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TIME’S CHOICE

RE “PERSON OF THE YEAR” [Dec. 23–30]: Greta Thunberg richly deserves the honor. She has mobilized global opinion and attention on a key issue of our times. She and her family should be proud. The world needs more young leaders like her who unite nations and do not splinter people on the basis of religion or race.

Raju Aneja,
MUMBAI

IS YOUR PUBLICATION PURPOSELY TRYING TO PUT DONALD TRUMP IN A GOOD LIGHT? He is right about your choice for Person of the Year: it is ridiculous. I have kept a child whose achievement in life is to theatrically recite whatever melodramatic script is written for her is an insult to all the hard-working scientists who have spent years researching the subject.

Kenneth Charles Curmi,
BRUSSELS

I HAVE BEEN A TIME SUBSCRIBER for many years. It is informative and can keep you abreast of happenings around the world. However, more and more I have seen you adopt an anti-Trump agenda. I have kept reading to try to find any article that is anti-Democrat, but they don’t exist. A magazine like yours should report views from all sides and try to implement a balanced approach. The final straw is that Thunberg is being presented as if she and other youths were the only ones talking about climate change, when this issue has been debated on an international level for years. Al Gore addressed climate change in his 2006 book and documentary film An Inconvenient Truth. Many of us “of a certain age” have been concerned about this for decades. To make this about youth is media-anointing and ageism.

Bill Clausen,
LOMPOC, CALIF.

I FIND IT INTERESTING that Thunberg is being presented as if she and other youths were the only ones talking about climate change, when this issue has been debated on an international level for years. Al Gore addressed climate change in his 2006 book and documentary film An Inconvenient Truth. Many of us “of a certain age” have been concerned about this for decades. To make this about youth is media-anointing and ageism.

Bill Clausen,
LOMPOC, CALIF.

MY HAIR STOOD ON END when I watched Thunberg on TV bringing forward her angry claim “how dare you.” Seldom do you see such hatred on a young girl’s face. Even though her message was understandable, it was frightening to watch her rage, and it made me reluctant to give her my sympathy.

Knud Skov Sorensen,
SVENBORG, DENMARK

THUNBERG IS SAYING LOUD and clear what most of us wish we could have done. She has galvanized both young and old to stand up for swift and decisive action on climate chaos, which will be upon us soon because people in power made empty promises and took tepid action. These people fear her wisdom and courage, refusing to listen to the voice that echoes that of the masses. Those in power would do future generations a great service by listening to our young now.

Koo Wee Hon,
PETALING JAYA, MALAYSIA

RE “GUARDIANS OF THE YEAR: The Public Servants”: I sincerely thank you for recognizing all the Americans who serve their country with gratitude and no desire for great accolades or thanks. I was one of these faithful federal civil servants for 34 years. I’m thankful that the press is talking about their work and dispelling the myths about a “deep state.” I wish I could meet these brave people and tell them how thankful I am that we have honest American citizens working for us, doing what they think is right.

Moira D. Keane,
MOUIT, SENEGAL

THIS ISSUE IS AN INDISPENSABLE WORK of committed journalism. The Person of the Year may motivate us to save our planet, and the Guardians of the Year may impel us to save America. The press can have no higher goals!

Tom Hall,
FOSTER, R.I.
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‘It doesn’t really matter.’

DONALD TRUMP, U.S. President, in a Jan. 13 tweet on whether Iran’s General Qasem Soleimani was plotting “imminent” attacks, as the Trump Administration claimed after he was killed on Jan. 3 by an American drone strike.

‘I hope the Beijing authorities understand that democratic Taiwan, and our democratically elected government, will not concede to threats and intimidation.’

TSAI ING-WEN, President of Taiwan, after winning a landslide re-election victory on Jan. 11.

‘I thought a woman could win; he disagreed.’

ELIZABETH WARREN, Massachusetts Senator and 2020 Democratic presidential candidate, in a statement released on Jan. 13 describing a private December 2018 meeting she had with Vermont Senator Bernie Sanders; he denied making the remark.

“This airplane is designed by clowns, who in turn are supervised by monkeys.”

A BOEING COMPANY PILOT, on the now grounded 737 Max, in a 2017 message made public on Jan. 9.

‘I want to find a “life partner.” With that future partner of mine, I want to shout our love and world peace from outer space.’

YUSAKU MAEZAWA, Japanese billionaire, in a Jan. 9 announcement asking women to apply to join him on a mission around the moon.

Number of missile tubes on the Nanchang, the destroyer commissioned by the Chinese navy on Jan. 12, which will be one of the largest in Asia.

Snowboarding Olympic halfpipe champ Torah Bright will no longer compete in the event.

2,000
Approximate population of giant tortoises on Española Island in the Galápagos, up from just 15 in 1970, thanks in part to the efforts of Diego, a more than century-old male tortoise who was retired from a breeding program on Jan. 10.

Skiing A U.K. skier became the youngest woman to ski solo to the South Pole.

SOURCES: NEW YORK TIMES; NIKKEI; NBC SPORTS; SKY NEWS
ON THE SPOT
Senator Elizabeth Warren speaks in Mason City, Iowa, on Jan. 11; the impeachment trial is set to call her back to D.C.
The looming Senate trial of President Donald Trump has claimed its first victim, and it’s not the besieged Commander in Chief, any of his closest aides or even a Republican. On Jan. 13, Senator Cory Booker ended his race for the Democrats’ White House nomination, blaming the decision partly on the fact that “the urgent business of impeachment will rightly be keeping me in Washington.”

Booker’s attendance at Trump’s trial is not optional. Senators are required to be in the Capitol for it, every afternoon from Monday to Saturday, under penalty of arrest by the sergeant at arms. And Booker’s not the only one affected. Once the proceedings begin in earnest—perhaps as soon as Jan. 21, just 13 days before the Iowa caucuses—four candidates for the Democratic nomination, including top contenders Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, will be handicapped in the first-in-the-nation contest. “It’s a very difficult time for these campaigns,” says veteran Democratic strategist Matt Paul. “This is exactly when you want your candidate in the state a great deal.”

The Senate trial hands a temporary but critical edge on in-person campaigning to former Vice President Joe Biden and former South Bend, Ind., Mayor Pete Buttigieg, as well as to billionaires Michael Bloomberg and Tom Steyer, who are already blanketing the nation with ads. That may be good news for those Democrats who fear a far-left lurch under Warren or Sanders. It’s also a reminder that even an embattled Trump can influence the contest for the White House, playing captor to candidates vying to end his presidency the old-fashioned way.

THOSE PRESIDENTIAL HOPEFULS who happen to work in Senate office buildings are doing their best not to disappear from the scene. Senator Amy Klobuchar, who has seen a late rise in her polling in Iowa, is bracing for long hours at her desk on the Senate floor during impeachment proceedings, and even longer ones before and after as she attempts to stay in contention. Her campaign is considering things like beaming her into videoconferences in libraries, schools and living rooms so she can take voters’ questions from afar. Klobuchar will lean on a network of backers: she says she has more endorsements from current and former Iowa elected officials than anyone else in the race. “We are going to do everything we can to continue to get her message out,” a senior Klobuchar campaign aide says.

The bigger-name Senators in the race, Sanders and Warren, who have been drawing huge crowds as they compete for the progressive wing of the party, are including out-of-state proxies in their arsenals. Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has been promoting Sanders, and former Housing and Urban Development Secretary Julián Castro has been extolling the potential of his pal Warren. Allies of both candidates argue that the time off the trail won’t be as damaging to them as it will be to, say, Colorado’s Michael Bennet, who’s gone all in with a bid centered on New Hampshire’s Feb. 11 primary. The Warren and Sanders crews say their backers can weather a little neglect, whereas folks like Bennet and Klobuchar are still at a more fragile stage. Bennet’s campaign says New Hampshire is an easier jump for evening events.

Sanders also has money to mitigate his absence. He paid more than $77,000 for Facebook ads targeting Iowa in 2020’s first week, compared with the less than $8,000 Biden’s campaign spent chasing the same audience during that period, according to a tracking database published by the Democratic consultancy Bully Pulpit Interactive. Warren, whose fundraising sagged at the end of 2019, spent less than $15,000 on Facebook ads during that window.

Even with proxies and campaign funds hard at work, Sanders and Warren are at risk if their message of a revolution gets stuck in Washington. There is little better than in-person, retail-style campaigning in Iowa and New Hampshire, where voters like to poke and prod the campaigns. A Des Moines Register/CNN poll released on Jan. 10 found almost one-third of likely Iowa caucusgoers still undecided or backing someone who is not viable under party rules that require 15% support to win any delegates.

Sanders, whose momentum wasn’t disrupted by an October heart attack that kept him off the trail, promises an aggressive campaign no matter what. “He’ll be out there on weekends, and he can get out there on evenings,” says Representative Ro Khanna, a national co-chair of Sanders’ campaign. “His priority will be the Senate trial. He’s made that clear.” Warren is similarly putting on a brave face. “There are some things that are more important than politics, and if we have an impeachment proceeding going on, I will be there,” she told reporters in Rochester, N.H., on Dec. 7. “This is not about politics.”

Some voters appreciate that stance. “I respect them more for going and upholding their oath to the Constitution and their duties there,” says 49-year-old Mary Kay Smith of Des Moines. That’s not keeping Smith from keeping her options open. On Jan. 13, Smith, who is leaning toward Buttigieg, attended a town hall to see fringe contender Andrew Yang speak. — With reporting by Charlotte Alter/New York, LiSSandra VillA/Des Moines, Iowa, and Abby Vesoulis/WaShinGtOn
THE BULLETIN

Iranian authorities struggle to contain protests afterdowning of jetliner

IT TOOK THREE DAYS FOR IRAN TO ADMIT the truth. Hours after it launched missiles at bases in Iraq that house U.S. troops on Jan. 8, a Ukraine International Airlines passenger jet bound for Kyiv crashed shortly after taking off from Tehran, killing all 176 on board. Iranian officials suggested the cause was technical failure but backtracked on Jan. 11, saying “human error” had led its military to shoot down the plane and blaming “U.S. adventurism” for creating the situation. Angry and distrustful, Iranians poured onto the streets as footage circulated of protesters chanting, “Death to the dictator.”

SENTIMENT SWING Days earlier, millions of Iranians had gathered in grief and rage after a U.S. airstrike killed Iranian commander Qasem Soleimani on Jan. 3. But the feeling shifted when it seemed Tehran was trying to cover up its role in the crash. “We are not citizens. We never were,” one of Iran’s most popular actors, Taraneh Alidoosti, wrote to her nearly 6 million Instagram followers on Jan. 12. “We are captives.” That night, police reportedly fired live ammunition at protesters in Tehran, injuring several. (The police deny firing the shots.)

RENEWED PROTESTS The period of national unity that followed Soleimani’s death marked a rare moment of reprieve for Iran’s leadership, which was rocked in November by the largest antigovernment demonstrations since the 1979 revolution. Sparked by a domestic gas-price hike amid crippling U.S. sanctions, that unrest prompted a nationwide Internet blackout during which security forces killed more than 300 demonstrators, according to Amnesty International.

DAMAGED TRUST As the U.S. sanctions bite, lower-income Iranians in traditionally pro-regime areas have joined protests normally populated by the middle classes and students. But after the crash, critical voices emerged from even less likely quarters. Resigning from the state broadcaster, a journalist asked viewers to forgive her for “the 13 years I told you lies.” The editor in chief of the right-wing Tasnim news agency also blamed “officials who misled the media,” tweeting, “We are all ashamed before the people.” With President Trump warning that the “world is watching,” Iran’s next steps will be under the spotlight both at home and abroad. —JOSEPH HINCKS
Deadly avalanches strike Kashmir

At least 55 people died and dozens were injured in Pakistani-administered Kashmir as avalanches caused by heavy rain and snowfall swept villages, officials said on Jan. 14. Twelve people were also confirmed dead in the Indian-controlled part of the disputed Himalayan territory.

U.S. and China sign ‘phase one’ trade deal

Beijing and Washington sealed “phase one” of a trade deal on Jan. 15, cooling a trade war that began in 2018. The deal commits China to $200 billion in additional purchases of U.S. goods, in exchange for a rollback in some tariffs and a hold on further punitive measures from the U.S.

Former Pope speaks out on celibacy

Retired Pope Benedict XVI has asked that his name be removed as a co-author of a new book after its Jan. 15 publication made headlines for his having taken a stance against allowing married men in the Amazon region to be ordained. Pope Francis is considering relaxing celibacy rules to address the shortage of priests in the area.

