

SYMPOSIUM BREAKFAST

October 16, 2009 – 7:45 – 9:00 a.m.

Ambassador Kenneth Quinn – President, the World Food Prize Foundation

Our speaker this morning is one of the two authors of a book called *Enough*, so he's going to come up and tell you what that title means. I hope all of you have had enough for breakfast. You know, we have to carefully choose who the speaker is at our breakfast because people are a little tired and starting early the next day, so we want somebody to come up and challenge you and wake you up and get the day off to a great start.

Roger Thurow and I were talking here at breakfast – the first time I met him and Scott Kilman, was in the coffee shop at the J.W. Marriott Hotel in Washington. Norm Borlaug was there; he'd just come back from an event in Africa, and I was going to come down and have breakfast with him. It was like about 6:30 in the morning, and here he's already there; Roger and Scott are there with him. I think it was supposed to be about a 45-minute breakfast or something like that, and then we'd go on to something else.

Two and a half hours later we were still there, and it's instructive about Dr. Borlaug – when he met people who really interested and understood what he was doing, he'd stay and talk a long time. And I think it's also indicative of the kind of reporters that Scott Kilman and Roger Thurow are, because they have, over the last 6-7 years, really become involved with a passion in the issues of hunger and feeding the world. And their stories in the *Wall Street Journal* have been as prolific as they are in-depth and telling.

Scott Kilman was supposed to be here this morning; it's supposed to be a two-man, tag-team event. He had a family event – where I think he had twins born. He called up to tell me, and so I said congratulations to him. And he said, "Roger can handle the whole thing. He's probably better at this than I am." So, Roger Thurow, you're welcome. Please come up and challenge us.

Roger Thurow – Co-author, *Enough: Why the World's Poorest Starve in an Age of Plenty*

Thank you very much, Ambassador Quinn. That was quite a breakfast meeting in Washington. And, yeah, things do go on, and that was one of the great things – I'll get into that – about Dr. Borlaug, that Scott and I, particularly as journalists, appreciated.

You know, last night, Ken, I read your tale of how Dr. Borlaug removed the Curse of the Bambino; it's a very plausible theory. And to think he could have done the same thing for the Chicago Cubs, since that was his team; he grew up wanting to play second base for them, you know. But that never worked out. But what I'm figuring is maybe next year Dr. Borlaug can kind of engineer some divine intervention for next season? So, please, please, if you can do that – I mean, after engineering the Green Revolution, how hard could that be, lifting a little curse? And he's got experience from Boston, so...

And, thank you, everybody, for coming this morning. It's impressive to see such a gathering at such an hour, particularly after all the raucous celebration for Dr. Ejeta last night. When the singing and dancing was going on and you got up to join them, I figured it was only someone from Africa that would do that, so I figured it was a great and grand Africa moment in the heart of Iowa. Scott and I both went to the University of Iowa, so sort of shout out to the Hawkeyes who are – what are they, 6-0? I think I've learned that Purdue was not on their schedule this year, unfortunately, right? So to see such a thing happen in Iowa was a real treat.

So, Happy World Food Day, everyone. Or, as I read from the World Food Program this morning, they call it, “No Food Day” for so, so many people. And in that vein, also welcome to the “Enough is Enough – Outrage and Inspire” breakfast. Ken wants us to get you going, so we’ll try to do that.

“Outrage and inspire.” That was the mantra that Scott and I, as we were writing our book, *Enough: Why the World’s Poorest Starve in an Age of Plenty*. During many of the moments of writer’s block, which frequently beset us, Scott and I could be found mumbling to ourselves, “Outrage and inspire, outrage and inspire” – kind of over and over, “outrage and inspire,” because those were the two goals of our book and what we set out and wanted to accomplish: outrage the readers into action, and inspire them by examples of how they can go forth and do that.

Outrage that we brought hunger with us into the 21st century after the Green Revolution was one of the great scientific and technological achievements of the 20th century. And inspire that hunger is one of the great problems in the world that can actually and truly be conquered, that everyone can make a difference, that individuals can do things, that it can be the singular accomplishment of our generation.

As Ken said, Scott sends his best regards. His wife gave birth to twins last week. They already had a two-year-old daughter, so Scott really has his hands full at home. So he wishes he could have been here. The problem is for you all, that of the “outrage and inspire,” I’m the “outrage” and Scott’s the “inspire.” So you’re left with me and the outrage, and maybe at 8:00 in the morning is a pretty good thing.

