These giants of the animal kingdom need help. Despite their strength and cunning they’re no match for a poacher’s rifle. For 50 years WWF has been securing protected areas worldwide, but these aren’t enough to stop the killing. To disrupt the sophisticated criminal gangs supplying animal parts to lucrative illegal markets, we are working with governments to toughen law enforcement. We’re also working with consumers to reduce the demand for unlawful wildlife products. Help us look after the world where you live at panda.org/50
THE GUNS OF APRIL
President Donald Trump and Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu conferred before Israeli planes attacked Iranian forces in Syria last month.
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In Focus — THE NEWS IN PICTURES

Over It

North Korean leader Kim Jong Un, left, and South Korean President Moon Jae-in shake hands across the line that divides their countries on April 27. It was just before their historic daylong meeting in “truce village,” the site of the Korean Armistice Agreement signing in 1953. Moon and Kim—the first North Korean leader to go to the South in more than six decades—committed to denuclearization and pledged a formal end to the Korean War.

MILITARY DEMARCATION LINE, KOREA

→ KOREA SUMMIT PRESS POOL
In Focus

A One-Horse Battleground
A Palestinian drives a horse-drawn cart during fiery clashes with Israeli security forces on April 27. Israeli troops reportedly killed three Palestinians and wounded 600 others. The Israeli military said hundreds were trying to break through the security fence. It was the fifth straight week of fighting along the Gaza-Israel border.

Justice Delivered
Bill Cosby arrives at the Montgomery County Courthouse on April 26. A jury found the 80-year-old comedian guilty of three counts of aggravated indecent assault for drugging and sexually assaulting a woman at his home in 2004. Cosby faces up to 10 years in prison on each count.

Color Him Mobilized
A man at the Acampamento Terra Livre (Free Land Camp) is one of roughly 2,500 people from various tribes participating in Indigenous National Mobilization. The protest addressed land demarcation and territorial rights issues with the Brazilian government.
"This is so insanely stupid. It's like burning books."

DANIEL ELLSBERG IS BEST KNOWN AS THE military analyst who leaked the Pentagon Papers and exposed Defense Department lies about American involvement in the Vietnam War. But in 1971, when he took those top-secret documents out of his office safe at the Rand Corp., he also removed a cache of materials related to his job as one architect of America’s nuclear strategy of so-called mutually assured destruction, or MAD. (The idea being that two nuclear nations would be reluctant to attack each other.)

He hid those top-secret nuclear papers in plastic bags on his brother’s farm in upstate New York, intending to reveal them after the furor over the Pentagon Papers died down. But Tropical Storm Doria in 1971 eroded the hiding place, and he never saw his papers again.

Now a hale and vigorous 87, Ellsberg is traveling the country giving talks about his latest book, The Doomsday Machine: Confessions of a Nuclear War Planner. It recounts his participation in what he calls America’s “criminally insane” nuclear program. Newsweek caught up with him in Washington, D.C., where he was addressing a gathering of progressive lobbyists on the day President Donald Trump decided to bomb Syria, a country where five nuclear-armed nations have been involved during its civil war. Ellsberg—who wants the United States to abandon its willingness to use nuclear weapons offensively (the so-called first-use policy)—said that the weapons system in the Dr. Strangelove years remains as hair-trigger as ever, and that a mere technical glitch or political clash with Russia could end with major American cities reduced to smoking ash with just 30 minutes’ notice.

This topic is terrifying and your book is so depressing. Why should people read it when it seems everyone prefers to be in the dark? When people say they enjoy my talk, I have to look askance at them, like, Are you some kind of weirdo? But as in Vietnam, if people know the obstacles and the challenges, it gives them a chance to make change—low as that chance may be. Without the information, you have no sense of the inertia of the system or what...
the obstacles are. The information gives you an understanding of why it has changed so little over the last half-century and where the possible points of leverage might be.

If, as you say, the nuclear weapons system is “criminally insane,” how did you, as one of the original planners, morally justify it back then? And are people still thinking the way you did?

Clearly they are. I’m not pointing fingers and saying you must be some sort of monster to have been participating in this. What I have learned is that very ordinary people are capable of promoting monstrous actions. It doesn’t take unusually evil people to do terrible things. In the case of building up a doomsday machine, the purpose was to deter an enemy that was supposedly far ahead of us. We were told to see the USSR as Hitler with nuclear weapons.

You talk about what happens to people who enter the system on one side and come out on the other—like President Obama. Late in his second term—after receiving a Nobel Prize for his anti-nuclear position and speaking at Hiroshima, calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons—Obama agreed to spend more than a trillion dollars to upgrade them. How much of that transformational process has to do with supporting the industry that developed around nukes?

I now see that this system was a massive subsidy to the aerospace industry, to prop it up. It was not that [aerospace companies] were doing what the Pentagon needed; it was that the Pentagon was rationalizing what Boeing and Raytheon and Lockheed needed in the way of sales to the government. And that warped everything: Members of Congress acted in favor of what their constituents and the corporations needed, as well as what their careers needed. And they didn’t see a conflict of interest because they could not imagine a conflict of interest between the U.S. and Lockheed. And that remains blatantly true now.

You describe the predicted effects of nuclear war to be the extinction of all species and almost all humanity. If that is the outcome, what is the definition of winning a nuclear war?

Remember, we won a nuclear war, but it was one-sided. No war has been fought between two nuclear states. Right now, they are thinking of winning a nuclear war with North Korea. I am sure [national security adviser John] Bolton is thinking that. Well, we would win. We’d still be here. But Korea—North and South—would be gone. [We may lose] San Francisco. Or Los Angeles. You could say one side would come out surviving. But for the U.S. and Russia, that would not be the case.

“We would win. We’d still be here. But Korea—North and South—would be gone.”

THE PAPER CHASE Ellsberg at a 1972 news conference when he was on trial over the Pentagon Papers, along with Rand Corp. colleague Anthony Russo, to his right.
there would be no survivors. With India and Pakistan, also no survivors.

Who are the five people in the world you would most want to read Doomsday Machine?
The first name that comes to mind is [German Chancellor] Angela Merkel. I think she's in a position to realize that she could exercise world leadership on this issue with great effect. We instituted first-use threats for Germany, and she could renounce that and say we do not want to be under anybody’s nuclear umbrella.

The next person, maybe even No. 1, is Xi [Jinping] in China. I would like to see China’s world leadership on this issue. They have had a relatively sane policy since 1964, and Xi does eat chocolate cake with Trump. China has had no pretense to be able to disarm another superpower or to attack first. The world would be enormously safer if all the superpowers did that.

After that, [British Labour Party leader] Jeremy Corbyn. He wants to denuclearize Britain. Corbyn would be reassured that he is right.

Finally, the Democrats. I would like Bernie Sanders, Elizabeth Warren and the other progressive leaders to read it because they don’t have this problem in their minds.

I’m surprised that you didn’t mention President Trump—or any Republicans for that matter.
[Defense Secretary] James Mattis, absolutely. I have some real hopes there. Mattis is a Marine like me, and that means he has never had anything to do with nuclear weapons. I can imagine Mattis would allow a study to be made of the effects of nuclear winter. The Pentagon has never done such a study, asking what would our bombs do to the world. They don’t have any plan other than doomsday.
Remaking the Revolution

Cuba’s new president, Miguel Díaz-Canel, intends to complete Raúl Castro’s economic revolution. It won’t be easy.

When Miguel Díaz-Canel formally accepted the presidency of Cuba on April 19, he became the first non-Castro to run the country since Fidel’s revolution swept the island in 1959.

In his inaugural address, the new president pledged to continue Raúl Castro’s vision, most notably his unfinished “updating” of the economy, a Cuban form of market socialism launched in 2011 to replace the former Soviet-style central planning system. If he is successful, his reforms would produce the most profound transformation since Fidel took power six decades ago and lay the groundwork for what his brother Raúl called “prosperous and sustainable socialism.”

But in taking the helm of government, Díaz-Canel faces strong political headwinds. He has to force Raúl’s economic reforms through a resistant bureaucracy—something even Raúl had trouble doing. He has to hold together a fractious political elite, which is divided over how far and how fast to push economic change for fear of unleashing forces beyond its control. And he has to deliver the goods to a population increasingly vocal in its demands for a higher standard of living and a greater say in politics.

Never has the pursuit of continuity seemed so hard, particularly given how slow progress has been so far. The Communist Party approved a total of 313 economic reforms in 2011. By 2016, less than a quarter of them had been achieved. The plans call for state enterprises (such as manufacturing) to be subject to market prices and efficient enough to show a profit; a vibrant private sector to generate jobs and tax revenue; and an open door for foreign investment to provide the capital for growth.