The most exciting new products from CES 2020

CES, the annual Las Vegas tech confab, is a showcase for the latest in technology and consumer gadgets—from improved products announced by major corporations to truly innovative ideas made real by entrepreneurial spirits. Here are some of the most exciting gadgets from this year’s exhibition, which ended Jan. 10, and you can find the rest of our top picks at time.com/CES2020. —PATRICK LUCAS AUSTIN

SEGWAY S-POD

Segway’s new S-Pod is, essentially, a two-wheeled self-balancing stroller that can hit speeds of up to 24 m.p.h. You control the S-Pod, unlike other Segway products, with a joystick instead of your body, making for a more relaxing jaunt around town. The S-Pod is outfitted with smart safety features too, such as automatic braking on turns and exterior lights that can double as turn signals.

HYDRALOOP WATER RECYCLER

With water conservation and sustainable tech set to take center stage in the coming years, Hydraloop’s water recycler is a no-brainer of an invention. The large appliance, which filters and purifies gray water from baths, showers and washing machines, can recycle up to 85% of the water used in the home for reuse in toilets, pools and irrigation systems (but not your kitchen sink, so don’t fret).

ACER CONCEPTD 7 EZEL

Acer’s ConceptD 7 Ezel is a laptop doubling as an artist’s easel, and doing it with style. Its 15.6-in. 4K display can be propped up to show off your work, used like a traditional laptop or folded flat for serious sketching. Built for artists, the Ezel supports the full range of Adobe RGB colors and features Nvidia graphics to keep your apps running smoothly when your work gets more complex.

CANON EOS-1D X MARK III

Rumors of the DSLR camera’s demise have been greatly exaggerated, judging by Canon’s update to its beloved—and expensive—EOS-1D X lineup. With improvements like the faster Digic X processor, burst shooting at 16 frames per second, and face and head tracking thanks to improved computer vision tech, it also shoots 5.5K RAW video and 4K video at 60 frames per second.

FISKER OCEAN

Electric vehicle maker Fisker is using its luxury SUV, the Ocean, to show the competition how to make eco-friendly vehicles. The Ocean boasts an all-electric drivetrain and vegan-leather interior, plus a slick solar-panel roof for passive battery charging—as well as a cool “California Mode” that rolls down every window for an open-air feeling without the safety compromises of a true convertible.

MOON ULTRALIGHT

Smartphone photos are always improving, but lighting remains an issue. Enter the Moon UltraLight, a tiny, touch-sensitive, clip-on light source that doesn’t require a bulky case. Its multiple color temperatures and adjustable brightness also make it the perfect companion for those with darker skin tones, whose photos are done a disservice by the cooler light often used on smartphone camera modules.
The Houston Astros
For stealing signs
ON JAN. 13, BASEBALL commissioner Rob Manfred fined the Houston Astros $5 million, swiped their first- and second-round draft picks for the next two years, and suspended general manager Jeff Luhnow and manager A.J. Hinch for a season because Houston used electronic espionage to steal signs from opposing catchers in 2017 and 2018. Thus a World Series title was forever stained: Houston cheated in the 2017 playoffs, and won.

Houston later fired Luhnow and Hinch. The Boston Red Sox effectively canned manager Alex Cora, an architect of Houston’s scheme as its bench coach in 2017; Cora won a World Series in 2018 as Boston’s manager (the Red Sox are also under investigation for shady surveillance).

Manfred acknowledged that baseball’s perceived “integrity” problem has inflicted “significant harm to the game.” For a sport already struggling to enthuse a new generation of fans, this scandal could be a disaster.

—SEAN GREGORY

A royal restructuring
The Queen greenlights Megxit
IN BRITAIN, THE ROYAL FAMILY IS NICKNAMED “THE FIRM,” AND on Jan. 13 its chief executive announced a “period of transition” ahead of a pending demerger. A week after Prince Harry and his wife Meghan shocked the public and royalty alike by announcing their intent to seek a “progressive new role” largely outside the family business, Queen Elizabeth II acted to stem potential “Megxit” damage: she convened a summit with her eldest son and his offspring to discuss how the Duke and Duchess of Sussex might live independently of the institution she has presided over for more than six decades.

Beyond the logistical difficulties, Harry and Meghan’s decision presents an existential problem for the royals. The popular Sussexes invested the crown with the kind of youthful glamour and modernity that might appeal to a new generation of subjects. But if one pair of senior royals can relinquish its duties and its claim to lavish taxpayer-funded lifestyles, it gives antimonarchists a powerful argument in asking why the others cannot. In a worst-case scenario, Harry and Meghan could become a 21st century Edward VIII and Wallis Simpson, whose postabdication embrace of celebrity became an enduring source of embarrassment to the family.

Exactly what was said in the Jan. 13 summit remains behind palace doors, and the Queen’s statement about it was crafted as precisely as any CEO announcement. She expressed support for the Sussexes, but noted her personal preference for things to stay the same and said the transition would be carefully managed. That stance may reassure the firm’s investors, but the effects of this royal restructuring on the nation’s balance sheet will take longer to divine. —DAN STEWART
Morning Edition host Steve Inskeep finds the American present in the past he mines as an author
By Karl Vick

IF HE IS IN BED BY 9 P.M., STEVE INSKEEP CAN GET six hours of sleep before the alarm. He’s due at NPR’s Washington, D.C., headquarters at 4 a.m. for the live broadcast of Morning Edition that starts an hour later. It means the most intense part of his workday is over when a lot of people are just heading to the office around 7:30, and he passes the rest of the morning preparing for the next day’s broadcast. “But the afternoons are sometimes mine,” Inskeep says, over a clamshell of scrambled eggs and bacon in the NPR cafeteria. “Sometimes they’re not. Someone will say, ‘The Senator will talk to you at 4 p.m.’ And so I’m just going to have a long day, and it’s fine. But other days I can escape at noon, and I may go over to the Library of Congress.” It’s where he researches his books, works of history that illuminate both the past and the present visible in it. The newest, published on Jan. 14, is Imperfect Union: How Jessie and John Frémont Mapped the West, Invented Celebrity, and Helped Cause the Civil War. It relates the life story of the man who popularized the settlement of the Great Plains and Rocky Mountains, and, kind of by accident, added the Pacific coast to the U.S. It is no less the story of the woman who found a rare agency of her own in ensuring that her husband’s name was widely known. It was Frémont who named the Golden Gate, as the prosenium to trade with China. The Republican Party’s first-ever nominee for President, he was so famous in his day that a magazine declared him one of the three most important figures since Jesus Christ.

“But it’s hard to figure out why,” Inskeep says, of the figure who today lives on mostly in the names of cities and streets that date to the era of his renown. “And I began to realize that for him, fame was the entire point. He went and did these explorations of the West, but they weren’t really about discovering new things, for the most part. They were about mapping trails that were already there and making it all explainable to the public and writing these beautiful lyrical reports that would become best-selling books or excerpted in newspapers so that people would be enticed to settle the West. To move west. Publicity was the point. And in the course of making the West more appealing, he made himself more famous.”

This was the 1850s, immigrants were falling out of favor with American-borns, and race, in the form of slavery, was the irreducible foundation for all political discourse. “The political arguments then feel like the political arguments now,” Inskeep notes. “The terminology has changed a little bit. The human emotions that underlie the politics are very similar. What’s happening here is America is establishing its borders and arguing over its identity: Who gets to be American and why?”

ON THE PAGE, Inskeep’s voice sounds like it does on the radio, or wherever it’s heard out in the real world. “I will get into a taxi and just say the address and hear, ‘How are you doing, Mr. Inskeep?’” At a kids’ birthday party, another parent once told him, “You have an interesting voice. Have you ever thought about going into radio?”

In many ways, it’s the voice of reason. Inskeep has a way of approaching a topic that projects both curiosity and openness to new information, which is another way of saying he models responsible civic behavior. He does this so well that during live interviews, Inskeep can get away with quick asides to correct something incorrect that a guest has just asserted, and then just continue the interview. It’s particularly impressive at National Public Radio, a world-class news organization sometimes confused with its stereotyped listener: a liberal with a furrowed brow and a canvas tote. The reality, especially in remote parts of the country, is far more nuanced, and Inskeep holds no truck with the notion that the appetite for thoughtful and thorough reporting is governed by political inclination.

“I think, also, the whole thing about who is liberal and who is conservative, who is biased, is a way of not talking about the facts of the story at hand,” he adds. “It’s a way of telling people, ‘Don’t think about the facts. Don’t listen to this person because I say they shouldn’t be listened to.’ The reality is that everybody who is politically engaged in America has some kind of opinion about something. As a journalist, I try to never have a final-final view of anything. Almost everybody you talk to has an opinion, which doesn’t mean they’re invalid. The question is do they make an argument that makes sense? Do they show their work? Are there facts to support what they’re saying? And that’s what we should actually be looking at, regardless of the political background of whoever we’re listening to. Do they make any sense? Do they prove their case? Do they connect dots that obviously don’t connect?”

NPR headquarters stands a few blocks north of the U.S. Capitol, in what had been a warehouse for the local telephone company. At 6 a.m., the lobby is vacant, but upstairs, the vast central newsroom is awake and alert. In the control room, halfway through the morning show, Inskeep is in the chair on the right, co-host Noel King a few feet away on...
As a journalist, I try to never have a final-final view of anything.

STEVE INSKEEP, co-host of NPR’s Morning Edition and author of Imperfect Union

the left. He addresses the microphone like it was a person, one elbow propped on the arm of his chair, the other arm gesturing as he speaks.

Inskeep, 51, is tall and has the looks and presence to be on television, which he sometimes is, doing interviews in the field with regular people on a feature called Three Meals for CBS This Morning. But the roughly 14 million people who tune in to NPR’s Morning Edition each week is more than any TV news show draws on a given night. And as a news medium, public radio is uncommonly healthy. NPR has benefited from the surge in interest in the news since the 2016 election. And at the local level, new funding has public stations hiring.

“There might have been two reporters, and now they have 32. Like, a ridiculous increase,” Inskeep says. “That’s still nothing compared to the loss of the local newspaper that had 350 reporters and now has 35. But if you listen to WAMU here in Washington, you will hear serious, interesting, national-quality local-news coverage of things that matter. And people respond to that as well.”

Not everyone, of course. On my way to see Inskeep, the Uber driver asked what I’d like to hear. I said NPR, but he heard MPR and his Apple CarPlay brought up the song by Pop Smoke. National Public Radio produced a song by Sledding With Tigers. The world of news is not everyone’s.

It’s one of the reasons Inskeep writes books. Maybe it was mostly coincidence that his previous one, Jacksonland, published in 2015, centered on the populist President whom Donald Trump would declare his favorite upon taking office two years later. But it’s no less likely that from the place he has made in the news cycle, Inskeep was responding to deep tones that sound through generations.

“History is often on my mind, and the long view of things is often on my mind,” he says. “Probably the vast majority of things that get labeled breaking news are not actually things you need to know, and you won’t even remember them or need to remember them two hours from now. And I would rather spend the time that I have with people on the radio talking about things that I think they will need to know, that will be useful to them over time.”
In the ashes

Volcanic ash coats the landscape and livestock near Laurel, Batangas province, Philippines, on Jan. 13, a day after the Taal Volcano, a popular tourist attraction south of Manila, began to spew ash, steam and lava. The eruption forced thousands to evacuate their homes and shut down an international airport, offices and schools as clouds of ash blew into the capital region. The Philippine Institute of Volcanology and Seismology set the alert level at 4, warning that a worse eruption might come in “hours to days.”

Photograph by Mark R. Cristino—EPA-EFE/Shutterstock
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The fridge needs help. Because much of the energy we need to power it produces waste, pollutes the atmosphere and changes the climate. We can transition the way we produce and use energy in a way that will contribute to a sustainable future. We’re campaigning in countries all around the world to provide the solutions for governments, for companies and for all members of society to make the right choices about energy conservation and use. And you, as an individual, can help just by the choices you make. Help us look after the world where you live at panda.org

Spitsbergen, Norway
© Wild Wonders of Europe / Ole Joergen Liodden / WWF
The man’s scraggly hair and white bushy beard hung from a wrinkled face as he stood with a shopping cart filled with clothes, shoes and empty cans. When Americans spot such a homeless person, the impulse is often to hurry past. That’s impossible when you suddenly realize that the homeless person is your old friend and neighbor.
“It’s good to see you,” Mike Stepp greeted us warmly. Mike and his brother, Bobby, were Nick’s closest neighbors growing up, and they used to walk together to and from their school bus each day in rural Yamhill, Ore.

Their family had purchased a home and seemed to be living the American Dream. That was true across America: until the 1970s, the working class made enormous gains. Yet Mike and Bobby both dropped out of high school and struggled to find good blue collar jobs like the one held by their dad, a Korean War hero who worked in a lumber mill. Mike self-medicated with alcohol and drugs. As for Bobby, he’s serving a life sentence in prison for child sexual abuse.

They are lucky to be alive. About a quarter of the kids who rode Nick’s bus are dead from drugs, alcohol, suicide, reckless accidents or similar pathologies. Two separate families have lost four of five children.

