THESE VITAL SPEECHES

THE BEST OF THE 2016 CICERO SPEECHWRITING AWARDS

GRAND AWARD

3 "The Downside of Up: The Outrageous Fortune of Being a Speechwriter," written and delivered by Dain Dunston, speechwriter and novelist

CATEGORY WINNERS

9 AGRICULTURE: "The House That Blueberries Built," by Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President, Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida

10 ASSOCIATIONS: "In the Decade of Human Capital, HR Must Lead," by Larae Booker for Henry (Hank) Jackson, President & CEO, Society for Human Resource Management

12 COMMERCE & RETAIL, ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING: "The Power of Serving Athletes Completely," by Seth Freedland for Trevor Edwards, President, Nike Brand

14 EDUCATORS: "Rhetoric: Indulging the Hope That Nature Will Finally Yield to Observation and Perseverance the Keys to the Heart," written and delivered by Rodger Evans, speechwriter, Scottish Parliament

18 ENERGY: "Mysteries of the Marginal Barrel," written and delivered by Bob Tippee, Editor, *Oil & Gas Journal*

22 GOVERNMENT, DIVERSITY: "Intelligence Community Pride," by Trey Brown for Stephanie O'Sullivan, Principal Deputy Director, National Intelligence

25 NONPROFIT: "The Pursuit of Happiness," by Katie O'Dea for Randall Dunn, Head of School, Latin School of Chicago

26 CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED: "National Intelligence, North Korea and the National Cyber Discussion," by Trey Brown for James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence

30 CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY, HEALTHCARE: "Health Is Everything," by Tanya M. Barrientos for Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, President & CEO, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

33 ENVIRONMEMT/ENERGY/SUSTAINABILITY: "Leading the Water Resource Revolution," Lori Harrison for Ed McCormick, 2014–2015 President, Water Environment Federation

35 LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT: "The Risky Business of Corporate Culture," by Bill Bryant for Myron Gray, President, U.S. Operations, UPS

38 PUBLIC POLICY: "Technology, Security, Freedom," by Charles Crawford for Sir John Sawers, Former Chief of MI6; Chairman, Macro Advisory Partners

42 COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS: "I Didn't Follow a Dream," by Aaron Hoover for Kent Fuchs, President, University of Florida

43 DEDICATION/GROUNDBREAKING SPEECH: "Treating Zorro, Treating Me," by Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture & Natural Resources, University of Florida

44 EMPLOYEE MEETING: "Tell Stories with Your Heart," by Aaron Hoover for Kent Fuchs, President, University of Florida

45 EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH: "The Man Who Made Winston Churchill," written and delivered by Hal Gordon, speechwriter

48 INAUGURAL SPEECH: "A Legacy Born of Hope," by Mark L. Kelly for Elizabeth Davis, President, Furman University

51 MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH: "Lullabies on the 4 Train," written and delivered by Tommy Fernandez, owner & speechwriter at Y&R Communications

52 STATE OF THE INSTITUTION SPEECH: "Purpose and Northwestern Mutual," by Mark Lucius for John Schlifske, Chairman & CEO, Northwestern Mutual

SEE HONORABLE MENTIONS, INSIDE FRONT COVER

HONORABLE MENTION

"The Power of Partnerships," by Joe Adams for John C. Hitt, President, University of Central Florida

"As Time Goes By," by Kevin Chappell, for Jim P. Cochrane, Chief Marketing & Sales Officer, Executive Vice President, United States Postal Service

"Lessons from Above (and Elsewhere)," by Lorne Christensen for David Eldon, Non-Executive Chairman, HSBC Middle East

"Convener's Speech, Health Inequities Debate," by Rodger Evans for Duncan McNeil, Convener of the Health and Sport Committee, Scottish Parliament

"Sentient Enterprise," by Katie Gray, for Oliver Ratzenberger, President, Teradata Data Lab

"Tissue Donation: A Pass from an Invisible Stranger," by Sarah Gray of the American Association of Tissue Banks, for Carson Palmer, NFL quarterback

"The Antidote to Hate," by Lieke Hagebeuk for Sander Dekker, State Secretary for Education, Culture and Science, The Netherlands

"The Orange and Blue Horizon Beyond," by Aaron Hoover for Kent Fuchs, President, University of Florida

"Speaking to the Eye," written and delivered by Jens Kjeldsen, Professor of Rhetoric and Visual Communication, University of Bergen

"Goodyear's 'Moonshot,'" by Ed Markey for Richard Kramer, Chairman & CEO, Goodyear

"It Can Happen Again: The Danger of Rising Anti-Semitism," by Alex Marklew for Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Business, Innovation & Skills, United Kingdom

"The Promise of Energy Efficiency," by Zachary Narrett for Ralph Izzo, Chairman, President & CEO, PSEG

"The Logistics of Staying Alive," by Janet Stovall Harrell for Romaine Seguin, Americas Region President, UPS

"I Am Guilty," by Diane Suchetka for Akram Boutros, President & CEO, MetroHealth System

"Flying Lessons, Firsthand," written and delivered by Rod Thorn, Communication Executive, Pepsi

"When War Changes, So Must Defence; a Call for Better Strategic Narratives," by Antonie van Campen for Rob Bauer, Vice Admiral, The Netherlands

GRAND AWARD WINNER

"The Downside of Up: The Outrageous Fortune of Being a Speechwriter"

Written and delivered by Dain Dunston, speechwriter and novelist

//

Delivered at the World Conference of the Professional Speechwriters Association, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., Oct. 8, 2015

I want you to think about something. Think about the moment someone walks out on a stage and steps into the light. In that moment, what do you have?

A bit of music starts and she lifts up on a toe. A door opens and he turns, surprised to see someone else in the room. A teleprompter starts to roll and a leader shares her dream. The MOMENT that happens, what do you have?

You have theater.

The moment the first cave dweller stepped up on a rock and said there are bison in the valley and I say, this time let's get one!

You have theater.

And we band of speechwriters—we few, we proud—we are the ones who script the business theater and the political theater of our time. It is an art, if done right, as good as any play.

Look at Shakespeare: what are the great moments of his work? The sword fights? No, the speeches, when someone steps downstage and says, let me tell you what it is, let me tell you what it could be, lend me your ears. The speeches, and the balcony scene. Those are the parts we remember.

Done right, a good speech can change the world.

And whether it does or not—whether or not it reaches that high and makes that moment—it all comes down to you and me and how much we believe we can make a difference.

***

Now think about this: you're in China, sometime in the 5th or 6th century, in the court of the Emperor Wu, who may have been the best Buddhist king ever, according to him.

He's very excited because there's this travelling monk in the neighborhood he has sent for the guy so he can have someone to show how smart he is.

He shows him all the good works he's done. The temples he's built. The sacred texts he's read. His shaved head, his orange robes.

And he asks the monk, "Look at all I've done. What's the karmic value of this?"

And the monk says, "None whatsoever."

OK. So the emperor never takes no for an answer, he presses on.

"How do you get karmic value?"

The monk says, "I don't know."

Now the emperor is confused because this monk is supposed to be the hottest thing going.

So the Emperor asks, "Then who stands before me?"

And the monk says, "I have no idea."

If those answers sound very Zen, it's because that monk was Bodhidharma, the father of Zen.

He was a blue-eyed Indian man who wandered north into China and messed with the minds of Emperors.

I love that story because imagine the balls to be in that moment and not feel you have to justify yourself to someone.

Imagine having the guts to say "I don't know."

So I'll do that.

What makes a great speechwriter?

I don't know.

How do you write a great speech?

I have no idea.

Every time I find myself looking at a blank screen, I have no idea how to write a speech. None. What I do know is, it will come. And I know this: the times I think, "Oh, I got this one," … those are the times I might not ask the right questions and might not dig deep enough. Because I think I know.

Of course, I'm not a complete idiot. When I'm standing in front of a client, I can do the sales dance as well as anyone else. I can sling the stories about the value I bring to their culture and their communications. I can do that. But that doesn't mean I know. It means I'm playing the game.

Earlier this year, I was invited to visit a company that—let's just say they're one of the biggest companies on Earth. And they were having a problem with their new CEO. A really good CEO, I think, but every time he gets on a stage to speak, he gets goofy. It's a little weird that he could get this far in his career and still have that problem. And it's embarrassing to watch. Can I help?

So I spend the whole day there. Interviewed by five executives. Coached a speaker for them. Learned they'd already had two of the biggest names in speech coaching in to work with the CEO and he hated it.

So finally I guess I passed some kind of test because I get passed up to the final gatekeeper, the Chief Communications Officer. And he asks, "How would you fix this?"

I have no idea.

"No, I mean, what's your process?"

There is no process.

And I can see him actually getting angry. He thinks I'm messing with him. But what can I say? You've had two experts in with processes and it didn't work. You want another process?

There is no process. This is a human being with an ontological problem. The "process" is, I sit and listen. I work with him on his speech until I hear the moment he goes off the rails and then I see if I can I uncover what went through his mind when that happened. And then when we know WHY it's happening, we see if he can fix it. Or we don't. It's up to him. There's no process.

I'm not currently working with that organization. I referred them to someone

who has a patented process. Maybe this time it will work. I don't know.

***

I love this quote from Abraham Maslow: "The story of humankind is the story of men and women selling themselves short."

That's our story. We grow up thinking we have to justify ourselves to people. At some point there in the crib, we look up and see we're surrounded by giants. We think, "I can't talk, I can't walk, I can't do anything these other people can do and, oh God, I just pooped my pants again! I must suck."

Isn't that the original sin? The original sin is that we think we're unworthy of love and so we spend the rest of our lives selling ourselves short, when it turns out we were worthy all along. And that's really what my novel, The Downside of Up, is all about.

It's about a freelance speechwriter who looks successful but when the book opens is maybe one unpaid invoice away from being out on the street. It's about learning to believe in yourself when every fiber of your body is telling you you suck … and everyone around you is nodding in agreement.

That's the story in every narrative. Somebody goes on a journey, sells themselves short, and then has to redeem themselves.

That's the story of Anna Karenina and it's the story of George Costanza. It's the story of Willie Loman and it's the story of Homer Simpson. And it's the story of Paul Lavallier, the speechwriter in The Downside of Up. It's his journey from selling himself short to owning the stage on which he stands.

Why a novel about a speechwriter? Why not? I guess you write what you know.

Here's the story. It was a Saturday afternoon in May, a few years ago. I was in Aruba, inside the Seaport Conference Center, rehearsing a cast production number for a big hotel business conference.

And somebody says to me, "Hey, read the CEO's speech, really good. But you know that part where you quote Charles Dickens? Where you say the opening lines of a Tale of Two Cities went 'It was the best of times, it was the worst of times?'"

Yeah.

"Well, I always thought those were the opening lines, too. But they're not."

WHAT?!! Bam! Laptop open, how could I have screwed this up so bad? What an idiot! I didn't do my homework. Actually, I don't think I ever even read A Tale of Two Cities. I just saw the movie. What a poseur. That's poser with an eur. It's phonier if you say it in French.

Onto the internet. I find it on line, open it up and ... Wait a minute! I was right. "It WAS the best of times. It WAS the worst of times." Right there on the top of the first page. And it just kept going.

"… it was the age of wisdom,
it was the age of foolishness,
it was the epoch of belief,
it was the epoch of incredulity,
it was the season of Light,
it was the season of Darkness,
it was the spring of hope,
it was the winter of despair,
we had everything before us,
we had nothing before us,
we were all going direct to Heaven,
we were all going direct the other way—"

On and on it went. One sentence. And what it said, I could have just opened the speech with all of it. It said everything about what my client's industry was going through. But I didn't. I shut it down and went back to rehearsals.

That was the first part. The second part was later, when I was joking with one of the division presidents. I said, "You know, I don't want to be a speechwriter forever. No, no, no. My dream job is to be a failed CEO. That's where the real money is.

"These CEOs who tank a company and walk away with a couple of hundred million? That's insane. I could fail for a LOT less than that. I could fail for $25 million. How hard could it be?

You know, make a few speeches, fly around to company locations, blame the previous CEO. I would be great at that.

They pay these guys a hundred or two hundred million to go away … that's an inefficient use of capital. If I can fail for $25 million, corporations should be lining up for the service. I'll reduce the market value of failure and the whole economy will boom."

It's funny. And it's true. And it's stupid. These ARE the best of times AND the worst of times.

So I went back to work and on and off during that week, I kept thinking about that opening sentence from Dickens and about that joke. And it seemed to me that somewhere in between those two thoughts there was a story of our times. A story of us at our best and a story of us at our worst. A novel.

And by the time I got on the plane to fly home, I had a story plotted out. It was the story of a corporate speechwriter who makes a joke at a party about wanting to be a failed CEO … and to his surprise someone takes him up on it. All he has to do is go down with the ship and he's rich.

But the same intuitions and sense of purpose that made him a good speechwriter, all that kicks in. He can't help himself … he has to start rewriting the script.

And when he discovers that while he's getting rich, 11,000 families will be poorer—and that some of the aspects of the deal might not pass SEC muster—he has to take action. Because, you know, what good is the use of the corporate jet when you're in jail?

And this is a true story… I was on the plane home with my laptop open, knocking out my first few exploratory paragraphs and this woman next to me interrupts me. Obviously, she's been reading over my shoulder.

"You writing a novel?"

"Yeah, how'd you know?"

"I'm a copy editor in New York."

"Really? So, how'm I doing?"

She wrinkled her nose and shook her head. Not well, it appeared.

Thanks, I thought. God sent you, didn't he? I've just had a CEO, two division presidents and a couple of producers tell me I was a genius. And to put the universe back in balance, somebody needs to tell me I suck.

***

In retrospect, I should have learned to play the accordion. You know, get me away from my desk and out in the world having fun with other people. I mean, when you write for a living, and then in your spare time you want to write a novel, that's kind of insane. But then, the whole idea of being a speechwriter is kind of insane.

It's the best of jobs, it's the worst of jobs.

We travel in circles of great power, we have no power ourselves. We travel in circles of great wealth; but have little wealth of your own. We check into lavish hotel rooms then stay up all night in empty ballrooms helping get the PowerPoint ready for the next morning's speech.

What a great name, PowerPoint. A product for people who have no power and miss the point.

We're court jesters. We play the Fool to the boss's King Lear. Tonto to his Lone Ranger. We're professional Nick Carraways. The life of a speechwriter is kind of insane. Which makes it a great premise for a novel.

Let me read a section from the second chapter, titled, appropriately enough, "Upgrade." In the first chapter, Paul the speechwriter is at a global conference of tractor dealers in Hong Kong. Six thousand people will be in the audience from everywhere in the world.

During rehearsals, two days before this scene I'm going to read, he pulls the CEO offstage because he's butchering the speech Paul wrote. Paul takes him outside on the balcony, overlooking Hong Kong harbor. He knows something's wrong and when he catches the CEO in a lie and busts him, the CEO confesses that those five initiatives which were the basis of all the messaging at the conference? The board has refused to fund them.

"That doesn't make any sense. Why would the board not fund the things you need to do … unless… is the board getting the company ready to sell?"

"Yeah. So you see my problem with the speech."

So Paul rewrites the five initiatives into five areas of focus and it's good enough that, the next day, when the CEO gives it, he doesn't have a panic attack. The CEO is grateful and invites Paul to a dinner party in his suite that night. At that party, Paul tells the joke about wanting to be the failed CEO.

Now it's the next morning, and Paul's in front of the hotel trying to get a cab to the airport, when someone taps him on the shoulder. This is his Mephistopheles moment; the moment he takes his laptop down to the crossroads to be tuned by the devil.

***

(Excerpt from The Downside of Up)

Someone tapped Paul on the shoulder. "Good morning."

Paul turned and found himself looking into the cold, gray eyes of George Sachs, the Englishman from last night's dinner. He wore a dove-gray flannel suit and one of those Saville Row shirts with the contrasting cuffs and collar. His tie was like a jewel, sparkling with pink and yellow brilliance.

"Paul, isn't it?" Sachs smiled thinly and handed his slim briefcase to the driver of the (gold) Rolls-(Royce). "Where are you off to?"

"The airport."

"Can I give you a ride?"

Seated in the cavernous business end of the Rolls, swaddled in milky cowhides and surrounded by burled walnut, Paul was impressed. It might just be a car, but it was a car that cost as much as a house.

Paul asked Sachs where he was flying.

"Mumbai and then onto Geneva."

He asked Sachs what he did.

"Oh, nothing very interesting, I'm afraid." He paused, as if considering whether to tell Paul more, then spoke as if sharing a secret, "I quite enjoyed your story last night."

"My story?"

"The failed CEO."

"With twenty-five million."

Sachs stared at him for a long moment and then smiled.

"I imagine you must be swamped with projects."

Paul shrugged. "Sometimes."

"Your friends at Aggro speak very highly of you. You must be very good at what you do."

"I guess so," said Paul.

"Yet the economy must have taken its toll."

There was a long pause, during which Sachs just sat and smiled at him. "Do you know what I think?" he asked thoughtfully. "I think you're underutilized. I should look for a way to use you better."

"Well … apparently I'm useful at dinner parties."

"Peter Kavanagh told me what you did for him. You identified his problem and helped him fix it. I can think of several companies where I wish I'd had a man like you on our side."

Paul was starting to like the direction of this conversation. The rear seat of a Rolls Royce was a good place for positive thinking, for imagining you could play a slightly larger role in life.

"It occurs to me you might have significant leadership ability that's not being used."

"Are you talking about the failed CEO thing?"

"It did get my interest, yes."

Paul shook his head. "I was just kidding."

"I think there's no such thing as kidding. I think there's a part of you that knows you could be at least as good a leader as any of your CEO clients."

"No, not at all," Paul lied. He had, at times, thought exactly that.

Sachs continued as though Paul had not spoken, "And you look at what they're taking to the bank and you think, that could be me."

It seemed pointless to refute that. Paul could name ten clients who were no smarter than he, but who were sitting on millions, even billions, in stock options and bonuses. Just the month before, Lou De Farcy at IBM had cashed in $40 million in options. Paul remembered the day in the early nineties when he had amazed Lou by walking into a meeting with a laptop, something Lou had never seen before. And now, not much more than a

decade and a half later, the guy was worth maybe a $100 million while Paul was still living month to month.

"May I ask you a very personal question?"

"Sure."

"How much you make?"

It was Paul's belief that he made significantly more than other writers in his business, mostly because he was always working. Or, always had been.