But the reforms are stalled, held back by recalcitrant bureaucrats loath to give up their authority and perks, and by senior party leaders who worry that the reintroduction of markets, private property and foreign investment betrays the revolutionary values for which they fought—an attitude Raúl called “an obsolete mentality based on decades of paternalism.”

Foreign investors have been wary. Minister of Foreign Trade and Investment Rodrigo Malmierca says Cuba needs to attract $2.5 billion a year in direct foreign investment. But in the three years since Cuba adopted a new investment law with attractive concessions, it has raised just $3.4 billion. Cuba’s opaque and unresponsive bureaucracy still deters all but the most intrepid foreign companies.
On the domestic front, most state enterprises lack adequate cost accounting systems. Introducing them and requiring that state enterprises make a profit has been an excruciatingly slow process. Some 20 percent of the state budget still goes to cover deficits from failing state companies. But closing them en masse is something the government has been unwilling to do, as it would create a huge unemployment problem.

The government, which used to control everything, has licensed 580,000 private businesses—a five-fold increase since 2010—and the agricultural sector is composed almost entirely of private farms and cooperatives. In total, the private sector now employs 29 percent of the labor force. But in the eyes of some Cubans, private businesses have been too successful. Hemmed in by unrealistic regulations, many private companies skirt the law—buying supplies on the black market because there are no wholesale markets, evading taxes because the rates are extortionate and operating beyond the terms of their licenses because the permits are so narrow.

To Communist Party conservatives, this looks suspiciously like incipient capitalism run amok. To the average Cuban, the private sector’s growth has fueled rising and visible inequality. Today, unlike a decade ago, you can find fashionably dressed Cubans eating at the most expensive restaurants and staying at tourist hotels once reserved for foreigners. Meanwhile, most people struggle to get by on inadequate state salaries.

Raúl understood that market reforms would produce inequality, but he expected the changes to boost productivity, stimulate growth and raise everyone’s standard of living, thereby blunting discontent over the inequality. It hasn’t worked out that way.

Because the state sector is so resistant to change, growth has been anemic, undermining the political logic of the reform process. A Cuban economist advising the government told me that Cuba’s senior leadership understands what economic steps it needs to take; what worries them is the political risk.

That explains why Cuba still has two currencies—the Cuban peso and the Cuban convertible peso, which has the same value as the U.S. dollar—and multiple exchange rates. Introduced in the 1990s to attract remittances from the Cuban diaspora in the U.S., the two-peso system is now a huge drag on growth, making realistic cost accounting almost impossible. But currency unification is complex and will ripple through the economy in unpredictable ways. With a chronic shortage of foreign reserves and no access to help from international financial institutions, Cuba will have to manage the conversion on its own.

So while Díaz-Canel’s most urgent tasks are economic, his bigger problems are political. Independent opinion polls conducted in Cuba consistently show that discontent with the economy is pervasive, and faith in the government’s ability to improve things is low. In a 2016 poll by NORC, 70 percent of Cubans cited the economy as the country’s most serious problem, and half thought that inequality had become too great. Discontent is even higher among younger generations, who have no memory of the revolution’s halcyon days in the 1960s and 1970s.

As Díaz-Canel tries to navigate the ship of state through these dangerous shoals, he also has to keep an eye out for mutiny among the crew. Although decision-making among the top leadership is opaque, signals point to divisions over the economic reforms and how to respond to expressions of popular discontent that have grown with the internet’s expansion. Raúl’s authority as a revolutionary veteran enabled him to maintain elite cohesion—an advantage Díaz-Canel will not enjoy.

Although he is a seasoned politician who has spent three decades working his way up the political ladder, he is not well known outside the two provinces where he served as Communist Party first secretary. But he will not be alone. Raúl still serves as Communist Party leader and promises to be there supporting Díaz-Canel, telling the National Assembly he expects him to ultimately become party leader as well.

So Cuba’s new president is no puppet. Through a calibrated hand-over of power, he will likely become the man in charge. And he has his work cut out for him.

Never has the pursuit of continuity looked so hard.
The Woman Who Kept the Secrets
Gina Haspel’s CIA colleagues praise her discretion, but that trait bedevils her hopes of running the agency

IN THE SUMMER OF 1969, THE CIA director urgently sought a meeting at the White House. Richard Helms was determined to get President Richard Nixon to quash an Army investigation into the murder of a Green Beret informant in Vietnam. The case was threatening to expose the CIA’s assassinations program in that country, as well as the agency’s more discreet killing devices, including lethal drugs.

Nixon despised the urbane Helms—and the CIA as a whole, which he considered part of the fashionable Georgetown crowd that looked down on him. But after letting Helms stew over his decision for a few weeks, Nixon forced the Army to drop the case. Helms was eventually tainted by the CIA’s dirty deeds but escaped town with an ambassadorship to Iran, leaving his successor, William Colby, to take the fall in widely televised hearings in 1971.

Gina Haspel, the Trump administration’s nominee to run the CIA, faces similar circumstances today. Her hand in the CIA’s program of “enhanced interrogations” of Al-Qaeda suspects might have remained obscure, had it not been for an attempt by former CIA Director John Brennan to appoint her head of operations in 2013, just as the torture issue was being investigated by the Senate Intelligence Committee.

Additional revelations of her leading roles in managing a torture site in Thailand and carrying out her boss’s order to destroy the interrogation videotapes further soiled Haspel’s reputation as an astute manager. But while the program had many authors—the George W. Bush White House, its Justice Department and CIA, congressional overseers—she is the lone official to be summoned to Congress for a public reckoning.

“She recognizes that waterboarding was morally reprehensible, if legal at the time. She is never going down that path again.”

That’s not the CIA’s position. In the torrent of accolades that journalists and Congress have heard since Haspel’s nomination was announced February 1, the spy agency makes no apologies for Thailand. But as former CIA Director Michael Hayden told Newsweek in March, her nod was “clear evidence that the agency intended to neither repeat nor repudiate its past.”

Leading Democrats on the Senate Intelligence Committee, and even some Republicans, like Susan Collins of Maine, want to hear Haspel explain, if not entirely recant, her past in public; they complain that the CIA has declassified only materials that make her look good. But “what they want to do is grandstand,” argues retired senior CIA operations officer Steven Hall. “It’s duplicitous and disingenuous to say, ‘We don’t have access to that information—any member of the oversight committee can ask for her personnel file, and they would get it, because that’s a legitimate oversight responsibility. They just can’t use it in public, which is what they really want to do.”

What they are likely to hear is what the CIA and Haspel’s backers have already said: that she was following legal orders in her administration of the agency’s counterterrorist interrogation program. But that won’t satisfy critics. They will want her to explain why she went along with her boss, Jose Rodriguez, to destroy videotapes of torture she oversaw in Thailand.

Ali Soufan, the former FBI counterterrorism agent who discredited CIA claims that its torture produced valuable intelligence, says it’s “reasonable” to ask Haspel about such claims. “Does she stand behind the attempts to mislead the public as to the techniques’ effectiveness?” he asked in a recent Atlantic essay. “Does she stand by Rodriguez’s public justification,
that he was protecting the lives of his operatives, or his private one, documented in declassified emails, that the tapes would make him and his group “look terrible? Above all, if the torture program was so valuable and necessary, why destroy the tapes at all?”

Haspel may see her nomination shredded because of the CIA’s refusal to declassify more documents related to the interrogations. She’s not likely to violate the spy agency’s code of omertà in open session, say those who have worked with her. In that, she is much like Helms, the last CIA director to come from the clandestine service, and known as “the man who kept the secrets,” after the title of journalist Thomas Powers’s biography.

“She is the woman who keeps the secrets,” Daniel Hoffman, another former senior CIA officer, tells Newsweek. “She’s the most discreet person I ever worked with.” After she signed up in 1985, she chose the clandestine world over a more public life or marriage, colleagues say. Hall recalls asking Haspel what her weekend plans were after a meeting. “Steve, come on,” he remembers her saying, “You know I have no life outside of work.”

In Langley’s executive suites, Hall goes on, she had a reputation for “discretion on dicey personnel matters and sensitive operations. Gina is extraordinarily discreet.” And that likely includes limiting what she has disclosed to senators during her pre-hearing rounds on Capitol Hill.

But Haspel has made a point of finding allies, says her friend. “Gina has gone out of her way as deputy director, before her nomination came up, to create dialogue among women in Congress and at the CIA, to talk about what she did in the past. We’ll see what comes of it. But I would far rather see her as director than John Bolton and others who made torture legal. They’ve never been held responsible, but the woman in the room has.”

