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“We have understood for many years that allocating budget to prevention is not an expense, but an investment,” says Dr. Such. “When the pandemic started, it did not catch us off guard.”

Along with vaccinating over 90% of its own workforce, SEAT is working to protect vulnerable people across Spain. The company has helped accelerate the rollout of vaccines to the general population, including supplying medical motorhomes to health services on Spanish islands to immunize people living in remote locations.

And as one of the largest investors in research and development in Spain, SEAT has also allocated significant resources to vaccine research. The company is supporting efforts by Barcelona-based Dr. Bonaventura Clotet, one of the world’s leading virologists and a long-term associate of the company, to develop vaccines that will work against future Covid-19 mutations.

“The virus will keep on mutating,” according to Dr. Such. “As a society, we have to continue to follow safety precautions and keep on investing in research. At SEAT, we have shown that it pays to be prepared for anything.”

When SEAT S.A. directors and employees sat down at the beginning of 2020 to discuss their plans for the year, they were in a celebratory mood. The Barcelona-based automotive manufacturer had just reported record car sales and was preparing to mark its 70th anniversary with a series of special events across Spain.

It was then that the company’s medical team, led by Dr. Patricia Such, SEAT’s Health, Safety and Emergencies director, sounded a note of caution. Multiple reports from SEAT sources in China and Italy suggested that a newly identified coronavirus was far more serious than was being reported in the media — and that it was only a matter of time before it reached Spain.

So, 70 years after SEAT first started helping turn Spain into a modern, car-owning society, the company swung into action to help its home country respond to one of the greatest challenges of our time.

SEAT’s success in combatting Covid reflects its long tradition of combatting health risks in the workplace, strongly supported by its works council and CEO Wayne Griffiths. In the years before the pandemic, the company established a CARS Health Care and Rehabilitation Center for workers and a scientific committee devoted to health issues. The company is also responsible for the health and safety of all employees in Spain of the giant Volkswagen Group, of which it is a long-standing subsidiary.
MORE THAN 90 YEARS AGO, TIME’S EDITORS REALIZED THAT THEY HAD SOMEHOW MADE IT all the way through 1927, the year the aviator Charles Lindbergh made his historic solo flight over the Atlantic, without putting him on the cover. And so they invented a new franchise, then called Man of the Year, and selected Lindbergh in order to give him the credit he was clearly due. I thought of this story recently while corresponding with the legendary conservationist Jane Goodall, whose life’s work in support of “every living creature,” as the actor Leonardo DiCaprio put it in a tribute to her in these pages two years ago, has inspired millions.

TIME has been covering Goodall for more than half a century, starting with her groundbreaking ethology work in Tanzania in the 1960s. But we had never put her on the cover. Fortunately, she consented to our proposal to rectify that with this issue, sitting for a portrait by the photographer Nadav Kander, who has done numerous covers for TIME, including two U.S. Presidents, and having a conversation with TIME staff writer Ciara Nugent in the home in Bournemouth, England, where she grew up. Now 87, Goodall is one of the most prolific environmental campaigners in history, speaking up about our predatory relationship with the planet decades before many of today’s leading climate voices were even born. “I’m about to leave the world, and leave it behind me with all the mess,” she tells Nugent, explaining why she’ll work to spread hope and inspire action for as long as she can.

HOPE AND ACTION are in many ways the themes of this issue, our second focused on a decade-long reporting project, TIME 2030, that’s dedicated to spotlighting solutions for a healthier, more resilient, more just post-COVID world. This latest edition of TIME 2030 focuses on the future of the global economy. In Compton, Calif., we go inside the largest guaranteed-income experiment in America, examining how relatively modest payments, given to individuals with no requirements attached, can impact physical, psychological and financial well-being. The issue also includes a report on how Latino-owned businesses are helping to drive economic recovery in the U.S. A pair of features examines how the U.K. and Taiwan have become hubs for innovations powering the future, exploring the rise of a growing financial-technology scene in London as well as the dominance of the Taiwan Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., whose chips are the key ingredients for the next wave of technology. And we welcome four new members of our TIME 2030 committee of outside advisers, including Silicon Valley veterans Ellen Pao and Michael Seibel, who are each committed to making the tech sector more equitable and democratic; Abu Dhabi investor Miray Zaki, a pioneering force in sustainable investment; and Fatih Birol, the chief of the International Energy Agency, who is redrawing the pathways to global net-zero emissions.

As we focus on repairing the home we have, TIME continues its long tradition of exploring worlds beyond ours. Recently, we announced a TIME documentary project that followed Inspiration4, the first all-civilian, nongovernmental crew to travel to orbit. That group, which appeared on our cover in August, launched and after three days safely splashed down back here on earth. As we consider what humanity can accomplish together, against the odds, the stories of the four people onboard that mission—and the documentary series about them now airing on Netflix—show what’s possible.

Edward Felsenthal, EDITOR-IN-CHIEF & CEO @EFELSENTHAL
WHAT YOU SAID ABOUT ...  

TIME100 The release of TIME’s annual list of the world’s most influential people in the Sept. 27/Oct. 4 issue sparked impassioned conversations. Highlighting icons and innovators, pioneers and titans, artists and leaders, “this year’s list could hardly be more diverse,” wrote Oren Spiegel of Peters Township, Pa. Readers likewise praised the recognition of those who have worked to elevate diverse perspectives in the mainstream, like Minor Feelings author Cathy Park Hong. “When you mother a child version of yourself, say things to them that you wish you’d heard,” Esther Tseng tweeted of telling her daughter that, like Hong, she too could make an impact. Darlene Cox of Northfield, Minn., wrote to praise Palestinian twins Muna and Mohammed El-Kurd, whose activism has shone a light on life under occupation in East Jerusalem, adding that “it was so valuable to have [their] plight and determination shown to the world.” And of journalist Nikole Hannah-Jones, Nancy Giles tweeted: “Bless you for the necessary and overdue conversations … you are helping this country own up to its past.”

The inclusion of Prince Harry and Meghan, photographed together for the first time for a magazine cover portrait, attracted a great deal of attention. “They are thriving where you think they’ll fail,” @GodmotherOlori wrote on Twitter of the couple. “They make a genuine impact.”

‘Well, slap me over with a flounder. I am apparently Influential.’
N.K. JEMISIN, TIME100 honoree

TIME PIECES TIME is featuring original works by 40 artists for a new non fungible token (NFT) collection of inspiring digital art. Among those contributing are longtime TIME cover artists and 2020 Kid of the Year finalist Tyler Gordon. See the collection, and join the TIMEPieces community, at nft.time.com

TIME100 A Sept. 20 ABC prime-time broadcast special highlighted the 2021 TIME100, with powerful musical performances from Billie Eilish and Kane Brown, and candid conversations between honorees including Allyson Felix and Tracee Ellis Ross, and Bowen Yang and Nikole Hannah-Jones (as pictured above). See the full TIME100 list at time.com/time100

This only increases my responsibility and my commitment to the purpose of mobilizing civil society to make a difference.’
LUIZA TRAJANO, TIME100 honoree

Subscribe to TIME’s coronavirus newsletter to keep up-to-date on COVID-19’s impact on people and society, and the race to distribute vaccines. Sign up for free at time.com/coronavirus
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How do you recycle CO₂ to make stronger concrete?

Concrete is the most used man-made material on earth. But before it can be used, it must first be cured.

We’ve developed a new curing method, storing up to 200kg of CO₂ in every ton of cement. Making it as strong as regular concrete in 3 days instead of 28, for faster, more efficient construction.

If the whole precast concrete industry switched to our technology, we could recycle up to 246 million tons of CO₂ a year – equivalent to removing emissions from 53 million cars.

See how we continue innovating for a better future at aramco.com/betterfuture-carbon-curing

---

1 Source: Global Cement and Concrete Association
2 Annual global cement production in 2019: 4.1 billion tons. Precast industry is 30% of total. Source: IEA.
3 Typical passenger vehicle emits around 4.6 metric tons of CO₂ per year. Source: EPA.
How do you lower the carbon footprint of a moving truck?

Over a third of all transport CO₂ emissions come from road freight.¹ We’ve captured up to 40% of the CO₂ from a truck’s exhaust in recent lab tests, storing it safely on board to offload later for reuse or to store deep underground.

If every heavy-duty truck in the world had our technology, we could reduce CO₂ emissions by up to 473 million tons a year² – equivalent to planting 80 billion new trees.³

See how we continue innovating for a better future at aramco.com/betterfuture-mcc

¹ IEA (2017), The Future of Trucks, IEA, Paris
² IEA (2020) CO₂ emissions from heavy-duty vehicles in the Sustainable Development Scenario, 2000–2030
³ One young tree absorbs 5.9kg CO₂ per year. Source: Urban Forestry Network.
‘MR. SPEARS HAS CROSSED UNFATHOMABLE LINES.’

MATHEW ROSENGART, attorney for Britney Spears, in a Sept. 27 statement on a recent exposé by the New York Times alleging the pop star’s father had hired security to secretly spy on her.

‘I am a fighter, and I will always be a fighter—inside and outside the ring.’

MANNY PACQUIAO, famed boxer and current Senator in the Philippines, announcing on Sept. 19 he will run for the country’s presidency in 2022.

‘It really was uncomfortable for my results to be released publicly, before I even knew what was going on.’

SUNNY HOSTIN, co-host of ABC’s The View, in a Sept. 27 statement discussing a recent episode of the show during which she was pulled off the air after testing positive for COVID-19, a result she says was a false positive.

‘All leaders should be you, because you’re an epitome of excellence.’

MONROVIA CITY COUNCIL, in billboards erected around the capital city of Liberia, celebrating the Oct 1. birthday of President George Weah.

$11 billion

The annual amount that the U.S. will commit to foreign aid to combat climate change by 2024, President Joe Biden announced on Sept. 21 at the U.N. General Assembly; Congress still needs to approve his proposal.

‘If there is a relationship that you’re in that might not be the best thing for you, leave it now.’

JOSEPH PETITO, father of Gabby Petito, in a Sept. 26 eulogy for the 22-year-old YouTuber, who was found dead in Wyoming a week earlier.

‘I am a fighter, and I will always be a fighter—inside and outside the ring.’

MANNY PACQUIAO, famed boxer and current Senator in the Philippines, announcing on Sept. 19 he will run for the country’s presidency in 2022.

GOOD NEWS of the week

On Sept. 20, Scotland became the first country in the world to require LGBTQ-inclusive education in its national school curriculum for primary and secondary schools.
Haitian migrants seeking asylum encounter mounted agents in Del Rio, Texas, on Sept. 20.
NATION

For Haitian migrants, history repeats

By Jasmine Aguilera

In the past 11 years alone, Haitians have suffered natural disasters, rising gang violence, outbreaks of cholera and COVID-19, and political instability, including the recent assassination of President Jovenel Moïse. The crises left many in the hemisphere’s poorest nation feeling they had no option but to leave—despite the difficulties they face in fleeing to other countries.

In late September, Americans were confronted with the reality of those difficulties too. An estimated 15,000 people arrived in Del Rio, Texas, that month, below a bridge connecting the city to Mexico’s Ciudad Acuña. A majority were Haitian nationals, migrants and asylum seekers who ended up living in tents or under tarps, in conditions similar to those in other camps that have formed along the U.S.-Mexico border in recent years.

On Sept. 24, Department of Homeland Security (DHS) Secretary Alejandro Mayorkas announced the camp had been cleared, just days after mounted U.S. Border Patrol agents were photographed confronting migrants attempting to cross into the U.S. to make asylum claims. In now viral photos and video, an agent appears to use his rein and horse to trip a migrant, who falls back into the waters of the Rio Grande. Public anger over the image was immediate. The Biden Administration condemned the Border Patrol agent’s actions, while Mayorkas announced that border agents would stop using horses and that an investigation was under way.

But if the images were both shocking and new, immigration historian Brianna Nofil recognized something familiar in them. “They fit in a longer pattern,” Nofil says—a pattern that she says has “enabled the U.S. to build this really dramatic detention and deportation system with the intention of keeping Haitian migrants out.”

The founding of the U.S.’s first modern-day detention center, Nofil says, can in fact be largely traced back to an earlier influx of Haitian migrants, who arrived in the U.S. in the 1970s hoping to claim asylum after fleeing political instability. An estimated 56,000 Haitians arrived in South Florida in that decade, straining city and county jails past the point that local officials could manage.

In response, the Carter and Reagan administrations opened several detention centers for immigrants, the first of them near Miami in 1980 to house Haitians, as well as Cubans who had flooded into the country after Fidel Castro announced that year that he would allow them to leave. While the facilities were described as “temporary” fixes at the time, that first one is still functioning today as the Krome North Service Processing Center. Nofil notes that at Krome, Haitians lived in “much more dire” conditions than Cubans.

The news today is in Texas, not Miami, but the U.S. approach to Haitian asylum seekers has not changed. Then and now, Haitian asylum seekers are often met with force, and their asylum claims with skepticism, says César Cuauhtémoc García Hernández, a law professor at Ohio State University and the author of Migrating to Prison: America’s Obsession with Locking Up Immigrants. “Unfortunately, I think we’re seeing a newer version of a very similar phenomenon in which federal immigration officials take a heavy-handed policing approach,” he says. “And they simultaneously cast doubt on any claims to asylum that Haitians are bringing.”

With the camp in Del Rio cleared out, DHS has moved some of its residents to locations south of the U.S.-Mexico border, and some have been able to enter the U.S. to have their asylum cases heard. Others, however, have already been sent back to Haiti, many under Title 42, a controversial measure that the Trump Administration used, citing COVID-19 risk, to expel asylum seekers before granting them hearings. If Haitians are caught by U.S. immigration officials, they are typically sent back to their home country, not to Mexico like many other migrants, even though many had earlier emigrated to Brazil and other South American countries and have not lived in Haiti for years. By some estimates, the Biden Administration has already expelled more Haitians back to Haiti, without granting them the opportunity to present asylum claims, than the Trump Administration did: more than 2,000 have been flown to Haiti on deportation flights, according to DHS.

To those aware of the history, these numbers can look like evidence that—despite the outcry—past trends will likely continue to hold true. “I think there’s always public alarm toward the most shocking images, but that doesn’t get at the structural issue,” Nofil says. “How do you move beyond just these specific flashes of violence? And how do you transition that into raising larger questions about the validity of the immigration system as a whole, of borders as a whole and of people’s ability to seek asylum?”
EDUCATION EQUITY Students gather in a school corridor on Sept. 26 in Kandahar, Afghanistan. Much uncertainty remains about the rights of women and girls to access education—or participate in many facets of public life—in the country following the recent Taliban takeover. The Taliban-appointed chancellor of Kabul University announced on Twitter on Sept. 27 that women could not teach or attend classes until a “real Islamic environment” is in place. The tweets were later deleted.

NEWS TICKER

Ousted ‘Don’t Ask’ vets given benefits

Thousands of LGBTQ veterans forced from the U.S. military under Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell (DADT) legislation—which from 1994 to 2011 banned openly gay service members—were given new access to full government benefits on Sept. 20, the 10th anniversary of the policy’s repeal.

Indian farmers call for new strike

Indian farmers, who have been camping close to New Delhi since November, blocked roads into the capital on Sept. 27 and called for a nationwide strike to mark one year after Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s government passed laws the farmers say benefit corporations at their expense.

R. Kelly found guilty of sexual abuse

R&B artist R. Kelly was found guilty of racketeering and sex trafficking on Sept. 27, after facing allegations of sexual abuse for decades. “Those of us who have fought for justice for so long understand that our work is not over,” says Kenyette Tisha Barnes, co-founder of the #MuteRKelly campaign. “[But] the truth finally prevailed.”

A COLD WAR–STYLE PRISONER EXCHANGE capped off an intense two weeks of Sino-U.S. wrangling. On Sept. 25, Chinese telecom executive Meng Wanzhou, who had been under house arrest in Vancouver for three years, touched down in her homeland. Some 6,000 miles away, Canadians Michael Spavor and Michael Kovrig were being welcomed at Calgary airport, after spending a similar length of time in Chinese jails on spying charges. Both Beijing and Washington deny that the release of the two men and the freeing of the Huawei CFO—who had been fighting extradition to the U.S. on fraud charges—was a swap. The timing speaks for itself.

RISKY PRECEDENT The sudden decision of both U.S. and Canadian officials to broker such a deal has raised fears that Beijing may be tempted to detain other foreign nationals in response to affronts in the future. It’s a concern that senior U.S. diplomats in China have long cited to TIME as a reason for not engaging in such negotiations; China hawks have since accused Joe Biden’s Administration of going soft on Beijing in permitting Meng’s return home.

STRENGTHENED BONDS On Sept. 24, Biden hosted the first in-person meeting of the Quad nations—the U.S., Japan, India and Australia. Beginning life 14 years ago as a low-key “strategic dialogue,” the grouping is now a full-fledged Indo-Pacific alliance committed to meeting “challenges to the maritime rules-based order, including in the East and South China Seas”—diplomatic parlance for standing up to China.

MAKING WAVES Just a week earlier, the U.S. and the U.K. announced plans to equip their ally with tools for the job: the AUKUS pact will see Australia acquire Tomahawk cruise missiles and technology to build nuclear submarines. It’s the biggest shake-up to the Asia-Pacific security architecture in decades.

In an Aug. 31 speech on the U.S. withdrawal from Afghanistan, Biden cited the need to meet “serious competition with China.” Beijing appears ready for him. “The ‘forever war’ in Afghanistan is over,” says PLA Senior Colonel Zhou Bo (ret.), senior fellow at the Center for International Security and Strategy at Tsinghua University, “but the ‘forever competition’ [with China] has started.”

—CHARLIE CAMPBELL/SHANGHAI
To boost or not to boost? Experts divided over additional dose

AFTER MONTHS OF ANTICIPATION, THE U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) on Sept. 22 authorized the first booster shots of a COVID-19 vaccine, from Pfizer-BioNTech, for certain groups of people, at least six months after their last dose. Two days later, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) followed up with its recommendations, which distinguished those who need boosters most urgently from those who will be allowed to decide for themselves if they should get an additional shot.

The CDC recommends boosters for people who originally received two doses of the Pfizer-BioNTech vaccine and are over age 65, or live in a long-term care facility, or are over age 50 with underlying medical conditions that may make them more vulnerable to COVID-19. The agency says anyone over age 18 with health conditions, or who lives or works in settings where they might be more likely to get exposed to COVID-19, such as in hospitals, schools or grocery stores, can also choose to get a booster if they feel they need one.

For now, only people who were initially vaccinated with the Pfizer-BioNTech shot are eligible for a booster of the same vaccine. People who received the Moderna or Johnson–Johnson–Janssen vaccines will need to wait until the FDA and CDC review data on those shots before they can line up for their boosters. Moderna has submitted its studies to the FDA, while Johnson & Johnson–Janssen is still gathering data. The agencies are also waiting for results from studies exploring whether it’s safe to mix and match doses of different vaccines, which will help them decide if people vaccinated with one type of vaccine can get a booster dose of another.

It’s certainly a confusing way to launch the booster campaign, with the CDC recommending boosters for some, allowing others to decide for themselves, and leaving some to wait. But it reflects the deep disagreement among public-health experts over whether everyone who has been vaccinated even needs another dose of a COVID-19 vaccine at this point. Studies show that while people’s vaccine-induced protection does wane several months after they get immunized, that immunity is still enough to shield them from getting severe COVID-19 or being hospitalized. Plus, it’s not clear that the waning is affecting everyone equally.

Both the World Health Organization and the European Medicines Agency maintain that so far, the data don’t show that boosters are necessary for anyone other than people with compromised immune systems. They also note that boosters will likely heighten inequities in vaccine coverage, as countries like the U.S., U.K., Israel, France and Germany authorize boosters to continue to protect the already protected, and potentially shift doses away from people in other countries who have yet to receive their first dose, leaving them even more vulnerable to the virus.

—ALICE PARK

POLITICS

Votes for women

Despite early reports, a recount of its Sept. 25 election results confirmed Iceland—which, in 1980, was the first country in the world to directly elect a female President—had fallen just short of becoming the second country in Europe to elect a majority-women Parliament.

Here, three countries that have hit (or surpassed) that milestone.

—Eloise Barry
DIED
Melvin Van Peebles
Blaxploitation pioneer

THERE WERE MANY WHO HATED—OR even feared—Melvin Van Peebles’ Sweet Sweetback’s Baadasssss Song upon its 1971 release. The X-rated film followed a Black outlaw on the lam after beating up two crooked white cops, and included explicit sex, violence and unambiguous critiques of white power structures. Van Peebles had self-funded and starred in the project after no studios agreed to back it; only two movie theaters in the U.S. even agreed to show it on opening night.

But Sweetback would soon become a runaway box office hit, leading to the greening of a new wave of Black films. And Sweetback would lay a foundation not just for the blaxploitation genre, but also for American experimental cinema over the next half century. Directors including Spike Lee and Quentin Tarantino have listed it among their foremost influences for its ambition, confrontation and unconventional narrative style. “[It] gave us all the answers we needed,” Lee wrote in 1991 of the film.

Sweetback was just one example of the ways that the fiercely independent Van Peebles, who died on Sept. 22 at 89, broke new ground. Beyond his filmmaking, he created several successful Broadway musicals, with his spoken-word songs serving as forerunners to rap. He became an options trader on the American Stock Exchange when few Black men were on Wall Street. And he collaborated several times with his son, Mario Van Peebles, a leading Black filmmaker of a new generation. Earlier this year, Mario Van Peebles told TIME: “Sweetback made going up against the man and questioning the system hip, not just onscreen but behind the scenes.” —ANDREW R. CHOW

SENTENCED
Capital Gazette gunman

THE FAMILIES OF GERALD Fischman, Rob Hiaasen, John McNamara, Rebecca Smith and Wendi Winters can take solace, however small, in justice. On Sept. 28, a judge sentenced Jarrod Ramos, who in June 2018 entered the Annapolis, Md., newsroom of the Capital Gazette before shooting and killing five of the paper’s employees, to five life sentences without parole. Ramos held a vendetta against the Capital for its coverage of his 2011 guilty plea to harassment.

The judge “lauded the news organization’s courage for publishing the edition of the next day,” according to an account of the sentencing published in the Capital, which continued to cover its own tragedy. (The staff was named a TIME 2018 Person of the Year in “The Guardians and the War on Truth.”) Reporter Selene San Felice, who survived the gunman’s rampage hiding under her desk, said, “No one could ever kill this paper.”

—SEAN GREGORY

DIED
Actor Willie Garson, well known for his role as Sex and the City’s Stanford Blatch, at 57 on Sept. 21.

> Richard Buckley, the fashion journalist and editor, at 72 on Sept. 19.

RETURNED
A 3,600-year-old tablet showing parts of the Epic of Gilgamesh, a sacred religious text, to Iraqi officials in a ceremony in Washington on Sept. 23, years after it was trafficked to the U.S.

RETIRED
The world’s most accomplished professional sumo wrestler—Mongolian-born Hakuho Sho—at 36 on Sept. 27 after a two-decade-long career and 1,187 total victories in the ring.

COMPLETED
A “full forensic audit” of the 2020 election results in Arizona’s largest county, which found not evidence of fraud but rather votes not previously counted for Joe Biden, noted a Sept. 24 report.

SELECTED
Foreign Minister Fumio Kishida as president of Japan’s Liberal Democratic Party on Sept. 29. From his new role in party leadership, Kishida is expected to become Japan’s next Prime Minister.

LEGALIZED
Same-sex marriage in Switzerland on Sept. 26, after almost two-thirds of voters expressed support in a nationwide referendum.
‘Accidental’ N.Y. Governor Kathy Hochul does not intend to go down in history as an asterisk

By Charlotte Alter

A MONTH INTO NEW YORK GOVERNOR KATHY Hochul’s term, Andrew Cuomo has become a ghost. Almost nobody in the governor’s office mentions his name. In a recent hour-long interview, Hochul called him only “this past governor,” when she referred to him at all. When I asked about a model of a ship on display in her New York City office, a staffer informed me that it was “a him thing.”

Until August, most of New York politics had been a “him thing.” The Empire State is usually dominated by wannabe emperors, men with massive egos like Cuomo or Eliot Spitzer. The state that birthed the women’s suffrage movement has never elected a woman as governor, or mayor of New York City. Even though she served for six years as Cuomo’s lieutenant, Hochul—a trim 63-year-old Irish Catholic with a voice like Caroline Kennedy and a near-encyclopedia knowledge of the Buffalo Bills—is in many ways an accidental governor.