"Mid to low six-figures," he claimed, exaggerating the top end only slightly in the hope that it would sound respectable.

"That's probably in line with others in your field, I would think."

Oh. Damn! Another bubble burst.

"So," Sachs continued, "and I'm speaking purely hypothetically here, if one were to come to you and say, 'Look, Paul, I've got such and such an opportunity for you and it's right up your alley and you'll be bloody well paid for it, your response would be …?"

Paul tried to gauge the level of bullshit in the question.

"I don't want to be in a position to fail," he said. "It's easy to be seduced by compliments and great offers and get caught up," he gestured to the car around them, "in the excitement and glamour of thinking, 'I'll be a big shot;' it's easy to think you could step in and do something better than somebody else, but it's not so easy to do."

You're rambling, he thought to himself. "All kidding aside, I really do not want to be a failed CEO."

The statement sort of hung there as the smile on Sachs' face broadened and his tie seemed to grow more brilliant.

"Not even," Sachs inquired sweetly, "for twenty-five million?"

***

At first, I thought the novel was about income inequality and the crazy-making idea that if we can't just work a little harder and if we can't lease a bigger BMW and we can't get the valets to park it in front of the restaurant, then there is something fundamentally wrong with us.

I was going to call it Affluenza and it was as much about our nutty attitudes toward financial status as it was about the 1% vs the rest of us. But as I got into the writing, it turned out there was another story the character wanted to tell, and that was about telling truth to power and how hard that is to do, especially when the power is yourself.

Because what would really happen if any one of us was handed the keys to the corporation and told we could take it for a spin? What would really happen if YOU had to sit in that seat and steer the ship? Would your close proximity to power and decision-making give you the chops to do the job yourself and do it as well as someone who … let me be frank here … you may or may not find to be quite as intelligent as you are? Maybe, maybe not.

But the work we do every day can give us powerful insights on the human condition and how to coach people to stand for more than just the quarterly results of the company. Or how the candidate is polling this week. Or where the stock price is. And as I got into the book, I found myself in the interesting position of creating this character, throwing him into this alien world of being a CEO and then coaching him through the experience as if he were a real client.

I was able to do that by calling on my own experience as a speechwriter, obviously, and on my experience working with executives. I mean, I've got clients I started working with when they were 35-year-old VPs and now they're CEOs. Like you, I've been alongside on their journey. And that helped me write about the development of this fish out of water who finds himself in the CEO chair and has to grow into it fast.

A man or woman in that position has a lot of people who want to be close to them but not many they know they can trust. One of my coaching clients confided in me that his biggest fear was looking weak. CEO of a major public company. And the fear isn't unfounded.

Even though the company is rocking, his executive team wants him to make the board do things it doesn't want to do. And the board wants him to make the executive team do things they don't want to do. And he's stuck in the middle, trying to remember what happens to his stock options if he just says to hell with it.

So lesson one as a speechwriter and speech coach: it's personal. It's not about us and our skills at rhetoric and clever copy. It's personal.

It's more than those five strategic initiatives and EBITDA and where the stock price will be in two years. It's personal.

It's about a man or a woman and their journey and helping them find the Ninja power to move armies that don't want to move against targets that won't stand still. And it's personal because if they fail, they take a lot of people down with them. It's not about the money. It's about being there in the arena.

It's personal because it's about the promises they made and fear they can't keep them. And our job is to be their Yoda and connect them to the force of authentic speaking. If we don't, then we're shorting them in what we owe them.

***

Here's a secret a speechwriter can never forget: people don't care that much about strategy, or sales goals or market share. They may say they do, but that's not it.

They want to be inspired. They want to be part of something meaningful and big. And our job is to show them what that feels like.

Every speech is a hero's journey. But the hero isn't the speaker up on the stage. No, no, no. In our theater, the hero is the man or woman out there in the audience looking for something that will stop them selling themselves short and finally let them become the person they long be.

I read a lot of cognitive science because I want to understand what's going on at THIS intersection of a speaker and an audience. What is this? How do we make it resonate? How do we make it more than a talking head?

Yes, it's theater but what is theater? It's a shared experience of consciousness.

Think about being in a movie surrounded by strangers and you find yourself laughing with the whole audience as one. That moment of shared joy. Remember that? Harold Pinter explained the pauses in his plays as a moment when everyone in the audience is thinking the same thought.

What is that?

You and I don't normally have much control over the audience. But we can exert an influence on the speaker—not just her words but something more. In an ontological sense, it's not about what the speaker is saying but who the speaker is being that makes the difference.

So what is it when a speaker walks onto a stage and stands before an audience? We have a phrase in our language that goes back to middle English.

What is it?

That first caveman who climbed up on the rock. Who stood there and called the other cavemen to the hunt? When Marc Antony stands up at Caesar's funeral and talks to the crowd. What was he doing? He was taking a stand.

Taking a stand is the fundamental ground of being of every speaker. She walks on the stage. She takes a stand. It's not enough to deliver information. You can do that in an email. It's not enough, God forbid, to say things to justify your salary as VP of packaging, although I'm sure you do a very nice job. But that's not a speech.

A speaker has two duties—you take a stand and you enroll the audience in joining you in that stand. What you're saying on stage? Yeah, that's important but who you're being is what makes the difference.

To paraphrase Abraham Lincoln, the world will little note nor long remember what you said on that stage. But they will always remember who you were. And how you made them feel.

***

Here's something else to think about. Why do we write?

I met Allen Ginsberg a couple of times when I was younger and I learned from him that if you think writing is about anything other than raising your own consciousness of the human experience, you just missed the point.

You missed the point. You don't write to make some corporation better. You're not some organism that evolved to spin the views of some lobbyist. You're better than that. It's more than that.

Yes, I hope the result of your work is to make the world a better place for puppies and polar bears. Really, I do, but that's not why we write.

We write because there's a great big unanswered question deep inside each of us that we're trying to get to the bottom of. We don't write because we have anything so deep to say. We write because we're writers.

When did you know you were a writer? I'm curious, how many of you knew you wanted to be a writer from the get go? Show of hands, who here knew from childhood that you wanted to be a writer?

My earliest memory in life—age two and a half—is trying to prove to someone I could write.

I was standing on a sidewalk in my underpants holding a pencil and a piece of paper. There was an older girl, maybe six or seven, and she was sitting on a stoop in a housing project in Dallas.

"I can write," I told her.

She wrinkled her nose and said, "No you can't."

Really? God sent you, didn't he?

So I tried to prove it to her. I took the pencil … and stuck and straight through the paper and into the palm of my hand. Yeah, that hurt. But what I remember was the shock—I knew I knew how to write. What the hell just happened?

That girl was just the first of many people who told me I couldn't write. Some of them I listened to, and it cost me. Most of them I ignored and pressed on. You can't let critics stop you.

Look at Elmore Leonard. Do you know his first novel was rejected by 84 publishers? Think about that! 84 rejections. What do you think he was telling himself when he wrapped that manuscript up for the 85th time? "This time, it's gonna be different?"

Except that it was. The 85th publisher said yes and the book sold OK. Which proves you just can't let anything stop you.

But we do. We do let things stop us. I never could have sent a book out 85 times. About three rejections per piece is my limit. After that, it's "OK, I get it. I must suck. I don't need to be told 82 more times."

But that's the lesson, isn't it? You just keep going.

***

I learned a little bit about the life of a top executive from my father. My dad was in the aluminum business. Not a "tin man," he sold aluminum to the aerospace industry. Always the youngest guy in whatever job he got promoted to, which happened about every 18 months and required us to move to another city.

So, in effect, my dad had two income streams. Selling aluminum … and flipping houses.

One day, when I was a senior in high school, Dad came home with a book that blew my mind in three ways. It was called The Dynamics of Change and it was written by an insane genius named Don Fabun.

The first way it blew my mind was what the book said. It gave me a vision of the future that I hadn't encountered before. Things called "personal computers" and how they would change our consciousness. Written in 1966, ten years before Jobs and Wozniak. Mind-blowing!

The second thing that was mind-blowing was, my Dad commissioned this work. Because it was really radical thinking. Quotes from Buckminster Fuller and Timothy Leary.

And then, here's the third thing that blew my mind. My dad told me that Don Fabun didn't work for any company. He wrote these books as a freelancer. And he lived on a houseboat on San Francisco Bay.

And right there, I had a vision of the life I wanted to live.

I already knew I didn't want to be a corporate executive. I wanted to be a visionary writer who lived on a houseboat. The only problem was … how the hell do you get to THAT?!!

I didn't have a clue. But I did know this: it wasn't enough to string a few good sentences together. You need to have ideas. And at 17, I still didn't know where ideas came from. Or at least, not good ones.

But that's the journey, isn't it? We set out to find our voice. We set out to get our 10,000 hours.

The comic Mark Maron says it takes most comics 20 years to find their voice. Steve Martin spent ten years working empty rooms where no one laughed. Ten years. When he finally got a spot on the Tonight Show, he thought he'd made it. The next morning, still in the glow, he goes to the supermarket and a woman stops him in the aisle.

"Hey, you were on Johnny Carson last night, weren't you?"

"Why, yes I was."

"Boy, you were terrible!!"

So it was back on the road again, trying to find his voice. If he didn't find it in ten years, that's was it. He was going to give up.

When he finally had his breakthrough on Saturday Night Live and became an overnight sensation just three months short of his 10-year deadline, he should have been happy. Except his father—who was the head of the Newport Beach Board of Realtors—penned a review of the performance in the Realtor's newsletter and panned him. In the Realtor's newsletter. Not like it was his beat or anything. Explained in detail why his son wasn't funny.

There's always somebody to tell you you can't write. You aren't good enough. You aren't worthy. And the fact that you know you have to ignore them and keep going doesn't make it hurt any less.

Arthur Miller told a story once. He was walking down 42nd Street one afternoon, coming out of rehearsals for Death of a Salesman. He looks up and there coming out of a restaurant in front of him is the man who was his family's next door neighbor and the father of his best friends growing up.

"Artie, Artie! How the hell are you? Haven't seen you in years."

This is the guy on whom Miller based the character of Willie Loman. And he based the characters of Biff and Happy on the man's two sons. He knew the guy all his life. So he asks about the man's family and the boys and the guy bends his ear for half an hour. Then finally, he goes, "So Artie, what are you doing these days."

"I'm a playwright."

"Artie, that's great. Anything I mighta heard of?"

"I had a play on Broadway called All My Sons."

And the guys eyes go wide and he says, "Wait a minute, YOU'RE Arthur Miller?!!"

You don't have to sell yourself short. Everyone else in your life will do it for you.

***

Twenty years. My journey to find my voice took 20 years from that day I realized I wanted to be a visionary writer on a houseboat. Along the way, I wrote comedy, I wrote song lyrics, I wrote magazine articles and edited a journal for a non-profit.

Everybody said it was great stuff but none of it went anywhere.

Until one year it did. One year, after twenty years of working at it, I started selling magazine articles. I started selling short stories. I started getting invited to poetry readings. I quit my day job and started writing ad copy.

One day, a Thursday afternoon, I came home to find the light on my answering machine blinking, which hadn't been happening quite enough. I pushed the button and heard a voice say, "Hi, my name is Don Runkle and I'm the chief engineer at Chevrolet. Would you give me call?"

Talk about out of left field.

So I called him and he told me that Road and Track magazine had sent them a spec article I had submitted. It was about how Chevrolet had lost their brand mojo and what they could do to get it back. The magazine didn't even send me a rejection letter. Now I have this guy on the phone telling me that everyone on the executive team had read the article and they wanted to know who I was.

He said, "We've been trying to articulate this for ten years, and you did it in ten pages. What do you do?"

And I don't know why I said these words but I said, "I'm a speechwriter."

He said we need speeches and the following Tuesday I was on a plane to Detroit. That one time I didn't sell myself short … and the payoff was huge. At 37, I vaulted straight into the C-suite, stuck the landing and I've been there ever since. And I've stayed freelance for two reasons: one, I like to take a nap; and two, because I'm not here to support the status quo—I'm here to tear it up.

I don't tell my clients this but I can tell you. I'm with the underground. I'm here to unlock the cells. It's a corporate jailbreak.

I want to bust the idea that a job is just a job and shove in a new, explosive idea that will blow the doors off business as usual. And here's the idea … an organization is not what you think it is.

A company is a giant energy conversion machine. It converts hours and dollars into expanded human consciousness and expanded human connectedness.

At its best, work is a path of enlightenment. At its best, work doesn't suck the meaning out of life. At its best, work IS the meaning of life. And I'm here to rattle the cage of every leader who doesn't get that and lead like she's a human being first and a manager second.

Like Paul Lavallier, the character in my book, I'm convinced you can make a company the ultimate expression of power to the people. And I still believe the greatest leadership song of all times is "All You Need is Love." Followed closely by "Dancing in the Streets."

Now … about that houseboat on San Francisco Bay: it turns out they're very damp and take a lot of maintenance. And they sink, which I would hate. So I make a life in the hills outside

Austin Texas with my wife Jean, my dogs and a pretty good wine cellar.

Look, I said earlier I don't know what makes a great speechwriter. But let me give you something to think about.

It takes talent, of course. You have to listen. You have to trust your intuition and be intensely open to what wants to happen next. And you better have a brain full of stories and the ability to synthesize them into something we don't already know.

But most of all, it takes a passion for the hero's journey. And a passion for helping others find their own journey. And stop selling themselves short.

If you have all that, you can write a good speech.

A good speech tells you what you didn't know. It shows you something new. It makes you want to learn more about the topic. That's what a good speech does.

But a great speech? No, no, no. A great speech doesn't show and tell. A great speech doesn't share. A great speech doesn't educate you, it destroys you.

A great speech reaches inside you and rips your heart out. And in its place it gives you a bigger heart. A heart that's on fire with a passion to stand up and be counted.

If you can do that in a speech, then you're a great speechwriter.

***

I'm the capnote speaker for this conference. Here's what that means. The keynote speaker opened the conference and set the tone. Lisa Muscatine … wasn't she great?

Basically, her responsibility—you traveled a long way, spent a lot of money, took time away from things you need to be doing—her job was to make you feel glad you came.

My job—and I only had an hour to do it—is to make you glad it's over.

You have work to do. You've got speeches to write. You've got a world to change. It's an awesome responsibility. Don't sell yourself short.

Make it a moment of theater.

Thank you.

WINNER: **AGRICULTURE**

"The House That Blueberries Built"

By Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President, Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida

//

Delivered at Straughn IFAS Extension Professional Development Center, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., July 14, 2015

A name on a building generally identifies the person who made it possible. A financial backer. A legislator. An activist.

So why are we here? Alto and Patrecia already gave us their name.

We're here to celebrate a relationship. It's a relationship between the Straughns and IFAS that goes back to before there was even an IFAS!

In 1952, Alto came to UF to study animal science. The Straughns and IFAS have been connected ever since.

In fact, Alto still remembers his student ID number.

[JMP looks to Alto Straughn, asks:"Can you give us that number, Alto?"]

[Straughn responds: 14,448]

Alto played on the freshman basketball team. He still has a ball from that era on the floor of his packinghouse office out in Waldo.

While he was here, he met Patrecia, who was also an animal sciences major.

We hired him in the late 1950s as an Extension agent in Marion County. It was the start of a 31-year IFAS Extension career.

He's been retired for 26 years, but he still has strong ties to our blueberry breeders.

If you walk into his fields in Waldo, you'd think you were on IFAS property the way he talks. He'll point to various rows where the 2010s are, the 2011s, and so on.

He's talking about IFAS cultivars. For years he has offered up his land for our breeders' field trials. Together they've tested thousands of possibilities in their quest for the perfect blueberry.

The Straughns just recently were also the lead donors for our Flavors of Florida celebrating the Plant Innovation Center, a breeding powerhouse that we think is going to be one of the driving forces in lifting UF to national preeminence.

Dave Clark leads that center. He recently learned that sometimes the Straughns' gifts come with strings attached. If Alto and Patrecia ask you if you want some blueberries, think carefully before you answer.

When Dave said yes, he suddenly found himself in a field with Alto, picking in 90-degree temperatures. You see, you don't get the berries unless you're there to help pick them. I think it's because Alto, too, values the relationship with the people of IFAS, especially those who can talk blueberries for hours.

There is one exception to the Straughns' you-pick-'em rule. Alto personally picks for Vam York, whom I'm happy to see here this evening.

Back to Dave. He returned from Alto's farm sweat-soaked with about 150 pounds of blueberries.

Dave was in California about a week later when Alto called. How about a couple thousand more pounds? Alto asked. Dave's no dummy. This time he asked for a little more context.

Alto said his pickers would take care of it. So Dave called his son, who brought a truck over to the farm and brought them back to campus.

All summer long, Gators in training are having these berries at their cafeteria fueling stations, in smoothies and even on the field where frozen blueberries are being used as tasty ice cubes in their Gatorade!

Maybe if we win a few more football games this year we can credit it to Alto's edge.

Two of Alto's closest IFAS friends are Larry Arrington and Jimmy Cheeks, two of my predecessors. The three of them used to have brownbag lunches together at Rolfs Hall. Larry and Jimmy packed lunches. Alto ate out of the vending machines.

As Alto prospered and Larry rose to VP, he told Larry to call if IFAS ever needed some money to support professional development. Alto was thinking a few thousand dollars.

Well, Larry called. I'm guessing that he proposed something north of a few thousand, because we now have this center for training Extension professionals to improve Floridians' lives.

It's a brick-and-mortar reminder of dear members of the IFAS family. The name on the façade signals support. But the plaque symbolizes a 63-year relationship.

Our IFAS family is ever expanding. I'm proud to welcome our president as one of its new members. President Fuchs, the floor is yours.

WINNER: **ASSOCIATIONS**

"In the Decade of Human Capital, HR Must Lead"

By Larae Booker for Henry (Hank) Jackson, President & CEO, Society for Human Resource Management // Delivered at the 2015 SHRM Annual Conference and Exposition, Las Vegas, Nev., June 28, 2015

[FOLLOWING SHRM COMMERCIAL]

I couldn't have said it better. Those three SHRM members in the commercial are with us today. They are Bhavna Dave,VP of HR for Add-This, Eduardo Sanabia, chief people officer for Think Food Group, and Kristen Medlin, HR director for Aiken Regional Medical Centers.