Whatever Haspel’s blemishes, many former CIA officers see her nomination as a bulwark against candidates they consider far worse, such as Republican Senator Tom Cotton of Arkansas, a waterboarding fan rumored to be in line for the job last fall. And he may be again, if Trump, who has disparaged the agency, tires of Haspel, a symbol of the CIA establishment.

“She’s just going to be a placeholder” until the end of Trump’s first term, at best, predicts a veteran of the agency’s clandestine services. “If he decides the Senate is secure” for Republicans after the midterms, Trump “may well decide to move Tom Cotton there.”

That prospect alone may spook Haspel’s critics into voting for her. But even if her nomination fails, it’s not likely that a Senate panel with qualms over her record would approve someone of Cotton’s ilk. Hovering over all of this, of course, is the specter of Senator John McCain, ailing with terminal brain cancer in Arizona. While Helms was keeping the secrets on Capitol Hill, McCain was a POW in North Vietnam—a fate Trump crudely mocked during his campaign. In March, McCain condemned Haspel’s nomination, saying she was involved in “one of darkest chapters in American history.”

His opposition may shame other Republicans into rejecting Haspel. The Senate could then send her back to Langley to resume her career in a kind of shadow-world purgatory, as the CIA’s acting director, until the president—or more likely his successor—comes up with someone better.
Russia is attempting to curtail internet access by blocking Telegram, the country’s largest service. Tech-savvy citizens are fighting back.

The data law is among a slew of new government rules regulating the internet, ostensibly in response to alleged terrorists’ prolific use of encrypted communications. In reality, Russia’s Federal Security Service, or FSB, has been using its access to data on social networks to arrest ordinary users for posting—or even liking—opposition-related content.

At least seven were imprisoned in 2017. In early April, state prosecutors in the Siberian city of Krasnoyarsk demanded an 18-month prison sentence for opposition activist Oksana Pokhodun for the crime of storing satirical memes about Ukraine, priests and President Vladimir Putin on her personal page on vKontakte, a popular Russian social media site. A supporter of opposition figurehead Alexei Navalny in the city of Pskov has been charged with “Nazi propaganda” for posting an archive photograph of an Orthodox priest shaking a Nazi soldier’s hand in front of a Nazi flag.

“Ironic comments about Putin, news of corrupt officials, anything about Ukraine that portrays them as ordinary people [and] not crazy fascists, as our government tells us—pretty much anything you post can be viewed as support of terrorism,” says Sergei Volkov, a 23-year-old Navalny activist from Moscow.

Telegram, unlike vKontakte, refused to allow the government access to its users’ data. As a result, it quickly became a refuge not only for activists but for millions of ordinary Russians who wanted to share information freely without the risk of prosecution. The service was also popular with many senior Russian politicians, who used the company’s Twitter-style news channels to communicate with tens of thousands of followers.

RKN’s attempted Telegram block, however, quickly degenerated into farce. To get around the ban, Telegram borrowed a technique pioneered by
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Russia is attempting to curtail internet access by blocking Telegram, the country’s largest service. Tech-savvy citizens are fighting back.

China has its own great firewall. Turkey has been blocking swathes of the internet, including YouTube, for at least a decade. So until last month, Russia was a glaring standout among authoritarian nations in allowing its people relatively free access to the World Wide Web.

No longer. In what is shaping up to be a historic showdown, the Russian state has mounted its first major assault on cyberfreedom. On April 15, Russian internet regulator Roskomnadzor (RKN) began trying to block Telegram, a secure messaging service and blogging platform used by more than 15 million Russians.

Its crimes? Refusing to comply with a new law that obliges all internet companies to physically store their data on Russian users in the country, and failing to hand over secure “keys” to enable secret police to read encrypted messages.

Even if Telegram had wanted to comply, it couldn’t; the platform provides encryption between one user and another, preventing Telegram from hacking into its own messages. Still, it is Russia’s “first huge act of censorship,” says Ilya Andreev, co-founder of Estonia-based Vee Security, a software company that has been helping Telegraph users bypass the ban. “The government has been blocking small internet resources since 2014,” he adds. If RKN succeeds with this block, “worse ones will come.”
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“Pretty much anything you post can be viewed as support of terrorism.”

of RKN’s wholesale shutdown of platforms that Telegram was using. Russians found they could not buy airline tickets, access Google products like Maps or Gmail, transfer or withdraw money, use Spotify or Amazon Web Services, purchase insurance policies or play online games. By April 25, RKN had received 42,000 complaints of disrupted website service, which were dismissed out of hand as “not containing correctly formulated complaints.”

“Thank you Apple, Google, Amazon, Microsoft—for not taking part in political censorship,” wrote Russian entrepreneur Pavel Durov, 33, the founder of both Telegram and vKontakte, on his personal Telegram channel. “I’m thrilled we were able to survive under the most aggressive attempt of internet censorship in Russian history.” Durov also called for Telegram supporters to throw paper airplanes with messages on them out of their windows on April 22 to signal their support. That protest landed at least one activist, Maria Alyokhina, a member of punk protest group Pussy Riot, in police custody.

Two weeks into the ban, Telegram claimed that its active base, an estimated 15 million Russian users, had shrunk by only 3 percent. Naturally, state-owned media-monitoring website Medialogia reported a much larger figure, 76.5 percent. Whatever the real number is, the showdown has turned into a test of strength between the Russian state and tech-savvy citizens. For the time being, the internet is winning. But Telegram supporters worry that this is “not a battle the Kremlin can afford to be seen to lose,” says Vladimir Markov, a Moscow-based information technology consultant. “Officials’ careers are at stake. [Telegram] has made a fool of RKN and the FSB…. They will do everything to punish this defiance.”

It’s likely that RKN will soon find a way to close most of the remaining loopholes—meaning that Telegram
can be accessed only through proxy servers or virtual private networks; both are methods of disguising the user’s geographic location. That workaround will inevitably make Telegram less appealing for ordinary users who aren’t obsessed with online privacy.

But the more profound impact of the Telegram ban, if RKN eventually succeeds, would be to set Russia firmly on the road to internet totalitarianism. For years, officials have been talking about creating an exclusively Russian, Kremlin-controlled, independent internet. Last October, the Russian Federation’s Security Council discussed plans to do just that, saying that “the increased capabilities of Western nations to conduct offensive operations in the informational space, as well as the increased readiness to exercise these capabilities, pose a serious threat to Russia’s security.”

At the time, Putin spokesman Dmitry Peskov claimed that “there is no question of shutting Russia off from the global internet.” But that’s exactly what Russia’s embattled dissidents fear. Putin’s internet ombudsman, Dmitry Marinichev, said in April that “Russia is technically ready to separate itself from the World Wide Web.” For the moment, he has stopped short of advocating that.

Cutting Russia off from the internet would signal a major retreat into isolation and repression. It would also deal the Kremlin’s political opposition a serious blow. Since Navalny was banned from appearing on state-sponsored TV, for instance, the internet has become his main method of communicating with hundreds of thousands of supporters across Russia. His YouTube channel regularly gathers over 2 million views, rivaling the nationwide viewership for most official news programs on traditional television.

Unsurprisingly, Navalny’s channel has been targeted by authorities for closure, most recently in January when RKN threatened to block access to YouTube and Instagram if the websites did not remove one of his videos, which showed a Kremlin-linked oligarch meeting with a senior government minister on a luxury yacht. Neither provider complied. But if the authorities can successfully shut down Telegram, it’s likely that sites with links to Navalny will be next.

A serious crackdown on internet freedom would also do serious damage to Russia’s economy. The IT sector is one of the very few industries where Russia still operates on a world-class level—for good and, admittedly, nefarious ends. Moscow-based Kaspersky Lab produces groundbreaking antivirus technology, in part by recruiting from Russia’s large talent pool of hackers and virus writers and using their dark skills for positive purposes. (The U.S. remains suspicious and has banned Kaspersky software from federal systems on the grounds that it could be used by Russian spies.) And criminal hackers have been at the cutting edge of inventing botnets—networks of computers covertly taken over by hackers—and in pioneering internet attacks on infrastructure, such as a December 2015 cyberattack that cut power to over 200,000 people in western Ukraine.

But the Russian government attacks on internet freedom have already caused a major brain drain of the country’s cybertalent to the West, including Durov, who was ousted from vKontakte in 2014 after the Kremlin demanded access to user data. He moved to Berlin to launch Telegram, which now boasts 200 million users worldwide.