She found out she was getting the job the same way the rest of the world did: while watching Cuomo announce his resignation on live TV. Like many New Yorkers, Hochul had assumed that the three-term governor would dig his heels in despite becoming hopelessly embroiled in a sexual harassment scandal. She watched Cuomo’s press conference with her aides in her Buffalo home office, then stood up, went into a small guest bedroom nearby and shut the door.

“I’m not overly religious, but I dropped to my knees,” she says. “And I said: God give me strength, and courage, and wisdom.” Hochul thought about how her tenure—however long or short it might be—would be scrutinized as a blueprint for how other women might handle executive roles. “And then I got up, walked in and said, ‘Let’s do this.’”

Hochul has less than a year to make her point before the 2022 governor’s race. “I need to prove that women can do this, and excel at it, and show that we govern very differently, but just as effectively,” she says. “We dream just as big. Our vision is just as bold. And we’ll get it done in a way where people can share in the success.”

You could look at Hochul’s career as a series of fortuitous accidents, the story of a woman who often seems to have found herself in the right place at the right time. She grew up as one of six kids in a working-class family in Buffalo, with a steelworker father and an “always pregnant” mother. Hochul started volunteering at the local Democratic headquarters as a teenager, but never considered elected office herself, mostly because there were so few examples of women who had done it. “I was preparing myself to be the best staffer,” she recalls. Her dream was to be a top aide to a Senator.

LIKE SO MANY WOMEN in politics, Hochul’s career would be singed by casual sexism, interrupted by motherhood, and shaped by the decisions and failures of flawed men. She became Erie County clerk, thanks to an appointment by then governor Spitzer, and later won a Buffalo-area congressional seat in a special election held when Republican Representative Chris Lee resigned after being caught sending shirtless photos to a woman he met on Craigslist.

Given that Hochul has ascended to the governor’s mansion because of allegations of sexual harassment, I asked whether she had ever been sexually harassed herself. “I don’t want to say any slight I had ever rises to what so many others have gone through,” she said. But still, there was that one time.

As a young associate at a law firm, she was asked to host a client from Japan because the partner wasn’t available to take him for dinner. At first she was excited for the opportunity. But “it became clear to me during dinner that he thought I was there … for him.” After dinner, Hochul recalls, “he was angry at me that I didn’t go upstairs.” She went back to her law firm and told them, “Don’t ever do that to me again.”

Hochul soon moved on to staff jobs on Capitol Hill, putting her on a path to achieve her teenage ambitions. While working as an aide to New York Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, she was so busy she didn’t bother to wonder why she wasn’t feeling well. “I didn’t know I was pregnant for about three months,” she says. “I literally went white-water rafting, not knowing I was pregnant.” She says her experience gives her a special perspective into the unfairness of a new law in Texas that bans abortion beginning at six weeks, long before many women know they’re expecting.

Unable to find good childcare options, Hochul quit the Hill after becoming a mother, and later moved back to upstate New York, where she raised her two kids. But she stayed political. In 1994, she was appointed to a vacant seat on her local town council, then was tapped to fill another vacancy as Erie County clerk in 2007, where she forged connections in the New York political hierarchy. New York Democratic Party chair Jay Jacobs recalls once traveling to Erie County for a state convention, expecting the county clerk’s office to send “some office worker” to pick him up at the
airport. Instead, he recalls, Hochul herself volunteered. In 2011, she won the special congressional election in her conservative district in an upset, and barely lost her re-election bid a year later, buffeted by unfavorable redistricting and GOP backlash to the Affordable Care Act. In 2014, Cuomo chose her as his running mate in part because he wanted to balance his ticket with a woman from upstate New York.

Lieutenant governor of New York is a largely ceremonial role, and Cuomo kept her at arm’s length. But Hochul made a point of traveling the state, building connections and making friends. When a new crop of young women arrived in the New York legislature in 2019, Hochul took them out for chips and guacamole in Albany and gave them advice on floor speeches (never read from a piece of paper) and luggage recommendations (her Away suitcase is always reliable).

BUT NEW YORK is not known as a place where nice ladies finish first, and just a month into her tenure, Hochul’s rivals are circling. Potential Democratic challengers are whispering about her administration’s ties to lobbyists, how much she may have known about Cuomo’s scandals and some of her past policy positions, like her 2007 opposition to issuing driver’s licenses to undocumented immigrants. (Hochul has said she’s “evolved” on this issue.) Hochul, who once held an “A” rating from the NRA, knows primary challengers will criticize her as insufficiently progressive. “They did it in 2014: I won. They did it in 2018: I won. They can do it again, and I’ll win,” she says.

In her first months in office, Hochul says she will focus on three major priorities: curbing COVID-19, delivering relief money to New Yorkers and investing in infrastructure. She’s replaced many of Cuomo’s allies with an experienced staff, says veteran New York state senator Liz Krueger. “And she’s getting them to work for her apparently on a day’s notice.”

When she’s not visiting New Yorkers whose homes were destroyed by Hurricane Ida, the governor is reading Accidental Presidents, about Chief Executives, from Teddy Roosevelt to Lyndon Johnson, who stepped into power at a moment’s notice. “These are stories of other people thrust into the roles who have to prove themselves very quickly to people who don’t know them,” Hochul says. “That’s my life right now.” —With reporting by Simmone Shah

‘It became clear to me during dinner that he thought I was there ... for him.’

KATHY HOCHUL, New York governor, recalling sexual harassment she suffered as a young lawyer
Burning a path

Lava flows creep across residential neighborhoods and farmlands on La Palma, in Spain’s Canary Islands, on Sept. 23, four days after an eruption of the small island’s Cumbre Vieja volcano. Hundreds of homes and buildings were destroyed and thousands forced to leave over 10 days of volcanic activity; the Canaries’ government chief Angel Victor Torres described the impacted area as a “catastrophe zone.” Officials said on Sept. 28 that lava had reached La Palma’s shoreline and was spilling into the Atlantic Ocean, releasing huge steam clouds and potentially toxic gases.
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On Sept. 1, Texas enacted an extreme law that effectively ended abortion care in the state. Since then, clinics in states on the western and northern borders have seen a dramatic increase in patient visits and calls from abortion funds. But here in the Gulf region, not much has changed. And that might be the most alarming news of all.
There is no region more crippled by abortion restrictions than the Deep South. Across the more than 800 miles along the Gulf Coast between the eastern edge of Texas and the end of the Florida panhandle, there are fewer than a dozen abortion clinics, and Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama require a waiting period of 24 or 48 hours between in-person visits to the clinic. That means a traveling patient must either make multiple trips or find the resources for some combination of housing, food, childcare and time off work, in addition to paying for the abortion. Most abortion patients come from low-income households, and state laws down here prohibit non-employer-based insurance from covering abortion.

So it is that with Texas prohibiting abortion as early as 14 days after a missed period, clinics in states like New Mexico and Oklahoma are seeing a flood of new appointments, but those in Louisiana, Mississippi and Alabama are not. While our phones at West Alabama Women’s Center ring more than before, it is nowhere near what we would expect with one of the nation’s largest states eliminating nearly all abortion care. It’s not terribly surprising, though. With enough hoops to get through, of course people will be deterred from seeking an abortion in the Deep South. That was the intention.

THOSE WHO HAVE the resources are able to travel, some as far as Illinois. But those who don’t? What are they doing now?

It’s a thought that consumes us daily. In Alabama, we’ve long seen patients from Mississippi, where there is just one clinic, and since Hurricane Ida, we’ve seen Louisiana patients unable to get into their own booked clinics. So it’s unlikely that these states are taking in many patients from East Texas.

Our fear is that pregnant people wanting an abortion have simply stopped trying to access the procedure—at least for now. Because the ban has continued to have court challenges, including one from the Justice Department, those who are early in their pregnancies may just be waiting, hoping that a new hearing might mean a chance to stay in the state and get a termination. After all, if there will be a judicial review in two weeks and it takes two weeks to book an appointment in Louisiana, does it really make a difference?

Unfortunately, it does. Whether this barrier to health care is temporary or permanent, one thing we know for certain is that people who decide to end their pregnancies will now be doing so later in gestation—either because of waiting for legal abortion to return in Texas or needing to book out-of-state visits weeks in advance. These delays will increase health risks as well as financial burdens and lead more people to take legal risks to terminate. What they will not do, for the large part, is make Texans and others affected in the region decide they should just give birth.

At our clinic, we will continue to do anything we can to meet this need as it arises. We now offer state-mandated informed-consent materials via certified mail, thus starting the clock on the 48-hour waiting period and eliminating one visit, which can be critical for patients traveling hundreds of miles. We will also increase our hours if needed so more patients can access the abortion care they need as quickly as possible, as is their constitutional right.

The problem is this may be just the beginning. With a number of other states considering similar bans—notably Florida—this crisis may get far worse. Florida is currently a destination for those in the region who are unable to navigate their states’ multivisit requirements. It is also the only state in the region with a number of clinics that is more aligned with the number of people living there. A near total abortion ban would not just cripple that state but every state around it. If Florida’s clinics were unavailable, the domino effect would essentially overflow the Southeast.

Abortion has always existed. Legal or not, it will continue to exist. Texas is playing a dangerous constitutional game—and using pregnant people as collateral.

Marty is the author of The New Handbook for a Post-Roe America and operations director at West Alabama Women’s Center. Torres is an ob-gyn and the medical director of West Alabama Women’s Center.

Demonstrators outside the Supreme Court on Sept. 4, days after the Justices declined to block a near total ban on abortion in Texas.
SOCIETY

Why you’re always tired
If you’re feeling more fatigued than usual—not sad or depressed necessarily, just exhausted—you’re not alone. Google searches for “Why am I tired all the time?” have been at historic highs lately.

There are obvious drivers like the pandemic, but I think something else is going on too: there’s a lack of excitement in our lives, and we’re filling that void with anxiety.

Many of us are going out less because going out feels stressful and risky. Instead, bored and sluggish, we check social media. We’re not doing this to learn anything specific. We just want a jolt, which often comes in the form of a horrific news story. Although this jolt can feel like excitement, it’s actually anxiety. And repeated bouts of anxiety lead to deep exhaustion.

But it’s possible to break this cycle. Although physical fatigue often benefits from rest, psychological fatigue often benefits from action. In other words, we don’t need to feel good to go out; we need to get going to give ourselves a shot at feeling good.

—Brad Stulberg, author of The Practice of Groundedness

THE RISK REPORT

Angela Merkel didn’t just save Europe, she strengthened it
By Ian Bremmer

GERMANY’S ELECTION on Sept. 26 ended without a clear winner, but one thing at least is certain: Angela Merkel will soon exit the political stage she has occupied for the past 16 years, kick-starting much debate about her legacy for Germany, and for the world.

Comparisons with her mentor and predecessor Helmut Kohl, who led Germany through reunification, are as inevitable as they are unfair. The demands of their eras were entirely different, and to understand that is to recognize Merkel’s lasting achievement.

In 1990, a heady sense of opportunity in both West and East Germany created the public support that Kohl needed to reunite the country. Over the Merkel era, by contrast, Germans (and Europeans generally) have needed a thoughtful, flexible problem solver to guide them through a debt emergency, a surge of migrants from the Middle East and a global pandemic. In the process, Angela Merkel helped save the European Union. That’s an accomplishment that deserves lasting respect.

Convinced that a strong and cohesive E.U. would be good for her country, the German Chancellor bridged the gaps and cut the deals that helped Europe’s most deeply indebted nations survive the 2010–2012 sovereign-debt crisis. Merkel kept her word that Germany would lead the way in coping with the 2015–2016 migrant crisis by welcoming more than 1 million desperate people into her country.

In response to the pandemic and the need for a bold economic recovery plan, she shifted German opinion on the need for common European debt.

Her critics say these decisions fueled the populism and cynicism that have threatened to poison European politics. But without Merkel, and her willingness to take on more costs and risks so that others could take less, the E.U. might have lost more than just Britain.

Her leadership has also been good for most Germans. Some 70% now say they’re happy with their economic circumstances. Much of Germany’s success might have happened without her, powered by new export opportunities in China and cheap labor from Eastern European countries. But Merkel’s ability to manage emergencies has helped keep Germany’s economic engine humming. Unemployment is now near its lowest point of the Merkel era. In addition, a balanced-budget law enacted in 2009 has helped keep public debt low.

Merkel has strengthened Europe by showing that compromise is possible for the good of all.

There is much more Merkel could have done, to be sure. By balancing its books, Germany has invested far less than it might have in renewable energy. While some credit Merkel for transitioning Germany away from risky nuclear power, the country’s carbon emissions are high by European standards.

Although Merkel remains popular, her party doesn’t. She leaves with an 80% approval rating even as the center-right alliance she led is in historic decline. In the Sept. 26 election, the CDU/CSU secured just over 24% and finished narrowly behind their center-left rivals, the SPD. Whoever emerges as the next Chancellor will be seen by most Germans as a pale shadow of her leadership.

Not only is Merkel a tough act to follow in Germany, there is also no one else now in Europe who can match her tenacity and resilience. In particular, French President Emmanuel Macron, facing a re-election campaign next year, inspires too much mistrust, including in France, to inherit Merkel’s ability to guide combative European leaders toward agreement.

Fortunately, Merkel has strengthened Europe itself by showing other leaders that compromise is possible for the good of all. That makes future crises less likely—a legacy worth celebrating.
Did I point my kids to the wrong North Star?

By Nicole Chung

Looking back, maybe I shouldn’t have used the phrase when this is over quite so often when talking about the pandemic with my kids.

It wasn’t that I thought everything would return to the status quo, or that the status quo was anything to be content with. And it wasn’t that I believed we would remain unaltered after COVID-19 upended our routines and sense of safety. But part of what kept us going through the first year of pandemic—through grief and loneliness, remote work and learning—was the hope of life after. Even when it became clear that millions of Americans were unwilling to take basic precautions to limit the spread of the virus, I still believed that most would get vaccinated as soon as they were able—to protect themselves, if the collective good couldn’t sway them.

So when my children asked, “When will this be over?” I encouraged them to look forward to a time when we would all have access to safe and effective vaccines. And for about six weeks of summer, with three-quarters of our household vaccinated, we did experience some of those joys we’d once taken for granted: friends came over for dinner; my sister flew out from the West Coast to visit; the kids spent a week at their grandparents’ house. My husband and I registered our children for what we hoped would be a far more typical school year, with local infection rates so low, we wondered whether our school system would even bother requiring masks. I started looking at flights home for more than a year. The week before school started, I was plagued with insomnia; a hard, painful knot had formed in my chest, reminiscent of the way stress had lived there for two years. I was not doing well when all of this began. Yet even without such recent losses, I suspect I’d be struggling now—because when I speak with friends, fellow parents, I hear many of my fears echoed back.

I would say that I don’t know how we got through that first shaky week of this third pandemic-impacted school year, except that I do know: We had no choice. We still don’t. Though we’re grateful to their teachers and glad that our kids are once again learning alongside their peers, the worry persists, an undercurrent to which we’ve been forced to adapt.

Each week brings more pediatric infections, more student quarantines. Each day, I’m conscious of the fact that I’m allowing my children to assume a risk from which I, working at home, am protected. I read every update to the school COVID-19 guidelines so I know what to expect after the inevitable exposure, but I can’t tell my kids what they have long wanted to know: When will things go back to the way they remember?

NEARLY EVERY INTERVIEW with a public-health expert once included the question “When will things get back to normal?” and I always found myself reading the replies with an almost child-like eagerness, a need to be comforted, or at least told what to expect. But part of living through the pandemic—for those of us who have, thus far, been lucky enough to live through it—is realizing that we’ve lost too much and too much for this to ever be “over.” One in 500 Americans has died of COVID-19, with a higher share of deaths in Black, Latinx and Native communities. Millions of people, including a statistically small but heartbreaking number of kids, now live with symptoms of long COVID. No matter how low cases fall, we’ve crossed into new terrain and cannot go back.

And I think this can be a hard truth to communicate to our children, as we toe that line between wanting to be honest and wanting to protect them from further trauma. So many of them were already threatened by racist violence, mass shootings, the deadly effects of a largely unchecked climate emergency, long before COVID-19 came to devastate our communities. So much has been asked of our kids; so much that they should have been able to count on has proved elusive, unrecoverable—they’ve suffered every kind of instability and trauma that adults have over the past year and a half, all while having to rely on us to shield them from fire and flood, infection and death.

I know my intentions were good when I encouraged my own children to expect an end to the alarming spread, the
immediate peril of this virus—I didn’t want them to despair, and I honestly believed that vaccines would bring about a return to normalcy, or something like it. But now, with Delta’s high transmissibility rate, fears over still more variants and millions still unvaccinated, I don’t think I’m the only parent wondering if I have pointed them toward the wrong North Star. While I expect that our own relative risk will downshift once all four of us are vaccinated, and I continue to tell my kids things will get better, I’m no longer certain they believe me. Nor am I certain they have a reason to, given how grievously so many adults have failed to take the easiest steps to keep them safe.

What can we offer our children now, if not the promise of an uninterrupted school year, or a guarantee that they can trust adults to try to protect them from a host of dangers? How do we help them live and learn when we, their parents and caregivers, lack that most basic of foundations to stand on? For now, I keep telling my kids that I love them. That many people do want to keep them safe, and are trying their best. And that I know they are doing their best in the hardest time we’ve known, and this makes me prouder than ever.

I DIDN’T EXPECT to find myself blinking back tears when I picked up my 10-year-old on the first day of school and saw throngs of masked children streaming from the doors, something I hadn’t witnessed since March 2020. I was moved at the sight of those students with their heavy backpacks and heavier burdens—they were doing such a brave thing, and many of them probably didn’t even realize it; they were just happy to be together again. By following rules established for their safety, they were doing everything in their limited power to take care of one another.

If some of our children are frustrated with us, if they’re angry that so many adults continue to make choices that put them and other vulnerable members of our society at risk, if it’s hard for them to picture an end to this pandemic, that’s more than fair. In a time of enormous loss and uncertainty, I’ve come to believe that my focus as a parent shouldn’t be on managing their feelings or expectations, or predicting a more stable future that might not come to be. I can’t supply all the answers they seek, or promise all the outcomes they deserve, but I can affirm what they’re experiencing while encouraging them to act with compassion and recognize their responsibility to others.

Over the past 18 months, a common refrain has been that this pandemic should compel all of us to recognize our interdependence, the inescapable fact that we will not address this or any of the other grave threats we’re facing without collective action. This is a lesson that I expect many of our children are also learning, though the cost feels too high. I know I don’t want my kids to conclude that they are powerless, or that there is no one who will fight with and for them. There are many things I still have to hope for to get through each day, and while our children’s survival and health top the list, I also want them to retain their faith in themselves and in their ability to look forward to something better than this—to find, as they so often do, their own reasons to hope.

Chung is the author of the memoir All You Can Ever Know
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JANE GOODALL
AND THE TENACITY OF HOPE

BY CIARA NUGENT
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Goodall has spent the past 19 months working from her attic bedroom in Bournemouth, U.K.
In the early years of World War II, when Jane Goodall was around 6 years old, she was often woken from her sleep by the blare of air-raid sirens. The sound warned that Nazi planes were flying over Bournemouth, the English seaside town where Goodall’s family had moved at the outbreak of the war. Her younger sister Judy would be up like a shot, bounding down the stairs to the bomb shelter. But Goodall refused to budge. “I did not want to leave my bed,” she says. “They had to take me down with all my bedclothes.”

Eight decades later, Goodall, now 87, is standing in the living room of the same house, an imposing redbrick Victorian building with cavernous ceilings, thick carpets and heavy armchairs. The bomb shelter is still here, now home to a washing machine and a fridge. In the rest of the house, wooden shelves are crammed with books, figurines and photographs — souvenirs from Goodall’s life as the world’s best-known naturalist. Her grandmother bought the house in the 1930s, and it has the thick layer of bric-a-brac of a home occupied by the same family for many years.

The new occupants on this late September morning are a camera crew, moving between rooms in search of furniture to take to the garden for a photograph. Goodall, though, is still, arms crossed and eyebrows raised. Her voice cuts through the commotion. Speaking softly yet with conviction, she suggests the crew try her preferred location: her attic bedroom. She exudes the same stubbornness as the girl who clung to her bed in wartime, then leads the group upstairs, victorious.

Goodall’s quiet determination has powered her through a lifetime of waiting for others to come around. In 1960, at 26, she sat for months in the forests of Tanzania, biding her time until chimpanzees accepted her presence and she could observe them up close. When she finally did, she made the seismic discovery that they use tools, transforming our understanding of the relationship between humans and animals and catapulting her to global fame. In 1962, while pursuing her Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge in the study of animal behavior, when professors criticized her for using human names and emotions to describe chimps, she says, “I didn’t confront them. I just quietly went on doing what I knew was right.” Although she learned to couch her observations in more scientific language, her contention that chimps are intelligent social animals is now widely accepted and has paved the way for much tighter restrictions on their use in lab testing.

After Goodall shifted from research to activism in the 1980s, her steady, non-confrontational approach allowed her to become one of the most prolific environmentalists in modern history. She leveraged her own life story — drawing on the powerful image of a lone woman living among the animals — to get people excited about environmentalism in an era when it was a fringe activity. Through the Jane Goodall Institute, which she founded in 1977, she fundraised for habitat conservation projects, poverty-alleviation programs and animal sanctuaries. The JGI now has chapters in 24 countries, from the U.S. to the United Arab Emirates. In 2004, she became a Dame Commander of the British Empire.

Along the way, she added new stories to her repertoire: on history, animal behavior, human ingenuity. These, rather than protest, became her campaign tools.

“If I’m trying to change somebody who disagrees—I choose not to not to be holier-than-thou,” she says, perched on a well-loved armchair. “You’ve got to reach the heart. And I do that through storytelling.”

Before the pandemic, Goodall traveled 300 days out of the year to speak to school assemblies, at conferences and on talk shows in an effort to instill some of her determination in others. Through her stories, she has built a popular brand of environmentalism centered around hope — a word that has appeared in the titles of four of 21 books for adults Goodall has published since 1969.

A fifth comes in The Book of Hope: A Survival Guide for Trying Times, co-authored with Douglas Abrams and Gail Hudson, a memoir cum manifesto on the centrality of hope to activism. The book, coming Oct. 19 in the U.S. and next year in the U.K., documents three sets of interviews between Abrams and Goodall. In their conversations, Abrams questions Goodall on how she can remain hopeful despite the environmental destruction and violent human conflicts she has witnessed, as well as the grief she has experienced, in her lifetime. (Goodall lost her second husband to cancer, less than five years after marrying him, in 1980.) She
gives four reasons: “the amazing human intellect, the resilience of nature, the power of young people and the indomitable human spirit,” fleshing out these concepts with the color of her life.

Something about her—her enthusiasm, the brightness of her eyes, the detail in her unusual experiences—leaves readers and audiences feeling hopeful that it’s possible, with enough effort, for us to save the planet, and ourselves, from environmental destruction. “She’s an amazing woman,” naturalist filmmaker David Attenborough told TIME in 2019, praising her ability to inspire. “She has extraordinary, almost saintly naïveté.”

The tenacity of Goodall’s hope, in the face of the crises we now endure, might seem naive. Despite decades of institutional efforts and dedicated activism by millions across the globe, humans have driven the planet to the brink of ecological and climate catastrophe. With a long-awaited U.N. climate summit just weeks away, scientists say world leaders have failed to even pledge enough carbon-emissions cuts to make a livable future, let alone begun to deliver on their promises. The situation has led a younger generation of activists to take a much more confrontational approach than Goodall’s.

Goodall says she understands the bleak projections from climate scientists and the economic and political structures that hinder change. But she argues that hope, and her mission to spread it, are nothing short of necessary for the survival of humanity. “If you don’t hope that your actions can make a difference, then you sink into apathy,” she says. “If young people succumb to the doom and gloom—if they lose hope—that’s the end.”

IN MARCH 2020, Goodall had just climbed into a car on the wide, tree-lined street outside the Bournemouth house, the first step on her journey to an event in Brussels. It was one of dozens of trips she had planned for the year, which would take her to cities and forests all over the world, to her house in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and back to Bournemouth to meet with Abrams. But then her sister Judy ran out of the house and told her to come back inside: the event had just been canceled. It was the start of COVID-19 shutdowns in the U.K. and an abrupt end to Goodall’s life on the road.

