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A toast to influence

Each April after we publish the TIME 100—our annual designation of the world’s most influential individuals—we host a gala in New York City to celebrate the people on the list, alumni from past years and the transformative power of influence itself. It’s an evening that brings together people of impact across a remarkable array of fields: Oscar winners and Olympians, artists and astronauts, chefs and CEOs, politicians and playwrights. One of the joys of working at TIME is the opportunity to get this extraordinary group into one room.

During the event, we ask some of the honorees to raise a glass to people who have influenced them. #MeToo movement founder Tarana Burke saluted survivors, who she said will “never be alone as long as I have a microphone.” Bollywood sensation Deepika Padukone opened up about her four-year struggle with clinical depression. The actor Sterling K. Brown toasted the teacher who changed his life. Figure skater Adam Rippon gave a hilarious and touching tribute to his mother and to mothers everywhere. Nice Nailantei Leng’ete, who has helped save an estimated 15,000 women in Kenya and Tanzania from ritualized genital mutilation, toasted “all the strong people out there who are fighting to make sure that every young girl can become the woman of her dreams.” They were followed by stellar performances from Shawn Mendes and Jennifer Lopez, who brought the house down with a rousing set that included a supporting role from her boyfriend, baseball legend Alex Rodriguez.

One of my favorite moments at this year’s gala came via TIME editor at large Jeffrey Kluger. Jeff was at a table with the courageous students from Parkland, Fla., who organized the worldwide March for Our Lives after a mass shooting at their high school. One of them, 17-year-old Alex Wind, told Jeff that he and fellow TIME 100 honoree Jaclyn Corin have been friends since grade school. A long-ago teacher recently sent them a copy of a project they had worked on in her class. The teacher had asked them to imagine what they would accomplish when they grew up. Alex and Jaclyn, who as we now know grew up much too quickly, drew pictures of themselves on the cover of TIME. (Both appeared on the real cover earlier this year.)

You can find videos from the evening and our full coverage at time.com/gala.
What you said about ... THE TIME 100, OUR ANNUAL LIST OF THE most influential people in the world, left many readers feeling hopeful. “I was disheartened about the state of the world until today when TIME’s 100 Most Influential issue arrived,” wrote Dick Rozeck of Portsmouth, N.H. Dorothy J. Stubblebine of Deptford, N.J., found “great joy” in reading about women such as #MeToo founder Tarana Burke and fire chief Jan Rader. “I’m passing this issue along to my daughter and granddaughter,” she added.

On the other hand, Everett Jones of Kingsport, Tenn., criticized the decision to have “GOP insiders” write the profiles of divisive conservative leaders, as with Senator Ted Cruz on President Donald Trump. And Sajeeb Wazed, a Bangladeshi government adviser, took issue with the citation for his mother, TIME 100 member Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina, for the way it addressed the country’s human-rights record. The author, who is Human Rights Watch’s South Asia director, “barely knows her and has long been a government critic,” Wazed wrote.

As for the future, readers already have lots of ideas for 2019: More classical musicians, said Richard W. Hooper of West Haven, Conn.; more scientists, said Seymour R. Levin of L.A.; more environmentalists, said Jeanie Scott of San Francisco. Jacqueline Lindeman of Bilthoven, in the Netherlands, suggested Rotterdam Mayor Ahmed Aboutaleb—and Carlos Gaviola of St.-Germain-en-Laye, France, thought bigger, asking for a whole issue devoted to non-U.S. influencers.

Inside the gala
On April 24, dozens of the world’s most influential people gathered at Manhattan’s Jazz at Lincoln Center for the TIME 100 gala—and proved that stars can still get starstruck.
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“INSPIRING” Singer Kesha, right, on activist Nice Nailantei Leng’ete

LIFESAVER Huntington, W.Va., fire chief Jan Rader

MEET THE PRESS From left, Hoda Kotb of NBC’s Today, TIME editor-in-chief Edward Felsenthal, Olympic medalist Adam Rippon and CBS This Morning’s Gayle King

PALING AROUND
This Is Us star Sterling K. Brown, left, and Master of None’s Lena Waithe

YOUngEST ON THE LIST Stranger Things star Millie Bobby Brown, 14

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT In “The Masters of Mind Control” (April 23), we misnamed a psychologist at the University of Oxford. He is Andrew Przybylski. In that same issue, 6 Questions mischaracterized NBC’s Lester Holt as the first black network news anchor. Max Robinson was an anchor of ABC World News Tonight from 1978 to 1983. Additionally, What you said about … used an incorrect gender pronoun for Francis Piraino, who is a man.
For the Record

‘We were hoping she could have made it to 50 years old.’
LEANDA MASON, lead author of a study on trapdoor-spider population in Western Australia, after the death of the world’s oldest known spider was revealed in the journal Pacific Conservation Biology; the spider was 43

‘If someone was spending $43,000 in my office, I would know about it.’
REPRESENTATIVE TONY CARDENAS, a Democrat from California, challenging EPA chief Scott Pruitt’s claim that he “was not aware of” the approval of the purchase of a soundproof booth for his office, during a hearing on ethical concerns facing Pruitt

‘This is going to be for building real long-term relationships, not hookups.’
MARK ZUCKERBERG, Facebook CEO, announcing that the social network plans to offer a dating service

1,475
Number of migrant children placed with U.S. sponsors by the Department of Health and Human Services whom the agency says it cannot now locate; the disclosure raises concerns about human trafficking

‘THE STATE DEPARTMENT WILL GET ITS SWAGGER BACK.’
MIKE POMPEO, the new U.S. Secretary of State, in his first address to the State Department’s diplomatic corps, on May 1

‘I wouldn’t change a single word.’
MICHELLE WOLF, comedian, defending the stand-up routine she performed at the White House Correspondents’ Association dinner

520
Number of files pertaining to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy that will remain sealed because of national-security concerns; more than 50,000 other JFK records have been made public by the National Archives since last summer, in accordance with a federal law that required their release by October 2017

80
Height, in feet, of a wave ridden by surfer Rodrigo Koxa in Portugal last year; World Surf League officials announced on April 28 that he had set a new record for biggest wave ever surfed

‘THE STATE DEPARTMENT WILL GET ITS SWAGGER BACK.’
MIKE POMPEO, the new U.S. Secretary of State, in his first address to the State Department’s diplomatic corps, on May 1

‘I wouldn’t change a single word.’
MICHELLE WOLF, comedian, defending the stand-up routine she performed at the White House Correspondents’ Association dinner

520
Number of files pertaining to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy that will remain sealed because of national-security concerns; more than 50,000 other JFK records have been made public by the National Archives since last summer, in accordance with a federal law that required their release by October 2017

‘THE STATE DEPARTMENT WILL GET ITS SWAGGER BACK.’
MIKE POMPEO, the new U.S. Secretary of State, in his first address to the State Department’s diplomatic corps, on May 1

‘I wouldn’t change a single word.’
MICHELLE WOLF, comedian, defending the stand-up routine she performed at the White House Correspondents’ Association dinner
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Number of files pertaining to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy that will remain sealed because of national-security concerns; more than 50,000 other JFK records have been made public by the National Archives since last summer, in accordance with a federal law that required their release by October 2017
HANGING IN THE BALANCE
Iranian President Hassan Rouhani has said the nuclear deal is not up for negotiation.

LIGHTS GO ON IN THE LAST VILLAGE TO BE CONNECTED TO INDIA’S ELECTRIC GRID

QUESTIONS ABOUT QUESTIONS: WHAT TO KNOW ABOUT ROBERT MUELLER’S LEAKED LIST

REMEMBERING A PHOTOGRAPHER KILLED ON A DEVASTATING DAY IN KABUL

THE ABIDING ANTI-PATHY THE U.S. PUBLIC FEELS TOWARD IRAN ENCOURAGED DONALD TRUMP TO ATTACK THE NUCLEAR PACT AS A POPULIST CANDIDATE. IT ALSO PROMPTED CONGRESS TO GIVE THE U.S. PRESIDENT THE LEVERS TO UNDO THE DEAL, WHICH LIFTED SANCTIONS ON TEHRAN IN EXCHANGE FOR STRICT LIMITS ON ITS NUCLEAR PROGRAM. SKEPTICAL LAWMAKERS PASSED A LAW IN 2015 REQUIRING THAT ANY DEAL BE “RE-CERTIFIED” EVERY 90 DAYS BY THE PRESIDENT. ON MAY 12, TRUMP GETS HIS HAND ON THOSE LEVERS AGAIN—and he seems to be on the fence about whether to finish it off.

INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS SAY THERE’S NO REASON FOR TRUMP TO VACCILLATE. THE INTERNATIONAL ATOMIC ENERGY AGENCY (IAEA), THE U.N. BODY THAT CONDUCTS INSPECTIONS, SAYS IRAN’S NUCLEAR PROGRAM HAS BEEN TAKEN DOWN PRECISELY AS PROMISED. AN ENTERPRISE THAT IN 2015 COULD HAVE PRODUCED A NUCLEAR WARHEAD WITHIN MONTHS HAS LARGELY BEEN DISMANTLED AND IS CLOSELY MONITORED. THE U.S.—PLUS CHINA, RUSSIA, GERMANY, FRANCE, BRITAIN AND THE E.U.—ALL HAVE GOTTEN WHAT THEY ASKED FOR.

TRUMP WANTS MORE. HIS ADMINISTRATION ARGUES THAT THE DEAL IS FATALLY FLAWED BECAUSE IT’S NOT PERMANENT. AFTER A DECADE, IRAN WOULD BE ALLOWED TO RESUME ENRICHING SOME URANIUM, AND GO BACK TO BASICALLY BUSINESS AS USUAL AFTER 15 YEARS. “THAT’S NOT ACCEPTABLE. [2025] IS TOMORROW,” TRUMP SAID AT AN APRIL 30 PRESS CONFERENCE. BUT HE ADDED: “THAT DOESN’T MEAN WE WON’T RENEGOTIATE A REAL AGREEMENT.” SECRETARY OF STATE MIKE POMPEO AND NATIONAL SECURITY ADVISER JOHN BOLTON, BOTH HAWKS ON IRAN, HAVE SAID THE MAY 12 DECISION HINGES ON FINDING A CREDIBLE WAY TO DO THAT.

ONE PERSON INTENT ON HAVING HIS SAY IS ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER BENJAMIN NETANYAHU, WHO TOOK TO THE AIRWAYS FROM TEL AVIV ON APRIL 30 TO UNVEIL WHAT HE DESCRIBED AS AN INTELLIGENCE COUP: 55,000 PAGES AND 183 DISCS CARRIED OUT OF TEHRAN WAREHOUSES BY MOSSAD AGENTS. NETANYAHU, WHO OPPOSES THE PACT, DESCRIBED IN DETAIL WHAT OUTSIDE OBSERVERS, INCLUDING THE IAEA, HAD KNOWN FOR YEARS—that IRAN HAD ONCE PURSUED A NUCLEAR WEAPON, DUBBED PROJECT AMAD. TEHRAN FAILED TO DISCLOSE THIS, BUT U.S. AND OTHER NEGOTIATORS WERE MORE INTERESTED IN WHAT IRAN WOULD DO IN THE FUTURE. BUT NETANYAHU’S DAMNING MESSAGE (IRAN LIED, SPELLED OUT IN GIANT LETTERS) COULD PROVIDE THE THIN REED FOR A PRESIDENT IN SEARCH OF A PREMISE FOR DISCARDING THE PACT.

IN FACT, NETANYAHU’S PRESENTATION HAD BEEN QUIETLY COORDINATED WITH THE WHITE HOUSE. “WE HAD DISCUSSIONS WITH ISRAEL ABOUT THEIR ROLLOUT,” SARAH HUCKABEE SANDERS TOLD TIME THE NEXT DAY. EVEN SO, SOME UNDERSTOOD NETANYAHU’S PROP-HEAVY PRESENTATION TO BE A LOBBYING EFFORT DIRECTED AT A VISUALLY ORIENTED—AND UNDECIDED—PRESIDENT. “HE SPOKE IN ENGLISH RATHER THAN HEBREW BECAUSE HE HAS AN AUDIENCE OF ONE,” SAYS DAVID MAKOVSKY, A SCHOLAR AT THE WASHINGTON INSTITUTE FOR NEAR EAST POLICY.

HONORING THE PACT WOULD BURNISH THE PRESIDENT’S CREDIBILITY IN TALKS WITH NORTH KOREA, WHERE CREDIBILITY MAY BE CRUCIAL: KIM JONG UN HAS SIGNALED HE WILL “DENUCLEARIZE” IF THE U.S. PROMISES NOT TO INVADE. BUT FRENCH PRESIDENT EMMANUEL MACRON SAYS TRUMP IS NOT AFRAID OF RISKING A SECOND SHOWDOWN: “HIS EXPERIENCE WITH NORTH KOREA IS THAT WHEN YOU ARE VERY TOUGH, YOU MAKE THE OTHER SIDE MOVE AND YOU CAN TRY TO GO TO A GOOD DEAL OR A BETTER DEAL,” MACRON SAID ON APRIL 25, AFTER A WHITE HOUSE VISIT.