Vee Security’s Andreev sees disaster in limiting internet access to Russia’s younger generation. “Without the internet, there is no IT. The social and cultural impact will be terrible,” he says. “This is so insanely stupid. It’s like burning books.”
“Journalism I don’t see elsewhere until later, if at all.”
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The upcoming wedding of **MEGHAN MARKLE** to **PRINCE HARRY** is being presented as evidence of a post-racist, post-classist country. **The reality is much more complicated**

**BRITAIN IN BLACK & WHITE**
ON A SUNNY DAY THIS APRIL, a teenage girl in a local school was having a picnic in a park. I was on a bench near them, reading a book, until the noise got too much. The students were in uniform, easy with one another and bursting with adolescent enthusiasm. They reflected London’s infinite class, race and ethnic variety. Some had clustered around a lovely, mixed-race girl and were weaving wild flowers around her curly hair: “Straighten your hair,” one said. “You’ll look just like Meghan!” They took selfies, squeezed over sites for bridal gowns and pored over celeb mags with pictures of Meghan Markle. Idolized and envied by them, she was the luckiest woman in the world. The girl with the floral crown broke the spell: “That’s silly. It will be hard, like, so far from her family, being a princess, mixed race and that.” Her quiet voice went unheard.

The U.K. is extravagantly upbeat, awash with joy over the nuptials of Prince Harry and Markle. They met in London through a mutual friend in the summer of 2016. By October, rumors were rife that Harry, sixth in line to the British throne, had found an unlikely girlfriend—a mixed-race, divorced woman of 36 who is, in addition to being an activist and actress, an American! Kensington Palace confirmed the relationship, and a year later the couple were engaged. The public immediately warmed to this refreshingly real royal-to-be, who was having a positive influence on the once wayward Harry as well.

And now the wedding, to take place on May 19 in St. George’s Chapel, Windsor Castle. Instead of presents, guests have been asked to donate to charities. The guest list includes, in addition to friends and family members, 1,200 “ordinary” people selected to gather on the grounds in celebration. These decisions make the event seem as accessible and open as Markle.

Her relaxed entry into the royal family suggests a transformed, cosmopolitan nation. And some of this hype is justified. Great Britain has long been culturally diverse, dynamic and biological. Some had clustered around a lovely, mixed-race girl and were weaving wild flowers around her curly hair: “Straighten your hair,” one said. “You’ll look just like Meghan!” They took selfies, squealed over sites for bridal gowns and pored over celeb mags with pictures of Meghan Markle. Idolized and envied by them, she was the luckiest woman in the world. The girl with the floral crown broke the spell: “That’s silly. It will be hard, like, so far from her family, being a princess, mixed race and that.” Her quiet voice went unheard.

The entrance of Meghan Markle into the royal family will do little to change the perception of it as a classist, outdated institution that underlines the gross disparity between rich and poor in this country. But it might, on one level, make them seem ever so slightly more relevant, particularly in a nation whose capital city will be majority nonwhite by 2030.

More had settled in other cities, melting into the population.

Although white British nationalists repudiate this history, the accumulated evidence is irrefutable. I describe some of the early cross-racial couples in my book Mixed Feelings. They defied society and were made to suffer. That didn’t stop them. Edward Long, who owned slave plantations in Jamaica, issued warnings in 1772 about the “malignancy,” which, in the course of a few generations, would “contaminate English blood.” Purist rage had little effect. Hybridity transfigured the DNA of the nation.

Today, the fastest-growing category of children in the U.K. is biracial. When it comes to interracial friendships, love and sex, this country is more progressive than the rest of Europe or the U.S. Professor Anthony Heath of Nuffield College, Oxford, who is writing a book on race and class, tells me that “white prejudice against mixed-race relationships and individuals is declining significantly.” That indicates an ease with diversity and a major shift in attitudes. Over half the children in Caribbean families have a white parent or grandparent, and in the past decade, the number of people in England and Wales living with or married to someone from another ethnic group has gone up by more than 35 percent. According to the Office for National Statistics, almost one in 10 people living in Britain is married to or living with someone from outside his or her own ethnic group.

You could say that the British royals have, at long last, caught up with societal trends and belatedly become part of the uplifting story of British race relations. But there is a bleaker reality too.

**The Marketing of Markle**

LESS THAN A MONTH BEFORE PRINCE HARRY’S MARRIAGE TO MARKLE, reports in The Guardian revealed that legally settled Caribbean British subjects and their British-born children had been ruthlessly persecuted and harassed by immigration officials. In May 1948, a former troop ship, the Empire Windrush, transported the first generation of Jamaican and Trinidadian migrants to Britain, brought to fill postwar labor shortages. Among the passengers were soldiers who had joined the British army and fought against the Nazis. These immigrants—British subjects—helped build the National Health Service and transport systems, and later generations dedicated themselves to public services.

But in 2014, the state arbitrarily withdrew their citizenship

---

**DIANA EVANS** is a British novelist and author of Ordinary People, The Wonder and 26.
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1. The Duke of Windsor abdicated the throne to marry an American divorcée, Wallis Simpson. 2. Queen Elizabeth II after her 1953 coronation.
5. The official Royal Guard. 6. Prince Philip, Harry’s grandfather, has gotten into trouble for racist comments.
rights. Many found that official documents proving their status had been destroyed by civil servants. Individuals, including retired nurses, were even denied health care, while others were detained in harsh immigration detention centers and deported back to their original countries. The bewildered, hurt, rejected citizens became the faces of what is now called the Windrush scandal—a sorry saga that is as much about race as immigration.

There are more American migrants in the U.K. than there are Bangladeshis, Jamaicans or Nigerians; more Australians than Trinidadians or Tanzanians. White immigrants are never seen as problems, burdens or undesirables. Racist immigration policies have been implemented by every British government since World War II. However, the past nine years have been particularly callous and immoral. The Conservative government was determined to create a hostile environment for new and old nonwhite migrants. It succeeded. Exiled from my birthplace of Uganda in 1972, I moved to the U.K. with my British passport. Today, immigrants are seen as interlopers. The most integrated of us now feel insecure and unwanted.

Until now, the royal family has embodied whiteness. More troubling, some of its members have held pernicious views or displayed unthinking bigotry. (The exception was Queen Victoria, an imperialist who denounced the instinctive racism of her courtiers and family members.) The queen mother, Harry’s great-grandmother, once told an upper-class editor that “Africans just don’t know how to govern themselves.... What a pity we’re not still looking after them.”

That was quite some time ago, you say. But when I met Prince Philip at an event to celebrate William Shakespeare, he turned to my English husband and inquired, “Is she really yours?” Princess Michael of Kent, no stranger to racist comments, attended the queen’s Christmas luncheon in December wearing a blackamoor pin. And this April, Prince Charles, father of Harry, asked Anita Sethi, a brown-skinned British journalist, where she came from. “Manchester,” she replied. “You don’t look like it,” he said.

And Harry? In 2005, he caused a scandal by dressing as a Nazi for a costume party. In 2006, he was filmed using the racist terms Paki and raghead while on army duty in Afghanistan. Surely Markle has Googled “Windsor family racist,” but you have to wonder if she really knows how illiberal, spoiled, stuffy, culturally stagnant and wily her future in-laws are. With Brexit on the horizon, projecting Great Britain as fair and internationalist has now become an urgent necessity. To safeguard the institution and maintain their wealth and position, the strategic Windsors badly need a makeover.

A royal nuptial is just what is required. Meghan Markle—daringly modern, biracial and social media–savvy—is a gift the country needs and the royals are eager to use. For now.

A Firm, Not a Family

The whole world loves a royal British wedding, even if, thus far, most of the blessed couples have been denied a fairy-tale ending. This is not a family but a firm. Its values and expectations can crush those who join it. Diana was their most conspicuous victim. Sarah Ferguson, ex-wife of Prince Andrew, was scorned; the husbands of Princess Margaret and Princess Anne, who never quite fit in, slipped away. The Windsors carry on in spite of...
I’m delighted that a mixed-race woman is marrying into the British royal family, which resides at the top of the aristocratic hierarchy. It’s so powerfully and positively symbolic. Rather like Obama winning the American presidency, it was unthinkable until they actually got engaged. My white English mother and Nigerian father faced terrible hostility in Britain when they married in the 1950s. The marriage of Meghan and Harry is a sign of how far we’ve come as a nation. —BERNARDINE EVARISTO is an award-winning British author of eight books and founder of the Brunel International African Poetry Prize.
Britain’s post-racial myth is more delusory than the claims made by Americans after Obama’s election. These things have symbolic importance, which should not be mistaken for substance. It’s telling that the biggest eruption in racial activism came under a black president but with almost no reference to him. He is the framed poster in the barbershop or the nail salon, the mural on the underpass. The question as to whether America can have a black president has been answered, while the issue of the sanctity of black life remains to be settled. Similarly, Meghan and Harry’s wedding comes at a time when racial attacks are high and immigrants are being persecuted. — GARY YOUNGE is a British journalist, editor at large at The Guardian and author of 2016’s Another Day in the Death of America.
self-congratulatory position of thinking we had no U.S.-type segregation or slavery or the kind of institutionalized, legalized racism well into the 20th century. But Britain’s colonies were practicing plantation economies and apartheid systems for just as long. We have inherited a racism that is far removed from the visibility of daily life but is nevertheless pernicious and pervasive.”