The 19 months Goodall has now spent in her family home, accompanied by Judy and Judy’s daughter and grandchildren, amount to the longest time she has lived there since school, and the longest continuous period she has stayed in any one place in decades. Over the past year and a half, she has traded hotels and auditoriums for her bedroom, a narrow attic room with a low ceiling, crowded by chests and bookcases, littered with gifts and mementos: a long gray Andean condor feather, a brightly printed South American cloth, dozens of old photos. In the corner, there’s the single bed where she sleeps, and within arm’s reach, a narrow desk, which holds the only two totems of our time: a laptop and a ring light.

Goodall’s determination to spread her message has kept her up here for hours each day, doing, on average, three virtual lectures or interviews between breakfast and bedtime. “That’s including weekends,” she says, both proud and a little weary. “I even had something on Christmas Day and on my birthday.” It’s been hard, she says, to stare into the tiny green light of her laptop camera all day. “When you’re giving a lecture to 5,000, 10,000 people, you say something funny and people laugh, or you say something moving and you see eyes being wiped,” she says. “But if you don’t get the same energy into it, there’s no point doing it.”

If she’d had the option, Goodall says, she would have spent the pandemic period completely alone. “I’ve always loved being by myself,” she says. “If I could have chosen, I would have been in a house with nobody else, and a dog.” She pauses to look disapprovingly at Bean, the gray whippet snoozing on a chair nearby. Occasionally Bean looks up, then noses back
beneath a leopard-print blanket to keep the light out of his eyes. “Not a dog like that,” Goodall says, chuckling. “A proper dog. He’s more like a cat.”

Goodall originally wanted to spend her life alone with animals. It’s the dream that sent her to Tanzania’s Gombe National Park in 1960. Although she had no formal scientific education, Goodall had managed to impress Louis Leakey, a renowned paleoanthropologist, with her passion for animals on a trip to Kenya with a school friend in 1957. Leakey secured funding to send Goodall to Gombe. Her observations of the chimpanzees there dispelled a then widely held belief that humans were the only animals who used tools, or had emotions or personalities. After the tool discovery, Leakey famously wrote to her, “Ah! We must now redefine man, redefine tools, or accept chimpanzees as human!”

Goodall’s mother Margaret came with her, answering a demand of the British research body that funded her trip for her to have a companion, and supported her daughter through the frustrating months in which the chimps ran away whenever she approached. But it was when she was alone, crawling through undergrowth or climbing mountains, that Goodall says she experienced a “spiritual connection” with the forest and its animals. “If you’re alone, you feel part of nature,” she says. “If you’re with one other person, even somebody you love, it’s two human beings in nature—and you can’t be lost in it.”

Goodall was among the last generation of researchers to spend time in the natural world before the scale of humans’ impact on it became a major topic of discussion in the scientific community. In 1986, at a primatology conference she helped organize in Chicago, she attended a session on habitat loss around the world. “After realizing what was going on, it was never quite the same, because then I felt I’ve got to try and save it,” she says. She still feels the spiritual connection when in nature, but there’s something else there, too: “There’s a little plea in it—a plea for help.”

**THAT NEW UNDERSTANDING** would transform Goodall’s life, taking her from the isolation of field and library research to a frenetic schedule of travel, charity work and activism for the next 35 years.

She describes in *The Book of Hope* an essential realization: if she wanted to protect nature, she would have to take a humanistic approach, striving to alleviate the conditions that drive people to hunt vulnerable animals or cut down trees. In 1991, she set up Roots and Shoots, a youth-activism program that now has local groups across 60 countries, in which young people are running more than 5,800 community projects to support people, animals and the planet. Three years later, she launched the Jane Goodall Institute’s flagship conservation program, which invests in social programs in villages in Tanzania, Uganda, the Democratic Republic of Congo and beyond, and then enlists villagers to help with tree planting and forest monitoring. (Marc and Lynne Benioff, TIME’s owners and co-chairs, have been among Goodall’s philanthropic supporters.) Goodall also began advocating for widening access to birth control in order to prevent population growth from putting too much pressure on natural resources.

Over the years, elements of Goodall’s philosophy have attracted criticism from some in the environmental movement. Some disagree with her focus on voluntary population control in developing countries, for example, when the wealthy contribute so much more to climate change and pollution. Others see the individual lifestyle changes that Goodall cites as inspiring examples of how “everyone can do their bit”—such as adopting a vegetarian diet or using less plastic—as a distraction from the much bigger changes that businesses and governments need to make, and a little hypocritical, given how often she flies.

Reflecting from her chair in Bournemouth, Goodall says she sees her ideas and her career as a pragmatic response to the crises. “We need to address it on every single side we can,” she says. “I try to be as environmentally friendly as I can with the life that I was sort of forced to lead.”

There’s a hint of martyrdom in Goodall’s use of the word forced. In reality,
although she romanticizes the solitude she had in Gombe, she acknowledges that connecting with people gives her energy. Her eyes light up as she picks up the objects she has collected on her travels, using them as prompts to tell stories. And she says she has “five to 12” friends in every big city around the world.

There’s no denying the success of her efforts in spreading hope. Per the JGI, at least 100,000 young people are currently engaged in activism or restoration projects through the Roots and Shoots program. Vanessa Nakate, a prominent 24-year-old climate activist from Uganda, says she read about Goodall’s life online a few years before she began her own work. “Long before I learned about how biodiversity loss is linked to climate change, I took from Jane’s work an instinctual understanding that protecting our ecosystems is so important,” she says.

For Abrams, Goodall’s co-author, one moment from their talks explained the appeal of her brand of hopeful activism. He asked her if, from what she had seen, she believed humans tended more toward good or evil. She responded that they have equal capacity for both. “The environment we create will determine what prevails,” she told him. “In other words, what we nurture and encourage wins.”

Her hope isn’t a denial of reality, Abrams says. It’s more of a choice: “Whether we focus on the devastation or the regeneration. Whether we focus on the possibility for good, or the inevitability of evil.”

**THE DEVASTATION** of the planet increasingly demands our focus. Extended droughts, destructive storms and unprecedented wildfires are fast becoming part of the daily news cycle. Climate scientists say these events are just the warning shot, with climate-change impacts set to become more frequent and intense—even if we stop emitting greenhouse gases tomorrow. In November, world leaders will gather for COP26, the U.N. climate conference, where they are due to scale up their emissions targets. Expectations are high, but many activists fear the conference will end without strong agreements.

As usual, Goodall is determined to find hope. “I won’t say I’m optimistic, but I have all my fingers crossed,” she says. “The positive thing is that there’s so much more awareness. There’s so much more pressure from the public.”

But the urgency of this moment has led many activists to doubt whether heightened consciousness will be enough to trigger the drastic changes we need. Kumi Naidoo, a South African anti-apartheid activist and former Greenpeace director, says Goodall was “ahead of her time” on raising awareness and that her present-day work is unquestionably valuable. But, he adds, “All of us in the environmental movement, especially those of us who have been around for a while, must acknowledge that notwithstanding our best efforts, our sacrifices, our hard work, we have not delivered the results we set out to deliver.”

A younger generation of activists has taken up more aggressive strategies to demand radical, systemic change, focusing more on the stakes for humans than for wildlife—an approach Naidoo argues is essential for forcing action. International networks such as the Sunrise Movement and Extinction Rebellion have blocked roads, occupied buildings and created disruptive spectacles in city centers. Millions of students are regularly skipping school to protest, bearing slogans that excoriate adult politicians.

Goodall says she can understand why young activists feel they need to be more assertive. Still, for her own part, a softer touch has always felt best, she says. “But then I’ve never tried the aggressive route. I couldn’t—it’s just not me.” She believes confrontational tactics can backfire, prompting those in power to pay lip service to demands without actually changing their minds. “If you can get into the heart with a story, you may not know at the time, but people will go on thinking.”

Her own story, meanwhile, continues—although not exactly in the same way as before. She will begin traveling again next year but says she will never resume the “crazy” schedule she maintained before the pandemic, having found she can reach so many more people online. “At 87, one never knows quite what the future holds. Still, I have good genes for a long life on both sides of my family.” She’ll work to spread hope and inspire people for as long as she can, for the sake of future generations. “I think about right now, I’m about to leave the world, and I want to leave it behind me with all the mess, ” she says. “Young people have to grow up into it. They need every bit of help they can.”

As if remembering her mission, Goodall picks up her laptop. “I want to read you a poem,” she says, enlarging the text so she can see it. The piece she chooses is by Edgar Albert Guest, a rhythmic, staccato quasi nursery rhyme titled, “It Couldn’t Be Done.” She reads with the joyful, kindly spirit of a grandmother speaking to a child, and it’s hard not to feel warmed by the encouragement. “Just start in to sing as you tackle the thing that ‘cannot be done,’ and you’ll do it.” She looks up, eyes flashing. “Don’t you love that?” —*With reporting by Alejandro de la Garza and Julia Zorthian/New York and Dan Stewart/London*
OVER THE HORIZON

At a U.S. military base in the Horn of Africa, the future of the war on terrorism has arrived.

BY W.J. HENNIGAN/LEMONNIER, DJIBOUTI | PHOTOGRAPHS BY EMANUELE SATOLLI FOR TIME
U.S. soldiers oversee marksmanship training of the Djiboutian Bataillon d’Intervention Rapide, an infantry unit equipped with American weaponry.
A remote corner of eastern Africa, behind tiers of razor wire and concrete blast walls, it’s possible to get a glimpse of America’s unending war on terrorism. Camp Lemonnier, a 550-acre military base, houses U.S. special-operations teams tasked with fighting the world’s most powerful al-Qaeda affiliates. Unfolding over miles of sun-scorched desert and volcanic rock inside the tiny country of Djibouti, the base looks—the troops stationed here will tell you—like a sand-colored prison fortress.

Inside, two subcamps sit behind opaque 20-ft. fences ringed with yet more razor wire. The commando teams emerge anonymously from behind the gates and board lumbering cargo planes to fly across Djibouti’s southern border with Somalia for what they call “episodic engagements” with local forces fighting al-Shabab, al-Qaeda’s largest offshoot. General Stephen Townsend, commander of military operations in Africa, describes it as “commuting to work.” The Pentagon has dubbed the mission Operation Octave Quartz.

The operation may be a sign of things to come. Despite President Joe Biden’s pledges to end America’s “forever wars,” he doesn’t plan a retreat from global counterterrorism missions. One month after his chaotic Afghan pullout, Biden is continuing the work his predecessors began, drawing down high-profile military missions abroad while keeping heavily armed, highly engaged counterterrorism task forces in place in trouble spots. The President plans to fight terrorism from “over the horizon,” he says, parachuting in special operators, using drones and intercepted intelligence, and training partner foreign forces.

Some 1,500 miles northeast of Lemonnier, about 2,500 U.S. forces operate from bases across Iraq, where they routinely come under rocket and mortar attack. An additional 900 forces are on the ground in Syria within striking distance of ISIS and al-Qaeda. In a June 8 letter to Congress, Biden listed a dozen nations, from Niger to the Philippines, where U.S. troops were on counterterrorism operations. These missions are undertaken by 50,000 men and women on the front lines of an active, under-the-radar conflict mainly waged in the Middle East and Africa.

Just how deeply Biden should invest in what used to be called the Global War on Terror has been the subject of live debate inside the Administration. His national-security team is finishing a new counterterrorism strategy that will in turn decide how big a global deployment of forces the U.S. makes. Biden has already halted most lethal drone strikes, ordering commanders to consult the White House on decisions to strike, and has initiated a review of when such lethal force should be used. At home, he’s increased counterterrorism investigations of domestic violent extremists, which, after the Jan. 6 attempted insurrection at the Capitol, the FBI rates as the single biggest threat to the homeland today.

The evolving U.S. approach represents a turning point for America and the world. Critics of U.S. military engagement abroad say the country should stop fighting shadow wars altogether, arguing that they can never be won, and that the ensuing civilian casualties and other costs create a self-sustaining global conflict. But full withdrawal would be dangerous. The U.S. military’s leaders worry their chaotic pullout from Afghanistan, and a new, diminished approach to fighting terrorism worldwide, could endanger
al-Shabab attack that left four Somali soldiers dead and several others wounded.

As the chaos unfolded on the ground, American special operators deployed as part of Operation Octave Quartz were watching through the high-powered cameras of a drone flying overhead. The U.S. forces were sitting far from the combat in a makeshift operations center elsewhere in Somalia, where they attempted to remotely advise their Somali partners, called the Danab Brigade, via encrypted radio. With their allies under serious threat, they ordered up an airstrike on the militants’ positions.

The U.S. bombing run ultimately turned the fight in Danab’s favor. The Somalis gained back control of Cammaara, which lies on a coastal smuggling route that is valuable to al-Shabab. U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM), which oversees all American military operations on the continent, characterized the airstrike as a “collective self-defense strike” in its public announcement, a description that allowed commanders to stay in line with the Biden Administration’s mandate that airstrikes in Somalia be approved by the White House unless they’re taken in self-defense.

Targeted drone strikes may help U.S. partners win individual battles, but they are unlikely to win a war against an entrenched enemy like al-Shabab. The group, whose name in Arabic means “the youth,” has waged an insurgency against Somalia’s fragile U.N.-backed government since 2007. Al-Shabab has received less attention than other terrorist organizations, but at 10,000 fighters it is al-Qaeda’s largest affiliate, controlling vast swaths of rural, south-central Somalia. Like the Taliban in Afghanistan, it runs a shadow government that extorts business owners and imposes its own harsh form of Shari’a, or Islamic law, with punishments such as public flogging, stoning and amputation. The group earns as much as $15 million per month in taxes, according to an October 2020 study from the Hiraal Institute, a Somalia-based think tank, revenue on par with that of the Somali government itself.

Al-Shabab strikes in the capital of Mogadishu at will. On Sept. 25, an explosive-laden car detonated near the presidential palace, killing at least seven people. Eleven days earlier, a suicide bomber walked into a tea shop and detonated an explosive vest, killing at least 11. Al-Shabab is responsible for the deaths of more than 4,400 civilians since 2010, according to the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data Project.

IN THE BRIGHTENING DAWN of Aug. 24, a truck loaded with goats and sheep pulled up to a Somali military camp near the central town of Cammaara. Suddenly the road erupted into a fireball. The explosion was the beginning of a multipronged

Americans and their allies. “A reconstituted al-Qaeda or ISIS with aspirations to attack the U.S. is a very real possibility,” the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Mark Milley, told Congress on Sept. 28. “Strategic decisions have strategic consequences.”

Biden is banking that a low-profile globe-spanning battle, and whatever collateral damage comes with it, will be politically palatable enough for Congress to keep funding, and effective enough to keep existing and emerging militant groups from threatening America. At Camp Lemonnier, the U.S. military’s only permanent base on the African continent, the approach is already being put to the test every day.

On Sept. 11, U.S. forces at Camp Lemonnier read out the names of each of the 2,977 people killed in the 2001 attacks
For years, the U.S. has been satisfied with containing al-Shabab. But the Taliban’s conquest in Kabul has stoked new fears that something similar may befall the frail government of Somalia. Al-Shabab has praised the takeover of Afghanistan on social media channels and repeated its desire to strike America and its allies. Unlike with the Taliban, whose sheltering of al-Qaeda paved the way for 9/11, it’s unclear what kind of damage an al-Shabab takeover could inflict on the U.S. A Pentagon inspector general report from November noted the group’s threats to kidnap or kill Americans in neighboring Kenya. “Al-Shabab retains freedom of movement in many parts of southern Somalia and has demonstrated an ability and intent to attack outside of the country, including targeting U.S. interests,” the report said.

Efforts by the U.S., the African Union and their allies to help stabilize Somalia have had some successes, like when Kenyan troops as part of the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) drove al-Shabab out of Mogadishu and the port town of Kismayo in 2011. But AMISOM has been unsuccessfully trying to hand over the fight to the Somali government ever since. “We know we cannot stay forever, but we do not want to see all the gains reversed,” says Kenyan Lieut. Colonel Irene Machangoh. “They can strike at any time.” The fractious Somali government, plagued by corruption and complacency, depends on foreign funding and training to support its military, and “Al-Shabab is not degraded to the point where Somali security forces can contain its threat independently,” the inspector general report found.

The U.S. has a checkered history of deployments to Somalia. It mostly pulled out after the infamous “Black Hawk Down” incident in 1993, when 18 American soldiers were killed and two helicopters were shot down over Mogadishu. After 9/11, contingents of U.S. special-ops forces started to rotate through the anarchic nation. Those missions targeting al-Shabab continued for years until President Donald Trump’s final days in office. Citing his own desire to end America’s “forever wars,” Trump ordered a full withdrawal from Somalia by Jan. 15, 2021, days before Biden was sworn in.

The U.S. had Camp Lemonnier nearby to which it could withdraw many of its forces. The Marines had first come to the base, a former French Foreign Legion garrison, in 2002 because of its strategic location. Near the choke point where the Red Sea meets the Gulf of Aden, it is on a sea-lane that’s critical to commercial shipping, but also to ensuring military supplies reach the Persian Gulf. Djibouti, a French colony until independence in 1977, is a politically stable nation that was willing to lease the U.S. a scrap of land sandwiched between an airport and a harbor.

From the start, the base served as a launching pad for U.S. operations against al-Qaeda in the region. Now, it’s at the forefront of Biden’s “over the horizon” approach. At nearby Chabelley airfield, drones take off on missions bound for Yemen, where they fight al-Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP), or for Somalia, just 10 miles south. The official name of the mission is Combined Joint Task Force–Horn of Africa—but the military, in its passion for acronyms, calls it CJTF-HOA. “We don’t want to own all the problems in the region, but we do want to be part of the solution,” the task force’s commander, Major General William Zana, tells TIME. “The U.S. presence in the region is a modest insurance policy to help achieve greater stability in the Horn.”

THE DEPLOYMENT AT LEMONNIER may be modest, but it’s effective. What began as an 88-acre Marine Corps outpost is now a vast combat hub, home to around 5,000 U.S. troops, civilians and contractors who train regional militaries, collect intelligence and deploy to combat zones. The command building bristles with antennas and satellite dishes, while an on-site forensics lab helps specialists hack into suspected terrorists’ phones and laptops, feeding future missions across the continent. The war these troops are fighting doesn’t turn on breaking the enemies’ defensive lines or sacking their seat of power. They grind along, ensuring an amorphous threat doesn’t grow into something more.

Commuting to Somalia, though difficult, may serve as a model for fighting terrorist groups from the distance Biden wants. Already, this mission is similar to the one the U.S. now carries out in Afghanistan and other nations: developing intelligence on suspected terrorist activity, largely from airborne surveillance, captured communications chatter and images captured by drones circling overhead, then launching strikes.

But it has its own costs. During the Trump Administration, the U.S. military was handed more authority to target al-Shabab leaders, bombmakers and operatives. There were 203 U.S. airstrikes on Somalia during Trump’s tenure, far more than were carried out under George W. Bush or Barack Obama. Trump’s willingness to use airpower led to rising claims of civilian casualties. Airwars, a London-based nonprofit, has received more than 100 allegations that innocent Somalis were killed under Trump. Those deaths are a big reason Biden launched a review into counterterrorism policy, officials say. So far, only four strikes have been carried out under Biden, all in self-defense, according to
the military. But with fewer troops on the ground, the U.S. military will likely become increasingly dependent on airpower in helping the Danab, Somalia’s special forces.

It’s not clear that remote war will work. Lawmakers, terrorism analysts and current and former government officials say that no technology can substitute for troops on the ground. Troops can’t develop strong personal relationships or understand local dynamics from afar. “We can remotely advise anybody,” one U.S. official says, “but it’s just more efficient when you’re there one-on-one.”

The U.S. military is prepared to continue the Somalia mission from afar, though it prefers to operate alongside its Somali partner force, the Danab. “The reposition of forces outside Somalia has introduced new layers of complexity and risk,” AFRICOM commander Townsend told U.S. lawmakers in April. “Our understanding of what’s happening in Somalia is less now than it was when we were there.”

Humanitarian groups, for their part, have repeatedly alleged that “over the horizon” strikes have killed or injured civilians in AFRICOM’s area of operations, as they have in other parts of the world where unmanned drones launch attacks. The true
toll of civilian deaths is significantly higher than the handful AFRICOM has admitted, says Chris Woods, director of Airwars. “U.S. military commands so routinely ignore reports of tragedies from affected communities,” he says. U.S. Africa Command says it researches each allegation it receives and refines tactics to avoid civilian deaths.

Biden’s critics, like Human Rights Watch, say his strategy will result in a never-ending battle, and point to the Afghan army’s spectacular collapse after 20 years of funding and training as evidence his approach is flawed. The U.S. military argues that by training local forces and joining them on operations, the U.S. can keep an eye on the evolving militant threat, and justify airstrikes if partner forces come under fire, using them as a kind of trip wire for targeting terrorists.

ABOUT 10 MILES off base from Camp Lemonnier, the U.S. Army’s 2nd Security Force Assistance Brigade trains a group of recruits from a Djiboutian infantry unit, which may one day join the AMISOM mission. Marksmanship training takes place on a windy Saturday at the foot of Mount Gubad. The young men lay on their bellies in dirt the color of dried blood, firing their M4 rifles at paper targets roughly 50 yards
away. The snap of gunfire resounds for miles. Sergeant First Class Jonathan Mills, 41, paces back and forth behind a dozen of the soldiers. “Hold your lead hand tight, and keep your eyes on the target,” Mills shouts, before an interpreter translates into French.

Aside from a 2014 attack that killed two at the La Chaumière restaurant in Djibouti City, the country hasn’t suffered much from al-Shabab’s violent campaigns. The nation has, however, capitalized on its strategic position, hosting bases for France, the U.S. and China—Beijing’s first overseas military facility. The bases, and foreign investment in local infrastructure, ensure some economic benefit from the regional counterterrorism campaigns.

Many of the Djiboutian troops come from parts of the impoverished country where quarrels are often settled with fists, rocks or shards of glass, and some have the scars to prove it. Now they wear the high-and-tight hairstyles of their American instructors, dress in similar camouflage uniforms and fire the same weapons. While they have not fought in Somalia, their commander, Lieut. Colonel Mohamed Mahamoud Assoweh, did throughout 2016 and 2017. “The fighting was very difficult,” he says, walking among volcanic rocks the size of beach balls. “Now that [al-Shabab] see what happens in Afghanistan, maybe they think they can wait us out.” Wearing a red beret and wraparound sunglasses, Assoweh says he’s pleased with his troops’ progress. He’s also happy with his arsenal of American-made M4s, .50-caliber Browning machine guns, encrypted radio systems and 54 humvees, even if it’s nearly impossible for his men to maintain. “This is what we need to fight,” Assoweh says of the al-Shabab threat.

And so the war on terrorism continues, marking grim anniversaries year after year, despite the talk of withdrawals and homecomings. At Camp Lemmonier, on Sept. 11, 2021, hundreds of troops stood in the windless heat in commemoration of the 9/11 attacks. It wasn’t yet 9 a.m., but the temperature had already soared past 104°. Rings of sweat began to appear upon the bands of the troops’ camouflage caps.

Twenty years ago, many of these service members were toddlers. Some weren’t born. But the attacks led them to a country that few could have found on a map before they received their deployment orders. “Things changed remarkably and irreparably after the attacks,” Major General Zana tells the service members. “None of us would be here. The street, this building, the planes that flew overhead, the relationships we formed, none of this would be here.” The troops uniformly salute an American flag as it’s pulled, inch by inch, to half-staff. An Army specialist steps into the silence, wets his lips and lifts his trumpet to play the distinctive 24 notes of taps—G, G, C, G, C, E. —With reporting by NIK POPLI/WASHINGTON and SIMMONE SHAH/NEW YORK
A U.S. soldier in Djibouti rests in the triple-digit heat during a joint exercise with French forces.
India’s Nowhere People

AN ANTI-IMMIGRANT CRACKDOWN IN ASSAM THREATENS TO RENDER 1.9 MILLION PEOPLE STATELESS

BY NEHA THIRANI BAGRI/DALGAON, INDIA
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MAMTAJ BEGUM, WHOSE HUSBAND HAS BEEN IMPRISONED FOR MORE THAN A YEAR
It had been a mundane day until then. Her husband Mahuruddin returned to their home in the northeast Indian state of Assam after selling fruit in a nearby town. He washed up, and they ate their dinner of rice and potatoes on the floor, by the table on which the children’s schoolbooks were piled high. At 2 a.m., they awoke to a commotion outside. In the dark, Begum could see about seven police officers gathered outside, surrounding their tin-roofed one-room house. Four of them barged into the room carrying large batons, ready to take Mahuruddin into custody. His offense: being unable to prove, in the eyes of the state, that he was not a foreigner.