“THAT’S A STRATEGY OF INCREASING TENSION. IT COULD BE USEFUL,” SAYS THE PACT IS NOT OPEN FOR RENEGOTIATION, AND THAT IT WILL WALK AWAY FROM IT IF TRUMP DOES. “WE NEED TO EXPECT A CHANGE IN THE COUNTRY’S SITUATION,” SAID MOHAMMAD BAGHER NOBAKHT, A SPOKESMAN FOR PRESIDENT HASAN ROUHANI ON MAY 2. IRAN’S LEADERS ARE AMBIGUOUS ABOUT WHETHER THEY WOULD RESUME A WEAPONS PROGRAM IN THE EVENT OF THE DEAL’S COLLAPSE, RAISING FEARS ABOUT U.S. AIRSTRIKES AND A REGIONAL ARMS RACE. SAUDI ARABIA HAS VOWED TO BUILD NUKEs IF IRAN DOES. BUT IRANIAN POLITICAL ANALYSIS ARE UNDOING THE NUCLEAR DEAL WILL ALMOST CERTAINLY BE A BOON TO THE HARD-LINE CONSERVATIVES WHO OPPOSED IT ALL ALONG. ROUHANI, A MODERATE, HAS NO CHOICE BUT TO BRACE FOR IMPACT. “WE ARE READY FOR A CHANGE IN THE SITUATION,” NOBAKHT SAID, “AND THE NECESSARY POLICIES AND FUNDS FOR THE DAYS DIFFERENT FROM TODAY HAVE BEEN PREPARED.” ANYONE HOLDING OUT HOPE FOR A MORE FAVORABLE PERCEPTION OF IRAN IN THE U.S. SHOULD PREPARE TO BE DISAPPOINTED. THE ONLY THING SIMPLE ABOUT IRAN IS HOW AMERICANS FEEL ABOUT IT. — WITH REPORTING BY KAY ARMIN SERJOIE/TEHRAN; ILENE PRUSHER/BOCA RATON, FLA.; BRIAN BENNETT/WASHINGTON
The Brief News

EVERY VILLAGE IN INDIA NOW HAS ACCESS to electricity, Prime Minister Narendra Modi said on April 29, one day after a remote village in Manipur, northeast India, was added to the national grid. It was a symbolic victory for Modi, who promised in August 2015 to electrify every Indian village within 1,000 days. He described April 28 as a “historic day in the development journey of India”—but more work is needed to bring the country fully into the electric age.

CHARGING AHEAD Modi was elected in 2014 on the back of pledges to modernize rural areas and improve living standards. At that time, roughly 270 million people in India lacked electricity—accounting for just under a third of the global access deficit. The gap hindered economic growth, education and health care. But while Modi has hit his target, the government only requires 10% of a village’s houses and public places to be electrified to count. By that standard, nearly 97% of India’s roughly 600,000 villages already met the criteria in 2014.

IN THE DARK Millions of Indians, particularly in remote villages, still rely on dangerous kerosene lamps. Just six of India’s 29 states, including Kerala and Gujarat, have all homes on the grid, according to recent government data. In poorer states such as Jharkhand, more than half of households have no power lines, while those that do experience hours of blackouts every day.

AMping UP Modi has announced a $2.5 billion plan to electrify all households by the end of December 2018—just a few months ahead of parliamentary elections. The challenge is steep: poorer Indian households struggle to afford the high cost of electricity; the Modi government would need to install connections at a much faster rate; and state-owned power companies are already saddled with debt. But with states like Uttar Pradesh, where 44% of households lack electricity, holding the biggest representation in Parliament, Modi is hoping that fulfilling his promise of “Power for All” will lead his party to a bright political future.

—KATE SAMUELSON

VERDICT RENDERED Caroline Heldman, Lili Bernard and Victoria Valentino, three of the dozens of women who have accused Bill Cosby of sexual assault, embrace after a jury in Norristown, Pa., found him guilty on April 26 of drugging and sexually assaulting Andrea Constand. The case was one of the first high-profile sexual-assault trials to take place since the #MeToo movement began.

U.K. appoints new Interior Minister Sajid Javid became Britain’s Home Secretary following Amber Rudd’s resignation over a scandal involving treatment of the “Windrush” generation, migrants from former Caribbean colonies who filled labor gaps after World War II but have recently been threatened with deportation. Javid is the first nonwhite person to hold the high-ranking Cabinet post.

T-Mobile and Sprint plan megamerger U.S. telecom giant T-Mobile agreed April 29 to buy its rival in a $26 billion deal. The move would narrow the U.S. wireless market to three major carriers. The companies scrapped a previous merger in 2014 over regulatory challenges, and the current deal must also pass muster with regulators to become official.

Museum: Half our paintings are fakes An investigation into the collection at the Terrus Museum, an art museum dedicated to the work of the painter Étienne Terrus in Elne, France, found 82 of its 140 paintings were fakes. Elne’s mayor said the discovery was a “catastrophe.”
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defamation and sexual
and fighting the spread
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reef conservation. The
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says Harvey Weinstein

U.S. and its allies will
European Union.
exports from
Weinstein's influence.

Australia has pledged
Great Barrier Reef, in what is the
country's largest-ever
investment in reef conservation. The
fund will include plans
for reducing pollution
and fighting the spread
crown-of-thorns starfish—a poisonous
coral-eating predator.

Ashley Judd
sues Harvey
Weinstein

The actor Ashley Judd
says Harvey Weinstein
damaged her career
after she rejected
his sexual advances.
Judd's suit, filed on
April 30, accuses the
disgraced producer of
defamation and sexual
harassment, among
other allegations. It
claims that Peter
Jackson did not cast
her in his Lord of the
Rings series “as a
direct result” of
Weinstein’s influence.

What do Mueller’s
inquiries for Trump tell
us about his probe?

IN A TOWN NOTORIOUS FOR LEAKING,
special counsel Robert Mueller’s team has
been a striking exception to the rule. Since
launching its investigation last May into
Russian meddling in the 2016 election, the
team of federal prosecutors has been tight-
lipped, tipping its hand only when unveiling
an indictment or announcing a guilty plea.

While the source of the April 30 leak
has not been revealed, that made the
more than four dozen questions Mueller’s
office would like to ask President Trump
especially revealing. The questions, which
probe everything from the firings of former
National Security Adviser Michael Flynn
and FBI Director James Comey to potential
campaign coordination with Russia,
represent the clearest indication yet about
the focus and scope of the investigation as
well as the perils it may pose to the President.

Prosecutors say the wording of the
questions makes it clear that the special
counsel is particularly interested in whether
Trump obstructed justice. “Before there
was a very rational expectation that there
was a lot of focus on the obstruction issue,”
says Preet Bharara, the former U.S. Attorney
for the Southern District of New York who
was removed by the Trump Administration
last year after he refused to resign from his
post. “If these are the questions they intend
to put to the President directly, then it erases
all doubt.”

Mueller may never get the chance to ask
them. Trump has said he would “love to” talk
with Mueller under oath, but outside advisers
and some of his own lawyers have advised him
not to, with one warning ominously that it
could be a “perjury trap.” Giving misleading
answers under oath was one of the reasons
former President Bill Clinton was impeached.

Trump responded to the leaked questions
by claiming they vindicated him, tweeting
that there were no questions about collusion
(there are, in fact, 13) and that it’s “very hard
to obstruct justice for a crime that never
happened.” (Obstruction charges do not
require that an underlying crime be proved.)

While the tweets show Trump’s current
mind-set, many of the questions are focused
on what Trump was thinking when he took
action at important moments during his
presidency, like firing Comey. That’s because
intent is a key element of any obstruction
to action at important moments during his

While the tweets show Trump’s current
mind-set, many of the questions are focused
on what Trump was thinking when he took
action at important moments during his
presidency, like firing Comey. That’s because
intent is a key element of any obstruction
charges—which is why prosecutors say an
interview with Trump is essential. “One of
the easiest ways to get to someone’s state of mind,
to determine guilt or innocence, is to question
them directly,” Bharara says.

If the questions provide a road map for
the Mueller inquiry, the interrogation might
still go differently if the President ever
decides to sit down with the special counsel.
“These strike me as a proxy, even though
they’re very specific, for areas they might
want to explore,” Bharara says. “I don’t think
these are precisely the questions that are
 gonna be asked.” —ALANA ABRAMSON

GOOD QUESTION

MUSIC

Hail to the Chief

After taking heat for his political tweets, rapper Kanye West defended his pro-Trump views in a
track released on April 27. Here, other artists who made presidential points. —Abigail Abrams

JAMES BROWN

The singer released
“Funky President
(People It’s Bad)”
in the tumultuous
year of 1974. He
said the song was
about President
Gerald Ford, who had
recently taken over
the White House
from Richard Nixon.

DIXIE CHICKS

The country group
denounced President
George W. Bush’s
invasion of Iraq in
2003. Three years
later, they released
the unapologetic
single “Not Ready to
Make Nice,” which
won them multiple
Grammy Awards.

KILLER MIKE

The rapper’s 2012
song “Reagan”
compares the
conservative hero
to both Bushes, Bill
Clinton and Barack
Obama, suggesting
that all of them
promoted war and
mass incarceration.
DIED
Tim Bergling, the Swedish DJ and electronic-dance-music producer known as Avicii, on April 20 at 28. In a statement, his family said he “could not go on any longer.”
Edward Jamieson, a former executive editor of TIME, on April 18 at 88. He began working at the magazine in 1955.

SUED
The Trump Administration, over its failure to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, by Texas and six other states. President Trump announced an end to the Obama-era immigration program last year, but DACA’s repeal has been delayed on the order of federal judges in other states.

DRAFTED
The first one-handed professional football player of the modern NFL era, linebacker Shaquem Griffin, by the Seattle Seahawks on April 28.

HIRED
Former NASA chief scientist Ellen Stofan, to direct the National Air and Space Museum. She became the first woman to hold the job when she started on April 30.

BANNED
Guns, at Vice President Mike Pence’s address to the NRA’s annual meeting on May 4. When the NRA announced the Secret Service rule before the event, the group saw pushback from gun owners and cries of hypocrisy from critics.

KILLED
Shah Marai
Courage behind the camera

By Massoud Hossaini

WHEN NINE JOURNALISTS WERE AMONG THE AT LEAST 25 people killed in a double suicide bombing in Kabul on April 30, I saw the blast through my camera. It was only because of luck that I survived, and then another photographer was shouting at me. “Marai is dead,” he said. “Marai is dead.”

My friend Shah Marai, Agence France-Presse’s chief photographer in Afghanistan, had a passion for his work that is rare to find in a war zone. He was calm and courageous, just trying to take his pictures. At 41, he was a mentor for younger photojournalists in Kabul, having joined AFP as a driver in 1996, five years before the Taliban was ousted, and later building a career with the agency to support his family.

After the attack, which the United Nations said was part of a “deliberate targeting of journalists,” I went to my office and sent my pictures. Marai was dead and I had to do my job, to say what had happened. In the afternoon, we went to his village, north of the city. Then we buried him. He had promised to bring all the local photographers there, to eat and be together in a good place, but it never happened until his funeral. During the prayers, I was looking at the sky and waiting for rain. If the rain came, it would mean Marai was crying, that even the clouds were crying.

—KATY STEINMETZ

Larry Harvey
The flame of Burning Man

IN A MIDSUMMER NIGHT’S Dream, William Shakespeare’s characters enter a forest to find that the rules and reality of their daily lives no longer apply. Larry Harvey, founder of the Burning Man festival, was well aware of the disorienting magic that can come from a change of scenery. By the end of his life, his annual anti-establishment jubilee was drawing tens of thousands to Nevada’s Black Rock Desert each year, allowing foolish mortals to temporarily live outside the bounds of capitalism, convention and even clothes.

Harvey died at age 70 on April 28 in San Francisco after suffering a stroke at his home weeks earlier. It was at a beach in that same city that 32 years before, he and his friend Jerry James first gathered a small crowd to celebrate the burning of a gasoline-soaked eigy of a man. The ritual soon outgrew the city and eventually inspired an even bigger mythology, one that people used as an inspiration for art and an excuse to party in a place known as Black Rock City. Wh eyever they came, it was Harvey’s most rare vision that brought them there.

—KATY STEINMETZ
The classic British pub is trying to survive challenging times
By Kate Samuelson/London

LIKE MANY BRITISH SEPTUAGENARIANS, DAVID CHARLES Graves lived alone. The 75-year-old, who was known to everyone as Charlie, had no close friends or family, but regulars at his local pub, the Ivy House in Nunhead, in southeastern London, often saw him sipping a pint of Beck’s lager at the bar.

Charlie’s attachment to his local public house will resonate with many Britons. As far back as Roman times, when roadside inns offered comfort to travelers, pubs have occupied a unique place at the heart of British society. In Shakespeare’s time, there was roughly one pub for every 200 people, and they feature in several of his plays. George Orwell’s famous 1946 essay “Moon Under Water,” describing the 10 key points of his ideal pub, notes that alongside draft stout, open fires, a garden and no radio, “the barmaids know most of their customers by name, and take a personal interest in everyone.”

Today pubs still play a part in alleviating social isolation, particularly among elderly Britons like Charlie. Research by the University of Oxford shows that they can improve people’s engagement with their community and affect how satisfied people feel in life.

