquakes and ooze emanated from the ground, thanks to the screw-ups of Texas Brine, a Houston-based drilling company. So why rally for politicians who want to eliminate the Environmental Protection Agency?

Turns out, many people Hochschild spoke to simply don't trust environmental authorities, often with good reason. The Louisiana Department of Natural Resourceshad known of the risks involved in Bayou Corne but had given out drilling permits anyway, Hochschild writes. She also describes the guidelines state health authorities had provided on how to eat contaminated fish. "Trimming the fat and skin on finfish, and removing the hepatopancreas from crabs, will reduce the amount of contaminants in the fish and shellfish," they advised, featuring handy drawings of how to cut away the yucky parts.

When this is your experience of regulation, the great paradox loses greatness. But Hochschild continues her quest, concluding that tea party supporters grow to hate government because of religious faith, opposition to progressive taxes and the perceived "loss of honor" government imposes. She groups her tea party friends into reductionist categories that sound like they were dreamed up in the faculty lounge: the Team Players, loyal to business; the Worshippers, with their capacity for "meaningful renunciation," forgoing clean lakes in exchange for steady employment; the Cowboys, who equate risky work with progress and scoff at wimpy regulators.

Hochschild's subjects are frustrated by the empowerment of new voices in American identity politics. "For the Tea Party around the country," she writes, "the shifting moral qualifications for the American Dream had turned them into strangers in their own land, afraid, resentful, displaced, and dismissed by the very people who were, they felt, cutting in line."

Then Hochschild attends a Trump rally in New Orleans, and it feels like a revival. "His supporters have been in mourning for a lost way of life. ... Joined together with others like themselves, they now feel hopeful, joyous, elated," she writes. "As if magically lifted, they are no longer strangers in their own land."

This may well be the mind-set of some Trump supporters; certainly, it is the candidate's pitch. But it's hard to entirely trust Hochschild's conclusions. Early in the book, she notes how federal assistance for strengthening environmental protections, combating global warming and reducing homelessness faces a "closed door" on the right. "If we want government help in achieving any of these goals, I realized, we need to understand those who see government more as problem than solution," she writes. "And so it was that I began my journey to the heart of the American right."

"Strangers in Their Own Land," then, is not an academic's impartial effort to understand conservatives but rather a means to an end - an end toward which the writer regards conservatives as obstacles to overcome.

There's a deep story for you.

Twitter: @CarlosLozadaWP

Carlos Lozadais the nonfiction book critic of The Washington Post.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY - Six weeks ago, Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto stood alongside President Obama in the White House and pledged his "absolute will" to cooperate with whichever candidate won the U.S. presidential election.

Even that banal political statement landed with alarm in Mexico. That's because the night before, the man who formally accepted the Republican nomination for U.S. president was Donald Trump, who built his campaign around calling Mexican **immigrants** criminals and vowing to wall off the border and roll back trade ties.

Peña Nieto's comment during the July 22 visit to Washington, however, hinted at the already brewing notion among some factions of the Mexican government that a meeting with Trump might be worth organizing. In the weeks that followed, Mexican cabinet members and advisers to Peña Nieto debated fiercely about whether to invite Trump to Mexico, either before or after the election, according to people here familiar with the discussions.

The result was Trump's surreal appearance Wednesday, calmly talking about his plans for the border wall as he stood alongside Peña Nieto, who hardly spoke a critical word about the American candidate. The event marked a dramatic departure from Mexico's historic caution about getting involved in U.S. presidential politics and has been roundly criticized in this country, where Trump is widely loathed. The meeting has divided the Mexican government and is being portrayed as a sign of ineptitude from Peña Nieto, who already had dismal approval ratings.

"This is probably the single worst public relations disaster of his entire administration," said Jorge Castañeda, who was Mexico's foreign minister from 2000 to 2003. "The substance of [Peña Nieto's] entire message should have been that the wall and the deportations and revisiting NAFTA are all unacceptable positions to Mexico, and all would constitute serious threats to the U.S. relationship with Mexico."

Mexico has long sought to carefully calibrate its relations with its more powerful neighbor and chief trading partner - seeking good ties but insisting on respect for its sovereignty and its citizens' contributions. But Trump's bid for the presidency has utterly flummoxed the Mexican government. Its response has veered from one extreme to the other, with officials first dismissing Trump's candidacy, then abruptly replacing the low-key Mexican ambassador in Washington this past spring and crafting an aggressive public relations strategy to counter Trump's claims and show Mexico's value to Americans. In March, Peña Nieto compared Trump to Hitler.

While it is common for American presidents to visit Mexico soon after being elected, a high-profile meeting between the Mexican president and an American candidate is quite unusual. In 2008, Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) visited Mexico while a presidential candidate, along with other senators, and met privately with then-President Felipe Calderón. But that didn't have the state-visit flavor of Trump's appearance.

Andres Rozental, who served as Mexican ambassador to Britain and was a career diplomat for more than 35 years, expressed astonishment that the Mexican government gave Trump a formal greeting at the presidential hangar, flew him by helicopter to the presidential palace and allowed him to appear with Peña Nieto before the world's media.

The planning "was entirely done in secret and outside of the Foreign Ministry's knowledge," he said. "It was certainly done in an extremely amateurish and totally unprofessional way."

Critics said the Mexican president not only took a huge political gamble but appeared to botch the execution of his strategy.

"Peña Nieto meddled in the electoral process of the United States, and as I see it, what was the use?" asked Lorenzo Meyer, a history professor at the College of Mexico. "Mexico is a weak country, and we have to take great care with symbols - it's almost the only thing we have - and he gave to Trump international exposure."

Economic concerns

Over the summer, Finance Minister Luis Videgaray, who had been Peña Nieto's campaign manager in the 2012 election, was a leading advocate for the Trump visit, according to Mexicans familiar with the deliberations, who spoke on the condition of anonymity to be candid. Videgaray, an MIT-educated economist, had been a state-level leader of the Institutional Revolutionary Party, and his political career had advanced along with Peña Nieto's. The president selected Videgaray to be his behind-the-scenes liaison to the Trump campaign.

Videgaray and other aides saw a Trump meeting as a political risk that was worth taking, in case Trump won the election, the sources said. But some senior members of the Mexican government strongly argued against such an invitation - among them, Foreign Minister Claudia Ruiz Massieu.

The Mexico City daily Reforma reported Friday that Videgaray was especially concerned after ratings agencies Moody's and Standard and Poor's had lowered their outlooks on Mexico's sovereign debt to negative in recent months because of the state of the country's public finances. Trump has threatened to slap a 35 percent tariff on many imports from Mexico, potentially making things worse. Videgaray wanted to bring Trump to calm financial-market fears over the potential impact of his victory on the country's economy, the newspaper reported.

"This was the type of political decision that was not popular but was needed," said one person in Mexico who was familiar with the decision-making, describing the advocates' position. "This was going to cost us in the polls, but it was important to meet face to face with the most dangerous candidate on the turf."

Videgaray's spokeswoman, Claudia Algorri Guzman, said that the "idea and the decision" to invite Trump were Peña Nieto's. Any other account is "false," she said.

Peña Nieto wrote in an editorial that ran on the front page of Mexico's El Universal newspaper Thursday that it is his responsibility to meet with both U.S. presidential candidates, but especially Trump, "because there are things that he should hear in person from the President of Mexico, beginning with how Mexicans feel."

"First, I was very clear - in public and in private - in emphasizing that in Mexico we feel offended and hurt by his pronouncements about Mexicans," he wrote.

Peña Nieto's three-page invitation, dated Aug. 25, was delivered to Trump's campaign headquarters in New York by courier on the next day, a Friday. Hillary Clinton received an invitation the same day.

"Dear Mr. Trump," began the note to the Republican candidate. "On November 8th, the American people will choose the next President of the United States of America. I am sure that the electoral process will be one of vibrant debate, contrast of ideas and intense citizen participation, honoring the great democratic tradition of America."

The letter referenced Peña Nieto's recent meeting with "my good friend President Barack Obama," noted the huge volume of trade between the two countries and called for strengthening their partnership.

"Therefore, it would be a great honor to meet with you and have a direct conversation about the common future of our nations," the letter concluded. "For this purpose, I have instructed the Secretary of Foreign Relations to contact your office."

Left out of the loop

Some Mexican officials who opposed the invitation didn't realize that a visit would happen so fast, and on Trump's terms. It occurred on the same day he gave an **immigration** speech in Phoenix.

"Things got out of control," said the Mexican familiar with the decision-making. "This was mishandled, to say the least."

Key parts of the Mexican government were not fully informed about the invitation and Trump's quick acceptance. The U.S. Embassy was alerted to the visit by the Secret Service, which was arranging security for the trip, but by Tuesday afternoon the American diplomats still hadn't received final confirmation of the visit.

On Tuesday, Ruiz Massieu, the foreign minister, was in Milwaukee, unaware that Trump would be landing in Mexico City the next day. In her speech in the United States, she emphasized the importance of trade and the contributions of undocumented workers to Wisconsin's economy, and she appeared to take a jab at Trump.

"The facts speak against the stereotypes," she said. "History against intolerance. Cooperation against xenophobia."

The next afternoon, as Trump stood alongside Peña Nieto, Ruiz Massieu sat with other cabinet members in the front row, a funereal look on her face.

joshua.partlow@washpost.com

Karen DeYoung in Washington and Gabriela Martinez in Mexico City contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In a presidential year expected to produce record turnout among Hispanic voters, there are few signs that Hillary Clinton is performing any better among Latinos than past Democratic presidential candidates - even with **immigrant**-bashing Donald Trump as her GOP opponent.

In Nevada and Florida, the two battleground states with the highest Latino populations, the Democratic nominee remains locked in a close race with Trump. Clinton is polling about the same as Democrats in previous contests among Latinos nationally, apparently gaining no ground from Trump's historic unpopularity.

The close polls in Nevada and Florida have prompted Clinton's allies to begin spending money targeting Hispanic voters in those states. The campaign itself will also begin airing Spanish-language ads in battleground states after Monday.

But some Democratic strategists fear that Clinton has already missed a unique opportunity and warn that counting on Hispanic voters to turn out just because they hate Trump is not a reliable strategy. Unlike President Obama four years ago, Clinton has run virtually no Spanish-language television ads in the general election, with the exception of a spot that aired during a one-day soccer event.

"I'm worried literally to death now that because Donald Trump is so visceral that they'll think that Latinos will turn out because of that alone," said Chuck Rocha, president of Solidarity Strategies, a Latino political-consulting firm. "Hate alone won't motivate somebody to vote. ... They need something to vote for."

The GOP nominee has staked much of his campaign on cracking down on illegal **immigration**, portraying Mexican **immigrants**, in particular, as "rapists" and criminals who take American jobs. Trump has promised to build a massive wall along the U.S.-Mexico border and deport millions of undocumented **immigrants**, while also suggesting that birthright citizenship should be abolished. As a result, just 18 percent of registered Hispanic voters have a favorable view of Trump in a new Washington Post-ABC News poll.

But there is also evidence that Clinton's standing with Hispanic voters may be weakening. According to the same poll, Clinton's favorability among Hispanics fell in August from 71 percent to 55 percent, a drop outside the sample's 10 percentage-point margin of error.

A new Latino Decisions poll released Friday found that 70 percent of registered Latino voters said they would definitely vote for Clinton or were leaning toward doing so, a drop from 76 percent who said the same in April. The survey, conducted for the **immigration** advocacy group America's Voice, also found that support for Trump rose from 11 percent in April to 19 percent in August.

"When you have less than 20 percent in your polling with Hispanics, how much worse could it get?" said Florida-based Republican strategist Al Cardenas, referring to Trump. "It's not so much that Donald Trump is doing better with Latino voters, but she's doing worse. That's tightened up the race in Florida and Nevada."

Clinton campaign officials defend their Latino voter strategy, including the decision not to begin airing general-election ads on Spanish-language television until later this month. The campaign has been aiming digital advertising at Latino voters since early July, and it did heavy Spanish-language advertising during the Democratic primaries.

"If they start doing it now, I think they're on time," said Federico de Jesús, a Democratic strategist who was the Hispanic media director for Obama in 2008. "Obviously, we would have liked them to do it earlier."