Hearing these three ambassadors talk about how HR is making organizations successful and leading the workplace raises a question for me: What does it take to make it in HR today at a time when the world around us is changing so dramatically? When one person can reach millions of others with the tap of a finger. When a single hashtag can spark a movement and anyone with an idea and the internet can disrupt an entire business or industry. Just think about Uber.

How do we, the Human Resources profession, navigate the new world of work? Work that is more global, mobile and social than ever before. Work that looks much different than it did just a few years ago and will look much different in the future than it does today. More diverse. More technology-driven. More dispersed.

In today's fast-paced, ever-changing business environment, What is it going to take for our careers our organizations our profession to thrive? That's our focus this week. And to help us get started, I want to share my perspective.

As SHRM's President and CEO, I get to hear from hundreds of HR professionals from students to thought leaders about their challenges and triumphs. I speak with other CEOs and business leaders about their perspectives on HR and what's needed in business today. I stay up-to-date on all the latest research and, like you, I see all of the commentary on the blogs about HR. I feel fortunate to get a close-up look at human resources at this time in our profession ... and here's what I see: I see a growing, dynamic profession whose value to organizations has made us the business leaders. Not business partners. Not trusted advisors. Not change managers. But business leaders.

(Not unlike what the Harvard Business Review recently pronounced when it looked at HR's need to set the agenda in today's marketplace. I agree with that.)

Given where business is now and where's its headed, HR has no option. We must lead.

You see, we're at this pivotal moment when the trends we've been watching for years are here. Think about it. Remember when it was a prediction that advancing technology would change the nature of work? Well. It's here.

Technology is raising the bar on the skills and education that people and businesses need. It's creating some new, innovative jobs and industries ... and making others obsolete. But more critically, technology is slowly eliminating the need for the traditional, central office management structure. How do we build or change culture in this environment?

And remember when we used to talk about the demographic shifts that would reshape the workplace?

Well, after years of warnings, they're here. On the one hand, we have the rise of the Millennials, who only a few months ago became the largest generation in the workforce. It's official now. And on the other hand, we're in the middle of that wave of Baby Boomer retirements. And let's not forget there are three other generations in the workforce.

So for the first time in history, there are five generations working side-by-side and they all have different

motivations and expectations when it comes to work.

And then, of course, there's globalization. Globalization has made us literally expand our thinking about where and when work gets done and who does it. Companies no longer have the option of saying, "I'm local," because a bright employee can work from anywhere in the world. And many of them do. Crowdsourcing, temporary and remote work are all on the rise. Talent is borderless so we are all global now, competing for the best and the brightest in the world.

Advancing technology changing demographics and globalization are just some of the mega trends changing work as we know it today. This is a brand new business world.

Now … to make it in this new world, organizations need the most engaged, productive and talented workforces. They need teams and cultures that give them the best chance of competing and winning, no matter where they are located. They need people who embrace change, seek innovation and press forward despite ambiguity. They need you. HR professionals.

I believe we're in the midst of the Decade of Human Capital. A time when people are seen as the real power behind business. When organizations will draw a clear, straighter line between their people strategies and their business goals. But … you don't have to take my word for that.

Recently the Conference Board asked CEOs, presidents, and chairs around the globe what their most critical challenges were, what was keeping them up at night. They named the usual suspects: innovation; customer relations; operations; sustainability.

But do you know what topped their list? Human capital. Yes ... human capital.

A survey by the SHRM Foundation and the Economist Intelligence Unit found much the same thing: that what organizations need most today and into the future are people management strategies. The World Economic Forum has also said that talent—not financial capital—is the key to "innovation, competitiveness and growth in the 21st century."

Just think about what all of this means for us. It means our job ... our job ... is now the most critical aspect of business. It means the human resources profession has no choice but to take the lead.

In HR, we've always known that people are the power behind business. We've always known that talent is the differentiator within organizations. We've just wondered when everyone else was going to get it.

Well, that time has come. Our time has come. Because now, we're in a world where so many mega trends are beyond business control. And no matter the size or location of our organizations, we can't escape these trends.

Leaders are quickly recognizing that the one thing they can do ... something they must do in this volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous world, is have the right talent. And finding, developing and keeping that talent? That's our job.

So HR: We're in the Decade of Human Capital. We're in the right place at the right time. The only question now is: What are we going to do about it?

Every day, I hear stories of HR leaders who are asking themselves this question, taking on this challenge and doing what it takes to move themselves, their organizations and our profession forward. Leaders like Shara Gamble.

Shara is the HR director for TAMKO Building Products, a company based in Joplin, Missouri with twelve hundred employees nationwide. We featured her in HR Magazine last month.

She wanted her 10-person HR team to do two things: provide useful people analytics; and make sure managers had competent, well-trained talent.

But when Shara looked at how they were actually spending their time, it was more on transactional duties like payroll and benefits. Maybe that sounds familiar to some of you.

Well, Shara decided to disrupt that status quo.

She trained her team on TAMKO's business model so they would speak the company's language. She made sure they understood their industry and the talent their business needed to succeed. She introduced cross-functional training so that her team had a greater understanding of the business operations. And finally, and perhaps most importantly, she challenged her team. She encouraged them to offer solutions to the business challenges their managers face.

And this small but passionate HR team rose to the occasion. They transformed even the most day-to-day HR duties into strategies that impacted their business.

For example, TAMKO needed a way to centralize one of its most time-consuming functions: tracking time and attendance. So the team implemented new technology that has reduced time spent on payroll.

But more than that ... more than that ... they've started to use the data from that new system for business insights—to spot and alert management to time and attendance trends that are costly for the company, and bad for employees.

And here's another example. There is a skills gap in manufacturing, and Shara and her team know that finding, hiring and keeping talent is a competitive advantage.

So they overhauled their company's onboarding process to make it less like a "task" and more like a TAMKO "experience." Instead of inundating new hires with paperwork on their first day on the job, they now use a virtual system that explains forms in plain language, introduces the TAMKO culture and even shows the connection between the employees and TAMKO's branding strategies.

And the key is that all of this happens before talent walks through the door, so that employees feel connected and are ready to contribute on day one.

You see, whether it was overhauling onboarding or turning time and attendance data into business insights, Shara started with her organization's strategy, goals and needs first, then designed HR functions to drive them. She's proven herself to be a business leader

who just happens to be an expert in HR. And she and her staff, her organization and—I'd say—our profession are better for it.

Now, like any good manager, Shara gives the credit to her team but today I'd like to acknowledge her. Ladies and gentleman, Shara Gamble. [APPLAUSE]

We're proud to count Shara as one of the nearly 50,000 HR professionals who have achieved the new SHRM certification and taken the SHRM Competency Model to heart. We extensively researched and carefully designed this Competency Model to take HR to that next level. To move our profession further into business leadership ... one HR professional, one HR team, one organization at a time.

Just imagine if the more than 15,000 of us here at this conference left with the same charge: To lead the business of our organizations. I guarantee you our careers, our organizations, and our profession will thrive.

HR Colleagues: This is the Decade of Human Capital. It's a time when the most pressing issues facing organizations are talent management issues. When leaders and others in business are coming to understand what we know: that great organizations are led by great HR.

We now have an opportunity to move our profession from where we are to where business needs us to be ... where we want to be ... where we must be. So what are we going to do about it?

I firmly believe that if we accept this leadership challenge, there will be no debate about which profession leads organizations. There will be no debate about the need to bring HR into every business decision. And more organizations will live up to their claims that people are their "greatest asset."

As SHRM President and CEO, I want nothing more than to see the HR profession take its rightful place leading the world of business. It's time ... our time.

And there's no better place to get started ... than right here in Las Vegas ... together, at the biggest and best gathering of HR professionals in the world.

Thank you, and have a great conference.

WINNER: COMMERCE & RETAIL, ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING

"The Power of Serving Athletes Completely"

By Seth Freedland for Trevor Edwards, President, Nike Brand

//

Delivered at Nike World Headquarters, Beaverton, Ore., Oct. 15, 2015

Good morning! Welcome to Nike.

It's great to be here to talk with you about Nike's deep connection with consumers, and how we will continue to drive sustainable, profitable growth for the Nike Brand.

I feel so lucky to work in sports. Sports have the power to inspire, to unite and to move people in a way that little else does.

Today, that power of sport has never been stronger.

We all know there's a global shift toward fitness, but that cultural shift runs deeper than some may think.

People all over the world are being personally inspired by sport every day.

A young boy in Chicago sees a Cristiano free kick on YouTube for the first time.

A girl in Beijing watches her first LeBron fast break.

And they feel something.

The next day, they pick up a ball for the first time—and they become athletes, and stay athletes for their entire life.

At Nike, nothing energizes us more than athletes. We have a singular focus of serving the athlete in everything we do. That is the power of the Nike Brand.

And by serving the needs of athletes, we drive growth in our business.

We have a saying at Nike: "The Consumer Decides." It's a simple thought, but it fuels our thinking every single day.

Today, we continue to see tectonic shifts in the consumer landscape. These shifts continue to reshape the marketplace and the relationships consumers have with brands.

And the result? Consumers are clearly in charge, and youth are more demanding today than ever before. They want what they want when they want it, and do what they do when they decide. They get something amazing one day, and they immediately expect it across their entire life experience.

The world is changing: It's faster paced, more connected, more personal. Everything is expected on-demand.

Now, our athletes have always been demanding. They expect us to deliver amazing performance products for their ultimate moment of achieving their highest potential.

This mentality of serving the best athletes uncompromised was there at the founding of this company. At its core, it was about relationships—and a desire to serve them.

Today we continue to focus on building relationships by serving athletes to deliver on our brand proposition.

Our brand is a promise:

- It's a promise to innovate.
- It's a promise to connect.
- And it's a promise to serve.

That commitment we make every day creates a relentless drive to deliver amazing products that help athletes be better.

The core principle of our product innovation is simple: we start by listening to the very best athletes for insight. And we turn these powerful insights into the innovations that solve problems for those athletes.

But we don't just hear and deliver. We strive to create something more—something athletes themselves could not have even imagined.

This obsession with pushing boundaries is why Nike is one of the most authentic and connected brands in the world. The brand isn't just everywhere—we're the #1 sports brand in all of our key cities from London to Shanghai, from Tokyo and Rio, from New York to Berlin.

The power of our brand is immense:

• It's the power of our brand that brings hundreds of thousands of runners together for a race.

• It's the power of our brand that drives sports cultures in different global communities.

• And it's the power of our brand that emotionally connects and inspires millions every day to do more and get better.

And we are just getting started.

We expect NIKE, Inc. to add nearly $20 billion in incremental revenue between now and the end of FY'20, a powerful continuation of our engine of growth.

This growth is what comes when you are as passionate about sport as we are. Part of that passion for sport is the competitive fire to be the best. And we translate that ambition into making our athletes the best.

And through our Category Offense, no one connects deeper with athletes than we do. This is how Nike continues to grow the market and take market share.

Since we launched the Category Offense, our business has grown more than 70 percent. There's no question that by drilling down on the sports that consumers love, we uncover the new growth opportunities across the marketplace.

Our first phase in the Category Offense was to go deep with athletes with performance product, focusing on everything they need from head to toe to perform their best in their sport.

Next, in the Amplified phase, we expanded off performance to include culture and lifestyle, serving the athlete across their entire journey:

• as they compete,
• as they train,
• and as they express their love of sport.

Today, as we continue to serve deeper, better and more completely, we are entering a new elevated stage in which we serve the athlete's complete experience through a connected ecosystem—shaped and strengthened by the authentic relationships we share.

***

Now, I'd like to show you a holistic example of how we realize a key growth opportunity in our business.

Let's take a young woman who runs and trains. She runs and works out twice a week, but she wants to be inspired to get better and do more.

So we invite her to join a movement with other like-minded athletes. This invitation, which we call "Better For It," centers on the idea of pushing yourself out of your comfort zone and focuses as much on the journey as the destination.

We provide personal motivation, a rich community, and the customized services to meet her goals. And the response has been incredible, with more than half-a-million women participating in runs and training events across 33 countries.

But this is not about one event or one campaign, it's about a continuous engagement with our consumers.

Take for example the Nike Plus Running app, which creates access to a community, with information and inspiration on demand. With in-run features like social cheers and curated playlists set to the runner's individual pace, we motivate millions of runners all over the world.

Our invitation to Run with Us also includes in-person runs with Nike Run Club. More than 20,000 participate every month in North America alone—the equivalent of hosting a major marathon every 30 days.

We also help her train with the Nike Training Club app for whenever and wherever she wants to work out. If she prefers the added motivation of her friends, she can join a Nike Training Club live session in her city. It's a huge hit with more than 21 million downloads and over 100 workouts featuring the world's best master trainers and athletes to give her guidance and motivation.

And as always, we serve her with the most innovative footwear, apparel, and accessories, curated for her performance and style needs.

Our ultimate goal with Nike product is to introduce a brand-new standard to give her the best fit in the most premium way possible.

And we bring this elevated product to her through incredible retail concepts. Nike Women's concept doors opened this past year in Shanghai, London and Newport Beach. By joining our partner doors like Chelsea Collective with Dick's Sporting Goods and 602 with Foot Locker, we offer premium retail executions for her across the entire marketplace.

With an emphasis on service, these doors are where personal shopping meets personal training. And when complemented by NIKE.com, it's a full and powerful retail experience.

This is where it all comes to life:

• personalized inspiration, a powerful community,

• amazing innovative products, great services

• and industry-leading premium retail.

No one else has the ability to bring all the pieces together.

No one else has the ability to serve her this completely.

Given all this, it's no surprise that women who are part of our service ecosystem spend more than two times with us than those who aren't.

And this unlocks real growth: Our Women's business today is $5.7 billion.

Over the next five years we expect it will grow to over $11 billion!

A big part of that success comes in serving consumers where they live and shop, throughout their journey in what we call the Integrated Marketplace. As always, we obsess connecting with consumers, giving them the right product and services in the right places at the right time.

We do this in our six geographies serving our consumers in nearly every country around the world, with clear strategic focus on key cities such as New York, London, Rio, Shanghai and Los Angeles.

For Western Europe and North America and other developed markets, we are targeting one connected marketplace serving diverse consumer needs.

In these markets we drill down into each city, shopping district and even specific stores to provide the best possible experience for our consumers.

And we also see significant opportunity in Emerging and Developing Markets, like Greater China and Southeast Asia. These markets have an ever-growing middle-class and a consumer base that loves sports.

In both these developed and developing geographies, we expect growth to be robust for years to come.

We know consumers expect to be served anywhere and anytime:

- in a nearby major city,
- in their favorite store,
- at home
- or just on the go.

Our digital commerce business lets us be that personal. We strive to serve the consumer better all the time. We've increased our mobile efforts to be in the palm of their hand, 24 hours a day, all over the globe.

And the results are paying off.

Today, our e-commerce business is just over a billion dollars. And we expect it to grow to $7 billion in FY20. This is the kind of growth Nike drives.

We think about digital as an accelerator of all that we do, as consumers expect to be better served in an on-demand world.

Our aim is to connect athletes with the knowledge, the services and—most importantly—the product they need to serve their potential. Digital gives every athlete around the world the service and self-understanding that elite athletes have always had.

What's exciting for us is: consumers choose to be part of Nike. If you are part of our ecosystem, you've chosen us.

And this makes our connections richer and more rewarding for everyone.

For us, it's not about selling them ads. It's not about just having an app on their phone. What matters are real connections that fuel passion and energy that, in turn, drive business opportunity.

With this in mind, we are moving to a place where we'll be at the consumer's fingertips every day, all day.

We will be the home of your athletic life, providing you the best of Nike when you want it, on demand.

I can't wait until we can talk more about it.

***

In the end, creating an industry-leading digital ecosystem is simply a continuation of the Nike promise to develop deep and lasting relationships, to offer the best athletic service, period.

And, ultimately, by always reaching consumers in new and innovative ways, they vote to stay with us over their entire life.

At Nike, we have a lot to be proud of. We may be at the front of the pack, but that's not enough: for us, or our athletes.

We don't just promise a future, we deliver it.

The work we do isn't about just meeting our consumers' expectations. It's about inviting them to dream a little bigger.

We've never had more potential than we have today—and the proof of that potential can be seen in every connection we have with athletes, all over the world.

Thank you.

WINNER: **EDUCATORS**

"Rhetoric: Indulging the Hope That Nature Will Finally Yield to Observation and Perseverance the Keys to the Heart"

Written and delivered by Rodger Evans, speechwriter, Scottish Parliament

//

Delivered at the Catholic Chaplaincy, University of Glasgow (Network for Oratory and Politics), Glasgow, Scotland, March 13, 2015

Can I make a confession?

It would seem only fitting—here in the Chaplaincy.

This is the first speech of this kind I've written and given.

I've been best man, presented training courses and performed spoken word gigs.

But today is like running my magnifying glass over a yellowed canvas print map.

On which I can just about make out the warning—

Hic sunt dracones.

Luckily for me you look like a lovely audience—not a dragon in sight.

My themes this morning are the triumphs and tribulations of the speechwriter—more the tribulations.

First, though, let me quote Dorothy Parker—

"If, with the literate, I am
Impelled to try an epigram,
I never seek to take the credit;

We all assume that Oscar said it."

I like quotes.

I like them a lot, as you're about to find out.

I like them so much I recently tried to foist one on my Chief Executive.

For his new year staff address—not a speech but an email.

He'd done his end-of-2014-you've-all-done-very-well message and non-denominational seasonal greetings. This was his now-let's-get-our-sleeves-rolled-up for 2015 number.

He didn't use the quote.

He liked it and said he would use it another time.

He won't.

The quote was apt and it was pithy and it had credibility.

But it didn't quite fit him.

And that matters.

This speech about speeches is, I hope, neither ill-fitting nor self-indulgent.

For the speechwriter is a tailor—a maker of bespoke garments.

Even if those garments might sometimes be said to resemble the emperor's new clothes.

I'm thinking here more of Professor Mary Beard than Dame Vivienne Westwood.

Professor Beard made a recent documentary for the BBC in which she bemoaned the use of "borrowed" words.

She said rhetoric should be about getting to the bottom of an argument, facing your own ignorance and confronting your own prejudices.

I agree.

She also said that having somebody else write your speeches was part of the problem with rhetoric today.

I disagree.

But in the words of Nina Simone—"Oh Lord, please don't let me be misunderstood."

Nina Simone didn't actually write the music to that song or indeed the lyrics.

It was penned by Bennie Benjamin, Gloria Caldwell, and Sol Marcus.

Does that diminish its majesty or make it any less her work?