Pubs are also a high-ranking tourist attraction. According to the tourist board Visit Britain, going to a pub is the third most popular activity for visitors to the U.K. Over time, the pub has become a symbol of the national spirit, and themed British pubs can be found in cities around the world.

Imagining Britain without pubs is like thinking of France without cafés, New York City without bodegas or Tokyo without karaoke bars. But this defining national cornerstone is under threat. From 2007 to 2015, the U.K. saw nearly 7,000 pubs close, thanks to higher taxes, rising staff wages and falling visitor numbers. The decline hasn’t stopped; according to the Morning Advertiser, one of the U.K.’s leading trade newspapers for the pub sector, two public houses now close their doors for good every day. Is the good old British pub on its way to extinction?

PUBS HAVE BEEN declining in number for decades, but many believe England’s 2007 smoking ban, which put an end to smoking in all enclosed public and work places, exacerbated the trend. “A lot of pubs closed, and many had to redefine themselves,” says Brigid Simmonds, chief executive of the British Beer and Pub Association (BBPA), a major trade association. Some so-called wet-led pubs—which only served drinks—branched out to offer food and accommodation; pubs now serve a billion meals a year and have 50,000 bedrooms attached to them.

But converting to a gastropub or inn is not an easy fix. Many pubs are located in Victorian, Edwardian or other historic buildings, which bind them to rigorous planning restrictions. These restrictions disincentivize investors who may have otherwise been interested in converting failing drinking dens into more profitable establishments. Climbing real estate prices, particularly in London, make pubs attractive prospects for developers—that is, if they have the permission to knock them down and build apartments instead.

Competition is also getting fiercer. Around 20 years ago, there were roughly 70,000 premises licensed to serve alcohol in the U.K.; today around 50,000 pubs and 70,000 other premises, from restaurants to coffee shops, have an alcohol license. “The sheer growth in the eating-out market over recent years means there’s massive

Pubs provide a cross between a coffee shop, a restaurant and a church.’

TIM MARTIN, founder of pub chain JD Wetherspoon

\[ \text{The Churchill Arms in London attracts crowds. But not every pub is doing well} \]
one of Britain’s biggest supermarket chains, spending the same amount if not more on one pint in a pub is not a particularly attractive prospect. “If you want pubs to survive decades down the road, then it’s common sense that you can’t tax them more heavily than what is the market rate,” says Tim Martin, founder and chairman of pub group JD Wetherspoon, which has 900 establishments around the British Isles.

All this is in the shadow of Brexit, the U.K.’s looming March 2019 exit from the European Union, bringing with it uncertainty and division. Some pub owners believe Brexit could turn things around for them; a poll conducted shortly before the 2016 referendum found that more small-food-service operators said they would vote to leave rather than remain. Martin was a major Brexit backer; he even printed 200,000 coasters calling for the U.K. to “take back control.” He believes that without the E.U.’s high tariffs on food and drink imports, their prices will decrease and pubs will flourish.

However, as much of the service industry, Brexit is likely to have a considerable impact on pubs’ workforces. In 2016, hospitality-intelligence firm Fourth Analytics estimated that 43% of workers in the hospitality industry come from overseas; in more metropolitan areas, this proportion can be even higher. It is still unclear whether these “soft-skilled” workers will be allowed to remain in Britain after March 2019; the government is in the process of assessing the economic and social contributions of E.U. migrants and isn’t due to report back on its findings until September of this year.

“We need to make sure people who are currently here can stay here,” says Simmonds, whose BBPA did not have an official position during the referendum. “We have to ensure Brexit isn’t only about highly skilled, highly paid workers.”

**THESE CHALLENGES** are forcing pubs to think creatively. Pub is the Hub advises licensees on providing a range of services, from building shops, libraries and post offices, to providing meals for local schools or the elderly. One pub in southwestern England even introduced a community playground designed entirely by children, with a bar serving mud and a “bug hotel.” Pub is the Hub claims to have helped nearly 500 pubs across the U.K. offer 27 different services, helping them stay afloat.

Communities are increasingly stepping in to save their local drinking establishments. Six years ago, the Ivy House—Charlie’s local pub—narrowly avoided being turned into an apartment block thanks to a group of residents who spent more than a year fighting to bring it under community ownership. In 2012, it became the first cooperatively owned pub in London, under a policy introduced two years earlier permitting local residents to nominate buildings and land for listing as “an asset of community value.” Once listed, the community may have the opportunity to bid to take control of the asset if it is put up for sale. There are now roughly 60 cooperative pubs open and trading in the U.K., and the number is likely to grow.

Innovations like these have been key to keeping pubs alive in an increasingly competitive marketplace. “Pubs provide a cross between a coffee shop, a restaurant and a church. It’s hard to define the attraction, but you know it when you see it,” says Martin.

Going to the pub no doubt made the Ivy House’s Charlie feel part of his community. When he stopped turning up for his regular pint last summer, locals began asking after him. Eventually, it transpired that he had fallen ill and passed away. The Ivy House managers decided to hold a memorial service for him and were shocked when about 150 pub regulars turned up to pay their respects to a man they barely knew. It’s a testament to the role that the pub has played in British communities for generations, says Matt Soper, secretary of the Ivy House management committee.

“I knew how many people knew him but didn’t realize how many would show up,” he told TIME. “It was proof of how successful this place has been—not just in business terms, but in the sense of being true to the spirit of a real community pub.”
Barrier to entry

As a caravan of Central American migrants made their way across Mexico over the past month by bus, foot and freight train, President Trump vowed they would be turned away at the U.S. border. And when about 150 reached the San Ysidro port of entry, the nation’s busiest, on April 29, they were told it was at capacity. The migrants—several of whom are seen here walking to a shelter in Tijuana five days earlier—said they feared for their lives in their home countries, some of which have among the highest murder rates on the globe. On April 30, a handful were allowed into the San Ysidro port to begin the asylum application process. That night Trump tweeted that “openly defying our border shows how weak & ineffective U.S. immigration laws are.”

Photograph by Meghan Dhaliwal—The New York Times/Redux
The Brief

Is listening to music good for your health?

If you’re looking for an easy way to shift your mind-set, cue the music. Studies have shown that music can buoy mood, fend off depression and improve sleep. It can also ease pain and lower levels of stress-related hormones like cortisol. How can listening to music do so much good? Music seems to “selectively activate” neurochemical systems and brain structures associated with positive mood, emotion regulation, attention and memory, says Kim Innes, a professor of epidemiology at West Virginia University’s School of Public Health.

But choose your tunes carefully. A song’s rhythm can influence heart rate and brain activity, says Daniel Levitin, a psychology professor at McGill University in Canada. And research shows that listening to music that agitates or unsettles you can trigger stress, anger and sadness. “There’s no one piece of music that will do the same thing for everyone,” Levitin says, but tracks with a slow tempo, gradual chord progressions and drawn-out notes tend to be calming, while chaotic, up-tempo tunes tend to have the opposite effect.

—Markham Heid

The arrest of the Golden State Killer

By Jamie Ducharme

Police recently arrested the suspected Golden State Killer using a tool they could only have dreamed of decades ago, when a gruesome spree of rapes and murders shook California: a database filled with people’s genetic data.

Investigators used an obscure open-source database called GEDmatch to find relatives who matched genetic material taken from an old crime scene, then worked backward to pinpoint and arrest 72-year-old former police officer Joseph James DeAngelo.

GEDmatch’s 950,000 users voluntarily upload and share their genetic information, making it accessible to others who share their own data—including law enforcement. More than a dozen other similar platforms also exist. “If your relatives have contributed and you are part of even a family tree that appears online in one of these shared resources, you can be indirectly tracked through the combination of their DNA and the publicly available family history,” says Dr. Robert Green, a medical geneticist at Harvard Medical School.

Data submitted to commercial companies like 23andMe, which has over 5 million customers, is much tougher for outsiders to access, but the case has still highlighted the issue of genetic privacy. Although many genetic-testing companies have been asked to cooperate with legal investigations, and clearly warn customers of this possibility, not all requests are honored. “23andMe has never given customer information to law-enforcement officials,” a company representative told TIME.

The stakes of keeping such sensitive data private are high. The potential for abuse exists; for example, insurance companies could theoretically use genetic data to refuse coverage, Green says. But the systems in place to prevent misuse appear to be working. One is the Genetic Information Nondiscrimination Act, a 2008 law that protects consumers from employment and insurance discrimination related to genetics. As long as that’s the case, Green says, the good of genetic tests outweighs the bad.

Sharon Zehe, an attorney for the department of laboratory medicine and pathology at the Mayo Clinic, takes a more cautious approach. “Genealogy services can be fun, but make sure you are using a reputable organization that has robust privacy policies in place,” she says. “A DNA sequence is the biometric equivalent of a fingerprint.”

Percentage of the 20,100 respondents who say they always or sometimes feel alone, in a new survey of loneliness in the U.S. by Cigna
It’s official: North Korea is moving into the future. On April 29, Kim Jong Un’s regime announced that it would shift its clocks forward 30 minutes on May 5, to unify with South Korean time—one of several conciliatory gestures decided at the historic talks between Kim and South Korean President Moon Jae-in. After a meeting oozing with symbolism...
at the riven peninsula’s demilitarized zone (DMZ), the North and South also agreed to restart reuniting families, open a liaison office and put an end to the Korean War, which officially is still being waged, as only an armistice, rather than a peace treaty, was ever signed.

“A new history begins now,” Kim wrote in the visitor’s book of the DMZ’s Peace House as the first North Korean leader to visit the South. “An age of peace, at the starting point of history.”

Despite all the optimism, the summit’s description of denuclearization was kept vague, leaving observers to guess what Kim might want in return. According to South Korean officials, Kim said he would offer up his nuclear arms in exchange for a nonaggression pact with the U.S. But top American officials have signaled that they’re skeptical of the rhetoric.

For North Korea to abandon nuclear weapons would require a fundamental change in its founding and governing precepts. Bylaws of North Korea’s all-powerful Workers’ Party define its purpose as to complete the revolution and “liberate” the South, while those who oppose the party are “enemies of the people.”

Besides, North Korea’s founder, Kim Il Sung, had a signature philosophy of juche, best defined as patriotic self-reliance. This would seem impossible to reconcile with accepting promises of nonaggression from age-old nemesis the U.S. Kim Jong Il—son of Kim Il Sung and father to the current Supreme Leader—added his own philosophy of songun, or “military first,” which built on juche while wrapping in elements of Marxism, Leninism, militarism, neo-Confucianism and realism. In a nutshell: raw power conquers all.

“From that perspective, they are the ultimate realists in the traditions of Machiavelli and Hobbes,” says Daniel Pinkston, an East Asia expert at Troy University in South Korea. “They have this obsession or fetish of power. Every political outcome is determined by power and power asymmetries.”

This hasn’t changed with the third-generation Kim, who took up the regime reins in 2011 and introduced his own political philosophy in March 2013 to cement his revolutionary credentials: byungjin, which means to “advance in tandem,” referring to the nation’s nuclear program and economy.

North Korea has already made tremendous progress in both. The summit now has a nuclear-armed international ballistic missile that experts believe can devastate any U.S. city. By relaxing state control over the economy, North Korea experienced 3.9% growth in 2016—its fastest rate of this century—despite ever-tougher sanctions.

But how does one square byungjin with disarmament? Socialist revolutionary doctrines are not policies to be tweaked or discarded, but distillations of a leadership’s eternal will. Even when announcing the dismantlement of his only known nuclear testing site—which Kim since said would take place in May, with South Korean officials watching—he described the weapons it had spawned as a “treasured sword.”

Lest we forget: North Korea already signed a denuclearization agreement with South Korea in 1992. And with the U.S. in 1994. And with the “six-party talks” participants in 2005. And with the Obama Administration in 2012.

The North Korean regime has inculcated every strata of society with the need of nuclear weapons to keep them safe and complete the revolution in the South. A 2012 constitutional amendment described the nation as a “nuclear-armed state.” To abandon its nukes “is something so radically revolutionary that it’s analogous to the Pope abandoning Jesus Christ and adopting Buddhism,” says Pinkston.

There is still reason to try again, especially because the military “option” is nothing of the kind, given that Pyongyang’s conventional, chemical, biological and nuclear retaliation could lay waste to Seoul, Tokyo and now even Los Angeles or Washington. But denuclearization will take a titanic feat of patience and trust-building. On May 5, North Korea’s clocks will leap forward by half an hour. For the regime to truly leave its past behind won’t be so easy.
COMEDY

The real bully has a pulpit

By Elayne Boosler

OUTRAGE IS HOW YOU KNOW YOU DID well at the White House Correspondents’ Association dinner, which I performed at in 1993. So here’s how well Michelle Wolf did this year: because the media couldn’t fault the truth in her jokes, they decided to rally around White House press secretary Sarah Huckabee Sanders, over a joke they wrongly said was critical of her looks. Sanders is a steamroller—regularly shutting down inquiries about the truth—yet she puts on an evening dress and suddenly she’s Blanche DuBois?

When I did the dinner, I was criticized for my jokes about capital punishment, abortion, gun control, sex education—all of which would sadly still work today, because we can’t make enough progress in this country. That’s why we need a Michelle Wolf, and the next comic, and the next, to get up there and keep saying so in front of the people who write about government and those who make the laws.