"If they wait too much longer until late September, that might be more concerning," he added.

According to Lorella Praeli, Clinton's Latino vote director, the campaign has consistently targeted Latino voters through digital ad campaigns in Spanish, appearances by surrogates on Spanish-language radio and through English-language ads targeted at Latino audiences through non-Spanish-language media.

"There are new tactics, new strategies and new platforms," Praeli said. "The way that we absorb information is also evolving, and if you don't adapt to that, then we're missing out on reaching Latino voters where they are."

With fewer than 70 days remaining until Election Day, television ads targeted at Hispanic voters in Spanish are beginning to roll in, albeit slowly. A new Spanish-language television ad from the voter registration group Mi Familia Vota is aimed at Hispanic voters in Arizona. Pro-Clinton super PAC Priorities USA Action announced a small ad buy this week in Nevada and Florida targeting Latinos in Spanish.

"Florida and Nevada are behaving like battleground states - they're supposed to be close," said Priorities spokesman Justin Barasky. "That's a problem for Trump. We have said on the record countless times that we expected the race to be competitive and close, and in a lot of cases, it is."

In 2008, Barack Obama's campaign began airing Spanish-language ads in mid-September, a timeline Clinton could still match this year. But in 2012, the president's reelection campaign spent tens of millions of dollars on ads in Spanish beginning in April.

Obama won Latino voters in 2012 by 71 percent to 27 percent for GOP nominee Mitt Romney - the largest for a Democrat since Bill Clinton won 72 percent of Hispanics in 1996. Latino turnout in 2012 also hit a high of 11.2 million voters.

This year, an average of recent Post-ABC polls shows Hillary Clinton leading Trump by 70 percent to 25 percent among Hispanic voters - similar to Obama's margin over Romney.

"Given how badly Democrats have been burned in recent elections by low turnout from episodic voters like Latinos and millennials, you would have thought the Clinton campaign would have spent more [on ads] than Obama, rather than less," said a Democratic strategist who spoke on the condition of anonymity to speak candidly about the state of the race.

Polls show that Clinton is weakest among Hispanic voters who are English-dominant and U.S.-born, while Spanish-dominant and foreign-born Hispanic voters are more likely to support her over Trump. The campaign has been running English-language ads targeted in part at the first group.

abby.phillip@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**At basketball games at his Oregon high school, Justin Ki Hong, an adoptee from South Korea, remembers putting his hand over his heart and singing the national anthem, proud to be a citizen of the United States.

It wasn't until he applied for a job years later that Ki Hong learned he had never been a citizen at all.

The employer asked for proof of citizenship, and Ki Hong's Social Security number and driver's license, which had worked when applying for college financial aid, were suddenly insufficient. He soon learned that his American parents had never filled out the paperwork to naturalize him after bringing him to the United States in 1985.

Now it was too late. Not only that, but Ki Hong is potentially deportable - to a country he doesn't remember.

"I kind of got into a panic," Ki Hong, 33, said of the discovery.

Today, children who are adopted from abroad by U.S. citizens generally receive automatic citizenship, and adoption agencies and embassies are better at informing parents about any follow-up they need to do. The Child Citizenship Act of 2000 awarded citizenship retroactively to what advocates estimated were more than 100,000 international adoptees younger than 18 who were already in the country when it went into effect in February 2001.

But Ki Hong was not covered by the law because he already was 18 at the time. He is among an estimated tens of thousands of people who were adopted internationally by American parents between the 1950s and 1980s but never naturalized.

For them, life has become a surreal identity crisis. They look and talk like Americans, but they are not technically Americans, though this is the only country they know.

"We're really stateless," Ki Hong said. "I feel like I deserve to be in this country."

In recent years, adoptees in similar circumstances have begun to find one another and are uniting behind the Adoptee Citizenship Act, proposed federal legislation that would grant citizenship to anyone who was adopted by a U.S. citizen regardless of when they turned 18. It would also allow those who have been deported to return to the United States.

"These adoptees grow up in American families, go to American schools and lead American lives," said Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), who sponsored the act. "This constant threat to the life they know is unjust. ... We need to ensure international adoptees are recognized as the Americans they are." Bills were introduced last year in the Senate and this year in the House and are awaiting votes.

While most adoptees received legal permanent residency when they arrived, those who thought they had become citizens were unaware that they had to renew the permits. Now, many have trouble finding employment, worry about losing their jobs and fear they will be unable to collect Social Security benefits they have paid into. And they live in terror that a wrong move will get them kicked out of the country.

If the legislation passes, "I think it's going to fill a very deep void and hole that I've had about who I am," Ki Hong said.

Widespread adoption of children abroad by U.S. citizens began in South Korea in the 1950s after the Korean War and then spread to other countries. It was initially less regulated than now. "The U.S. federal government and state government did not keep adequate track of numbers," said Kevin Vollmers, a South Korean adoptee who founded the adoptee advocacy organization LGA.

Based on estimates by the South Korean government about U.S. adoptees whose status remains unknown, advocates estimate there could be up to 18,000 from South Korea in this situation, along with an undetermined number from countries such as Venezuela, Germany, India, Guatemala, Vietnam and Iran.

Growing up, they were able to obtain Social Security numbers and driver's licenses. Before the 1990s and early 2000s ushered in a stricter era of screening, many even received U.S. passports, served in the U.S. military and voted - unaware that they were not citizens.

"Then when they went to renew [a document], the paperwork they were using up to then are suddenly not enough," said Emily Kessel, advocacy director of the National Korean American Service and Education Consortium.

Often, families did not understand the implications of dropping the ball on the paperwork.

"There wasn't a lot of education to adoptive parents in the earlier time about naturalizing their children or even what papers to keep, said Kessel, whose organization is helping push for bills in the House and Senate.

Some have been able to pursue a typical **immigrant** path.

Joy Alessi, 50, of Houston learned of her status when she was 25 and attempted to get a passport for a vacation to Mexico. Her legal residency was still valid, so she continued to renew it and got a South Korean passport for travel abroad. But not having U.S. citizenship has limited her.

"Applying for jobs, that was difficult," Alessi said. "I basically carried my adoption papers and relied on people's leniency. ... I kind of learned not to apply for jobs that had thorough background checks."

Being convicted of a crime, no matter how minor, can raise the stakes exponentially. Around three dozen adoptees - including one who served in the U.S. military - have been deported or are at risk of being deported after criminal convictions; one was later killed in Brazil, his country of birth.

South Korean-born Monte Haines holds little hope for returning to the United States if the act doesn't pass. Adopted by an American family in 1981 when he was around 10, he says his family assumed that adopting him automatically made him a U.S. citizen.

In the 1990s, he enlisted in the Army and served in Kuwait; then in 2001, he was arrested on a drug charge. While he was in a Texas county jail awaiting trial, **immigration** officials told him he had never been a U.S. citizen.

"I was, like, shocked," said Haines, 44. "I kept on arguing, saying, 'Yes I am; I was adopted.'"

But after serving a prison sentence, he was deported to South Korea, where he did not speak the language. "The first week, I was living on the street underneath a bridge."

He now works for a dollar store in Seoul, unable to return to the United States even on a South Korean passport.

"I'm banned for life - that's what the judge said," he said. "I have my family there, my friends, I went to school, I went to college. What more American can you get?"

Many unnaturalized adoptees try to stay under the radar, telling few people about their situations, avoiding international travel and keeping away from the polls on Election Day.

One woman adopted from Iran in the early 1970s did not learn of her status until 2008, when she applied for a passport. The Social Security Administration had her on record as a citizen, and until learning her status, she used to vote and get called to jury duty.

She met with an array of **immigration** attorneys; one suggested she marry an American to help solve the problem, and another scared her so much about deportation that she balked at applying for legal residency. She learned her father had begun - but never finished - the process of getting her naturalized; he died before she could ask him about it.

"As a child, my mom was always, like, 'Oh, you have citizenship because we're citizens,'" said the woman, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because she feared her employer would think she lied on the job application she filled out before knowing her status.

Now 46 and living in California, she is terrified of losing her job.

"And with all the Trump stuff about **immigration**, I'm even more scared," she said. "The attitude is, like, 'Why didn't you do the paperwork?' People forget, we're these small little kids who came into the country."

tara.bahrampour@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PARIS - Toward the end of summer, warmer weather and calmer seas have brought a spike in attempted migrant passages across the Mediterranean, many of them life-threatening.

This past week, the Italian coast guard reported rescuing approximately 6,500 migrants off the Libyan coast as part of the summer spike along the central Mediterranean route, from North Africa to the Italian peninsula and its outer islands.

The incident was the latest in a long summer of similar occurrences in which makeshift and ill-equipped boats have frequently capsized in dangerous waters. Drownings have been reported for months off the coasts of Cyprus, Sicily and Libya.

The summer of 2016 has marked a dark new chapter in Europe's migrant crisis, the largest in European history since the upheavals of 1945, with more than a million people having arrived on the continent in the past year alone.

The numbers of migrants from the Middle East and Africa who have made these sea crossings to European ports - mostly in Greece and Italy - have gradually declined this year. Despite the lower numbers, fatalities have actually risen.

According to the International Organization for Migration, nearly 280,000 migrants and **refugees** entered Europe by sea in the first eight months of 2016, compared with nearly 355,000 in the same period last year.

But through the end of August, more than 3,000 migrants and **refugees** have drowned in the Mediterranean, at least 500 more than at this point last year, the IOMreports.

In a year that has seen the European Union confronted with some of its greatest challenges since its establishment, many have begun to consider these fatalities as inevitable collateral damage in a continent preoccupied with processing migrants when they arrive and the aftermath of Britain's vote to leave the E.U. altogether.

The composition of the Brussels-based bloc often has impeded any comprehensive, unified plan for processing migrants who come by sea. And Frontex, the E.U.'s border-control agency, relies on particular member states to provide the equipment and vessels the agency needs in the Mediterranean. As a result, migrant rescues in the Mediterranean have been conducted largely through a combination of governmental and nongovernmental initiatives, with the coast guards of Libya and Italy and organizations such as Doctors Without Borders and Greenpeace carrying out search operations.

According to Marc Pierini, a former E.U. ambassador to Libya and Syria, in theory the E.U. has sought cooperation from African states in curbing the flow of migrants, but certain governments are reluctant to take any actions that curb an emerging people-smuggling trade that has proved lucrative.

"A lot of people are making money along the way," he said. "Not only in terms of repression costs, but on top of that, the flow of illegal money is huge compared to the national wealth.

"You have to compare this phenomenon to growing cocaine in cocaine-producing countries," he said. "There's nothing legal that matches the money that people can make growing illegal stuff. That is the hard reality."

Meanwhile, along the other major migrant sea route into Europe - from the Middle East through the eastern Mediterranean and into the Greek islands - this past week saw more than 460 migrants and **refugees** arrive on the islands of Lesbos and Kos.

In a landmark deal that the E.U. signed with Turkey in March, this route was supposed to be closed in exchange for the E.U. considering visa liberalization for Turks seeking to live and work in Europe, as well as the prospect of Turkey's admission to the 28-member bloc.

After the attempted coup against the Turkish government in July, the deal may no longer stand. European officials have objected to alleged human rights abuses by the Turkish government, and Turkey is frustrated that visa liberalization, five months after the agreement, has not been granted.

Under the terms of the deal, migrants who crossed from Turkey to Greece without proper documentation are supposed to be returned to Turkey, unless they have successfully applied for asylum in Europe.

An E.U. official involved in migration and counterterrorism talks said that this past week's spike in migrant arrivals in Greece did not necessarily suggest a Turkish abandonment of the March agreement.

"I don't think it's an effect of the coup," said the official, who spoke on the condition of anonymity because he was not authorized to speak publicly. "I know they're putting the visa liberalization on the table at the moment, but I haven't seen any effect in numbers."

On Friday, E.U. ministers arrived in Bratislava, Slovakia, for informal talks with Turkish officials to discuss the political developments in Turkey as well as the future of the country's relations with the E.U.

james.mcauley@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**"We need to believe him [Donald Trump] when he bullies and threatens to throw out every **immigrant** in the country."

