

2014 BORLAUG DIALOGUE

October 17, 2014 - 9:00 a.m.

Panel: *Ambassador Kenneth M. Quinn, Moderator*

PANEL:

**TRENDLINES FOR POLITICAL STABILITY, GLOBAL TRADE AND
POTENTIAL DISRUPTIONS**

Panel Moderator:

Ambassador Kenneth M. Quinn

President, World Food Prize Foundation

Panel Members:

Dr. John Hamre CEO and President, Center for Strategic and International Studies

Amb. Daniel Speckhard President and CEO, Lutheran World Relief

Ambassador Kenneth M. Quinn

Thank you Ambassador Rivkin for being here. I'd like to now invite Dr. Hamre and Dr. Speckhard to come up here and join me here in the middle seats. And I'll move over there, and we'll get started. So I'm a diplomat. When Norm Borlaug first met me, here he was, agricultural scientist wondering, what's a guy like me doing in this job at the World Food Prize. But he and I had a connection from our experience in villages around roads and around the issues of – can agriculture operate freely and flow?

So you've heard, and you're going to continue to hear about all of the agricultural productivity and distribution elements in the food chain. But they operate within a world of political stability or instability and conflict. And so, ever since I came here in 2000, I have been endeavoring to build in the national security elements that I lived with all my time at the State Department as an American diplomat, so they would be seen in connection with these very issues.

So I'm so pleased that Dr. John Hamre and Ambassador Daniel Speckhard are here with me. They have extraordinarily distinguished careers – Deputy Secretary of Defense and for the last 15 years the head of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, one of the most respected – is it okay to say think tank? – place where the ideas in Washington germinate, just like the plants, and are brought forward. And Ambassador Speckhard's career, ambassador to Greece, to Belarus, and also his service at NATO.

And I have to say his first job in the government was in the Office of Management and Budget, and those are the words that strike terror in the hearts of those of us who are running aid programs in the government. But he was the food aid inspector. And the very first thing I ever did out in the villages in Vietnam – we were delivering USAID, and I caught local guys trying to steal money off the top. So I want to be sure you can report and add that to my record.

But anyway I'm going to turn to them, and they're going to kind of give you their view of what are the trends in these areas. Dr. Hamre, can we begin with you.

John Hamre

Well, I'm honored to be here, and thank you. I flew in from Washington late last night. I couldn't get here in time for the laureate dinner – I'm sorry for that. You know, Washington is, they say, ten square miles surrounded by reality, and it's wonderful to get out of Washington. I can't tell you how nice it is to come here in Iowa. I grew up in South Dakota; my brother and family live up in Anamosa, and so this is coming home for me. But it was coming home in a little different sense.

This morning, listening to Dr. Swaminathan, you transported me back to a time 41 years ago when I had the privilege of listening to Norman Borlaug give a talk about the Green Revolution, 41 years ago; it was such an inspiration to me at that time. And I looked out over that room – 1,500 young kids, and what you did for them today is you gave all of us new Norman Borlaugs. We don't know who they are yet, but you did that with your presentation this morning. It moved me, and I was just really very grateful for that.

I was confused when I got this invitation, to be honest. I run a think tank that focuses... everybody knows about CSIS as a defense think tank. And I was the Deputy Secretary of Defense, but it's important for me to be here. Because when I first came to CSIS – this was in 2000 – we had just, we had not finished, we had concluded the fighting part of the war in Bosnia. But I remember at the time thinking – we know how to win wars, we just don't know how to build countries. We were struggling with what we called post-conflict reconstruction.

And so the first project I started at CSIS was post-conflict reconstruction – how do we recreate civil society after we fight wars? It was before Iraq. We tried to help. We failed miserably, honestly, in Iraq. But it set in motion a kind of a transformation of our think tank, where we used to be a defense think tank.

Our largest program now is global public health, and right now we're in the middle of this Ebola nightmare. Our second-largest program is the role that the profit-seeking private sector plays in development, I mean, so it's now much more important to us, even though I'm a defense guy, and I still chair the Defense Policy Board for the Department of Defense. Hard defense is much less efficient than soft power when you get down to it.

Let me just share with you an interesting study that was done about ten years ago by the World Bank; it was a fascinating study. And it was a study trying to account for why our country is wealthy. What accounts for the wealth of nations? And it was a large econometric analysis, trying to account for the wealth of nations by looking at three categories of natural resources.