This wasn’t one town’s problem but a crisis for all of working-class America, whether white, black or brown. “Deaths of despair,” as mortality from drugs, alcohol and suicides is known, have sent life expectancy in the U.S. falling for three years in a row, for the first time in a century.

IN AFFLUENT AMERICA, people either don’t notice this humanitarian crisis or think that it’s hopeless. But there are tested solutions that are imperfect but do chip away at these problems—and often save public money.

The highest-return investment available in America today isn’t in hedge funds or private equity, but in at-risk children. It’s much easier to help a 3-month-old or a 3-year-old than a 13-year-old or a 30-year-old. Programs like Nurse-Family Partnership or Reach Out and Read help young children as their brains are developing. The results are outstanding.

Another crucial public investment is in drug and alcohol treatment. America’s big policy response to narcotics was the war on drugs, which was expensive and ineffective. It should be a scandal that just slightly more than 1 in 10 Americans with substance-abuse disorders gets treatment. Every dollar invested in treatment can save about $12 in reduced crime, court costs and health care savings.

We also can do much more to help people find well-paying jobs. If the federal minimum wage had kept pace with inflation and productivity since 1968, it would now be more than $22 an hour, not $7.25. That’s one reason 76% of adults expect their children’s lives to be worse than their own—and one reason so many white working-class men and women voted for Donald Trump; he did particularly well in areas with high rates of “deaths of despair.”

Most other countries have figured out how to tackle these problems. Automation and globalization affect workers in Canada and Germany as well, but life expectancy is not falling in those countries. Meanwhile, the U.S. has effectively addressed some social problems. We’ve reduced teen pregnancy. We’ve raised high school graduation rates. We’ve cut veteran homelessness—which suggests that if we wanted to slash child homelessness, we could probably accomplish that too. So there’s reason to be optimistic.

Something similar to today’s malaise occurred in the Soviet Union. It was still a superpower

Adapted from Tightrope: Americans Reaching for Hope. Kristof, a New York Times columnist, and WuDunn, a business consultant, were the first married couple to win a Pulitzer Prize for journalism

Heaven on earth

Many people think you go to heaven when you die, but according to N.T. Wright, professor of New Testament and early Christianity at the University of St. Andrews, that’s not what the early Christians believed. “The point was not for us to ‘go to heaven,’ but for the life of heaven to arrive on earth,” he explains.

Under attack

After 14 years of reporting in India, journalist Rana Ayyub thought she’d seen the worst. Then she saw police stand by as masked men attacked university students.

“The first week of the new decade marked a remarkable low for law and order in India, a low for our justice system and our political leadership,” she writes.
Rigged!: Who governs the U.S.?

November elections will produce a result many will see as illegitimate. If Donald Trump wins amid credible charges of irregularities, the result will be contested. If he loses, particularly if the vote is close, same. The loser is unlikely to accept a court-decided outcome as legitimate.

2 The great decoupling

The decoupling of the U.S.-Chinese tech sector is already disrupting bilateral flows of tech, talent and investment. In 2020, it will move beyond strategic tech sectors like semiconductors and 5G into broader economic activity, casting a deep geopolitical chill over global business.

3 U.S.-China

As this decoupling occurs, U.S.-China tensions will provoke an explicit clash over national security, influence and values. The two sides will continue to use economic tools in this struggle: sanctions, export controls and boycotts.

4 Corps not to the rescue

Far from filling the gaps on critical issues created by underperforming national governments, multinational corporations will face new pressures from political officials, both elected and unelected, working to manage slowing global growth, widening inequality, populist rivals and security challenges.

5 India gets Modi-fied

In 2019, Prime Minister Narendra Modi made Hindu nationalism a central focus of Indian government policy. Now protests of various kinds have expanded across India. Emboldened state-level opposition leaders will directly challenge the central government, leaving Modi less room to maneuver on economic reform.

6 Geopolitical Europe

The E.U. aims to more aggressively defend itself against competing economic and political models, generating friction with the U.S. and China. On regulation, antitrust officials will continue to battle North American tech giants. On trade, the E.U. will become more assertive on rules enforcement and retaliatory tariffs.

7 Politics vs. economics of climate change

Climate change will put governments and investors on a collision course with corporate decisionmakers. Civil society will be unforgiving of investors and companies. Disruption to supply chains is a meaningful risk. Investors will reduce exposures to carbon-intensive industries, sending asset prices lower.

8 Shi’ite cresendo

The failure of U.S. policy toward Iran, Iraq and Syria creates significant risks for regional stability. Neither Trump nor Iran’s leaders want all-out war, but Iran will disrupt tanker traffic in the Persian Gulf and will hit the U.S. in cyberspace. Feckless U.S. policy in Syria will also drive regional risk in 2020.

9 Discontent in Latin America

Continuing anger over sluggish growth, corruption and low-quality public services will keep the risk of political instability high. Demand for more state spending will reduce the ability of governments to undertake austerity measures. We’ll see more protests, fiscal balances will deteriorate, and antiestablishment politicians will grow stronger.

10 Turkey

President Recep Tayyip Erdogan has entered a period of steep political decline. He’s suffering defections from his own party as popular former allies establish new parties. His ruling coalition is shaky. Relations with the U.S. will hit new lows as likely U.S. sanctions take effect.

2020 will prove a tipping point for the world. Developed-world countries are toxically polarized. Climate change matters as never before. China and the U.S. are breaking the 21st century economy in two.

SCIENCE

Taking a new temperature

For 150 years, 98.6°F (37°C) has been considered “normal” human body temperature. But recently, Stanford University researchers analyzed some 677,000 temperature readings collected from nearly 190,000 people, from 1862 to 2017, and found that they fell by 0.054°F and 0.052°F per decade for men and women, respectively, in those years. Changes in average height and weight could explain some of the decline, says Julie Parsonnet, a Stanford professor and lead author of the study. And today, she adds, “we have better nutrition, medical care and public health.” But perhaps most important, antibiotics and vaccines can control many of the inflammatory conditions that can drive up body temperature. Plus, she says, if we do get sick, “we conquered general inflammation with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and statins,” which frees the body from heating up in an effort to fight off disease. The findings suggest doctors should move toward more personalized temperature readings that take into account all the things that affect body temperature, like height, weight, age, time of day and outside temperature. —Alice Park
The View Essay

The complicated truth about U.S. citizenship
By Laila Lalami

THE FIRST TIME I SAW THE STATUE OF LIBERTY WAS 25 years ago, from a noisy ferry that brought me and hundreds of other eager tourists across New York Harbor. Back then I was a foreign student, in Manhattan for three days to attend an academic conference on linguistics. I had only one afternoon to devote to sightseeing, and faced with the choice of which landmark to visit, I settled immediately on Ellis Island. The site loomed large in my imagination, likely because of its romantic portrayal in the American movies I had grown up watching. I ambled through the stately inspection room, where original chandeliers cast their pale light, sat for a few minutes on the wooden benches, then went inside the exhibit rooms, filled with artifacts documenting the arrival of immigrants.

I still remember the jolt of surprise I felt when I came across a portrait of three Moroccan men and a little boy, all clad in national dress—cloak, djellaba, cross-body bag, leather slippers. It was a trace of a history I didn’t know existed. After the surprise wore off, I began to wonder about their names, their pasts, their families, their reasons for emigrating. Years later, researching this picture online, I discovered that the photographer, an employee of the Executive Division of Immigration, had scribbled “Arab jugglers” on the back of the print. These were performers, then, seeking fame or fortune here. They forged new identities and became Americans, just like the other 12 million immigrants and refugees who passed through Ellis Island from 1882 to 1954. Or at least, that is how the story goes: America was formed from huddled masses yearning to breathe free.

As I walked around the exhibit rooms at the Ellis Island immigration museum, it never occurred to me that someday I would become an immigrant too, and eventually a citizen. At the time, my goal had been to complete a graduate degree in linguistics and return to Morocco. But my life took an unexpected turn when I met and fell in love with an American. I said yes to him, and yes to staying here. Years passed, during which I learned more about the country I now called home: its charms and foibles, its culture and history, its claims to being a “nation of immigrants.” And I came to understand that, like any origin story, this one leaves out inconvenient details.

THE BOUNDARIES OF AMERICANNESS, which seem so elastic in the myth of a “nation of immigrants,” have in fact been very rigid—and always, always contested. At the founding of the United States, American citizenship was available exclusively to “free white persons.” It took decades of struggle, and a bloody civil war, before citizenship was extended to formerly enslaved people and their descendants. Indigenous people, who were members of sovereign nations, did not have full access to citizenship until 1924. And for much of this country’s history, a slew of race-based immigration laws, like the Chinese Exclusion Act, prevented most immigrants from outside Western Europe from coming to the U.S. or claiming U.S. citizenship.

It is tempting to think that this ugly history is behind us. Yet even a glance at current headlines makes it clear how deeply entrenched white-supremacist ideas about Americanness remain. The Trump Administration announced in 2019 that it would cut the number of refugees the U.S. will resettle in 2020 to no more than 18,000, the lowest number since the program was created 40 years ago. These refugees come principally from Asia, Africa
and Latin America, which is to say they often come from countries the President has frequently disparaged. Ken Cuccinelli, the acting head of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, has long been an opponent of birthright citizenship and last fall told reporters that he doesn’t believe a constitutional amendment would be needed to end it. And Stephen Miller, the White House aide who has long echoed white-nationalist talking points and who is widely credited with being the architect of the Muslim ban, has pushed for sweeping changes to immigration laws that would favor people who speak English.

There are also rhetorical clues from this Administration and its supporters about who gets to be a “real” American. Last summer, Donald Trump called on Congresswomen Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, Ilhan Omar, Ayanna Pressley and Rashida Tlaib to “go back” to the “crime-infested places” from which they came. (All but Omar were born in the U.S.) More recently, conservative cable hosts like Laura Ingraham and Brian Kilmeade insinuated that Alexander Vindman—an official at the National Security Council who testified that the President had asked the leader of Ukraine to investigate a political rival in exchange for military aid—might not be entirely loyal to the U.S. because he was an immigrant. It didn’t matter that Vindman was an active-duty officer in the U.S. Army; his allegiance was called into question.

**BEING AMERICAN** isn’t just a state of being, whether native or acquired. It’s a relationship between an individual and the nation-state. To be an American means, among other things, to have the right to vote in state and federal elections, to have protection from unreasonable searches, to be free to speak or worship or assemble without government interference. In the past, these rights, protections and liberties were not granted equally to all, and they still aren’t today. For instance, millions of formerly incarcerated people in states like Alabama, Kentucky, Florida and Mississippi have lost the right to vote and are therefore shut out of the democratic process. This has vastly disproportionate effects on black men. By comparison, Vermont and Maine, the two whitest states in the union, allow both incarcerated and formerly incarcerated people to vote. Citizenship is supposed to be an equalizer, yet in many ways it still functions as a tiered system that mirrors past racial hierarchies.

Four years ago, while I was visiting New York for a literary event, I took my daughter and niece to see the Statue of Liberty and Ellis Island. It was a cloudy day in June, but the air was thick with humid heat. Both girls were excited about seeing the national landmarks; both undertook ancestry searches at the interactive exhibits. Although neither site was new to me any longer, I felt just as moved as the first time I’d seen them. There is something deeply seductive about these symbols. Even with the awareness of America’s history of colonial expansion and white supremacy, the promise of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness is still a potent lure.

I live with this contradiction every day, with the knowledge that the bleak past and the better future meet in the present moment. Citizenship is both an idea and an ideal, the journey from one to the other a measure of the nation’s progress. I wish this journey could be taken in a giant leap, even as I fear it will be walked slowly, fearfully, and with many steps back along the way. Yet I keep the faith. Perhaps it’s because I’m a novelist, whose work involves constant use of the imagination. Or perhaps it’s because I’m an immigrant, whose vantage point grants the privilege to look at the country from the inside and the outside. Either way, I know that promise is the best catalyst for progress.

Lalami is the author of four novels, including The Other Americans, a finalist for the National Book Award. Her new book, Conditional Citizens: On Belonging in America, will be published in April.
Just what the doctor shouldn’t order
By Jamie Ducharme

Beyond its effects on the body, medical care can be a balm for the mind. Extensive treatment can feel like a promise that doctors have done everything possible. But that perceived security can come at a high price. As health costs soar, patients are emptying their pockets for care that may not make them healthier, research suggests. Last year, a 5,000-person trial showed that for patients with chronic but stable heart disease, surgical procedures such as stenting and bypass did not reduce the risk of heart attack or death more than lifestyle interventions and medication. Even patients with extensive damage did not, on average, experience fewer heart problems after surgery than those who simply took meds, ate well, exercised and didn’t smoke.