My title today is—

"Rhetoric: indulging the hope that nature will finally yield to observation and perseverance the keys to the heart."

I love that.

A line from an essay penned in 1897 by a young Winston Churchill.

The other contender for the title was one I'd used for an article in an online journal—

"Touch me, I'm rhetoric: confessions of a celery eater."

I think I chose wisely.

Now, I want to say a big thanks to Henriette for inviting me today.

I'm always, but always, delighted to talk about one of my favourite things—speechwriting.

It's up there with indie music from 1982 to 2003, Oxford United the glory years—a much shorter timespan—and every art-house film released in 1995.

'95 being a year I found myself between careers.

Speechwriting is a part of my work but never the part that feels like work.

When writing these words I might as well have been skipping through a summer meadow.

Colleagues in my open plan office were assailing their keyboards—preparing agendas, drafting reports, sending emails.

And it looked like I was too.

When in reality—my version of it—I was lying in the grass, shielding my eyes from the sun, and searching for animal shapes in the clouds.

That's not work!

Louis Armstrong said—

"What we play is life."

And, if I may try on the reversible raincoat of rhetoric—chiasmus—life is what we play.

So how did I get into this game?

I wrote my first speech in 2002.

For a Green MSP for a debate on his Organic Farming Targets Bill.

And endured three hours of frustration one Friday afternoon before an idea had the decency to show up.

Not an especially brilliant idea, certainly not a very original idea.

But I grabbed it.

What was this in my hands—tiny and shivering with life?

No less than a metaphor to drive the speech.

Albeit carbon neutral and made from recycled materials—this was Green party policy after all.

Suitably enough it was travel themed too—something about maps and destinations as I recall.

No dragons.

But which neatly framed what this draft legislation was about.

How pleased was I.

No, that won't do.

I was more than pleased.

I was smitten.

I was onto something—something new, to me at least.

I'd always loved words, from bedtime stories and the backs of cereal boxes to big old novels.

By way of kids' comics, football fanzines, political pamphlets, the NME and Private Eye.

I'd even written for magazines and newspapers as a side-line.

Another confession …

I'd been, whisper it, a music journalist.

Yet this was different, as if I'd been ushered into another realm.

Was it Wonderland or 100 Acre Wood? Moomin Valley or The Far Away Tree? Bedrock or Springfield?

I felt fuzzy.

I felt filled with anticipation.

I felt like a diabetic in a sweetshop.

For the rest of that afternoon and into the evening, when I should have been doing Friday things, I wrote that speech.

And the following Wednesday there I was at the back of the debating chamber.

Waiting for Robin to breathe life into my words.

My words that would become his words if this was to work at all.

I had, in modest self-assessment, succeeded in capturing his warm tones on the page.

It was only the former leader of the Greens' trademark Dr Who scarf I couldn't quite replicate in text.

It's a disconcerting discovery at first—having someone else's voice in your head as you write.

Tuning in—crackle of static as you turn the dial—trying to lock onto that signal.

You can't always find it.

You won't always find it.

But, on this occasion, find it I did.

He didn't disappoint either.

At least not for the first three and a half paragraphs.

Then he was side-tracked, ambushed by Government back-benchers.

He never recovered the plot nor indeed the speech.

Ten minutes evaporated into nothing.

The debate came and went.

The Bill was defeated.

Robin must have been gutted, if not entirely surprised.

He knew he didn't have Government support.

How was it for me?

It was exhilarating but execrable.

It was diabolical but divine.

It was heaven but hell.

I was hooked.

As Lewis Carroll said—

"No good fish goes anywhere without a porpoise."

And you might call this thing rhetoric, but where I work—in the parliamentary sphere—rhetoric has rather a bad press.

It's a pejorative.

A music hall double act.

It's Hooey & Guff.

It's Hog & Wash.

It's Flap & Doodle.

It's Balder & Dash.

A euphemism for BS.

Like Stan & Olly—

"Well, here's another fine mess … "

Not that this is a recent development.

I consulted Ambrose Bierce's The Devil's Dictionary.

And before disappearing a century ago into the smoke and gunfire of the Mexican revolution, he defined oratory thus—

"A conspiracy between speech and action to cheat the understanding."

But look closely and you can't help but see the critics of rhetoric using rhetoric in order to decry others for using rhetoric.

Don't you just love rhetoric!

Another quote of the musical kind—

"Frank's got to be on your mind … He had this ability to get inside of the song in a sort of a conversational way. Frank sang to you—not at you."

So said Dylan of Sinatra.

We can apply that lesson, even if we're not tackling the great American songbook.

Great speechwriting?

It should be poetic.

It should be mellifluous.

It should be the music of words.

It should be aimed at your head and your heart and your gut.

Good speechwriting?

It should have what Steven Pinker calls "the egalitarian give and take of conversation".

A speech isn't an essay or a policy document.

A speech isn't the time for a tonne of technical detail.

A speech isn't an instruction manual for your washing machine.

A speech isn't made up of 74-word sentences.

Which, let me say, is at least 59 words too long.

A speech says more with less.

A speech has a heartbeat.

A speech tells a story.

A speech is made of the simplest ingredients.

Voice, audience, words.

We're back to Frank.

And the genius of the Hoboken Hoodlum, remember, was to talk to you, not at you.

Respect the audience and chances are they'll respect you right back.

Okay, the worst thing a speechwriter can do …

Are your minds a-boggle?

Mine is and I know the answer.

Here's the charge sheet.

It's not setting down a busy paragraph so the senior politician you're writing for overlooks a crucial full stop.

Thereby elevating a former deputy leader of the Scottish Tories to the position of First Minister.

A surprise not only to the former deputy leader but to the speaker herself and to the rest of the room.

It's not that.

It's not using a Superman motif for a former stand-in leader of the Scottish Labour party.

Before finding out she suffers from a curious and confoundedly obscure condition—a fear of superheroes.

Which is why only 10% of the speech is used.

The good 10% though.

The 10% covered by the media the next day.

It's not that.

It's not deploying a record-breaking number of excrement-related puns during a debate of the Dog Fouling (Scotland) Bill.

Having the MSP in charge of the Bill refer to himself as Mr "Keech" Harding.

And discovering that one of his more mischievous colleagues has placed a plastic dog turd on every MSP's seat.

It's not that.

No, the worst thing a speechwriter can do is easy to overcome but difficult to avoid.

You can hear the results in any council chamber, at AGMs, during wedding receptions, for retirement dos, and, yes, even from lecture halls.

And that thing is to write a dull speech.

Because had Moses taken the time to turn over that tablet, he'd have found an 11th commandment—

Love thy audience.

Which means never inflict on others a speech you would not yourself wish to hear.

It's not the job of the speechwriter to send them up the wooden hill to Bedfordshire.

Surely it must be an offence under Scots law or breach of the European Convention on Human Rights to bore the listener?

I'm in a room-full of learned types here—help me out!

And it would be so easy to remedy—this endless ennui.

How?

Simply by writing like a human being for others of the species.

And not being afraid to delve into the toolbox of rhetoric.

The one we borrowed from next door and haven't quite got round to returning.

From old man Aristotle.

Though he borrowed it from Plato and never gave it back either.

My colleagues have spoken about rhetoric with insight and erudition this morning.

And somewhat less of a Horrible Histories approach.

I still struggle when thinking of ethos, logos and pathos not to picture a '70s prog rock ensemble.

Capes billowing, dry ice swirling at their feet, and the singer dressed as a sunflower.

It's what Cicero would have wanted.

Sorry, Amy!

Ted Sorensen, President Kennedy's speechwriter, described a good speech in four words.

A quarter of a tweet.

Brevity, levity, charity, clarity.

Salvador Dali once told a press conference—

"I shall be so brief I have already finished."

I can't compete with that.

Wit can be a trickier area.

But if it was worthy of Lincoln, of Churchill, of JFK … why shy away?

Laughter can be the shortest distance between speaker and audience.

True, not everyone can be Billy Connolly, but comedy is a broad church.

One that covers bathos, mockery, satire, drollery, irony, anecdote and observation.

Though irony must never be seated next to sarcasm, for obvious reasons.

Self-deprecation is there too.

But as Dr Johnson advised—don't overdo it or they might believe you.

Charity?

For me this is about tone but also treating the audience well.

Who are they and what do they want?

Like our friend Frank quipped during a Las Vegas gig—

"How did all these people get in my room?"

Do you remember Tony Blair being slow handclapped by the WI?

Even a Prime Minister can trip up if he tries to talk over the heads of his audience.

As for clarity, I'm an admirer of Blair—Eric not Tony.

His questions for a scrupulous writer are always worth remembering—

What am I trying to say?

What words will express it?

What image or idiom will make it clearer?

Is this image fresh enough to have an effect?

Could I put it more shortly?

And have I said anything that is avoidably ugly?

Orwell was right of course.

Words can be ugly, they can be devious and they can be cruel.

Rhetoric isn't without its dark side.

At the shadowy end of the street you'll find the premises of propaganda—more a fallen-down shack than a palace.

Over the road—say in a mock Tudor mansion—live that photogenic couple known as Advertising & PR.

From regulars in Hello! magazine to their neighbours from hell—it's quite a postcode.

So do speeches matter?

I believe they can help us to make sense of an increasingly complex world.

But don't take my word for it.

I'd completely fail the Mandy Rice Davies test.

Well, he would say that, wouldn't he.

He's a speechwriter.

No, ask the current occupants of the White House and of Number 10—whose careers turned on their ability to speak well.

Ask the young soldiers of the Irish Guard addressed by Colonel Tim Collins before their tanks rolled into Iraq in 2003.

Ask anyone who has hung on the wise and well-tailored words of Coretta Scott King or Christine Lagarde or Tilda Swinton.

I began with a confession, a poem and a quote—or, rather, talking about a quote that wasn't used, a quote that didn't quite fit.

A quote my Chief Executive may or may not use another time.

He won't.

But here's another I have up my bespoke sleeve, this from Madame Bovary—

"Human speech is like a cracked kettle on which we tap crude rhythms for bears to dance to, while we long to make music that will melt the stars."

Desire, dancing bears, the end of the universe …

And a singing kettle.

If that doesn't finally yield to observation and perseverance the keys to your heart …

Then, Mr Churchill, I confess we're going to have to get out there and find ourselves a good locksmith.

WINNER: **ENERGY**

"Mysteries of the Marginal Barrel"

Written and delivered by Bob Tippee, Editor, *Oil & Gas Journal*

//

Delivered to the Texas Alliance of Energy Producers, Dallas, Texas, Oct. 1, 2015

Thank you, Bill.

And thank you, Texas Alliance of Energy Producers, for inviting me here tonight.

***

Two creatures were crossing a desert—a spider and a worm.

"What was that?" the spider asked. "I felt something."

"It's gonna rain," answered the worm.

"Rain?" mocked the spider. "Rain? Don't be silly. This is a desert. It doesn't rain in the desert."

"We should find high ground," the worm said.

"High ground?" said the spider. "High ground? This is the flattest ground I've ever seen. There's no high ground here."

"This way," said the worm, turning sharply to the right.

After a minute or so the spider remarked, "I see no high ground in this direction—or any direction, for that matter."

"Look at the sand grains in front of you," the worm said.

"Want me to count them?" the spider joked.

"Now look behind you."

"A lot in that direction, too."

"See any difference?" asked the worm.

The spider looked forward, then backward, then forward again. "The grains do seem a little finer ahead of us."

"We need to hurry," the worm said.

Another minute passed before either creature spoke again. It was the spider.

"I don't see why you think it's going to—"

Ba-doom, ba-doom, ba-doom. Thunder rumbled unmistakably in the air behind the animals and in the sand beneath them. The spider looked first downward, then back and to the rear and said, "Why, it's a dark cloud—"

The worm interrupted him. "No time to talk. Hurry."

The worm and the spider rushed—to the extent worms and spiders can rush—on the course set by the worm. When they both were quite tired, the worm made his peristaltic way toward a space overhung by a barely noticeable outcropping of flat rock.

"This should be high enough," he said.

Together, the worm and the spider took shelter beneath the rock. Soon, the black, booming cloud, laced intermittently by lightning, passed overhead. Rainfall drenched the desert.

From their dry haven, the worm and spider watched as water first puddled, then quickly began to flow in the place from which they had fled. The little, flash rivulet certainly would have washed them to their deaths.

"How'd you know?" asked the spider.

"It's a matter of managing risk in a complex world," the worm responded.

The spider harrumphed, needing to recapture the dignity he believed animal taxonomy accorded his species.

"Spare me the lecture," he said. "Look at us: me with eight delicately jointed legs and a body in two parts, and you with no legs at all and body as much male as female. What do you know about complexity?"

The worm sighed. "You're probably right," he said. "But look who's closer to the data."

***

I hope that story helps you remember the second point I want to make here tonight.

It's about a skill oil and gas producers will have to develop in response to a fundamental change in the oil market, which will be my first point.

And because speeches, like sermons, are supposed to make three points, I'll end with a prediction in the hope that, if I turn out right, you'll remember and that, if I'm wrong, the worm and spider are what stay with you.

***

As everybody here knows, the price of crude oil collapsed in the second half of last year. The basic commodity of the oil and gas producing business lost half its value in half a year's time. Nobody expects hundred-dollar-a-barrel oil anytime soon. The good old days are gone…

…And not just because crude prices tanked.

The good old days are gone also because decision-making in every part of the oil and gas industry—especially the upstream part—has lurched into a new era of complexity.

It's an era defined by the disappearance of something on which the oil market depended for many decades: a mechanism for accommodating supply to best-available estimates of contemporaneous demand.

This condition is new. If it lasts, as it probably will, the industry will need to respond to unexpected new risks—like a spider and worm seeking high ground in a sudden desert downpour.

***

In the world of economists, supply and demand always balance.

You know about economists: They're the folks who went to grad school to become able to assure you

with soaring authority when things are lousy that everything will get better … and to warn you when everything's great that things surely will worsen.

About the inevitability of change, economists always are right.

But about the timing … well, grad school makes economists smart enough not to predict WHEN change will happen … and if forced to predict timing never to guarantee their work.

Anyway, supply and demand continuously seek equilibrium at some price.

The dynamic never holds still. Supply, demand, and price are continuously buffeted by forces of economics, politics, weather, news, and trading floor hallucinations. The equilibrium price is a moving target.

In that sense, the oil market is more spider than worm: very complex, lots of moving parts.

And of the market's three fundamental elements, only one seems subject to coordinated management.

That's supply.

Through most of the oil and gas industry's history, supply has had some balancing apparatus at the frontier of demand change. Lately, that's been OPEC, the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries.

More particularly, it's been OPEC's most influential member, Saudi Arabia.

After its failed experimentation with true cartel behavior in the 1970s and 1980s, OPEC settled into the role of marginal supplier, raising production when a price increase signaled a demand gain, trimming production when the crude price fell, mostly trying to keep the crude price near some target level or within some target band.

Success was mixed. Calibrating something as unwieldy as oil supply against a value as ambiguous as real-time demand isn't easy. And coordination of output from countries with disparate interests is inevitably dodgy business.

Most of the time, though, OPEC controlled enough idle production capacity—nearly all of it in Saudi Arabia—to provide a valuable buffer against surprise increases in consumption or disruptions to supply.

And the group's ability to assess demand improved over time as the OPEC Secretariat learned to interpret signals from the futures markets it once distrusted—and as it got closer and closer to the data.

But the system worked only as long as supply from everywhere else flowed at capacity rates and as long as OPEC members as a group controlled enough production to influence price.

While OPEC still controls plenty of production, the other condition no longer applies.

As a consequence, OPEC last November made clear that it no longer wished to be the oil market's marginal supplier, at least not now.

At a meeting in Vienna, instead of lowering the collective production target to accommodate reduced need for their countries' crude, OPEC ministers left the group quota at 30 million barrels a day—clearly more than the market needed. At the time, actual production by the OPEC countries was half a million barrels a day above quota. Crude prices, already sagging, plummeted.

Even more important than that, coordinated effort to adjust oil supply in accordance with best-available estimates of demand had ceased.

The change was historic.

The geographically widespread oil market, with its many sellers and even more buyers, and with its naturally unruly production, seems always to have needed some mechanism for moderating supply.

The reason is easy to see. When supply reflects only the sum of individual production decisions, it tends to overshoot need. Then competition gets out of hand, and the market becomes chaotic.

Before OPEC, the Texas Railroad Commission managed production in the United States.

The Railroad Commission's influence was a function of Texan domination of Western Hemisphere oil supply and evolved out of a federally sanctioned system of voluntary state production quotas, import duties to limit competition from low-cost foreign oil, and prohibition of interstate sales of so-called hot oil—or oil produced in excess of allowable amounts.

The voluntary scheme replaced a system of mandatory state quotas imposed by the federal government until the Supreme Court rejected the practice in 1935.

Federal intervention had responded to oil-field anarchy following the 1930 discovery of giant East Texas field, which created a surplus that crushed oil prices.

Supply outside the United States had management, too—first under the furtive As-Is Agreement fashioned by large international oil companies at Achnacarry Castle in Scotland, in 1928, and later via collusion by the oil companies known in infamy as the Seven Sisters.

As I said, for good or bad, the oil market seems to need coordinated supply management. It always has had it, at any rate.

Since OPEC's announcement last November that it no longer intends to provide the service, the market has had to wrestle itself into balance the hard way: through competition among individual producers with no idea what the oil price will be the day after tomorrow, let alone next year or next decade.

And the change is complicated by OPEC production that not only didn't decline last November as it once would have done, but that since early this year has exceeded the unadjusted quota by as much as a million and a half barrels a day.

Some observers regret the lack of a production decline from North American shale plays as steep as they say they expected. But shale production has fallen fairly rapidly month-over-month since about the middle of the year. The effect is simply being swamped by higher production by OPEC members, mainly Saudi Arabia and Iraq—and soon to be followed by Iran.

Producers everywhere else are reacting to the torturous signals the market is sending them. They don't settle their differences in the oil fields with sabotage and thievery anymore—at least not yet.

So far, they've shed cost and workers, slashed investment, and, when necessary, liquidated assets to preserve cash flow and profitability while regaining control over debt. Some have gone bankrupt. Others will follow.

Maybe that's what OPEC hoped to achieve. Maybe OPEC wanted to chase competitors out of business, especially producers active in the high-cost North Sea, deepwater frontiers, oil sands of Canada, and tight-oil plays of Canada and the United States.