Britain did become less racially conflicted and fairer in the early aughts. The April 1993 murder in London of black teenager Stephen Lawrence and the subsequent failures of the police were a wake-up moment. His parents doggedly fought to get justice, deeply impressing the public, the media and politicians. In 1999, Prime Minister Tony Blair’s government held an inquiry, led by a judge. The report concluded that racism was embedded in institutional practice and British society. More effective anti-discrimination laws came into force. More important, businesses and powerful individuals did what they could to combat conscious racism and unconscious prejudices.

But jingoism and nativism are on the rise again. On the 25th anniversary of Lawrence’s murder, Prime Minister Theresa May announced an annual remembrance day for him. (Markle, who attended the ceremony, was chastised in numerous tweets for “messy hair” and wearing a sleeveless dress. Welcome to England!) Some white Britons became furious that a black life was being honored. These critics believe themselves to be victims of equality policies and political correctness. Many minorities, meanwhile, considered the gesture one of pacification, coming, as it did, right after the Windrush scandal.

Since 2009, xenophobic political parties and politicians have become more vocal and influential. Brexit has further befouled the atmosphere. Not all those who voted to leave the European Union were racist, but it’s likely all racists who voted chose Brexit. And they remain agitated. According to the National Police Chiefs Council, hate crime went up 49 percent after the referendum. Brexeters interviewed for this article were furious that dark-skinned people and Eastern Europeans are still living in Great Britain. A retired zoo worker tells me, “We want our country back. Ham and spam, and you lot gone. You are married to that English chap but will never be one of us. I am not racist. Each to their own. I don’t want Pakis like you in my coutry.”

Apparently, we migrants and people of color snatch everything—jobs, houses, health care, lovers. And now Harry.

Based on a 2017 online survey, academics at the University of Oxford’s Migration Observatory found that “British people make clear distinctions between immigrants based on their country of
RACE MATTERS
not one black student was offered a place at 13 Oxford colleges in 2017. The Office for National Statistics has reported that black male graduates are nearly twice as likely to be unemployed as white male graduates. I used to teach young black and Asian teenagers and spent hours persuading them to go to university. Some borrowed a lot of money and were accepted. Of the six who got degrees, only one found a suitable job. Another killed himself, disenchanted and depressed.

A further alarming development is the rise of the hard right. Neo-Nazi parties are creeping into the mainstream from the fringes, their views appropriated by mainstream parties to get populist votes. The government is belatedly trying to tackle this problem.

Danny Dorling, a social geographer, tells me not to succumb to pessimism and to take the longer view. “Since the day after the Brexit vote, a great deal of evidence has emerged that attacks and abuse have risen,” he says. “This can be seen as a step back, but in general we are moving forward. A small group of racists have become more emboldened, while at the same time the majority of the population are still gradually becoming less racist.” That’s not how it feels to many of us. I hope he is right. I’m sure Markle does too.

Dorling also believes the wedding will be a boost for Britain, just as people realize how painful Brexit will be for the economy. Tourists and goodwill are what the nation needs.

But is it what Markle needs? She is now being vigorously groomed for her role by palace and state insiders, who will keep her away from inconvenient realities, but the whispered rumors among the tabloid reporters who stick to the Windsors like glue is that Markle is not happy. “She feels isolated and alone,” one tells me.

This January, Jo Marney, girlfriend of Henry Bolton, then the leader of UKIP, a hard-right, popular anti-EU party, текстed that Harry’s wife-to-be would “taint” the blood of the royal family. She also described Markle’s mother as “a dreadlocked African-American lady from the wrong side of the tracks.”

The Runnymede Trust, an established think tank that monitors racial, religious and ethnic discrimination, has found that one in four white Britons now admits to being racially prejudiced, and that about half the population would not want a relative to marry a Muslim. Black and Asian Britons have to send twice as many résumés as white Britons with the same qualifications do to get interviews, and according to former Higher Education Minister David Lammy,

I am not a royalist. The monarchy is symbolic of a deeply problematic class system often unspoken of in British society, yet still I cannot ignore the cultural and political significance of having a person of any color, biracial or otherwise, joining the most visible British family in the world. Representation matters. My only fear is Meghan Markle, previously an articulate, political activist, is silenced by royal protocols and a media circus that seems fixated on every aspect of her life other than what she has to say. — MAHSUDA SNAITH is the British-Bangladeshi author of the novel The Things We Thought We Knew.

Yasmin Alibhai-Brown is an award-winning journalist who has written for The Independent, The Guardian, The Observer, The Sunday Times, the Daily Mail and The New York Times. Currently, she is a columnist for 1 newspaper, the International Business Times and The New European. She has twice been voted the 10th most influential Asian in Britain.
Already host to three conflicts, Syria prepares for another war on its soil.

by Jonathan Broder

May 11, 2018
already and first

WAR ON ITS SOIL—THIS ONE BETWEEN ISRAEL AND IRAN by Jonathan Broder

READY TO ROLL
A fighter plane at Israel’s Ramon air force base in the Negev Desert.
Iranian reconnaissance aircraft lifted off from a military base in central Syria and penetrated Israeli airspace over the Golan Heights. An Israeli Apache helicopter tracked the drone, filmed it and blasted it from the sky with an air-to-air missile. Israeli warplanes then roared into Syria and bombed the military base where the drone had been launched, destroying an Iranian control center. Amid the strike, Syrian anti-aircraft missiles shot down an Israeli F-16, the first Israeli fighter downed since 1982.

It was two months before Israel responded, but on April 9, after Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu conferred with President Donald Trump, Israeli warplanes attacked Iranian forces in Syria head-on. In addition to destroying additional Iranian drones, the Israelis wiped out an advanced Iranian air-defense system that had been shipped from Tehran to Syria and killed seven members of Iran’s elite Quds Force, including the commander of the drone unit.

Hard as it is to fathom, these skirmishes between Israel and Iran represent yet another conflict on the blood-soaked battleground of Syria.

The country is already host to one war between government troops and Sunni rebels; another between a U.S.-trained Arab militia and the Islamic State militant group (ISIS); and a third pitting invading Turkish troops against Kurdish fighters. Yet even after seven years of fighting that have left half a million dead and uprooted two-thirds of Syria’s 18 million people, the country is bracing itself for a fourth war, this one between Israel and the Iranian forces that have established a sizable military presence in Syria. As both sides trade military blows there, current and former Israeli officials warn that a larger battle between the Jewish state and its archnemesis in Tehran is just a matter of time.

“The confrontation with Iran is unavoidable,” former Major General Yaakov Amidror recently told the Israeli daily Yediot Ahronot. Military analysts in Washington agree. “The trend...
“WITH THE U.S. ON THE SIDELINES, ISRAEL CAN’T SEND ITS SIGNALS WITH WORDS; IT HAS TO SEND THEM WITH ACTIONS.”

line that both countries are taking seems headed in the direction of a serious clash,” Michael Eisenstadt, director of military and security studies at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy, a think tank with close ties to the Israeli military, tells Newsweek.

Eisenstadt and other analysts say that trend line began to develop as far back as 2012, when Israeli warplanes began attacking shipments of Iranian missiles and other weapons after the hardware had arrived by air in Damascus and was being trucked overland to Hezbollah, Iran’s proxy militia in Lebanon. Over the past five years, Israeli warplanes have bombed these weapons convoys more than 100 times, Israeli officials now acknowledge.

But those airstrikes represented indirect attacks on Iran, part of a shadowy war between the two rivals that also included Israeli cyberattacks on Iran’s nuclear program and assassinations of Iranian nuclear scientists. Israel refrained from taking credit to avoid provoking Iranian retaliation. When Tehran did strike back, it also chose to act indirectly, using proxies to strike at distant targets, such as the attacks in 2012 on Israeli diplomats in India, Turkey, Thailand and the Republic of Georgia.

That dynamic changed when Iranian forces sent their drone into Israel, setting in motion the retaliatory airstrikes. Initially, Israel didn’t claim credit for the April 9 attack, which came just five days before the U.S., Britain and France launched missiles against three Syrian chemical weapons facilities in response to an alleged Syrian poison gas attack on a Damascus suburb. It was Russia that identified the Israelis.

But since then, Israeli military officials have admitted they launched their attack in response to what they deemed to be an attempted Iranian strike against Israel. The evidence: According to The New York Times, further Israeli study of the film of the Iranian reconnaissance drone that penetrated Israeli airspace back in February showed it was carrying explosives. “The one who takes this path must know that it ends with a difficult war,” said Amidror.