Margaret Talev, president of the White House Correspondents’ Association, contended that the evening is supposed to promote unity. But she missed what was missing: the President.

No matter what the comedian’s politics have been since the dinner began using stand-ups as the event’s lead performers in 1983, the President was there to respond—to roast and counterattack in the spirit of the evening and, yes, unity. President Trump is the first in decades to hold the office and not attend (in 1981, President Reagan called in by phone while recovering from an assassination attempt). Like all bullies, the current President is capable of delivering cracks against the media, Democrats and others only from a safe distance. (Yes, sirree, that night, Trump was the funniest guy at his rally in Washington, Mich. No contest.)

Whatever you think of the dinner, it’s a venerable tradition in a free country that celebrates a free press. By not attending, Trump continued his bulldozing of American values like decency, inclusiveness and fair play. His review from afar? “This was a total disaster and an embarrassment to our great Country.” He ought to know. The comic reflects the times.

Boosler is a writer and comedian and the founder of Tails of Joy animal rescue
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Learning about lynching helped heal my wounds

By Issac J. Bailey

IT TOOK ME A LONG TIME BEFORE I REALIZED THAT MY family’s struggles had not simply materialized out of thin air—that although we have rightly never made excuses about our faults, they weren’t evidence of ugliness running through our veins. My father beat my mother. My maternal grandfather beat my maternal grandmother. Moochie, my hero big brother, murdered a man. My youngest brother, Jordan, is serving 20 years in a federal prison. A nephew who was raised like a brother is in the middle of a 25-year sentence in a state facility. Another brother is serving 16 years.

I know now that a sense of shame convinced us as black people to not speak too loudly about our struggles, only to fuel a cycle of violence that led to more shame. You can’t cure a disease you refuse to acknowledge. As I prepared to visit the National Memorial for Peace and Justice and the Legacy Museum, both of which opened to the public on April 26 and honor victims of lynching, I had a reaction I had not anticipated: a rage at the unbroken chain that connects slavery to my own life.

Before I read Mary Turner’s story in Patrick Phillips’ Blood at the Root: A Racial Cleansing in America, I didn’t know they had lynched us and taught us to hate ourselves for not being able to perfectly navigate a terrorized land soaked in slave blood. In 1918 Georgia, Turner was hung from a tree by her ankles, doused with gasoline, set afire; her 8-month-old fetus was cut from her belly and stomped upon. She was lynched because she demanded justice for her husband, who himself had just been lynched. Countless others died like this because they dared to try to vote and organize black laborers or were deemed “uppity” in their attempts to exercise their rights. Many black men hung from trees after being falsely accused of raping white women, or for merely speaking to or glancing at them in a way that white men deemed inappropriate. A twisted hallucination, born of hate, became a justification for murder.

The rules between right and wrong were always morphing, intentionally illusive. To survive, we told ourselves that talking right or walking right or beating our kids enough to keep them in line would convince white people that we too were American, worthy, beautiful. But we were mistaken. So the shame grew, and we swallowed it.

LEARNING THE TURNER STORY, and others like it at the memorial and museum, helped alleviate my shame.

I know what my father did to my mother was wrong. I also have come to realize that society is steeped in institutional racism that shaped my parents in ways that we are still trying to recover from. My father was probably a 2-year-old when Turner was lynched in a neighboring state. I didn’t understand that when I began despising him as a boy, scared and helpless in the corner of the kitchen watching him hit my mother.

What must it have been like growing up in a country that hated you for possessing the wrong skin? That forced you to bow down to white boys and girls who routinely called you “nigger”? That legislated you out of an equal education and into the worst jobs and neighborhoods? All of it enforced by white neighbors and businessmen and pastors and judges and juries and prosecutors and sheriffs and policemen. What must it be like to see that, to this day, those people still often face no justice?

For all that we’ve seen change—in, yes, the wake of America’s first black President—we forget how much we are surrounded by those who remain understandably wary of who we say we’ve become. When I worked as a columnist in South Carolina for a daily newspaper whose readership was mostly white and conservative, elderly black people would call to check on me. They spoke in whispers, as though they might be overheard. They explained to me why they feared I would be disappeared if I kept on criticizing the white governor and other officials. They were not joking. They had seen too much to dismiss what may feel to some like a remote possibility.

The museum in Alabama, as gut-wrenching as any ever conceived, is for all of us, but especially for those people. They will no longer have to speak in hushed tones about what happened. An unflinching portrayal of the hell they lived through is public confirmation that their lives still matter, that what they survived was real, as are the lingering effects of the trauma.

They, like me, were taught in public schools with history books written by a descendant of a Confederate soldier who spent more time suggesting that black people were satisfied under Jim Crow than exploring the decades-long aftershock of slavery. They, like me, have witnessed more than their share of violence. The lynching monuments can’t erase the rage and the shame and the fear that remain. But by correcting the historical record, they allow a deeper healing to begin. I have felt it myself.

Bailey is the author of the forthcoming memoir My Brother Moochie: Regaining Dignity in the Face of Crime, Poverty, and Racism in the American South.
THE FBI ON TRIAL
Espionage failures. Missed mass shootings. Presidential attacks. The bureau has a crisis of credibility—and America is paying the price

By Eric Lichtblau
at the FBI’s 56 field offices nationwide, piping in the latest news as agents work their investigations. But these days, some agents say, the TVs are often off to avoid the crush of bad stories about the FBI itself. The bureau, which is used to making headlines for nabbing crooks, has been grabbing the spotlight for unwanted reasons: fired leaders, texts between lovers and, most of all, attacks by President Trump. “I don’t care what channel it’s on,” says Tom O’Connor, a veteran investigator in Washington who leads the FBI Agents Association. “All you hear is negative stuff about the FBI … It gets depressing.”

Many view Trump’s attacks as self-serving: he has called the renowned agency an “embarrassment to our country” and its investigations of his business and political dealings a “witch hunt.” But as much as the bureau’s roughly 14,000 special agents might like to tune out the news, internal and external reports have found lapses throughout the agency, and longtime observers, looking past the partisan haze, see a troubling picture: something really is wrong at the FBI.

The Justice Department’s Inspector General, Michael Horowitz, will soon release a much-anticipated assessment of its investigations branch—a “witch hunt.” But as much as the bureau’s roughly 14,000 special agents might like to tune out the news, internal and external reports have found lapses throughout the agency, and longtime observers, looking past the partisan haze, see a troubling picture: something really is wrong at the FBI.

The report closely follows an earlier one in April by Horowitz, which showed that the ousted deputy director of the FBI, Andrew McCabe, had lied to the bureau’s internal investigations branch to cover up a leak he orchestrated about Clinton’s family foundation less than two weeks before the election, the sources say. The report is expected to also hit Comey for the way he reopened the Clinton email probe less than two weeks before the election, the sources say.
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who runs the New York field office and oversaw the April 9 raid against Trump’s personal lawyer Michael Cohen, says his agents’ response to the turmoil has been to “double down and [say], ‘Hey, we’re gonna keep on moving.’”

Some question whether the FBI has gotten too big and has been asked to do too many things. After 9/11, then FBI director Robert Mueller, who is now the special counsel leading the Russia probe, made massive new investments in counterterrorism and intelligence, shifting resources and investigative focus from white collar crime and bank robberies.

Many of the bureau’s woes developed on Comey’s 3½-year watch. They extend beyond the most visible controversies, like the Clinton email and Russia investigations, to his costly confrontation with Apple over unlocking an iPhone used by one of the terrorists in the San Bernardino, Calif., shooting in 2015, and beyond. Critics say Comey’s penchant for high-profile moral fights has, ironically, undermined the bureau’s reputation. Trump himself has used that line of argument to challenge the FBI.

Democrats have questioned the integrity of the bureau as well, with Clinton and her aides claiming Comey and the FBI helped tip the election to Trump. But the biggest difference between past crises and the current one, according to virtually everyone interviewed for this article, is the President. Trump has continually attacked the integrity of the institution and its leaders, alleging not just incompetence but bad faith in the commission of justice. Ronald Hosko, who retired in 2014 after 30 years at the bureau, compares the moment to a wildfire, saying Trump “is either the spark that creates the flames, or he’s standing there with a can of gas to stoke the flames.”

The bureau’s current director, Christopher Wray, recently said his first priority is to “try to bring a sense of calm and stability back to the bureau.” But the FBI is facing one of the greatest tests of its 110 years. In the coming months, it must fix a litany of internal problems, fend off outside attacks on its trustworthiness and pursue investigations touching on a sitting President, at the same time a growing number of Americans are asking themselves: Can we trust the FBI?

**THE WATCHDOG REPORTS**

The Justice Department Inspector General’s office has long exposed problems at the FBI, uncovering counterterrorism and other abuses after 9/11, when Robert Mueller was director. Since he took over in 2012, IG Michael Horowitz has often targeted FBI misconduct.

**SEPTEMBER 26, 2017**

Horowitz identified possible “systemic” problems in the FBI’s lax treatment of employees who posed “high-risk security concerns.” One computer specialist with top-secret clearance admitted to viewing pornography on his work computer and conversing secretly with a “foreign national” for months but faced no discipline or follow-up investigation.

**MARCH 14, 2018**

The IG urged better training for FBI supervisors on laws protecting whistle-blowers from retaliation after unidentified supervisors threatened a technician who had reported misconduct. Two earlier investigations in 2016 also documented retaliation against whistle-blowers, which has been a long-standing problem.

**MARCH 27, 2018**

After the 2015 San Bernardino shooting, then director Comey confronted Apple in testimony and got a court order to force de-encryption of the perpetrator’s iPhone. A two-year probe by the IG found that the FBI had “only just begun” looking for its own solutions when it filed the court order. The bureau ultimately cracked the phone without Apple.

**APRIL 13, 2018**

A scathing report found that former FBI deputy director Andrew McCabe authorized a leak about an FBI investigation into the Clinton Foundation less than two weeks before the 2016 election, then lied repeatedly in sworn statements, denying it. Attorney General Jeff Sessions fired McCabe on March 18, barely a day before he was set to retire.

**APRIL 30, 2018**

An investigation found evidence that an unidentified agent had tried to tamper with witnesses in a criminal case, gave “misleading testimony” in a civil case, mishandled classified information and gave confidential law-enforcement information to people who shouldn’t have had it. Yet criminal charges were “declined,” the IG said.

**MAY 2018**

The IG is expected to release a much-awaited report scrutinizing the FBI’s actions during the 2016 presidential campaign. Sources say the report will sharply rebuke then director Comey’s unorthodox handling of the Hillary Clinton email investigation that went against normal protocols.
MISSES AND MISSTEPS

The FBI has erred in a number of recent investigations. Those errors, experts say, have diminished the bureau’s credibility.

LAST MAY, McCabe, then the FBI’s deputy director, sat down at the table in his seventh-floor office for a meeting with two agents from the inspections division. The agents had some questions about the Clinton Foundation leak just before the election. It was a quick meeting. McCabe, an FBI veteran who rose through the ranks over a 21-year career, told them he had “no idea” where the leak came from. The agents left after just five minutes or so, according to the Inspector General’s April 13 report.

McCabe had offered that same basic assurance months earlier to his boss, then director Comey, investigators said, and had angrily lit into FBI officials under him, suggesting the Clinton leak had come from their offices and telling one senior agent in Washington to “get his house in order.” But as it turned out, McCabe knew exactly where the leak had come from. He personally authorized it, Horowitz’s investigators found, to counter charges that he favored Clinton. (His wife received $467,500 from the PAC of a Clinton ally, investigators found, to counter charges that he favored Clinton. His wife received $467,500 from the PAC of a Clinton ally, then Virginia governor Terry McAuliffe, in a failed 2015 bid for state office.)

The McCabe findings have shaken the FBI. The bureau has massive power, and as a result, it has strict rules. Lying to investigators is considered a dire breach in an organization built on trust. The referral to the U.S. Attorney’s office, which emerged a week after the report was released, could result in charges against McCabe of making a false sworn statement. He has challenged the findings, disputing even the most basic elements, like how many people were in the room. The IG said it did not find many of his objections credible, with some elements contradicted by notes taken contemporaneously by an agent. McCabe previously called his firing part of a “war on the FBI” and the Russia investigation. But viewed against the backdrop of other Horowitz reports, McCabe’s alleged rule-breaking looks like part of a much larger problem.

In September, Horowitz found that bureau investigators had allowed employees with dubious polygraph results to keep their top-secret clearances for months or even years, posing “potential risks to U.S. national security.” In one instance, an FBI IT specialist with top-secret security clearance failed four polygraph tests and admitted to having created a fictitious Facebook account to communicate with a foreign national, but received no disciplinary action for that. In late 2016, Horowitz found that the FBI was getting information it shouldn’t have had access to when it used controversial parts of the Patriot Act to obtain business records in terrorism and counterintelligence cases.

Just as troubling are recent FBI missteps not yet under the IG’s microscope. At 2:31 p.m. on Jan. 5, the FBI’s round-the-clock tip center in West Virginia received a chilling phone call. The caller gave her name and said she was close to the family of an 18-year-old in Parkland, Fla., named Nikolas Cruz. Over 13 minutes, she said Cruz had posted photos of rifles he owned and animals he mutilated and that he wanted “to kill people.” She listed his Instagram accounts and suggested the FBI check for itself, saying she was worried about the thought of his “getting into a school and just shooting the place up,” according to a transcript of the call.