The findings upended assumptions about cardiac care, says co-author Dr. Robert Harrington, a cardiologist and the chair of the department of medicine at Stanford University. Harrington says doctors have long assumed surgery is the way to go for patients with blocked arteries—but the new study adds nuance to that notion. “We can’t just trust our intuition. We need data,” Harrington says. “I actually think this is a good thing for medicine, to pause and think, Why do we do that?”

Across the medical field, doctors are reconsidering the status quo. Many surgeries are medically necessary and even lifesaving—but increasingly, evidence suggests invasive care shouldn’t always be a physician’s knee-jerk reaction.

A 2016 paper found that men who actively monitored their early-stage prostate cancer were no more likely to die over the next decade than those who opted for surgery or radiation. Research has shown that physical therapy can be just as restorative as surgery for a torn meniscus. Studies have found that C-sections are not only unnecessary for many deliveries but also potentially risky. Numerous minimally invasive alternatives to open surgery have been shown to be safer and equally effective. Taken together, these results from disparate corners of the medical field point to a changing approach to treatment.

That shift stands not only to improve patient outcomes; it could also chip away at care costs. A 2010 Institute of Medicine report estimated that overtreatment costs the U.S. medical system $210 billion per year. In a 2017 survey, U.S. doctors said more than 20% of medical care was unnecessary—even as access to care is lacking for many. Fear of malpractice lawsuits and patient requests or pressure were the most common reasons for ordering unnecessary prescriptions, tests and procedures, while more than 70% of respondents said physicians are more likely to perform unnecessary services when they profit from them.

Overtreatment also often begets overtreatment. In a fall 2019 survey of about 400 interns, 94% said they had observed an unnecessary “cascade of care”—an ultimately frivolous chain of interventions often triggered by a fluke test or screening.

Co-author Dr. Ishani Ganguli, an assistant professor of medicine at Harvard Medical School, says these cascades waste patients’ time and money and lead to unnecessary pain and stress. She and other doctors are bringing awareness to these consequences through research and resources like ChoosingWisely.org, a website that aims to spark conversation between doctors and patients about which tests and procedures are actually worth it. “Things are changing, but slowly,” Ganguli says.

Harrington, meanwhile, hopes the growing body of evidence on overtreatment will be seen not as a total condemnation of invasive procedures but rather as a call for more thoughtful treatment decisions. In some cases, of course, surgery will still be the right decision. But patients who opt against it can take comfort in knowing their health may not be the worse for it.
Denying climate science while my nation burns
By Malcolm Turnbull

AUSTRALIA’S FIRES THIS SUMMER—UNPRECEDENTED IN the scale of their destruction—are the ferocious but inevitable reality of global warming. A hotter, drier climate means more and longer droughts and more and fiercer fires.

So if Australia is on the front line of the climate crisis, why are we not also a world leader in climate action?

In most countries, asking people whether they believe in the science of climate change is like asking them whether they believe in gravity. It is a simple matter of physics. The more greenhouse gases are in the atmosphere, the hotter our climate will become.

But in Australia, as in the U.S., this issue has been hijacked by a toxic, climate-denying alliance of right-wing politics and media (much of it owned by Rupert Murdoch), as well as vested business interests, especially in the coal industry.

As Prime Minister, I tried to ensure that our climate and energy policies were governed by engineering and economics, not ideology and idiocy. Tragically, the climate-denying political right in Australia has turned what should be a practical question of how to respond to a real physical threat into a matter of values or belief.

Even as the fires rage, Murdoch’s News Corp. newspapers and television networks have been busy arguing that arsonists or a lack of controlled burning are the real causes of the fires. This has been refuted point-blank by the chief of the fire service in New South Wales, but the misinformation campaign continues in both mainstream and social media.

CLIMATE-CHANGE DENIAL has also infected our politics. Australia is currently governed by a center-right coalition of the Liberal Party and the National Party. I led the coalition twice—first as opposition leader from 2008 to 2009 and then as Prime Minister from 2013 to 2018. Both times, my efforts to take concerted action on climate change were followed by my losing my job.

In 2018, my government introduced a National Energy Guarantee (NEG), which combined emission reductions with reliability standards as a means of ensuring a smooth transition to a lower-emissions electricity sector while maintaining reliability of supply. It was supported by business and unions as well as state governments on both sides of politics. A majority of coalition legislators also backed it, but a right-wing minority, supported by their allies in the media, sabotaged the bill and then brought down my government.

In the chaos that ensued, Scott Morrison became Prime Minister, and one of his first acts was to formally abandon the NEG. Since then, the government has had no coherent, integrated climate and energy policy.

These fires show that the wicked, self-destructive idiocy of climate denialism must stop. The world must drastically cut its greenhouse-gas emissions. Above all, we have to urgently stop burning coal and other fossil fuels. Australia, rather than being a laggard, should be a leader in climate action. Not just because our country is on fire. Not just because we are a wealthy, advanced economy that can afford to lead. But also because we have formidable wind and solar resources that can enable us to generate all of our energy from renewable sources and at the same time enjoy cheaper electricity. Renewable resources are already the cheapest new power sources in Australia, and new developments in storage technologies are making renewables reliable 24/7.

That’s why I started Snowy Hydro 2.0, a project that will use pumped water to create energy and, like a battery, store enough power for 3 million homes for a week. The latest estimates show that by 2030, power from solar panels, backed with storage from pumped hydro, will be more than $40 per megawatt-hour cheaper than power from new black coal, even without a carbon tax.

Australians no longer need to sacrifice economic growth to reduce emissions. We must not waste this climate crisis. There are no excuses and not much time left. Australia and the world need a Green New Deal now.

Turnbull was Prime Minister of Australia from 2015 to 2018.
INSIDE

THE UNUSUAL POWER OF JARED KUSHNER

BY BRIAN BENNETT

GAME

PHOTOGRAPHS BY CHRISTOPHER LEE FOR TIME
Jared Kushner’s White House office is a shrine to his own influence. Gold-framed accolades from his father-in-law hang on the walls, written in thick black Sharpie in President Donald Trump’s spiky hand. To Jared, great job on Mexico. Thanks Dad, reads one. A limestone replica of the plaque marking the move of the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem, which Kushner helped orchestrate, rests atop a bookcase. There’s his medal representing the Order of the Aztec Eagle, the highest award given to foreigners by the Mexican government, with whom Kushner hammered out a trade deal. Above the door is a commemorative poster for the criminal-justice bill Kushner shepherded, signed by the rapper Kanye West. (To Jared from Your Friend YE.) Near his desk sits a rack of folders with handwritten labels that nod to Kushner’s unrealistically broad policy portfolio: health care, Lebanon, border infrastructure, Central America econ plan, potus environment, DOJ [Department of Justice].

The office is smaller than the others lining the south wall of the West Wing, where some of the President’s top aides cloister. But Kushner, an erstwhile real estate developer, values setting over size, and chose the space adjoining Trump’s private dining room, the President’s favorite hideaway. “Not the biggest office in the world, but it’s a good location,” he explains to TIME. Kushner likes to show visitors the spot on one wall where a door to the President’s inner sanctum was plastered over. “This is where Monica used to come in,” he says, of the former White House intern who visited Bill Clinton’s study.

The rack of folders does not contain his entire portfolio. As senior adviser to the President, he’s been entrusted with brokering peace in the Middle East, building a border wall, reforming the criminal-justice system, pursuing diplomacy with China and Mexico, and creating an “Office of American Innovation” dedicated to revamping how the government works. Kushner is in charge of the President’s 2020 re-election campaign, overseeing fundraising, strategy and advertising. He has walk-in privileges in the Oval Office and can weigh in on any decision across the building. “Nobody has more influence in the White House than Jared. Nobody has more influence outside the White House than Jared,” says Brad Parscale, whom Kushner installed as Trump’s campaign manager. “He’s No. 2 after Trump.”

At the start of Trump’s term, very few people in Washington considered this a good thing. Some White House officials complained privately that the President’s decision to task his 39-year-old son-in-law with some of the world’s hardest problems made the Administration look incompetent at best and corrupt at worst. Conservative Republicans worried that Kushner and his wife Ivanka, both former Democratic donors like Trump himself, would steer the new President toward the political center. To liberals, Kushner was a case study in the dangers of nepotism, a dilettante playing diplomat who was either unable or unwilling to use his political capital to rein in Trump’s worst impulses.

His first few months after Trump won the White House were littered with mistakes that showcased naivety. His meeting with a Russian banker linked to the Kremlin stoked speculation about collusion. His support for Trump’s decision to fire FBI Director James Comey helped trigger the appointment of special counsel Robert Mueller. His spongy top-security clearance application and ties his family’s real estate business has had to foreign governments forced the President to grant him a clearance by fiat, overruling counterintelligence officials and White House lawyers. Foreign intelligence services reportedly identified Kushner as a target for manipulation. As criticism rained down, Kushner was content to remain a cipher, often seen but rarely heard.

Kushner now acknowledges his learning curve. “I had some bumpy patches along the way. I got here, and obviously at the beginning, there’s a lot I needed to learn,” he tells TIME, sitting at a conference table in his office. “I didn’t know all the files that well. I didn’t know which files were my responsibility, which files were other people’s responsibility. I didn’t necessarily know what it took to be successful.”

But over the course of Trump’s term, few people have been as influential as Kushner. He was an architect of the primary bipartisan legislative achievement of Trump’s first term, the criminal-justice reform bill. He helped negotiate a revamped trade deal with Canada and Mexico. His push to tighten America’s
embraced of Saudi Arabia and Israel has altered Middle East politics. He has proven a deft bureaucratic knife fighter, helping push out a series of senior staffers who tried to impose order on a freewheeling President. “Hopefully my results speak for themselves,” Kushner says. “I think that I’ve accomplished a lot. I think the President trusts me, and he knows I’ve had his back, and he knows that I’ve been able to execute for him on a lot of different objectives.”

The portrait that emerges from interviews with Kushner, current and former White House officials, lawmakers and people close to him is of an increasingly confident operator who is learning to pull the levers of power in the White House and throughout Washington in ways that may surprise critics. Listening to Kushner describe his role makes it clear that he was never going to be the moderating force that Democrats hoped for and Trump loyalists feared. He doesn’t see his job as steering Trump to a decision. He sees himself as the enabler of the President’s agenda.

“One thing you have to remember when you work for President Trump is that you don’t make the waves. He makes the waves,” Kushner explains in his office, a silver bowl of Reese’s Peanut Butter Cups on the table. “Your job is to surf the wave as best as you can every day. And you have to always smile and have a sense of humor with it, because he’s the one who’s got the instinct.”

The Trump presidency may depend
on Kushner’s surfing skills. As the Senate prepares to convene its impeachment trial on Jan. 21, Kushner is overseeing strategy meetings in the West Wing to bring competing White House factions together and plot out the President’s defense. At the same time, he approves every expenditure of $1 million or more for the 2020 re-election bid.

America has a history of Presidents appointing family members to positions of power dating back to John Adams. John F. Kennedy’s closest adviser and Attorney General was his brother Bobby. Bill Clinton tapped his wife Hillary to run the signature issue of his first term, health care reform. But it is rare for a President to give such power to a family member with no policy experience. Kushner has proved he has the quality Trump prizes most—loyalty to the boss—but his blind devotion has sometimes carried a cost. Some White House aides argue that the President’s impeachment was the result of Kushner’s working to oust aides who had tried to put up guardrails to protect the President.

Kushner’s many critics inside the White House admit he is now nearly untouchable—one reason they all insisted on speaking anonymously for this article. And while he may have learned a lot in three years, when you’re tackling the world’s toughest problems, overconfidence can be dangerous. “He’s a classic ‘don’t know what you don’t know,’” says one senior Administration official. “He should stop assuming and ask some questions and try to learn.”

ON MOST MORNINGS, Kushner wakes up around 5:30 a.m. in the $5.6 million white brick mansion he and his wife, Ivanka Trump, rent in Washington’s Kalorama neighborhood, where his neighbors include ambassadors, Amazon boss Jeff Bezos and the Obamas. He practices transcendental meditation—he won’t reveal his mantra—and puts an espresso pod into a coffee machine for his wife. On a recent morning when Ivanka was out of town, Kushner read the newspapers in bed with their youngest child while the eldest daughter walked the family’s fluffy white Pomsky, named Winter. (The duty conforms to a contract Kushner required the 8-year-old to write and sign before bringing the dog home.) By 7:15 a.m., Kushner is usually in the back seat of a black Secret Service SUV heading to the West Wing.

KUSHNER SEES HIMSELF AS THE ENABLER OF THE PRESIDENT’S AGENDA

On Dec. 19, the day after Trump’s impeachment, Kushner had a full agenda at the White House. Over the course of three hours, Kushner worked on Trump’s effort to cut government regulations on businesses, expand school-choice programs and increase investment in poor urban neighborhoods. When Kushner’s team of nearly a dozen advisers packed his office, the updates ticked from immigration to technology upgrades at agencies to prison-release programs, along with a half-dozen other initiatives Kushner is tracking.