- Hillary Clinton, interview on CNN with Anderson Cooper, Aug. 24, 2016

A reader called this quote to our attention, saying that it was clearly wrong. Donald Trump has certainly called for deporting an estimated 11 million illegal **immigrants** from the United States - though in a speech on Wednesday he appeared to initially call for deporting at first 6 million - but he has not called for removing every **immigrant** in the United States.

This was a live interview, and the Clinton campaign says the former secretary of state misspoke. She apparently meant to say "every undocumented **immigrant**." Now, regular readers know that we don't like to play gotcha here at The Fact Checker, so ordinarily that might be the end of it.

But then on Aug. 25, a tweet was issued under Clinton's name: "In 2015, Trump launched his own campaign for president by describing Mexican **immigrants** as rapists and criminals." The accompanying video, which starts by saying that "Donald Trump built his candidacy on demonizing **immigrants**," includes clips of tough talk from Trump, mainly about illegal **immigrants**. The video ends with this warning: "Trump has made his plans for **immigrants** and their families clear."

There was a similar tweet on Aug. 31, also accompanied by a video. It quoted Trump as saying "They have to go" and then added, "Trump has been perfectly clear about his intentions for millions of **immigrants**."

This made us wonder whether Clinton's supposed slip of the tongue actually was part of an effort by her campaign to try to blur the line between legal **immigrants**and undocumented ones. Let's take a look.

The Facts

Part of the difficulty with fact-checking attacks on Trump based on his statements is that he often has made contradictory comments - or made bold attacks that he later tried to clarify.

So, for instance, the Clinton campaign points to Trump's announcement speech on June 16, 2015, as evidence for an attack on all **immigrants**. Trump said: "When Mexico sends its people, they're not sending their best. ... They're bringing drugs. They're bringing crime. They're rapists."

At the time, this was often interpreted in the news media as a reference to all **immigrants**. Not until July 6, three weeks later, did Trump clarify that he was talking only about illegal **immigrants**.

Trump's lack of precision in his language has thus left him open to attacks, especially because he often allows initial impressions to gel before he attempts to clarify what he had supposedly meant to say.

Trump, however, eventually clarified that he was attacking illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as rapists and criminals, not all Mexican **immigrants**. So here, the Clinton campaign is deliberately ignoring his clean-up explanation.

The Clinton campaign points to other Trump statements as evidence of a broader attack by the GOP presidential nominee on **immigrants**, not just undocumented **immigrants**. The campaign says this material backs up the line in the video that "Trump has made his plan for **immigrants** and their families clear."

In particular, the campaign cites his proposal for funding a wall on the border with Mexico, his position on birthright citizenship and his proposal to rescind Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA). Let's look at each of these in turn.

The wall. Trump told The Washington Post in April that he would force Mexico to pay for the wall (which could cost as much as $25 billion) by threatening to cut off the flow of billions of dollars in payments that **immigrants** send back to the country. Mexican **immigrants** make up 28 percent of 42 million foreign-born population in the United States, according to the Migration Policy Institute. At the time, Trump said the threat would be withdrawn if Mexico made a $5 billion to $10 billion payment to the United States to help fund the wall.

Birthright citizenship. Trump not only has said that he believes it is wrong for the children of illegal **immigrants** to automatically receive citizenship if they are born in the United States ("anchor babies"), but in interviews in August 2015, he also indicated that he would seek to deport children of illegal **immigrants** who are U.S. citizens by virtue of their birth. In his words, he would "test it out in the courts" because he thought he could make a case that "they do not have American citizenship." (He said he might make an exception if a child had parents who are "very bad people.") In theory, that could affect about 4.5 million people born in the United States to parents who were undocumented **immigrants**. But most scholars believe any change in birthright citizenship would require a constitutional amendment.

DACA. Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals is an Obama administration policy that allows qualified undocumented **immigrants** who entered the country before their 16th birthday and before June 2007 to receive a renewable two-year work permit and exemption from deportation. More than 650,000 applications have been approved, and presumably these people would be subject to deportation under a Trump presidency. Of course, some might argue that these individuals do not fall under the category of "**immigrants**." But the Clinton campaign says that people approved under DACA now have documents.

The first two items - the threat on remittances and the threat to deport children with birthright citizenship - conceivably might affect some **immigrants** and their families. But not all.

A campaign official said that the "millions of **immigrants**" in the second tweet referred mostly to undocumented **immigrants**, but he also pointed to Trump's plan to revoke DACA as something that would affect people who have legal documents.

The Pinocchio Test

Trump's campaign has been centered on the threat that he claims is posed by illegal **immigrants**. His announcement speech was interpreted as an attack on Mexican **immigrants**, but he eventually clarified that he was talking about undocumented **immigrants**. His plan for a wall on the border, his denial of birthright citizenship and his pledge to rescind DACA are all part of his proposed efforts to thwart illegal **immigration**.

His proposal to make Mexico pay for the wall by halting remittances could certainly affect legal **immigrants** from Mexico, but again he makes this proposal in the context of attacking illegal **immigration**; any possible effect on **immigrants** is a by-product of his plan to eliminate illegal **immigration**.

All too often, Trump's proposals are ill-defined and poorly explained, making it hard to discern his actual intentions. Muddying the waters even more, he has also proposed a temporary ban on Muslims entering the country and forcefully claimed that vetting procedures for **refugees** are inadequate.

Still, the Clinton campaign is using slippery language to suggest that Trump's attacks on illegal **immigrants** are actually a broader assault on all **immigrants**. If Clinton misspoke, she did so in a way that conveniently mirrored her campaign's videos. The videos stretch the truth, leaving the impression that Trump is broadly attacking even legal **immigrants**. It's quite possible that the Clinton campaign does not want to appear as if it is endorsing illegal **immigration**. But it goes too far in claiming that Trump's "plans for **immigrants**" are clear.

We will accept that Clinton misspoke in the CNN interview. But we are going to keep a close watch on whether her campaign keeps using slippery language that blurs the line between legal **immigrants** and undocumented **immigrants**. In the meantime, these tweets earn Two Pinocchios.

glenn.kessler@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IN THE face of the most calamitous **refugee** crisis since World War II, the United States has finally begun granting **refuge** to displaced Syrians on a pace that, while still unequal to the problem's scale and the United States' capacity, at least starts to acknowledge that a crisis exists.

In an announcement Monday, the White House said the administration had met its goal of granting asylum to 10,000 Syrians in the current fiscal year, which ends in a month. Officials said they expect to continue accepting asylum applications in coming weeks and months.

The modesty of the numerical goal is incommensurate with the weight of the challenge posed by some 5 million Syrian **refugees**, including roughly 1.1 million already in Europe. Measured against resettlement programs on behalf of **refugees** by Germany, France, Britain and other Western countries, to say nothing of those by Turkey, Lebanon and Jordan, America's own efforts are meager. Canada, with a population barely a tenth the size of the United States', has resettled three times more Syrian **refugees** since last fall. And Washington's goal for the next fiscal year, starting Oct. 1, is no greater than its goal for the current year.

National security adviser Susan Rice heralded the arrival of the 10,000th **refugee** by releasing a statement lauding the "important message" President Obama had sent. Given the craven resistance to any resettlement, especially among some Republican governors, the self-congratulation was understandable. Yet the United States could do much more.

Hundreds of thousands of Vietnamese were resettled in this country after the war there. More than 120,000 Cubans came to the United States in the course of a few months during the Mariel boatlift in 1980. As former Maryland governor Martin O'Malley has noted, if the United States, a country of 320 million, granted asylum to 65,000 Syrians, it would be statistically akin to adding 6½ people to a baseball stadium holding 32,000. And notwithstanding grandstanding politicians who depict the **refugees** as a grave threat, many of those who have been resettled, in towns and smaller cities in nearly 40 states, say they have been treated well by their new American neighbors.

The political headwinds have more to do with xenophobia, especially regarding the Middle East and Muslims, and a generalized fear of terrorist attacks, than with any specific or real threat posed by Syrian **refugees**.

While most Syrian **refugees** resettled in the past year are children and women, it is impossible to assure that none of them, and none of the 75,000 **refugees**accepted from around the world, may pose a security threat, now or in the future. Still, Syrian asylum-seekers have been subjected to intensive and enhanced security vetting, including face-to-face interviews by U.S. officials, scrutiny of social media accounts and other screening measures.

Previous waves of **immigrants** and **refugees** - Irish, Italians, Jews and Vietnamese - have been despised, feared and shunned by some Americans, much as Syrians are being vilified by some Americans now. Yet like their predecessors, Syrians, joining 150,000 of their countrymen already in the United States, will make new and productive lives that ultimately add to America's unique dynamism.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**In most countries, 6-year-old Shaima would be in school, frowning through work sheets before scrambling to the playground at recess.

"She used to zoom home and do her homework so quickly I would suspect she was lying, but she really would finish it in no time," said her father, Mahmoud Tafeye.

Without significant luck, the child might never see again. She was blinded by a sniper's bullet that ripped through her family's minibus and sliced through her head and arm last November.

Shaima's childhood, like those of millions of other young Syrians, was shattered by a war that has spurred the gravest displacement crisis since World War II. Of the country's 4.3 million **refugees**, at least half are children.

A year ago, the war's toll on children was painfully underscored by the image of a little boy lying facedown on a Turkish beach. In death, Alan Kurdi became a symbol of Syria's "lost generation."

Shaima's own escape was a narrow one. She had lived her first five years in the east Aleppo suburb of Sukkari, before the November morning when her parents packed their two children into the minibus in a panic as fighting neared. When bullets started to fly - apparently from Kurdish forces - she was hit and blinded in both eyes. Her 12-year-old brother, Abdo, whom Mahmoud Tafeye described as Shaima's "protector," was killed.

Children are thought to account for about 20 percent of the nearly half-million Syrians who have died during the course of the five-year conflict. According to UNICEF, an additional 8.4 million children - more than 80 percent of the country's youth population - have been affected in some way, either living with violence in Syria or fleeing abroad.

Across rebel-held parts of the country, repeated strikes on hospitals have severely limited access to health care. As soon as a Syrian becomes a **refugee**, a host of new problems begin, including the need for new paperwork to access a foreign country's health-care system as well as the need to endure extensive waiting lists.

After arriving in southern Turkey, Shaima would lie for months in hospitals and clinics, at times curled up so small under a blanket in her father's arms that an observer might have missed her.

What happened next confounded everyone. "She fought and she fought," her father said. "And she survived."

By her 6th birthday, she could stand tall again. In a photograph from that day, she is wearing a party hat and a quizzical expression, lost in thought as she clutches a bright balloon.

"We thought she was going to be paralyzed, but she is a fighter," her father said in a phone interview from Turkey last week. "She keeps telling me: 'Baba, it's okay that the sniper hit me - I am not sad. God meant it to be this way, and I know I will get better.'"

With the help of specialized medical care abroad, doctors believe, Shaima will see again.

The invisible wounds of war are harder to treat. Aid groups say that most of the Syrian children they encounter show signs of trauma, including severe anxiety, flashbacks and even suicide attempts. Although international and local organizations offer an array of counseling services, they reach only a minority of **refugees**in Lebanon, Turkey or Jordan, the countries where most Syrians have settled.

Lina Sergie Attar, co-founder of the Karam Foundation, which provides support for Syrian **refugees**, said the levels of need shocked even experienced trauma professionals.

"It's not just the children, it's everyone. It's parents, it's teachers," she said. "Many of these people have traditionally relied on their families, on their neighbors, for support. With the war came a total unraveling of that."

Marking the anniversary of Alan Kurdi's death, Amnesty International Secretary General Salil Shetty called on wealthier countries to do more to assist Syrian children.

"Until wealthy countries take more responsibility for the crisis unfolding before them, and take in a fairer share of the people fleeing war and persecution, they will be condemning thousands more children to risk their lives in desperate journeys or being trapped in **refugee** camps with no hope for the future."

Photographs of the child were shared millions of times, prompting fierce debate over global responsibility for Syria's **refugee** crisis. But in the year that followed, a powerful wave of right-wing populism across Europe and the United States, as well as repeated Islamic State-linked attacks across both continents, appear to have reversed what small concessions the little boy's death inspired.