The FBI specialist checked Cruz’s name against a database and found that another tipster had reported 3½ months earlier that a “Nikolas Cruz” posted a comment on his YouTube channel saying, “I’m going to be a professional school shooter.” But neither tip was passed on to the FBI field agents in Miami or local officials in Parkland. After Cruz allegedly killed 17 people with an AR-15 rifle at his old school just six weeks later, the bureau admitted that it had dropped the ball and ordered a full review. “You look at this and say, ‘You’ve got to be kidding me,’” says Anderson, the former FBI official.

The Parkland shooting was only the latest in a string of devastating misses. After Omar Mateen shot and killed 49 people at the nightclub Pulse in Orlando in June 2016, the FBI said it had investigated him twice before on terrorism suspicions, but shut the inquiries for lack of evidence. The year before, after Dylann Roof shot to death nine African-American parishioners at a South Carolina church, the FBI acknowledged that lapses in its gun background-check system allowed him to illegally buy the .45-caliber handgun he used in the massacre. And in 2011, the FBI received a tip from Russian intelligence that one of the Boston Marathon bombers had become radicalized and was planning an overseas trip to join radical Islamic groups. The FBI in Boston investigated him but found no “ nexus” to terrorism.

The Orlando shooting provoked more second-guessing in late March, when the shooter’s widow, Noor Salman, was acquitted on charges of aiding and abetting him and obstructing justice. The jury foreman pointed to inconsistencies in the FBI’s accounts of the disputed
admissions that agents said Salman had made, according to the Orlando Sentinel. The judge also scolded the government after an FBI agent contradicted the government’s earlier claims that Salman and Mateen had cased the club.

THE CONCERNS about FBI testimony in a major terrorist prosecution underscore a larger question: Are people less likely to believe what the bureau says these days? In January, a federal judge threw out all the criminal charges against renegade Nevada cattleman Cliven Bundy, his two sons and a supporter who had been in an armed standoff over unpaid grazing fees. Judge Gloria Navarro accused the government of “outrageous” and “flagrant” misconduct, citing failures by both prosecutors and the FBI to produce at least 1,000 pages of required documents. The judge said the FBI misplaced—or “perhaps hid”—a thumb drive revealing the existence of snipers and a surveillance camera at the site of the standoff.

A related case in Oregon, growing out of the 2016 takeover of a wildlife refuge by Bundy’s sons and their followers, has not gone well for the FBI either. An agent at the scene, W. Joseph Astarita, is now charged with five criminal counts after prosecutors say he falsely denied shooting twice at an occupation leader who was fatally shot by police, who said he appeared to be reaching for his handgun during a roadside encounter. The Bundy sons and five supporters who helped in the takeover were found not guilty of conspiracy and weapons charges, in another jarring setback for the government.

Some legal experts and defense advocates see the string of recent not guilty verdicts as a sign that jurors and judges are less inclined to take what the FBI says in court at face value. Data examined by TIME support that conclusion. The number of convictions in FBI-led investigations dropped last year for the fifth consecutive year—from 11,461 in 2012 to 10,232, according to Syracuse University data, which was obtained under Freedom of Information Act requests.

Moreover, TIME’s analysis shows a surprisingly low rate of success for the thousands of cases the FBI investigates and sends to the Justice Department for possible prosecution. Over that same time period, the Justice Department has ultimately won convictions in fewer than half the cases the FBI referred for prosecution, with a conviction rate of 47% last year, the data showed. That fell well below the average of 72% for all agencies. Prosecutors themselves have rejected many of the FBI’s referrals before they ever got to court. The bureau’s low success rate in these cases has remained largely unchanged in recent years.

Federal prosecutors still win the bulk of the thousands of cases they choose to bring based on FBI investigations. Justice Department spokesman Ian Prior says a variety of factors could play into the drop in prosecutions and convictions over the last five years, including “de-emphasizing” some crimes under Obama-era policies and cutbacks in prosecutors in recent years. Prior says that “judging the performance of the FBI based on a minuscule sample of cherry-picked cases” ignores its thousands of annual convictions.

Gina Nichols, a nurse in Minnesota, says she never had strong impressions one way or the other about the FBI until her daughter Maggie Nichols, who was a member of the national gymnastics team, reported three years ago that team physician Larry Nassar had molested her. Gina waited anxiously for the FBI to contact her and interview Maggie. But no one did so for nearly a year as the case languished among different FBI field offices in Indianapolis, Detroit and Los Angeles. Nassar is believed to have molested dozens of additional victims over the course of that year. “It makes you sick,” Gina tells TIME. “I have a child who was sexually abused for 2½ years by an Olympic doctor, and the FBI did nothing.”

The FBI has opened an internal inquiry to determine why the Nassar investigations appear to have dragged on for so long. John Manly, a Southern California lawyer representing many of the women, says he is angry that no one from the FBI has contacted the victims to explain the delay. “Knowing that the best law-enforcement agency in the world knew exactly what he was up to and did nothing—I can’t explain that to them,” Manly says. “You’ve got people who were really hurt here, so fix it,” he says.

PERHAPS THE EASIEST problems to address are the internal lapses. Experts say putting assets and management attention back to work on cyber, counterintelligence and traditional crime after Mueller shifted them to counterterrorism would help. “There’s an overextension of the mission,” says Brian Levin, a professor of criminal justice at California State University, San Bernardino, who has worked with the FBI. Most of Horowitz’s reports include measures the FBI can take to address their problems, including stricter rules for investigating polygraph test failures and training to protect whistle-blowers.

A failure of imagination is harder to fix. Mueller’s Russia probe has found that Moscow’s operation against the 2016 election first got under way in 2014, but the FBI failed to grasp the scope and danger of what was unfolding. The bureau
missed the significance of the damaging 2015 hack of the DNC database. And when the Russian operation began to heat up in the summer of 2016, the FBI was always a step behind the Russians, struggling to understand intelligence reports they were getting about possible connections between Moscow and Trump aides. The bureau also sat on the disputed “dossier” prepared by former British intelligence officer Christopher Steele.

A report released on April 27 by Republicans on the House Intelligence Committee found that the FBI was slow to confront the election meddling, especially in its failure to notify U.S. victims of Russian hacking quickly enough. The committee also charged that the bureau’s decision to surveil former Trump campaign adviser Carter Page was influenced by politics. At the same time, the GOP has pointed to text messages between FBI special agent Peter Strzok and FBI lawyer Lisa Page, which were critical of Trump—as well as many Democrats—to argue the bureau is fundamentally biased.

FBI Director Wray says the bureau has started “specific activities” to prevent election meddling by Moscow, but outsiders worry that the U.S. remains vulnerable this fall and beyond.

The most important thing the FBI can do to fix itself? Follow its own rules. In his handling of the Clinton email probe ahead of the 2016 election, Comey acted without telling the Justice Department what he planned to do. Comey is expected to come under fire in the upcoming IG report for breaking with Justice Department rules and norms by assuming authority usually held by prosecutors and speaking in public about a case that did not produce criminal charges, sources with knowledge of the report tell TIME. He will likely also be criticized for weighing in so close to the election in a way that could impact the outcome, sources familiar with the investigation say.

On his book tour, Comey has defended his decisions as the best way out of a bad situation. Facing what he called “a series of no-win decisions,” Comey says he did what he thought was necessary and transparent to protect the integrity of both the FBI and the legal process in such a high-profile case.

FBI agents at the damaged rear wall of the nightclub Pulse, where Omar Mateen killed 49 people in June 2016

MANY OF THE BUREAU’S WOES DEVELOPED ON COMEY’S WATCH

AS HE FACES the crises at the FBI, Wray has told his senior aides to “keep calm and tackle hard.” Asked if recent misconduct cases concern Wray, FBI spokeswoman Jacqueline Maguire said the bureau’s 36,000 employees “are held to the highest standards of conduct—but as in any large organization, there may be occasions when an employee exercises poor judgment or engages in misconduct.” While she declined to discuss specific cases, Maguire said claims of misconduct are “taken seriously [and] investigated thoroughly,” leading to discipline when needed.

At FBI headquarters, agents and supervisors say they are keeping their heads down and focusing on their investigations. But the building is literally crumbling around them—Comey kept in his office a slab of concrete that had fallen off the side. Designs for a new complex were scrapped in February. Visible across Pennsylvania Avenue from the main entrance, with J. Edgar Hoover’s tarnished name above it, is the gleaming, gold-plated sign on the newly renovated Trump International Hotel.

Trump’s attacks on the FBI have been filled with inaccuracies and innuendo, wrongly claiming on Twitter, for instance, that McCabe was in charge of the Clinton email investigation. Trump makes a point of praising rank-and-file agents, but his punches have landed inside the FBI and out. Some worry the damage may take years to repair. “I fear Trump’s relentless attacks on the institution are having an effect on the public’s confidence in the FBI,” says Matthew S. Axelrod, a senior Justice Department official in the Obama Administration.

Mueller may play an outsized role in how his old agency gets through the current crisis. If the special counsel finds that Russia did collude with members of the Trump campaign—the central question in his investigation—and any perpetrators
are charged and found guilty in court, it would rebuff Trump’s charges of a “witch hunt.” If Mueller finds no evidence of collusion, or declines to make it public, it would open the door for Trump and his campaign to paint the FBI as a band of partisan hacks with a reputation, as he has tweeted, “in tatters.”

There may be no immediate way to fix a place with as many missions and masters as the FBI. One official, asked what it would take for the FBI to move past all the controversy, paused and said simply, “Time.” Many hope that the extraordinary confluence of events that drew the FBI into the 2016 election will prove to be, as Comey called it, “a 500-year flood” that won’t repeat itself anytime soon.

Others are doubtful. Jeffrey Danik, a retired FBI agent in Florida who now works with whistle-blowers at the bureau, blames the state of affairs on “a severe lack of leadership” and transparency at headquarters in owning up to recent mistakes. Those damaging failures, he says, “have just about pushed our incredible organization over the brink.” For now, everyone inside and out who cares about the reliability of law enforcement in America is left hoping that the bureau has at least started on the road back.

Over two short weeks, former FBI director James Comey has sold more than 600,000 copies of his new book, A Higher Loyalty, barnstormed the interview circuit and appeared frequently in public without a tie. For a former FBI director, any of these is a dramatic break from the norm.

So what does his book tell us? Chiefly this: that when President Trump asked Comey in February 2017 to “let” one piece of a criminal probe into the Russian influence operation against the prior year’s presidential election “go,” Comey declined, recorded the substance of the conversation in a memo and then, months later, leaked it to a reporter through a law professor. That move probably guaranteed that the federal probe into connections between Russia and the Trump campaign (and what, if anything, Trump knew about them) would continue.

Comey’s book is a fast and timely read. It includes a useful reminder of the impossible national-security choices our leaders faced in the wake of 9/11, and is a rare primer in the many unwritten rules between all those lawyers at the Department of Justice and all those agents at the FBI. Those rules, unwritten or otherwise, were front-page news during and after the 2016 election, when Comey had the task of sorting out whether either or both of the two contenders to be the 45th President had broken the law.

First came Hillary Clinton: it fell to Comey and the FBI in mid-2015 to investigate whether Clinton broke the law in 2009 when she set up a private email system and discussed classified information “extremely careless.”

Comey argued there was no reason to charge Clinton with a crime but still calling her handling of the classified information “extremely careless.”

A few months after that, the FBI briefly reopened the case just before the 2016 election. Although Comey again cleared Clinton, the controversy was center stage worldwide just hours before millions prepared to go to the polls. Many Democrats still blame Comey for Clinton’s defeat.

James Comey’s no-apology tour

By Michael Duffy

IF THE COMEY and Clinton saga seemed like farce, his encounters with Trump were bizarre. Comey first met him during the transition at Trump Tower, where he informed the President-elect, among other things, about the efforts by Moscow to influence the 2016 election. It seemed odd to Comey that, with the top U.S. intelligence officials before him, Trump had no follow-up questions about the Russian threat or Moscow’s next moves.

Trump soon upped his courtship of Comey, appearing neurotic about the Democrats, obsessed with the size of his Inauguration Day crowds and worried about allegations that he spent time with Russian prostitutes in 2013. Trump pleaded with Comey to back off Michael Flynn, the National Security Adviser who had been talking with Russian counterparts before Trump took office.

Readers quickly see that Trump can’t count on Comey to be his errand boy; they may also conclude that Comey didn’t handle his Trump meetings deftly. He should have skipped several of them entirely, and when he did attend, he should have pushed back harder at Trump’s inappropriate demands. But it’s not easy to speak truth to power, and Comey likely did not want to be fired prematurely; as it happened, he lasted only until early May. A few days later, Comey slipped his memo to a law-professor friend who made sure it found its way to the newspapers.

Mueller took over the Russia probe within days of Comey’s firing. Given Mueller’s cool and undramatic nature, Trump probably now wishes he had left Comey in place.
IN RESPONSE TO THE SOCIAL UPHAEVALS OF the 1960s, Hollywood produced a series of highly popular “angry man” crime dramas in the 1970s. These are the stories of vigilantes and renegade cops, played by the likes of Clint Eastwood and Charles Bronson, who push past weak-willed bureaucrats, corrupt politicos and political correctness to restore justice in violent times. These are men who never let law undermine order.