Natural resources, qualities of agriculture, qualities of fish stocks, forestry, underground resources, minerals, oil, that sort of thing – that was one category, natural resources.

The second category was human resources, manmade resources, factories, rail infrastructure, cities, things of this nature, things we make to create wealth.

And the third category was called intangible resources. And intangible resources were things like the quality of the education system of a country, the stability of a currency, the sense of fairness of a judicial system, the sense of common and shared purpose in society among the members of society – these were intangible resources.

And throughout this econometric analysis of 189 countries, overwhelmingly the most important factor for national wealth were these intangible resources. And if you think about it, every one of them – quality of education, stability of the currency, the fairness of the judicial system, the sense of fairness of politics. Every one of them is the product of good government. Good government is the foundation of national wealth. Poor government, ineffective government, corrupt government is invariably the ground spring of pestilence, war, disease.

That's the common ground right now that links together Ebola and ISIS in Iraq. These are profoundly different dangers, but they're grounded in exactly the same problem. They're grounded in a place where government is remote and corrupt and illegitimate. They're grounded in a place where countries cannot bring remit of governments to deal with the problem at its source.

Now, we're living in an international age when good things and bad things can move at unprecedented speed, whether it's investments, whether it's drugs, illegal drugs, whether it's terrorism, whether it's pollution. The world, all of the complex problems in the world are horizontal, but all of the governments are vertical. We cannot solve these problems as sovereign nation states alone. That's what we're learning right now about ISIS. That's what we're learning right now about Ebola. We've known for six months Ebola was going to become a global problem. We didn't do anything as a nation. We thought of it as a remote problem, a tragic problem that affected West Africa, not us. Well, that is not the case any longer.

And I think what Norman Borlaug realized 50 years ago was that the human condition is now becoming seamless. We are not the beneficiaries if we try to hide. I hear our politicians now saying, "Let's close off the airlines so nobody can fly from West Africa." Well, that no more solves the problem than putting a Band-Aid on somebody who's got cancer. I mean, we have got to take a very different approach.

Now, President Obama was criticized, rightly, in my view, when he said that we were going to overthrow the Muammar Gaddafi in Libya. We were going to fight from behind. I don't think you fight anything from behind. But what we do have to do is we have to fight from within. Our role now, this country's role has to be, to be in the middle and bind people together to help with a common problem. That's the Ebola issue. We can't possibly deal with the Ebola problem for our own wellbeing by simply being on the outside and preventing people flying into the United States. We only can do it – and the President was right – we now have 4,000 American soldiers in Liberia. Now, they're doing the logistic support to help. But that's going to have to

be the nature of American leadership in this new world if we're going to deal with what I think are right now the most frightening problems we face as a nation.

So let me stop with that.

Ambassador Quinn

So I think, Dr. Hamre, you have made a really profound point about this connection of the health issues, the food issues and the security issues. And if you were here and you heard the minister of Liberia, and the president of Sierra Leone yesterday in a live feed from Freetown, and you hear Florence Chenoweth discussing how they had struggled to rebuild Liberia after a decade or more of civil war when there was nothing left, and painstakingly rebuilt it under President Sirleaf Johnson's leadership – and now it's all a threat of being wiped out, to use her words, by Ebola. And so exactly right, that these threats of the health side can be the same as ISIS.

Now, someone who's worked very closely and intimately on the issues in the Middle East and Iraq, Ambassador Speckhard – your perspective, please.

Ambassador Speckhard

Thank you very much, Ken. It's really a privilege to be here. I've really been in awe over the last couple of days as I've listened to all the scientists, agronomists and world experts to realize that this goal of feeding over nine billion people is really within our reach. It's something that I didn't think I would see in my lifetime. But you're right to bring us here today to talk also about the security issues. Because, while science may have the answers, man can destroy it fairly quickly if we don't have the political framework and the security and stability in the world to be able to manage that.

And I think about security and stability sort of in this context and three levels to stability at the global geostrategic level, stability at the regional level and national level, and then stability at the local levels. One only has to turn the television on or open the newspapers to see how significant the challenges are when you look at security and stability in the world. And in spite of all the advances we've been making, the world still faces in many places, war, famine and the modern equivalent of the plague. Natural and manmade disasters seem to be arising with the frequency and a dispersion that is making heads spin in capitals around the world. And we're poorly positioned, I think, to manage these.