Newsweek has been unable to confirm the veracity of the Israeli claim, but events on the ground have rendered it a moot point. Iranian officials have vowed revenge. The big question now is how General Qasem Soleimani, commander of the Quds Force, will respond.

Eisenstadt, who has closely studied Soleimani’s
tactics, says he expects the Iranian military leader will press ahead with his strategy to turn Syria into a missile platform against Israel. The role of the estimated 2,000 Iranian troops now in Syria, he adds, is to set up the military infrastructure for that endeavor, including factories to produce sophisticated GPS-guided missiles with increased accuracy to hit high-value military and economic targets in Israel. Once this has been accomplished, he said, Soleimani will turn these bases over to Hezbollah and allied Shiite militias. “The goal is to surround Israel on almost every side with proxies equipped with rockets to be able to bombard Israel,” Eisenstadt says. 

As Israel braces for Iran’s response, its military officials have vowed they will not allow Iran to do in Syria what it did in Lebanon, which was arm Hezbollah with enough missiles so that the Lebanese Shiite militia presented Israel with a serious threat. Israel eventually went to war against Hezbollah in 2006, resulting in massive damage to Lebanon’s infrastructure, a stinging blow to Hezbollah’s political popularity in Lebanon and an enduring state of calm along Israel’s northern border. Still, Israeli military intelligence estimates Hezbollah now has more than 120,000 missiles in southern Lebanon that could be unleashed in any war between Israel and Iran.

As Iranian forces populate forward air bases in Syria, Israeli military officials recently indicated they are drawing up target lists for counterstrikes against a broad range of Iranian military installations in Syria. These officials recently publicized satellite images and a map showing five air bases in Syria that Iran allegedly uses for its drones and cargo aircraft. The officials also provided the names of three senior Iranian Revolutionary Guard officers allegedly commanding missile units and related projects in Syria. Eisenstadt says the disclosure was a clear warning to Iran. “The message is ‘You’re totally exposed. If you retaliate, these targets are next,’” he says. 

Last year, Israel’s land, air, naval and intelligence forces also conducted their largest military exercises in two decades along the country’s northern border in what was seen as preparations to invade Lebanon in the event of another war with Hezbollah. The aim of any invasion, Israeli military officials said, would be to “vanquish Hezbollah” so that it “either has no ability or desire to attack anymore.”

Another danger is that Israeli and Russian forces
Ross says has "emboldened Iran and Russia and signaled Israel that it’s on its own."

“As time goes by, the potential for war increases, and it increases precisely because the U.S. is on the sidelines,” Ross tells Newsweek. “And with the U.S. on the sidelines, Israel can’t send its signals with words; it has to send them with actions.” He adds that Trump’s threats to pull out of the 2015 Iran nuclear deal and reimpose sanctions on Tehran play into the hands of Iranian hard-liners like Soleimani, who never trusted the United States in the first place and sees the Quds Force as the spearhead of Iran’s drive to dominate the Middle East and confront Israel.

Ever since Israel’s founding in 1948, its defense forces have followed a dictum found in the Babylonian Talmud, the fourth-century compendium of Jewish religious law: “When an enemy awakes in the morning to kill you, wake up earlier and kill him first.” As the tensions with Iran escalate, that advice appears, once again, to be Israel’s order of the day.

in Syria could come to blows during any future Israeli airstrikes against Syria. Russian officials recently announced that Moscow will soon supply Syrian President Bashar al-Assad with advanced S-300 air defense missile systems. They add that if Israel attacks these missile systems, it will suffer what one official called “catastrophic consequences.”

Israeli Defense Minister Avigdor Lieberman threw the threat right back at the Russians. “One thing should be clear,” he told Yediot Ahronot. “If someone fires on our planes, we will destroy them. What’s important to us is that the weapons systems that the Russians transfer to Syria are not used against us. If they are used against us, we will act against them. It doesn’t matter what system—S-300, S-700 or something else.”

Dennis Ross, a former Middle East adviser to both Republican and Democratic presidents, notes that while Israel, Iran and now Russia are rattling their sabers, Trump has publicly stated his intention to pull U.S. troops out of Syria, an announcement that
ROCKERS, BASEBALL PLAYERS AND COUNTRY MUSIC singers have halls of fame, so why shouldn’t the people who enrich, simplify and sometimes save our lives have one too? Well, they do: The National Inventors Hall of Fame, located in North Canton, Ohio (a museum is in Alexandria, Virginia), honors 15 inventors every year. The 46th Annual Induction Ceremony happened on May 3. In the next few pages, Newsweek takes a look at some past and present nominees, including the following 2018 inductees, whose brain power helped shape our world.

High Wireless Act
For mobile access to the internet, you can thank Arogyaswami Paulraj, a professor emeritus at Stanford. In the early 1990s, he patented MIMO wireless technology, a system that uses multiple antennas to send and receive signals, increasing the data a long-term evolution wireless network or home wireless router can handle.

Safety in Numbers
RSA, the public-key encryption that keeps credit card information private during online purchases, exists because of Ronald Rivest, Adi Shamir and Leonard Adleman. Their system of cryptography, uses two prime numbers and several mathematical equations to encrypt and decrypt messages. It is best known for those “SecurID” fobs that generate a changing, six-figure sequence.

Seeing the Light
The iPhone X is one of the first devices to use organic light-emitting diodes in its screen. The diodes, invented by Ching Wan Tang and Steven Van Slyke while they were scientists at Kodak, are made of carbon-based semiconductors that glow when charged particles run through them. Because OLEDs use less power than the more common liquid-crystal displays, they could help a device’s battery last longer.

A Tighter Squeeze
Hair metal bands and Cher can thank Joseph Shivers Jr., then a chemist at DuPont, for inventing and patenting Lycra (the brand name for spandex) in 1962. It replaced the threads of rubber used in bras and girdles.

Transplant Matchmaker
The cells that make up an organ have proteins on the surface, and if a surgeon transplants that organ into someone with different proteins on his or her cells, problems can arise—including death. Paul Terasaki, a professor at the University of California, Los Angeles, made the process a lot more precise in 1964, with the invention of a micro test that identifies the proteins on a cell’s surface. “It was the most important thing I did,” said Terasaki, who lived in a U.S. internment camp with his family during World War II. He died in 2016. —Kate Sheridan
WHAT'S THE BIG IDEA? The Hall of Fame honors individuals whose inventions have made the world a better place. The 2018 inductees are:

1. Joseph Shivers Jr. for Lycra
2. Leonard Adleman, RSA cryptography
3. Arogyaswami Paulraj, MIMO wireless technology
4. Stan Honey, sports broadcast graphics
5. Ronald Rivest, RSA cryptography
6. Sumita Mitra, dental materials and nanoparticles
7. Marvin Caruthers, chemical synthesis of DNA
8. Howard S. Jones Jr., antennas that conform to a shape
9. Adi Shamir, RSA cryptography
10. Paul Terasaki, organ transplant tissue typing
11. Steven Van Slyke, organic light-emitting diodes
12. Ching Wan Tang, organic light-emitting diodes
13. Jacqueline Quinn, emulsified zero-valent iron solution
14. Warren Johnson, temperature control systems
15. Mary Engle Pennington, food preservation and storage technique.
Horizons

Innovation Nation
Could an open patent system spur technology and economic growth?

CONVERTING IDEAS INTO tangible products has long relied on patents. Even before the U.S. Patent Act of 1790, which gave 14 years of exclusivity to whoever owned a piece of intellectual property, we have relied on a stringent code of laws to ensure that the creator of something new reaps the benefits of that idea and its execution.

The 15 people recently inducted into the National Inventors Hall of Fame have 545 patents among them.

That’s a lot of light-bulb moments, many of them leading to demonstrable progress. But what if progress is also hampered by patents, as some are now saying?

Tesla CEO and SpaceX founder Elon Musk is one of those people. The vocal opponent of intellectual property law maintains they actually harm invention, and he’s acted on that belief: In 2014, Tesla promised not to sue people for using its electric car patents.

“I thought patents were a good thing and worked hard to obtain them,” Musk wrote in a blog on Tesla’s website in 2014. “And maybe they were good long ago, but too often these days they serve merely to stifle progress, entrench the positions of giant corporations and enrich those in the legal profession, rather than the actual inventors.”

Musk isn’t alone in his assessment—or in the steps he’s taken to address it. Dozens of think pieces have decried our “broken patent system.” And months after Musk’s announcement, Toyota opened 5,680 patents related to its fuel cells. Anyone can work with the patents, without paying the company royalties. But would-be inventors must agree to forego collect royalties on any of their own resulting intellectual property. That requirement, says David Levine, an economist at the European University Institute, is key to an open patent system. Software and biotechnology inventors are also making their licensed creations free to all.