Begum followed them to the police station with all the money they had at home, about $108, nearly eight months’ wages, and offered to pay the officer in charge in exchange for her husband’s freedom. When her offer was denied, she sat awake outside the police station all night. In the morning, she ran to a lawyer’s house and brought him back with her. But her efforts were in vain; as the sun reached the middle of the sky, police took Mahuruddin away to a detention center nearly 70 miles from their home. “I was completely lost for a few days,” she says. “It felt like my world had fallen apart.”

Begum, who never attended school, hesitates when asked how old she is—either 36 or 37—but knows exactly how long her husband has been behind bars. One year and nine days.

The divisive debate over who belongs in Assam, a hilly, ethnically diverse state in India’s northeast that shares a 163-mile border with Bangladesh, stretches back more than a century, to when the first waves of migrants arrived to work on the sprawling British tea plantations. The state’s population grew throughout the century, inspiring a vocal movement of Assamese citizens against Bengali-speaking migrants.

It culminated in 1985 with the signing of the Assam Accord, which said anyone who entered the state on or after March 25, 1971, the day before neighboring Bangladesh gained independence, is considered to be in India illegally and must be deported. Since then, the state of Assam and the national government have introduced a complex, overlapping web of measures to determine who is a lawful citizen and who is not.

It is this web in which Mahuruddin and many others are now caught. When India’s Prime Minister Narendra Modi’s Hindu-nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) came to power in the state in 2016, it intensified efforts to weed out so-called illegal immigrants in Assam. As part of an exacting citizenship test, all 33 million residents of Assam had to provide documents proving they or their ancestors were Indian citizens before March 1971. When the National Register of Citizens (NRC) was finally published in August 2019, it excluded nearly 1.9 million people. They now live under the threat of being ruled noncitizens by opaque foreigners’ tribunals and detained indefinitely.

Although the citizenship registry purports to target all undocumented immigrants regardless of religion, the crackdown under way in Assam has disproportionately
affected Muslims, who make up 34% of the population. The tribunals tasked with identifying legal citizens of India have tried significantly more Muslims and declared a much greater proportion of Muslims to be foreigners, according to a 2020 report by Human Rights Watch.

Human-rights observers and families of the detained now fear that Modi’s BJP has turned an anti-immigrant movement to identify and deport mostly Bengali-speaking migrants into a project to disenfranchise and create a climate of fear among all 10 million of Assam’s Muslims.

Tellingly, the government has moved to protect some 500,000 Bengali Hindus and people of other religions also left off the citizenship registry. Months after it was published, the Indian government enacted the Citizenship Amendment Act (CAA), which gave fast-track citizenship to many immigrants in the country illegally who are Hindus or members of five religious minorities—although not Muslims.

“For Muslims, even if we have all our papers, we are foreigners,” says Begum. “If there is no mistake in our documents, even then we are declared foreigners. This is being done to us because we are Muslim.”

The experience of Mahuruddin—in perpetual limbo, with little opportunity to fight his case—could be a preview of what lies ahead for at least some of the 1.9 million people who were left off the NRC in Assam and are now waiting to hear what will happen to them.

Mahuruddin’s family, and the families of dozens of others labeled noncitizens under existing laws, told TIME stories of children dropping out of school as parents struggled to pay legal fees, crippling poverty resulting from mounting debt, and the pain of families being separated. The economic, social and psychological impacts of India’s crackdown on illegal migration are felt acutely by those on either side of the prison bars.

What is happening in Assam could offer the government a blueprint for similar moves across the country. India’s powerful Home Minister Amit Shah, who has previously referred to so-called illegal migrants as “termites,” said in 2019 that the CAA would be put in place before the NRC was implemented nationwide.

Although experts say it would be practically impossible for the government to incarcerate or deport all of the country’s 200 million Muslims, these laws could be used to create a Jim Crow–like system of mass disenfranchisement for Indians of Muslim faith, says Ashutosh Varshney, the director of the Center for Contemporary South Asia at Brown University.

Some observers are drawing parallels between the situation for Muslims in Assam and those of the predominantly Muslim Rohingyas who lost their citizenship rights in Myanmar as a result of a 1982 citizenship law—despite decades of living in the country. “There’s been no such process of this scale of creation of statelessness by states in modern times,” human-rights activist Harsh Mander tells TIME. “This would be creating a Rohingya-like situation where millions of people will be rendered stateless.”

IN NOVEMBER 2018, Begum’s husband Mahuruddin received a notice that said he was suspected of being a foreigner. Within a matter of weeks, he was told to appear in front of a foreigners’ tribunal with documents proving his citizenship. These quasi-judicial bodies are unique to Assam, and the primary means of determining who is a citizen in the state. The courts place the burden of proof on the people accused of being foreigners, many of whom are poor and illiterate, unable to navigate a convoluted system or afford legal representation.

Mahuruddin gathered all the evidence he could find to identify and deport mostly Bengali-speaking migrants into a project to disenfranchise and create a climate of fear among all 10 million of Assam’s Muslims.
was not a citizen. They appealed the judgment in the state’s high court, but the appeal was rejected. It was a week later that officers barged into their home and took Mahuruddin away.

In the year since, Begum has visited several local government offices, carrying a fraying pink folder with her husband’s papers. The money she had collected for her daughter’s wedding has gone toward lawyer’s fees, nearly $1,240 so far. As the country went into a nationwide lockdown in March 2020 to limit the spread of COVID-19, little work was available. She washes dishes and cleans homes for a meager $14 per month. Her son, 16, who was attending private school, has dropped out and now takes on sporadic work at shops in town.

“I have all these papers, but yet they say he is not an Indian,” says Begum, flipping through her folders. “If I didn’t have any documents, then I can understand if they caught him. But we have everything—yet they took him. What should I do?”

In Assam, the citizenship registry is only the latest process by which the state identifies suspected foreigners. There are two other initiatives, which work in parallel and can sometimes even result in different outcomes for the same people. One, which was started by the election commission in 1997, allows an official in the local government to arbitrarily flag people on voter rolls as doubtful voters, or “D voters,” thereby revoking their right to vote.

The second is through the Assam Police Border Organization, a border police force unique to Assam that was established in 1962. Here, a police constable can declare that a person is a suspected foreigner based on tips from their neighbors. This is how Mahuruddin was sent before a foreigners’ tribunal.

These two processes have continued during the pandemic, with more people marked as suspected foreigners over the past year and sent to detention centers, according to lawyers and activists based in Assam—although official statistics are not publicly available.

Assam has not yet begun trying to deport people left off the citizenship registry. Those caught in the current crackdown were labeled noncitizens under existing laws. But two years after the list was published, the government has also not handed out formal rejection notices, which would detail the reason they were deemed foreigners and allow them to appeal their exclusion.

Officials from Bangladesh have repeatedly said they will not accept people deported for being left off Assam’s citizenship registry, and have accepted only a small percentage of people declared foreigners by the tribunals. In total, only 227 people have been deported to their country of origin—most of them to Bangladesh—between March 13, 2013, and July 31, 2020.

With little opportunity to appeal in a complex legal system and Bangladesh refusing entry, some have spent years behind bars. “Without the right of citizenship, countless will be dispossessed. They will become the ‘nowhere people,’ refugees in their own land, without rights, entitlements or legal protections,” says Angana Chatterji, the author of *Majoritarian State: How Hindu Nationalism Is Changing India* and a human-rights expert at the University of California, Berkeley.

**IT’S AN OVERCAST MARCH AFTERNOON** at Goalpara district jail when Samiran Nesa arrives in an auto-rickshaw. The air is heavy with humidity after thunderstorms the night before. A red plastic folder peeps out of her pink purse, carrying the important documents related to her husband’s case.

When the gates open at noon and Nesa sees her husband Sohidul Islam through the iron bars, she well up and is unable to speak. He looks at her, averts his eyes. Nesa jostles with about two dozen other visitors lined up outside the
jail windows. They are separated from the detainees by a wire mesh, iron grills and a metal fence. A cacophony of simultaneous conversations fills the air.

Islam threads his fingers through the wire and presses his face against the metal, wiping his tears on his sleeve. He asks after his children, ages 15, 17 and 18. Finally, Nesa speaks up and inquires about her husband’s health, her voice strained. He has been having abdominal pain and feels faint on some days. “The days feel very long here,” says Islam. “It is hard to pass the time.”

Nesa and her family are shocked by her husband’s case because the entire family was included in Assam’s NRC. “How did he suddenly become a foreigner?” she asks. “He was born here only; how could he have come here after 1971?”

And his detention has devastated his family. Both of his sons have had to leave their studies and take jobs, one in a tile factory and one as a security guard. For the first time in her life, Nesa has taken up work outside the home, cleaning classrooms in a nearby school. “I miss him a lot, he is in there, and I am sleeping here,” she says. “Even when I dream, I dream of the jail lockup.”

Detention centers for migrants—which are located inside existing prisons—have been functional for more than a decade and were first built in Assam in 2009, when the state government was headed by the Indian National Congress, now India’s main opposition party. Currently, there are six detention centers with a combined capacity of 3,300 people—although they house just a small fraction of that number.

The conditions faced by those held in detention centers have been the subject of growing concern in India. In January 2018, Mander, the human-rights activist, visited two of Assam’s detention centers as a special monitor for minorities for India’s National Human Rights Commission. Later that year, Mander resigned from the position and took his findings public, saying the commission did not act on his report.

“They were really hellish places,” Mander tells TIME. The detainees he saw lived in confined spaces with no prospect of release. Families were brutally separated and parole was not allowed, according to Mander’s findings. Detainees were not allowed to work, a right afforded to prisoners convicted of serious crimes. “They create a kind of dread in the heart of every person whose citizenship is contested.”

Crucially as well, all but the most serious criminal convicts have sentences with a definitive end date, after which they will be released. For those declared noncitizens, it remains less clear. India’s Home Ministry, which oversees citizenship rules, did not respond to TIME’s written requests for comment.

Begum, whose husband is in the detention center inside Tezpur jail, says his stay in prison has changed him. Previously a healthy, fit man, he now looks gaunt and shrunken. “He is not the same man he was when he went in,” says Begum.

On her visits to the jail, Begum noticed a pattern in the detainees who were in prison for being “foreigners.” “There are mostly Muslim people in jail for this issue, this is what I have seen when I go there,” says Begum. “There are not too many Assamese Hindus or Bengali Hindus.”

But detainees caught in Assam’s citizenship crackdown will not be held in prisons much longer. Because of the attention brought to the conditions in detention centers by activists...
like Mander, they will soon be moved out into detention centers specifically built to hold those who are declared illegal immigrants. One of these “model detention centers” is being built in Goalpara—a sprawling construction site spread over six acres, bounded by thick, towering walls painted red. The compound, which will include a hospital and separate sections for men and women, will have a capacity of 3,000 people when it is finished.

“The new detention center itself would be an apparatus to create fear,” says Anjuman Ara Begum, a human-rights researcher based in Assam who is not related to Mamtaj. Its capacity may sound small, she says, “but it would create a deep fear among vulnerable Bengali Muslims or Bengali Hindu people.”

Assam is not alone in building detention centers for immigrants who are found to be in the country illegally. At least five other sites are being constructed across India, in addition to ones that are already operational in Delhi, Karnataka and Goa. On Aug. 17, the Assam state government altered the formal term applied to detention centers, stating that they were to be called “transit camps” from now on.

AT THE CENTER of the citizenship tangle are the foreigners’ tribunals. First set up in 1964 to appease growing anti-immigrant sentiment in the state, the tribunals—which number more than 100—have been repeatedly found to be riddled with flaws. According to government data, nearly 87,000 people were declared foreigners in Assam from 2015 to June 2020—although most were tried in absentia and only a small fraction have been detained.

A 2019 investigation by Vice, based on judgments from five courts and interviews with nearly 100 people, found that the percentage of people found to be illegal immigrants varied greatly from tribunal to tribunal. About 75% of the decisions were issued in the absence of the accused. In some cases, individuals who were declared Indian citizens were summoned again by the same tribunal. Nearly 9 in 10 cases that were brought in front of the courts were against Muslims, who were also disproportionately declared illegal immigrants.

Aman Wadud, a human-rights lawyer in Assam who has argued many cases in front of foreigners’ tribunals, tells TIME that since the BJP took control of the state in 2016, rulings have “become much more arbitrary.”

A study published in September, led by Chatterji, reviewed 38 foreigners’-tribunal cases and found that in 30%, a document was rejected because the official who had issued it was not present to attest to its authenticity. The incorrect placement of the official emblem led to documents being rejected in 11% of the cases.

In 2020, the New York Times interviewed one current and five former members of the foreigners’ tribunals, who act as judges in the courts. Tribunal members told the Times they felt pressure to “find” more foreigners and declare more Muslims to be noncitizens. Assam’s Home and Political Department, which oversees the tribunals, did not respond to a request for comment.

For all its flaws, the system of rooting out foreigners is not uniformly unfair. After Bengali-speaking Hindus were caught up in the citizenship dragnet in Assam, the BJP-led government has worked to ensure that they have a way out through the CAA, which gave non-Muslim immigrants a path to becoming citizens.

The consequence, says Sanjib Baruah, a professor at Bard College in New York and the author of a book on Assam’s anti-immigrant history, In the Name of the Nation, has been to effectively redraw the definition of who belongs in India along religious lines: “Since Hindus by definition cannot be illegal immigrants in India, illegal immigrants [in Assam] can only mean Bangladeshi Muslims.”

The introduction of the CAA sparked massive protests across India in December 2019—including on the streets of Assam. But inside Goalpara district jail, Hindu detainees celebrated. Arun Shutradhar, who was among them, chuckles as he remembers the hopeful mood—people prayed, sang and beat drums. Shutradhar was sure that the new law would solve his problems.

Shutradhar discovered in June 2017 that he had been

“I FEEL LIKE I AM NEITHER ALIVE NOR DEAD. THE DAYS ARE JUST PASSING.”

—MAMTAJ BEGUM
marked as a doubtful voter. He submitted his papers, unaware that a tribunal had already declared him a foreigner in his absence. In March 2019, he was arrested and taken to an immigrant detention center.

Shutradhar was finally released on $68 bail this past April after a judge ordered all detainees who had been in jail for two years released to reduce overcrowding amid the pandemic. “On television, Modi-ji was giving speeches in support of Hindus, announcing a new bill to protect us,” says Shutradhar’s wife Shivani, using a common honorific to refer to India’s leader. She believes her husband will soon be free for good. “Being a Hindu, at least I can believe that we will not face trouble under this government,” she says.

The people swept up in Assam’s dragnet are not completely abandoned to their fate; lawyers and human-rights activists have come together to help those whose citizenship is contested. There are now about eight “constitution centers” scattered throughout the state that serve as legal-aid clinics for those who cannot afford representation. Volunteers attached to every constitution center are trained to provide basic legal advice to people who are fighting citizenship cases. The centers hold workshops, are stocked with a small library of books about the constitution, and raise funds for those who cannot afford lawyers.

“People must also know the basic rights they have—that everyone should be treated equally, that the constitution guarantees the right to life and personal liberty,” says Wadud, co-founder of the Justice and Liberty Initiative, which provides pro bono legal aid to people in citizenship cases and is spearheading the constitution centers. “We are trying to build infrastructure where people have access to justice.”

For Mamtaj Begum, the future remains uncertain. As further proof of how erratic Assam’s anti-immigration policy is, her husband Mahuruddin, who remains behind bars after being declared an illegal immigrant, was nonetheless included in Assam’s NRC—while Begum and her son were left off the list. With the status of the current list in limbo, it’s unclear when, or if, Begum will be hauled in front of a tribunal and potentially detained. It also means her husband will get no reprieve for being found to be a citizen.

But she is too preoccupied with her present troubles to worry about the prospect of going to a detention center herself. “I don’t think about the future, I just want to bring my husband home,” she says. Yet the independence that has been thrust upon Begum has made her braver. Before, as someone who never worked outside the house, she spent most of her days confined to her home and felt afraid to go into town alone. Now she travels around the state by bus, visiting her lawyer, the prison where her husband is being held, the state high court, various government offices, the homes where she works as a cleaning lady and the construction sites where she sometimes finds daily wage work.

She says that when a border police officer stopped her recently and asked why she was not afraid of him, she told him she had nothing to fear. But in quiet moments of reflection, Begum feels very alone. Although her brother-in-law tries to help her and sometimes sends rice and wheat, he is also struggling to support his family.

“No one asks after me if I have eaten or if the children have eaten,” says Begum. “I feel like I am neither alive nor dead. The days are just passing.” —With reporting by Leslie Dickstein, Nik Popli and Simmone Shah

The reporting for this story was made possible by a grant from the South Asian Journalists Association
Is a new Holocaust memorial also an instrument of Kremlin propaganda?

By Simon Shuster/Kyiv

On a breezy afternoon last spring, the Russian billionaire Mikhail Fridman took me on a tour of a public park near the center of Kyiv, the capital of Ukraine, along with a team of aides, architects, historians and artists. They had spent several years building a complex of memorials on the grounds, honoring the victims of a massacre that took place there during World War II. But the project had become so controversial in Ukraine, especially in the context of the country’s ongoing war with Russia, that the entourage had brought a team of bodyguards, who surrounded Fridman in a loose formation, tensing every time a stranger came too close.

Fridman was used to this. For nearly a quarter-century, he has survived at the top of Moscow’s billionaire class despite the regular purges and shake-ups that have sent several of his peers to prison or exile. His fortune comes from two of the most cutthroat sectors of the Russian economy: oil and banking. But in person, Fridman does not come off as a typical robber baron. At 57, he has a boyish smile and stooped shoulders that make him seem shy, as though instinctively shrinking from attention. He says he prefers to avoid the meetings that Russian President Vladimir Putin convenes with the oligarchs every few months. “I always feel awkward” at such conclaves,
Fridman told me. “I never know what to do with myself.”

In the park, he seemed at ease among the couples with strollers and the teenagers riding skateboards. He led our tour to a path that ran along the edge of a steep slope, overlooking a stand of leafless birches. “Here it is,” Fridman said. “This is where they would shoot them and throw them down.”

In September 1941, soon after the Germans occupied Kyiv, tens of thousands of the city’s Jews were rounded up, forced to strip naked and ordered to stand near the edge of this ravine, known as Babyn Yar. Over the following two days, machine-gunners shot more than 33,000 Jewish men, women and children at Babyn Yar. The Nazis continued to use the site for mass murder throughout their occupation. Many Roma people and other ethnic minorities were killed there, as were prisoners of war and patients at a nearby psychiatric hospital. Amid their retreat from Ukraine in 1943, the Nazis rushed to exhume the mass graves at Babyn Yar and burn the bodies in an attempt to hide evidence of the atrocities.

Several monuments have been built over the years to commemorate these events. But Fridman’s project is far grander. Comprising art installations, a museum, and an archive and research center, the memorial complex spans around 370 acres. The project has already produced numerous memorials, including an ornate synagogue in the shape of a book, a “mirror field” of reflective columns riddled with bullet holes, and an elaborate “sound sculpture” that murmurs the names of the dead in a perpetual loop. The sensory barrage has led some critics to call the project a “Holocaust Disneyland.” When finished, its total cost is expected to reach $100 million, making it the world’s most ambitious effort to memorialize the Holocaust in at least a generation.

Though its sponsors include several oligarchs, from both Russia and Ukraine, Fridman is by far the wealthiest and most powerful among them. He has become the project’s reluctant figurehead, as well as the focus of attacks from its critics—an unlikely alliance of U.S. diplomats, Ukrainian spies and members of Kyiv’s Jewish community. Some of them claim that the memorial is not about honoring the memory of the victims, but rather manipulating it, by subtly shifting blame for the massacre onto Ukrainians.

Fridman’s ties to the Kremlin are the foundation of these worries. The week before our tour of the memorial grounds in the spring, Putin had sent thousands of troops to menace Ukraine at the border. It was one of the worst escalations of the conflict in years. But the war extends beyond the eastern borderlands where more than 14,000 people have died in the fighting. Russia has also attacked on other fronts, using targeted assassinations, espionage, cyberattacks against the power grid, efforts to starve the Ukrainian economy and disinformation campaigns designed to sow division. Critics of the Babyn Yar project have cast it as part of this “hybrid war” against Ukraine, a Trojan horse in the form of a Holocaust memorial.

Some officials at the U.S. State Department have opposed the project from behind the scenes. At a meeting early last year, George Kent, the career diplomat who oversaw U.S. policy toward Ukraine at the time, asked the project’s managers whether they took orders from the Kremlin. He also urged them to avoid what he called the weaponization of history, according to two people who attended. The project’s creative director, Ilya Khrzhanovskiy, tried to convince Kent and his colleagues that the memorial is not a Russian influence operation. “But they weren’t having it,” he says. “They had made up their minds.” (The State Department declined to comment on the meeting. A spokesperson told TIME the U.S. “supports the establishment of a world-class memorial at Babyn Yar that accurately and fully reflects the site’s history.”)

Among the many challenges Russia has thrown at the U.S. in recent years—whether by hacking elections or bombing U.S. allies in the Middle East—few have been as messy as the one posed by the oligarchs. The U.S. tends to treat them as instruments of the Kremlin, and many have faced sanctions over Russian
BRENDAN HOFFMAN FOR TIME

As a child growing up in a Jewish family in western Ukraine, Fridman learned about Babyn Yar from his grandmother, whose native village was decimated in the German blitzkrieg of 1941. “Nothing was left,” he told me. “Not even the graves.” For years after the war, the subject of the Holocaust was taboo in the Soviet Union, absent from official histories. Among Fridman’s generation, many people learned about the massacre only through a poem that appeared in 1961 in a state-controlled literary journal. Its first lines read:

At Babyn Yar there are no memorials just a steep drop, rough as a tombstone

The journal’s editor was fired for publishing the poem, which caused such a scandal that Soviet leader Nikita Khrushchev personally denounced it. The author, Evgeny Yevtushenko, wrote it after visiting Babyn Yar and finding that Soviet authorities had turned the site into a landfill. “They were unloading stinking garbage on the tens of thousands of people who were killed,” the poet told the BBC. The Soviets finally agreed to build a memorial at the site in the early 1970s. In line with the state’s semiofficial policy of anti-Semitism, the inscription on that monument made no mention of the Jews who had died there.

Fridman recalls his family discussing these events at their kitchen table. They reserved particular scorn, he told me, for the Ukrainian militias and other locals who helped the Nazis persecute the Jews. When we first spoke last spring, he brought up an old photograph that still colors his understanding of the tragedy. Taken in the city of Lviv, where he grew up, it shows a group of Jewish women early in the Nazi occupation. “They are fully naked,” Fridman remembered, “being forced to clean the streets. And there are people standing around, shoving them, laughing.” He took a deep breath and measured his words. “These were not Germans,” he told me. “These were local people, my countrymen, people who might have lived in my neighborhood.”

In the absence of honest histories of the war, many Soviet Jews pieced together their awareness of the Holocaust from such scraps and artifacts—whispers in the kitchen, an old photo glimpsed in a book. The young Fridman was no exception. To this day, he believes the family lore that his great-grandparents may have been killed not by the Nazis but by their Ukrainian collaborators. “Nobody knows how they died,” he acknowledges. But his suspicion lingers, faint yet inescapable in his vision for the monument he wants to build.

To his opponents, Fridman’s views are a sign of the project’s bias. So is his status as a Kremlin ally, especially when it comes to Ukraine’s ongoing reckoning with its history. Thirty years since gaining independence from Moscow, the nation is still struggling to write its past, to agree on a canon of symbols and heroes and decide which pages in its history are shameful and which are worthy of pride. World War II looms large in this project, and Fridman does not hide his desire to shape the way Ukrainians teach it to their children. “This is our moral duty to our relatives, to the Jewish community,” he says. “That is the central goal.”