At the geostrategic level – let me just start at that level for a moment – I think what's going on is a number of factors. First, we have declining power and influence of the United States. And I know some people may put that on individuals, individual leaders here; but I think it's more a function of the reality of the United States' position in the world. And it's going to continue whether or not someone else of a different persuasion is elected in the next election. This is a fundamental issue that's happening geostrategically in terms of where the U.S. is positioned in the world.

Second, we have a Europe that is very weakened. On the economic front, it has lots of internal political challenges, making it in a poor position to serve as another leader in the global situation.

And third, we have nationalism rising in Russia and in China, as they want to assert themselves on the world stage in a way that plays well to their domestic audiences and overcomes some grievances that they feel that they've had even over decades or centuries in terms of the world status.

And the result of that is an inability to effectively address the security and economic challenge in the world at the geostrategic level. And this is coupled with the political side with the challenges of climate change causing migrations and dislocations around the world that create further political challenges at the geostrategic level. We see a lot of these challenges playing out then at the regional level. In the Middle East there's an implosion in Syria and fallout into Iraq. There's tensions in Israel and Palestine, and there's challenges facing Jordan and Egypt as a result of some of this, and of course perennial concerns with Iran, and now nervousness about Saudi Arabia as the leadership there gets to a ripe age.

In Africa we face famine in Southern Sudan and problems in al-Shabaab in East Africa. In West Africa you're looking at the Ebola outbreak we were just talking about. But don't forget Boko Haram and the extremism that is also inflicting challenges in that area. If you move to Central America, you see violence leading to significant migration, criminal and gang violence. But it's being exacerbated by drought that's hurting the poor in those areas and feeding this process. And in Asia we see competing claims over the South China Sea, rises in tensions in the major trading route that could have significant consequences for global trade. And we always have this wonderful nuclear North Korea, keeping our tensions up and our nervousness in guessing what they're going to be up to next. And last we have Pakistan and Afghanistan, where there are also always significant challenges.

So with that picture in mind, how can we stay on track to feed more than nine billion people? It's not easy, and a comprehensive discussion would take a lot more time than we have here in the few minutes that I want to say these remarks. But I had one key thought that I wanted to lay out for you as you think about this.

Just as you in the audience and all the speakers have been working on building resilience into crops to withstand the challenges of climate changes and pests, we need to be equally thinking in the political and security world about how we build resilience into our political system. What would that mean? Well, for starters, at the global and strategic level, it means that world leaders need to keep two principles in mind.

First, de-escalation, and second, engagement. And we as citizens need to support them in this. Engagement doesn't mean appeasement. I'm not talking about being appeasers, but I am saying, keep pushing back against populace tendencies – not just as we always blame overseas the populism that we see in other countries, but we need to reflect and be self-aware when we see it happening in our own countries. It's easy to gain poll numbers by being populist and nationalistic and showing how tough you are, but we lose sight of our geostrategic and out national interests oftentimes when we do so.

And second, at the geostrategic level, we need to recognize that, while globalization has brought many benefits, and I think John was talking about this, it's also brought with us significant vulnerabilities, so that a problem in one part of the world spreads so quickly to another. And policymakers need to be thinking in the political level as well, how to build in dampeners and firewalls to enhance resilience in this globalized world to keep that transmission in a dampening way rather than in an escalating way.

At the regional and national levels, building resilience means supporting and encouraging regional mechanisms to address crises and flashpoints before they become global. We have to have the regional mechanisms to deal with these things before we need the world capitals jumping in.

And second, we need to recognize that the link of food security to conflict and instability is a strong one. We shouldn't forget that multiyear droughts in Syria between 2006 and 2010 are part and parcel of the spark that led to the beginning of the crisis in that country. During that period, one half of the country was turned into desert. More than 80% of the livestock of the country had to be eliminated, and that resulted in 800,000 people without livelihoods that started migrating to the cities to survive because of how they were received, because of the poor governance that John was talking about. They weren't well taken care of, and country responded with issues like – to drill a well, you had to be of a certain sect, and you can imagine how that started playing out. And it was the spark in Dara that began the violence there. So food insecurity leads to insecurity more broadly.

And last, at the local level we need to be thinking about how to build resilience, and for us that means continuing to help farmers and communities become more resilient. And this where, while I was working at the national and international levels, a diplomat for many years, I'm pretty excited now to be working at Lutheran World Relief where we're focused singularly on building that resilience in local farmers at the local level and supporting them in food security in the developing world.