For Scott and I, Dr. Borlaug fueled much of our outrage and supplied an abundance of inspiration. As I said, as journalists, we particularly appreciated his outrage. It didn’t take much to get him pounding the table and raising and shaking his first and railing against the complacency in the World Bank – “the damned World Bank” – structural adjustment; everything that basically was turning the tide in the ’80s and ’90s away from the Green Revolution.

A few months ago I was in a nonfiction narrative writing conference in Dallas, north of Dallas, in the indeterminate Grapevine area or something. We didn’t exactly know where we were, but it was somewhere in the metropolis, I guess. And there were a number of leading literary lights; I was only there because the guy who runs it is a former *Wall Street Journal* colleague, and he needed to fill out the speaking bill.

One of the main draws was Paul Theroux, the novelist and travel writer. And even though our names sound the same, we’re not related. He’s from, I think, the French side of the Theroux family, and I’m from the Pomeranian side. And in his speech Paul Theroux was explaining the difference between fiction writing and nonfiction writing, which he specializes in and is extremely gifted on both of those fronts, both fiction and nonfiction writing.

And what he said is, “Fiction writing comes from within.” It comes from within the mind. You’re creating your world, you’re creating your characteristics, your scenarios, based on reality, perhaps, but this is something that you’re drawing out of yourself. In nonfiction writing, he said, what you do is, “You go out into the world and you seize a story.” I thought that was pretty profound. I wrote it down in my notebook – “You go out into the world and seize a story.” And next to what I wrote... I did my own kind of addendum and my slight change to fit my case. For I went out into the world as a foreign correspondent with the *Wall Street Journal*. I went out into the world, and a story seized me – and that story was hunger.

And that was from what I experienced and saw in Ethiopia during the famine of 2003. And more precisely it was one particular quote from Dr. Borlaug that seized me and seized Scott. It was a doozy of a quote, full of potential outrage. Three years ago when I spoke here – I think it was three years ago, two or three years ago – before we had even set out to write the book, I talked about that quote and the impact that it had on us.

It was 2002, Scott and I do were doing a story that was asking the question: “Why can’t Africa feed itself? How come the Green Revolution never got to Africa?” In doing the research, we came across the text of Dr. Borlaug’s Nobel Peace Prize lecture in Oslo from 1970. One passage particularly hit a nerve and propelled

our writing on that story, and as Ken said, all the writing that we've done for the past six or seven years on that, and really inspired us then to do the book.

Dr. Borlaug sounded a warning that day. What he said was, "Man can and must prevent the tragedy of famine in the future, instead of merely trying with pious regret to salvage the human wreckage of the famine, as he has so often done in the past. We will be guilty of criminal negligence without extenuation if we permit future famines."

Criminal negligence. As I said three years ago here, a light went off for us: "Aha!" That's what we are as we write about hunger – we're crime reporters. As we reported about hunger, we were investigating one of the great crimes of our age. I mean, what else could you call it when 25,000 people die every day of hunger and malnutrition and related diseases? Now I'm here to say we've written our crime novel.

You know, I wandered into a bookstore the other day. That's what they say, new authors – for Scott and I, for both of us it's our first book – and authors, in particular first authors, I guess, whenever we pass a bookstore we just wander in and search for our book. And I'll tell you, sometimes that wandering takes quite a while. Well, in this one bookstore that I wandered into, I found *Enough* in the "true crime" section. "Excellent," I thought, "these guys get it." I think it was an independent book store. Barnes & Noble and Borders prescribe where these books should be; I think in Borders for a little while, they just thought it was *Wall Street Journal* reporters, so they put the book in the business management section or something. But as I looked there, there was also a book from Jeffrey Sachs, so I figured, Okay, we're at least in good company. So these guys, I figured, got it. We were in the true crime section.

"Outrage and inspire" – why is that important to what we're all doing here? I think they're vital additives to all the great work that is being done on the hunger front by the scientists, researchers, and humanitarians who are filling and gathered in this room. And they're also vital emotions for all you students out there. They will fuel your ambition and light your way. With the outrage, the emotion will propel you; "We've got to do something about this." With the inspiration in some of the stories, hopefully, that we provide in the book, they'll show you the way and light your way.