Shaima's father said that until he raises enough money for her eye operation, he is teaching her what he can at home. And then, reaching for the phone, the young girl chimed in, her voice strong and mirthful. "I just want to go back to school," she said. "I know I will be there soon."

louisa.loveluck@washpost.com
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**PHOENIX - Donald Trump's latest **immigration** proposals would require a dramatic and costly expansion of the U.S. border-control system - targeting millions more people for immediate removal while also making it much harder for millions of others to enter the country legally.

The deportation priorities outlined by the Republican presidential nominee during a policy address here late Wednesday would target at least 5 million and as many as 6.5 million undocumented **immigrants** for swift removal, or about half of the 11 million estimated to be living in the United States. And he left open the possibility that he would seek to deport many more as well.

"Anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation," Trump said.

Trump delivered a series of similarly sweeping statements and proposals during the hard-edged speech, following a tortuous two-week period in which he had signaled that he might soften his tone on the issue instead. He not only called for removing all undocumented **immigrants** who had committed crimes, but also said he would prioritize the deportation of those who have overstayed their visas.

To accomplish that goal, he said he would triple the number of **Immigration** and Customs Enforcement agents and create a "new special deportation task force" to track the most serious security threats.

"We will break the cycle of amnesty and illegal **immigration**. We will break the cycle. There will be no amnesty," he said. "Our message to the world will be this: You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country. Can't do it."

That speech, which followed a quick visit to Mexico earlier Wednesday to meet with President Enrique Peña Nieto, effectively shut down speculation that he would move toward the center on **immigration** issues before Election Day. Many Republican strategists hoped that such a move would help him court moderate voters and regain ground against his Democratic rival, Hillary Clinton. His speech also prompted resignations on Thursday by several members of his Hispanic Advisory Council, who said they felt misled by earlier overtures.

There has been widespread confusion about Trump's position in recent weeks, in part because he has repeatedly contradicted himself in public statements about mass deportation. He said in Phoenix that what becomes of the 11 million undocumented **immigrants** "will never be a central issue" even as he vowed that he would begin removing millions on "day one, as soon as I take office." And although he rejected any possible path to legal status - or "amnesty" - during that speech, he suggested Thursday during an interview with conservative radio host Laura Ingraham that he would revisit legalization after his border security policies were enacted.

Despite the confusion, what is clear is that Trump's specific deportation prescriptions would require an expansive effort.

An estimated 690,000 undocumented **immigrants** have committed significant crimes that would make them security priorities - felonies or serious misdemeanors - according to a study by the Migration Policy Institute. That number is closer to 2 million according to some, including Jessica Vaughan of the anti-**immigration**Center for **Immigration** Studies, whom the Trump campaign has consulted on the issue.

If visa overstays are included in the immediate priorities, as Trump said he would order during his speech, the number would grow by about 4.5 million people, according to estimates that place overstays at about 40 percent of the total undocumented population.

In all, the number of people prioritized for removal by ICE would be about 5 million to 6.5 million, according to available data and estimates.

"And you can call it deported if you want. The press doesn't like that term. You can call it whatever the hell you want. They're gone," Trump said.

A Washington Post analysis of the possible cost found that Trump's plan could add $51.2 billion to $66.9 billion in **immigration** enforcement costs over the next five years.

Frank Sharry, executive director of America's Voice, an **immigration** reform organization, said that Trump's speech detailed a massive deportation effort that puts him far to the right even of the Republican Party.

"The speech was the most radical platform on **immigration** of any nominee in modern American history," Sharry said. "He's talking about a deportation strategy that is relentless."

Sharry added that the speech is likely to do little to expand Trump's political support among moderates and independents.

"Honestly, he reaffirmed his hard-right stance and left no doubt [that] who he's appealing to are those in his angry white base of support," he said. "I can't imagine a college-educated woman in the [Philadelphia] suburbs seeing that speech and thinking, 'Yeah that was reasonable.' "

Ryan Williams, a GOP strategist who worked for Mitt Romney's 2012 campaign, said the position Trump ultimately adopted on **immigration** this election cycle threatens to set back the Republican Party's effort to improve its standing among Hispanic voters.

"He's proving the type of long-term damage that the RNC warned about after the 2012 election," Williams said.

jose.delreal@washpost.com

Aaron Blake and Sean Sullivan in Washington contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump's diatribe on **immigration** Wednesday night dispelled any conceivable doubt: He is a dangerous demagogue who rejects the values of openness and inclusion that made this country great. Rarely has an American politician given such an un-American speech.

Foreigners who come here seeking a better life are the scapegoats he blames for problems real and imagined. Never mind that Trump's mother was an **immigrant**, or that two of his three wives came from overseas. Ronald Reagan saw this country as a shining city on a hill; Trump wants us to cower in fear behind a Berlin-style wall. Reagan invited millions of undocumented **immigrants** to stay and contribute to their adopted land; Trump wants to round them up, all 11 million, and ship them home.

That's what he wants his loyal followers to believe, at least. Like any effective demagogue, Trump is fluent in doublespeak.

At one point, to thunderous applause, he said this: "For those here illegally today, who are seeking legal status, they will have one route and one route only: to return home and apply for reentry like everybody else, under the rules of the new legal **immigration** system that I have outlined."

A few sentences later, though, he appeared to take it back. Only after he has built the Great Wall of Trump on the southern border, which isn't going to happen, and persuaded Congress to approve a whole new **immigration** system, which also isn't going to happen - only then, he said, "will we be in a position to consider the appropriate disposition of those individuals who remain."

See what he's trying to do? He allows listeners to believe whatever they want about his true intentions. Xenophobes can dream of mobs wielding pitchforks and torches while apologists can assure moderate voters that Trump doesn't really propose a vast pogrom of ethnic cleansing.

I choose to believe the first version - that Trump is saying all 11 million have to go - because the whole point of the speech was to convince his most fervent supporters that he is "hardening," not "softening," his position on **immigration**. Fear and loathing of the "other" is his core appeal.

Trump also told us who would go first: up to 2 million undocumented "criminals," in addition to 4.5 million individuals who are here because they overstayed their visas. Also, any undocumented person stopped by law enforcement for any reason would be detained pending deportation. It is not alarmist to note that actually trying to do all of this would require the creation of a police state.

Of course, that's not what he intends - unless you happen to like the idea of a police state, in which case it's exactly what he intends. Policy positions are just words to Trump, and words are just paving stones on the road to power.

Trump's support base is mostly white and working-class, and he skillfully exploits these voters' fears of demographic change. We must "be honest about the fact that not everyone who seeks to join our country will be able to successfully assimilate," he said. "Sometimes it's just not going to work out. It's our right, as a sovereign nation, to choose **immigrants** that we think are the likeliest to thrive and flourish and love us." He warned ominously that "**immigration** as a share of national population is set to break all historical records."

Translation: Doesn't it tick you off to hear so many so-called Americans speaking Spanish?

Trump's antipathy toward Hispanic **immigrants**, however, is nothing compared to what he thinks about Muslims. He has changed his proposed Muslim ban into a country-specific ban - that happens to cover only Muslim countries. And he wants screening to include "an ideological certification to make sure that those we are admitting to our country share our values and love our people."

Ideological certification? Approved by whom, the thought police?

Earlier in the day, Trump tried his best to sound sober and statesmanlike in his meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto. By evening, though, he was back to insisting that Mexico would pay for the border wall, although "they don't know it yet." And on Thursday morning, Trump was again touting a "softening" in his **immigration** views.

But you can't soften bigotry. You can't soften jingoism. You can't soften Trump's naked appeal to anger and resentment. You can't soften the fact that he rejects American exceptionalism, which is based on creed, in favor of tribalism based on ethnic purity.

He can't be George Wallace one day and Thomas Jefferson the next.

eugenerobinson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**John Rakolta Jr. was skeptical as he headed to a private meeting with Donald Trump in July at Chicago's Trump International Hotel. The Michigan construction executive, a longtime ally of 2012 Republican nominee Mitt Romney and a top fundraiser for Sen. Marco Rubio, was not yet sold on raising funds for Trump.

But the Trump whom Rakolta encountered in a suite on the 27thfloor was nothing like the provocateur he expected. "He is extremely soft-spoken," Rakolta said. "None of the stuff that I imagined." The two had a wide-ranging discussion about why auto companies build plants in countries such as Mexico instead of the United States.

Rakolta left with newfound enthusiasm. Trump left with a new talking point.

"I have a friend who builds plants, and he's a great builder of plants, and I was with him the other day - great guy," the candidate told reporters a few weeks later. "And I said, 'How's it going?' He said: 'Unbelievable. ... The plants I'm building in Mexico, I've never seen anything - it's the eighth wonder of the world.' And he's not happy. He's an American guy. He'd rather build them here."

The New York billionaire, who has cast himself as free from the influence of the party's donor class, has spent this summer forging bonds with wealthy GOP financiers - seeking their input on how to run his campaign and recast his policies for the general election, according to more than a dozen people who have participated in the conversations.

Private meetings with top contributors turn into strategy brainstorming sessions. High-priced dinner fundraisers are transformed into impromptu focus groups.

During a July lunch at a Southampton, N.Y., estate, he spent at least an hour asking the 60 heavyweight contributors in attendance to each share their pick of whom he should tap as his running mate. At a photo line with donors in Minneapolis in August, he polled whether he should continue using a teleprompter at public events.

At a mountainside chateau in Aspen last week, Trump quizzed locals about how the campaign could better compete in Colorado. And in a pistachio orchard outside a supporter's home in Tulare, Calif., this week, he queried farmers about how to create a "permit" system for undocumented workers.

The episodes illustrate how Trump, who has a tiny circle of intimates, is turning to the wealthy business leaders he encounters on the fundraising circuit to serve as an ad hoc kitchen cabinet. He appointed many of his biggest financial backers to his economic advisory council, including Wisconsin billionaire Diane Hendricks, investor Tom Barrack and oil executive Harold Hamm. There are already signs of how Trump is incorporating ideas from donors into his campaign.

The most dramatic example came in August during a fundraiser in East Hampton, N.Y., when conservative benefactor Rebekah Mercer touted the merits of Breitbart News chief Stephen K. Bannon in a conversation with Trump about his campaign leadership. Days later, Trump sidelined campaign chairman Paul Manafort and effectively replaced him with Bannon.

Several days later, casino billionaire Sheldon Adelson privately urged Trump to show more humility and to treat people with more respect, as the New York Timesfirst reported. The next day, the candidate issued a rare apology for causing "personal pain."

In a statement, Trump told The Washington Post that he has "met some really wonderful people while raising money for the RNC. They do also like that I am personally investing many millions in my own campaign. Some of the people I've met I'm sure will be lifelong friends."

When asked about the perception that donors have input on his decision-making, spokeswoman Hope Hicks responded that Trump "is an excellent listener and welcomes the advice of people he respects."

"It is a great leadership quality and reflective of his creative, bold thinking that proved to be so successful throughout his career," she added.

In private, supporters see a side of Trump that sharply contrasts with his onstage persona at his raucous rallies. Solicitous and restrained, he disarms those expecting a bomb-thrower.

"I had heard he was a different person than you see in the media, but you don't know until you experience it," said Janet Beihoffer, a national committeewoman for the Minnesota Republican Party, who was struck by how engaged the candidate was during the photo line in Minneapolis several weeks ago. "I was floored."

Over and over, donors said they were impressed by Trump's attentiveness - he leans in close, moves his chair over, focuses only on what they are saying - as well as his intense efforts to glean new information.

"I had no idea what to expect, and I was very pleasantly surprised by how well he listened to what I had to say," said Andrew Sabin, the owner of a New York-based precious-metals refining business, who met privately with the candidate earlier this summer in the Hamptons to assess whether he wanted to contribute to his campaign. "No arrogance, you know, 'I'm Donald Trump, the king of the world.' He sat back and wanted to know what your opinion was."

The two men discussed **immigration**, among other topics, and Sabin said he made the case that it was impractical to deport the estimated 11 million undocumented **immigrants** living in the United States, as the candidate had insisted in the primaries that he would do through a "deportation force."