And I just want to close with giving you one example. At Lutheran World Relief we're working in West Africa on a Resilience Plus Program that's reaching 300,000 people affected by food crisis and vulnerability. And we're working with farmers and communities to better understand these periodic droughts and the other shocks they're facing and helping them to reduce migration, strengthen their local systems and secure economic assets and environmental capital. You can believe that this is a badly needed antidote to unrest in that region. It's more than just a moral... I think as we were talking about earlier, Charles was talking about an imperative – this is a security imperative for the world to be addressing these things, because it plays out very quickly.

So I'll close there, but I think we need to be thinking about strategic resilience, regional resilience and local resilience. And I'm so excited about what this audience is contributing to that local resilience question.

Ambassador Quinn

Thank you. That was a terrific overview. And I hope, if you didn't think so before, you're beginning to see how critical these kinds of elements are to the plans that we have to enhance

food productivity, distribution, make it more nutritious and sustainably and nutritiously feed nine billion people within this context. 2008 – you referred to the crisis then in food prices going up and riots. So the head of the World Bank, Bob Zoellick, came here. We sat in these two places, he and I, and had a discourse about – how's the world going to deal with that? And it came home to me at that time that we don't really have enough structures in place, at least I didn't see them – that who's going to provide the global leadership for this.

At the same time I thought as I listened to both of you – you know, we're from inside the government. When there's an issue inside the U.S. Government, someone will ask that there be a national intelligence estimate performed and put together, and so all of the elements within the U.S. Government that collect information, whether secretly or openly, and they put it all together and for the President and is systematic, and you think very thoughtful and helpful way and say, "Here's what it looks like. Here are the trendlines. Here are the projections about this."

So I wanted to ask you – What do you see as the global structure for dealing with issues that have agriculture, health part of it? Are they within internationally or the U.S. Government or other governments? Is that there? And is anybody doing that kind of thinking and putting together those kinds of estimates about health issues, security issues, food productivity, and water – and water. We haven't mentioned water, but yesterday the panel here – would we have enough water to do all this? Not sure. To all those, it seems combustible. So I wonder if...

John Hamre

We don't have a global institutional focus for this. I mean, there are basically two forms of internationalism: Structural internationalism; you know, we go into a treaty, we create an institution, we understand the purposes, and we create infrastructure around that institution, like the U.N. system.

And then we have consensus internationalism, coalitions of the willing, where you have a problem, you find people that agree with you that it is a problem, you see if you can find an agreement on how you approach it, and they just go off and do it.

Structural internationalism, the great strength is it's normative. It creates a framework where we can give the next generation a starting point to deal with the problem, because the structure exists. And normative values about the purpose of the institution exist. The problem is that these institutions tend to atrophy over time, and they have their own internal dynamic. So back 15 years ago when the United Nations decided that Libya should head up the Human Rights Commission, Americans got pretty – off and said to – with that. But there is not international institution other than the U.N. and the U.N. system. Coalitions of the willing are easy, but they're not normative. I mean, you put together one coalition, and it doesn't give you any way to start solving the next problem.

So we struggle with these two forms of internationalism that don't reconcile themselves into a systematic way of dealing with breaking problems. And it's one of the great problems that we have, and there's a great question of legitimacy now about the international institutions in the world, because they were set up by the white guys that won the war in World War II. And so most Asians think that these institutions aren't legitimate, because who's on the Security Council – France, Germany, Russia, China, the United States. Well, where's India or Japan?

They're just not perceived as being legitimate. But then institutions like the G-20 are seen as being arbitrary and also have a different kind of illegitimacy. So we struggle with this question.

I think we would do well to build around institutions that do have credibility and that are growing and are rebuilding themselves. I think the World Bank right now is one of the most exciting things going. I think that President Kim is a really remarkable man and I think could be a foundation for helping us. They used to at one time have a very large part of their program that was helping develop competencies in governments so that they could become more competent to do a complex tender offering, get the corruption out of the system.

I think we have to find in this era things that work and try to make them normative over time, which is what I think you're exactly saying about these regional structures and about resiliency. Resiliency is not just your own personal stamina but having an organization that can adapt when a new problem emerges and can deal with it. Right now the World Health Organization should be leading but isn't really leading, so it's the Center for Disease Control. And yet, I don't know, did you see how they treated the head of the Center for Disease Control yesterday in Congress? That was appalling. I mean, they're doing everything they possibly can, and he's being beat around like a stupid soccer ball. I mean, come on, get over it – we've got a problem here. This country's in deep trouble. And probably the biggest part of our problem is our politics.