At one point, Kushner walked across the hall to the Roosevelt Room to offer advice to a group of White House fellows, young professionals spending a year working with senior staff and Cabinet secretaries. He salted his remarks with business jargon, using phrases like growth curve and calculated risk. “You’re always at a posture until you are at a deal,” he said.

It’s hard to pin down Kushner’s ideology. He did not register as a Republican until September 2018. White House officials were suspicious of his priorities and resentful of his clout. Turf wars were rampant. Kushner says he has learned to express his opinions with the President in private—usually in the White House residence or in the President’s dining room next door to his office—so that aides with competing interests don’t leak to the press. “It’s very
rare that I’ll give my opinion to the President in front of other people,” he says. “I have my personal opinions and my personal sympathies, but I work for the President of the United States. And my job is to, when he asks my advice on things, give him my advice. But then when the President makes a decision, my job is to help him execute that decision.”

A descendent of Holocaust survivors, Kushner grew up in Livingston, N.J., in a family of Orthodox Jews. His parents were prominent Democratic donors close to Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who once crashed in Kushner’s childhood bedroom.

Kushner is no stranger to family controversy. When Jared was 23 years old, his father Charles pleaded guilty to illegal campaign contributions, tax evasion and witness tampering in a case that involved trying to influence Charles’ brother’s testimony by setting him up with a prostitute and secretly videotaping the encounter. Kushner’s father spent 14 months in federal prison in Alabama. Kushner remains close with his immediate family, speaking with his parents on Friday nights before Shabbat. He wears a Kabbalah bracelet of red thread, a gift from his sister that invokes how his grandfather used to sew red thread into family clothing to ward off evil.

Kushner’s bond with Trump was forged by more than his 2009 marriage to the President’s elder daughter. Both men are ambitious scions who inherited real estate empires and lifted them to glitzy heights in Manhattan. Kushner’s cornerstone acquisition was 666 Fifth, which his company bought in 2007 for $1.8 billion. It was a record price paid at the wrong time: within a year, the recession hit and the debt became hard to service. Talks between the Kushner Companies and business interests in China and Qatar in 2017 sparked speculation by Democrats that those countries might be trying to gain leverage over Kushner.

Like the Kushners, Trump prefers to run his enterprises as a family business. So when he launched his campaign in 2015, Kushner was eventually drawn into the fold, and he quickly became a key adviser, pushing a blitz of Facebook ad buys and encouraging Trump to do more friendly interviews with local television stations in swing states. Trump leaned on Kushner, who took no title in the campaign, to oversee decisions about spending, advertising and travel.

Campaign officials competing for power often waited until Friday nights to approach Trump about decisions Kushner opposed, according to two former campaign officials, knowing that as modern Orthodox Jews, Kushner and Ivanka would be home for Shabbat and off electronic devices. In October 2016, rivals tried to strip Parscale’s control over television ad buys while Kushner was out of the office observing Yom Kippur.

But Kushner proved a capable infighter as well. During the presidential transition, he persuaded Trump to jettison former New Jersey governor Chris Christie, who had once prosecuted Charles Kushner. (Kushner has publicly denied doing so.) He nixed a host of conservatives who had criticized Trump for key Administration posts. And he worked to sideline officials whose objectives he believed were different from the President’s. “The biggest source of tension I had early on with different people here centered around the fact that people wanted him to make decisions that they want him to make, as opposed to getting him information,” Kushner says. “He’s rotated out a lot of the people who have maybe been more in it for themselves than for him.”

But bringing on board malleable underlings has sometimes produced the unique chaos of Trump unbound, and Kushner’s own feel for people has been spotty. He pushed for Michael Flynn to be hired as National Security Adviser, a job that lasted 24 days after Flynn became embroiled in an FBI
investigation over his lying about a phone call with the Russian ambassador. Later he helped push out press secretary Sean Spicer to bring in New York financier Anthony Scaramucci, who imploded within 10 days. His decision to embrace Saudi Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman backfired when Saudi agents killed Washington Post journalist Jamal Khashoggi in Istanbul.

There were policy flaps too. Flouting Republican doctrine, Kushner consulted former Obama Administration health adviser Zeke Emanuel about salvaging the Affordable Care Act, according to one current and one former White House official. Kushner held talks with Republican Senator Lindsey Graham about rewriting U.S. immigration laws behind the back of then Department of Homeland Security Secretary John Kelly, according to the officials. Carping about Kushner became an unofficial pastime in the Trump Administration.

Six months into his term, Trump tapped Kelly, a retired four-star Marine general, as chief of staff to impose a dose of military discipline in the building. Kelly tried to curtail Kushner and Ivanka’s influence, insisting they schedule appointments through him to see the President. For a time, Kushner’s power in the building seemed to wane.

**But as Kushner knew,** nobody who tries to control Trump lasts very long. One by one, his antagonists fell by the wayside, and Kushner was there to fill the void.

In late 2017, Kushner was at loggerheads with then Secretary of State Rex Tillerson and then Defense Secretary James Mattis over moving the U.S. embassy in Israel to Jerusalem, a campaign promise. Tillerson and Mattis warned the move would ignite a conflagration in the region, endangering American lives. Trump overrode them and sided with Kushner. “I just want to say for the record, I am against this,” Tillerson told Trump during a secure meeting in the White House in November 2017, according to a White House official.

Less than a month later, Tillerson learned he was being fired as he read Twitter on the toilet. Kushner and others suggested replacing him with CIA chief Mike Pompeo, a former Kansas Congressman with whom Kushner had gotten along during the presidential transition. Pompeo took the job and has become one of Trump’s most loyal aides, pushing a pro-Israel, anti-Iran agenda that comports with Kushner’s.

When the drive to replace the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), another Trump campaign promise, stalled in the spring of 2018, Kushner flew to Mexico City to meet with Luis Videgaray, then the Mexican Foreign Minister. Kushner persuaded Videgaray to peel away from Canada in the negotiations and deal directly with Trump, giving the President an edge on concessions from both countries.

The move infuriated some White House officials, who resent the way that they say Kushner steps in to take credit for projects they’ve been working on for months. “Sometimes he comes in, he f-cks everything up, and if it works well, he takes credit, [but] if it’s sh-tty, he just flies away,” says another senior White House official, who like others spoke on condition of anonymity, noting that Kushner’s influence with the President makes public criticism dangerous.

U.S. Trade Representative Robert Lighthizer offers a different view. In the final push for the trade deal known as the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement (USMCA), Kushner “was in my office sitting in those negotiation sessions for weeks and weeks, and we would go to 10, 11 at night,” Lighthizer recalls. “He’s tough and he’s 100% with the President.”

Kushner’s sway now extends to Congress, where he helped drive the First Step Act, a modest package of prison reforms, into law. Powerful Republicans, including Senate majority leader Mitch McConnell, were skeptical. In November 2018, Trump summoned Kushner to the Oval Office for a meeting. “Mitch, why don’t you tell Jared what you told me,” Trump said. McConnell told Kushner there weren’t enough days on the calendar to move the legislation. Then he turned to Trump and joked that Kushner had been having everyone in his Rolodex lobby McConnell. “I have a lot more people lined up to call you,” Kushner said. Trump laughed and told the pair to work it out. Kushner’s pressure helped persuade McConnell to put the bill on the floor, where it passed in December 2018.

Kushner’s work on criminal-justice reform helped persuade some skeptics in the White House that his value had begun to outstrip his inexperience. “If you want to measure a cost-benefit analysis,” says a former White House official, “that’s a clear example, and I think there are others like it, where the value-add significantly exceeds whatever kind of drawbacks might exist.”

Kushner’s role in the White House is different from that of his wife or her siblings. While Trump’s sons stayed in New York to run the family real estate business, Ivanka Trump has taken on a small but well-defined portfolio of popular issues—workforce development, women’s empowerment and paid family leave—while steering clear of more controversial subjects. Kushner, on the other hand, has taken on radioactive projects like the border wall.

“The President tends to task Jared with his highest-priority projects,”
Ivanka Trump tells TIME. “He obviously said anything to him. Kushner took a phone call from a senior Mexican official and kept talking as the plane taxied and lifted off. The two spoke until the call dropped off as the plane gained altitude.

In northwest Milwaukee, Kushner sat at a long table at the Greater Praise Church of God in Christ and listened to stories from former inmates who had found jobs through a local faith-based program called the Joseph Project. Some of them had been released early under provisions in the First Step Act. One person at the event said Kushner’s experience visiting his father in federal prison had clearly given him a better understanding of the challenges people face after being incarcerated. Kushner nodded. “It didn’t come at a cheap price,” he responded.

Kushner believes that prison reform could improve Trump’s paltry support in African-American communities. He’s most focused on neighborhoods like this one, which happen to be in crucial swing states. One of the core themes Kushner is hammering for Trump’s re-election campaign is that the President has fulfilled his promises. There are, of course, big exceptions—like the border wall. But Kushner knows that in a tight race, expanding the President’s coalition even a little bit beyond his core supporters could prove critical. “You think about prison reform. He didn’t even promise to do that. He came in and he got that done,” Kushner says as his car wheels away from the low-rise brick sanctuary. “He’s delivered for his voters, but he’s also delivered for people who were not his voters.”

He says the key states in 2020 will be Wisconsin, Michigan and Pennsylvania. He says data has persuaded him to push the campaign to compete in states like Minnesota, New Mexico, Nevada and Colorado as well. If Trump wins a second term, there’s a fear among conservatives that Kushner’s influence will only grow. And it seems increasingly clear that Kushner and his wife aren’t going anywhere. “I think there’s a lot more that we can do,” Kushner says. “Hopefully, I’ll get the chance through a second term to continue to put these reforms into place.”

Left unmentioned is the question of whether Kushner, a fixture in Manhattan business and media circles, would be welcomed home after working on behalf of a President many of his old friends and associates detest. “I’ll be honest. My family likes Washington,” he says. “The kids love their schools. The lifestyle here is quite nice. But for me, I like challenges. I think the challenges I get to work on here are some of the most complicated, best challenges you could find.”

As the sunlight fades in Milwaukee, Kushner’s SUV glided past a snaking line of hundreds of Trump supporters waiting to get into the UW-Milwaukee Panther Arena for Trump’s rally. The car stopped by the stadium’s loading docks and Kushner jumped out. Walking inside, he spotted Parscale, who was waiting to give Kushner an update on the Wisconsin campaign operation. A Phil Collins song thumped from the speakers. “I’ve got a meeting with the campaign team now,” Kushner said. “And then wait for the President to get here, and have some fun when he does.” —With reporting by Tessa Berenson/Washington
Can the oil-and-gas industry survive the climate-change fallout? By Justin Worland

A peculiar theme park in the Hague celebrates the history of the Netherlands through a series of miniature models. The Madurodam features little canals, old-fashioned windmills, tiny tulips and, amid it all, an homage to Royal Dutch Shell, the oil giant that is the biggest company in the country and, by revenue, the second largest publicly traded oil-and-gas company in the world. There’s a Shell drilling platform, a Shell gas station and a Shell natural-gas field, complete with a drilling rig. The display is at once odd—energy infrastructure in a children's theme park—and entirely fitting: Shell has been, for decades, one of the most powerful players both in Dutch politics and on the global economic stage.

But that could soon change. As concerns grow over the existential challenges posed by climate change, Shell must grapple with its own existential crisis: How should a company that generates most of its profits by serving the world’s enormous appetite for oil navigate a long-term future in which shifting political and economic tides threaten to make fossil fuels obsolete?

The pressure to abandon oil and gas is already in force. In recent years, protesters have swarmed Shell’s headquarters; advocates representing 17,000 Dutch citizens have sued the company; and powerful investors successfully coerced executives to say they will reduce emissions. In 2015, countries around the world promised to aggressively tackle greenhouse-gas emissions, in order to meet the target laid out by the Paris Agreement: goals that require buying and burning significantly less oil and gas.

Shell CEO Ben van Beurden has a bird’s-eye view of the situation from his corner office at the company’s global headquarters in the Hague. “We have to figure out what are the right bets to take in a world that is completely changing because of society’s concerns around climate change,” he says.

Projections from energy companies show demand for oil could peak
Environment

and fall in the coming decades; some outside analyses suggest demand for oil could plateau as soon as 2025. Markets are already jittery about the industry: energy was the worst-performing sector on the S&P 500 index in 2019. In 1980, the energy industry represented 28% of the index’s value, according to the Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (IEEFA). Last year, it represented less than 5%. The shift away from oil looms so large that Moody’s warned in 2018 that the energy transition represents “significant business and credit risk” for oil companies. The heads of the Banks of England and France said in an op-ed that any company that does not change strategically to the new energy reality “will fail to exist.” On Jan. 14, Larry Fink, founder and CEO of investment giant BlackRock, wrote in an open letter that “climate change has become a defining factor in companies’ long-term prospects.”