Fridman understands why his role has been controversial, and he admits that the Kremlin wields enormous power over billionaires within the system Putin built. One of the most revealing accounts of this system came from Fridman’s friend and business partner Petr Aven, who discussed with U.S. investigators in 2018 what it means to be rich and politically connected in Russia. In his testimony to the office of special counsel Robert Mueller, Aven said he meets with Putin every few months and receives “implicit directives” that he works hard to carry out.

When I asked Fridman about this practice, he described a subtler arrangement, one closer to a dance of courtiers around the czar than to soldiers saluting a general. Still, he confirmed the essence of what Aven described. Putin
does summon the oligarchs to regular meetings, where he tends to drop hints that should never be taken lightly. It would be an “oversimplification,” Fridman says, to think of Russian billionaires as lackeys of the Kremlin. Their priority is making money. But they are careful to stay in line with the Kremlin’s interests as they pursue their own. “We study Putin closely,” Fridman told me. “For our business, this is a question of survival.”

**SINCE PLANS** for the Babyn Yar memorial were first made public in 2016, its most influential critic has been Josef Zissels, a lifelong dissident who heads a Jewish community group in Kyiv. Now in his 70s, Zissels is frequently in touch with U.S. diplomats there, and his views on the project have helped shape the U.S. position. I first met him on a warm afternoon in New York this fall, when he came to speak at a conference on Ukraine’s modern history. The event fell on the morning after Yom Kippur, the Jewish day of atonement. Zissels had observed the holiday’s ritual fast from his seat in economy class. “It wasn’t so bad,” he told me. “I’ve done worse fasting during my hunger strikes in prison.”

As a young man in the 1970s and ‘80s, Zissels was twice sentenced to prison for opposing the Soviet regime. He now serves as vice president of the Ukrainian chapter of the World Jewish Congress, a powerful advocacy group. In an awkward twist for Zissels, the group’s longtime president, Ronald Lauder, a Republican stalwart and former U.S. ambassador to Austria, sits on the board of the Babyn Yar memorial project alongside Fridman. Among the other board members are Joe Lieberman, the former U.S. Senator and the first Jewish vice-presidential candidate, and Joscha Fischer, a former German Foreign Minister. “They must think it’s prestigious,” Zissels remarked when I asked him how the memorial had assembled such an illustrious board. “They don’t understand that it’s part of a hybrid war.” As for the motivations of its sponsors, he swatted away the notion that Fridman has some personal connection to Babyn Yar. “I don’t believe in the sentimentality of people with $20 billion.” (Fridman’s current fortune, according to *Forbes*, is $16 billion.)

Part of what makes the project suspicious to Zissels is its timing. In the fall of 2015, when the first discussions around the memorial took place, the deadliest fighting in eastern Ukraine had settled into a stalemate as Russia shifted to subtler means of attack. The cyber-assault against Ukraine’s power grid took place that December. “If this wasn’t part of his strategy,” Zissels says of the Babyn Yar memorial, “you think Putin would allow the oligarchs to invest $100 million on enemy territory?”

The real aim of the project, Zissels says, is to weaken Ukraine—in the eyes of both its own citizens and its Western allies. “Putin wants the world to see Ukraine as a pariah, as a nation underserving of statehood, a country of nationalists, anti-Semites, neo-Nazis,” he says. The Russian President has pushed that narrative for years, once describing Ukraine as a country convulsed by a “frenzy of neo-Nazism.” Such insults cut deep in a region whose politics is still shaped by the legacy of World War II, and have become a staple of Russian propaganda against Ukraine.

The memorial project thus looks to Zissels like an extension of Putin’s rhetoric. Some of its accounts of the massacre have played up the involvement of two Ukrainian militia units, Zissels says, even though their role is still a matter of dispute among historians. As the project continues to produce books, films and research papers on the tragedy, Zissels fears it will shape the public understanding of these events for generations. “Mark my words,” Zissels says. “Their plan is to show that Ukrainians were the ones who killed the Jews.”

Most historians say that is part of the real story. Some Ukrainian militants did collaborate with the Nazis. At the outset of the war, a lot of them were grateful to the Germans for evicting their Soviet oppressors. Most grew disillusioned with the Nazi regime and turned against it. By the end of the war, many Ukrainian nationalists wound up in Nazi concentration camps. Still, according to the most authoritative histories of the war in Ukraine, militias like the Organization of Ukrainian Nationalists did take part in pogroms against the Jews, and some of their commanders served under the Nazis.

‘Their plan is to show that Ukrainians were the ones who killed the Jews.’
—JOSEF ZISSELS, A CRITIC OF THE BABYN YAR MEMORIAL
human skulls on the ground,” Fridman told me, looking down as though he half-expected to find more human remains under his feet.

The memorial project, he says, will not downplay the acts of collaborationism in Ukraine, nor will it ignore the many Ukrainians who risked their lives to save Jews. “We want to show all historical facts,” he says. “If that helps Ukrainian society look the truth in the eyes, to accept that truth, to process it and draw conclusions from it, and to move forward as a society based on that understanding, then I would be very glad that we helped.”

In the spring and summer of 2019, when the first elements of the memorial project at Babyn Yar had already been installed, Ukraine held a pair of elections to choose a new President and parliament.

The hardline nationalist parties, which see themselves as political descendants of the insurgents who sided with Nazis, were routed, failing to win a single seat in parliament. For the first time in its history, Ukraine elected a Jewish President, Volodymyr Zelensky, who lost many relatives during the Holocaust.

Early in his tenure, Zelensky faced pressure to block the memorial at Babyn Yar. His own intelligence chief warned the government in a letter last year that the project is part of a Russian plot to “discredit Ukraine on the international stage,” according to a copy of the letter obtained by TIME. But the President still decided to support it. “My position is simple,” Zelensky told me. “Anyone who lays a stone in honor of the victims, they will have my blessing.”

For the President’s advisers, the project also presented a chance at diplomacy. They wanted world leaders to gather in Kyiv for the 80th anniversary of the massacre at Babyn Yar. Starting last spring, they sent invitations to U.S. and European leaders, including President Joe Biden, asking them to attend the commemoration ceremony in Kyiv. “This is very important to us,” Zelensky’s chief of staff, Andriy Yermak, told me.

After Biden took a pass, the Ukrainians held out hope for Secretary of State Antony Blinken, who has placed the memory of the Holocaust at the center of his public image. In his first speech after Biden nominated him to lead the State Department, Blinken told the story of his late stepfather, who survived Auschwitz. During another speech in April, marking Holocaust Remembrance Day, he recalled how in the minutes before they died, Jews had scrawled two words on the walls of the Nazi gas chambers: NEVER FORGET.

But as the day of remembrance at Babyn Yar approached, the controversy surrounding the memorial only intensified. Mirroring the efforts of the U.S. government, Zelensky’s national security council began imposing sanctions against oligarchs, seizing their assets and shutting their TV channels. The State Department has applauded those sanctions. Among the targets was one of Fridman’s partners on the Babyn Yar memorial. But even amid the government’s stated campaign of “de-oligarchization,” Zelensky has stood behind the memorial project.

During a trip to the U.S. in early September, he praised the project for telling the story of Babyn Yar “for modern generations.” But he also seemed concerned about the ways that history could haunt Ukrainians. “The people of Ukraine cannot have the germs of anti-Semitism and Nazism at the genetic level,” he said at the Holocaust Museum in Washington on Sept. 1. “It cannot be in the heart or in the soul of the Ukrainian people, who survived Babyn Yar on their land.”

Zelensky’s remarks, delivered the same day as his first meeting with President Biden at the White House, looked ahead to the ceremony he will lead at Babyn Yar on Oct. 6. The Presidents of Israel and Germany have confirmed they will attend. As for senior officials from Washington, Fridman and the other organizers are not expecting any. —With reporting by Leslie Dickstein/New York and Nik Popli/Washington
HARD TRUTHS
THE CHALLENGING REALITY OF HAVING A CHILD THROUGH SURROGACY
BY GABRIELLE UNION

IN 2016, MY DOCTOR, KELLY BAEK, A NO-NONSENSE REPRODUCTIVE endocrinologist in L.A., gave it to me straight: “Your best chance for a healthy baby would be surrogacy.”

I had been through an adenomyosis diagnosis and more miscarriages than I could confidently count, and all I could do was nod. I was not ready to do that. I wanted the experience of being pregnant. To watch my body expand and shift to accommodate this miracle inside me. I also wanted the experience of being publicly pregnant. I would shake off the distrust society has for women who, for whatever reason—by choice or by nature—do not have babies. I had paid the cost of that for years, and I wanted something for it.

I held out for a year after Dr. Baek suggested surrogacy, and instead chose to endure more IVF cycles and losses. Everyone comes to the decision differently. Near the end of that year—that hopeful and hopeless year—I had a new plan to take Lupron, which basically quiets the adenomyosis. Dr. Baek told me I would have a 30% chance of bringing a baby to term. But the side effects of Lupron can be intense: you’re basically throwing your body into early menopause and you can break bones very easily.

It was something my husband said that changed my mind. I told him I wanted to try the drug. Dwyane was quiet, then said, “You’ve done enough.” There was a desperation dripping off him that I couldn’t ignore. He said it again.

I looked at D with an instantaneous white-hot rage. I was fighting with my husband about what was best for my body? He looked me in the eye. “As much as we want this baby, I want you,” he said slowly.

I didn’t receive this as concern at the time. It sounded like an acknowledgment of failure. Because at that point I would have sold my soul to get out of the endless cycle of loss. What was the going rate for souls? What was mine worth, anyway?

Clearly, my feelings weren’t originating from a healthy place. So much of what made the decision so difficult was that if I didn’t submit to a surrogacy, then I was convinced I needed to let Dwyane go. Even if he didn’t want to, I had to let him find someone who could give him what he wanted.

But I loved him. And we had worked hard on our relationship, through major conflicts and the struggles of daily life. Sometimes, I realized, I focused so much on our bond that I failed to care for myself. And now there I was, still putting my life second to some shared mission. Why was I so willing to risk myself for a chance? If there was another way for me to bring my baby into the world, and have my health, why was it so hard for me to make peace with that?

FOR WEEKS, I WENT DOWN a rabbit hole of books, surrogacy message boards and conversations with our fertility agency. At the top of the surrogate food chain were married, white, American women who have their own kids. The belief is that if they are married, they have a built-in support system, and if they have more than one child, there’s proof they can do the job. On the message boards, people can be anonymous, so they rank surrogates by race. I got the sense a lot of white families-to-be were more comfortable with brown people as surrogates—Latin and South Asian—who were often classified as “breeders.” Now, I am Black, and I am used to hearing how people speak of women of color, but this was some Handmaid’s Tale shit.

We chose the most ethical agency we could find, and answered most of their questions about prerequisites with “We don’t care.” Religion, active lifestyle, diet.

Two months later, in early December, we were presented with a surrogate who seemed to check all the boxes. We were introduced over the phone, but the conversation was made awkward by the fact that we couldn’t reveal our identities, to protect the anonymity of both parties. She said all the right things about how she experienced the gift of life having her own kids, and wanted to give this gift to others. But I was cautious, wondering if people were prepped to say that.

After she was cleared by Dr. Baek, we agreed to meet in person in her office. As I got dressed that morning, I realized this was like the best and worst blind date ever. I wondered what outfit said, “I’m grateful, but I’m also not a loser. And I’m not some actress, you know, farming out her responsibilities.” This woman and her husband had the power to look at me and say, “Ennh...” I needed her to like me and accept me. Accept us, since I was also standing in for Dwyane, who was in the middle of the season. I was very aware that the surrogate and her husband didn’t know we were Black.

I got there early. Dr. Baek put me in a small office, and the liaison from our agency arrived. “Are you comfortable?” she asked. I smiled and nodded, unable to put words to the feelings. There had been so much fear and failure, but now there
was a vague relief that I was finally here. And something else: anticipation. I had not let myself have that for so long that I had difficulty recognizing it.

The door opened. Like a blind date, you look everywhere at once, knowing you are being looked at, too. The first thing I noticed was a nose ring. Oh, I thought, she’s a cool-ass white girl.

And then I noticed her notice me. Her eyebrows shot up. “Oh, ho ho ho,” she said. There was an excitement to her voice, and I smiled. “This is such a trip. I have your book on hold at four different libraries.”

I have never been done wrong by readers. I started laughing, and we hugged. “So, I guess now I can get a copy, huh?” she joked.

“Yeah,” I said, meaning yes to everything. Her name was Natalie, and when her husband came in, I saw they matched. Free spirits with an aura of goodness to them. They had an easy rapport and were affectionate with each other. I hadn’t known that would be so important to me, knowing that she had a partner in this. I called D and put him on speaker, and as they directed their attention to the phone, I looked up at them. You’re those people, I thought. You really want to help others.

WHEN WE GOT the positive pregnancy test in March 2018, my first thought was, “Wow. Sh-t. This is really happening.” The due date was Thanksgiving.

We’d even begun to pick out names. When I was in my 20s and thought my life was going to be a little different, I’d begun keeping lists of baby names. There was one name I saw at the end credits of a TV show or movie: Tavia. That would be pretty, I thought, with a K. Kavia. That name made it onto every hopeful list I kept. Dwyane knew the list by heart, too, and we both felt it. This hope, this starburst, was her.

Near the end of the first trimester, we all returned to Dr. Baek’s office, this time with Dwyane, for the first 4-D ultrasound. Two couples crowded into a room built for one, awkward in our affection for each other, yet still feeling like strangers. This was the first time Dwyane had met Natalie and her husband in person, and our hugs were those of people who did not know each other but had survived something as a unit. She was showing me her stomach, turning to the side, cupping the weight of my own maternal ineptitude. This growing bump that everyone thought I wanted to see was now a visual manifestation of my failure. I smiled, wanting to show I—we—were so happy and grateful. But part of me felt more worthless.

Natalie lay down for Dr. Baek to pass the ultrasound wand over the bump. “There she is,” she said. And she was. There. Here. This very clear little baby in there. Her head, her spine, her little heart pumping, pumping, pumping. Determined to live. It was suddenly incredibly real. Dwyane took my hand, and there was so much happiness on his face, I lost it. My cry was a choke stopped up in my throat, tears streaming down.

It was grief. I’d had so many miscarriages. I say the following
with the caveat that I am steadfast in being pro-choice. I was on a fertility journey at 44. The smallest cell was weighted with the expectation of life. A zygote was a baby, just on potential alone. When one of my eggs was examined, that was a baby. When Dwyane got a sperm analysis, that was a baby. Every swimmer was our baby. But when I miscarried in the first trimester, I never thought I had lost a baby baby. I had never let it count. Looking at the screen, I understood how many potential babies I had lost. That’s why I was crying. A floodgate of grief and sorrow overcame me, threatened to drown me.

I saw my husband so happy, and I was not a part of it. I felt a chasm widening between us. I was embarrassed to be crying so much, but everyone was looking at me with smiles and nods. They thought these were tears of gratitude. The awe of witnessing the start of life. I was reliving death. Of course I was grateful, it would be impossible not to be. But what I was grateful for was that this life might be spared. That this heartbeat might continue, beat strong for decades, long after my own stopped. So many had stopped inside me.

I allowed the misreading of my tears. Crying showed that I was a good mom. My first performance in competitive mothering. Nailed it.

I was on the other side of the world from my daughter when I began to let myself look forward to her arrival. We were in Beijing on business for Dwyane and brought friends with us. It was the end of July, the five-month mark we had never made it to. Dwyane’s confidence was something to behold and envy. He was so certain she was going to make it that we told our friends. After my first miscarriage, I had never ever told people when we were expecting. Even this felt dangerous. The words were out of my mouth to my friends and I thought, What the f-ck did I just do?

Dwyane broke out whiskey and cigars, and he announced that he wanted to get a tattoo of her name—we’d decided it would be Kaavia James—on his shoulders that night, written where his Heat jersey would cover it. I was terrified of the permanency. As he sat before me with his shirt off, I placed my hands where her name would be, and kissed the top of his head. I thought of something he would sometimes say to himself and to others: “My belief is stronger than your doubt.” He usually said this when he was counted out after an injury, or walking away from a deal everyone thought he was crazy to turn down. But this was different. I didn’t know if his belief was strong enough for both of us.

Then, a week after my late-October birthday, I was on my way to the gym before work. It was 11 a.m., and I’d been on set late the night before. My phone rang. I looked down and saw Natalie’s name.

“My water broke,” she said.

“Hunh?”

I had Kaavia James’ due date in my mind as set. She would be here at Thanksgiving. I was just getting used to it being November.

“I’m headed to the hospital now,” she said.

“O.K.!” I said. “O.K.”

I called D. He was in Miami, and in the first few weeks of his final NBA season. He’d had a plane on standby for just this moment, and called the pilot right away. I called my mom in Arizona, and she got on the first flight. What happened next—more phone calls, a trip home for my pre-packed bag, booking a hotel room near the hospital—happened fast. My mom got there before Dwyane. D arrived, followed by the baby nurse and her crew.

And then Natalie proceeded to go into labor for 38 hours—so long that Kaavia James was in danger. The doctor had to do an emergency C-section because the umbilical cord had become tied around Kaav’s ankle. Now that I am Kaavia James’ mother, I know that she tied it herself because she was simply over it. I definitely didn’t know how C-sections work. Turns out it’s all kinds of rough. But it was fast, and suddenly the doctor was holding her up for our wide-eyed gaze.

“Oh my God,” I said. The room was festive almost, people saying over and over, “Congratulations.” Just as quick, the doctor placed her on a little exam table and asked her name.

“Kaavia,” I said, my voice a choke.

This baby, given a name written on a wish list for decades, then tattooed on her father’s shoulders. She was loved even as an idea. My body seized in a full release of every emotion. Relief, anxiety, terror, joy, resentment, disbelief, gratitude… and also, disconnection. I had hoped that the second I saw her, there would be a moment of locking in. I looked over at Natalie and her husband. There was a stillness to them. I looked at Kaavia James on the table, and then back at them. It took all of us to create her, so I wanted to share this time with them.

The nurses took Kaav to the newborn nursery. Dwyane, my mom and I all reassembled in a hospital room, waiting for them to weigh Kaav and clean her up. I put on a surgical gown for modesty so I could do skin-to-skin bonding with her. My mother and D were crying, our surrogate was crying, our baby nurses were crying, and I was a mess. Then the door opened and Kaavia James was brought into our lives.

So much time has passed. So many firsts. Yet the question lingers in my mind: I will always wonder if Kaav would love me more if I had carried her. Would our bond be even tighter? I will never know what it would have been like to carry this rock star inside me. When they say having a child is like having your heart outside your body, that’s all I know. We met as strangers, the sound of my voice and my heartbeat foreign to her. It’s a pain that has dimmed but remains present in my fears that I was not, and never will be, enough.

And Dwyane leaves me with another riddle that has no answer. I can never know if my failure to carry a child put a ceiling on the expectation of life. A zygote was a baby, just on potential.

I definitely didn’t know how C-sections work. Turns out it’s all kinds of rough. But it was fast, and suddenly the doctor was holding her up for our wide-eyed gaze.

“Oh my God,” I said. The room was festive almost, people saying over and over, “Congratulations.” Just as quick, the doctor placed her on a little exam table and asked her name.

“Kaavia,” I said, my voice a choke.

This baby, given a name written on a wish list for decades, then tattooed on her father’s shoulders. She was loved even as an idea. My body seized in a full release of every emotion. Relief, anxiety, terror, joy, resentment, disbelief, gratitude… and also, disconnection. I had hoped that the second I saw her, there would be a moment of locking in. I looked over at Natalie and her husband. There was a stillness to them. I looked at Kaavia James on the table, and then back at them. It took all of us to create her, so I wanted to share this time with them.

The nurses took Kaav to the newborn nursery. Dwyane, my mom and I all reassembled in a hospital room, waiting for them to weigh Kaav and clean her up. I put on a surgical gown for modesty so I could do skin-to-skin bonding with her. My mother and D were crying, our surrogate was crying, our baby nurses were crying, and I was a mess. Then the door opened and Kaavia James was brought into our lives.

So much time has passed. So many firsts. Yet the question lingers in my mind: I will always wonder if Kaav would love me more if I had carried her. Would our bond be even tighter? I will never know what it would have been like to carry this rock star inside me. When they say having a child is like having your heart outside your body, that’s all I know. We met as strangers, the sound of my voice and my heartbeat foreign to her. It’s a pain that has dimmed but remains present in my fears that I was not, and never will be, enough.

And Dwyane leaves me with another riddle that has no answer. I can never know if my failure to carry a child put a ceiling on the love my husband has for me. There is an asterisk next to my title of mother, which denotes that the achievement is in question. “She didn’t really earn it.”

If I am telling the fullness of our stories, of our three lives together, I must tell the truths I live with. And I have learned that you can be honest and loving at the same time.

Adapted from You Got Anything Stronger?
THANK YOU TO OUR PARTNERS
Actor Danny Burstein during rehearsal for Moulin Rouge! The Musical on Sept. 21. Less than a week later, Burstein won a Tony Award, in the Best Featured Actor category, for his role as Harold Zidler.
After a long and uncertain break, Broadway makes its jubilant return

BY STEPHANIE ZACHAREK
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For the spectator, the theater is magic, not work: every show is a feat of illusion, designed to allow an audience to slip into another world for a few hours. But the creation of any illusion involves labor, and that’s especially true on Broadway. Every performance of every show is in some way touched by thousands of hands. A live show involves so many makers—not just actors and dancers and stage managers, but also musicians, electricians, laundry and wardrobe people, and others—that it may be the ultimate act of making.

By the time Broadway shut down, in mid-March 2020, many performers and workers had already contracted COVID-19, some requiring hospitalization. No one knew how long the shutdown would last. Many Broadway workers left New York: no shows meant no work, making life in one of the world’s most expensive cities untenable.

Which makes Broadway’s return this fall especially joyful for everyone who struggled through that limbo. The reopening of shows like Moulin Rouge!—winner of the 2021 Tony for Best Musical (among nine others), and featured in the behind-the-scenes photos here, taken from Sept. 12 to Sept. 23—is great news for Broadway’s workers and loyal theatergoers alike. Caution is still warranted: Dancers stretch and rehearse while masked. Wig and makeup people take extra care. Even with vaccinations, testing is a must. Present and future variants remain a question mark.

But if anyone can prevail, it’s show people. Behind-the-scenes Broadway gigs may seem glamorous, but they’re challenging too: Dressers pull off a grueling ballet of kneeling, standing and running around. Workers who come in direct contact with performers need an even temperament to deal with diva behavior. These jobs are harder than they look, but many of those who hold them can’t imagine doing anything else. No wonder these people look out for one another. And no wonder, as these pictures show, they’re so happy to be back.

Moulin Rouge! ensemble members during a studio run-through on Sept. 12. The production cost $28 million to bring to the stage in 2019.
Theatergoers stand in line for a Moulin Rouge! dress rehearsal on Sept. 23. Some 200 frontline workers, plus friends and families of the cast and crew, were invited.

Hairdresser Akilah Abrams prepares a wig in the hair room. Moulin Rouge!, Abrams’ Broadway debut, was one of the shows hardest hit by COVID-19, with 25 employees infected.
Actor Jeigh Madjus, who plays Babydoll, applies his makeup before rehearsal on Sept. 21.

Natalie Mendoza, who plays the dancer and courtesan Satine, stretches in the studio on Sept. 12, before heading to the theater for tech week.

A man inquires at the ticket-sales window before the show's invited dress rehearsal. The show broke box office records when it first opened in 2019.

Ensemble members Olutayo Bosede and Julius Anthony Rubio wait in the wings during a rehearsal.
Cast members take their final bow at dress rehearsal, the night before the musical’s official reopening on Sept. 24
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The newest installment of TIME’s decade-long reporting project on the path to a **fairer, more sustainable world by 2030**: dispatches from the global economy
Ideas for a fairer world

Leaders from the business and policymaking community share their solutions for a more equitable and sustainable future

RETHINK OUR APPROACH TO INCLUSION

We need a reset. We know we have racism, sexism, ableism, and additional forms of bias and discrimination built into our workplaces, our schools, our medical care and all our institutions. We know it is systemic and harmful.

In the tech industry, its products are harming our brains, our self-worth, our values, our pandemic response, our children and our society. Social media platforms are enabling and amplifying white supremacy and other forms of hate for profit. Workers are struggling to make a living wage while CEO billionaires work them harder, pay them less, create poor working environments and hoard ill-gotten profits. In politics, we are witnessing attacks on voting rights, abortion and housing; in schools and universities, teaching racism and science are under threat.