Ambassador Quinn

I just want to be sure that everybody knows that President Kim... so be sure that everybody knows that President Jim Yong Kim, the head of the World Bank that Dr. Hamre referred to is from Muscatine, Iowa. Yes, no, it's true. He played quarterback for the Muscatine Muskies, Huskies or Muskies, I guess. No, really. Yes, absolutely.

Ambassador Speckhard

John, that was really, I think, insightful. And the one thing I would add to it is this idea that in reality the world has changed so dramatically that it's not just institutions that deal at an international level or a state-to-state Westphalian kind of system, that the reality is the world's changing so rapidly that, whether it's on the issues of conflict or food security or whatever, you need other actors besides state actors to solve these challenges. And the reality for us is we need to be thinking radically different in what those institutions look like that solve these problems.

And so the best we've done in the past, we always started having Track 2, so you'd see that all the diplomats and world leaders come together and try to solve it, but they can't quite, so we'll have a conference on the side with all the non-state people who are in there – the NGOs and the researchers and academics – and they try to talk to each other. Well, until we get all of those pieces together – the NGOs, the businesses, the governments, the participants, the representatives of society – all figuring out in an institutional way how to attack these problems, I think we're going to get stuck in an old mode that was designed for a world that wasn't so globalized where state-to-state relations were key and where international institutions do those things with old diplomats like us.

Ambassador Quinn

Well, so I mean that's what we've tried to build here, to make the World Food Prize in Des Moines be this neutral environment. And people from the bank and others say – Oh, this is great because you're not beholden to anyone here. And so what we find is, for example, the leaders of business of the international agriculture and food companies are really a profound group when they're together.

And they have something called the Global Harvest Initiative. I don't know if Margaret Zeigler is here, but she runs it on a day-to-day basis in Washington. But when they were kicking it off, I was together with the heads of Monsanto and DuPont Pioneer and Syngenta and ADM. And I said, "My goodness, all together, all of you are incredibly influential." And for what they have to contribute through an international and global trading system is so important for economic, ongoing development. And global trade is approaching a trillion dollars just in food and agriculture. But that all can be threatened by any one of these.

So do you have a sense that there are people together at senior levels outside the government or inside the U.S. Government or other governments that are looking at bringing health leaders, food and the political and national security elements together? One of my thoughts when I was at the Chicago Council was – maybe we ought to have in our national security structure in the United States something of a high level NSC-type council that brings agriculture, food and health all together so it would be a kind of crisis and policy-managing mechanism.

Ambassador Speckhard

I think that is wise advice. I don't see that happening in the way you've described it.

Ambassador Quinn

No.

Ambassador Speckhard

I do think that it happens and that actually some of the work done that is the most forward thinking happens in those kinds of environments under the auspices, I think, of the international organizations and others who bring us together in different groups and stuff, and we produce really some exceptional thinking. But when it comes to the policy side, it's very hard not to get it broken down into those stovepipes.

And I think the big challenge for us is the speed and the breadth of the crises that happen around the world. You have to give some sympathy to the policymakers, because what happens is, when you start having three, four, five global crises around the world, the machinery in these national governments start getting focused like lasers on those pieces, and they start missing the bigger, longer-term challenges that they're facing.

John Hamre

I agree with this. I mean, I attended National Security Council meetings for three years. I don't ever remember the Secretary of Agriculture coming to anything. He wasn't invited. So I think

it's unlikely that we're going to get that done as a government policy. But I don't want to be pessimistic here. I tell you, every day I am thrilled to learn about something that is happening in the private sector, especially the NGO world and the mirroring space between profit and nonprofit organizations. If you look at phenomenally things that have been going on between CARE and Cargill, for example, I mean, the dynamism, the creativity, the imagination in the nonprofit world is just, it's breathtaking. That's really what's going to get us through this.

We're stuck with these politicians for years, I'm afraid – but it's not holding us back. We're now moving ideas and agendas. The government can't move very quickly, but the private sector can move in breathtaking ways. So look what the Gates Foundation is doing. I mean, the Gates Foundation is probably more important in shaping global public health right now than the United States Government. I mean, this is what the nonprofit world is doing, and it's like yeast in dough – a little bit of it can enliven so much of this world.