In fact, explanations need to be no more pointed than the one offered many times by Saudi Oil Minister Ali al-Naimi.

If OPEC members cut production and the crude price rises as a consequence, Al-Naimi says, some other producer will just raise production, elevate supply, and lower the price yet again. OPEC then will have sacrificed its low-cost market share to higher-cost competition and have nothing, in the way of a strengthened crude price, to show for it.

That dynamic always has applied. Before now, though, the cycle stretched out over years. Producers prompted into action by a crude price jump had to find oil and gas—never a certain bet. Or, more recently, they had to excavate an oil-sands mine, steam a reservoir in a thermal bitumen project, or develop a deepwater field on the fringe of commerciality.

Shale and other tight-oil plays radically compress the timing. In those geologic environments, producers know where the hydrocarbons are. Once they've optimized lateral placement and completion parameters, they can bring new production on stream in the time it takes to drill and fracture wells.

This short-cycle supply—of which quite much awaits development—is new to the oil market. And it's supremely important. It vacates one of those conditions essential to success of OPEC supply management that I mentioned a minute ago: production by non-OPEC suppliers at near-term capacity rates.

Non-OPEC production capacity isn't fixed like it used to be. By their nature, tight-oil resources give the market new, upside supply elasticity, control over which is unmanageably diffuse.

OPEC leaders—the savvy ones, anyway—understand the ramifications. I don't believe this is the only reason they—led, as always, by Saudi Arabia—abandoned supply management.

Undeniably, though, the new ability to bring incremental, non-OPEC oil quickly to market at high rates makes coordinated supply management by OPEC self-defeating.

What, then, will align supply with demand, prevent ruinous surplus, and enforce order in the oil market?

I can confidently predict the Texas Railroad Commission won't reinstate prorationing. And Washington, DC? Of course not.

Can you imagine a politician of either party calling for supply restraint in service to the elevation of oil prices? For most politicians, being blamed for four-dollar gasoline is worse than getting caught with coal slag in their carbon footprint.

Producers themselves can't restrain supply collectively. Price collusion is illegal in this country.

Unless a more-formal mechanism not now in view materializes, supply-demand balance will have to reflect the individual decisions of all the world's producers of crude oil—and only those decisions.

So those decisions better be good.

In the new world of oil and gas supply subject to rapid expansion from numerous, uncoordinated sources, every producer faces a new risk. It's the risk that a decision to bring production on stream to meet new demand indicated by price elevation will be matched by supply from other producers responding to the same price signal, creating a surplus that lowers the oil price yet again and wrecks profitability for all but the lowest-cost projects.

In this new environment, producers have to start paying closer attention than ever to what their competitors do—or, more importantly, what their competitors can do.

New supply has to come from the producer able to meet new demand most profitably. The newly disordered market I've described will punish higher-cost producers who try to bull-rush competition.

Production restraint now has to come from producers willing to respond to incremental demand with incremental caution, yielding when necessary to competitors able to deliver supply at lower cost and greater efficiency.

This requires an expanded role for competitive intelligence in the market assessments on which producers base investment decisions. It imposes new complexity on the quantification and analysis of risk. And it creates competitive advantage for producers most skillful with modern tools for data management and integration.

Producers, of course, have increased their use of data to manage risk for decades.

I remember when producers were content to drill four dry holes for every one productive well.

Then 3D seismic technology became affordable, and producers learned that a survey could pay for itself by preventing the drilling of a single hole in the wrong place.

And the one-in-five standard for drilling success is ancient history.

Nowadays, too, producers of all size use sophisticated analytics to assess project risks, manage work flows, and support drilling and development decisions. And they accumulate data on seemingly everything: machines, work flows, logistics, the subsurface, and much more.

In a fascinating paper published in May by the Manhattan Institute, Senior Fellow Mark P. Mills predicted the application of big data analytics will inaugurate the next wave of supply from unconventional resources, which he called Shale 2.0.

Data used now to improve efficiency and optimize operations are unconnected. Big data can link disparate data sets and identify patterns helpful in decision-making.

In Mills's words: "Big-data analytics can already optimize the subsurface mapping of the best drilling locations;

indicate how and where to steer the drillbit; determine, section by section, the best way to stimulate the shale; and ensure precise truck and rail operations. Mobile computing, using app-centric analytics, can increase uptime, reduce maintenance, improve workforce productivity, reduce errors and rework, and enable low-cost compliance."

That's what's possible now.

For the future, Mills thinks big data analytics will enable operators to identify new potential in shale sections already cut by wellbores, but so-far unproductive, and to determine the most appropriate fracturing techniques, which might not have been available or perfected during the first round of completions.

This data-centric surge of work and production doesn't depend on hundred-dollar oil. In fact, it's stimulated by the cost-cutting imperatives imposed by oil at half that price. And it's already happening—mostly as work still proprietary at service and operating companies.

Mills believes big-data analytics will improve upstream operations so much that shale and tight-oil production will regain its dramatic growth rate of 2014 within a year or two.

Think about that. Think about how technology so amazingly inaugurated and now propels the unconventional resource revolution—and how that revolution has turned the oil market inside-out. Then think about how mastering the data storm generated by modern work might leverage technological development.

I see no reason why big-data tools soon to be optimizing operations can't also help with production decisions in a market newly devoid of coordinated supply management.

As I mentioned earlier, supply management now depends—and probably will continue to depend—on individual decisions of producers, especially those in control of hair-trigger oil available from shale and other low-permeability reservoirs.

Those producers essentially trade exploratory risk for the risk of boomerang price weakness resulting from excessive production starts.

And as I suggested, every producer will have to manage that risk by determining whether it can produce the marginal barrel most efficiently and thus outlast competitors.

This will be difficult and complex. It will require sophisticated benchmarking based on all accessible information about the performance and capabilities of competitors.

And the producers who do this best will be those able to use big-data and advanced analytics to evaluate the competitive landscape and decide when to bring new production onstream and when to exercise the option to wait.

***

I come to that prediction not as a big-data expert, which I'm not, but as a journalist who observes and writes about the world's most interesting business.

I observe new problems for producers based on the oil-market changes I've described.

And I observe a possible solution in data-management tools able to deliver newly precise assessments of competitive landscapes.

Those are my first two points. And I promised a prediction.

I'm not an economist, and I don't have a graduate degree.

But I can assure you things will get better. Trends never last. The future is never an extension of the present.

The price of crude oil might fall lower before it goes higher—but it will go higher. Fifty bucks a barrel is, quite obviously, intolerable. So, it seems, is a hundred bucks a barrel. Economic sustainability must reside somewhere in between.

To survive and profit with oil prices vacillating in a range somewhere north of fifty and south of a hundred, producers will have to navigate through complex new risks as they always have: by staying smart and getting smarter.

And when the market spills over its banks, as it will with painful frequency in this era of oil abundance, the producers who reach safe ground and avoid drowning will be those who—like the worm in my little fable—stay closest to the data.

***

You're probably wondering what happen to those two critters.

Well, safely across the desert, they went their own ways.

The headstrong spider actually tried to fake his way into a job in big data analytics. His prospects faded when the interviewer asked about experience with the worldwide web and the spider responded by saying he stayed there once and liked how everybody on the staff spoke different languages.

Frustrated and unable to find work, our marvel of eight-legged complexity became an antioil activist. And in his first protest march, forgetting everything he'd learned from the worm, the spider got squashed by a frac truck he never saw or felt coming.

The worm moved to Wichita Falls, Texas, and became a consultant. Business was steady there but hardly dynamic. When he tried to expand his practice into aqueous surroundings, the worm found himself nose-to-nose with a fat catfish and confronted by the urgent need to negotiate his way out of the zoological equivalent of a hostile takeover.

Although the emergency negotiations apparently succeeded, details were never made public. Apparently, the deal involved pro bono counsel and a non-compete stipulation. The worm retired to stud service in a comfortable pile of wet soil outside a bait shop. The catfish went into business as a motivational speaker. And as word spread about how to use data integration to avoid risk, fishing turned lousy on the Wichita River.

Thank you.

WINNER: GOVERNMENT, DIVERSITY

"Intelligence Community Pride"

By Trey Brown for Stephanie O'Sullivan, Principal Deputy Director, National Intelligence

Delivered at National Reconnaissance Office Headquarters, Washington, D.C., May 6, 2015

Thank you for the introduction and for welcoming me here today in place of Director Clapper. He had a personal issue that pulled him away, and there is simply no way he could be here today. I know it's the standard line to say, "I know he wishes he could be here." In this case, that's a vast understatement. He was very much looking forward to making this speech—which now, I get to make. [laughter]

He's talked a lot about how much last year's LGBTA Summit meant to him, and he asked me to relay some things. Over the past 14 months, he's spent a good bit of time ruminating on that speech, and he told me that what he said last year—he's felt that way for years, decades. But he's never before spoken out in public like that about his experiences.

He said it took him a while to process just how much the injustice he'd seen during his career bothered him, particularly his personal experience 50 years ago when he was a very young lieutenant, when he had to process the dishonorable discharges of two fine airmen who had been outed as homosexuals.

They were model airmen: superb Russian linguists and meticulous about their military responsibilities. And they loved serving their country. He says that, five decades later, it still stings him to think of being asked to out-process them. It was a waste of superb talent, as well as a profound injustice.

Decades later, when Director Clapper was wing commander for all Air Force troops at NSA, he saw Admiral Bobby Inman take a stand and go in a different direction. The standing logic at the time was that anyone who was gay was open to blackmail and therefore should not hold a security clearance.

Of course that is—and was—very flawed logic. The main reason gay clearance holders were open to blackmail is because, if anyone found out their orientation, they'd lose their clearance. You'd lose your clearance, because of the threat of losing your clearance. [laughter]

It's funny, in a tragic sense, because the consequences are terrible.

So, when DNI Clapper was Colonel Clapper, Wing Commander at NSA, and a gifted crypto-mathematician there was outed and lost his clearance, NSA Director Bobby Inman restored his clearance, asking only that this officer acknowledge his sexual orientation to his coworkers, so that there was no longer any threat of blackmail.

Of course, that's a big "only." That forced the officer to follow someone else's timeline with his very personal process of coming out. But it was a courageous and unprecedented decision.

A decade later—Jim Clapper has a lot of "decades" in this business [laughter]—he was profoundly grateful for the example Inman set, because as the Chief of Air Force Intelligence, then-General Clapper was given a similar opportunity to correct an injustice, by restoring the clearance of a civilian employee who'd been outed.

He says he doesn't think that act makes up for out-processing the two airmen at the start of his career, but he says with that second chance, he had the power to do something about it. So he did. And this is a quote from Director Clapper: "Damn, it felt good." [laughter and applause]

And he says more importantly, it was the right thing to do, and it helped the Air Force retain talent they desperately needed. He says, in the weeks and months after that decision, he wore it as a badge of honor when his fellow General and Flag Officers gave him a hard time about it.

At the 2014 LGBTA Summit here, he talked with you about those experiences and a few others. He says it felt good to him to get those things off his chest and out in the open. So the first thing he asked me to pass on is his appreciation for that invitation to speak last March. I believe that speech was cathartic for him. He used the term, "cleansing." It meant a lot to him.

I think he understands the influence he has as DNI, but he underestimates the impact he can have personally, because he's been a bit taken aback by how much that discussion meant to you. This February, when he was on travel in Paris, an NSA integree caught him between meetings and, with a good deal of emotion, said she'd been at the March summit, 11 months earlier. She said hearing him talk about his experiences made a huge impact on her, and the way she felt about the Intelligence Community and her career choice to join this community.

That's fantastic, and it shows not only what an impact he can have, but the impact you have by holding this summit, and by establishing an LGBTA community in the IC.

I want to give you the words the DNI had planned to say about that interaction in Paris and to her: "I'm amazed and humbled that I—a 74-year-old, straight, white man—can say anything that has that kind of impact on you, because I can only imagine the obstacles you've had to overcome, not for your personal gain, but so that you can serve our country. You inspire me, I believe, far more than I could inspire you." And since you all know him, you know he means that sincerely.

That passion reminds me of another senior leader I think we can find inspiration in. In the fall of 2012, OPM Director John Berry came to visit our office and spoke at an ODNI town hall. His enthusiasm for the federal workforce was evident in his remarks. When he said the government is a great place to work, he wasn't just feeding us a line.

He said he'd taken a visit to Google's campus and told an auditorium full of their employees that, for a small pay cut [laughter], and fewer stock options [laughter], they could do truly meaningful work as part of the federal workforce. As you can imagine, that's a bit of a tough sell to make on Google's home turf, but he meant it.

At our town hall, John talked about working to streamline federal hiring practices and boost hiring of veterans, about making recruitment of students and recent graduates easier, and about improving the diversity of the federal workforce. What John didn't mention in his speech was his own personal story. But with our very first question, someone from my office thanked him for being "out" as the most-senior openly-gay official in the history of the federal government.

We asked John what obstacles he'd had to overcome to achieve his position. John laughed and talked about going through his very first security clearance interview, just 90 days after President Clinton signed the executive order to allow people to hold a clearance while serving openly. John said his security interviewers were more nervous than he was. [laughter] They had no idea what questions they could or couldn't ask him. [laughter] And being John, he ended up having to comfort them [laughter] and tell them it would be okay. [laughter]

We then asked John what advice he would give to gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgender employees in the IC as they progress through their careers. He advised everyone, and this advice stands for everyone in this room, no matter what orientation, background, or experiences you've had, "Be open with who you are, because life is simply too short not to be yourself." Our auditorium erupted with applause that went on for almost a minute. I was proud of us for that.

I started my career as an engineer, contracted to work for the Office of Naval Intelligence. I worked as an ONI civilian, and then joined the CIA through the directorate of science and technology. I've got far fewer decades than DNI Clapper, [laughter], okay, two fewer, [laughter], but I've been around a while. And I've known many gay, and some bisexual, men and women; both civilians and uniformed military.

I cannot imagine the stress they were forced to endure to serve their country. It's simply incomprehensible to me, trying to keep and live with such a secret. It was wrong to have compelled people to live that way under "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" and under our regulations to hold clearances. I'm glad those things are in our past.

And now, I'm happy that those draconian rules also no longer hang over the heads of transgender employees. By the way, I just found out, getting ready for today—that there's a label for me. Apparently, I am "Cis-gender." [applause, extended applause]

That means my body, the gender I was assigned at birth, and my personal identity all match. It was really only a few years ago that I, and many of us, first thought about how it would feel if those didn't match.

The past couple of years have been huge for the transgender community. Case law precedents that protect transgender employees from being fired have been stacking up. And a 2012 ruling on Title 12 by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission extends protections to transgender workers in all 50 states.

Then, in May of 2013, the diagnosis manual for psychology stopped listing being transgender as a "mental disorder." That was a big step forward, for the medical establishment to decide that, if your body and your assignment don't match your identity, there are much more constructive ways to help you than with a diagnosis of mental illness. It's good for the medical establishment to catch up to something most people have known for a long time.

Of course, that won't be the end of the struggle. We know that, because homosexuality was pulled from the list of "disorders" in 1973, and yet there are still outliers that try to "cure" homosexuality. So that, just a month ago, President Obama took a stand and called for an end to "conversion therapy." I like having a boss who publicly does things I'm proud of.

In January, for the first time ever, the President used the word "transgender" in his State of the Union speech. He was talking about how we as Americans respect human dignity, and he said, "That's why we defend free speech and advocate for political prisoners, and condemn the persecution of women or religious minorities or people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender." The President's remarks show how, just in the past few years, we as a society have become much more attuned to how being transgender is simply a part of the human experience.

And very recently, Bruce Jenner has brought this into the public consciousness. [Note: this speech was delivered two weeks after Ms. Jenner came out as transgender and three weeks before she changed her name to Caitlyn.]

I think we could have a reasonable debate about whether the media circus is a good thing or not, but nationally, I think we're ready for the discussion. I think the national transgender community has laid a lot of the groundwork to define terms and help us understand. And, media circus or not, personally I think airing the difficulties that transgender people experience is a good thing.

I'm happy, for instance, we can have a public discussion about "passing," specifically the idea that transgender people don't need—and shouldn't feel the need—for other people to immediately identify them with the gender that they identify with. Transgender people can, in fact, dress and present according to who they are, and nothing that other people believe should drive what they do. Some people may not be ready to hear that message, but I don't consider that to be my opinion. That's just truth.

Just five or 10 years ago, it was acceptable for pop culture to use confusion over perceived sex and gender for low-brow comedy. But the transgender community has made a huge, positive impact in the past few years, and when Bruce Jenner came out with his transition, the few Paleolithic comedians who tried to make a joke of it very quickly found out how unacceptable that is today.

That's a lot of progress, very quickly made. However, just because mainstream America is learning what actions and reactions are unacceptable, that doesn't mean everyone knows how to be supportive. That's why I'm particularly proud of the work your transgender working group has done since it stood up after the first IC LGBTA Summit in 2012.

You filled a much needed gap with your publication of your, "Best Practices Guide for Transgender Employees, their Colleagues, and Managers," and I think more importantly, you've formed what I'd have to describe as a "cross-agency rapid-response team" [laughter], to help, across the community, anyone considering gender transition, and to help that person's managers and coworkers. Beyond a sense of duty, that shows a true love for our Intelligence Community and for the people who work here. So, thank you.

So I've addressed the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender members of this alliance. I want to take just a couple minutes to talk to the allies—the people who put the "A" in "LGBTA." [laughter].

First, I'd like to officially add my name to your ranks. [applause] Thank you. [continued applause] That's humbling. [continued applause]

I'd like to add my name by repeating something the DNI said last year: "There's no way I can ever really know what members of the LGBT community go through and have gone through, but I can absolutely proclaim myself to be an ally." I'm proud to be one, and I'm proud of everyone else who's here today as an ally, because we, as allies, need to find a way to translate personal support into public advocacy.

The director and I both spend a lot of time talking about the "business case" for diversity in the Intelligence Community. Put simply, if we get together a bunch of people who all look and think alike to brainstorm about some problems we have, we'll all come up with similar ideas about what to do. If you look back at prominent intelligence failures, particularly as laid out by the Iraq WMD Commission, you'll see that each time, diverse thinking by people with diverse life experiences might have prevented the mistakes we made.

But here's an important distinction: hiring a diverse workforce is not enough. We won't reap the benefits of that diversity unless we also foster a culture of inclusion. People who belong to a minority group in our IC, whether that's because of their national origin, native language, race, color, disability, ethnicity, gender, age, religion, sexual orientation, or gender identity, need to feel welcome in our community, and they need to know they don't need to hide what makes them unique. It's from our differences that we draw our strengths. That's the "business and mission case" for diversity.