Relinquishing royalties may seem like throwing money away. But, Levine says, opening a patent might help a market grow by facilitating the creation of new products. For anyone with a financial stake in an emerging field, open patents could bring monetary gain sooner: “Even though you only have a share of the market,” Levine says, “you have a share of a growing market rather than a larger share of a not-growing market.”

For now, patents remain the order of the day. Until that changes, releasing intellectual property will require owning it in the first place, and that means pushing it through a broken system intended to protect it.
Clarence Birdseye and Mary Pennington

New Jersey–raised Birdseye (1886–1956) began selling frozen fish in 1924 after seeing Labrador fisherman keep their catch fresh on the ice’s surface. He refined the technique between 1925 and 1930 (the freezing speed was crucial), eventually founding the modern frozen food industry. But it took a woman, Pennington (1872–1952)—the Food and Drug Administration’s first female lab chief—to pioneer the refrigeration and transportation of frozen foods. (Birdseye was inducted in 2008, Pennington in 2018.)

Jan Matzeliger

The self-educated Matzeliger (1852–1889), born in what is now Suriname, mechanized the process of combining the sole of a shoe with the upper portion. The first models for his Automatic Shoe Lasting Machine were made out of wooden cigar boxes, elastic and wire. Eventually, he created a version capable of making 700 pairs of shoes a day, thus paving the way for future shoe addict Imelda Marcos. (Inducted into the Hall of Fame in 2006.)

John Kellogg

Kellogg (1852–1943) was a health nut with some odd ideas, but he did accidentally create dry cereal. He and his brother were trying to make a new wheat meal for patients at Michigan’s Battle Creek Sanitarium, where Kellogg was superintendent. Some rolled-out dough they left uncovered overnight had split apart into thin corn flakes by the next morning. His patients loved it, presumably adding milk. (Inducted in 2006.)

Luther Burbank

The American botanist (1849–1926) didn’t invent the peach, just the freestone variety, with a pit that easily pops out of the flesh. Burbank, one of 18 children, would create 113 varieties of plums and prunes and 10 varieties of berries. His Burbank potato helped the Irish combat the potato blight; the $150 he earned from selling the rights got him to Santa Rosa, California, where he established the Experiment Farm, revered by plant cultivators. (Inducted in 1986.)
Mother of Invention

Sumita Mitra made a product dentists and their patients love, which almost never happens.

What made you think nanotechnology would be useful for fillings?
True nanoparticles have much smaller wavelengths than visible light, which means fillings made with them would look smooth. But they are also very strong, so one particle could serve both needs of the composite: They can be used for the stress-bearing areas of the posterior teeth and the...

“The ability to cluster and combine nanoparticles was the big breakthrough.”
biting surfaces of the front teeth. The material also retained its aesthetics with brushing and abrasion, which is very important to patients. It also has opalescence, a key characteristic of natural teeth.

Did you make the fillings yourself?
I didn’t have much experience with nanotechnology, but scientists at 3M’s corporate research labs were working with it for other uses. We joined forces and developed some very unique combinations of nanoparticles, called nanomers and nanoclusters, which provided the nanocomposite.

The work was groundbreaking and led to the creation of the 3M Filtek Supreme Universal Restorative. The product was the first successful use of nanotechnology in dental material and the first commercial application of nanotechnology at 3M.

What was the “eureka!” moment?
There were several. Any invention starts with a problem, and I knew what that was. But this one had several different solutions. Realizing that nanoparticles could achieve all the requirements was one significant moment, but the ability to cluster and combine nanoparticles was the big breakthrough. Nanoparticles are all the same size, and I realized that you could cluster them like a bunch of grapes—you could have three or 30 or 300 grapes. That would provide the broad distribution of sizes.

Did you have any idea how successful your invention would be?
I knew what creating a commercial success would take, but I didn’t think our invention would be broadly embraced. It really took dentistry by storm, though, and that’s because patients and dentists were pleased with it. —Kate Sheridan
Balm in Gilead?

Will Season 2 of Hulu’s The Handmaid’s Tale solve its race problem? The book’s author, Margaret Atwood, and the show’s creator agreed to disagree.
FOR 33 YEARS, READERS OF THE HANDMAID’S Tale reached the end of the book and thought, What happens next? Now, thanks to Bruce Miller, there’s an answer. He is the executive producer of the critically acclaimed, Emmy-winning adaptation of Margaret Atwood’s classic 1985 dystopian novel, which returned to Hulu on April 25. The first two episodes of the second season picked up where the novel and the Season 1 finale left off: Offred (played by Elisabeth Moss) getting into a van that will either take her, as Atwood wrote, “into the darkness within; or else the light.”

And so to Miller’s task: extending the author’s tale beyond the pages of her novel, much as the writers of The Leftovers did with Tom Perrotta’s book. Rather than spoil those first two episodes for future bingers, let’s just say that determining Offred’s next few steps was a comparative cinch. “Everybody had an idea of what happened. It’s the ultimate parlor game for Handmaid’s Tale fans,” says Miller, who, like those fans, had the advantage of “Historical Notes on The Handmaid’s Tale,” Atwood’s metafictional epilogue to her novel.

In it, we learn that academics discover an audio recording by Offred in 2195, long after the fall of the totalitarian Republic of Gilead, a fundamentalist Christian regime that turned fertile women like Offred into baby-making slaves (their new names indications of who they belong to—Of Fred, in other words). The academics speculate that the recording means that she managed to escape, at least briefly.

The far bigger challenge for Miller involved the issue of race. Atwood, 78, serves as a consulting producer on the series—which, she says, “doesn’t mean I have veto power.” One of her most intense conversations with Miller arose because of his decision to take the show out of the ‘80s and place it in the present—or, as Atwood calls it, “the land of cellphones and cafe lattes.” In her Gilead, the government collects and ships “Children of Ham,” or African-Americans, to “National Homeland One,” somewhere in North Dakota. In the novel, Offred learns of this in passing; it’s the only reference to people of color—all of the women chosen to bear children for Gilead’s evangelical elite are, like their masters, white.

Some readers found that decision racist. Atwood says they “should read some history. [Evangelicals] were segregationists. Remember how old I am,” she adds. “I existed for quite a while before the civil rights movement. I saw [racism] in action.”

Fast-forward to 2016 and the rising tide of identity politics, and Miller could foresee a far tougher response to a lack of diversity—particularly for a show as left-leaning as The Handmaid’s Tale. The shift to the present was, to his mind, essential. “Margaret and I had a long talk about the difference between a novel that has only white characters and a TV show—a visual medium—that has all white characters.” The evangelical movement, he argued, isn’t as racist as it was three decades ago. Therefore, would it not make sense that in a fertility crisis like Gilead’s, the government would overlook race for a viable womb? “I wanted our audience to be able to relate to the world of the show,” Miller says, “and to exclude people of color is leaving so much of our audience out.”

Atwood made her peace with the shift, to a time when “being a fertile women trumped race.” (“I probably shouldn’t have said ‘trumped,’” she says with a laugh.) Offred remained white, but her husband, Luke (actor O.T. Fagbenle), is black, as is her best friend, Moira (Samira Wiley). Unnamed characters of color appear in the background, as handmaids and guards. But race? That remained a non-issue in Season 1—it’s never mentioned.

And that, according to some fans, was a flaw, particularly in light of the plot points clearly influenced by the history of American slavery. (The handmaids’ network of escape, for example, is called the Underground Femaleroad.) The show’s “race problem” swiftly became a hot internet topic. “The Handmaid’s Tale’s silence on race grows more awkward as the show goes on, particularly in light of its marketing as a politically astute salve
for these troubled times,” wrote Vulture’s Angelica Jade Bastién last June. “How can you attempt to craft a political, artistically rich narrative that trades in the real-life experiences of black and brown women, while ignoring them and the ways sexism intersects with racism?”

“We certainly take it to heart,” Miller says of such criticism. “We want the show to feel like the real world, and we know we have room for improvement.” After reading the Twitter discussions—which he called “incredibly respectful and helpful”—the showrunner vowed to do better in Season 2. And in the first six episodes made available to the press, more characters of color are introduced. But there’s still no reference to race as a concept. “We try to address it in big and small ways, and we’ll continue try to address it in big and small ways” is all Miller will say.

Other current headlines are front and center, however. In one flashback, Serena Joy (Yvonne Strahovski), the wife of Offred’s master, attempts to spread her message of “biological destiny” at a university talk but gets shouted down by protesters holding signs that say “Resist” and “Stop Nazi hate.” Miller says that, given the “news junkies” in the writers’ room, that was inevitable. “It’s affecting everybody’s life, and it certainly affects the way we come up with stories.” At the same time, he adds, The Handmaid’s Tale is “not trying to make direct connections.” There are “plenty of differences between Gilead and America.”