Several weeks after their meeting, Trump set off a storm of confusion by suggesting that he was still assessing whether all undocumented **immigrants** would be subject to immediate deportation. Sabin was heartened. "I think he liked what he heard," he said.

In a speech Wednesday in Phoenix, Trump vowed to crack down on people who are in the country illegally.

Peter Leidel, a Texas-based energy investor, was impressed with how the candidate solicited ideas from a dozen donors at a breakfast fundraiser at Trump Tower in New York in early August.

"To every person who said something, he would ask questions and say, 'Let me get this straight,'" Leidel recalled. "He would jot things down."

When it was Leidel's turn, the investor told Trump that he should do more to highlight Hillary Clinton's "bad judgment" for supporting the war in Iraq and President Obama's health-care overhaul.

Trump scribbled "judgment" in his notebook as Leidel spoke, a word he had used as a cudgel against his Democratic rival in the past.

The very next morning, Trump took up the attack again, tweeting that "Hillary Clinton has bad judgment and is unfit to serve as President."

"I don't know if it was me or not," Leidel said of Trump's tweet. "But I think listening is a very important skill. I think a lot of people pretend they are listening, and they don't even care what you're saying."

Billionaire investor Wilbur Ross, who hosted Trump at his Southampton estate in July, described the candidate as "very relaxed, very low-key, and very, very good at including everybody in the conversation."

"It's a different persona from the one you see at the big rallies," Ross said, "and much more like his persona when he is hosting parties at Mar-a-Lago or at one of his golf courses."

Andy Puzder, chief executive of CKE Restaurants, said that Trump's style behind closed doors reminds him of how he himself conducts business meetings.

"He says to the guys and gals, 'So what do you think of this?'" Puzder said. "Whatever he is working on, he tries to get input on. That's what I do."

In one case, the restaurant chain executive recalled that Trump walked into a small group of donors gathered at Trump Tower in June and said, "Who do you guys think I should pick for vice president?" Indiana Gov. Mike Pence, his eventual selection, was among those discussed.

While Trump has reportedly little appetite for fundraising, he has kept up a busy pace of pricey events in August, headlining more than 20 receptions and dinner s, including some that cost up to $100,000 a couple, according to a tally of invitations by The Post. (Unlike Clinton, who was on her own fundraising spree in August, Trump does not disclose when he is attending fundraisers, who is hosting them or the minimum donation required.)

Each gathering serves as another sounding board. At an August dinner in Canton, Ohio, he quizzed about 30 donors at a local country club for their thoughts on local business issues.

"He would say: 'How would you solve that? What would you do?'" recalled Doug Sibila, the chief executive of a warehouse and transportation company, who weighed in on what he views as onerous Labor Department regulations. "As he shared some of his ideas and opinions, you can see they were in process, that he was willing to adapt based on what made sense."

Their biggest regret, many donors said, is that more Americans do not get to see the private Trump.

People view him as "off the cuff, but I think he is actually very thoughtful and measured," Leidel said. "He is not going to make a decision without listening to advisers."

At the breakfast fundraiser at Trump Tower in early August, where he went into details about his approach to issues such as the war in Syria, attendees urged Trump to share more policy specifics in public.

"At the rallies, if I give much more than a one-word sentence, I lose the audience," Trump responded, according to Leidel. "I want to keep their attention."

matea.gold@washpost.com

Sean Sullivan contributed to this report.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The one great service of Donald Trump's extended peregrinations on **immigration** policy is to have demonstrated how, in the end, there's only one place to go.

You can rail for a year about the squishy soft, weak-kneed and stupid politicians who have opened our borders to the wretched refuse of Mexico. You can promise to round them up - the refuse, that is, not the politicians (they're next) - and deport them. And that may win you a plurality of Republican primary votes.

But eventually you have to let it go. For all his incendiary language and clanging contradictions, Trump did exactly that in Phoenix on Wednesday. His "deportation task force" will be hunting ... criminal **aliens**. Isn't that the enforcement priority of President Obama, heretofore excoriated as the ultimate **immigration** patsy?

And what happens to the noncriminal illegal **immigrants**? On that, Trump punted. Their "appropriate disposition" will be considered "in several years when we have ... ended illegal **immigration** for good." Everyone knows what that means: One way or another, they will be allowed to stay.

Trump's retreat points the way to the only serious solution: enforcement plus legalization. The required enforcement measures are well known - from a national E-Verify system that makes it just about impossible to work if you are here illegally, to intensified border patrol and high-tech tracking.

The one provision that, thanks to Trump, gets the most attention is a border wall. It's hard to understand the opposition. It's the most venerable and reliable way to keep people out. The triple fence outside San Diego led to a 90 percent reduction in infiltration. Israel's border fence with the West Bank has produced a similar decline in terror attacks into Israel.

The main objection is symbolic. Walls, we are told, denote prisons. But only if they are built to keep people in, not if they are for keeping outsiders out. City walls, going back to Jericho, are there for protection. Even holier-than-thou Europeans have conceded the point as one country after another - Hungary, Macedonia, Bulgaria, Austria, Greece, Spain, why even Norway - has started building border fences to stem the tide of Middle Eastern **refugees**.

The other part of the **immigration** bargain is legalization. What do you do with the 11 million already here? In theory, you could do nothing. The problem ultimately solves itself as the generation of the desert - those who crossed the border originally - is eventually replaced by its American-born children who are automatically legal and landed.

But formal legalization is a political necessity. It gets buy-in from Democrats who for whatever reason - self-styled humanitarianism or bare-knuckled partisanship - have no interest in real border enforcement. Legalization is the quid pro quo. If they want to bring the **immigrants** "out of the shadows," they must endorse serious enforcement.

Such a grand bargain could and would command a vast national consensus. The American public will accept today's illegal **immigrants** if it is convinced that this will be the last such cohort.

This was the premise of the 1986 Reagan amnesty. It legalized almost 3million **immigrants**. Because it never enforced the border, however, three has become 11.

And that's why the Gang of Eight failed. They too got the sequencing wrong. The left insisted on legalization first. The Gang's Republicans ultimately acquiesced because they figured, correctly, this was the best deal they could get in an era of Democratic control.

The problem is that legalization is essentially irreversible and would have gone into effect on Day One. Enforcement was a mere promise.

Hence the emerging Republican consensus, now that Trump has abandoned mass deportation: a heavy and detailed concentration on enforcement, leaving the question of what happens to those already here either unspoken (Trump on Wednesday) or to be treated case by case (Trump last week).

The Trump detour into - and retreat from - mass deportation has proved salutary. Even the blustering tough guy had to dismiss it with "we're not looking to hurt people."

The ultimate national consensus, however, lies one step farther down the road. Why leave legalization for some future discussion? Get it done. Once the river of illegal **immigration** has been demonstrably and securely reduced to a trickle, the country will readily exercise its natural magnanimity and legalize.

So why not agree now? Say it and sign it. To get, you have to give. That's the art of the deal, is it not?

letters@charleskrauthammer.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Of the 2016 election's lightning storm of shocks, few will have more lasting political consequence than the discrediting of the main media organs of movement conservatism.

Fox News - the "fair and balanced" alternative to the liberal media, the voice of traditional values, the never-ceasing hum in the background of American conservatism - has been revealed as the personal fiefdom of a Donald Trump shill and as an institution apparently operating (according to one lawsuit) "like a sex-fueled, Playboy Mansion-like cult, steeped in intimidation, indecency and misogyny." While Fox News is not going away, it will need to be relaunched and rebranded as the network of Bret Baier and Megyn Kelly (both fine journalists), rather than of angry white television personalities who employ perpetual outrage as a business model.

Speaking of which, a similar unveiling has occurred with the right's defining radio personality, Rush Limbaugh. It is difficult to overestimate Limbaugh's influence on two generations of intensely loyal listeners. Steve Forbes has called him "part of the trinity that made modern conservatism," in the company of Ronald Reagan and William F. Buckley.

In this campaign cycle, Limbaugh fully embraced right-wing populism, including defending Trump's hard line on **immigration** and mass deportation - a position Limbaugh once described as "standing up for the American way of life." During the recent six-day period in which Trump moderated his **immigration** stand and essentially embraced Jeb Bush's views, Limbaugh fielded a call from "Rick in Los Angeles," who was angry at Trump for adopting a position he had savaged other Republicans for holding. "This is going to enrage you," Limbaugh replied. "I can choose a path here to try to mollify you. I never took him seriously on this."

It is an admission of astounding cynicism. Trump began his campaign by stereotyping Mexicans as rapists and proposing the forced expulsion of 11 million people - an extreme, inhumane, politically self-destructive policy that Limbaugh urged his listeners to support as a matter of principle. But Limbaugh, it turns out, was in on the joke. He knew it was part of a show, much like his own, in which incitement builds an audience.

Limbaugh is particularly influential but hardly unique. Over the past few decades, conservatives have developed an infrastructure of media institutions that - with notable and principled exceptions - constitutes an ideological bubble. One may listen to Limbaugh at lunch, watch Sean Hannity in the evening and get Twitteralerts from the Drudge Report and Breitbart News all through the day. But these are not just sources of information; they are also businesses, particularly sensitive to the views of their audience. And what gets rewarded with listeners, viewers and clicks? Outrage at the perceived aggressions of liberalism. Anger at the compromises of the Republican "establishment." And the defense of American identity against illegal **immigrants** and Muslims.

These positions can (and should) be debated on their own merits. But this much is undeniable: The market imperatives of conservative media institutions have nothing - absolutely nothing - to do with the health of conservatism, the success of the Republican Party, the election of a Republican president or solving serious national problems through principled compromise. To the contrary, conservative media outlets are incentivized to promote anger and discord, and to beat the hell out of mainstream Republicans. Some resist this incentive structure; most do not.

In this election, we have seen something remarkable. A candidate who reflects the views and values of conservative media was able - with a plurality and a fractured field - to seize the presidential nomination of the Republican Party. But the political universe of conservative talk radio does not constitute anything close to a majority of voters in the general election. In fact, this cartoon version of conservatism tends to **alienate** key groups of voters, including minorities, Republican women and the college- educated.

Much (not all, but much) of the new conservative establishment feeds outrage as its source of revenue and relevance. It is a model that has been good for Limbaugh and Fox News but bad for the GOP. Republicans are now caught in a complicated electoral dynamic. What their base, incited by conservative media, is demanding, the country is rejecting. A choice and a conflict are becoming unavoidable. Trump's angry nativism - newly restated in Arizona with a few twists - is a talk-radio shtick, correctly viewed by most of the electorate as impractical and cruel. It is less a proposal than an offensive, unhealthy form of ideological entertainment. And this show needs to close.

michaelgerson@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The founder and chief executive of one of the largest residential property management companies in the region said Thursday that he regrets comments he made to The Washington Post last month regarding **immigrant** tenants.

David Hillman, chairman of Fairfax County-based Southern Management Corp., had told The Post that overcrowding that occurs in many **immigrant** apartments is a matter of cultural preference, rather than financial need. He also said **immigrants** are often paid cash for their work and are not as strapped for money as many people assume.

The remarks were included in a report about the difficulties **immigrants** displaced by a deadly gas explosion at a Silver Spring apartment complex may face in finding a new place to live in the region's expensive marketplace.

After a small protest by the Virginia-based Legal Aid Justice Center outside Southern's company headquarters on Thursday, Hillman told The Post that his remarks "were not intended to disparage or offend any group."

"My printed comments in the Washington Post on August 20th regarding **immigrants** and their housing challenges were part of a much longer and comprehensive conversation with the reporter," Hillman said in statement that was emailed to the newspaper in response to a request for comment. "I regret that anyone has taken offense to them and I certainly apologize for any misunderstanding of the intent."

At the protest, about a dozen demonstrators raised neon-colored signs reading "Solutions not stereotypes" and "Housing is a right," in Spanish and English, and pointed them toward the windows of the towering Southern building on Old Gallows Road.

Multiple households sharing a single apartment "is not a cultural preference," said Edgar Aranda-Yanoc, a community organizer. "It is a necessity."

Hillman said he had not been in direct communication with the Legal Aid center.