To me, there's an equally important reason to convert personal support into public advocacy. It's the right thing to do, to treat everyone, especially IC professionals, with dignity and respect. That may mean, if you pass someone cracking an inappropriate joke in the hallway, you stop and say, "That's not how we act here." Or that may mean actually speaking out in public.

As a rule, the director and I try not to take ourselves or the positions we occupy too seriously, but we realize that we can and should use our positions as, and this is how Director Clapper puts it, a "bully pulpit" when the occasion calls for it. I do have to remind him he's not actually old enough to have been Teddy Roosevelt's principal intelligence advisor. [laughter]

This occasion calls for using that bully pulpit. After the 2014 LGBTA Summit, we published the DNI's remarks on ODNI's public website, and we got outside publications to print them as well. I intend to continue talking about IC pride after today's summit, and Director Clapper has assured me that he'll be doing the same for the 87 weeks he has left to serve this community; not that he's counting. [laughter]

By the way, I love the name of this group: IC Pride. I checked online for a definition of gay pride or LGBT pride, and I found this: "It's is the positive stance against discrimination and violence toward lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people, to promote their self-affirmation, dignity, equality rights, increase their visibility as a social group, build community, and celebrate sexual diversity and gender variance."

The phrase in there that jumped out at me was, "build community." That's been our goal at ODNI, building a community of diverse intelligence agencies. Each Intelligence Community agency and element has its own unique intelligence tradecraft that it brings to the table. And we work best, as a community, when we celebrate how each agency is different, and we take advantage of the strengths inherent in their different cultures and ways of doing business. That's true at a macro level with agencies and at a micro level with individual intelligence officers.

So, going forward, I plan to be even more public with my support, because it's good for our community to be inclusive, and because it's right for our IC to welcome everyone who's a member. We should all take pride in doing so.

The work you do here, work that cuts across agency lines and brings people together as a community, is an important part of intelligence integration. That goes for the transgender working group, the ally engagement group, the recruitment and retention group, the communications and technology group, and the group that put this summit together. Thank you all for the work you do every day, and particularly for the work you're doing with IC Pride and at today's summit.

I want to leave you with a few words from the President. Two weeks ago, my office celebrated our tenth anniversary, and our celebration was capped off by a visit from President Obama. He

spoke to our workforce and asked us to go out to all the agencies and pass along his message.

He said first to tell you—simply—"You can take great pride in your service."

He talked about integrity. He said, "The work you provide is vital for me being able to make good decisions. And the fact that the work you prepare is giving it to me straight, that it doesn't look at the world through rose-colored glasses, that it doesn't exaggerate threats, but doesn't underplay the significant challenges that we face around the world—that's vitally important to me."

Then he talked about the great successes we've had over the past few years, and the great challenges. And he wrapped up with this message; he said, "I know what you do. We're more secure because of your service. We're more secure because of your patriotism and your professionalism. And I'm grateful for that."

So that's the President's message he wanted me to pass along, and because of the challenges we've faced over the past few years, that message comes from a President who has a better understanding of how the intelligence enterprise works than any of his predecessors.

I know he'd agree with me, that in our 21st Century world, your work here with IC Pride is critical to our Intelligence Community and to the defense of our nation. So I want to leave you with the President's words: "You can all take great—pride—in your service." Thank you.

WINNER: **NONPROFIT**

"The Pursuit of Happiness"

By Katie O'Dea for Randall Dunn,
Head of School, Latin School of Chicago

//

Delivered at the Chicago History Museum,
Chicago, Ill., July 4, 2015

Thank you Gary. Given the fact that America is my adopted country and Chicago is my adopted city, I am particularly honored to be speaking today. The Chicago History Museum is a real treasure in this city—and a great neighbor to the Latin School. So, it is a pleasure to share this amazing event with you.

And what is this event all about? Although there were many significant events in our country's fight for freedom, I find it interesting that we celebrate the day we declared—not won—but declared our independence as our national holiday. Today is all about that declaration, and declarations are all about words. So, I think it is the perfect opportunity to take a moment to think about the words that were used on July 4, 1776. And although the teacher in me would love it, this is not going to be a grammar lesson. Instead, I would like to focus on a few of those words and why they are still relevant today.

Thomas Jefferson and his committee of five editors did a masterful job compiling this document. Every phrase is steeped in meaning. But, the first sentence of the second paragraph is by far the most inspired:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

This has been called one of the best-known sentences in the English language. It contains, arguably, the most powerful and significant words in American history. Despite our many differences, regardless of our ethnic and cultural origins, these words represent a shared understanding of what it means to be an American ... particularly the last phrase that lists our inalienable, or non-negotiable rights: life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Other nations use 3-part phrases to sum up their core beliefs. France's national motto is "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity." Germans rally behind "Unity, Justice and Freedom" and Canada's mantra is "Peace, Order and Good Government." If you've noticed, America stands apart with our inclusion of "the pursuit of happiness" on equal level with our other rights.

Fast forward 238 years and the pursuit of happiness has become nothing short of a cultural obsession. Amazon.com has nearly 40,000 books on the topic. At least 100 universities offer classes on happiness. And the United Nations now publishes a World Happiness Report on an annual basis. If you happened to be at Latin's upper school graduation ceremony this year, it was even the topic of my remarks to our graduating seniors.

So, we are certainly in hot pursuit. But ... are we happy?

To help us find out, I've prepared a pop quiz for you today. Please keep your answers to yourselves ... and no cheating! Here goes…

Number 1. Are you curious? Happy people are curious. They seek risk even though it can be scary at times. They do not engage in knowingly dangerous behavior, but they consciously step outside their comfort zone to learn and grow on a regular basis.

Number 2. Are you happy for others? Happy people truly feel joy at the good fortune of others. Studies have proven is that happiness actually is contagious. When people spend time sharing in the joy of others, they become happier themselves.

Number 3. Lastly, does your life serve a greater purpose? Happy people recognize the need for short-term gratification, but they balance those pleasures with making progress toward a purposeful goal.

So, how did you do?

Personally, I think the last one—living with a purpose is the most important. At Latin School, our mission statement directs all of students to lead lives of purpose and excellence. We help them understand that it is not enough to be good, you must also do good—in your school, your neighborhood, your city and your world. For 125 years, we have believed that knowing what you do well, combined with serving others is the key to not only a good education, but a fulfilling and happy life.

But you don't have to be a student at Latin School to learn this important lesson. I learned it from my mother. She was a nanny. When I was 6 years old she left me, my four siblings and her home in Jamaica to move to Boston for a job. She worked hard enough to eventually bring all of us to this country so that we could have opportunities that were not available in Jamaica. Thinking back, it seems like all she did was work. But, growing up, I witnessed the amount of love, care and concern she demonstrated to other people's children. She never tired of her work because it brought her so much joy—it truly made her happy.

When I arrived in Boston as a 9-year-old, I was ecstatic just to be reunited with my mother. I soon realized however, that the tough Dorchester neighborhood was far from the idyllic America I had dreamed of for so long. Transitioning to the public school system, away from my extended family and friends, at the height of racial tensions didn't exactly make it the happiest place on Earth.

Since then, my personal pursuit of happiness has been directly tied to people in my life who saw things for me that I couldn't see for myself. In addition to my mother, one of my middle school teachers recommended me to A Better Chance…a program that provides educational opportunities for young people of color. Because of him, I was able to attend Milton Academy, which led me to college, graduate school and a career in education.

My educational opportunities in this country and my personal mentors have made all the difference in my life. They allowed me to learn about who I am, what I am good at, and how I can serve others. Like my mother, I am energized by seeing others grow and do well—whether it is my own children, the students of Latin, or my amazing faculty and staff—helping them succeed is the reason why my work as an educator has been so rewarding. It gives my life purpose. I am happy.

I won't ask you to reveal how you did on the quiz, but the correct answer was: "any or all of the above." The pursuit of happiness has no prescribed path. Whether you achieve it by being curious, by sharing another's joy or by living with purpose, this inalienable, and uniquely American right is well within your reach.

As Benjamin Franklin, once said, "The Declaration of Independence only gives people the right to pursue happiness. You have to catch it yourself."

Thank you!

Happy 4th of July!

WINNER: CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED

"National Intelligence, North Korea and the National Cyber Discussion"

By Trey Brown for James Clapper, Director of National Intelligence

//

Delivered at Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y., Jan. 7, 2015

It's great to be here after fighting the snow traffic in Washington to get to the airport, and then flying here. I want to thank Father McShane [Fordham University President Joseph M. McShane], for that kind introduction. You have some truly remarkable speakers and panels this week, and I'm humbled that you invited me to speak. Thanks for having me.

This morning, I'm serving as the warm-up act for FBI Director Jim Comey. He really is the senior expert on the investigative side of cybersecurity. And tomorrow, CYBERCOM Commander and NSA Director Admiral Mike Rogers is speaking, and he's the senior expert on how cybersecurity ops actually happen. You have three-and-a-half days filled with cyber experts, from government, the academic world, and industry.

In the interests of truth in advertising, I'm not an expert on cyber. I guess that's a way of saying I'm going to refer technical questions to the real experts here. So, I was trying to think through what my contribution to this conference could possibly be. Well, I recently traveled to North Korea—and back, happily. So I thought I'd talk about—[delayed laughter] Yes, that's a joke. [laughter] I learned from Father McShane that this crowd needs cuing. [laughter, applause] So I'll talk about that trip and how it applies to this week's conversation about cyber, given the Sony hack.

The first question I always get is: "Why you?" As in, "Why on earth would we send the DNI, the director of national intelligence, especially this DNI, on a diplomatic mission to get two American citizens who were imprisoned in North Korea?" The truth is, the mission had been in the works for quite a while.

North Korea wanted an active member of the National Security Council and a cabinet level official to come and to bring a letter from President Obama. The White House knows I've had a long history of working Korean issues, since I served as chief of intelligence for U.S. Forces in Korea in the mid-'80s. So the White House put my name forward to the DPRK,

the Democratic People's Republic of Korea as they call themselves, government in Pyongyang. And I think we were all surprised, to include me, when they agreed. That's how and why I was picked to go.

Actually, I thought the New York Times had a better explanation: Clapper is "Gruff, blunt-speaking and seen by many as a throwback to the Cold War." [laughter] "An unlikely diplomat, but perfect for the North Koreans." [laughter] That's the nicest thing the New York Times has ever written about me. [laughter, applause]

I want to talk about a few experiences from that trip, and how some insight from the trip could play into our discussion about cyber. But first, for those who may not be familiar with the director of national intelligence, I thought I'd spend a couple of minutes on that.

Later this spring, my office will be celebrating the tenth anniversary of our standup—in April of 2005. Our establishment came from shortfalls perceived by the 9/11 Commission. The assertion was that the intelligence agencies weren't sharing information with each other and were incapable of "acting jointly." So ten years ago, Congress and the President created the position of the DNI, which I now occupy and have for the past four-and-a-half years, and it feels like it's been at least four-and-a-half years. That was a joke too. [laughter]

Part of my statutory job description designates me as the President's senior, but by no means exclusive, intelligence advisor. We have many, many experts on intelligence. Another part of the law says I manage the national intelligence budget, which, by the way, has not gotten a pass, as some people seem to think, from the Balanced Budget Act and sequestration. But I believe the third duty of the DNI is the most critical, which is bridging that "joint action" gap that the 9/11 Commission identified.

That responsibility goes way—way—beyond just getting the intelligence agencies to talk to one another. It's about helping them to recognize the cultural strengths and capabilities that each of the 17 Intelligence Community elements brings to the table, and then getting them to think as a community. It's about the intelligence culture, bringing our best and most appropriate community resources to bear against our toughest national security problems.

That's what I've referred to as "intelligence integration." It's been my theme, my shtick, my mantra, for the past four-and-a-half years, because I believe that's what the 9/11 Commission had in mind. And that was instantiated in law by the Intelligence Reform and Terrorism Prevention Act of 2004 that created my position—a seriously flawed piece of legislation, as most legislation is.

Intelligence integration is the prerequisite to reaching the 9/11 Commission's goal that we act jointly as an Intelligence Community. That means integration horizontally, across agency lines, with each agency on equal footing and stature. I'm speaking of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, the National Reconnaissance Office, etc.

But I also believe we have to work toward vertical integration from federal to state and local governments, and also to commercial partners, like many here. So that's primarily why I'm here today; to take advantage of a great opportunity to encourage intelligence, law enforcement, homeland security, state and locals, and private industry to work together, to the fullest extent we can, on this difficult cyber problem.

I'm also here to promote transparency. That's the big lesson I've learned from the past few years of unauthorized leaks. We've got to preserve and protect our tradecraft, the special skills and capabilities that let us do our work. At the same time, we need to talk to the American public more about other things, the things we can talk about.

So with that long preamble, I want to jump into the things we need to talk about as part of an ongoing cyber conversation. From an intelligence standpoint, that conversation starts with the cyber threat, of course.

Every spring for the past four years, I've made the rounds on Capitol Hill, testifying in open sessions to our various Congressional oversight committees about our assessments of worldwide threats. Talking to Congress in the open about classified matters and dancing around many issues, in televised sessions, while trying to protect intelligence tradecraft, is one of my favorite things to do. [laughter] Right up there with getting a root canal or folding fitted sheets. [laughter and applause] But I'll be doing it again, starting in just a few weeks, because it's important to be open and transparent with the issues we can discuss, even though for me as a career intelligence guy, it's almost genetically antithetical to be transparent.

Each of the past four years, I've told Congress that we're facing the most diverse array of threats I've seen in all my years in the intelligence business. That line has morphed from "my almost 50 years in the intelligence business," to "my 50 years," to "my more than 50 years in the intelligence business," because the threats have grown substantially more diverse every year—so much so that in 2014, I had to go back to the Hill in the late summer to give a mid-year threat update.

At the threat hearings two years ago, we made news when "cyber" bumped "terrorism" off the top of our list of threats. That was the first time since 9/11. But that top-of-the-list cyber threat doesn't mean what a lot of people think it means. Although we must be prepared for a large-scale strike—a "Cyber Pearl Harbor" scenario or "Cyber 9/11;" big scary things like that get play in the media—our reality is that we've been living with a constant barrage of cyber attacks for some time now.

And those attacks are not monolithic. Different cyber actors have different capabilities and different goals when conducting operations in Cyberspace. Russia for example, has a broad range of highly sophisticated technical and human intelligence capabilities. Moscow's focus goes beyond just taking advantage of common vulnerabilities that can be fixed with a software patch,

and in the event of a military conflict or geo-political crisis with Russia, some U.S. critical infrastructure networks will be at risk.

While the Russian cyber threat is much more sophisticated than the others, we've seen that Iran and North Korea are now unpredictable and aggressive cyber actors who aren't afraid to undertake offensive cyber operations against private sector targets. And we hear a lot more public discussion of the Chinese, because they, and now the North Koreans, are much noisier. China has been robbing our industrial base blind, largely with vulnerabilities that are easy to guard against or to simply fix. And that's one of the places where we can talk about a government and industry partnership.

Now, I recognize that banks and retail stores aren't about to turn their systems over to the FBI and Department of Homeland Security to look for cracks in their cyber firewall, but we can definitely help each other carry out our respective roles. So I want to lay out three things that the private sector can do today that will protect it from the vast majority of attacks, from the Chinese and elsewhere.

One: Patch IT software obsessively. Most Chinese cyber intrusions are through well-known vulnerabilities that can be fixed with patches already available.

Two: Segment your data. A single breach shouldn't give attackers access to an entire network infrastructure and a mother lode of proprietary data. If you've seen James Cameron's movie, Titanic, and I guess statistically, everyone here has seen it six times [laughter], you'll remember the forensic reconstruction of the sinking—how the ship had segmented bulkheads, so that if the hull was breached, the flooding would stay isolated to just one section, and the ship would stay afloat. But the forensic analysis in the film showed that the bulkheads didn't go high enough, and so the water spilled over the top of each section into the next section until the entire ship was flooded. So we tell the private sector: Don't let that happen to your data. Make sure a single breach won't sink your entire company, your entire enterprise.

And Three: Pay attention to the threat bulletins that DHS and FBI put out. This is the easiest and least intrusive way for industry and government to partner on cyber. We're already warning about the intrusions that are taking place against U.S. businesses and advising the private sector about how to protect itself. So please take necessary measures and encourage your customers, partners, and contacts to pay attention to those bulletins, and let the Bureau know when an intrusion or attack happens, so that the FBI can do its part and help.

So those are the three free pieces of advice our cyber professionals are out proselytizing. I'm sure those are things everyone here already knows, but there's a good reason I'm saying them again: because bad cyber actors are using precisely those avenues to steal our lunch every day. The Chinese in particular are cleaning us out, because we know we're supposed to do those simple things, and yet we don't do them.

And, if there's a fourth commandment, it's this: Teach folks what spear phishing looks like. So many times, the Chinese and others get access to our systems just by pretending to be someone else and then asking for access, and someone gives it to them.

In national defense, few things turn heads like seeing your aviation system flying over the skies of a foreign nation with a different flag on its tail, or finding out that an adversary is already working to counter your expensive, cutting-edge capabilities that haven't been released yet. And in the private sector there are few things more dispiriting to corporate health and morale and corporate wealth than seeing proprietary products show up on a foreign market a month before product-launch at a tenth of the price. That's China's primary motivation: to catch up to and then surpass Western industrial and defense capabilities and to eventually pass by the U.S. economy.

The Chinese are focused on those goals; whereas the recent cyber attack [on Sony Pictures] from North Korea, which by the way is the most serious cyber attack ever made against U.S. interests, with potentially hundreds-of-millions of dollars and counting in damages, was driven by an entirely different philosophy.

So, back to the weekend trip I took, which was two months ago today. We flew into Pyongyang, the capital city, on Friday evening, the seventh of November. And the first thing that struck me was just how dark the city and airport were, just completely dark. We damaged a tire on the plane while taxiing in the dark, because of the poor construction of the taxiways and runways at Sunan airport.

When I saw the city on Saturday, I was expecting to see drab clothes and lack of modern tools, people walking to get around, people sweeping and doing similar, mundane, labor-intensive jobs. And those expectations were met, but I was also struck by how impassive everyone was. They didn't show any emotion. They didn't stop to greet each other, didn't nod hello, and we didn't see anyone conversing or laughing. They were just going about their business, going wherever they were going. It was almost automaton like. It was eerie.