In hospitals, Black, Latinx and Southeast Asian workers hold the front line while their communities get less access and worse care.

We need to channel our energy for change, for transformation, for equity and for fairness.

Today we aren’t doing enough. Good intentions are not going to do it. Neither will social media posts or reading books. Advocating within our existing processes isn’t working. The greatest changes have come from workers organizing, individuals suing or speaking up, and media coverage. Yet worker and leadership demographics are still stagnant, companies are blocking unions, and harm is increasing.

We need to hold people accountable for the harm they cause, and that means tracking metrics and results. COVID-19 has highlighted and exacerbated harm in the workplace, with the burden on women and nonbinary workers; Black, Latinx, Asian and Indigenous employees; transgender or disabled workers; and especially those at the intersections of these identities. It’s time for action, for each and every one of us to be an active participant in change.

We need to measure for demographics in hiring, pay, retention, promotions and leadership. We also need to reward those who meet the goals and hold those who don’t accountable for failures.

We cannot wait. If you have a position or opportunity because of privilege, share it with someone without that privilege. Or even better yet, give that opportunity to another person. Organize your co-workers or communities for a bigger voice and more impact. Take responsibility for long-term solutions and harm prevention by thinking through the impact of what you and your company do. Call out potential problems, and push for better solutions.

Now is the time for us to take action. Be an active participant for meaningful change. It’s time to stand up for those who haven’t been protected. It’s time to fight for what America should stand for. And it’s going to take all of us working together to make it happen.
USE TECHNOLOGY TO STRENGTHEN DEMOCRACY

By Fatih Birol, executive director, IEA

TACKLE EMISSIONS FROM ENERGY

Scientists tell us that if we want to have a livable planet in coming decades, then emissions need to come down to net zero by 2050. As around three-quarters of the emissions that cause climate change come from energy, we at the International Energy Agency have turned this net-zero target into a road map for the energy sector. What needs to happen? We have described more than 400 milestones: for example, in 2030, 60% of cars sold should be electric vehicles, compared with 5% today. By 2040, half of all flights should be using sustainable fuels and the world needs to have phased out all coal and oil power plants where emissions aren’t captured.

If we do these things, are we sure we will keep the global temperature rise to 1.5°C? The answer is, I’m not sure. But, even if we don’t succeed entirely, if we do our best and follow this road map, we will still help avoid the worst of climate change. If we cannot reach 1.5°, then 1.6° or 1.7° is still far better than 3.5°, where the consequences for our planet will be catastrophic. This is a race, not between countries, but a race against time.

—As told to Justin Worland

Over the next decade, democratic governments will be tested by the rise of China. They will have to prove to their citizens and those of developing nations that democracy can deliver widespread economic growth, stability and security in the modern world. Once again there will be a global competition between two very different forms of government, and right now the outcome is uncertain. For democracies to win this contest, they will need to leverage software to deliver more prosperity to a wider cross section of their populations, while still preserving individual rights. They have powerful potential allies in the private tech sector who could be of service building and selling industry-leading software to democratic governments. They should be intrinsically motivated because helping preserve democracy also safeguards the marketplace rules these companies depend upon to generate financial returns. In the following 10 years, the chief executive officers of every large software company in a democratic country must embrace a new key performance indicator: the success of the software of democracy.

The software industry should view democratic governments as their most important customers in the upcoming decade and create the tools they need to thrive.

REDUCE RELIANCE ON ANIMAL-SOURCED FOOD

By Michael Seibel, managing director, Y Combinator

‘The software industry should view democratic governments as their most important customers.’

By Miray Zaki, managing partner, Dismatrix Group

‘The software industry should view democratic governments as their most important customers.’

No rate of growth is sustainable when the world has finite resources. Producing food through animals is inefficient, wasteful and dangerous. Today, animal agriculture, including many kinds of meat and dairy, as well as fish farming, uses roughly 80% of all arable land and 41% of all freshwater. It also produces nearly 60% of agricultural emissions, and it is the leading cause of wildlife extinction, deforestation and loss of biodiversity, yet it produces less than 18% of all calories consumed globally. It is also the cause of zoonotic diseases such as COVID, and a root cause of antibiotic-resistant diseases. In a few years, there will be a gap of 40% between demand of freshwater and actual freshwater supply, largely driven by agriculture, making production of food through animals all but implausible.

As the world’s population grows, producing food through innovative use of plants becomes the answer. Avoiding traditional meat, dairy and farmed fish, food production would free 75% of all arable land, while abundantly housing and feeding a rapidly growing global population. Innovation in plant-based food production is advancing rapidly: some of the analog meats and dairy products are arguably indistinguishable from the animal-based versions. Their resource and environmental impact is relatively negligible.

At the same time, technologies such as cell culture and precision fermentation promise to radically revolutionize food production. Meat or fish grown in cell cultures are derived from the animal-based originals, reducing the comparable use of resources and emissions to a fraction.

Precision fermentation, which has been used for many years for insulin, or food ingredients such as rennet, is already presenting remarkable progress, potentially solving protein and other production gaps. Through the use of selected bacterial cultures, it can produce several molecules normally found in meat and dairy. Some processes are net carbon-negative, using CO₂ as an “ingredient.”

Moving away from industrially produced animal-based food is not just an option, it is a necessity. —With assistance from Sebastiano Cossia Castiglioni
TSMC workers in the “clean room” where fabrication of chips takes place in the company’s Hsinchu headquarters.
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ON THE NORTHWEST COAST OF TAIWAN, NESTLED BETWEEN MUDFLATS TREMING WITH FIDDLER CRABS AND SWEETSCENTED PERSIMMON ORCHARDS, SITS THE WORLD'S MOST IMPORTANT COMPANY THAT YOU'VE PROBABLY NEVER HEARD OF. TAIWAN SEMICONDUCTOR MANUFACTURING CO., OR TSMC, IS THE WORLD'S LARGEST CONTRACT MANUFACTURER OF THE SEMICONDUCTOR CHIPS—OTHERWISE KNOWN AS INTEGRATED CIRCUITS, OR JUST CHIPS—that power our phones, laptops, cars, watches, refrigerators and more. Its clients include Apple, Intel, Qualcomm, AMD and Nvidia.

Inside its boxy off-white headquarters in sleepy Hsinchu County, technicians in brightly hued protective suits—white and blue for employees, green for contractors and pink for pregnant women—push polished metal carts under a sallow protective light. Above their heads, “claw machines”—nicknamed after the classic arcade game—hauls 9-kg plastic containers containing 25 individual slices, or “wafers,” of silicon on rails among hundreds of manufacturing stations, where they are extracted one by one for processing, much like a jukebox selecting a record. Only after six to eight weeks of painstaking etching and testing can each wafer be carved up into individual chips to be dispatched around the planet.

“We always say that it's like building a high-rise,” one TSMC section manager tells TIME, pointing to how his technicians diligently follow instructions dictated to them via tablet. “You can only build one story at a time.”

The $550 billion firm today controls more than half the global market for made-to-order chips and has

Silicon ally

Inside the Taiwan firm that makes the world’s tech run

By Charlie Campbell
an even tighter stranglehold on the most advanced processors, with more than 90% of market share by some estimates.

“TSMC is just absolutely critical,” says Peter Hanbury, a semiconductor specialist at the Bain & Co. consulting firm. “They basically control the most complicated part of the semiconductor ecosystem, and they’re a near monopoly at the bleeding edge.”

The importance of semiconductor chips has grown exponentially over the past half century. In 1969, the Apollo lunar module sent tens of thousands of transistors with a combined weight of 70 lb. to the moon; today, an Apple MacBook crams 16 billion transistors within its total weight of just 3 lb. The prevalence of chips will keep rising alongside the spread of mobile devices, the Internet of things (IOT), 5G and 6G networks and a growth in demand for computing power. Global chip sales were $440 billion in 2020 and are projected to grow over 5% annually. President Joe Biden calls them “critical products” whose “supply-chain disruptions can put Americans’ lives and livelihoods at risk,” while the governments of Japan and South Korea compare the importance of semiconductors to “rice.”

TSMC’s success in cornering this vital market has become a geostrategic migraine. The Pentagon is pressing the Biden Administration to invest more in advanced chipmaking, so its missiles and fighter jets are not dependent on a self-ruling island that China’s strongman President Xi Jinping believes is a breakaway province and has repeatedly threatened to invade. More immediately, a global chip shortage has impacted a staggering 169 industries, according to Goldman Sachs analysis, from steel and ready-mix concrete to air-conditioning units and breweries. Most drastically, automakers across America, Japan and Europe were forced to slow and even halt production, meaning 3.9 million fewer cars will roll into world showrooms this year than last.

Car companies “immediately pointed the finger at TSMC” for the shortage, TSMC chairman Mark Liu tells TIME in an exclusive interview. “But I told them, ‘You are my customer’s customer’s customer. How could I [prioritize others] and not give you chips?’”

The scarcity of chips has thrust TSMC from a largely anonymous services company to the center of a global tussle over the future of technology; the firm will play an outsized role in determining what the world looks like at the end of this decade. Some foresee an emerging dystopia, driven by a worsening climate crisis and rising geopolitical tensions between China and the U.S. Liu’s more optimistic scenario is that widespread adoption of artificial intelligence (AI) by 2030 will help mitigate the ravages of climate change through granular weather prediction, make more accurate cancer diagnoses possible, and even fight fake news through automated fact-checking of social media. “With COVID-19, everybody feels the future has been sped up,” says Liu. From his perspective, what it will look like “is much clearer than, say, two years ago.”

THE SEMICONDUCTOR-CHIP SHORTAGE first got boardrooms sweating around February, when average order-to-delivery times for chips stretched to an unprecedented 15 weeks because of a confluence of factors: a pandemic-induced economic slump prompted carmakers to prematurely slash chip orders, which soon rebounded as chips were hoarded by firms that feared being embroiled in the U.S.-China trade and technology war. Amid what was described as a global chip shortage, more chips were being sent to factories than were leaving them in products, meaning “there are people definitely accumulating chips who-knows-where in the supply chain,” says Liu.

To fix things, Liu ordered his team to triangulate different data points to decipher which customers were truly in need and which were stockpiling. “We are learning too, because we didn’t have to do this before,” says Liu. It forced him into tough decisions to delay orders for valued clients whose immediate need was judged to be less acute. “Sometimes [customers] may not be satisfied, but we just have to do what’s best for the industry.”

The crisis sharpened focus on access to technology that the U.S. invented and still designs better than anyone else but doesn’t manufacture at scale anymore. Biden’s $2 trillion plan to fix American infrastructure included $50 billion to boost semiconductor competitiveness. That was on top of $52 billion committed under the U.S. Innovation and Competition Act, which was passed by the Senate in June and is aimed squarely at competing with China in all areas of technology. Yet TSMC alone is investing $100 billion in new capacity over the next three years. It’s a staggering sum, though for Liu, “the more I look at it, it’s not going to be enough.”

The semiconductor industry has contracted even
as the chips themselves have grown more prevalent and pivotal. Other than TSMC, the only firm capable of commercially producing today's most advanced 5-nanometer (nm) chips is South Korea's Samsung Electronics. However, TSMC is building a new fabrication plant—or “fab”—across 22 football fields of land in southern Taiwan to produce groundbreaking 3-nm chips, expected to be up to 15% faster and use far less power. This latest generation of chip manufacture, or “node,” will leave U.S. firms like Intel and GlobalFoundries at least two generations behind. “That's disgraceful for Intel,” says Daniel Nenni, co-author of Fabless: The Transformation of the Semiconductor Industry. “It's just very disappointing that they lost leadership.”

At the outset of the modern computing industry, pioneers like Intel designed and built chips in-house. But American firms began to struggle against Japanese competitors in the 1980s and, to remain competitive, outsourced the fabricating sides of their businesses, instead concentrating on the more profitable design aspect. Fabrics were expensive, with low margins, so offsetting that capital investment and risk made a lot of sense.

The “fabless” trend was foreseen by a canny Chinese-born engineer named Morris Chang, who founded TSMC in 1987 after studying at Harvard, Stanford and MIT and working for 25 years at Texas Instruments. Among his many breakthroughs, Chang pioneered the tactic of initially pricing chips at a loss, in the expectation that gaining an early market share would increase scale to the point when reduced costs would generate a profit. As the technology advanced, the cost of new fabs soared, pushing more chipmakers to outsource and

TSMC's market share to increase. “It was doing work that nobody else wanted to do,” says Willy Shih, a professor at Harvard Business School.

In June 2018, at the age of 86, Chang finally handed over the reins of TSMC to Liu and CEO C.C. Wei. What might have been a difficult transition instead proved a springboard for a more aggressive business philosophy that enabled TSMC to pull clear of rivals. Apart from the billions invested in locking down technological primacy, it is embarking on “a geographic diversification that would not have happened under Morris Chang,” says Shih. While Wei was the more technically focused of the new leadership team, he was perfectly complemented by the polished and business-oriented Liu, whose idea of fun is kicking back with a global-affairs periodical and a classical-music stream on YouTube.

In many ways, Liu’s career path traces that of his mentor, Chang. A native of Taipei, Liu earned his Ph.D. at the University of California, Berkeley, before taking a job at Intel, where he helped launch the transformative 1386 processor that fueled the personal-computer revolution of the late 1980s. After leaving Intel, he spent six years conducting research at AT&T Bell Laboratories in New Jersey before joining TSMC in 1993. One of his first roles was to get his “hands wet” in fab construction, he says, as the founder took him under his wing. “Morris gave me a huge trail of experience, from operations to planning, sales, marketing and R&D,” says Liu. “That's why I ask our people to get out of their comfort zone to learn things and not just feel satisfied getting a good performance review from your boss.”

TSMC's more recent run of success has been linked to one client in particular: Apple. The Cupertino behemoth outsourced the manufacturing of its chips to Samsung for the first six generations of iPhones. But after Samsung launched its own competing Galaxy smartphones, Apple in 2011 brought a lawsuit over IP theft, which was ultimately settled with an award of $539 million to the American firm. That dispute was a boon to TSMC as Apple sought to extricate its supply chains from Samsung and avoid any partnerships that could burnish a potential rival. It was reassuring that TSMC was a dedicated foundry business that wouldn't stray from its lane. Apple remains TSMC's biggest client today. “It is a trust business,” says Liu. “We do not compete with our customers.”

Apple was also pivotal to TSMC's emergence as undisputed technology leader. Computing has been long governed by Moore's Law, named after Intel co-founder Gordon Moore, which is better described as an “observation” that processing power doubles every two or so years. The tendency of the industry was to prioritize a new semiconductor node to fit that time frame.

However, Apple insisted that it wanted a new node for each iteration of iPhone. Because Apple prides itself on never missing a launch of its crown jewel, TSMC was under enormous pressure to come up with constant advances. So instead of combining lots of new technologies
to double power every two years, it pioneered small advances annually. “People made fun of TSMC, saying, ‘Oh, that’s not a real node,’” says Nenni. “But taking these baby steps helped them learn these new technologies. And they laughed all the way to the bank.”

Still, leadership brings different challenges. Chips may be ubiquitous today, but uses for the most advanced variety remain limited. (Toasters and traffic lights can use far less advanced nodes.) As TSMC’s pool of customers has shrunk, the risk of one of them being caught up in political turbulence has swelled; TSMC last year stopped supplying Chinese telecom giant Huawei, for example, after U.S. intelligence agencies accused it—without presenting hard evidence—of being a proxy for the Chinese state. Finding the required resources to keep pushing boundaries is also becoming tougher on an island of just 23 million, where a recent severe drought put the water-intensive semiconductor industry in jeopardy. “The future is more and more challenging,” says Dan Wang, an industry and technology analyst at Gavekal Dragonomics. “When you’re at the top, the only direction is down.”

**TSMC’s Dominance** is such that its chief rivals are not companies but governments. The auto-industry shortage was a wake-up call for policymakers already reeling from the pandemic and trade war. The European Commission has unveiled a public-private semiconductor alliance aimed at increasing its share of global production to 20% by 2030. South Korea’s government is offering incentives to drive a $450 billion investment by chipmakers through 2030.

China, meanwhile, has been throwing billions at the semiconductor problem, with limited success and some eye-catching failures. Although it will likely soon become the biggest producer of chips by volume, they are not of the latest design. Its top firm is Shanghai-based SMIC, but despite $300 million in government grants in 2019, the best chip it can produce is about five years behind TSMC’s, with little hope of catching up. Meanwhile, at least six multibillion-dollar Chinese chip firms have gone bust over the past two years, including Wuhan Hongxin Semiconductor Manufacturing Co., which turned out to be a $20 billion scam perpetrated by tricksters with no industry experience.

Beijing’s efforts to catch up have also been hampered by Washington’s repeatedly blocking its attempts to buy foreign chip firms outright, as well as the specialized equipment needed for cutting-edge fabs. This presents a quandary for Beijing, which aspires to the enhanced geopolitical clout that global technological leadership brings. Xi has regularly highlighted the critical importance of “indigenous R&D,” creating “secure and controllable supply chains” and achieving breakthroughs on “choke-point technologies.”

The situation also presents a quandary to Taiwan and the U.S. While American firms account for 65% of all TSMC sales, China is the biggest end destination by virtue of its role as the world’s factory, importing around $350 billion worth of chips in 2020 alone. Boston Consulting Group estimates that “decoupling” the U.S. and Chinese tech sectors would trim U.S. chip-company revenues by $80 billion, while competition with Beijing would cost those same firms $10 billion to $15 billion.

Liu echoes many business executives when he says that the current enmity between the U.S. and China benefits no one. Many Chinese firms are stockpiling chips lest they find themselves targeted as Huawei has been. “The U.S. and China need to understand that they may not be friends, but they are not enemies either,” says Liu. “We need common rules to … give people some expectation about how to do business.”

If TSMC is caught in the middle of a tug-of-war between Washington and Beijing, then so too is the island on which it sits—with far more dangerous potential consequences. On Sept. 16, senior U.S. and Australian officials vowed to “strengthen ties” with Taiwan just a day after both nations, with the U.K., unveiled a new security alliance, dubbed AUKUS, to contain China. Beijing is already sending air and naval sorties close to Taiwan territory with alarming frequency.

Strategists say Taiwan is protected by an effective “silicon shield,” given what the disruption to chip supply chains in the event of an invasion would mean for China’s economy. However, as tensions and the importance of chips rise in tandem, some analysts are reassessing this viewpoint. Oriana Skylar Mastro, a specialist on China’s military at Stanford University’s Freeman Spogli Institute for International Studies, says the prospect of gaining effective control of the world’s chip supply may make Taiwan more, not less, vulnerable, because a prize that big means Beijing could effectively dictate peace terms: “I think it gives China an upper hand.”

Liu disagrees, insisting the threat of invasion by Beijing is “overblown.” “Taiwan definitely would not create actions to trigger a war,” he says, acknowledging that the cross-strait relationship is no longer dictated solely by the island. “It is really the U.S.-China relationship.”

**Despite America’s Dominance** of chip design, its lack of manufacturing capability remains worrisome for policymakers, who are trying to bring more fabs onshore. While remaining a TSMC customer, Intel is revamping its foundry business, building two new fabs in Arizona at a cost of $20 billion. Last year, TSMC committed to building a $12 billion fab, also in the Grand Canyon State. It is also exploring more plants in mainland China, Japan and Europe.

Liu is candid about the reasons for that U.S. investment and its limitations. It was prompted by “political nudges on our customers,” he says, insisting that “semiconductor localization will not increase supply-chain resilience.” He says it may even “degrade resilience.”

Making chips is so unbelievably complex and specialized that diversifying the location of fabs will make it more difficult to maintain quality. The transistor in a 3-nm node is just 1/20,000th the width of a human
hair. Were you to enlarge a foot-long wafer of semiconductor to the size of the continental U.S., the required patterning for these chips would still be only the width of a thumbnail. The key component may only be silicon—or purified sand—but the magic happens in how it is processed and manipulated. “It’s like baking bread,” says the TSMC section manager. “The ingredients are pretty much the same, but how long should you bake it, what temperature should it be, that’s what matters.”

For this reason, TSMC’s foundry is meticulously controlled. All visitors must don head covers, dust-free jackets, pants and shoes before passing through an “air shower” to remove errant particles. The extreme ultraviolet lithography machines that TSMC uses each cost around $175 million. Larger fabs will have 20 of them. Creating a chip takes around 1,500 steps, each with 100 to 500 variables. Even if each step’s success rate is 99.9%, that means less than a quarter of the final output is usable. “Is there something slightly different in the water or the air or the chemicals in Arizona?” asks Hanbury. “The R&D team is not going to be a bullet train away to solve these problems.”

While TSMC founder Chang praised “cheap land and electricity” in the U.S. in a recent speech, he also grumbled that “we had to try hard to scout out competent technicians and workers.” Liu notes that costs in the U.S. have turned out to be “much higher” than TSMC expected.

It all points to a localization craze driven by politics rather than by science or business. After all, opening a fab in the U.S. affects only one small part of the manufacturing process. Today, semiconductors are typically designed in the U.S., fabricated in Taiwan or South Korea, tested and assembled in Southeast Asia, and then installed into products in China. It is already incredibly specialized: as much as TSMC dominates foundry services, only the Dutch firm ASML produces those advanced lithography machines that all its fabs rely on.

If a chain is only as strong as its weakest link, opening fabs in the U.S. won’t strengthen much. U.S. competitiveness may be boosted only incrementally. The new TSMC plant in Arizona, for one, will produce 5-nm chips, which, though cutting edge today, will be a couple of nodes behind the fastest when mass production begins in 2024. Meanwhile, TSMC’s headquarters will be moving ahead with next-generation 3-D integrated circuits, which, Liu says, “will unleash the innovation of semiconductor architectures.”

These technologies are so advanced that it’s impossible to catch up without pumping in vast sums of money. Even then, nothing is guaranteed. After all, the $100 billion investment that TSMC unveiled does not stand alone. It is combined with and augmented by the deep R&D pockets of Apple, Nvidia and all TSMC’s other close partners to create a “budget that is 100 times what you will see on their financials,” says Nenni. “It’s just impossible for any company or country to catch up to this huge ecosystem that’s moving forward like a freight train.”

What would make more sense, says Liu, is for the U.S. to ensure it stands at the frontier of the next great advance. Its lifesaving prowess in mRNA COVID-19 vaccines, for example, exists only because of huge investments in genomics and biotechnology over the past 40 years. Instead of futilely chasing and localizing aspects of the semiconductor supply chain, Liu suggests plowing that same money into developing the next great leap.

“The U.S. should focus on their strengths: system design, AI, quantum computing, those forward-looking things,” says Liu. TSMC may already have won 2030, but the decade after is still up for grabs. — With reporting by GLADYS TSAI/HSINCHU and ALEJANDRO DE LA GARZA/NEW YORK
London calling

How the city became a global hub for fintech

By Gina Clarke

WHEN SILICON VALLEY VETERAN EILEEN BURBIDGE moved to London in 2004, it was only meant to be temporary. With more than a decade of experience at tech stalwarts including Apple, Sun Microsystems and Verizon Wireless, the Chicago native felt a stint in Europe might help advance her career back in the U.S. With no language barrier and an emerging software-development market, London was an obvious choice. She took on a job as product director for a newly launched startup named Skype.

Nearly 20 years later, Burbidge is still there. Now co-founder and partner of early-stage venture-capital firm Passion Capital, she has established herself as an intrinsic part of London’s financial technology, or “fintech,” scene. Burbidge was the digital representative on former Prime Minister David Cameron’s business advisory panel and was honored by Queen Elizabeth II in 2015 as a member of the Order of the British Empire—or MBE—for services to U.K. business. She also served as tech ambassador for the office of the mayor of London, and is now a fintech envoy to the U.K. Treasury.

It’s little surprise then that Burbidge sees London firmly at the beating heart of the tech-forward financial world. “It’s got the unique combination of a financial-services heritage, with 300 of the world’s banking headquarters based here, plus progressive policymakers who support fintech innovation,” she tells TIME over video call from her home office in North London.