The U.S. is now emerging from another period of sweeping social change, economic anxiety, urban crime and pointless wars, which again has stoked demand for a tough-talking vigilante to pay weak-minded liberals a lesson. But this time, he isn’t a creation of Hollywood. He lives in the White House, and he’s playing his role with gusto.

This trend is not confined to the U.S. In every region of the world, changing times have boosted public demand for more muscular, assertive leadership. These tough-talking populists promise to protect “us” from “them.” Depending on who’s talking, “them” can mean the corrupt elite or the grasping poor; foreigners or members of racial, ethnic or religious minorities. Or disloyal politicians, bureaucrats, bankers or judges. Or lying reporters. Out of this divide, a new archetype of leader has emerged. We’re now in the strongman era.

Perhaps the most prominent of these can be found in Russia. After the fall of the Soviet Union fed fears of economic chaos and political impotence, Vladimir Putin answered the call for a restoration of the Russia that had been the center of an empire for three centuries. He has promised to wave away Western vultures that would pick Russia clean by making trouble in neighboring states like Ukraine. Putin, a 65-year-old man in a country with a male life expectancy of 64, embodies an image of Russian virility and swagger.

Strongmen can also be seen across Asia. In China, memories of Tiananmen traumas and the horror of the Soviet collapse have pushed the Communist Party to keep a tight hold on dissent. In power since 2012, Xi Jinping has used an anticorruption campaign to sideline potential rivals while consolidating power on a historic scale. He has announced the dawn of a “new era” for China, or a golden age of expansion that will bring his country to the global center stage. And recently, he erased presidential term limits. The era of rule by party consensus is finished, at least for now. There can be no doubt about who’s in charge.

In the Philippines, a rising tide of violent
street crime helped elect Rodrigo Duterte, a former mayor who talked more like a Mob boss than a President, on his promises to wipe out the drug trade with his own brand of justice.

Extreme political dysfunction in Thailand allowed the army to seize power in 2014 with little public resistance, and despite repeated promises to hold new elections, General Prayuth Chan-ocha remains in charge.

In Latin America, the specter of the caudillo, or military leader, has made a comeback. Nicaragua’s Daniel Ortega has stifled dissent and scrapped term limits. In economically stricken Venezuela, Nicolás Maduro has detained opposition figures and violently stamped out protests. The trend may yet be infectious; a poll conducted by Vanderbilt University found that nearly 40% of Brazilians, exhausted by crime and corruption, would support a military coup in their country.

Then there’s the Middle East, where some imagined that the Arab Spring might usher in democracy. In Egypt, Abdul Fatah al-Sisi, the general whose forces violently quashed protests over the overthrow of President Mohamed Morsi in July 2013, was elected President the following year. Like Putin, he won another landslide victory this spring over handpicked opponents.

In Saudi Arabia, the Arab Spring gave the royal family a look over the precipice, and a sharp drop in oil prices made clear that painful economic reforms could not be avoided. The man leading those is Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman, who is replacing elite consensus with a new level of control. That was never more obvious than when he ordered the detention late last year of at least 17 Saudi princes and some of the kingdom’s wealthiest and well-connected men.

In Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan and his Justice and Development Party, in power since 2003, have won a passionate following among socially conservative Turks by challenging the dominance of secular elites. Now he is manipulating Turkey’s political system to remain in control. A failed military coup in 2016 emboldened Erdogan to suspend the rule of law to target his opponents. He has identified his own set of “deep state” enemies and has jailed an extraordinary number of journalists.

The character of strongman is also making a comeback in the heart of Europe. Following a migrant crisis that aroused fear and indignation in Eastern Europe, Hungary’s Viktor Orban has just won another term as Prime Minister while embracing “illiberal democracy”—a political system with free elections but scant regard for civil liberties. For Orban, the threat comes from Muslim migrants and advocates of liberal Western democracy—like Hungarian-born George Soros—who threaten the country’s “national values.”

Which brings us back to Donald Trump. Voters who say lost manufacturing jobs, immigration and urban crime have created a crisis for the American working class have a personalized loyalty to Trump that extends well beyond allegiance to party. An August 2017 poll published in the Washington Post found that 52% of Republican voters would support postponing the 2020 election if Trump said the delay was needed to ensure that only eligible American citizens could vote.

These leaders have won followers by targeting “them,” including the familiar U.S. and European sources of power and influence. But they have succeeded because they know something about “us,” or the people they’re speaking to. They understand the sense of threat—and they’re willing to exploit it.

THE COLD WAR’S END appeared to open an era of ascendant liberal values, one in which democracy, rule of law and open markets would carry the day forever after. Yet consider the current political woes of those who still sing from this prayer book. Germany’s Angela Merkel is at the lowest point in her 10 years in power, with the far-right Alternative for Germany party the main opposition to her weakened coalition. France’s Emmanuel Macron faces angry protests at home by students and public-sector workers, and recent polls show waning public support. Japan’s scandal-plagued Shinzo Abe is even more unpopular, while Britain’s Theresa May continues to fight for her political life.

These are leaders who face choices about whether to tack to extremes to protect their vote share or stand on principle in response to populist pressure. Strongmen don’t have this problem. They’re usually the ones exerting that pressure, and their systems allow them to protect their advantages by changing the rules of the political game as needed. And nothing has made it easier for them to do so than advances in technology.

A decade ago, it appeared that a revolution in information and communication technologies would empower the individual at the expense of the state. Western leaders believed social networks would create “people power,” enabling political upheavals like the Arab Spring. But the world’s autocrats drew a different lesson. They saw an opportunity for government to try to become the dominant player in how information is shared and how the state can use data to tighten political control.

In many countries, these efforts have proved successful. In Iran, where Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei remains firmly in charge, the government has long wanted to create a “halal” Internet, where authorities can control content and every user is identified. Reporters Without Borders described it as an “Intranet that can be completely disconnected from the World Wide Web when the authorities so
decide.” In August 2016, Iran announced the opening of the National Information Network, while shutting down press agencies and news sites—and arresting at least 100 Internet users.

In Russia, the state keeps its citizens in the dark by banning web pages and content it deems controversial. When antigovernment protests broke out across the country in March 2017, many Russians were unaware—Yandex News, the country’s largest news aggregator, pushes stories from publishers that are more likely to meet the state’s approval. Foreign media, meanwhile, are required to register as “foreign agents.”

China’s leaders have famously safeguarded “cyber sovereignty” with the “Great Firewall,” which blocks access to tens of thousands of websites. The “Golden Shield” is an online surveillance system that uses keywords and other tools to shut down attempts to access politically sensitive content. China also now uses a “Great Cannon,” which can alter content accessed online and target websites the state considers dangerous to China’s security with “dedicated denial of service” attacks designed to overwhelm servers.

The communications revolution has also had an impact in wholly democratic countries. On social media and on cable news, success depends on the ability of information providers to maximize engagement, or the amount of time users spend participating or viewing as well as the amount of data they share. Information providers target particular ideological, political and demographic segments of the media market, which receive different sets of content about the world. The gap between “us” and “them” is widened, and the strongmen are in position to reap the rewards.

WHAT IS TRUMP’S PLACE in all this? The U.S. President has expressed sincere admiration for the likes of Putin, Xi, al-Sisi and Duterte. Like many such leaders, he knows well what his supporters want to hear. He has pointed at many forms of “them” and pledged to build a “big beautiful wall.”

But the U.S. political system has demonstrated its own set of strengths. Trump may complain about judges, but he can’t avoid their rulings. He thrills audiences with attacks on the press, but public fascination with his every utterance replenishes media financial reserves. His party may not control Congress after November. His approval rating is unlikely to ever reach 50%. He might be impeached.

That doesn’t mean there’s nothing to worry about. The impact this President has had on U.S. politics—including the very fact that he was able to get elected—has exposed holes in the systemic makeup of what was once the West’s beacon of democracy. Right now, some Americans think the U.S. is more urgently in need of structural political reform than China. That’s a win for the strongmen.

And the shifting, mercurial demands of voters—or “us”—have made it very hard for political leaders and parties in democratic nations to stay in place long enough to set an example or forge long-term strategies. In countries like China and Russia, leaders have years ahead of them to pursue far deeper strategic goals, such as Xi’s One Belt One Road infrastructure plan or Putin’s war of attrition on the norms and values of his Western rivals.

Perhaps the most worrying element of the strongman’s rise is the message it sends. The systems that powered the Cold War’s winners now look much less appealing than they did a generation ago. Why emulate the U.S. or European political systems, with all the checks and balances that prevent even the most determined leaders from taking on chronic problems, when one determined leader can offer a credible shortcut to greater security and national pride? As long as that rings true, the greatest threat may be the strongmen yet to come. □

Trump, seen here during a January speech on Capitol Hill, has praised the leadership qualities of strongmen
Then: Lilah, 5, in her childhood bedroom in Brisbane, Calif., in 2004.
Now: Lilah in her room in 2016
Silicon Valley has changed drastically in the last 20 years. The hopes of the families who live there have not been realized. Photographs by Beth Yarnelle Edwards
FOR ITS OUTSIZE REPUTATION, SILICON VALLEY is a narrow thing. America's innovation capital mainly consists of a thin column of towns and cities on the San Francisco peninsula squeezed between the coastal mountain range to the west and the bay to the east. It has traditionally comprised the top of Santa Clara County as well as the very bottom of San Mateo County. And as it has grown in recent years, parts of the city of San Francisco have become its satellites, instead of the other way around.

Before its current name began to stick in the early 1970s, this place was known as the Valley of Heart's Delight, renowned for its bountiful fruit orchards. The circumstances that turned a pastoral eden into a technological and economic mecca have been studied and dissected the world over, and many have attempted to replicate the magic in Silicon Hills, Silicon Forest, Silicon Prairie. Would-be copycats would be right to conclude that access to basic research and startup capital, ease of mobility and more than decent weather are some of the essential elements. But for the past two decades, photographer Beth Yarnelle Edwards has been documenting the one aspect often neglected by these observers: Silicon Valley's fundamentally suburban character.

Edwards' Suburban Dreams project was born in 1997. “I felt isolated and trapped, but I realized that the people around me really loved being there,” she recalls. She began by photographing friends and acquaintances near her home in San Carlos. The project grew as she interviewed her subjects extensively to understand how their environment shaped their hopes and dreams. “It's really important to me that the images are authentic to what is happening in the home,” she says. In 2016, Edwards began revisiting her subjects to see the effects of the growth, the wealth, the congestion. But she was surprised by how little had changed in the lives of those still there. “This population is kind of blessed,” she says. “This isn’t how the larger population lives.”

Many Silicon Valley natives and those who, like myself, have spent significant amounts of time there do not recognize much of what they see there nowadays. It’s true that on the alleyways of my childhood—Vine Street in Menlo Park, Shearer Drive in Atherton—modest Eichlers and ranch homes have been bulldozed and replaced by mansions and manors. Almost everything is more crowded, more expensive, more pretentious. But a lot will never change. The arteries—Highway 101, the El Camino—are the same. So too the bones, great freestanding oaks and gentle hills wreathed in golden grass. And at the heart of it all, as Edwards' photos illustrate, the suburban dream is still alive. —MATT VELLA

Society
Then, from left: Sisters Lucia, 17; Rita, 21; and Niki, 24; in their Redwood City, Calif., home in 2000.
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SUMMER MOVIE PREVIEW

THE CHARACTERS YOU’LL MEET THIS POPCORN SEASON, FROM INCREDIBLE PARENTS TO HAN SOLO’S NEMESIS

ILLUSTRATION BY ALEX EBEN MEYER FOR TIME
Ocean’s 8 marks the return of the great glam caper
By Stephanie Zacharek

THE BIG SELLING POINT OF OCEAN’S 8, a riff on the Ocean’s Eleven guys-pulling-off-heists series, is its all-women cast. In the trailer, Cate Blanchett and Sandra Bullock cook up a jewel heist while striding along a New York City sidewalk, looking as if they own not just the sidewalk but the whole city. Their pockets may be empty, for now, but they’ve got the million-dollar look. Bullock wears a drapey trench coat that’s the color of money, Blanchett a tailored cheetah-print wrapper, whose every blurry black dot whispers class. But what’s most striking about this movie isn’t that it stars a bunch of women—among them Sarah Paulson, Mindy Kaling and Rihanna—in the types of cool-crook roles that would normally go to men. It’s how unapologetically glamorous the whole thing looks. And though we may cling to the illusion that today’s movies are filled with glamour, we’re actually slogging through a serious cashmere shortage, moviewise. Why can’t we have more champagne and châteaus in our movies? Will Ocean’s 8 be the movie that revives the glam caper?

Fantasy is a multibillion-dollar business in Hollywood, but much of that money is poured into—and, eventually, flows out of—movies based on comic books. Meanwhile, fantasies of luxury, escape and intrigue, with stories for grownups that feature attractive individuals getting away with preposterous crimes, have become as rare as a flawless emerald.