And one of our biggest efforts right now is to shine a light on the very positive role that the profit-seeking companies are playing in the development agenda. I won't mention names, but there's one company that's a food manufacturer, because their raw material is too expensive to transport long distances to turn into a processed food, they have to put their factories close to the farmers. But because of their global reputation, they can't afford to have an adulterated product. So they hired 3,000 agronomists to train 600,000 farmers and license them and certify them – now, that's a development accomplishment that the U.S. Government would be very proud to have. This is happening all over. We need to now channel that energy. It's not a bad thing to do well and to do good. Matter of fact, it's the best of all worlds, because then your heart's in it every day. Well, that's what we're moving toward in this country, and that's what's going to save us. It's not going to be my Washington...

Ambassador Speckhard

Yes, thank you for that.

Ambassador Quinn

And we're so thrilled we have so many NGOs who come here, and this is where the deals get made, out in the corridors.

Ambassador Speckhard

One of the most exciting things for me coming into this sector and thinking about it and seeing this idea of shared values across the private sector with the nongovernmental sector – and we're doing exactly as you say at Lutheran World Relief where we're partnering with Starbucks in Colombia or Keurig Green Mountain in Central America, or other countries similarly, and Hershey's for cocoa and coffee, and bringing that kind of thing together where it's in their business interests, is what you're talking about. It becomes not a corporate social philanthropy but a business interest. And the economic engines – and that's one thing we can probably all agree on too – the connection between security and economics is so strong that, if you can get the economic engines working in these unstable places, the dynamic and the equation of instability changes, and the opportunities for growth increase dramatically. And that has direct

impact on the life of the poor and the food insecure. So I couldn't applaud you more, John, for bringing that up.

Ambassador Quinn

We have a couple of minutes left. I wanted to ask sort of the two bottom-line questions: The first is – What's the trendline? So if we had the whiteboard here, handed you the magic marker and going up is security issues are abating and it's very positive for reinforcing agricultural productivity, or kind of flatline, or is it downward because security issues are going to get worse? If you had to write, draw a trendline on the board, where would you put it?

John Hamre

I think we're probably only halfway through this global recession. It looks like it's coming back again in Europe. It looks like it's starting to hit China. If you would save all... You highlighted all the problems around the world, but there is a common foundation – this global recession is bringing out bad things all over the place, and I think we're probably only halfway through it. So I'm quite nervous about the next years.

I do think that America is going to not go into recession; I think our recovery is going to be weaker. But I also think there's more consciousness, global consciousness in Americans than any time in our history. The young people, they're different. My generation was very parochial, but this rising generation has a consciousness of their global connectedness and their global responsibilities.

Eventually those voices are going to start being heard in Washington. The evangelicals have changed. Twenty years ago the evangelicals came to Washington to talk about human sexuality, human plumbing – that's all they cared about. Well, they're now in town talking about poverty; they're talking about developments around the world. I mean, the young generation is changing the politics in this country. I just wish you'd hurry up.

Ambassador Speckhard

Listening to Sir Gordon Conway the other day, and he mentioned – who's a pessimist and who's an optimist was genetic, and he put himself on there. I was thinking it might have to do with age, so I'm thinking as well about the youth, because as I get older I get a little more pessimistic. And as I look at the world, that's partly because of what I was talking about earlier. We are in a change of eras, from the industrial age to the information age. And when this happened from the agricultural to the industrial age, there's a shaking of the whole global order that happens as the economics turns upside down, the politics turns upside down, and everything else. And we're at the beginning of that shaking of this change of era. So I'm very nervous about that, and I think it requires global leadership and stability to get you on that trend.

The positive part that I take away from this conference is that there's so much happening on the scientific front and the advancements in those areas that you guys are going to going like this – we're going to be working against you, but hopefully the combination of that is still growth. And I think with what you were saying, the young people's demand in terms of how they look

at the world in a much more inclusive way than we looked at it, I think, is really that inclusivity and that fight against tribalism, whether it's tribalism of nations, countries, regions, peoples, is what hopefully this next generation is going to take on and say, this is a world where we're all in it together.

Ambassador Quinn

So I just say, if I had to draw the trendline from Des Moines, I'd probably put it as maybe and maybe even slightly more pessimistic about whether the security issues, the health issues are going to be able to be contained or ameliorated so that the agricultural productivity can take place. So I think the potential for catastrophe is greater than very many people are saying. And I think whether we can meet this greatest challenge in human history or not really hangs in the balance. And I think the biggest program is that leaders, global leaders don't perceive it as such and don't treat it as such.

So thank you both for being here for a terrific conversation on this issue. And I hope we haven't scared all of the agricultural side too much, but let's have a hand for Dr. Hamre and Ambassador Speckhard.