But Simon Sandoval-Moshenberg, director of the group's **immigrant** advocacy program, said he welcomed Hillman's apology and hopes he will be part of a greater effort to provide quality housing to those on the low end of the income spectrum.

The organization, which helps bring legal cases on behalf of low-income and **immigrant** families, said it was important to draw attention to Hillman's remarks because his views reflect a broader sentiment that they believe is shared by apartment developers in the area.

"When someone in the community expresses racism, we have to respond," Jerrold Foltz, a retired clergyman, said during the protest.

**Immigrants** without legal status or with a status shy of a green card are ineligible for most, if not all, types of housing assistance from the government. Many therefore share space in poorly maintained complexes, which advocates say was the case with the destroyed Flower Branch apartments in Silver Spring.

Angela Reyes, 61, shares a two-bedroom apartment in Falls Church, Va., with four other adults, who together pay nearly $1,800 a month in rent and utilities.

"If I could, I would live alone," said Reyes, who also attended the demonstration. "But I don't have that luxury."

arelis.hernandez@washpost.com

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**IT'S USEFUL that Donald Trump has clarified his plans for Larissa Martinez, who started classes this week as a freshman at Yale University, having graduated in the spring as class valedictorian at her Texas high school. After weeks of waffling, and suggestions that his views on **immigration** might be "softening," Mr. Trump has set the record straight: Ms. Martinez has no future in America.

The recipient of a full scholarship to Yale, Ms. Martinez is hoping for a career as a neurosurgeon. As it happens, she's also a top-notch student, a compelling public speaker and, according to Mr. Trump's policy, a high priority for deportation.

Discarding his dalliance with fairness and compassion, the Republican presidential nominee this week tossed red meat to the xenophobes in his base by reaffirming his intention to launch a crusade of mass deportations that would target, according to an analysis by The Post, at least 6 million people. Among them, he said, would be **immigrants** who have overstayed their visas. That category would sweep up Ms. Martinez, who, at age 13, accompanied her mother and sister to the United States on a tourist visa; they stayed after the visa expired, having fled an abusive home in Mexico.

Of course, there is no place in Mr. Trump's cramped mental universe for someone like Ms. Martinez. To Mr. Trump and the crowds who egg him on, undocumented **immigrants** are criminals, murderers, rapists, carriers of disease and drug smugglers, fit to be rounded up by deportation agents and shipped far, far away.

Just why Mr. Trump would prioritize visa- overstayers for deportation, and not those who entered the country illegally in the first place, is unexplained. Logic is hardly the point of his policy. He asserts that illegal **immigrants** have stolen jobs from Americans and triggered a crime wave. In fact, they have met a labor market demand for low-wage workers and been a catalyst for economic growth.

While there are undoubtedly instances of terrible crimes committed by unauthorized **immigrants** - as there are by authorized **immigrants**, and green card holders, and, it goes without saying, citizens - they are hardly the rule. In fact, young **immigrant** males are incarcerated at roughly half the rate of native-born Americans. Illegal **immigrants**, like legal ones, are generally law-abiding and extremely hard- working.

To the GOP nominee, illegal **immigrants** are a useful instrument with which to whip his supporters into a froth of nativist agitation. He would hire thousands more **immigration** and Border Patrol agents; he would create a "special deportation task force"; he would round up the criminals whose countries refuse to accept them. He would do it all on Day One, in the first hour, the first minute, in the first fleeting seconds of his administration - by fiat, presumably, because he makes no reference to Congress or legality or judicial precedent. It will all be so fast, so beautiful, so efficient. Believe him.

The self-contained imposter who called briefly on Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday was masquerading as Donald Trump. In fact, the real Mr. Trump is the man who has been on television all these months, playing on hatred and fear, threatening people such as Ms. Martinez, who represent American values more truly than Mr. Trump ever could.

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**The morning after Donald Trump once again embraced his hard-line **immigration** posture in a shouted speech, at least four members of his two-week-old Hispanic advisory council said they might not vote for the Republican presidential nominee and warned that his harsh rhetoric would cost him the election.

At meetings Thursday on the 14th floor of Trump Tower in Manhattan, the candidate's top aides held the opposite view. They thought his tough talk on **immigration** - combined with a whirlwind trip to Mexico on Wednesday - had, in the words of one adviser, "won him the election."

"How do you like our poll numbers?" Trump excitedly asked in a brief telephone interview with The Washington Post on Thursday. He rattled off recent surveys that he said show his support has inched up.

For nearly two weeks, Trump has publicly and privately debated how best to describe his **immigration** positions, especially when it comes to the roughly 11 million illegal **immigrants** in the country.

He spent days floating a series of possible changes and gauging the reaction, and even visited Mexico for a few hours Wednesday in a bid to appear more presidential. But later that night, he decided to stick with the far-right positions that were key to his success in the Republican primaries and could help him cement the support of white men - one demographic where he beats Democratic rival Hillary Clinton.

The roller-coaster debate - which continued Thursday after a speech the campaign heralded as definitive - centered on Trump's repeated calls during the primaries to deport all of the undocumented **immigrants** in the country. He suggested that his declaration applied even if they have lived here for decades, are contributing members of society or have children who are U.S. citizens, although he appeared to back away from his call to immediately deport all of the illegal **immigrants**living in the United States with a "deportation force."

But in the end, the debate within the Trump campaign turned out to be about messaging rather than policy.

"He hasn't changed his position on **immigration**," Trump surrogate Katrina Pierson said on CNN last week in remarks that were widely mocked at the time but in hindsight seemed to capture internal thinking. "He's changed the words that he is saying."

The public side of the debate took a turn on Aug. 20, when Trump held a hurriedly organized Saturday meeting with a newly formed National Hispanic Advisory Council at Trump Tower. He asked those around the table to share alternatives to mass deportation, signaling that he was willing to change his mind on the issue.

The council urged Trump to focus on how undocumented **immigrants** contribute to the nation's economy and abandon his plans to quickly deport millions - a view Trump heard from fellow business owners and wealthy Republican donors over the course of the summer. For several days, the candidate seemed to echo these views, saying in interviews with Fox News Channel that he would be willing to work with those who came here illegally and are living prosperous lives.

At a town hall meeting in Texas, Trump even polled audience members to get their input on the fate of the nation's undocumented **immigrants**, using his most flattering language to date.

But some Trump advisers told him that many voters like his stubborn dedication to issues that other politicians won't touch, and warned that flip-flopping on **immigration** would make him no different from the career politicians he has accused of being "weak" and beholden to donors.

These advisers urged Trump to use tough, nativist language in his **immigration** speech in Phoenix on Wednesday to create as sharp a contrast as possible with Clinton. They argued that by showing strength and force of leadership, Trump will attract undecided voters.

"We had a serious adult conversation about where we are. The people that won this debate said, 'Look, this is what got us here, and we can't abandon it,' " one Trump adviser said Thursday, speaking on the condition of anonymity to be candid about the campaign's internal deliberations. "There were many of us who made input, and it was clear that the hold-the-line people, we had more sway with him. I think the political calculation is, you can't abandon the base."

By Thursday of last week, Trump's tone was noticeably different during an interview with CNN, when he said that any **immigrant** who wants to become a legal resident would have to leave the country and apply to return - a process that can take many years.

"You have a lot of people being deported" already, he said on CNN, having praised the policies of President Obama and former president George W. Bush in an earlier interview. "We're going to do that vigorously."

As Trump's campaign was debating whether and when he should give an **immigration** policy speech, the nominee received a three-page invitation from Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto.

The prospect of a preelection Trump visit alarmed several Mexican cabinet members, but Peña Nieto decided to do it. Advocates for the meeting viewed it not as a chance to raise the president's sagging approval ratings, but as a political gamble that was important in the long run in case Trump won.

But Trump surprised them by agreeing to come within days. Not all parts of the Mexican government were fully informed about the plan, and the U.S. Embassy was alerted to the visit by the Secret Service, arranging the logistics of his trip.

Trump arrived Wednesday afternoon - hours before he was to give his **immigration** speech in Phoenix - and met with Peña Nieto for about an hour. Each then gave friendly remarks praising his neighboring nation. Many pundits lauded Trump for seeming willing to work with the leader of a nation that he has insulted so deeply during his campaign.

Hours later, Trump's tone changed significantly as he gave his formal policy speech - broadly painting many undocumented **immigrants** as violent criminals and promising that he would quickly deport millions. At least 5 million **immigrants** would be subject to rapid deportation under Trump's latest proposals, according to a Post analysis.

"That is all him. Those are his decisions," a top campaign aide said, speaking on the condition of anonymity to discuss internal talks. "He got very different viewpoints on **immigration**. But in the end, it was all him. That speech has to be his words, his cadence, his delivery."

Former New York mayor Rudolph W. Giuliani - who traveled with Trump to Mexico and has been a key figure in the candidate's discussions on the issue - said the contrasting speeches showed Trump's range.

"This is what a president has to be able to do," Giuliani said. "If you're meeting with a head of state, you'll act differently than if you were at the Heritage Foundationspeaking to scholars or speaking at a rally. That's why Trump seized on the invitation so quickly. He wanted to show that he could operate on several fronts and speak to different audiences, boldly and regardless of the risk."

But the harsh tone of the policy speech stunned Jacob Monty, a member of Trump's Hispanic advisory council and a Houston-based **immigration** lawyer. Monty has helped Trump raise money and wrote a newspaper column in June headlined, "A Latino's case for Donald Trump."

"The speech was just an utter disappointment," he said in an interview Thursday.

Soon afterward, Monty resigned from the advisory group and posted on Facebook that he will not vote for Trump.

"I don't want to be a prop like the Mexican president," Monty said in the interview. "We were out there defending him. And then to be just lied to like that - it doesn't feel good. It's not okay."

Others felt the same way. Ramiro Peña, a Texas pastor, called the advisory council "a scam" in an email to campaign and party leaders, according to Politico. Massey Villarreal, a Houston businessman, deemed the speech "awful" in an interview with NBC Latino. Alfonso Aguilar, a Latino activist, tweeted that he felt "disappointed and misled."

Even as those defections were unfolding Thursday morning, more than a dozen senior Trump campaign staff members met at Trump Tower to map out their strategy for the rest of the race. The mood in the room was charged and optimistic, with attendees praising Trump's speech and trip as a jolt to his bid, according to two people familiar with the discussions who spoke on the condition of anonymity to discuss a private meeting.

One Trump ally involved in the talks Thursday described Wednesday's drama as the "day that won him the election" because of Trump's reiteration of his conservative views on **immigration**, which many in his orbit consider crucial to wooing economically frustrated working-class voters.

And in another sign that Trump's orbit would continue to hold to its combative ethos, longtime conservative operative David N. Bossie was introduced as the new deputy campaign manager. Bossie, previously president of the Citizens United advocacy group, has been a prominent investigator of Clinton controversies for decades.

"A friend of mine for many years," Trump said, speaking from his office in New York. "Solid. Smart. Loves politics, knows how to win."

Yet even after his big speech, Trump continued to send mixed signals.

"We're going to sit back, we're going to assess the situation, we're going to make a decision at that time," he said on Fox News Channel on Thursday night about undocumented **immigrants** who had not committed other crimes. "I want to see, before we do anything further, I want to see how it shapes up when we have strong, impenetrable borders."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**A good day for Trump, but no bull's-eye

Donald Trump's Wednesday was a net plus for his campaign. I'm still somewhat shocked by the opening he was given by Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto, but good for Trump for seeing the opportunity and acting quickly. While Trump was holding a news conference alongside Peña Nieto and conducting himself in a diplomatic and serious manner, the Hillary Clinton camp was left muttering.

However, the surprise gift of Trump's visit to Mexico was somewhat diminished by his subsequent **immigration** policy speech in Phoenix, where he returned to his bombastic rhetoric of building a wall, making Mexico pay for it, etc. After his more nuanced approach earlier in the day, Trump left himself vulnerable to the charge that he choked at the meeting with Peña Nieto but, in classic bully style, reverted to tough talk when he was back in an environment where no one would challenge him.