As oil flirts with the prospect of decline, energy executives are at odds over what to do. Some firms, like ExxonMobil, are positioning themselves to squeeze the last lucrative years from the oil economy while arguing to shareholders that they will be able to sell all their oil. Shell and a handful of others are beginning to adapt.

Under van Beurden’s leadership, Shell is charting a path that will allow it to continue to profit from oil and gas while simultaneously expanding its plastics business and diversifying into electrical power. By the 2030s, the 112-year-old fossil-fuel giant wants to become the world’s largest power company. As part of this strategy, Shell has worked to present itself as environmentally friendly. Last year, it committed to reduce its emissions by as much as 3% by 2021, and by around 50% by 2050, tying its executives’ compensation to the cuts.

Shell’s moves earned some applause among environmentalists, but the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the U.N.’s climate-science body, concluded in 2018 that to keep temperatures from rising to levels that would bring a wide range of catastrophes, countries must halve their greenhouse-gas emissions by 2030 and hit net-zero emissions by 2050. That would mean more than incrementally reducing emissions; it means keeping vast reserves of oil already discovered in the ground.

Van Beurden’s strategic response shows that years of political and economic pressure—especially from governments and investors responding to a sustained public outcry—can push even the most powerful interests to change. Whether climate activists can harness this mounting pressure to compel Shell and other oil companies to transform the global energy economy may be the weightiest question of our time.

EXECUTIVES AT SHELL knew decades ago that burning fossil fuels would cause the planet to warm, and that once climate change became a global issue, their firm would need to change. Last year, I sat down with van Beurden for a wide-ranging interview and asked him how he felt about “Shell knew,” the activist mantra that accuses the company of failing to act on climate change despite knowing the consequences. He was sanguine: “Yeah, we knew. Everybody knew,” he said. “And somehow we all ignored it.”

In the 1990s, he explained, Shell publicly acknowledged climate science and said the world needed to act to combat the problem. But at the time, neither governments nor consumers seemed too concerned about emissions, and the demand for oil was growing like gangbusters to fuel a global economic expansion. So the company dutifully responded to market demands: it produced and sold oil to turn a profit.

Nearly three decades later, Shell’s business model is shifting by the same market-driven calculus. Despite advertising that depicts the oil giant as environmentally friendly, its decision to reduce reliance on oil is not born of benevolence. It’s reacting to market forces. A 2019 McKinsey report predicts that declining gas consumption in the transport sector, because of factors like fuel efficiency and electrification, could lead oil demand to begin decreasing in the early 2030s. “The future of energy needs to evolve

Shell’s decision to reduce its reliance on oil is not born of benevolence. It’s reacting to market forces

The path ahead

Proposed energy policies show demand rising for natural gas but slowing for oil and coal. If countries meet the Paris Agreement’s bold targets, demand for all fossil fuels would decline.
activist shareholder resolutions that, if they had garnered the support of 75% of shareholders, would have required the company to take aggressive climate action. While the resolutions failed, the threat was real.

By December 2018, Shell relented and, a few months later, made the commitment to reducing emissions as much as 3% by 2021. Significantly, the commitment included end-use emissions: the company was agreeing to take responsibility not only for its own operations, but also for how consumers use Shell’s products. The activist investors claimed victory. “The only reason Shell has made this leap forward is because investors started supporting our resolution,” Follow This founder Mark van Baal told me.

Shell’s public commitment was part of a broader rebranding effort. For decades, Shell and other oil-and-gas companies portrayed themselves to consumers as essential to modern life. Their products power your car and warm your house. But over the years, that image has soured. The 2010 BP oil spill and a series of journalistic exposés of the industry’s misbehavior stole headlines. Shell faced reports of corruption in Nigeria, where it has significant drilling operations, including its alleged complicity in government human-rights abuses. Organizers say that in September 2019, more than 7 million people marched around the globe, skipping school and work to demand that their governments take action to reduce greenhouse-gas emissions. The U.K. declared a climate emergency and prominent members of the U.S. Congress called to eliminate the country’s fossil-fuel emissions by 2050. In July, the head of OPEC, the oil cartel that in 2018 accounted for more than 40% of the world’s crude oil production, called climate activists “the greatest threat to our industry.”

Widespread public criticism of Big Oil is perhaps especially damaging to Shell. Unlike many of its competitors, Shell purchases much of its oil from other companies, then slaps the Shell brand on it, rather than digging the stuff out of the ground itself. That means that its consumer reputation matters more than, say, Occidental Petroleum’s. Shell also faces scrutiny as a Netherlands-based company. While U.S. firms like ExxonMobil contend with a relatively conservative political environment in Texas, Shell is headquartered in the Hague, a city where you’re more likely to get hit by a bicycle than a car. In Amsterdam, 40,000 people took to the streets last spring to demand action on climate change, and some protesters carried signs with a version of the Shell logo fashioned into a middle finger. In London, protesters demonstrated outside Shell’s offices, graffitiing the walls with slogans like CRIME SCENE and SHELL KILLS.

“Their own company is built on the death and destruction of nature and of people all around the world,” says Farhana Yamin, a lawyer turned activist who glued herself to the cement outside Shell’s London headquarters last April. The National Theatre
in London dropped Shell as a sponsor in October, just as it declared a “climate emergency,” and the Dutch branch of Friends of the Earth is suing Shell for reneging on its “duty of care” obligation under Dutch law. “All of these initiatives add to the pressure,” says Freek Bersch, a campaigner at Friends of the Earth Netherlands.

Van Beurden certainly feels the heat. In recent regulatory filings Shell listed its “societal licence to operate,” industry lingo for how society views the company, among its key concerns. Shell executives now need “to ask ourselves more questions than just, ‘Hey, is this legal or not?'” van Beurden says. They have to consider how society sees their brand.

TO WITNESS EXACTLY how Shell is changing, I visited one of its biggest ongoing investments: a chemical facility outside of Pittsburgh estimated to cost $6 billion. When it’s completed, the nearly 400-acre site will churn out more than a million tons of polyethylene every year, the base for a host of plastic products that may become anything from packaging to toys to medical devices to car parts.

Activists describe the facility as an environmental nightmare. Studies have found plastic in tap water, in food products, and in the bellies of sea birds and whales. And plastic production is a significant driver of climate change. The chemical sector is responsible for 18% of industrial carbon-dioxide emissions, according to a 2018 report from the International Energy Agency. Emissions are expected to grow 30% by 2050. But, for Shell, the investment is emblematic of its future business model. As the company rethinks its business, it plans to expand in plastics.

Shell’s other big bet outside of oil is natural gas, which is also controversial. When burned, natural gas produces less carbon than oil or coal does, but it’s still much more polluting than renewable sources, like solar or wind. But Shell is all-in: in 2016, the company maneuvered a $53 billion takeover of BG Group, an oil-and-gas company that focused on liquefied natural gas (LNG), and two years later Shell announced it would fund a $31 billion LNG-export terminal in Canada along with other partners. Shell is widely known as one of the world’s leading natural-gas producers. The company argues that natural gas is necessary to back up clean-energy sources like wind and solar and to feed growing demand for energy in the developing world.

The company’s least contentious area of change is its investment in the power sector, delivering electricity to homes and businesses. While the power sector is widely seen as essential to reducing emissions, critics point out that it’s a tiny portion of Shell’s portfolio. Shell is now spending up to $2 billion a year building out its capacity to supply electricity—just a sliver of its roughly $25 billion capital expenditure, which is predominantly spent exploring and drilling for oil.

Avoiding the worst effects of climate change means trillions of dollars of oil assets need to remain in the ground.
the company’s stock valuation roughly level, but it’s hardly a workable long-term strategy. Across the sector, companies “have to figure out who they are in this changing market,” says Tom Sanzillo, director of finance at the IEEFA. “They are not the profit center that they used to be, and they probably never will be.”

The viability of sticking with oil, even as major world economies promise to move away, is uncertain. Both ExxonMobil and Chevron are staying the course, hoping to outlast their competitors. But Shell and others are moving to adapt. BP, for instance, has also invested in natural gas and power, while ConocoPhillips has prioritized “short-cycle project times” to help it stay economically competitive. Occidental has dropped money into a method of drilling that allows it to store CO₂ in the ground, a bet that it can offset some of the regulatory costs of CO₂ emissions within its own operations. And in December, the Spanish oil giant Repsol committed to being carbon-neutral by 2050 and wrote down many of its oil assets on the grounds that their value will diminish as oil fades.

Meanwhile, the landscape for the planet remains bleak. To keep average global temperatures from warming more than 1.5°C above preindustrial levels, oil companies would have to agree to keep trillions of dollars of oil assets in the ground. So while Shell and others are taking steps in the right direction to reduce total emissions, they are still barreling into a catastrophically climate-changed future. “Shell is doing a lot of the right things,” says a senior energy official, who asked to remain anonymous to speak freely. “The question is: What award do you get for being the best-painted deck chair on the Titanic?”

**LAST SPRING, SHELL ANNOUNCED** that it was leaving American Fuel & Petrochemical Manufacturers, an influential oil-industry trade lobby. The group’s position on climate change, Shell said, was incompatible with its own. Shell cited AFPM’s lack of support for the Paris Agreement and for carbon pricing.

The news made a splash. Shell appeared to be firing a shot across the bow to other powerful lobbying groups: the politics on climate change is shifting. Get with the program or get left in the dust.

It was the latest in a series of similar moves. In recent years, Shell, as well as Exxon and BP, left the American Legislative Exchange Council, a conservative political group, over its stance on climate change. In 2014, Shell and other major global oil companies convened to form the Oil and Gas Climate Initiative to fund clean-energy ventures, and in 2017, a consortium of global Fortune 500 companies, including Shell, Total, ExxonMobil and BP, joined with a handful of green groups to launch the Climate Leadership Council to advocate in the U.S. for a carbon tax that reflects “the conservative principles of free markets and limited government.” A related lobbying group has spent several million dollars lobbying Congress for the proposal. Critics largely dismiss these efforts as too little, too late. They question the companies’ sincerity and suggest they may abandon their support when push comes to shove. And, given the scale of the challenge, many argue that the time has long passed for incremental initiatives.

But given the central role the oil-and-gas industry plays in both politics and the global economy, it’s hard to imagine the world tackling climate change unless the industry either loses its political power or stops roadblocking climate solutions. The rise of the oil industry is intrinsically intertwined with the rise of modern capitalism and the 20th century market economy. Oil provided the resources to power the near nonstop GDP growth of the postwar era. That history offers the modern oil industry immense political power, which it has used to block any legislation, including climate initiatives, that would curb its profits. In particular, Big Oil has spent decades
funding campaigns to discredit the science linking greenhouse-gas emissions to warming and later spent millions more on messages that downplayed the catastrophic significance of climate change. For the most part, they have been successful both in blocking bills that would have curbed emissions and in securing government support for their business. Senator Sheldon Whitehouse (D., R.I.), who wrote a book on corporate influence in government, told me he doesn’t “think there’s ever been such political might assembled on one issue in the history of the Congress” as oil-and-gas interests fighting climate-change regulation. Globally, fossil fuels receive roughly $5 trillion annually in government subsidies, a figure that includes the cost of environmental damage caused by industry that’s left to everyone else to clean up, according to a 2019 International Monetary Fund paper.

But if Big Oil’s roots are deep, belief is growing across the globe that the industry’s untouchable status needs to end. Beyond activists, public opinion in the U.S. continues to turn against fossil fuels. According to a 2019 Gallup poll, 60% of U.S. adults, including the vast majority of Democrats and a large share of Republicans, support policies aimed at reducing the use of fossil fuels. Senators Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders, both of whom are polling at the top of the Democratic presidential primary, have promised to ban fracking—a move that (though unlikely) would transform the industry overnight. And, across the Atlantic, a Green Deal in the E.U. unveiled late last year proposes, among other things, to create a new tax on imports that could hit oil companies. Even the Shell display at Madurodam, that strange miniature theme park in the Hague, has been condemned by activists.

Basic economic factors also loom large. This year, analysts expect that many overleveraged oil firms in West Texas will likely go bankrupt, and those that stay afloat will face withering headwinds. Production of low-cost shale oil means some established companies will need to continue to reassess their portfolio to turn a profit. Meanwhile, both geopolitical tensions in the Middle East and disagreements over trade continue to rattle the industry: global operations require safely and efficiently moving vast amounts of oil across borders.