The U.K. capital has for centuries been a center of global finance, with long-established trading exchanges and trusted banking and insurance institutions. In the digital era, it has become an emerging hub for fintech companies, which use technology to improve financial services. Not even the uncertainty presented by the U.K.’s departure from the European Union in early 2020, coupled with the disruption of the global pandemic, has stemmed growth. Venture-capital firms invested $4.57 billion in U.K.-based fintech companies last year, making the country second only to the U.S., where investment was $19.6 billion, according to growth platform Tech Nation’s annual report on the U.K. tech sector. And in the first half of 2021 alone, U.K. tech companies raised more than $18 billion worth of venture-capital funding, according to figures compiled for the U.K.’s Digital Economy Council. “Investors showing their confidence in London’s fintech offering reinforces our city’s position as a leading global hub for this important and growing industry,” Sadiq Khan, the mayor of London, says in a statement. “Despite the impact of Brexit and the pandemic, we’ve seen record levels of funding for fintech businesses in the first six months of the year.”

The success story of this boom in fintech innovation has undoubtedly been so-called challenger banks—digital-only banking apps that use cloud-based infrastructure, embedded artificial intelligence, and agile frameworks to give consumers easier and faster access to banking services and financial products. Companies like Revolut, Starling Bank and Monzo have raised increasingly large sums of money and established themselves as household names among their tech-savvy, largely millennial and Gen Z consumer base, many of whom have eschewed traditional retail banking in favor of these more user-friendly banking apps.

How London evolved to become a challenger to established hubs for innovation in the U.S. has lessons for entrepreneurs and investors who find an increasingly difficult regulatory environment and a shrinking talent pool for development in California, New York or Texas. Burbidge, one of the key architects of the fintech boom, sees a changing of the guard. “Before long my colleagues [in the U.S.] stopped asking when I was coming back and by 2016 were instead coming across to join me,” she says.

WHEN BURBIDGE SET ABOUT building her team at Skype in 2004, the lack of qualified workers was one of the biggest challenges she faced. “Despite this burgeoning tech and digital sector in London, it was impossible for me to find a product manager, and the first few hires I made all came over from the States.” Now, she says there is a “wide concentration of developers, so much more than San Jose or New York.”

VENTURE-CAPITAL INVESTOR EILEEN BURBIDGE, PHOTOGRAPHED IN LONDON, ON SEPT. 16
That change has been helped in part by shifts in London’s economic ecosystem in the past decade. As a bruised City of London emerged from the financial crisis, it had lost its shine for some workers, who had seen how antiquated technology and a lack of innovation were stagnating progress and career development. Public attitudes toward the City had cooled amid austerity measures that also exacerbated problems for those who were unbanked or underserved by traditional outlets.

It was this environment that led Starling Bank’s founder Anne Boden—who spent 30 years working for traditional banking heavyweights that had been battered by the crisis, like ABN Amro, Royal Bank of Scotland and Allied Irish Banks—to launch her own bank in 2014. “I noticed that banking hadn’t progressed technologically, and this frustrated me,” says Boden. “The big banks seemed to be stuck in the past … Their systems were slow and yet no one seemed to be improving them. I realized that if I wanted to see a real digital bank in action, I would have to launch one myself.”

Boden says she founded Starling as “a more human alternative to the banks of the past.” The digital bank, which counts Fidelity and the Qatar Investment Authority among its backers, was recently valued at $1.7 billion.

Many others in the financial industry had similar sentiments to Boden’s, and left the industry to join some of London’s burgeoning startups or create their own fintechs. As attitudes have shifted, the conveyor belt that once took the brightest young minds from the halls of Europe’s top universities to the trading floors and deal rooms of investment banks has slowed, and fintechs have been reaping the benefits. Nikolay Storonsky, the British-Russian CEO of Revolut, says it was London’s talent pool that was most compelling when he established the company in 2015. “We have a hugely diverse U.K. workforce—more than 80 nationalities—many of whom were Londoners already, and others who were enthusiastic to come here.”

Storonsky, a former derivatives trader at Lehman Brothers and Credit Suisse, was also able to tap two talent pipelines to fuel the company’s phenomenal growth. “London’s eminence as a world financial centre is a huge advantage. There’s deep experience and talent here, both from the financial sector and from the startup world,” he says in an email.

Burbidge found that what wasn’t as established in London was the early-stage venture-capital funding network that startups need to grow, and that creates unicorns. In the U.K., venture-capital firms have typically been later-stage investors, meaning startup founders have had to rely on angel investors, bank loans and even their own cash for early funding. Burbidge and her two business partners at the time, Robert Dinghero and Stefan Glaenzer, who has since left the firm, decided to replicate the Silicon Valley model of first-round funding through Passion Capital when they founded it in 2009. They were determined to back exciting and dynamic startups, leading to standout investments in GoCardless in 2011 and Monzo in 2015. The latter neobank, known for its distinctive colorful debit cards that can be used abroad without fees, has since surpassed a $1 billion valuation and is piloting a beta version of its app in the U.S. in partnership with Sutton Bank.

A major reason challenger banks have been able to thrive in London is a supportive regulatory environment, says Storonsky, whose Revolut is now valued at $33 billion, making it the U.K.’s most valuable tech company in history. U.K. watchdog the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) has taken an active role, engaging with banks and new fintech companies on consumer-focused solutions, and it has established a world-class sandbox, where approved new fintech firms can test products with real consumers.

Yet by 2016, just as the fintech industry was becoming established in London, storm clouds loomed on the horizon. That summer, the British public voted to leave the E.U.—although notably voters in London backed Remain by 60-40.

London’s financial industry grew into what it is today partly because its rules mirrored those of the E.U., allowing for seamless transactions. Many in the London-based fintech industry were concerned about how Brexit might change the legal framework that the City operates within. The U.K. ultimately left the bloc last January, but Burbidge says that there has been no doomsday scenario so far: “We certainly haven’t seen the big asset managers or banks clear out of London. Perhaps that’s because it’s been the home of traditional financial-services institutions for so long—there’s still a draw.”

The regulatory environment remains advantageous for fintech companies post-Brexit, she says. “If you’re going to be a fintech you do have to be regulated and domiciled, which means you’re subject to compliance. And the U.K. is one of the most progressive and forward-thinking homes for fintech.”

For the industry to continue growing, however, it will also require the pool of talent to be continually replenished, but restrictions on freedom of movement between the U.K. and the E.U. may make that harder. The U.K. fintech industry employed 76,500 people in 2017, and that was projected to reach 105,500 by 2030 if immigration rules remained as they were.

Simon Schmincke, a partner at venture-capital firm Creandum, which has invested in several U.K. fintech companies, says that bringing in talent from other countries is becoming a headache for many companies: “I am stunned that in two years, we still haven’t figured out how to bring smart people in quickly. And that is having both a negative impact on individual companies and on the country’s image.” It used to be that “everyone was welcome as long as you worked hard and smart,” Schmincke says. “Now, that image is fading.”

Last year, after the U.K. formally left the E.U., Britain’s Finance Minister Rishi Sunak commissioned businessman Ron Kalifa to chair an independent strategic
review of how the U.K. government, regulators, and companies can support the growth and widespread adoption of fintech and maintain Britain's global reputation in the sector. The government has committed to adopting a number of the report's recommendations.

“We've set out a road map to sharpen the U.K.'s competitive advantage and deliver a more open, green and technologically advanced financial-services sector,” a spokesperson for the U.K. Treasury said. The government plans to support U.K. fintech companies by introducing new visa routes for foreign workers, enhancing its regulatory toolbox, reforming its market-listing rules and exploring a central-bank digital currency, the spokesperson said.

These kinds of reforms will be necessary for London to retain its competitive edge, according to Shampa Roy-Mukherjee, associate professor and director of impact and innovation at the Royal Docks School of Business and Law, University of East London. European countries such as Malta and Lithuania are taking advantage of the uncertainty caused by Brexit to offer new homes to London-based fintech companies, she says. “These countries are able to provide the fintech companies regulatory authorization to trade with the E.U., which the U.K. currently cannot provide.”

U.S. investors haven't been scared off by Brexit—and in fact have helped to power the U.K.'s fintech industry to greater heights. John Doran, general partner at U.S. growth-capital firm TCV, an investor in Revolut, says in an email that the company’s fundamentals were the key consideration. “We look to invest behind exceptionally driven visionary founders, who are building category leaders in industries undergoing a massive structural shift, and Revolut has all of these things.”

It also has the size and clout to pursue growth in the U.S. market. Similarly to Monzo’s relationship with Sutton, Revolut currently partners with Metropolitan Commercial Bank, but it applied for an independent U.S. banking license in March and began offering services to small and medium-size businesses in the U.S.

Burbidge is skeptical that the success of London could be as easily replicated across the pond. “It’s definitely down to the culture and ecosystem,” she says. “Because the U.S. is so siloed in terms of regulation, the success of financial-services hubs would be difficult to replicate.”

She says entrepreneurs in London are more mindful of customer outcomes than their U.S. counterparts. Partly in an effort to avoid comparisons with payday-loan apps that have been criticized for predatory tactics in recent years, many U.K. founders have worked to ensure that “wellness and mental health are built in at the core of new startups,” Burbidge says. “Historically this hasn’t been part of the startup culture in the U.S.”

She adds that the FCA is more attuned to these issues and wields “a far greater influence” in the U.K. than regulators do in the U.S. “While attitudes toward financial inclusion and customer outcomes are shifting over there, I believe if they had started thinking earlier about it as a proposition, they would have attracted further investment and customers. It’s a missed opportunity for the U.S.”

America’s biggest bank has taken notice of the particular advantages the U.K. market offers too. On Sept. 21, JPMorgan Chase launched its digital bank, Chase, in the U.K., marking the commercial bank’s first foray outside the U.S. in its 222-year history. It is attempting to attract U.K. consumers in the competitive market with a range of cash-back and savings offers. The bank has indicated it is in it for the long haul, and is prepared to spend hundreds of millions of dollars to become profitable in the U.K.

Burbidge isn't planning on leaving London anytime soon either, and remains its biggest cheerleader. “It’s a city with a massive commercial center, but it’s also the policymaking hub of the U.K. and additionally so creative and diverse that it’s as if you combined all of San Francisco, New York City, Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles all into one megacity,” she says. “It’s hard to beat.” —With reporting by Eloise Barry/London

London's Canary Wharf business district, where fintech company Revolut is based
One evening in early June, Leo and his family were able to enjoy a treat they hadn’t experienced in months: a sit-down meal at a restaurant. At a fried-chicken chain in a Compton, Calif., strip mall, four of them splurged on a few plates of fried rice, which added up to about $60. Leo, 39, who works as a mechanic, said the dinner felt like a luxury. “It made me very happy,” he says in Spanish.

The family was only able to afford a dinner out because Leo was recently selected to participate in a groundbreaking economic experiment called the Compton Pledge. Between late 2020 and the end of 2022, Leo and 799 other participants will receive, in regular intervals, a defined cash payment—between $300 and $600 monthly, depending on the number of dependents they have—that they can spend however they like. Leo, an undocumented immigrant from Guatemala whom TIME has agreed to refer to by a pseudonym, will receive $900 every three months.

The Fund for Guaranteed Income, the nonprofit organization running the Compton Pledge, has partnered with a research group to study the extent to which these relatively modest payments will impact the recipients’ lives: their physical and psychological health, their job prospects and their communities.

In the past six years, similar pilot programs have rolled out in nearly two dozen cities around the country, from St. Paul, Minn., to Paterson, N.J., according to the Stanford Basic Income Lab. Most of the programs, Compton’s included, are privately funded, and many target specific populations, like Black pregnant women or former foster children. The Compton Pledge, which includes a diverse cross section of the city’s residents, is among the most inclusive of the pilot projects, distributing three rounds of no-strings-attached stimulus checks to eligible Americans over the past 18 months. Polling on the topic is limited, but according to an August 2020 Pew Research Center survey, roughly 45% of Americans say they support the idea of the government giving every adult citizen, regardless of employment or income, $1,000 per month.

While a sustained federally run guaranteed-income program is not politically feasible right now, proponents of the idea say the tide is turning. Five years ago, guaranteed-income programs were largely relegated to economic seminars and think pieces in leftist outlets. Now it’s a topic on presidential-debate stages and an actual policy across the Atlantic in Spain, where the government is offering 850,000 very poor families up to the U.S. equivalent of $1,200 per month.

Nika Soon-Shiong, the executive director of the Fund for Guaranteed Income, says the question isn’t whether there will ever be a national guaranteed income statewide, but when. To speed up that process, the Fund for Guaranteed Income has made the technological interface it created to distribute cash payments available to other programs. “This is an inevitable future,” she says.

Soon-Shiong, a doctoral candidate in international development, planned to launch a privately run guaranteed-income experiment after completing her thesis at the University of Oxford on cash-transfer systems in India. But the COVID-19 economic crisis accelerated her timeline. “It really felt like there were not enough people thinking about the solution,” she says.
Soon-Shiong, who had returned home to West Hollywood when COVID-19 struck, turned her attention to her own backyard. Compton, whose 100,000 residents are mostly Black and Latino, was hit particularly hard. With an average household income $10,000 lower than the national median of $62,800, its residents suffer disproportionately from an array of diseases that increase the lethality of COVID-19, including obesity and diabetes, according to data compiled by the L.A. County department of public health. So in mid-2020—as Compton’s unemployment rate eclipsed 20%—Soon-Shiong approached Aja Brown, then mayor of Compton, to bring some of the city’s struggling residents a reprieve.

Unlike some existing welfare benefits and guaranteed-income pilots, Soon-Shiong and Brown’s plan would include undocumented immigrants and formerly incarcerated people. Participants were selected randomly from a list of low-income Compton residents compiled from city records and community leaders like Baptist ministers and immigration attorneys. Starting in August 2020, Soon-Shiong, the daughter of billionaire Dr. Patrick Soon-Shiong, helped raise $9.2 million, from donors including Amazon Studios and the California Wellness Foundation, to fund the payments.

Compton Pledge recipients were given no instructions or requirements on how to spend their payments, but most families interviewed by TIME report using some for health-related costs. Three of the four Compton Pledge families TIME interviewed over the past six months expressed that they are battling chronic illnesses. Leo’s first $900 installment was meted out carefully: $250 for a car diagnostic tool that will enable him to take on more mechanic jobs; $150 on a college textbook for his 23-year-old stepdaughter; a few hundred dollars to his ailing mother in Guatemala; and $90 in payments toward a $3,000 payday loan that has accrued nearly $1,000 in interest fees in less than two years. The extra financial cushion hasn’t yet put a dent in the $10,612.80 hospital bill Leo recently received after going to the emergency room for chest pains that a physician linked to stress.

Tiffany Hosley, a 40-year-old former teacher’s assistant in the Compton unified school district, is also receiving $900 quarterly. Unable to work since having a serious heart attack last October, Hosley says she uses a portion of her payment to defray the cost of her $988-per-month heart medication, which was denied by her insurance.

Compton Pledge, which has been operative since late 2020, has yet to release comprehensive data on the payments’ effects—health or otherwise. But initial findings from a different guaranteed-income pilot in Stockton, Calif., indicate that recipients saw an overall improvement in their well-being. In March, the pilot reported that the recipients of its $500-per-month stipend showed statistically significant improvements in mental health vs. the control group, moving from likely having a mild mental-health disorder to likely being mentally well. One year into the two-year pilot,
Stockton recipients had spent 37% of their allotments on food, 22% on assorted merchandise and 11% on utilities. They spent less than 1% on alcohol and tobacco. On average, the recipients spent 3% on medical needs.

Beyond covering their own needs, some Compton participants have said they plan to use their funds to support their communities. Georgia Horton, who became an evangelist preacher while serving a 25-year prison sentence for a murder she says she didn’t commit, put her first $400 monthly payment toward the tools she needed to preach the gospel virtually—namely, a new HP laptop and a ring light. With subsequent checks, she paid registration and notarization fees to launch a nonprofit, Georgia Horton Ministries, which will lead trauma-informed prison workshops and support other formerly incarcerated people.

Christine S., who asked that TIME not use her last name, has committed hundreds of the $1,800 she receives quarterly toward feeding homeless individuals in Compton’s historic Lueders Park, inspired by her own experience with homelessness. She plans to purchase a mobile shower so homeless people don’t have to use garden hoses as she did. But her Compton Pledge money also helped her take her daughter on a vacation to San Diego, where the toddler got to swim in a pool for the first time.

The idea of guaranteeing a basic income is hardly new. Thinkers from all political persuasions, including Charles Murray, Milton Friedman and Martin Luther King Jr., have suggested directing the government to inject cash directly into people’s wallets. Prior to former President Bill Clinton's sweeping welfare reform measures in the 1990s, the U.S. provided millions of poor families an average of $374 monthly through a program called Aid to Families With Dependent Children. In the years since, U.S. lawmakers have repeatedly voted for direct-payment stimulus checks as a tool to combat economic recession.

The more recent explosion of guaranteed-income experiments has been fueled in part by support from wealthy tech moguls. Twitter CEO Jack Dorsey has given to guaranteed-income projects through his #startsmall initiative, including donations of $15 million to the OpenResearch lab (formerly Y Combinator’s UBI project) and $18 million to Mayors for a Guaranteed Income, a group founded by former Stockton mayor Michael Tubbs. In March, New York University used $3.5 million from Dorsey to launch the Cash Transfer Lab, a center that will study the effect of such policies.

In the past six years, at least 40 new guaranteed-income projects have been either launched or announced on a state and local level. Most are designed to help specific populations. A pilot project in Cambridge, Mass., for example, targets single-caretaker households, giving more than 100 families $500 per month for 18 months. The project in St. Paul, Minn., is helping up to 150 families whose finances were negatively impacted by COVID-19 with $500 monthly payments for 18 months.
A pilot in Oakland, Calif., is focusing on nonwhite residents, offering $500 monthly for 18 months to 600 families earning below the area median income. A group in San Francisco is partnering with the city’s department of health to give pregnant Black and Pacific Islander women $1,000 a month for the duration of their pregnancies and at least six months of the child’s life. And in Jackson, Miss., the Magnolia Mother’s Trust, now in its third cycle, is giving 100 Black mothers $1,000 monthly for one year. In July, California approved the nation’s first state-funded guaranteed income project, designating $35 million for monthly cash payments to pregnant women and youth who have recently aged out of foster care.

But even amid this wave of new interest, a sustained federal universal basic income, like the version Andrew Yang campaigned on, remains extraordinarily unlikely. Giving every American adult $1,000 per month, as Yang suggested, would cost the U.S. government more than $3.1 trillion per year—a sum equal to roughly 90% of all the money the federal government collected in revenue last year.

Yang, along with fiscally conservative UBI advocates, insists that the math makes sense, since such cash payments would allow the government to zero out other expensive entitlements, like housing vouchers or food stamps. Others argue that a UBI should supplement the existing safety net, and be paid for by wealth taxes such as those advocated by progressive Senators Elizabeth Warren and Bernie Sanders. They argue that while it takes money to invest in a larger social safety net, it’s more expensive in the long run not to: providing health care to uninsured people cost the country roughly $42.4 billion per year from 2015 to 2017, according to an estimate from the nonpartisan Kaiser Family Foundation. People who can’t pay rent or other bills are likely to need other services the government will end up paying for, like housing assistance. Poverty is also strongly linked to incarceration, which costs taxpayers at least $80 billion per year.

Many moderate and conservative policymakers dismiss such arguments as magical thinking. While former President Donald Trump and many congressional Republicans supported sending stimulus checks to help Americans in the spring of 2020, they saw it as a short-term remedy to a once-in-a-century crisis—then quickly soured on more spending. Douglas Holtz-Eakin, former director of the Congressional Budget Office and president of the center-right American Action Forum, points at the $28 trillion national debt and blames the pandemic-era stimulus spending for a recent uptick in inflation. This spring, Democrats, under pressure from moderates in their own caucus, narrowly passed a smaller stimulus bill, with more targeted direct payments and limited unemployment benefits.

Perhaps the most sustained objection to giving people “free money”—including increasing existing benefits—is that doing so discourages work. In Compton, nearly half a dozen small businesses—including a taco truck, an insurance shop and a Chinese restaurant—told TIME that larger government unemployment checks, which expired in September, combined with direct cash payments through programs like the Compton Pledge, were making it difficult to hire workers. “That sign has been out here for six months,” says Roland Barsous, the manager of a local auto-insurance outlet, of a HELP WANTED placard in his window. He hired two people to fill the clerical position, but neither lasted more than a few weeks. “One of them stayed for about a month,” he says, “but she was getting more money staying home.”

**SOME EXPERTS SAY** these critiques don’t hold up. “There’s little to no evidence” that the federal income-support programs are leading to work shortages, says Mark Zandi, chief economist at Moody’s Analytics. Despite 26 states voluntarily ending supplemental unemployment insurance early, there was little difference in their employment numbers and workforce-participation rates in July. Participants in guaranteed-income experiments also generally report that cash payments did not allow them to stop working. Danel Paige, 28, who participated in the Jackson program, continued to work as a Head Start teacher, attending graduate school and taking care of her two children, ages 8 and 3, while her father’s military job kept him stationed several states away. The money from Magnolia Mother’s Trust has helped her keep up with her electric bill and car payment, and she’s hoping to save enough to move to a safer neighborhood after losing a loved one to gun violence. “I’m trying to lead a different life for myself,” she says. “This money is a huge part of that decision.”

Paige’s story is not unique. Guaranteed-income advocates say that modest cash payments are not enough to solve poverty or address its root causes. Instead, they merely loosen the financial straitjackets that have confined the beneficiaries for most of their lives. “Having a guaranteed income and a poverty floor enables people to have breathing room to make better decisions for their families,” former Compton mayor Brown says, “to be able to spend time to maybe be able to actually go on an interview, to be able to plan a few years in advance instead of having to live paycheck to paycheck.”

For Leo, the Compton Pledge payments are an answer to a prayer whispered earlier this year after months of financial hardship. “I asked the Virgin Mary for some sort of miracle,” he says from the covered patio outside his home that doubles as his stepson’s bedroom. An extra $3,600 per year won’t pay off all his debts, buy him health insurance or allow him to move his family out of their small rental home, which was converted from a car garage. The payments do, however, let him breathe a little easier. “Dios apierta pero no ahoga,” explains Leo’s stepdaughter, Lesley. God squeezes but he does not choke. —With reporting by Mariah Espada and Nik Popli/Washington and Leslie Dickstein/New York
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Jaime’s Place, an emerging Latino-owned small business in San Antonio
Rising from the ashes

Latino-owned businesses are poised to spur the post-pandemic recovery

By Jasmine Aguilera
San Antonio,
Andrew R. Chow and Mariah Espada

Jaime Macias could hardly have opened his bar and restaurant, Jaime’s Place, at a worse time. In the weeks before his scheduled grand opening in October 2020, COVID-19 ran rampant through San Antonio. Restrictions had shuttered the doors of bars and restaurants, and Macias’ own Latino community was particularly hard hit, with people dying at higher rates than the overall population. Macias, 56, had poured his life savings into the restaurant on the West Side of the city, and unexpected costs brought him within $800 of going broke before the restaurant even opened.

A year later, a stream of loyal customers fill Jaime’s Place each night, drawn by publicity Macias’ 26-year-old daughter Gabriela posts on Instagram and Facebook, to watch live performances or dance under a tin canopy decorated with Mexican papel picado. Regulars ranging from agricultural workers to officials from the San Antonio mayor’s office gather at tables in the bar’s open lot. Although the Delta variant of the virus remains a threat to the community and its businesses, Macias has a renewed sense of optimism about the bar. “Gentrification has a way of eradicating what once was, kind of whitewashing everything,” he says in his Chicano accent, seated at a wooden table outside, as Selena’s “Fotos y Recuerdos” plays in the background. “I wanted to make sure that Jaime’s Place planted the flag … We’re here por vida [for life].”

Jaime’s Place may prove to be one of the thousands of Latino-run businesses to help guide San Antonio—and the U.S. at large—out of its devastating pandemic-induced economic slump. Over the past 10 years, Latino
entrepreneurs have started small businesses at a higher rate than any other demographic, all while facing higher hurdles than their white counterparts. Before the pandemic, the roughly 400,000 Latino-owned businesses in the U.S. with at least one employee generated nearly $500 billion in revenues a year and employed 3.4 million people, according to a 2020 Stanford Graduate School of Business report citing 2018 Census Bureau figures. Now, according to the U.S. Department of Labor, Latinos will make up a projected 78% of net new workers between 2020 and 2030.