You know, we have to create a clamor that hunger won't be tolerated. At the end of that quote where Dr. Borlaug says we'll be guilty of criminal negligence without extenuation if we permit future famines, he says something like, "And that will be a guilt that will be too much for humanity to bear." And that's the stakes that we're at.

So we have to create this clamor that hunger won't be tolerated, a clamor that'll be heard in Washington and other capitals of the world. Let's make ending hunger the next great populist cause. In the past several years we've seen what can happen when the clamor is raised over issues of debt relief, of AIDS. We've seen governments move on the debt-relief issue. We've seen them take great strides in launching an assault on AIDS. And we're seeing that kind of happen on the climate-change issues now.

A point that we make in the book and has been addressed by speakers here over the years is that, particularly on the climate-change and the AIDS fronts, nobody will be able to declare victory without declaring victory against hunger. On the climate-change front, you can't declare victory until the farmers of Africa and their conditions are addressed and dealt with, because they're the ones, all the predictions are, that will have the greatest impact, and in the equatorial zones.

On AIDS, the big push has been to get as many drugs into Africa as possible so the Africans have the access to them and the affordability to them – and that's very laudable and great, and a marvelous thing that's happened on that front. But you can get all the drugs to the AIDS sufferers, you can get them all the AIDS drugs they want; but if they're still hungry, if you're giving the drugs to hungry and malnourished bodies, what good do they do? And in fact, sometimes, because they're very powerful drugs, if the body is undernourished, they'll actually do more harm than good.

When you think about it, what do all the drugs that we take in this country say? “Take with food.” We figured that wasn’t applicable to Africa? “Take with food.” Let’s do something on the agricultural-development front, on ending the hunger front; or we won’t be able to declare victory on either of these fronts.

So why not hunger? I mean, there’s plenty of precedent for this. The Jubilee 2000 campaign, if you remember, came to the United States from Britain. One of the main proponents of that movement was Bono, the Irish rock star, who, believe me, can outrage with the best of them. Tom Arnold from Concern is laughing – he knows that. He’s on the Irish Hunger Task Force with Bono. He’s often in his presence. And he can outrage with the best of them.

Bono came. He met with members of Congress. He told them of the suffering that was caused by the heavy debt payments, and he stressed the urgency to grant debt relief. You know, a number of Congressmen said, “Yeah, yeah, we get it; we understand that. We appreciate what you’re saying, but when I go home to my constituency, I don’t hear any clamor on this issue.”

Well, Bono and his aides and assistants, they all got together and huddled after that. They said, “If these guys want clamor, we’ll give them clamor.” So we went on the Heart of America Tour in 2000. In late November, early December, he got in a bus without his band, traveled the highways and the back roads, going from Omaha to Nashville, going through the heart of America. He came through Iowa, came through Des Moines, came through Iowa City. He went to universities, schools, churches, coffee shops, donut stores, truck stops, wherever there were a few people gathered.

And he’d bound off his bus and tell them what the story was. Spreading the outrage is what he was doing on the impact of Africa’s heavy debt load and the expanding AIDS epidemic. The resulting grassroots clamor that he and others ignited – the folks from Bread for the World and other advocacy organizations were also essential in that – the clamor he ignited was heard in the halls of Congress and in the White House. Legislation moved, debt was forgiven, funding was approved, and spending on AIDS drugs and prevention programs multiplied.

Why not with hunger? We need to crank up the outrage, amplify the outrage, crank up the clamor. Outrage that we have brought hunger with us, as I said, into the 21st century – and not only brought it with us, brought it with us at increasing numbers from the rates that we were seeing and the successes after the Green Revolution.

Now, we’ve heard these numbers many times in the past few days, and they kind of matter-of-factly roll off our tongues and maybe go in one ear and out the other. But let’s think of them again with a strong dose of outrage:

Outrage that more than 1 billion people go to bed hungry every day. That number is higher than it was before the Green Revolution, in absolute terms.

Outrage that the prevalence of hunger – this is really disturbing – the prevalence of hunger has increased to 15 percent of the world’s population compared to just 13 percent a couple of years ago. We’re giving back the gains of the Green Revolution that had put us ahead of the population curve. Shame on us.