There’s no good reason for these pictures to be so scarce. Great directors have contributed to the genre. In Alfred Hitchcock’s 1955 dazzler To Catch a Thief, Cary Grant and Grace Kelly swerve and glide through the French Riviera in search of a jewel-snatching cat burglar. A later but no less stylish specimen is Norman Jewison’s The Thomas Crown Affair, with Steve McQueen as a wily, thieving millionaire and Faye Dunaway as an even sharper insurance investigator. The picture’s ’60s-luxe vibe—including a teasingly erotic chess game between the two stars—makes it pure pleasure to watch, though John McTiernan’s 1999 remake, with Pierce Brosnan and Rene Russo, is even better. In the updated version, the always-dashing Brosnan steals not money but a priceless Monet. Jewels and art always make for better visual movie totems than mere cash.

The element that truly distinguishes the glam caper from the ordinary heist movie—even great ones like Rififi (1955) or The Italian Job (from 1969, but remade, respectably, in 2003)—is the pronounced presence of women. In the 1999 Thomas Crown, Russo is both elegant and sensuous, but it’s her dusky wit that really makes the performance. More recently, in 2015, Alicia Vikander brought mod magnificence to Guy Ritchie’s The Man from U.N.C.L.E., based on the ’60s TV show. The picture, which also stars Armie Hammer and Henry Cavill as Cold War-era spies from opposite sides of the Iron Curtain, ticks of nearly all the necessary glam-caper boxes, including luxurious locales and good stunt driving. But as handsome and funny as the male leads are, it’s Vikander—with her voice a mingling of silk and smoke—who holds our attention.

You could argue, if you wanted to be unimaginatively reductive, that the characters played by Russo and...
Vikander are just eye candy, svelte hangers for beautiful clothes. But that—aside from demeaning the actors—misses the deeper ways that even seemingly light entertainments can speak to us. Flattened, rigid applications of the notion of the male gaze have done more to damage our understanding of how movies work than to further it. What about the human gaze? And the fact that both men and women, gay and straight, find pleasure—if not always the same kind of pleasure—in looking at women? These movies provide escape, but not necessarily the mindless kind. We’re all just coming to terms with how much toxic masculinity hurts men. It’s all the more reason for men to relax and let women do more of the driving. The glam caper, as a genre, offers infinite possibilities for female characters whose problem-solving capabilities are at least as good as, or better than, those of their male counterparts.

That’s not to say clothes are unimportant. Any glamorous heroine’s allure lies in great costuming. But there, too, we’ve been left hungry. Truly beautiful contemporary clothes have become a rarity in the movies—and it will count for something if, in Ocean’s 8, costume designer Sarah Edwards redresses even just that single wrong. Our ideas of glamour have become distorted by our definition of what gives a garment or accessory value: we know how to read the meaning of logos and brands, but we’ve lost the gift of assaying the more rare value of, say, a suit that falls from the shoulder line with impeccable propriety, or of the way a suede boot can take on almost liquid form as it’s unzipped. Russo’s wardrobe in Thomas Crown, an assortment of supple coats and sexy yet businesslike turtlenecks, are a case in point.

Good movie clothes speak movie language, not brand language. They’re like lines of dialogue written in folds and shadows; the way they move with, or against, an actor becomes part of the performance. A good glam caper needs great clothes, ensembles that inspire not “How much is it and where can I get it?” acquisitiveness but something deeper and less tangible, a kind of moody yearning. That’s a tall order for a bunch of cheetah spots. But it’s never too late to learn how to read their secret language.
**Everybody and their mother**

*By Mahita Gajanan*

*Mamma Mia!, based on the Abba-fueled hit musical, is about a young woman's search for her father. In the sequel *Here We Go Again* (July 20), flashbacks reveal how the young woman’s mother met her suitors in the 1970s. Here’s a handy family tree to help viewers keep track of generations past and present.*

**THE FATHERS**

Each man had a fling with Donna in the 1970s. *Mamma Mia!* ended with Donna marrying Sam and Sophie happy to have three father figures—even if she still doesn’t know who her dad is. Now we’ll see how the romances got started.

**PAST**

- **BILL**
  - Josh Dylan
- **HARRY**
  - Hugh Skinner
- **SAM**
  - Jeremy Irvine

**PRESENT**

- **Lily James**
- **Stellan Skarsgard**
- **Colin Firth**
- **Pierce Brosnan**

**THE DAUGHTER**

Newly pregnant, she explores her mother’s past to better understand how she raised a child on her own.

**PAST**

- **DONNA SHERIDAN**
  - Meryl Streep

**PRESENT**

- **SOPHIE SHERIDAN**
  - Amanda Seyfried

**THE FRIENDS**

From singing in a girl group to attending surprise weddings, Donna’s closest friends have always been along for the ride.

**PAST**

- **ROSIE**
  - Alexa Davies
- **TANYA**
  - Jessica Keenan Wynn

**PRESENT**

- **RUBY SHERIDAN**
  - Cher
- **Julie Walters**
- **Christine Baranski**

**THE GRANDMOTHER**

Donna’s glamorous mother drops in for a surprise visit—via helicopter, of course.

**THE MOTHER**

A look back at her origins will show how the singer, mother and hotel owner’s life came together.

**PAST**

- **Lily James**

**PRESENT**

- **DOMINIC COOPER**
  - Sky

**SHINING A LIGHT ON REAL-LIFE ICONS**

**RBG (MAY 4)** Documentarians Betsy West and Julie Cohen celebrate the life of Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, whose groundbreaking work broke down gender barriers. Footage includes private moments with family and her Internet-famous workout routine.

**POPE FRANCIS: A MAN OF HIS WORD (MAY 18)** The Holy Father isn’t known for granting interviews, but in this doc, the leader of the Catholic Church talks with unusual candor to renowned German filmmaker Wim Wenders about everything from social justice and inequality to death.

**WHITNEY (JULY 6)** Legendary singer and actor Whitney Houston died tragically at 48 years old in 2012. In *Whitney*, Academy Award–winning director Kevin Macdonald takes an authorized look at her life and career, including unreleased recordings and live performances.

**WON’T YOU BE MY NEIGHBOR? (JUNE 8)** This cinematic eulogy to beloved PBS personality Fred Rogers offers a nostalgic look back at the man behind the critically acclaimed and long-running children’s television show *Mister Rogers’ Neighborhood.*

—Megan McCluskey
IT'S BEEN 14 YEARS SINCE superheroes Mr. Incredible (Craig T. Nelson), Elastigirl (Holly Hunter) and their children battled villains in Pixar’s *The Incredibles*. Dozens of superheroes—including no fewer than three Batmen—have graced the big screen in the intervening years. But none have been as accessible as the family in *The Incredibles*, a movie about super people dealing with un-super problems. “If *Incredibles 2* was a cash grab, we would have made it 13 years ago,” says Hunter. “But the creator, Brad Bird, really wanted to find a relatable story.”

That story, out June 15, picks up where the first movie left off: the family members prepare to fight a new brute, the Underminer, even though using their superpowers remains illegal. Along the way, *Incredibles 2* introduces new conversations around parenting and gender roles. Since 2004, women have more openly debated how to balance career ambitions and family responsibilities. And parental-leave policies have gradually evolved to offer fathers more time at home with their children, though stigmas persist.

Bird tackles these issues by flipping the roles of Mr. Incredible and Elastigirl. A media mogul offers Elastigirl an opportunity to fight crime as the face of a PR campaign aimed at legalizing superpowers, and she becomes the family breadwinner. “I think *Time’s Up* has triggered another iteration of the feminist movement, and this movie reflects that,” says Hunter. “In the first one, I came to superheroism really reluctantly and only because my husband was in danger. In this movie, my ambition is fully unfurled. I’m unapologetic and competitive. I approach the job with abandon and glee.”

Meanwhile, Mr. Incredible takes care of the kids. “He finds out parenthood is hard,” says Nelson. “He wants to empower and support his wife. But he feels like the opportunity she has should be his.” It’s a constant calibration between encouragement and envy, not unlike what many parents experience in the real world. Raising kids, it turns out, is even harder than defeating villains.

---

Pixar flips the script on traditional parenting roles

**By Eliana Dockterman**

This summer’s superheroic parents

**TULLY (MAY 4)** Charlize Theron is eminently relatable as the mother of a newborn—her third—trying to figure out how she lost sight of her dreams amid the mess of breast pumps, nipple cream and frozen pizzas.

**BREAKING IN (MAY 11)** Gabrielle Union shows that a mother’s love knows no bounds—and sometimes extends to some pretty impressive martial arts moves—when her kids’ lives are threatened by shady criminals.

**A KID LIKE JAKE (JUNE 1)** Claire Danes and Jim Parsons balance angst and compassion as Brooklynites struggling to help their gender-nonconforming child find a place in the world while still just being a kid.

**HEARTS BEAT LOUD (JUNE 8)** Nick Offerman plays a wistful dad who starts a band with his talented but reluctant daughter (Kiersey Clemons) for last-minute bonding before she heads off to college.

—Eliza Berman
Two movies confront a rapidly changing Oakland

By Cady Lang

OAKLAND, CALIF., THE BAY AREA CITY affectionately known as the Town, has a reputation as the grittier, more radical counterpart of San Francisco. Shaped by segregation and urban renewal, it became a mecca for artists and activists—most notably the Black Panther Party, which was founded there in 1966. This rich political history has long inspired the city’s equally rich cultural legacy, which includes Jack London’s writings on socialism and the socially conscious rhymes of Tupac Shakur.

It’s no surprise, then, that Oakland acts as both muse and setting for two new movies—Sorry to Bother You (July 6) and Blindspotting (July 20)—that embrace its history of disrupting the status quo by turning a keen eye to race and class in the rapidly gentrifying city.

Sorry to Bother You, a satirical sucker punch of a debut written and directed by Oakland activist and musician Boots Riley, is a cautionary tall tale about capitalism that’s part magical realism, part revolutionary manifesto and part hallucinatory fever dream. Lakeith Stanfield stars as Cassius Green, a financially struggling black telemarketer who discovers that using his “white voice” with customers can make him rich and save his uncle’s house from foreclosure. But code-switching comes at a cost that undermines his humanity.

Carlos López Estrada’s Blindspotting, written by and starring Hamilton’s Daveed Diggs and spoken-word poet Rafael Casal, both Bay Area natives, tackles similar themes. Colin (Diggs), a cautious black man on parole, and Miles (Casal), his reckless, Ebonics-spouting white friend, are best pals who are forced to confront the ways in which race and privilege have contoured their lifelong bond.

Both films feel like love letters to the Oakland that existed before the Silicon Valley tech boom. Blindspotting opens to the funky strains of local hip-hop legend Mac Dre and laments the appearance of green juice at the corner store as well as the influx of hipsters. Sorry pays homage to the city’s history of protest with a militant workers’ strike against Armie Hammer’s coke-snorting, sarong-wearing New Age tech bro of a CEO.

But while hipsters and tech bros coax some laughs, both films make it clear that there’s something much more sobering about the changes that are happening in the city. Homeless encampments spring up blocks from sleek new skyscrapers. Cassius plays whistle-blower on a corrupt corporation, only to be turned into a viral meme by a public that knows the truth and doesn’t care. Colin experiences a heart-pounding incident of racial profiling by police, and his dread is heightened after witnessing police shoot and kill an unarmed black man, not unlike Oscar Grant, who was fatally shot by police there in 2009. Neither film is interested in tidy endings or false hopes, but for a dose of reality served with flair, it’s worth taking a trip—or two—to the Town.
Sometimes heroes wear capes. Sometimes they wear Trader Joe’s shirts. In The Spy Who Dumped Me, Audrey (Mila Kunis), woeful after getting dumped by her boyfriend via text message, is momentarily buoyed when a handsome customer flirts with her in the store parking lot. When he shoves her into a van, she learns he’s not a potential rebound but a British agent hunting for information on her now-missing ex (Justin Theroux)—who, to her surprise, turns out to be in the CIA. Soon, Audrey and her best friend Morgan (Kate McKinnon) are swept up into a treacherous spy game that sends them fumbling across Europe—at first running for their lives, but quickly getting the hang of the whole international spy thing.

On its surface, The Spy’s appeal lies in its car chases and buddy-comedy humor: think Mission: Impossible meets Bridesmaids. But its pulsing heartbeat is the ride-or-die friendship beneath the plot. Writer-director Susanna Fogel is well versed in stories of female friendship—her 2014 comedy Life Partners explored a codependent relationship between two women—and The Spy prioritizes Audrey and Morgan’s tie above all else, including romance. Like so many BFFs, these two know each other’s quirks and insecurities and weirdest secrets. They’re so close, they can communicate complicated plans with a single glance. Even the most sophisticated villains are no match for that kind of bond.

—Lucy Feldman

Everyday, everywhere, our connections to nature are infinite. Healthy forests capture and slowly release rainwater into rivers and aquifers—providing reliable water that farmers use to grow the food we eat. Working together, we can build a planet where people and nature thrive.

Explore the infinite ways you can connect with nature at nature.org.
A GOOD SUMMER MOVIE MAY BE remembered for its hero, but great summer movies are defined by their villains. And most can’t quite measure up to the bad guys from the Star Wars galaxy, including Darth Vader, Jabba the Hutt and Boba Fett. Paul Bettany talked to TIME about joining that pantheon of evildoers in Solo, a prequel out May 25. Set before Han Solo meets Luke or Leia, the movie chronicles Han’s descent into the smuggling world and his encounters with shady characters, including Bettany’s scarred gangster Dryden Vos.