And the plight of the citizens of Pyongyang stood in solemn contrast to the dinner I had the previous night, Friday the seventh, an elaborate 12-course Korean meal. Having spent time in Korea, I consider myself somewhat a connoisseur of Korean food, and that was one of the best Korean meals I've ever had. Unfortunately, the company was not pleasurable.

My dinner host was General Kim, the four-star general in charge of the Reconnaissance General Bureau, the RGB, the organization later responsible for overseeing the attack against Sony. The RGB is an amalgam of special operations and intelligence resources. They do overseas collection, reconnaissance, and importantly, cyber operations. General Kim claimed to me that he was my North Korean counterpart. He was just a couple years younger than I, and we had to communicate through a translator, a North Korean

who spoke flawless English but with a British accent that was pretty strange. [laughter]

General Kim spent most of the meal berating me about American aggression and what terrible people we were. He said that North Korea was under siege by its closest neighbors, who were supported, aided, and abetted by the United States. He got louder and louder, and he kept leaning toward me, pointing his finger at my chest and saying that U.S. and South Korean exercises were a provocation to war. And not being a diplomat, my reaction was to lean back across the table, point my finger at his chest, [laughter] and respond that shelling South Korean islands wasn't the most diplomatic course of action they could have taken either. [laughter] This kind of connoted the entire evening's conversation. [laughter and applause]

But of course, my purpose was to secure the release of our two citizens. So at one point, my executive assistant suggested I take a head break to let things cool off, which I did. I guess I have to give the New York Times credit, "Gruff and blunt-speaking" aren't too far off. [laughter] I'm not sure I was "perfect for the North Koreans," though.

At the end of the evening, I presented General Kim with a letter from President Obama. The letter didn't say much, except to designate me as his envoy, and that releasing our two citizens would be viewed as a positive gesture.

Saturday, the next day, was nerve wracking. We weren't sure—I wasn't at least—whether we were going to get our two citizens back or not. So we stayed around the state guesthouse all morning. About 11:00, an emissary from the minister of state security showed up to announce that the DPRK government had demoted me. They no longer considered me the President's envoy, and accordingly, they couldn't guarantee my safety and security in the city of Pyongyang. He said the citizens of Pyongyang were aware that my purpose was to secure the release of our two "criminals."—Thanks. [laughter]

So we waited around and waited around. It's not like you can hail a cab and go ride somewhere. We were under their control. About 3:00 that afternoon, this same emissary from the minister of state security came back and said: You've got 20 minutes to hustle together your luggage and check out of this place. You're leaving.

We went in the vehicles to downtown Pyongyang, and we were ushered into a conference room there, and sat through an interesting "amnesty-granting ceremony," I guess I'd call it, in which the minister of state security read a proclamation from Kim Jong Un, the Supreme Leader. That was the first time I'd seen our two citizens, who were still in their prison garb. They were turned over to us. We got them a change of clothes, out to the vehicles, and back to the airport. I can't recall a time when an aircraft with "United States of America" emblazoned across it ever looked as good. [laughter]

The next day, really our second Saturday after we crossed the date line, we landed at McChord Air Force Base, near Seattle. I went up to the cockpit and watched the two family reunions, which were very gratifying and very emotional, and at that moment, it was all worth it to me.

Okay, I want to bring this story back to cyber. I think it's important to note that the general I had dinner with that first night, General Kim, is the director of the RGB. He's the guy who ultimately would have to okay the cyber attack against Sony, and he really is illustrative of the people we're dealing with in the cyber realm in North Korea.

All of that vitriol he spewed in my direction over dinner was real. They really do believe that they're constantly under siege from all directions. Painting us as an enemy that's about to invade their country any day now is one of the chief propaganda elements that's held North Korea together for the past 60 years. And they are deadly serious about affronts to the Supreme Leader, whom they consider to be a deity.

By the way, I watched The Interview over the weekend, and it's obvious to me that the North Koreans don't have a sense of humor. [laughter and applause]

The DPRK is a family-owned country. It's been that way ever since it was founded in the '40s. And there's no room for dissent, not when the favorite management technique of their leader is public executions. It's "super effective" as a management tool. [laughter]

Behind all of this, North Korea wants to be recognized as a world power. They see nuclear weapons as their insurance policy and ticket to survival, and the rest of their society, including their conventional military forces, suffers for it. But cyber is a powerful new realm for them, where they believe they can exert maximum influence at minimum cost, and this recent episode with Sony has shown that they can get recognition for their cyber capabilities. That's why we have to push back. If they get global recognition at a low cost with no consequence, they'll do it again, and keep doing it again until we push back. And of course others will follow suit.

So, here in the United States, the role of the Intelligence Community is to put all of those factors in context, to give our national leaders the intelligence they need, everything that figures into their calculus to make good decisions about how to respond, and we have to do that without oversimplifying the situation and while acknowledging the things we don't know.

Despite what some people think, the Intelligence Community doesn't have the eyes and ears of God. We're not omniscient. A closed society like North Korea is a really hard target for intelligence, and they're just one small piece of the cyber-threat puzzle, which includes actors that aren't nation-states. We see indications that some terrorist organizations are very interested in developing offensive cyber capabilities, and that cybercriminals are using a growing black market to sell cyber tools with little regard for whose hands they fall into.

Taken all together, cyber poses an incredibly complex set of threats, because criminals, and "hacktivist" collectives

like Anonymous, are all thrown in together with aggressors like North Korea and Iran, and with the Russians and Chinese, who could do real damage if they are so inclined. Each of those actors has different capabilities and different objectives when they engage in Cyberspace, and all them of operate on the same Internet.

It makes me long for the halcyon days of the Cold War, when the world essentially had two large, mutually-exclusive communications networks. One belonged to the United States, dominated by the United States and our Allies, and the other was dominated by the Soviets and theirs. So we could be reasonably sure that if we were listening to someone on the Soviet network, that person was not a U.S. citizen.

Today, the internet and telecommunications networks are all interconnected and global, and much of the technology the infrastructure relies on comes from the U.S. Our task, as an Intelligence Community, is to find the bad actors and to distinguish a terrorist sending directions on how to build a bomb or how to defeat TSA procedures, from someone sending their granddaughter a recipe for apple pie. So we're not just looking for a needle in a haystack. We're looking for thousands of needles scattered over acres and acres of haystacks.

It's our job to provide insight into the nature of cyber intrusions and give warnings where we can, and that job is extremely difficult in the absence of international norms and standards. We're, to borrow a legal phrase, developing a "body of case law," to define what constitutes a cyberwar, or act of cyber terrorism, or cyber vandalism, or cybercrime. And we're learning as we go, just as everyone else is.

And through it all, the IC holds civil liberties and privacy as a top priority. We're going to make mistakes—and some of those have been exposed—a small percentage of the time. We're going to accidentally intercept someone's grandma's apple pie recipe. But we've shown that when we do, as soon as we realize our mistake, we get rid of that information, and we report ourselves to the bodies that conduct oversight, in all three branches of the government. That's important to me, personally, because, by the way, I'm an American citizen, and I care about my civil liberties and privacy too.

Beyond that, when we can do so without compromising our tradecraft, we've been transparent with the public about our mistakes. So we've published about 5,000 pages of previously classified documents on our Tumblr website: "IC on the Record," many of which are pretty critical of our mistakes, including classified court documents that show the FISA court—the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court that oversees sensitive surveillance programs—is not a so-called "rubber stamp.

Two years ago, I didn't know what a "Tumblr" was. Two weeks ago, Tumblr featured our site, the IC's site, as one of a select few "Big in 2014" sites for their end of year review. We were right up there with "L'il Bub." [laughter] Another joke. [laughter] Sorry, I said I'll try to give you warning. [laughter] I'm here to tell you, sharing the stage with a famous cat—on the internet—that's how you know you've arrived. [laughter and applause] That, and traveling to North Korea.

So let me end with that point, and I think we have some time for some questions. Thanks.

WINNER: CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY, HEALTHCARE

"Health Is Everything"

By Tanya M. Barrientos for Risa Lavizzo-Mourey, President & CEO, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

//

Delivered at Urban Land Institute 2015 Fall Meeting, San Francisco, Calif., Oct. 6, 2015

Health is everything. How many times in your life have you heard someone express that idea? You'll ask a young couple "do want a girl or a boy?" And they'll say "it doesn't matter, as long as the baby's healthy!" Or at Thanksgiving, when you go around the table listing what you're grateful for, there's always that aunt who says "as long as I have my health."

Health is everything. We hear people say it so often that most of the time it just goes in one ear and out the other. But what if we started thinking about the concept of health a little differently? What if instead of simply hearing "health is everything," we started to focus on the fact that health is every–thing.

Most of us still define health as not being sick. But it's so much more than that. Health is every- thing. It's the bedrock of personal fulfillment. The anchor of community well-being. It's about where, and how, we do our work. How we socialize, what we teach our children. And it's about the way you plan and build our towns, and neighborhoods, and streets. When we open our eyes to all the things that really influence health and well-being, the list keeps getting longer and longer. Poverty. Violence. Economic opportunity. Clean air and water. Public transportation. What are you adding to the list while I'm talking? Stress? Diet? Exercise? Sleep? Spirituality? See what I mean? You're having what I call the health-is-everything light bulb moment.

Let me tell you when that light bulb moment first happened to me: I trained as a physician at Harvard and rotated through a hospital in West Roxbury, a few miles away. That is where I met a patient that I will forever remember as

"Patient Ruth." She appeared at the admitting station late on a cold winter night, homeless and helpless. Her feet were swollen. She wore a pair of flimsy house shoes. Raw leg ulcers made walking painful. Her medical chart was thick. She'd been to the hospital many times before. We did what we always did-gave her a few hours in a warm bed, some antibiotics, a decent meal. But the next morning she had to go because according to the "rules" our job was done.

So she limped out the door, straight back into the dark tunnel of problems she faced every day: No home. No job. Lousy food, and no family or friends to turn to for help. Our care ended at the front door of the hospital, and that is so short-sighted. What if instead of ushering her back into the cold, we could have asked what she needed to keep from having to come back? And then, what if we linked her to all the things outside the clinic that she needed to get better and stay healthier? That was my light bulb moment. And believe me, once that light turns on, you can't help but see that health is influenced by every aspect of how and where we live.

Do you know that your zip code may be as important as your genetic code in predicting how well, and how long you live? Take a look at this map of New Orleans. A person living in Lakewood—over there on the left—can expect to live 25 years longer than someone over there, in Iberville, near the French Quarter. Twenty five years! And what's even more eye-opening is that the stretch between these two communities is only six miles. That's just a few minutes by car. And still, the unemployment rate in Iberville is three times higher than Lakeview. The crime rate is 60 percent higher. And the high school graduation rate is 18 percent lower.

Now, this map was drawn a few years after Hurricane Katrina devastated New Orleans. And I'm happy to say that the folks there, who are working hard to bring the city back, are striving to address disparities like this openly and honestly. Still, I could show you maps of Chicago, Atlanta, Las Vegas, Seattle … and lots of other places where the contrast in life expectancy is as high as 15, or even 20 years. Think about your hometown. What would that map look like?

All across America there are neighborhoods where parents are afraid to let their kids got out to play, or walk to school. And when they do get to school, the playground is nothing but a chewed up piece of asphalt, littered with broken glass and trash. No monkey bars. No slides. No swings. In too many neighborhoods to count there are more liquor stores than grocery stores. And I am not exaggerating when I say, it's easier to buy a gun, than it is to buy fresh fruit.

The foundation I lead has a vision for a better way of living. We want to get everyone in America invested in building a Culture of Health—for ourselves and the people we love.

Now, whenever I mention that phrase, I can see people trying to work it out in their heads: A Culture of Health…What does she mean by that? Well, let's start thinking of the word "culture."

Last year, the Merriam-Webster Dictionary named "culture" its word of the year because people use it so broadly. It can mean art and music. It can mean history and heritage. But basically, it boils down to this: Culture is how we do things around here…How we do things within our families…Within our communities and workplaces…And how we do things as a nation.

When we talk about a Culture of Health, it means recognizing that health is an essential part of everything we do. Think of what a difference it would make if our communities were places that were intentionally designed to encourage health, instead of it being places where it's so damn hard to make a healthy choice.

What if everyone—no matter how much money they have–had the opportunity to stay safe, to be vital, and be active? And what if we not only provided our children with the promise of upward mobility, but with real pathways to achieve it?

I believe this is something our nation can achieve. But we've got a long way to go. Because, let's be honest, right now our health, and the state of our entire health care system, aren't exactly badges of pride. We spend nearly 3 trillion dollars on health care—more than any other developed nation on the planet. But we lose nearly 226 billion dollars in productivity every year because of personal and family health issues.

Heart disease, cancer, and stroke still account for more than 50 percent of all deaths in America each year—regardless of income or ethnicity. And about one-third of our kids are overweight or obese, giving them the very real chance of becoming the first generation to live sicker, and die younger than their parents' generation.

(slide) This is Jose Gomez Marquez from the famous Little Devices lab at MIT. Not too long ago, I heard him talk about innovation. He told a story about how he showed a picture of a blind person to a group of students and asked them: Can this person drive a car? And, of course, the students began to debate whether it was possible, or not.

Then, the professor showed the same picture to a different group of students and asked: How can this person drive a car? And—you guessed it—the students instantly started coming up with ways to make it work. I've thought about this a lot. And it's made me change the way I talk about building a Culture of Health. I've stopped asking if it's possible. And I've started talking about how we can do it. How can you and I do it? How can urban and rural communities do it? How can land developers, and architects, and families do it? How can we all work together to make getting healthier a national movement?

Well, one way is to start making the automatic things we do every day a little healthier. I'm sure you've heard that sitting is the new smoking—as if the "old" smoking wasn't bad enough! Studies show that sitting 8-10 hours a day is associated with diabetes, heart disease, all kinds of bad things. What you may not know, is that research has also found that if you walk for just two minutes after sitting for an hour, you can combat some of those bad

things. So the next time you're out doing errands—sitting in the car—why not park in one of those empty spaces on the other side of the parking lot, instead of fighting for that spot right in front of the door?

Or better yet, what if shopping areas were designed and developed so that beautiful promenades were more prominent than parking lots? And, at work: the next time you're sitting through yet another meeting, what if you asked everyone to stand up, and told them to stay standing? You're not going to believe how much faster that meeting's going to go!

Now, is walking a little more going to solve all of our health problems? Of course not. But it will get us one step closer to a Culture of Health. And if we all take Dr. Gomez-Marquez's advice and start asking how we as individuals, as investors, as developers, and planners—can build better health into everything that we do, we can and will make a difference.

It's time for this country to make a seismic shift—to raise our expectations as a nation. And recalibrate our individual behavior. Because personal responsibility plays a key role in improving health. No doubt about it. But we also need to remember that the choices people make depend on the choices that they have. So, let's make the healthy choice the easy choice. Let's make better health part of what it means to live in America.

Now, why do I think a cultural shift of this magnitude is possible? Because it's happened before. Back in 1970, the year Earth Day was established, the word "recycling" wasn't part of our common vocabulary, much less part of our lives. But people began asking why we were choking our land and our oceans with plastic, glass and paper that could be repurposed. And then they insisted on a change. And now, recycling is part of our culture. And one of the reasons that happened is that we made it easy. Put paper in the bin over here. And bottles in the one over there. In fact, it's become so much a part of our lives that how many of you have actually reached into the garbage to fish out a bottle that you've accidently tossed in there?

You're laughing because you know you've done that. I know I have.

And how many of you were fans the show Mad Men? Do you remember how you laughed when you saw Peggy and Joan being examined by a doctor with a cigarette in his mouth? And how all those guys didn't think twice about slamming back five or six bourbons at the office! It's laughable now because our culture is so different. We just don't do that anymore. So let's make changes that will allow the next generation to laugh at the notion of cities that focus more on cars, than on people. And let's make the thought of growing up in a neighborhood without green space a joke. The good news is, some communities are already starting to do this. And you are playing a big part in the movement. In the time I have left, I'd like to tell you about some folks—who are leading the way.

(slide) This is the Rev. Michael Minor of Hernando Mississippi. Not too long ago he had the crazy idea that he would ban fried chicken from church suppers because he was tired of conducting funerals for people dying from avoidable diseases. Well, if any of you have ever spent time down South, you can imagine how well this idea went over at first! But Pastor Minor was committed to leading his flock down a new path. And today, not only do his church suppers feature healthy pot-lucks, but there's also a walking track around the building, and a blood pressure monitor in the lobby. And what's more, the Rev. Minor has created a curriculum to help other churches start health and wellness ministries. And it has been adopted by the American Heart Association. We need to start acting as if health is at the top of our national agenda. We need to work across sectors, and cultivate communities that make healthy choices possible for everyone. And we need to stick to these commitments until we see success.

In Brownsville, Texas ordinary citizens teamed up with builders, civic organizations, universities, and government to transform their surroundings into a home-grown Culture of Health. This video will give you a glimpse at what they've done. And lastly, I want to tell about the East Lake neighborhood in Atlanta. I'm sure many of you are familiar with this amazing revitalization story. But today I want you to think of it as a story about how health is everything.

(slide) This is what the neighborhood looked like 20 years ago. It was a scary, violent, place. The crime rate was 18 times higher than the national average. And the people who lived there felt angry and abandoned. Just like any of us would if we lived there. But thanks to the vision and leadership of a developer named Tom Cousins East Lake looks like this today. Instead of tackling the crushing poverty, the failing schools, and the horrible blight in a piecemeal fashion, Tom helped establish the East Lake Foundation—which brought business leaders, residents, philanthropists, and city officials together with Purpose Built Communities—and they made the collaborative decision to tear down the slum and replace it with 1,400 units of mixed-income housing, half of which is market rate. They started a charter school. They built a world-class YMCA. And they even revived a professional golf course that everyone who lives in East Lake—no matter how much money they have—can use.

And what happened? Well, the employment rate skyrocketed—from 13 percent to 75 percent. The charter school has one of the best academic records in the state of Georgia. East Lake kids are going to college in record numbers—some of them on golf scholarships! And the crime rate has dropped by 90 percent. When you define health and well-being as more than the absence of sickness, these are all health issues, aren't they? And they are issues that you're impacting with the Urban Land Institute's focus on creating healthier, more sustainable communities.