It seems as if Trump can't help diminishing the positive moves he makes on the issues he ostensibly cares about. On **immigration**, he makes some valid points that should be part of the debate Democrats and Republicans could be having. But he weakens his arguments by exaggerating, making misstatements and using downright deceptive, suspect information. Look at what Post fact-checkers Michelle Ye Hee Lee and Glenn Kessler had to say about some of the wild inaccuracies in Trump's speech in Phoenix. Even when Trump has facts on his side, the Fact Checker pointed out that the information he uses is often "misleading and lacks context." It's almost as if Trump would rather not use the truth, even when the truth would do nicely.

And oh, by the way, according to Gallup, only 8 percent of voters list **immigration** as "the most important problem facing this country today." So even if Trump did score a few stylistic but important points Wednesday, that is diminished by his still missing the bull's-eye by a mile. In the same Gallup poll, 35 percent of voters say economic issues are the biggest problem facing the country. A simple message from Trump about how he will grow our economy is long overdue. There seems to be a new reason for him to "pivot" every week or so, but it never sticks. It wouldn't be hard for Trump to mimic the sound economic plan House Speaker Paul D. Ryan (R-Wis.) has laid out in the Better Way initiative or to ask distinguished economists Larry Kudlow and Stephen Moore to write four paragraphs that he could recite on the campaign trail. Plus, it would be a good opportunity for other Republicans on the ballot to follow his lead. Just think - there could actually be a coordinated GOP message on the issue that is the No. 1 priority for voters. Maybe not. We will see what happens.

- Ed Rogers

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Only the naive have ever believed that democracy is solely a noble contest over competing ideas, proposals and solutions. Emotion looms large in every human decision, including how we cast our ballots, and smart politicians have always blended appeals to the heart and the gut with their entreaties to reason.

We cherish what might be called the Lincoln-Douglas approach to politics, inspired by the 1858 debates between Honest Abe and "The Little Giant," Stephen Douglas, when the two candidates went from place to place in Illinois arguing with great eloquence about the future of slavery. But we forget that even in those debates, emotion was often in the saddle. Racism was at work, and so was a passionate anger at "the Slave Power," the popular term in the North for the domination of the federal government by Southern planters.

For decades, political scientists have blasted away at electoral models based primarily on the idea of rational choice. In the most recent and sophisticated entry in the field, "Democracy for Realists," Christopher Achen and Larry Bartels argue that even well-informed and politically engaged voters mostly choose candidates based on their social identities and partisan loyalties. Judging from the 2016 polls, that theory looks pretty good.

And in a brilliant article for Vox, Lee Drutman of the New America Foundation shows how Donald Trump, far from being an aberration from the trajectory of Republican politics, is instead "a historical culmination" of a strategy rooted in racial feeling. The irony for Republicans, he notes, is that "this strategy reached its full completion at precisely the moment when it was no longer a winning national strategy."

In an increasingly nonwhite country in which the younger and better educated are relatively liberal on matters of diversity, Trump has divided voters on race and **immigration** in a way that worked in the Republican primaries but is failing him with the broader electorate.

Drutman's insight explains Trump's whirls and twirls over his approach to **immigration**, as well as his sudden visit to Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and his evasively anodyne statement afterward. Trump is asking some to believe that he is an authentic nativist and racist who really thinks Mexican **immigrants** are "rapists," and more middle-of-the-road voters to see him as a fake nativist and racist willing to adjust to whatever position will make them breathe easier.

One way or the other, how can anyone with strong commitments on any issue now support Trump? Rarely has a candidate embarked upon such an extended public negotiation with himself over the core promise of his campaign - and Trumpism has been about **immigration** if it has been about anything. Imagine the campaign manager for any other candidate saying what Kellyanne Conway said last month about Trump's position on his signature issue. It was, she said, "to be determined."

What would have happened to Ronald Reagan's campaign manager if, at this point in the 1980 campaign, he had said that the Gipper's views on communism or taxes were "to be determined"? Or if a top Barack Obama aide had said the same in 2008 about his view of the Iraq War?

Have a candidate's political strategists ever before treated their candidate like a rambunctious child and spoken of their pride that they finally coaxed him to "stay on message"? The high-spirited boy may send out the offensive tweet now and again, but look how much better he's being! And don't you have to admire his gift for large gestures, like suddenly throwing a trip to Mexico on his schedule?

Trump's indifference to truth and consistency is what happens when the honest efforts of political scientists to grapple with the balance between the rational and irrational in politics become an excuse for absolute cynicism - about voters, their attention spans and democracy itself. Return to Lincoln and Douglas: Yes, they used emotion, but each also had carefully considered, strongly held views about slavery and the Union. The politicians we most respect try to persuade their fellow citizens not simply to vote for them but also to share at least some of their view of the world.

Political realists are right to challenge purely idealistic views of politics that mislead us into ignoring the role of power, group interest and the imperfections of all of us who vote. But the democratic idea is in grave jeopardy when citizens simply shrug over being manipulated and don't expect more from their political leaders than posturing, positioning and captivating media circuses.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**By Gary Lachman

There are at least two good reasons to read "Beyond the Robot." First, it is an enthralling account of the life and work of Colin Wilson, the often controversial writer who explored the nature of human consciousness in dozens of books, starting with his most famous, "The Outsider," which appeared in 1956 when he was just 24. If you've never encountered this celebration of **alienated** artists and intellectuals, Tarcher has just reissued it in a 60th anniversary edition.

The other reason to read "Beyond the Robot" is because it will introduce you to Gary Lachman, who writes about philosophical and mystical ideas with exceptional grace, forcefulness and clarity. One of the leading students of the western esoteric tradition, Lachman has published critical studies of Swedenborg, Madame Blavatsky, Aleister Crowley, Rudolf Steiner, P.D. Ouspensky and Jung - and he has done so without being raptly worshipful or casually dismissive. He has also brought out several general surveys of the occult, most recently "The Secret Teachers of the Western World." This begins with magic in antiquity and goes on to consider Gnosticism, Jewish Kabbalah, Renaissance alchemy, the secrets of the Rosicrucians, 19th-century Theosophy, the strange practices of Russian guru George Gurdjieff and New Age speculations about Ley lines, Atlantis and cosmic consciousness.

As Lachman reveals in "Beyond the Robot," he owes his fascination with outside-the-box thinking to Colin Wilson. Back in the 1970s under the name Gary Valentine, he was the bass guitarist in the rock group Blondie when he happened upon a copy of Wilson's "The Occult." A massive, anecdote-rich history, it enticed him to learn more, and he soon started visiting metaphysical societies in New York and Los Angeles. Eventually, Lachman moved to England, gave up his music career and remade himself into a freelance writer and scholar of the occult. To this day, he views himself as a Wilsonian.

But what does that mean?

Colin Wilson was born into a blue-collar family in Leicester, England, left school at 16, and spent his youth drifting around Europe, working at short-term menial jobs in London, sometimes sleeping on Hampstead Heath to save money, and constantly reading and scribbling in his journals. While trying to finish a philosophical shocker about a serial killer - later published as "Ritual in the Dark"- this lonely autodidact found himself wondering about the relationship between rebellion and creativity. He realized that visionary misfits and troublemakers such as William Blake, van Gogh, T.E. Lawrence, Nijinsky and Sri Ramakrishna rejected the meretricious facade of the world around them and tried to break through to some larger, truer reality. When "The Outsider" was published, it was rightly described as an intellectual thriller and became a bestseller.

With the money he earned - never matched by any of his later works - Wilson and his wife bought a house in rural Cornwall, which he gradually filled with 30,000 books. Defining himself as an optimistic existentialist, Wilson then embarked on a lifelong exploration of humankind's ache for spiritual purpose and meaning, an ache that people usually try to assuage through art, sex, drugs, religion or even crime. Men and women deeply yearn, in Lachman's summary, for "an inner expansiveness, a release from trivia and banality, a sensation of more 'life.' " We really should awake each day as if it were Christmas morning, as if the dawn were bringing us - in G.K. Chesterton's phrase - "absurd good news."

Throughout his life Wilson always remained an intellectual magpie. Abraham Maslow's theories about "peak experiences," those meaningful coincidences that Jung dubbed "synchronicities," Robert Graves's fantastic scholarship about the White Goddess - they all enriched Wilson's thinking. He grew particularly excited by the implications of the division between the brain's rational, verbal left lobe and its imaginative, pattern-oriented right. The world we experience, he deduced, is actually highly edited, created by what we choose to perceive. In fact, we sleepwalk through much of our lives, relying on an internalized robot self that automatically attends to our routine tasks and ignores the richness and wonder around us. The more we rely on the robot, the less authentic we feel.

However, some of us - like Proust when he nibbled on a tea-soaked madeleine - discover that we carry whole universes within ourselves and by using what Wilson calls "Faculty X" we can escape the present moment and dwell in the spirit whenever and wherever we choose. But this doesn't mean we should just go with the flow, become lotus eaters. People flourish best, says Wilson, when confronted by obstacles and challenges. Life's setbacks shock us out of our mental laziness and allow us, through disciplined effort, to reshape and strengthen our inner selves. An active will is the key to psychological health.

Over the years Wilson's investigations of fringe science, the paranormal and extreme behavior yielded an astonishing diversity of books: "Encyclopedia of Murder" (co-authored with Patricia Pitman) and "A Criminal History of Mankind," surveys of the supernatural such as "Mysteries" "From Atlantis to the Sphinx" and "Super Consciousness," and even several fictional "thought experiments" including the Lovecraftian science fiction novels, "The Mind Parasites" - made into the Tobe Hooper movie "Lifeforce" - and "The Philosopher's Stone." This self-described "intellectual worker" also taught and gave talks, while tirelessly persevering with his outlier researches right up to his death in 2013 at age 82.

Needless to say, Colin Wilson's immensely readable books and nearly all his ideas were generally dismissed by the literary establishment as the lunatic imaginings of a crank or gullible naif. How could anyone actually treat dowsing, UFOs and **alien** abductions seriously? Yet no matter how wild his ostensible subject, Wilson invariably stressed its connection to crucial humanistic concerns: We need to break free of our mind-forged manacles, cast aside our proclivity for existential despair and strive to live heroic and fulfilling lives. To me, that doesn't sound at all crazy.
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**MEXICO CITY - Donald Trump, who has made maligning illegal **immigrants** from Mexico a cornerstone of his presidential campaign, met with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto on Wednesday - striking a remarkably subdued and cooperative tone as he faced a world leader who forcefully opposes his signature proposals.

Yet just hours later in a major speech on **immigration** in Phoenix, the Republican presidential nominee had returned to the aggressive tenor that has defined much of his campaign. Repeatedly raising his voice to a yell, he said that "anyone who has entered the United States illegally is subject to deportation," and he vowed to crack down especially hard on illegal **immigrants** who have committed other crimes.

With less than 10 weeks until the election, Trump increasingly has tried to adjust his pitch to appeal more to moderate voters, as polls show he has fallen solidly behind Democratic rival Hillary Clinton nationally and in battleground states. However, the visit here and the speech in Phoenix could provide a jarring contrast for voters and send a confusing message about the kind of president he would be.

Trump said at the joint news conference in Mexico that he and Peña Nieto didn't discuss who would pay for his proposed wall along the U.S.-Mexico border, despite his long-standing vow to compel Mexico to foot the bill. He and Peña Nieto avoided direct confrontation in front of the cameras, airing their differences on **immigration**, border security and trade in cordial tones.

But later, Peña Nieto tweeted: "At the beginning of the conversation with Donald Trump I made it clear that Mexico will not pay for the wall." The Trump campaign did not immediately comment on the apparently conflicting accounts.

Trump spokesman Jason Miller issued an opaque statement Wednesday evening saying the meeting "was not a negotiation. ... It is unsurprising that they hold two different views on this issue, and we look forward to continuing the conversation." Peña Nieto spokesman Eduardo Sanchez said that the president told Trump, "Mexico won't pay for the wall," but that his comments did not spur a discussion.

The address in Phoenix was considered a chance for Trump to clarify whether he still wants to forcibly deport all of the nation's estimated 11 million illegal **immigrants** after sending mixed signals recently. He left that question unanswered - dismissing it as irrelevant - while also strongly suggesting that he would push to deport as many people as possible.