In San Antonio, which is America’s seventh largest city, a fifth of businesses—or roughly 7,000—are Hispanic-owned. But although that proportion is one of the highest in the nation, it is nowhere near representative of the actual population, which is 68% Hispanic. In San Antonio, Hispanic residents are almost twice as likely as non-Hispanic white residents to be living on an income of less than $25,000.

Barriers to entry, such as language and a lack of access to established infrastructure, have historically been high for Latino entrepreneurs. Those challenges were exacerbated when COVID-19 struck, shuttering many of the businesses most commonly run by Latinos, such as restaurants, cleaning services and retail shops, forcing owners and workers to dip into their often meager savings.

Ramiro Cavazos, president and CEO of the United States Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, says that Latino business owners typically have less access to funding than their white counterparts and that only half of them have a banking relationship. That meant many of these owners had difficulties accessing the Small Business Administration’s Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) loans last summer, aimed at keeping workers on the payroll during the pandemic, because they were distributed primarily through banks. “The businesses that were able to apply for and receive those forgivable loans first were larger, more successful nonminority businesses,” Cavazos says.

But now a pandemic that threatened to decimate the community might usher in the next era of small-business growth. Economic leaders like U.S. Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen believe Latinos will be essential to driving the economic recovery, just as they were after the Great Recession. From 2007 to 2012, the number of Latino-owned businesses in the U.S. grew by 3.3%, compared with a decline of 3.6% among other businesses during that period. “If history is any guide, Hispanic-owned businesses will drive a large portion of the recovery,” Yellen said during a press conference in March. A 2020 report by consultancy firm McKinsey & Co. found that the long-term recovery of the U.S. economy is “inextricable from the recovery of Hispanic and Latino families, communities, and businesses.”

Members of the Latino small-business community in San Antonio say the pandemic has accelerated several positive developments. They have become more connected with their communities, and many have adopted digital strategies to reach more customers. Some have also benefited from easier access to capital.

“COVID has opened our eyes to the fact that nobody is successful working in silos,” says Mariangela Zavala, the executive director of the Maestro Entrepreneur Center, a small-business incubator in west San Antonio. “We’re vulnerable by ourselves, and we really need community in order to grow.”

**MANY LOCAL ENTREPRENEURS**—mom-and-pop businesses that once relied on proximity to a local, loyal customer base—embraced social media to reach new customers as foot traffic stalled. Lazaro Santos, 32, set up his coffee-truck business, Me Latte, in August 2020, offering signature flavors from his hometown of Piedras Negras, Mexico.

Business started out slow, but immediately spiked after a popular local food influencer, S.A. Foodie, posted a video raving about Santos’ horchata iced latte. Before long, Me Latte’s Instagram account was inundated with new followers (now more than 4,800). Santos posts new photos every few days, featuring oat-milk-latte art and grinning customers. He and his wife Melissa, who helps him run the accounts, spend at least 10 hours a week on digital marketing on Instagram, Facebook and TikTok. Santos says the social engagement across all platforms has led directly to a 60% increase in sales, and he is now looking to experiment with different forms of marketing.

At his teal-colored Me Latte trailer, parked just off the 10604 highway, Santos receives a notification on his phone. Melissa Santos just shared a photo of Lazaro pouring cream into a latte on Me Latte’s Instagram account. He hopes it will remind his customers to visit.

“It’s just about being there, you know—**presencia.**”

Small businesses are also strengthening community bonds as a business strategy. Maestro Entrepreneur Center, based in an abandoned elementary-school building in one of the poorest neighborhoods in the West Side of San Antonio, was founded by Julissa Carielo five years ago, funded by a mixture of public and private capital. Currently, 42 businesses share the space, chasing their dreams in catering, cosmetology or accountancy. Maestro puts on classes, provides digital support and connects cooks with veteran chefs to develop recipes.

Teresa Garcia, whose company Food Safety Direct provides training and certification for food handlers, has been with the Maestro center since 2019. When the pandemic struck and people stopped attending classes, Maestro gave Garcia a one-month reprieve on her rent and helped her to apply for grants. Experts there also helped her pivot her business to a hybrid model, offering food handlers training and certifications through virtual and in-person classes, she says.

A year and a half later, Garcia’s business has “100% returned” to its pre-pandemic levels. The support she received encouraged her to pay it forward in her
community, running weekend job fairs in local malls to match up unemployed people with restaurants needing staff. For Garcia, it’s a virtuous circle. “If the restaurants are doing well, then I’m doing well—even if it means I have to do some food-handler classes for free,” she says.

Other local organizations such as the San Antonio Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, San Antonio for Growth on the Eastside and the San Antonio Chapter of the Texas Restaurant Association have pooled education and resources, making sure the most vulnerable businesses aren’t left behind. The Chamber of Commerce has been hosting webinars on financial literacy and social media for beginners. Sandi Wolff, head of strategic relations at the Chamber of Commerce, says the organization waived its membership dues to foster connection, keeping all its members last year. She says “people are realizing they can absolutely use us to promote themselves and connect with other businesses.”

Although these organizations can provide support and education, small businesses can go only so far without funding. Capital is the biggest hurdle Latino entrepreneurs face, says the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce’s Cavazos. The Stanford study found that just 51% of Latino business owners receive all or most of the funding they apply for from national banks, compared with 77% of white business owners.

Cavazos says larger banks historically “were not reaching out to our community because in their eyes, a loan under $1 million was not worth the effort.”

When PPP loans were first rolled out, even the more established Latino-owned businesses struggled with the mountains of paperwork required. April Ancira, vice president of Ancira Auto Group, the first Hispanic Chevrolet dealer in the country, which has a strong relationship with the community-oriented Jefferson Bank, holds an M.B.A. degree and has been in her role for 15 years. Yet she says she couldn’t have completed the application without the help of numerous accountants and her company’s chief financial officer. “It honestly took a rocket scientist to apply for PPP,” she says.

Since the pandemic began, business leaders in San Antonio and beyond have worked with lenders to improve access to capital. Last fall, Houston-based Woodforest National Bank partnered with the Maestro center and Bexar County to award $15,000 each to 56 entrepreneurs in San Antonio, setting them up with business bank accounts and advisers from Maestro’s network.

Daniel Galindo, a senior vice president and community development and strategy director at Woodforest, has made investing in small businesses a priority, providing small loans to low-income borrowers, such as gardeners who might need to replace a lawn mower.

Some of Woodforest’s loans are as small as $500 and borrowers may be considered high risk, but Galindo says the lender is taking a holistic approach to banking. “We have larger institutions that sometimes say, ‘There’s not a whole lot of money in smaller money lending.’ But we need to stop looking at it from a revenue perspective,” he says. “Without a thriving community, banking wouldn’t exist.”

Woodforest often refers clients to more flexible microlenders like San Antonio—based nonprofit LiftFund. Lenders like these are becoming more prevalent, allowing small-business owners who previously felt alienated by banks to access capital without resorting to more predatory lenders with exorbitant interest rates. Isabel Guzman, the leader of the Small Business Administration, has stressed the importance of making lending easier and more accessible, and her agency has recruited more than 5,400 approved lenders like credit unions, community banks and fintech companies to make PPP loans, compared with 1,800 active lenders pre-pandemic, in an effort to distribute loans quickly and equitably.

The shifting environment for entrepreneurs has led to a flurry of post-pandemic activity and growth in San Antonio. Garcia says the food-truck and ghost-kitchen scenes—delivery-only restaurants catering to consumers still reluctant to eat out—are exploding across the city. Woodforest is seeing more interest in its entrepreneur-accelerator program than ever, Galindo says. And the Maestro center is adding to the pipeline with two 10-week accelerator programs for more than 50 local businesses.

While the lessons learned in San Antonio could prove useful to the 30 million other small businesses across the country helping to power the recovery, the role they play on the ground is just as significant. Businesses like Jaime’s Place serve as emotional lifelines after a devastating year and a half. For its largely working-class clientele, it’s where they want to spend their hard-earned cash. “[People] respect the place because it’s something that they’ve been longing for,” says Gabriela Macias. “It’s not just a bar but a place to gather and bring your kids and just be safe—and also celebrate your culture.”

Macias, 56, opened his local bar, Jaime’s Place, in October 2020, during the pandemic.
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Amor Towles had never actually been beneath the vaulted ceiling of an Adirondack lake house when he described the one in his 2011 debut, the best-selling Rules of Civility. He could only imagine the appeal of such an exalted communal space—“this great room where the family gathers”—until, while shopping for a second home with the money from that book, he found himself touring a property an hour and a half north of Manhattan. “I was like, ‘This is it!’” says Towles, throwing his arms toward a 30-ft. ceiling that, like the glistening lake outside, now belongs entirely to him. “It was this weird thing where I was kind of buying the living room that I had written about,” he says. “Which, in a Stephen King novel, would end badly.”

In the storybook life of Amor Towles, however, the new owner lays down thick Oriental rugs (thicker still where they overlap), sets his laptop on a long oval table by floor-to-ceiling windows and—with wife, son, daughter and a nephew within earshot—rides out a pandemic writing a new book. The Lincoln Highway for the most part steers away from the upper-class milieu of Rules of Civility, which tracks the ambitions of a winning young woman in 1930s New York City, and 2016’s even bigger hit A Gentleman in Moscow, in which an aristocrat is sentenced to live in a luxury hotel. The new novel, out Oct. 5, begins with a farm boy named Emmett being driven home across Nebraska in 1954 by the warden of a reform school. He did time for accidentally killing a bully, and while he was away, Emmett’s father died and the local bank foreclosed on the family farm. It may sound bleak, but adventure awaits. There are stowaways in the trunk of the warden’s car who want to take the story in one direction. Tugging it in another is Emmett’s kid brother Billy, who has stumbled on a cache of postcards their mother sent after disappearing from their lives years earlier.

“These are the postcards,” Towles says, spreading across the table a stack of vintage cards he began searching out after the idea occurred to him. The top one depicts a motel in Ogallala, the mother’s first stop after leaving her family. Next, Towles pulls from a drawer the British army officer’s wristwatch that shows up in two of his novels.

The author may set his stories in a specific past, but he regards history as only suggestive, like the backdrop in an opera. The foreground, on the other hand, must be as concrete as the artifacts that bridge the worlds he creates. “If it’s a Chekhov play, and they are sitting around the table, and there’s tea on the table, that stuff can’t feel fake,” he says. “When someone slams the cup down, it’s got to sound like china hitting the table.”

In many ways, Towles writes what he knows. The upbringing outside Boston that he calls “middle class” involved private school, then Yale and Stanford. “My great-grandparents,” he allows, “would have been very comfortable in Edith Wharton’s novels.”

Towles started writing in first grade, and years later at a Yale seminar was taken aside by Paris Review co-founder Peter Matthiessen, who saw a talent the two made a pact to cultivate. So when Towles broke the news that to please his father, a banker, he was going to work in finance, his mentor was “furious.” America’s finance industry is
notorious for skimming the brightest minds from every field. “The people I’ve seen go to Wall Street do not come back,” Towles remembers Matthiessen saying. “So you should assume that at this moment, you have turned your back on writing for the rest of your life.”

While making his first fortune as a partner in a boutique investment firm, Towles would occasionally see Matthiessen. “He was the Jacob Marley in my life. The chains were clanking outside the door.” After a decade, convinced that if he did not resume writing he would reach 50 “bitter and a drinker,” he found time over seven years to write a novel that he ultimately concluded was bad. But recognizing that the best writing in it had been done in the first year, he engineered a fix: spend as long as necessary to outline a story, but just 12 months getting down the first draft.

The idea was “to try to capture the freshness of the imaginative moment, where it’s all sort of exciting and interesting and revealing itself,” he says. The detailed outline is crucial. It lets him get his bearings when he surfaces from wherever he goes to produce the sinuous, frequently charming prose that, like Towles, may be best described as cosmopolitan. “For me, it’s very much about this thread of language, and how it’s unfolding and referring to itself as it goes,” he says.

He took the time thing to heart. Rules of Civility covers one calendar year, which is precisely how long he took to write it, starting on Jan. 1, 2006. He was determined that The Lincoln Highway should unfold over 10 days, though at 600 pages the first draft required 18 months, as did A Gentleman in Moscow.

The new book’s title, referring to the nation’s first transcontinental highway, seems to promise a road trip. “It’s more accurate to say it’s a journey book,” Towles says. Emmett and the stowaways—a fast-talking rogue known as Duchess and his woebegone companion, Woolly—are all 18, the age at which, Towles notes, having received advice from all quarters, a young person begins making decisions about his own life.

LAKE SPARKLING in the September morning light, the tour continues. Behind the main house, on the wall of his underused study, hangs a framed map of Yoknapatawpha County, invented by William Faulkner and populated with characters apt to pop up in any of his books. Joyce employs the same trick, as does the espionage writer Alan Furst, whose best work offers satisfactions similar to Towles’—summoning eras we think of in black and white, partly by evoking the films of the time (some of which Towles name-checks in the book), while offering the singular pleasures of literary fiction.

Woolly turns out to be short for Wolcott; his uncle was in Rules of Civility. Towles, a vivacious sort, visibly brightens recalling the moment when it occurred to him that the nephew would be the second boy emerging from the trunk of the warden’s car. “No reader has to ever notice it for me to be happy about it,” he says. “You have a story and suddenly a person’s appearance opens the door to that other story.” Or, as the case may be, to a great room.
I signed my first book contract without paying much attention to what it said. I didn’t know at the time that the book would be a best seller or that it would one day inspire a Netflix series. I just needed the money. I was a single mom with a 2-year-old and a 9-year-old, living in low-income housing, and because of a late paycheck, I hadn’t eaten much for a few weeks, subsisting on pizza I paid for with a check I knew would bounce.

This wasn’t my first bout of hunger. I had been on food stamps and several other kinds of government assistance since finding out I was pregnant with my older child. My life as a mother had been one of skipping meals, always saving the “good” food, like fresh fruit, for the kids I told myself deserved it more than I did. The apartment was my saving grace. Housing security, after being homeless and forced to move more than a dozen times, was what I needed the most. Hunger I was O.K. with, but the fear of losing the home where my children slept was enough to cause a mind-buzzing anxiety attack that wouldn’t let up.

Hunger changes you. As your body begins to claw at you, your stomach churning in anger, every person who shares a photo of the fancy meal they’re about to eat is no longer your friend. Around that time, a guy who had a crush on me kept texting me what he was making for dinner, and I finally had to ask him to stop without really explaining why.

When the advance money to write the book came, I wasn’t exactly “free” from poverty. I got a book deal that most writers, especially BIPOC writers, do not receive. It was an amount of money that didn’t seem real, so I always thought it would disappear as quickly as it came. I could fill my fridge again, but I had $20,000 in credit-card debt, a truck that kept breaking down and almost $50,000 in student loans. I had years of untreated complex PTSD and generalized anxiety disorder. All of our clothes, furnishings and towels were falling apart. Beyond that, mentally speaking, living in poverty is walking a tightrope over a floor that’s about to drop out from underneath you. Every time I felt like my head was finally just above water, when I had a day off to take my kids out for an afternoon, that’s when my car wouldn’t start. My brain had learned to be suspicious of good things. To almost fear them. As things started to feel more comfortable, the panic attacks screamed, When? When will the bad thing happen, because I know it’s there.

In the year leading up to publication of my book, I woke up in panic maybe 100 times. (By the time I was on book tour, it happened every morning at 4.) Every night, my anxiety seemed to come up with a new “what if” scenario based on what I’d been through as a freelance writer. I thought the trolls would catch wind and share photos of my kids on 4chan again, calling us names I will never repeat. As a single mother who had written about being on food stamps, I’d experienced enough death threats that I paid a service to keep my information off search engines. Now I had written an entire book about mothering my older kid when we had nothing, and I worried for their safety too.
of society, one I had been mistreated by for most of my adult life. I no longer felt like I could be part of the community of people I’d worked beside, stood in line with to buy the cheapest burrito as our only meal for the day.

I was a “success story,” and an extremely likable one. I’m very conscious that my story is the palatable kind of poor-person story. There’s no doubt in my mind that people paid more attention to it because I am white, hold a bachelor’s degree, and even though my parents grew up poor, I was raised in three-bedroom, 2½-bath homes for most of my childhood.

After living in poverty for the previous decade, struggling to pay bills by cleaning poop off toilets, it jarred me to be treated as an equal by people who previously could have been my clients. At cocktail parties put on by my publisher or the organizer of a speaking event, I wanted to hang out with the caterers. I had tattooed the backs of my hands—what my tattooist called “the everlastling job stopper”—to not blend in even more. On book tour, people asked over and over why someone like me had worked as a house cleaner. Some said, “Of course you made it out of poverty, but why do you think others can’t?” Some even said “won’t,” as if poverty is a decision people make when they wake up in the morning.

Not only did strangers hug me, but emails and direct messages started pouring in with highly personal questions often rooted in anger. Why didn’t you get an abortion? Do you really think what you experienced was abuse? What did all of this do to your children? One woman was obsessed with the kids’ mental health and kept messaging me that I should give them up for adoption. On a photo of my youngest, who was about 5 at the time, smiling while eating ice cream, someone commented how terrible it was to get pregnant when you can’t afford your kids. I had been off government assistance for three years.

When I started meeting people who had read my book, I was unprepared for their hugs and words of appreciation. People saw themselves in my story. It had been my hope, but not my expectation. As a shy introvert, I had no idea what to do but nod and say thank you. Then it started happening in grocery stores, and when I dropped my kindergartner off at school. I could usually spot them coming, but sometimes they surprised me. Like the time I heard, “Oh my God, are you Stephanie Land?” from the pharmacy clerk as I reached for a bag containing medication to assist my body’s first miscarriage.

I had moved to a house with a yard. My kids and I lived with a tall, handsome man I’d recently married, his daughter, and our mix of fish and dogs. I was never hungry. I could afford to purchase clothes that didn’t come from consignment stores or Target. What’s more, I had been pushed up to a different class

When people ask me how to help, I tell them to ask people what they need. I’m the story we love to hear, and every time I speak to an audience, I point that out. It has become my purpose. But as my friend Rene Denfeld recently wrote on Facebook, “We live in a world that embraces the success story only because we are O.K. with the majority suffering.”

We need to look marginalized people in our community in the eye and listen to their stories of struggle, heartache and impossibility. We need to sit with the pain people in systemic poverty and systemic racism experience, especially because those two things go hand in hand. There are excellent books on this subject, like Ijeoma Oluo’s So You Want to Talk About Race. When people ask me how to help, I tell them to ask people what they need. I’m betting the answers are things like tampons and diapers and $10 for gas, because life is so small and short-sighted when you’re that hungry that you can’t demand affordable housing and a living wage. That’s for all of us who have means to fight for.

Land is the author of Maid: Hard Work, Low Pay, and a Mother’s Will to Survive
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Good hair, bad blood

Lee Daniels went platinum with Fox’s Empire, his splashy drama about a hip-hop dynasty. His next potential hit for the network is Our Kind of People, a soap inspired by Lawrence Otis Graham’s acclaimed book on the Black upper class.

The charismatic Yaya DaCosta stars as Angela Vaughn, a single mom who drains her savings to spend a summer building a hair-care business—and restoring her late mother’s good name—in the elite Black enclave of Oak Bluffs, on Martha’s Vineyard.

Her foil is haughty Leah Franklin-Dupont (Nadine Ellis), who was born into one of the community’s most prominent families and married into the other. (As Leah’s amoral father, Joe Morton essentially reprises his role as Scandal’s Papa Pope.) To excel here, Angela must gain membership to Leah’s exclusive women’s club by running a gauntlet of glittery events in a sort of grownup sorority rush.

The show’s initial insights into the politics of Black wealth aren’t groundbreaking, but that would be a lot to ask of the genre. A good soap need only be addictive—in which case, People is primed for greatness. —Judy Berman

OUR KIND OF PEOPLE airs
Tuesdays on Fox

REVIEW

Flanagan haunts an island

IS IT EVEN HALLOWEEN IF NETFLIX isn’t unveiling a horror show from The Haunting of Hill House and The Haunting of Bly Manor auteur Mike Flanagan?

This year’s follow-up to those adaptations, Midnight Mass, comes straight from Flanagan’s imagination. Like the Hauntings, it has its flaws. Dialogue is often stagey. While the leads—Zach Gilford, Kate Siegel and especially Hamish Linklater—are great, some other performances lag. These problems can exacerbate one another. Yet after a few slow episodes, the show’s alchemy of spectacle, suspense and storytelling starts working.

Set on Crockett Island—a fishing community (pop. 127) where it could be the ’50s if not for the cell phones—Mass opens with the arrival of two characters. Riley (Gilford) grew up on the island, left and got a fancy job, only to spend four years in prison for a drunk-driving accident that killed a teen girl. Once an altar boy, he’s since lost his faith and is treated as a pariah. His only confidant is his high school sweetheart, Erin (Siegel).

Also fresh off the ferry is Father Paul (Linklater), an energetic priest who explains to the island church’s shrinking congregation that he’s been sent to fill in for their ailing octogenarian clergyman.

At his side is the officious Bev (a chilling Samantha Sloyan), the prototypical church lady, dressed like a girl scout and always judging, scolding, guilting.

What begins as a gritty ex-con narrative grows spookier when a violent storm hits the island. Ghostly figures appear. Dead cats wash up on the beach. Soon, miracles start happening. Could Father Paul possibly have the power of the Almighty at his fingertips?

Catholicism has permeated the darker realms of pop culture lately (see: the Conjuring franchise). The most ambitious takes—HBO’s dazzlingly odd The Young Pope and The New Pope; the harrowing film First Reformed—interrogate the role of an old faith in a world many believe to be beyond salvation. Mass isn’t quite on the level of those works. Flanagan would rather entertain than blow minds. Yet neither does he oversimplify questions of faith, salvation, morality and mortality. With so many series these days delivering lectures on how to be a person, it’s refreshing that this one, Flanagan’s best, trusts viewers to wade through those murky waters on our own. —J.B.

MIDNIGHT MASS is streaming on Netflix
Jasper Johns The iconic American artist, still working at 91, on his two retrospectives, the perfect day and the pleasure of poetry

The retrospectives of your work at the Whitney Museum of American Art in New York City and the Philadelphia Museum of Art are called “Mind/Mirror.” For you, is art more a way of representing thought, or a way of representing what you see? I don’t know about more or less. I think it is both, and a play between them.

Do you miss anything about being young? Agility.

What would constitute a perfect day for you? Few interruptions.

You’ve had friends who were poets, and you’ve been interested in the overlap between poetry and art. Do you still read poetry? I do still read poetry, old and new. I read the Poetry Project’s newsletter when time allows. Friends sometimes email their poems or send copies of recently published books.

One of your friends, the poet Frank O’Hara, wrote that he was “sentimental enough to wish to contribute something to life’s fabric, to the world’s beauty.” Do you feel confident you have done that? It’s not what I set out to do, but I suppose the possibility that it might be a consequence is a nice thought.

For what in your life do you feel most grateful? I am lucky for being able to devote myself to work that remains interesting to me.

You have spoken of how many of your works start with “things the mind already knows”—numbers, colors, targets, flags. Did any of these things start to become unfamiliar? All familiar things can open into strange worlds.

Would any flag have worked? The Union Jack? The Japanese sun? My first flag painting followed a dream of an American flag, so that is what I painted.

You have returned in several works to a Life photograph, taken by Larry Burrows in Vietnam, of a soldier devastated by the death of a fellow soldier. It’s not his most famous image; why did that one speak to you? I was not familiar with Burrows’ work. The photograph itself seemed to ask for my attention.

A few years later, Burrows died while on assignment in Laos. Is imagemaking worth dying for? Dying while on assignment doesn’t seem like a bad idea.

Can any images—as mundane as a coffee can or dramatic as a mourning soldier—still have power in a world so suffused by imagery and information? Visual information remains a primary source of meaning.

To what do you attribute your long creative life? One does not plan the length of one’s life, so I might attribute it to chance.

Do you wonder what the last work you make will be? I sometimes think it is the one I am working on.

Your work is sometimes regarded as chilly or detached. Do you understand that perception? No.

Robert Rauschenberg said, “Good art can never be understood.” Do you agree? Not with the language. I don’t know that art can be understood in any final way, but a search for understanding tends to open one’s eyes rather than close them.

—BELINDA LUSCOMBE