Who is Dryden Vos? He’s a gangster, a godfather figure. He’s got a long reach, and he demands his tribute before any sort of business deal goes forward. And, of course, Han gets mixed up with him.

Han Solo has always operated in a moral gray area. Is it fair to say that Dryden and the other Solo characters aren’t so concerned with the dark side and the light? It feels very different tonally from the other Star Wars movies. This is definitely a world where Han shoots first. And that’s as it should be.

It’s absolutely what attracted me to Han when I was a little boy. Thinking, Oh my God, he’s so bad. He’s just out for himself. But then he can’t help but show up at the Death Star when you need him. He’s worked out that the galaxy is cruel and you need to be cruel to get by, but he can’t quite do it because he has a heart.

Do you have a favorite Star Wars villain? I have to say Darth Vader. It’s a beautifully complex character. Look, I could lie and say I became an actor because of Fellini films. But the truth is, in 1977, I saw Star Wars and the whole world changed. The first day on the set of Solo, I was walking down a set of stairs on a Star Cruiser and there was an R2-D2 carrying a champagne glass. I felt like a kid in a toy shop.

What makes a good villain? A good villain has to have a clear philosophy about how the universe operates. They can’t just be doing bad things because they’re evil. They have to be thinking, Everyone else is getting theirs, so why can’t I get mine?

You joined Solo midway through production after Ron Howard took over the film. (Disney parted ways with directors Phil Lord and Chris Miller over a difference in “creative visions.”) Were you worried about the production? It all happened very quickly. I got the call from Ron Howard, and I was on the set two weeks later. I was worried about it going in, but all my fears went away the moment I arrived. I got off the plane, and I was in the makeup chair 20 minutes after that. Ron was like a laser. It was virtuosic what he did in a very short amount of time and in very trying circumstances. It was lovely seeing an old friend be so brilliant.
A Rolodex of rogues

The season’s biggest baddies—and how to survive their wrath

Villain: Skyscraper. Story: In Skyscraper (July 13), terrorists invade the world’s tallest building. It’s also on fire. And the family of our hero (Dwayne Johnson) is inside. Achilles’ heel: The Rock can punch through walls. How to survive: Don’t live there. Sequel potential: The Rock is in it. So, high.

Villain: Megalodon. Story: In The Meg (Aug. 10), a long-extinct, prehistoric 75-ft. species of shark attacks an underwater research facility. Deep-sea diver and ex-military man Jonas Taylor (Jason Statham) is going to need a bigger boat. Achilles’ heel: Can’t walk on land. How to survive: Don’t go swimming (or pursue a career in marine biology). Sequel potential: The megalodon probably won’t survive Taylor’s firepower, but perhaps she has a little sister who will want to avenge her death.

Villain: Cable. Story: In Deadpool 2 (May 18), Josh Brolin plays a time-traveling mutant with a robotic arm. Cable travels from the future to kill a mutant boy with some particularly potent powers. Deadpool (Ryan Reynolds) unites a team of grownup mutants to protect the youngster. Achilles’ heel: Time travel is exhausting. How to survive: Disable the robot arm. Sequel potential: Cable is the straight man to Deadpool’s joker. They’re an undeniable moneymaking duo.

Villain: Genetically modified dinosaur. Story: Remember the island with the Jurassic World theme park? Turns out there’s a volcano there. And in Jurassic World: Fallen Kingdom (June 22), it’s about to erupt. The dino experts (Chris Pratt and Bryce Dallas Howard) want to save these man-eating creatures—by bringing them closer to a city. Naturally, the biggest, baddest dino gets away. Achilles’ heel: Short arms. How to survive: Modern weaponry. Sequel potential: Even if this new hybrid dies, those scientists can certainly continue to iterate on the T. rex. —E.D.

Villain: Evil sociologist. Story: In prequel The First Purge (July 4), Marisa Tomei plays a doctor who designs a social experiment in which anyone can commit any crime for a day. But residents of the Staten Island community where the Purge is tested soon discover that the government is using it as a cover to kill people in black communities. Achilles’ heel: Privilege. How to survive: Vote Purge proponents out of office. Sequel potential: The Purge will live on for as long as evil people continue to exist—and the box office receipts keep pouring in.
Meet Awkwafina, this summer’s secret weapon

By Mahita Gajanan

AWKWAFINA IS HAVING A MOMENT. The 29-year-old Queens-bred rapper, comedian and actor, born Nora Lum, gained a dedicated following following with boundary-pushing viral videos like “Green Tea,” a 2016 collaboration with Margaret Cho that sends up Asian stereotypes. This summer, she breaks big in *Crazy Rich Asians* and *Ocean’s 8*. She spoke with TIME about playing rich, Asian representation in Hollywood and her ultra-famous castmates.

This is a big year for you. The past year has been a whirlwind. I never expected my life to end up where it has, and I still have these dreams where I wake up and it was all fake. It is the best dream ever.

What was it like to be among the over-the-top luxury of *Crazy Rich Asians*? Pretending to be a rich person is probably the hardest acting I’ve ever had to do. *Crazy Rich Asians* teaches audiences that that world doesn’t end in Beverly Hills. It’s even more extravagant out there. When you’re in Singapore, you feel this air of opulence everywhere. I really wish I was as rich as [my character] Peik Lin.

How did working with an all-Asian cast affect the experience? The cool thing is that it was something that was never spoken of on set. Asian-American people—not just characters—are not one-dimensional. When you have a collection of Asian people on the screen, each one becomes a more complex character that you’ve never seen before.

Could *Crazy Rich Asians* lead to more diverse casting in romantic comedies? I hope so. This movie is a risk. But you don’t want the weight of the world on it—diversity shouldn’t be dependent on the success of one movie. We want characters that reflect us, that transport us and that entertain us. You always hope that any movie you’re in does well, but this was an important movie for me as an Asian person—not just as a member of the cast.

Between *Crazy Rich Asians* and a mostly female cast in *Ocean’s 8*, these movies are rather atypical. I came into acting during an enlightenment period in the industry. Stories are being told differently. This is a very exciting time. I probably won’t go through a lot of the bullshit a lot of Asian-American actors from years ago went through. I’m very aware of that.

Which *Ocean’s 8* castmate were you most excited to meet? Could there really be a ranking? I will say, it was an extremely warm environment, and that chemistry shows in the movie. It was like we were really pulling a heist.

---

AWKWAFINA: WARNER BROS.; DIRECTOR X, BURNHAM, RILEY: GETTY IMAGES; NELSON: LUISA DÖRR FOR TIME; LIKE FATHER, BOYS: NETFLIX; JULIET, NAKED: LIONSGATE/ROADSIDE ATTRACTIONS; ROBIN: DISNEY; WIFE: GRAEME HUNTER PICTURES; DON’T WORRY: AMAZON STUDIOS; WASHINGTON: FOCUS FEATURES
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Like Father
Kristen Bell and Kelsey Grammer team up as an estranged father-daughter duo on a Caribbean cruise originally intended to be her honeymoon. (Aug. 3)

Alex Strangelove
A teen is preparing to lose his virginity to his girlfriend when his sexual identity becomes confused by the introduction of a handsome stranger. (July 20)

American Animals
This unconventional crime film dramatizes the true story of four young men who attempted to pull off a rare-books heist from a Kentucky university in 2004. (Aug. 10)

Don’t Worry, He Won’t Get Far on Foot
Joaquin Phoenix plays the quadriplegic cartoonist John Callahan as he struggles with alcoholism and hones his offbeat style. (July 13)

Cargo
In this zombie survival movie, the infected father of an infant daughter forges unexpected connections while trying to protect her in the wilderness. (May 18)

A Cargo
In this zombie survival movie, the infected father of an infant daughter forges unexpected connections while trying to protect her in the wilderness. (May 18)

The Bookshop
A purveyor of books (Emily Mortimer) agitates a buttoned-up town with her controversial taste in literature in this take on Penelope Fitzgerald’s 1978 novel. (Aug. 24)

The Catcher Was a Spy
Moe Berg (Paul Rudd), a brainy backup MLB catcher, leaves the plate to spy on the Germans during World War II. (June 22)

The Wife
In this adaptation of Meg Wolitzer’s 2003 novel, Glenn Close simmers with years of pent-up grievances as the wife of a novelist (Jonathan Pryce) who was just awarded the Nobel Prize. (Aug. 3)

The Legacy of a Whitetail Deer Hunter
Josh Brolin flexes his comedic muscles as a hunter setting out to bond with his son over a pastime that’s far from a shared interest. (July 6)

Set It Up
Two frazzled, overworked assistants try to set up their demanding bosses, played by Taye Diggs and Lucy Liu, in an effort to get them off their backs. (June 15)

The Little Stranger
Lenny Abrahamson (Room) adapts Sarah Waters’ supernatural-horror novel about a country doctor (Domhnall Gleeson) called to a haunted estate. (Aug. 31)

The Seagull
Anton Chekhov’s 1895 play about mismatched love gets a new film adaptation starring Annette Bening, Saoirse Ronan and Elisabeth Moss. (May 11)

Blackkklansman
Spike Lee directs the true story of Ron Stallworth (John David Washington), an African-American police officer who infiltrated a chapter of the Ku Klux Klan in 1979. (Aug. 10)

The Guernsey Literary and Potato Peel Pie Society
Lily James plays a writer who travels to a small British island and embeds with a quirky local club after World War II. (Aug. 10)

On Chesil Beach
Saoirse Ronan and Billy Howle anchor this Ian McEwan adaptation about the fraught wedding night of a couple in an English seaside town. (May 18)

To All the Boys I’ve Loved Before
In this YA adaptation, a teen (Lana Condor) is mortified to find that all of the secret love letters she’s written have been mysteriously delivered. (Aug. 17)

Juliet, Naked
In a mature rom-com from a Nick Hornby novel, a woman (Rose Byrne) bonds with the obscure musician (Ethan Hawke) with whom her boyfriend is obsessed. (Aug. 17)

Breaking Out
More movies breaking out, in and off this summer

By Eliza Berman
A season full of stories to stream, books come to life and real events reimagined

True Stories Coming to the Big Screen

Breaking Out of the Headlines

Breaking Off the Page
Adaptations of new and classic books and plays

Adaptations of New and Classic Books and Plays

Breaking Into Your Living Room
Movies to Add to Your Streaming Queue
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7 Questions

Condoleezza Rice The former Secretary of State on predicting chaos, dealing with Russia and how to fix Foggy Bottom

In your new book with Amy Zegart, Political Risk, you liken leaders’ ability to manage political risk to athletes doing strength conditioning. How does one condition a team for the Donald Trump era? In any era, you learn to expect the unexpected. Obviously, now there’s more volatility. But that volatility and that issue of preparing for the unexpected has been there long before this President, and it will be there long after. You have to develop that muscle to constantly look around corners.

How much of that muscle training counts on imagination? With 9/11, it was the absence of imagination that they might use airplanes in that way. Some of it is also analyzing events. A lot of people thought of the Arab Spring as a black-swan event. You didn’t see it coming. Well, if you thought of those regimes—corrupt, dynastic, isolated, high unemployment among youth—you could’ve seen something coming.

In an earlier book of yours, No Higher Honor, you describe the Soviet Union during the time of former President George H.W. Bush as a spent force that was heading toward collapse. How did we get that wrong? The Soviet Union, in fact, did collapse, and its institutions and its power with it. But we had greater hope that what would emerge from the embers of the fire that killed the Soviet Union was a Russia that would be more democratic and more oriented toward the West. It looked that way for a very brief period of time. And then you got Vladimir Putin, who basically said to the Russian people, “I’ll give you order, I’ll give you respect, and I’ll give you security.” And the price for that has been increasing authoritarianism over time.

Are Trump and Putin engaged in a new Cold War? I don’t describe it as a Cold War because the Cold War had very specific characteristics. It was a challenge between two systems that had a view of how human history ought to unfold. They were mirror images of each other. This now is really more great-power politics, great-power rivalry, great-power conflict. There’s no doubt that it comes from the fact that Putin is trying to rebuild Russian influence.

During the Cold War, the Soviets used our treatment of African Americans and other minorities in their propaganda. Why haven’t we learned our lesson? It’s more efficient with social media than it ever was in the Soviet period. The Russians are trying to manipulate our differences. But they won’t manipulate our differences if our differences are not so pronounced. They won’t manipulate our differences if we can find unity again around an American creed that is devoted to everybody’s ability to actually achieve and prosper in this society.

Morale at the State Department is pretty low. What can Secretary of State Mike Pompeo do to fix that? Get people appointed, particularly to the assistant secretary positions for the regions. Those are your line officers. When you’re worrying about Syria, somebody has got to be worrying about Venezuela or the election in Kenya. And make sure that you’re bringing in young foreign-service officers.

What is the one place we should be paying more attention to? We should be paying more attention to a region that actually is doing rather well, which is Latin America. But Venezuela is a disaster. It is a humanitarian disaster. It is a tragedy because this was a middle-income country that now can’t feed its people, and people can’t find medicine. The Maduro regime has destroyed that country. And to let that happen is going to come back to haunt us all.

—PHILIP ELLIOTT
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