Outrage that 25,000 people die every day of hunger and malnutrition and related diseases. Look, that’s three times as many daily deaths as occurred during the 1994 genocide in Rwanda, when an average of 8,000 people were killed each day during a 100-day orgy of slaughter and killing. There’s an international war-crimes tribunal to deal with those deaths. But what about the criminal neglect, as Dr. Borlaug prophesied, the criminal neglect that has allowed hunger to kill three times as many on a daily basis – those 25,000 people? It’s something I think the World Food Program and some of their officials over the years have put into perspective. That’s the equivalent of 60 jumbo jets fully loaded, crashing every day, each day. Imagine the headlines if one goes down. Sixty a day; no headlines, rarely.

Outrage that investment in agricultural development, particularly in Africa, dramatically slumped from \$8 billion a year in the 1980s to less than \$3 billion this decade. The Obama administration, the G20 and G8, are trying to reverse that. Pledges have been made, and as Bill Gates said yesterday, in essence, “Show us the money.” He’s good for showing the money, so he can say that with some authority. Show us the money, show it to us now; what are you going to do about it? Spend it, get going on the ground. “The time is now,” he said.

Outrage that, in the rich world, agricultural subsidies amounted to about \$260 billion in 2007 while we, in the rich world, who were giving out those subsidies, told African governments not to spend one single dollars on subsidies to their farmers.

Outrage that African farmers – basically alone among farmers in the world – bear 100 percent of the risk in an inherently risky business. If a crop dies in the United States or in Europe, in most cases someone’s writing a check – usually the government or insurance company. If a crop dies in Africa, people die.

Outrage that the American food-aid system has refused to modernize to go to some cash rather than all food. The result being that in Ethiopia in 2003, horrible famine – 14 million Ethiopians who were on the verge of starvation were being fed by the international community. America spent more than \$500 million in 2003 sending food aid to feed starving Ethiopians. It was welcomed, saved an awful lot of lives. Just remember the numbers – \$500 million, more than \$500 million sending food aid to feed starving Ethiopians. That same year, in 2003, the United States spent less than \$5 million on agricultural-development aid to help the Ethiopian farmers grow more food so they wouldn’t be in a position of having to receive the food aid to begin with. \$500 in food aid, less than \$5 billion dollars in agricultural-development aid. What’s wrong with these numbers? Why do they persist like that? Now, Congress has taken some first steps towards a local-purchase system, and it’s been through some of the dialogue that’s been here at this conference that’s kind of moved things along. But there’s a lot of convincing that still remains that modernization needs to happen on this, more flexibility.

Outrage that much of the chronic hunger of today is largely manmade. Certainly there are natural disasters that trigger famine; there’s drought. We’ve seen another tsunami and what happens in the wake of that. And, of course, hunger follows in the wake of war and corruption; we had a panel yesterday that was addressing that. It happens all too infrequently, and we need to get on top of that. But so much of today’s hunger is caused by bad policies spanning the political spectrum, in the rich world and in the poor. It’s avoidable. It’s from neglect, hypocrisy, good intentions gone bad. There’s been our food-aid policy, the farm subsidies, the self-interest of Western countries that often put their interest – or our interest – ahead of the interest of the hungry. Their aid systems – it’s often the question, you have to wonder, “Well, who’s actually being aided by these programs?”

Outrage – and here’s the most recent one that I’ve conjured up – outrage that already there’s some voices in Congress muttering that President Obama’s commitment of \$3.5 billion over three years for agricultural-development assistance is too much. “Don’t you know we’re in a financial crisis?” they ask. Well, look, they came up with \$3 billion and spent it over a couple of months on the Cash for Clunkers program, \$3 billion to get old cars off the road. But they get stingy when it comes to the hungry? Outrage.

Outrage that we have the tools and the know-how to end hunger, yet we don’t.

You know, so outrage fills the first part of our book. You know, I was hoping we were succeeding in doing that when we sent off our first draft to the publishers, Public Affairs. One day I called the book’s copy editor just to go over a style question. She answered the phone, and I kind of detected some annoyance in her voice. “How is it going?” I asked. “I’m infuriated,” she said. You know – “Uh oh.” I mean, the last word you want to hear from an editor is “infuriated.” I mean, believe me, there is rarely anything good comes from an infuriated editor.

“What’s wrong?” I asked. I was hoping that she was frustrated or infuriated over some kind of overuse of semicolons or some kind of grammatical goof that I had been doing. “No, no,” she said. “It’s a good infuriation. It’s a good infuriated. I’ve just finished a chapter on subsidies,” she said. Okay, I thought. The outrage is working. Then she asked me, “Look – tell me. Does it get anymore hopeful?”