Despite the gathering momentum to wean the economy off fossil fuels, we’re not there yet. Analysts predict oil will continue to dominate the global economy into the early 2030s. And even as this transition takes place, Big Oil will likely continue to wield outsized political influence. In the U.S., the coal industry is a shadow of what it once was as companies struggle to turn a profit, but the Trump Administration continues to work on behalf of its barons.

Oil executives would, at any rate, prefer to avoid coal’s fate. In his office in the Hague, van Beurden considers the uncertainty facing his company over the next decade: souring public perception, shifting consumer behavior, the risk of becoming activist investors’ next target, political leaders’ bold promises to dramatically reduce emissions. In this environment, van Beurden says, companies like Shell must be ready to adapt. “It’s the time we live in,” he says. “I have to find a way to make the most of that.”

A Shell plastics facility estimated to cost $6 billion is currently under construction outside of Pittsburgh
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The Sleepless Generation

What’s keeping middle-aged women up at night? By Ada Calhoun

In the middle of the night, I wake up feeling warm. I open the window, pull my hair back into a ponytail and drink some water. Then I glance at my phone, delete a few things and see some spam. I hit unsubscribe and go back to bed. Then I lie there thinking, What if by opening that spam email I got myself hacked? What if I just sent everyone in my contact list a Burger King ad at 2 in the morning?

Now wide awake, I move on to other concerns: my parents’ health, my stepson’s college tuition, pending deadlines. Hours roll by. I tackle real-life math problems: how many weeks I have before getting my next freelance check, how many years until my husband and I pay off our mortgage, how much will be in my retirement account in 2040, how many hours of sleep I will get on this night. Four … 3½ … Then it’s 6 a.m., time to make breakfast and send my 13-year-old son off to school.

Members of Generation X like me—those born from 1965 to 1980—report sleeping fewer hours per night than members of the Silent Generation,
boomers, millennials and Generation Z. Sleeplessness is particularly common among Gen X women, a third of whom get less than seven hours a night on average. Even compared with Gen X men, we do worse when it comes to both falling asleep and staying asleep. A 2017 national report found that perimenopausal women were most likely to sleep less than seven hours a night, followed by postmenopausal women.

Gen X-ers not only sleep less than other generations—studies often find us to be more anxious than previous generations. Nearly 60% of those born from 1965 to 1979 describe themselves as stressed about subjects like their finances and caring for loved ones.

“By many objective measures, the lives of women in the United States have improved over the past 35 years,” wrote the authors of an analysis of General Social Survey data a decade ago, as the oldest members of Generation X entered middle age. “Yet we show that measures of subjective well-being indicate that women’s happiness has declined both absolutely and relative to men.” If we flail about for solutions, it may be because we are trying to do something new.

THE YEAR I WAS BORN, 1976, Gail Sheehy published the mega best seller Passages, which took seriously both men’s and women’s midlife reckoning with mortality and described predictable phases of life in the manner of the “terrible twos,” with tags including “Trying 20s” and “Forlorn 40s.” According to Sheehy, the years from 35 to 45 are the “Deadline Decade.”

When Sheehy wrote a new introduction to Passages in 2006, she acknowledged that Gen X women were playing a whole new ball game: “There are still broad, general stages of adulthood, and predictable passages between them. But the timetable has stretched by at least 10 years, and counting. Age norms for major life events have become highly elastic. Since there is no longer a standard life cycle, people are left to customize their own.” Women of this generation, she wrote, are living “cyclical lives that demand they start over again and again.”

According to a 2016 Gallup poll, 16% of Gen X-ers were single and had never been married when they were 18 to 30 years old, compared with 10% of boomers and just 4% of the Silent Generation when they were the same age. The ages at which Americans marry and have children are now at new highs. The median age of first marriage, which hovered between 20 and 22 from 1890 to 1980, has risen in recent years to almost 28 for women and 30 for men. This is especially true for women who pursue higher education and who seek to rise in the ranks at work. According to a 2015 survey by the Pew Research Center, about a quarter of women near the end of their childbearing years with at least a master’s degree have not had children.

Middle age is different for Gen X women than it was for our mothers and grandmothers. They struggled with midlife stressors and hormone-related sleep trouble too, but in their 40s they were most likely empty nesters, holding down a less-than-full-time job if they worked outside the home at all. Our generation’s delay in childbearing means that as we enter our 40s we are likely to have children who, on average, are 14. While men are doing more these days to take care of children (as well as the elderly), caregiving responsibilities still fall on middle-aged women more than on any other group. Middle-aged Gen X women bear financial responsibilities that men had in the old days but are also still saddled with traditional caregiving duties. We generally incur this double whammy precisely while hitting the peak of both career and child raising; in 2017, a major Gallup poll found that the two biggest stressors women reported were work and children, with a compounding effect on those responsible for both.

Further, given the surge in divorce rates when we were young, in middle age many of us are dealing with parents who don’t live together, which often adds tension and doubles the number of houses that need cleaning. And the supply of possible caregivers is declining. In 2010, the ratio of those caregivers to people needing care was 7 to 1. By 2030, it’s predicted to be 4 to 1; by 2050, just 3 to 1.

Thanks to corporate downsizing and the rise of the gig economy, we also lack job stability at a time when it’s hard enough to pay the bills. Gen X has more debt than any other generation, and women have less money saved than men. At the same time, we face a significantly higher cost of living than boomers did at our age, particularly when it comes to essentials like housing. Because my husband and I are both self-employed, we pay for our own health insurance through our state’s health exchange. We have the cheapest bronze plan, and it’s $1,247 a month. Adjusted for inflation, insurance costs have grown
by 740% since 1984, and Americans now spend twice as much out of pocket as they did then.

For Gen X women, all of these stressors are exacerbated by the profound changes our bodies go through in the years leading up to menopause (which occurs, on average, at age 51). “Sleep is very sensitive to hormonal shifts. When your hormones start shifting in wild ways, there might be insomnia, changes to bedtime, night waking. It can come in any of those forms or all of them,” says Janet K. Kennedy, Ph.D., a clinical psychologist and the author of The Good Sleeper. “The hardest part is that it’s unpredictable.” For some women, perimenopause—the time frame of transition into menopause—isn’t a big deal. For others, symptoms can include a bulging midriff; breast pain and cysts; moodiness; changes in appetite, energy and concentration level—and major sleep disturbances. In a widely cited 2018 AARP survey, 75% of menopausal women said such symptoms interfered with their lives.

The unique confluence of stressors and hormonal shifts poses a sort of chicken-or-egg problem for Gen X women: the symptoms of hormonal fluctuation (like sleeplessness) are exacerbated by stress, while those symptoms (like not sleeping) in turn raise stress levels. “How well your ovary functions depends on your cycle and your mental and emotional state. It’s all tied together,” says Dr. JoAnn Pinkerton, executive director of the North American Menopause Society. When she sees perimenopausal patients, Pinkerton asks how much time they are spending on things like work, childcare and caring for aging adults, and then draws a pie chart for them. Pinkerton says that looking at this visual representation of their obligations may help women understand why they could be feeling overwhelmed. If a patient asks her, “Why am I irritable at work?” she responds, “Well, you don’t just have work. You have work at work and work at home and work in the family and work in the community.”

IT’S NO WONDER my friends and I swap sleep tips more often than we do recipes. We’ve all heard the solid advice about exercising and getting out into nature and moving the TV out of our bedrooms. And most of that helps, although none of it is a silver bullet. One go-to stress reducer is wine, though unfortunately that causes what comedian Bridget Everett calls the “Chardonnay shocker”—when you’re awakened by a sugar rush paired with the booze wearing off at 4 in the morning. In my experience, this is often followed by what a New Yorker cartoon depicts as my own private movie-theater hell: “Now playing … Everything You Said at the Party.”

Sometimes it feels as if everyone I know is trying something to help them sleep, from melatonin and Ambien (in spite of the drug’s receiving a black-box warning in May 2019) to CBD oil and noise-canceling headphones to the latest self-help book on mindfulness and meditation to the keto diet to certain antidepressants (now taken by 1 in 5 middle-aged women). My friend Sheri uses something called the MegRhythm Gentle Steam Eye Mask, which she buys at an Asian grocery store. It’s a disposable eye mask that gets hot through oxidation and exudes a smell like lavender. “It looks like you’re wearing a maxi pad on your face,” Sheri says, “but otherwise it’s awesome.”

Gen X women’s attempt to innovate in the field of self-care is often part of an attempt to avoid hormone therapy. Most of the leading gynecology experts I spoke with said that hormone replacement therapy (HRT) remains the single most effective scientifically proven treatment for symptoms of menopause like hot flashes, which can keep us up at night. For years, HRT was believed to be associated with dangerous side effects. But in 2017, the North American Menopause Society claimed that the increased risk of cancer, stroke and blood clots thought to be associated with HRT had been overstated. (HRT appears to raise the risk of these health problems far less than being overweight or smoking, for example.)

Anything may help at least some women sleep for some period of time. Personally, I’ve tried hormones via a low-dose birth control pill (which did even out my mood swings), exercising more, getting out into nature and even the gentle steam eye mask. And all of it helped for a while, but I do still wake up at night. What’s given me the most comfort is actually realizing that what I used to think of as my own neurotic anxieties aren’t only mine—they’re my generation’s. I’m reassured—if also a little depressed—to know that when I’m up in the middle of the night staring at the ceiling, millions of other women my age are too.

This article is adapted from Calhoun’s new book, Why We Can’t Sleep: Women’s New Midlife Crisis
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Awards shows are a Hollywood institution. But are they still relevant?
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Awards shows are dying. Is that so bad?

By Judy Berman

I used to love the Golden Globes. There’s more riding on the Oscars, sure, and the Grammys have performances from the world’s most bankable singers. But for those of us who were never all that impressed by these institutions’ efforts to identify the best in popular art—or who simply prefer low camp to high glamour—it was always the boozy, blowzy Globes that delivered. Where else could we mortals observe People’s then reigning Sexiest Man Alive Brad Pitt thanking anti-diarrheal drug Kapectate, or Meryl Streep kicking off an acceptance speech by announcing, apparently apropos of nothing. “I wanna change my name to T-Bone?”

So I knew I was finally over awards shows when the run-up to the 2020 Globes, on Jan. 5, elicited nothing in me but dread. The feeling wasn’t unrelated to the bushfires raging in Australia or what threatened, at the time, to become a war with Iran. In past years, I might’ve treasured a night of champagne, gowns and gaffes as a respite from such concerns. This time, every aspect of the Globes, from the nominations—light on women, heavy on Joker—to a telecast that stretched past its allotted three hours, registered as a dull inevitability.

Judging by their choice to invite back self-styled provocateur Ricky Gervais for his fifth hosting gig, even NBC and the Hollywood Foreign Press Association failed to muster much enthusiasm for this year’s festivities. “I don’t care anymore,” Gervais proclaimed in his intro, before scraping the mold off jokes about a “woke” entertainment industry and exhorting the winners to keep politics out of their speeches. (Predictably, the stars ignored him.) The shots he took at self-righteous celebs for their hypocrisy in working for corporations with questionable ethics might’ve landed if he hadn’t been simultaneously earning a paycheck from Comcast and plugging his Netflix show.

By the next morning, right-wing commentators thirsty for famous allies had anointed Gervais their savior, with Fox News host Greg Gutfeld opining that the comedian’s late-night-ready monologue had “said everything you’ve ever wanted to say to that self-obsessed pile of pulsating flesh known as Hollywood,” while conservatives insisted Twitter’s leadership was purposely keeping his name from Trending. So massive was the outpouring that Gervais took to Twitter as well, asking, “How the f-ck can teasing huge corporations and the richest, most privileged people in the world be considered right-wing?”

The same day brought the also-inevitable news that the Globes had hit an eight-year ratings low. At 18.3 million, the audience for Gervais’ roast was even smaller than the one that tuned in for uncontroversial hosts Sandra Oh and Andy Samberg in 2019. With 94% of Americans opting out, maybe the pundits really were the only ones watch-

For all their flaws, once in a while, awards still elevate deserving winners

ing. So, as traditional TV viewership dwindles and the list of stars willing to withstand the public scrutiny of a hosting gig shrinks, while unfiltered celebrity thoughts abound on social media, it seems worth asking: Are we—or, for that matter, the entertainment industry—still getting anything out of these shows?

We’ve entered the second decade of streaming dominance, and original cable fare has been cutting into the networks’ numbers for even longer; millions watched Real Housewives, Live PD or Power instead of the Globes this year. Awards shows that once attracted enormous audiences are, notoriously, tanking in the ratings. After decades of consistently attracting at least 32 million viewers—with typical broadcasts drawing 40 million and clearing 50 in those few years with blockbuster Best Picture nominees—the Oscars slipped to a low of 26.5 million in 2018. If last year’s 29.6 million was a slight improvement, it also suggested that nominating megahits like Black Panther for the top prize wasn’t sufficient to restore the telecast’s relevance.