Still, with American abortion clinics disappearing faster than you can say “blessed be the fruit,” direct connections between right-to-life conservatives and Gilead extremists are hard to ignore. Atwood is well acquainted with the panic spread by religious fundamentalists; she recalls graffiti that read “The Handmaid’s Tale is here” on a Venice Beach wall in 1985, the year the book was published. But the current political divide in the United States surprises even her. “It’s more extreme now than anytime that I can remember,” she says.

Handmaid’s Tale’s central topic, of course, is acutely relevant. But female subjugation existed long before the Time’s Up movement. The book is “historically situated,” says Atwood, “and the past 3,000 years have not been very feminist, to put it mildly.” Still her Gilead is very pointedly a world where neither gender is blameless. Atwood has described the matriarchal network of “aunts,” who police the handmaids, as “a new form of misogyny: women’s hatred of women.”

She is, nevertheless, continuously asked if her book is “feminist,” and her refusal to give a definitive answer “seems very worrisome to people. If you ask them, ‘What do you mean by feminist?’ they quite frequently do not have an answer,” says Atwood. “Any novel that has women at the center, in the way Handmaid’s Tale does, is going to be viewed as, in some way, feminist. Anna Karenina has women at the center—does that make it feminist?”

Miller’s adaptation, however, is “absolutely” feminist. “I don’t know what it’s like to walk through the world as a woman,” he says. “But I have three sisters, a wife and a huge writing staff of pretty much all women who are super honest. That helps.”
DREAM STREAM Celebrity gamers playing live at 2017’s TwitchCon, which was attended by a record 50,000 people.

or simply hanging around to talk. Video game creators were benefiting as well: For the first time, they could make money from sharing their creations directly with fans, who were happy to trade feedback for the virtual community Twitch provided.

Between 2011 and 2012, the site went from 3.5 million to 20 million unique visitors, and it has continued growing exponentially, to hundreds of millions. “Twitch took the seed of Justin.tv and blew it up,” says Shear of the one-of-a-kind streaming platform, sold to Amazon for $970 million in August 2014.

Twitch has traditional subscription fees and advertising, but also monetizes its trademark interactivity. Fans purchase Twitch Bits to spend on things like custom chat room emoji or to have a streamer read a personal message during a live broadcast. Fans can even donate directly to a streamer with no strings attached. Streamers “of course need to make money, but most want fame,” says Shear. And Twitch has its superstars. One of the most popular, Ninja, pulled in more than 600,000 viewers while playing Fortnite with rappers Drake and Travis Scott and Pittsburgh Steelers wide receiver JuJu Smith-Schuster. Ninja told CNBC in March that he is making “at least six figures” a month.

Twitch recently added other categories, including IRL (in real life), dedicated to streamers documenting everything from walking their dog to lifting weights at the gym. But Shear sees the platform extending well beyond gamers. “We want everyone with ambition to come to Twitch,” he says.
Swamp Thing
Jake Tapper’s first novel, *The Hellfire Club*, imagines Washington, D.C., in the ’50s, so why does it feel so contemporary?

The story is set in 1954, a year that saw both the end of Senator Joseph McCarthy’s anti-Communist crusade and the handing down of the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision by the Supreme Court, which ended segregation in the Jim Crow states of the South. It is Tapper’s first novel (in a rarity for fiction, there are 10 pages of endnotes) and fourth book. His last one, 2009’s *The Outpost: An Untold Story of American Valor*—about an American military base in Afghanistan—has been optioned by Millennium Films, with Rod Lurie set to direct.

*Newsweek* spoke with the host of CNN’s *The Lead* and *The State of the Union* as another week of the Trump presidency opened with what has become a predictable maelstrom of news. This interview has been edited for clarity.

*The Hellfire Club* is full of conspiracy theories and a swamp even swampier than ours. Have you sent a copy of it to President Trump?
I have not. I probably should. I do think it was swampier back then—although it’s plenty swampy today.

When did you find time to research and write this book?
I’d been trying to write it for the better part of a decade; I started and stopped so many times. The first time, it took place in the modern era. I wrote a few chapters and didn’t like it. Then I tried one that took place in Colonial days, and that didn’t work. I finally settled on 1954, and things started falling into place.

*The Hellfire Club* was an exclusive club for high society in 18th-century England. When do you first learn about it?
Maybe a decade ago. When I found out that Benjamin Franklin had visited it, that was the part of the story I wanted to write around.

You describe Joe McCarthy, a recurring character, as a blowhard who takes up an
Nobody talks about how charismatic and compelling a person Joe McCarthy was. That this was a priority for the president has had an effect, and he should get some praise for that.

The Hellfire Club’s Washington is rife with racism. The Southern Democrats, or Dixiecrats, who opposed civil rights, were in control of the party. Do you see remnants of that on today’s Hill? I do. Obviously it’s much, much improved. In the ’50s there was only one black member of Congress, although in my book there are two. Now there are dozens. That said, the concerns of the Congressional Black Caucus too often are siloed off as concerns just for this one group of people, as opposed to concerns for all Americans. And how many black senators are there? Two?

I know from your Twitter account that you’re a reader. What’s the last great book you read?

David Orr’s The Road Not Taken: Finding America in the Poem Everyone Loves and Almost Everyone Gets Wrong. Orr presents an argument at the beginning, that there are two different audiences for Robert Frost. One is the vast public that misunderstands his poems, and then there’s the elite that reads them differently. That separation, between the elites and the public, reminded me of what we see today in politics in general.

Not to get too philosophical, but what’s the difference between fake news and fiction?

Actual fake news or the way the president uses the term?

Actual fake news.

I will use the actual term the right way: stories that are purposefully wrong and written to smear someone for some sort of reason, political or otherwise. Fiction is meant to entertain people, to make them think. There’s a vast difference.

Any thoughts on casting if The Hellfire Club gets made into a film?

[Conservative writer] John Podhoretz said Jessica Chastain should play [Charlie’s wife] Margaret. I like that idea. I don’t know about Charlie. Somebody who’s able to convey both naiveté and ambition, but he would have to be 35. The people that I think of—Paul Rudd or Chris O’Donnell, James Marsden—they’re all too old. Because I’m too old.
She has remained a substantial film draw for more than 40 years after winning an Oscar for Martin Scorsese’s Alice Doesn’t Live Here Anymore. Among 85-year-old Ellen Burstyn’s 21st-century roles: playing the late Barbara Bush in Oliver Stone’s W. But her latest part, in The House of Tomorrow, seems almost fated. When Burstyn was a rising star in the 1970s, she struck up an unlikely friendship with the eccentric architect and visionary Buckminster Fuller, then in his 70s. She had attended one of his lectures while filming The Exorcist. “He could speak at the highest level to experts in philosophy, architecture, inventions,” says Burstyn. “He was fascinating—I had the feeling I was running as fast as I could mentally—but also so, so kind.” She was thus well prepared to play Tomorrow’s Fuller-worshipping, geodesic dome-living grandma, who is raising her grandson on a strict diet of the late thinker’s futurist teachings. When Burstyn met the director, Peter Livolsi, she gave him a videotape she had made of Fuller, including footage of her young self, which Livolsi used in the film. “I don’t know what you’d call an event like that,” says Burstyn. “Serendipity, maybe?”

How did you meet Fuller?
I had always wanted to make a film about his great-aunt, Margaret Fuller, a transcendentalist friend of Emerson and Thoreau. I called Fuller to meet, and his assistant said I could have two hours at the Boston airport on such-and-such date or five hours at the Chicago airport on such-and-such date. He obviously hated layovers with nothing to do! I picked Chicago. When we met, I took out a cigarette and said, “Do you mind?” He said, “Oh, I don’t mind for myself, dear. I mind for you.” I said, “You don’t smoke, huh?” He said, “No. I, being the most sensitive sending and receiving mechanism ever designed, don’t want anything to interfere with my sensitivity.” Soon after, I stopped smoking.

Is there a filmmaker you’d like to work with again?
I love Darren Aronofsky. Did you see Mother!? It’s an allegory, so you need to interpret the film as you’re watching. Some people aren’t willing to do that, and they hate it. I think it’s a masterpiece.

What made The Exorcist such a great horror film?
Because it slowly and carefully brought the audience from a place of reality into the nightmare—like Get Out. That was wonderful! I’m sent scripts for horror films all the time. They’re mostly disgusting and stupid and start right out assuming everybody’s going to be scared. —Emily Gaudette
Tinalbarka wants to be a lawyer. She and her family fled violence in Mali.
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