Yes, it does get hopeful. For with the “outrage” comes the “inspire.” In fact, the inspire fuels more outrage. Inspire, because we can conquer hunger. We have the knowledge, the tools, the science. Dr. Borlaug showed the way, and all of his colleagues and the people that have been awarded and honored, and Dr. Gebisa that have been honored by the World Food Prize. You know, we have plenty of great examples to follow, individuals who have made a tremendous difference.

So “inspire” fuels the second half of the book. We highlight some of the work of these people and organizations on the frontlines of fighting hunger.

There’s African entrepreneurs. There’s Midwestern town families, philanthropists, priests, politicians. You usually don’t hear those in the same sentence – philanthropists, priests, and politicians. It’s good alliteration but strange bedfellows, perhaps. Southern housewives, corporate executives, evangelicals – all of them fueled by some measure of outrage, all of them providing inspiration.

Permit me just to read, since Scott’s not here, a couple of brief passages from the book, and you’ll get an idea about the inspiration and its linkage to outrage. The first is about another stalwart in the fight against hunger, a humble Irish priest, Father Aengus Finucane. He also died in recent weeks. As some of you may know, Father Aengus was the longtime leader of Concern, the great Irish aid organization that Tom Arnold now heads. I’ll just read a couple of paragraphs.

Aengus Finucane had left Limerick for the monastery and then headed to Africa as a missionary. He was a parish priest in Uli, in the Biafra region of Nigeria, when that province sought independence in 1967. War erupted; famine spread. As Father Aengus recalled an interview 40 years later in his Dublin apartment, “Parishioners were dying all around. Parents burying their children, children crying at the gravesites of their parents. You heard of cannibalism. You saw things. A man kicked to death in a market because he had stolen food. The parish house was surrounded by hungry people. The basement windows were lined with faces. You developed a horror of famine.”

The aging priest shivered, and he crossed himself. “Usually I have a drink when I tell these stories,” he said. But it being 10 in the morning, the drink would have to wait. Leaning on a cane carved from Irish blackthorn, he hobbled to his kitchen and put on some soup instead.

“I spoke at a Sunday mass,” he continued, “and I said we’d do our best to feed 200 of the worst-off children in each of the four towns in the parish. I went to one of the towns; the families were lined up around the football pitch, the children in front of the parents, the worst one in the front. I had to make the selection. I could only take one from each family, 50 from any clan. I went all along the touch line of the pitch, selecting children to feed.”

The next day Father Aengus returned with food. A father presented an emaciated child to him. “He said the one child in his family I had selected had died overnight. Could I select another one?”

Standing before that broken man in Biafra, Father Aengus believed he had stepped back in time to the days of the Irish Famine. More than a century before. Back then, too, selection determined who lived and who died: who got the job at the public works, who got a place in the workhouse, who got a bowl of soup. It seemed unconscionable that he was forced to make the same decisions in Biafra. As I said, that was more than a century later. What have we learned?

He watched an old Biafran man crawl on his hands and knees the final yards to a refugee camp, only to collapse at the gate. How many Irish people, the priest wondered, had done the same, crawling on all fours to the poorhouses, even perhaps to the poorhouse across the street from his home in Limerick.

Back in Ireland, a small flock of churchgoers who heard these tales from Father Finucane and his fellow missionaries in Biafra formed a group called Concern Africa, and devoted themselves to gathering up relief supplies to send to Biafra. Though most of the

Irish had little to give – this was still in the 1960s – donations poured in; within three months, a ship filled with aid sailed from Ireland to the west coast of Africa. Then, in order to avoid detection by the Nigerian government, supplies were flown nightly into remote airstrips inside Biafra, where missionaries like Father Aengus would collect them. Other ships followed.

Concern Africa would become Ireland's largest humanitarian organization, with Father Aengus at the helm. His abiding mantra to his fellow citizens, whether summoning assistance from his posts in Africa or while standing on O'Connell Street in Dublin holding a donation box, had been, "It's the right thing to do." And they understood. As Father Aengus said, "Even the poor would come up and put money in and say, 'Ah, Father, we know what it was like to be poor and hungry.'"