"The truth is, the central issue is not the needs of the 11 million illegal **immigrants**," Trump said, arguing that "only the out-of-touch media elites think the biggest problems facing American society today is that there are 11 million illegal **immigrants** who don't have legal status."

He said that undocumented **immigrants** seeking legal status would first have to leave and try to return lawfully - a process that can take many years under current procedures. Trump said that he would have "zero tolerance" for illegal **immigrants** who have committed crimes beyond their **immigration** violations.

"We will issue detainers for illegal **immigrants** arrested for any crime whatsoever," he said, going further than other Republicans who have called for felons to be deported. Later, he said he would create a "deportation task force" to deal with "the most dangerous criminal illegal **immigrants**" who have "evaded justice."

He also proposed an"ideological certification" test to ensure that **immigrants** share Americans' values, and promised not to issue visas to people coming from parts of the world where "adequate screening cannot occur."

The hastily arranged meeting in Mexico City was aimed at easing concerns among U.S. voters about his preparedness for the presidency, campaign aides said.

After an hour behind closed doors at Los Pinos, the official presidential residence and office, Trump and Peña Nieto strode out slowly to adjacent lecterns - in front of only the Mexican flag - to address the public about policy differences wider than the Rio Grande is long.

"We had a very substantive, direct and constructive exchange of ideas over quite a period of time," Trump said. "I was straightforward in presenting my views about the impacts of current trade and **immigration** policies on the United States."

At campaign rallies nationwide, Trump has a favorite call-and-response in which he asks his massive crowds who is going to pay for the wall he has promised he would build.

"Mexico!" his supporters shout back. In his Phoenix speech, he renewed his promise to build a wall and make Mexico pay for it.

But according to his account of the meeting with Peña Nieto, Trump passed on a chance to press the issue, apparently keen to play down what has become a very sensitive issue for many Mexicans and Americans.

"We did discuss the wall. We didn't discuss payment of the wall. That'll be for a later date. This was a very preliminary meeting," the candidate said.

Peña Nieto also was tactful during his remarks, offering a polite and careful rebuke to many of Trump's signature stances.

He cast illegal **immigration** and border security as a shared challenge but said that undocumented **immigration** has slowed in recent years. He also praised the merits of free trade; Trump has expressed deep skepticism about sweeping trade deals and has vowed to "rip up" the North American Free Trade Agreement.

"I shared my strong view that NAFTA has been a far greater benefit to Mexico than it has been to the United States and that it must be improved upon to make sure that workers, and so important, in both countries benefit from fair and reciprocal trade," Trump said.

Peña Nieto noted that he also had invited Clinton to visit, and he pledged to respect the electoral process of the United States.

Trump outlined five goals he has for the region: ending illegal **immigration**, creating a secure border, dismantling drug cartels, improving pay for workers and keeping jobs in the hemisphere.

The Republican nominee hit familiar notes about the loss of manufacturing jobs in the United States. But he didn't blame Mexico as directly as in the past, suggesting that keeping jobs in the hemisphere is the goal.

"We must take action to stem this tremendous outflow of jobs from our country," he said. "It's happening every day, it's getting worse and worse and worse, and we have to stop it."

During Peña Nieto's remarks, Trump stood with his hands clasped, and with a slight frown, while an interpreter spoke into his ear. When it was his turn to speak, Trump said it was a "great, great, honor" to be invited to Mexico.

He said he had "tremendous feelings" for Mexican Americans, not only his friends, but his Mexican employees. "I am proud to say how many people I employ," he said. "They are tremendous people."

When Trump began his campaign, he cast illegal **immigrants** from Mexico as "rapists" and criminals. Clinton sought to remind voters Wednesday about his controversial language and warned that he cannot simply paint over it with a quick stopover.

Speaking at the American Legion convention in Cincinnati before Trump's meeting, Clinton said coalition building and leadership will take more than a "photo-op."

"It certainly takes more than trying to make up for a year of insults and insinuations by dropping in on our neighbors for a few hours and then flying home again. That is not how it works," she said without naming her rival.

After the Mexico City event, Clinton campaign chairman John Podesta said in a statement that Trump had "choked" by not confronting Peña Nieto about his signature issue. Then he amended the statement following the differing accounts of paying for the wall: "It turns out Trump didn't just choke, he got beat in the room and lied about it."

Former Mexican president Felipe Calderón, Peña Nieto's immediate predecessor, said after the news conference that Trump is "a hypocrite" and "a liar." Are Mexicans "rapists," he said, referring to Trump's remarks last year, "or are we a wonderful, marvelous hard-working people," as Trump said at Peña Nieto's side? "I don't believe in him. I think he's lying," Calderón told CNN.

Peña Nieto, who is deeply unpopular here, shocked his country and much of his government by inviting Trump for a personal visit. The invitation, Calderón said, "was a very bad move for Mexico. ... It was completely unnecessary and inconvenient."

Mexicans learned only late Tuesday that Trump would be visiting - and many were outraged about the invitation. How could a man who has proposed walling off the border, deporting millions, blocking remittances and undercutting Mexican jobs be welcomed in their capital?

Former and aspiring presidents, opposition rivals and regular citizens expressed anger and bafflement at the surprise guest. As one senior Mexican official put it, "This is not a winning proposition having him here."

Using the joint appearance to make the case of Mexico's economic importance to the United States, Peña Nieto rattled off trade and job statistics during the news conference, while mentioning that Trump's commentary had "hurt" his country, and that his people, and millions of Mexicans in the United States are "honest and hard-working people."

"They are good people. They respect family. They respect community life and they respect the law," Peña Nieto said. "Mexicans deserve the respect of everyone."
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**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Donald Trump has warned us about those Mexican rapists. Apparently the country also has body snatchers.

The Republican presidential nominee **immigrated** briefly to Mexico on Wednesday for a hastily arranged visit with the leader of the country he has made his No. 1 scapegoat. He spent all of an hour with President Enrique Peña Nieto - but when the two men emerged, whoever was occupying Trump's body sounded nothing at all like the bombastic billionaire.

"In the United States, first-, second- and third-generation Mexicans are just beyond reproach - spectacular, spectacular, hard-working people. I have such great respect for them and their strong values of family, faith and community," this Trump look-alike declared in Mexico City.

The impostor gushed about a "common interest in keeping our hemisphere safe, prosperous and free," and waxed poetic about"joint operations between our two countries." He pledged "cooperation" toward shared objectives, a "deep and sincere" bond, and a "close and honest relationship" between the two countries in pursuit of "mutual good." Trump said the countries should be "working beautifully together, and that, I am sure, will happen."

And the North American Free Trade Agreement, which Trump had called a "disaster" and promised to "rip up"? This Trump doppelganger spoke instead about "improving NAFTA" and making sure it's "updated." He voiced a wish for a "strong, prosperous and vibrant Mexico," and he pronounced Peña Nieto "a friend."

A reporter asked: Did they talk about his constant vow to get Mexico to pay for the border wall he wants to build?

"We didn't discuss that," warm-and-fuzzy Trump said.

What had they done with Trump?

Alas, within hours, he was back to his xenophobic self. The bickering began even before he cleared Mexican airspace, as Peña Nieto, contradicting Trump, said he had told Trump at the beginning of the meeting that Mexico would not pay for a wall.

But Trump, having completed his photo op with the Mexican president, discarded the "friend" he had apparently just used as a prop. Trump landed in Phoenix for what was supposed to be a detailed "policy address" on **immigration** but was a familiar, nativist rant. Preceded at the lectern by Joe Arpaio, the Arizona sheriff and anti-**immigration** hard-liner, Trump launched into a lament for the "countless Americans" who are "victims of violence" by illegal **immigrants** who are "dangerous, dangerous, dangerous criminals."

"We will build a great wall along the southern border!" he said to an enormous cheer.

"And Mexico will pay for the wall! One-hundred percent. They don't know it yet, but they're going to pay for the wall."

So much for working beautifully together.

This was the Trump we all knew, the Trump who questions the judicial independence of an American-born judge because of his Mexican heritage, who fights with Mexican American journalists, claims that Spanish-language broadcaster Univision "takes its marching orders" from Mexico, and asserts that Mexico is "killing us."

Trump's trip to Mexico was something of a Hail Maria, as polls show Democratic rival Hillary Clinton with a yuuge advantage and Democrats with a better than even chance of taking back the Senate. And from Arizona and Florida on Tuesday came new signs that Trump's rebellion has fizzled.

In Arizona, Kelli Ward, a pro-Trump primary challenger, had been trying to oust Sen. John McCain, whose war heroism Trump famously belittled, with a "defeat the establishment" theme like Trump's. She lost by 13 points. In Florida, Carlos Beruff said that he "supports Donald Trump 100 percent," while his primary opponent, Sen. Marco Rubio, did not. Beruff lost by 54 points. Insurgent Democratic candidates in Florida did no better against their party's establishment.

But Trump's attempt at appearing diplomatic was only a feint. If his core supporters were worried - and if the rest of Americans were reassured - that he was softening his hard-line position, they had to wait only until he spoke in Phoenix on Wednesday night.

In Mexico City, Trump endured without complaint a lecture from the Mexican president, who said that NAFTA has been good for "the U.S. as well as Mexico" and that the U.S. Chamber of Commerce thinks that more than 6 million American jobs rely on trade with Mexico. Peña Nieto said that **immigration** from Mexico to the United States peaked 10 years ago and is now at a net negative. "Mexican nationals in the United States are honest people, working people," he said. "Mexicans deserve everybody's respect."

Trump almost seemed to agree. "Illegal **immigration** is a problem for Mexico as well as for us," he said. "We will work together and we will get those problems solved."

But back on American soil, he returned to his familiar lines: "It's called America First! ... There will be no amnesty! ... You cannot obtain legal status or become a citizen of the United States by illegally entering our country."

The real Donald Trump was back. Alas.

Twitter: @Milbank

**NEW\_DOCUMENT\_HERE**Trump's odd trip to Mexico

It's not unusual for a presidential nominee to travel abroad. It is unusual to do so without planning and without letting the press media attend. Here are some takeaways from Donald Trump's remarks after his meeting with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto:

1. We can believe nothing Trump says about events we did not witness and where no independent observer was present. He lies about things we all have seen (e.g., the reaction of Muslims to 9/11), so he surely will not hesitate to embellish, distort and outright lie about a closed-door meeting with a head of state who once compared him to Hitler.

2. Trump apparently went to Mexico with no briefing, reading or preparation. He never does these things. It should give voters pause when a person running for president does not bother to prepare for big events. Trump says he knows more about the Islamic State than "the generals." He no doubt thinks he knows all there is to know about Mexico.

3. We wonder how he responded to Peña Nieto when he was asked about his stance on undocumented **immigrants**, which he almost certainly was.

4. Contrary to the preview, he did answer questions afterward. That was a plus for him. Without question, Hillary Clinton's lack of news conferences is highly objectionable.

5. Even a photo-op was tough for Trump. He looked ill at ease, plainly out of his element. If this was supposed to create pretty pictures, Trump's ad- makers will need to do an awful lot of editing. He looked subdued, even tired. What was the point of this again?

6. In saying, "We may not agree on certain topics," Trump tried to avoid the obvious. No Mexican president is going to pay for his silly wall. He made zero mention of Mexico paying for it. When asked afterward, Trump confessed he did not even bring it up with Peña Nieto. That's a far cry from his applause line for more than a year.

7. Peña Nieto managed to get in a dig, saying that Mexicans in the United States are "honest people, working people . . . respective of the law. As such, Mexicans deserve everybody's respect." Trump has called them rapists and criminals. In the Mexican president's presence, he declared them "beyond reproach." In other words, he cannot say to a foreign leader what he says to low-information voters at home.

8. Trump's written statement was simplistic to the point of being childish. ("We want to make sure the people of the United States are well protected.") You wonder who wrote it. Instead of calling for repeal of NAFTA, he gave a vague, meaningless thumbs-up to free and fair trade.

9. No one is likely to remember the visit, or change their vote because of it. Trump certainly is not going to win over Hispanics with it.

10. He has once again undercut the tone, if not the message, of his anti- **immigrant** followers. Any of his opponents in the primaries could have made the remarks he made - and looked a whole lot more comfortable doing it.

- Jennifer Rubin
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