The problem isn’t just an excess of viewing options or the epochal shift away from watching programs as they air, which began back with the advent of the VCR. Awards shows are also suffering from the political polarization of the American public, as partisanship invades sectors of society that used to be essentially neutral ground and nurtures the vitriol with which conservatives like Gutfeld attack Hollywood types for their left-of-center views.

Politics aside, young people are showing less and less interest in awards season. Variety recently noted that the median age of viewers for all four top-tier telecasts—Oscars, Globes, Emmys and Grammys—had soared past 50, an increase of more than 10 years since the turn of the millennium. It makes sense. Gen Z-ers aren’t just streaming natives; they’re devotees of social video platforms like YouTube and TikTok, whose homegrown stars (Lil Nas X, Lilly Singh) only show up on the red carpet once they’ve crossed over to conventional fame.

Considering that the standard TikTok video is 15 seconds, it’s tempting to blame kids’ short attention spans
In 2020 the question seems absurdly trivial. Instead of watching Joaquin Phoenix dribble out koans to one side of the aisle while Gervais lands zingers for the other, shouldn’t we be registering voters or aiding in hurricane-relief efforts? I mean, why wouldn’t we abandon these self-congratulatory rituals without another thought?

Unfortunately, there are the awards themselves to think about. I can’t imagine them attracting even the diminished amount of attention they now enjoy if winners were announced via press release. And maybe that’s fine—because Emmy voters are erratic enough to celebrate Fleabag’s sublime final season and Game of Thrones’ awful one in the same year, or because efforts to diversify the Academy haven’t stopped the Oscars from honoring simplistic racial parables like Green Book. I haven’t even gotten into the decadence of awards PR campaigns, the fact that Oscars season has squished all “serious” film releases into the fourth quarter of the year, or the futility of comparing very different artworks.

Yet for all their flaws, once in a while, awards still elevate deserving winners. The Oscars box-office bump is real: rereleased after its Best Picture upset, Moonlight earned $2.5 million its first weekend alone—not bad for a film that cost only $1.5 million to make. The Grammys’ Best New Artist category occasionally kick-starts the career of a thrilling, genuinely obscure talent like Esperanza Spalding. And now that risk-averse studios are cutting down on stories for adults in favor of spaceships and superheroes, you can’t underestimate the role awards play in ensuring that studios keep making “prestige” titles.

So maybe it’s a minor blessing that as much as their ratings have declined, the major awards shows don’t seem to be in danger of cancellation. They still outperform most networks’ nonfootball lineups, after all. (As Gervais said, “No one really watches network TV!”) Yet it’s also hard to envision producers figuring out how to restore these telecasts to the fun collective viewing experiences they once were. With another hostless Oscars on the horizon and Grammys headlined by overexposed 2019 breakouts Lizzo and Billie Eilish, the rest of awards season 2020 seems unlikely to spark more joy than the Globes. But instead of wringing our hands over the demise of a tradition that isn’t really ending, we’d do well to invest our attention in the thing that awards exist to celebrate: great art.
SQUEALS AND LAUGHTER RING OUT ACROSS THE SET OF SEX EDUCATION. It’s Gillian Anderson’s last day of filming for Season 2, and Ncuti Gatwa—who plays the show’s ebullient teen Eric Effiong—has just discovered Anderson has hired an ice cream truck as a parting gift. A blackboard next to the treats, decorated with chalk drawings of genitalia, reads: TO THE CAST + CREW FROM GILLIAN ON HER LAST FILMING DAY. THANK YOU A MILLION ZILLION PENISES AND YONIS!!!!

It’s exactly what you might expect on the set of Sex Education, the heartfelt British teen sex comedy that earned acclaim last year for its mix of raunchy humor and vulnerability. In the first month after its debut, Netflix said 40 million accounts were on track to stream the first season, which introduced viewers to awkward 16-year-old Otis (Asa Butterfield) as he begins charging his fellow students for sex and relationship advice, thanks to the encyclopedic knowledge he has gleaned from his mother, free-spirited sex therapist Jean (Anderson).

Like its premise, Sex Education is a study in contradictions. Its aesthetic is timeless, but its issues couldn’t be more timely: abortion, anti-LGBTQ violence and revenge porn were all plot points in its first season. The show subverts the archetypes—jocks, bullies and mean girls—we’ve come to expect from high school stories, making those characters feel deeply human. It exists in a geographical and chronological limbo where smartphones and present-day pop-culture references exist alongside nostalgic ’60s clothing and ’80s music. And it’s a bold, earnest show about a subject that makes some people squeamish. “Brits are notoriously much more prudish than Americans are,” says Anderson. “It’s cathartic and freeing to get to be as bold and shameless as possible.”

FOR DECADES, hit movies from American Pie to Superbad have centered on horny heterosexual teenage boys with hopes of losing their virginity. Sex Education may have resonated so widely because, instead, it gives compelling story lines to a broad supporting cast and delves deeply into how teenagers connect with their families. “The different age groups makes it more interesting,” says creator and screenwriter Laurie Nunn. “I think if it was just teens, I’d get a bit claustrophobic.”

The show’s second season tackles subjects including self-harm, STI stigma and the trauma of sexual assault. But it’s really about how people, regardless of their age or sexuality, relate to one another and to themselves. At the heart of the show is the friendship between Otis and Eric, a gay black teen who is “more fabulous than ever” in Season 2, Gatwa says. Nunn explains she was eager to show a male friendship where “they talk in a really open way, as an antidote to a lot of the narratives about more performative masculinity that we’re seeing in the world.” In Season 2, a friendship between sporty Jackson (Kedar Williams-Stirling) and superintelligent Viv (Chinenye Ezeudu) also comes into focus. “It’s beautiful to show that relationship and growth between two dark-skinned black people,” says Williams-Stirling. “You don’t see that a lot.” Many of the dilemmas that come up in the show emerged from frank conversations in the writers’ room. “The themes are pretty universal,” says Nunn. “Having healthy sex and relationships goes beyond being a teenager.”

Indeed, the show has thoughtful lessons for audiences of all ages about the search for belonging, both inside and outside the bedroom. As Jean reminds one client: “Sex doesn’t make us whole, so how could you ever be broken?”

SEX EDUCATION streams Jan. 17 on Netflix
**Picard goes way beyond**

Being a Star Trek fan in a Star Wars world is a tough gig. They get toys that end up on every kid’s wish list; we get a Christmas ornament. But signs of hope are emerging: 2017’s Star Trek: Discovery, the anchor for CBS’ All Access streaming platform, mercifully reversed a trend of steadily decreasing Trek quality, largely thanks to stellar performances. Now something really special is ahead: the return of Patrick Stewart as the beloved Jean-Luc Picard of The Next Generation fame.

Star Trek: Picard goes where no Trek has gone before: the future. In a season set two decades beyond any previous Trek, much has changed for both the universe and our dear captain. He’s an admiral now, for one—and a retired admiral at that. A man once married to his uniform has departed Starfleet (or, more accurately, Starfleet has departed him). But when a mysterious woman with a connection to a certain beloved android appears on the doorstep of Picard’s château, it sparks a chain of events that sees the captain get off his couch and back into the final frontier, though with a crew more swashbuckler than Starfleet. It’s a radically different take on Trek, but there’s plenty to love about a series that’s willing to experiment rather than just rehash old ideas. *(Sorry, Star Wars fans.)*

—Alex Fitzpatrick

**REVIEW**

**The princess of Queens**

By Judy Berman

Awkwafina is Nora From Queens isn’t just the name of a new Comedy Central show—it’s a statement of fact. The 31-year-old, who recently won a Golden Globe for her lead role in last year’s indie hit The Farewell—and who rose to fame in the early 2010s spitting jokey feminist raps like “My Vag”—is known to her family as Nora Lum of Forest Hills. So, what distinguishes the woman from her alter ego? “Awkwafina is big and brash. She’s the person who says whatever’s on her mind,” Lum has said. “Nora is the person who is neurotic and overthinks.”

Those neuroses are on full display in Nora From Queens. In the tradition of comedies from Seinfeld to Better Things, the show casts its creator and star as a less successful version of herself. Like a slightly younger Lum, Nora Lin has a Chinese-American dad (BD Wong) and an adoring spark plug of a grandmother (the hilarious Lori Tan Chinn of Orange Is the New Black); her Korean mom died when she was a kid. Unlike Lum, Nora Lin is unemployed and still lives at home in a largely ungentrified corner of Queens. And though it superficially resembles Comedy Central predecessor Broad City, with its bawdy humor and New York setting, Nora From Queens is just as much a family sitcom as a broke-millennial-female-stoner comedy. Saturday Night Live’s Bowen Yang makes an ideal addition to the clan as Nora’s haughty tech-phenom cousin.

The bits can be hit-or-miss, but the show improves as the season progresses. A pilot where Nora discovers that a well-off friend who claims to be a lawyer is really a camgirl only made me chuckle when our hero accidentally lights herself on fire. Episodes that find her scamming focus groups and popping Adderall to stay up late gaming with children in other time zones play more to Lum-as-Awkwafina’s slacker charms.

But the real pleasure of Nora From Queens is in how elegantly it avoids the traps so many other TV shows about immigrant families fall into, either dwelling on the ways in which the characters diverge from some imagined American norm or erasing all cultural specificity. There are no so-called tiger parents among the Lins. Instead, Lum gives us a story line in which a gang of Chinese grannies spend a full day in Atlantic City in order to cash in the free casino chips that come with their bus tickets. It seems only fitting that a performer who has played such a distinctive role in Hollywood’s recent Asian-American renaissance would use her own auteur project to push the movement further.

Awkwafina is Nora From Queens premieres Jan. 22 on Comedy Central
Isabel Allende The world’s most popular living author in Spanish on not fearing death and the forgotten event behind her new novel

Your new novel, A Long Petal of the Sea, centers on a historical event: in 1939, the poet and diplomat Pablo Neruda chartered a boat to take 2,200 Spanish Republicans fleeing Franco’s dictatorship to Chile. How did you hear about this? When the ship first reached territorial waters in Chile, they sent, as I write in the book, two very young bureaucrats to receive the ship and give them visas to enter the country. One of those guys was my stepfather. Many years later, I stumbled upon the story again, when I was living in exile in Venezuela. With family like mine, you don’t need to invent anything.

Why did you decide to write this book now? The theme of migrants and refugees and displaced people is in the air. And it’s something that is very close to my heart. First, because I have been a foreigner all my life. I don’t have roots in a place. And also I have a foundation that works with migrants and refugees on the border. I know so many cases, it’s so close to me right now.

Do you have any strong feelings about President Trump’s “wall” rhetoric? I think it’s brutal. It’s very interesting how in the world everything has become global: mining, drugs, guns, illnesses, the stock market, everything—except people.

What do you say to Americans who believe a country has a right to defend its own borders? I say that we have to defend the borders from aggression. But not from the desperate. How are you going to stop the invasion of the desperate? You have to incorporate them and provide space for everybody.

In the book, you write of a man who has seen the angels and fears nothing. Is that also true of you? I don’t fear death. And I don’t fear most of the things that other people fear. I’ve lived long enough. I’m 77. I’ve seen everything. And I’ve seen how things seem really bad and we seem to be in a very dark place, and then we get out.

Elsewhere in the book, a daughter appears out of nowhere. Does this reflect your desire to see your daughter [who died at age 29] again? I don’t know; I wasn’t thinking of Paula. I do often think how would she look today. Would she tint her hair? I don’t think so. Would she still be married to the same man? Probably not. And I see sometimes a woman who is 56 years old today, and I say: Would she look like this?

You have said that people write to recover what has been lost. What were you recovering in this book? Memory. It’s the memory of things that have happened in the past and are still happening today exactly the same way. The difference between those 2,200 refugees that came to Chile [and those today] is that they were well-received. They made space for them. And they contributed immensely to our culture.

You’ve got a Presidential Medal of Freedom. You have 75 million copies of your books in print. You are the biggest-selling Spanish-language author in the world. Do you feel like any of your achievements eclipse others? I just work. I love the work in progress. I love to tell a story. I still write on the same computer in the same place, the same stories. I always start on January the 8th. It’s discipline. If I didn’t have a time to start, I would be procrastinating forever. So nothing changes really for me or for the little circle of my family and friends around me. The rest happens outside, in another place, in another dimension of reality that has nothing to do with me.—BELINDA LUSCOMBE
WE WILL NOT ROLL OVER.
EXCEPT FOR BELLY RUBS.

Now is not the time to roll over. Every day, nearly 2,000 dogs and cats are killed in shelters across the country. It’s time to adopt change and Best Friends Animal Society is leading the way. Working together with passionate people like you alongside shelters, rescue groups and other animal welfare organizations, we will Save Them All.

save-them-all.org