Now I'll read just a little bit from the final paragraphs of the book. It's about Dr. Borlaug, and there you'll find his good mixture of "outrage" and "inspire." It's in 2007, and he's back in Mexico. I believe this is in Obregon.

In the city hall, a mural wrapped around a stairwell depicted highlights of the region's history. Alongside scenes of marching peasants and a dam supplying water for crops, a well-tanned Borlaug appears within a halo of golden wheat stalks as he scribbles notes in the crop-breeding book, a microscope by his side. The inscription borrows a line from his Nobel Peace Prize lecture: "If you desire peace, cultivate justice, but at the same time cultivate the fields to produce more bread, otherwise there will be no peace."

Borlaug himself was not at peace, for in 2007 there was still not much work to be done. Global hunger was on the rise again. There was a new generation of disciples to inspire.

As Ken said, one of the great things of this conference that he always loved was talking with the students, future disciples to inspire.

Cancer had begun to bend and hollow his body. Yet his passion and determination were undiminished as he talked with colleagues over dinner in a motel restaurant. "It's criminal what is happening. The West just isn't doing enough to fight hunger," Borlaug said. I'm sure his fists were pounding and his arms were waving. "I am not satisfied with how far the Green Revolution has gone."

Suddenly, blood spurted from his nose, a side effect of his cancer treatment. Borlaug was so caught up in conversation that he wasn't even aware of the blood soaking in front of his plaid shirt until he noticed the startled look of his companions. He snatched some paper napkins from the table and dabbed. A look of fear and then anger flickered across his blue eyes as he cursed his cancer. "This damn thing," he said, "I don't have time for it," as he stood up from the table and walked to his room.

At dawn, though, Borlaug was back, pacing the motel lobby. Probably up before everybody else. He was anxious for a ride to his old research station to see the latest experiments and encourage the newest crop of researchers. Angela Dennett, a petite Australian college student, in jeans and a T-shirt, stood shyly to the side as Borlaug walked slowly through her plot of grain, peering closely at the individual plants. "It's amazing what one person can do," she said.

Sensing a teaching moment, an instructor began to tell the story of how Borlaug had invented a new way of breeding wheat in these fields. Borlaug turned around, chuckling. "Permit me to interject," he said. "Perhaps you don't know I was worried I could get fired if I didn't come up with something fast."

It would have to be fast now if he were to see it. As he left his fields, Borlaug didn't know if he would ever return. He was preparing for the end of his days. But that didn't mean his dreams had to die, too. As he stared out the window of the airplane, watching the fields of the Yaqui Valley grow smaller and smaller, he said, "Hunger isn't an insurmountable problem. I have big faith in the judgment of common people if they get the facts. When change comes, it can come quickly."

That was a scene from 2007. As I conclude, here's a very short video of an interview Scott had with Dr. Borlaug in Dallas just this past May. I think it's only a minute and a half. Chris, if you could roll the tape.

Kilman: *When you gave your speech, you said, "We will be guilty of criminal negligence without extenuation if we permit future famines. Humanity cannot tolerate that guilt." You said that in 1970. When you wrote that, it seemed to me you were really challenging the rest of the world that there doesn't have to be famine anymore. There was the science and there was the technology in 1970 that there didn't have to be famine anymore.*

Borlaug: *That's right.*

Kilman: *There was no reason to have a famine anymore. How did you feel then as the years went on and you would still see famine, you would see them...?*

Borlaug: *I think for the time being I would repeat that thing right now, that we've got the know-how to feed the present world population.*

Kilman: *Why is it still happening, do you think?*

Borlaug: *The modern-day leaders of the new generation are not working hard. They are, but they're involved in making decisions, policy decisions, that they have no sense of the impact of some of their decisions.*

Kilman: *If you were 40 years younger, would you want to go to Africa and be doing the kind of work you did before? Would you want to do that in Africa still?*

Borlaug: *I think I would be stupid enough to try it.*

“Stupid enough.” I think that might be a good title of our sequel to *Enough – Stupid Enough*.

As you see, in that phrase there is both the “outrage” and the “inspire.” And you can see – I mean, that was just in May – kind of the outrage there: “What are the modern leaders doing? I would still call it criminal negligence.” And there was also the “inspire”: “I’ll go to Africa.”

The *outrage* is the job isn’t finished yet, that there is still so much work to do. And *inspire* – that against all the odds, let’s roll up our sleeves and get after it. There’s a clamor that needs to be created.

Thank you.