I've got to tell you, I was so excited to be invited to speak here today. Because even though the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation is the largest philanthropy in America dedicated solely

to improving health, we don't make policy. We don't administer health care. And we don't build anything. The only power we have is to bring people with great ideas together with people who have the commitment and the drive to see those ideas through. People like you.

So this is what I'm going to ask of you today: Go back to your workplaces, your towns, your neighborhoods, and turn the light bulb on for others. Think about your work from the perspective of improving well-being and opportunity for all. Talk about health being everything to anyone and everyone you come across. Get your co-workers, your friends, and especially your kids to start demanding that health be seen as a priority where they live, learn, work and play, so no one in America will ever feel as if the opportunity for a healthier life is beyond their reach. Because I guarantee, once those light bulbs start shining from California to Maine change is going to happen, the way it is happening in Brownsville. The way it is happening at that Baptist church in Mississippi. And in that beautiful neighborhood of East Lake. Everyone one of us has the power to make a difference.

We are living in a moment of urgency. Our nation cannot continue doing more of the same. We have to give people the real opportunity to lead the best lives they can. And all we have to do is act. Health is everything. And when we start acting like we really believe that, I know we will raise the state of health in America to the level that this great nation deserve.

Have a great conference.

WINNER: **ENVIRONMEMT/ENERGY/SUSTAINABILITY**

"Leading the Water Resource Revolution"

By Lori Harrison for Ed McCormick, 2014-2015 President, Water Environment Federation // Delivered at the WEFTEC 2015 Opening General Session, McCormick Place, Chicago, Ill., Sept. 28, 2015

Good morning, everyone! On behalf of the Water Environment Federation and all of our dedicated volunteers, welcome to WEFTEC 2015, WEF's 88th Annual Conference. We're very excited that you have chosen to join us, and to be back in the Great Water City of Chicago! We truly appreciate the warm welcome and support that we continue to receive from our local partners and everyone involved with this year's event—what I consider the World Cup of the Water World!

Chicago is known globally for its vibrant culture, with great contributions to the culinary arts, visual arts, sports, theater and music—the birth of urban blues. It's also known for its close relationship to water, and its ongoing commitment to initiatives that reflect smart, sustainable water management. This alone makes it a fitting host for WEFTEC, and for me personally, the intersection of great music and over 80% of the U.S. fresh water supply in one place, holds a special meaning.

Water has long been my favorite beverage, and music, perhaps my favorite "language." Like music, water is a unifying force that cuts across all cultural boundaries.

We know that water is essential for every living organism on earth. As water professionals, seven billion fellow humans rely on us to clean the earth's water and safely return it to the environment. The importance of what we do as water professionals cannot be overstated. Nor should our commitment to working together be understated.

One world, one water, one event. Six simple words that say so much about what we do, and why we've gathered this week in Chicago. To engage with each other and benefit from the diversity, depth, and value for which WEF and WEFTEC are known and respected.

WEFTEC is where innovation in water happens! With more than 22,000 attendees, 1,000 exhibiting companies and a high quality technical program developed FOR water professionals BY water professionals. WEFTEC represents the very best that the world of water has to offer.

For more than eighty years, this has been the world's leading forum for water quality management. It's the place to innovate, exchange knowledge, and connect with peers and experts from across the continent, and around the world. WEF was the very first professional wastewater association and has developed a solid reputation that follows us around the globe. I'm proud to say that I'm often told that WEF still sets the "gold standard" for high quality water leadership.

Based on the positive feedback we continue to receive from our attendees and exhibitors, WEFTEC is the best forum for water professionals to stay on top of new management and technical developments, and the core skills that you need as practitioners. WEF leaders, volunteers and staff take a tremendous amount of pride in the trust that we have built over the years with you, our customers. This trust is built on the knowledge that when you come to WEFTEC, you will receive an educational experience of the highest caliber and relevance for addressing today's greatest challenges ... PAUSE…

Forty years ago, I was a first-year meteorology major at the Lowell Technological Institute, now known as the University of Massachusetts at Lowell. Back then, it was known as the "poor man's MIT." I privately assumed it was the "dumb man's MIT." My life changed when Congress slashed the NASA budget, only five years after we put a man on the moon.

Seventy-five percent of graduating meteorologists at that time went to work for NASA, studying the atmospheres of other planets. It became clear that a PhD would be necessary for even the possibility of finding a job as a meteorologist. At age nineteen, that did not excite me.

The Clean Water Act was only two years old, and as a child of the turbulent sixties, I thought it could be a way to make a difference in the world. It was an easy decision to make the switch to environmental engineering.

As it turns out, that budget cut was one of the best things that ever happened to me. I have had the great fortune to work for two world-class organizations—Brown & Caldwell Engineers, and the East Bay Municipal Utility District. My career in water, including the honor of serving as WEF president, has given me the opportunity to fulfill my goal of making a meaningful and positive contribution.

As water professionals, we are all environmental warriors! The work that we do is essential, and we should all be extremely proud. Now, we are pioneers on the leading edge of a major sea change in the water sector. We are experiencing a renaissance in our role as water stewards, as we work together to create Water Resource Recovery facilities.

Collectively, we are transforming our world of treatment into one of recovering valuable resources. We are producing useful products for society: clean renewable energy…recycled water…natural fertilizer…nutrients… even renewable transportation fuel. Treatment plants are becoming manufacturing facilities.

They are green factories that reduce costs and increase revenue, while becoming more sustainable, positive influencers of our environment. Around the world, we are rapidly becoming "Utilities of the Future."

WEF has helped lead this sea change, with our Utility of the Future partners, WERF and NACWA. We have changed the term "wastewater treatment facilities" to "water resource recovery facilities" in all WEF publications. We have released the Energy Roadmap and the Nutrient Roadmap. And, we have provided a platform for water sector innovation through the WEF/WERF Partnership—the Leaders Innovation Forum for Technology.

Historically, WEF has focused primarily on wastewater and recycled water. But as with any organization that's committed to meeting the needs of its membership, we are evolving with the times and the issues. We are adopting a more holistic, integrated view of the water cycle that includes all water—drinking, wastewater, recycled and stormwater, as we lead this Water Resource Recovery Revolution.

To reflect this change, I worked closely over the past year with my fellow Board members and staff to amend WEF's vision, mission, critical objectives and measurable strategic goals. We have also instituted a new set of core values that will lead us into the future. These values center around "Service" because providing exceptional service to you, and to all of our 35,000 members, is WEF's highest priority.

This paradigm shift to water resource recovery is tangible, exciting and real. I've seen it first-hand in my travels as WEF president over the past year. Clean natural gas from biogas and heat recovery from sewers in Japan. The most advanced water resource recovery facility in the world in Strass, Austria. Drinking highly treated wastewater in Singapore. Our host city of Chicago will soon feature the largest phosphorous resource recovery facility on earth. These are amazing developments that hold great promise for the future!

We are now midway through the second decade of the twenty-first century and there is no denying that we are facing a crisis that may be the greatest environmental challenge of our generation and those to come—the growing impact of changes to the earth's climate.

Weather events are becoming more extreme, with one hundred year storms and typhoons occurring every few years. At the other extreme, my state, California, is suffering through our most severe drought in over 1200 years.

As environmental professionals, I'm confident that we will rise to this challenge, and we will become an important part of the climate solution—recycling every gallon, producing renewables, and significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions and our carbon and methane footprints.

We will develop adaptive, resilient infrastructure as sea levels rise. We will be the leaders who look beyond the borders of our profession, our communities, and our countries to recognize that these issues impact everyone. The efforts of a few will grow into a movement of many that brings about real solutions, real results, and real change.

Sometimes we need a revolution to achieve the change we need. I believe that's where we are today.

Six months ago, the CO2 in the earth's atmosphere reached four hundred parts per million. We don't yet know what this will mean but ice cores tell us that it has been more than twenty million years since it was at a level that high. How much of it is connected to human activity? We don't know for sure but we do know that human beings evolved just three million years ago. In the nineteenth century, the Industrial Revolution marked a major turning point in earth's ecology and forever altered humans' relationship with our environment. The impacts, both good and bad, are still being fully realized today.

Although the extent of human influence is still being debated, scientists now believe that we are currently in the midst of the earth's sixth mass extinction of species. The fifth occurred sixty-six million years ago and eliminated the non-avian dinosaurs.

Even if we stop all greenhouse gas emissions today, the earth's sea level will continue to significantly rise for the next several hundred years as a result of emissions from the past 150 years.

It's a dire prediction yet everyone in this room has the ability to do something about it. Growing up in the 1960's taught me that improvement comes through change—and sometimes it takes revolutionary change to turn the tide.

I grew up seven miles from Lex-

ington Green in Massachusetts, where the American Revolution began. I was taught in school to be proud to have been part of a revolutionary culture, to question authority, to challenge the status quo to achieve something that benefits our world.

I AM a revolutionary. I would argue that every one of you is a revolutionary, too. No matter what part of the world we're from, we all collectively fight for clean water every day and stand united as the first line of defense for our communities.

Protecting water is the heart of our profession…it's what unites, uplifts and inspires us. That heartbeat, driven by the passion for what we do, is the primal call that will lead us in a water resource revolution!

WINNER: **LEADERSHIP & MANAGEMENT**

"The Risky Business of Corporate Culture"

By Bill Bryant for Myron Gray,
President, U.S. Operations, UPS

//

Delivered at the Seattle Rotary Club,
Seattle, Wash., Sept. 2, 2015

One hundred and eight years ago, almost to the day, a few young men gathered in a basement storefront at Second and Main in downtown Seattle, about 20 blocks south of here.

Inside the small office were two telephone lines—one for each of Seattle's telephone companies. It was August 28, 1907, the first day of business for the American Messenger Company, the company that would later become United Parcel Service.

In the middle of the commotion, was a 19-year-old named Jim Casey and his partner, 18-year-old Claude Ryan. Along with the other young men, they were about to change the course of commerce.

They also were beginning a culture that has endured and strengthened across two centuries. It's a culture that is one of our greatest strengths and now one of our most significant challenges.

Our culture has cemented what we value and how we work. It is the beating heart of who and what we are. But it's also a challenge.

It's a challenge because culture can become so ingrained that—in a different era with far different forces at work—it can become a barrier to innovation and change.

Today, I want to share some thoughts on how we leverage the best of that culture without allowing it to stand in the way of our future. To do that, I'll take you back to those early days in Seattle.

Our early business model was pretty simple: At a time when most people didn't have a telephone, we delivered messages. Here's how it worked: Let's say one of you wanted to get a message to me, and I lived across town. If you didn't have a telephone at your house, you would likely find a public telephone and call the American Messenger Company.

Then one of the clean-cut young men in the office would jump onto a streetcar or a bicycle and deliver the message. Quaint, wasn't it?

Last Friday, on what we call Founders' Day, in Atlanta and at UPS locations around the world, we celebrated the foresight and dedication of those pioneers.

The company they started—which was renamed United Parcel Service in 1919—last year earned more than $58 billion in revenue and ranked 168th on Fortune's list of the world's largest companies.

Every day, approximately 2 percent of the world's GDP and 6 percent of U.S. GDP flows through the UPS network. And it all started right here. In a part of Seattle's commercial district appropriately known as Pioneer Square.

We employ more than 5,000 women and men in Seattle out of a worldwide workforce of some 435,000. Our business is good here, and for that we thank your robust economy and our loyal customers.

In fact, based on a balanced scorecard, Seattle is UPS's No. 1 district in the U.S. So the folks delivering your packages and syncing up your supply chains are the best in the business.

Seattle is a unique city. I don't know of a city that combines immense physical beauty with such an eclectic mix of music, food and business. And let's not forget, you've got the Seahawks.

We like to think that UPS is a unique company. We have our own way of doing things. Deliberately. Precisely. Efficiently. We have strong opinions about the way a company should be run. Reliably. Profitably. And with integrity.

We also think brown is beautiful.

If you want a sense of the role that our past and our culture play at UPS, consider that our meetings often start with a reading from our Policy Book. It contains the fundamental values and principles that have shaped our company for more than a century.

It's a distinctive culture and one that's undoubtedly helped make us successful. But, if we're not careful, that culture and our love of history could also limit our future. And we're not the only ones who face that threat. Maybe you do, too.

So today I'd like to talk to you about the value of a strong culture, as well as its inherent risks. I'll finish up with a few words on how leaders can help their companies avoid those risks.

Let's start with the research. Last month Fortune magazine released a study that said business decision makers today place greater significance on a business partner's culture than ever before.

60 percent of the global executives surveyed said that when choosing a busi-

ness partner, it's more important to know what a company stands for than whether it's innovative or dominates its market.

68 percent said that it's even worth making short-term financial sacrifices to cultivate long-term relationships.

80 percent agreed that a successful company's biggest idea is often the one on which it was built.

Culture gets everyone rowing in the same direction, toward the same goals. It builds esprit de corps around a set of shared values. It makes the whole stronger than the sum of its parts.

That's all very good. However, let me give you an example of the risks.

For years and years our drivers mapped their daily routes with push pins and clipboards. They loved their clipboards. They were part of our history and culture.

About 10 years ago, one of our engineers—his name is Jack Levis—started work on a project to make those clipboards obsolete.

Jack's goal was to use operational technology to identify the most efficient routes a driver could take while making their daily stops. Some considered his quest blasphemy. After all, for nearly a century we had done pretty well with our push pins and clipboards.

The project eventually consumed eight years of Jack's life. The first seven of those yielded little tangible progress. People were telling him that he was putting an otherwise fabulous career in jeopardy.

The easy thing would have been for us to stay the course with our push pins and clipboard approach and for Jack to go back to his day job.

But he didn't. And, finally, he and his team found the algorithm—and the solution—they were looking for.

The system they came up with—which we call ORION—considers all of the potential routes a driver might take to make an average of 120 stops per day. That's the number on the screen. I'll save you the eye strain. That's 199 digits.

ORION has saved our company 10 million gallons of fuel … $300 million dollars … and reduced 100,000 tons of carbon emissions. That's like taking 21,000 passenger cars off the road.

It's a good thing a stubborn engineer didn't allow culture and history to block a more efficient path to the future.

Today, our company delivers more than 4.6 billion packages a year—about 18 million a day—in more than 220 countries and territories. It's an achievement that's only possible because our employees rally each day behind the principles Jim Casey and the founders promoted—respect, honesty, hard work, humility and a commitment to the communities we serve.

But it's like fingernails on a blackboard when I hear an employee say, "That's not how we've always done it." Or ask, "What would Jim do?"

Jim Casey built a company on timeless values, and there's no doubt his presence is still felt at UPS. But I want to say, "Folks, Jim isn't here. We're on our own."

But I don't. Instead, I remind them that Jim was smart enough not to become too sentimental nor too attached to the old ways of doing things. He promoted the concept of "constructive dissatisfaction," knowing that the only way to survive in business is by never getting too comfortable.

Others wish they had heeded the same lesson. Plenty of companies were so intent on staying on the path of least resistance that they didn't see the threat coming up behind them.

Film didn't see digital—and the company that saw it first discounted its disruptive power. Newspaper classifieds didn't see Craigslist. Video stores didn't see Netflix. Travel agents didn't see Expedia. And the process continues.

Jack Welch, GE's longtime CEO, could have warned them all. "If the rate of change on the outside exceeds the rate of change on the inside," Welch said, "the end is near."

Certainly the technology-led and consumer-empowered ambush is far from over. Look what streaming is doing to networks and cable. Look what Uber is doing to cabs and limos. Look what Airbnb is doing to hotels.

Let's throw in shopping malls, maybe financial advisors, libraries and the family farm. When technology offers a better way, the better way wins.

Too many businesses resemble Army ants. Army ants are blind—to survive they follow each other over a pheromone trail. Sometimes an ant will lose the trail's scent and wander away from the group. The ants behind follow. Eventually they end up going in circles, marching without stopping, even to their own death.

But on occasion, an ant manages to break away from the death march, sometimes by accident. When it steps off course, the renegade creates a new path for the ants to follow. Its radical departure ends up saving the entire group.

Winners become losers because it's easier to keep doing the things that made them winners. Easier than challenging whether what built success will be enough to sustain it. Fortunately, UPS never followed a pheromone trail.

Clearly, Jim Casey saw the need for non-linear shifts in our business. On multiple occasions he had the vision and the fortitude to veer away from the established model.

The first time was when he saw that the telephone was going to eventually put his and other messenger companies out of business. He did it again when automobiles with plenty of room for packages and groceries threatened the package delivery service.

In more recent times, starting about 20 years ago, data and operational technology fueled a new era of expansion. We've since built the largest and most sophisticated technology infrastructure in the transportation industry.

Our mainframes operate around the clock, processing 27 million instructions every second and tracking 18 million packages every day. They collect and distribute information from drivers' handheld computers. Then they use that information to coordinate the operations of our global fleet of vehicles, as well as an entire airline.

We're using all that information to bring customers deeper into our network and help solve their problems in new and innovative ways.

So, the question becomes: "How do you manage for growth while respecting your past?" My answer, is that the job falls to leaders. And it's a job in three critical parts.

First, leaders must be confident enough to hire people smarter than they are and ones who don't fit the traditional mold.

I learned that lesson early on. I was a senior manager of UPS's Rocky Mountain District, which wasn't very profitable when I got there. I decided we needed a real sales pro—someone with a long sales resume. My boss sent me a candidate who had none of that. He said: "Just talk to him."

So I meet this young guy at the airport, and the first thing he wants to do is pick up his luggage. I said: "Let's talk first." I'm thinking that once I describe how tough the job is, he'll want to get back on a plane to go home.

I talked about all the problems we had, and the special skills it would take to solve them.

Finally he looked at me, and said: "I know what you're doing. You're painting the worst picture you can paint because you don't think I'm the right guy for this job. This is my job. I want to help you do what you want to do, and I'm not getting on that plane."

So I said, "OK, let's get your bag."

It's probably the best hire I ever made. And a great lesson came along with it. Get outside your comfort zone. There's a whole new world out there.

That young man totally changed our ability to pursue customers outside our areas of expertise. Would we have made that same breakthrough if I had hired someone who did things the way we had always done them?

I think about that every time I talk to somebody who—in my opinion—is not quite right for the job.

The second thing leaders must do is recognize the power of the individual. Especially those who don't look, act and think exactly like they do.

For example, we all know the book on Millennials. Thin-skinned, shielded from failure by their parents, entitled, picky, inflated sense of importance. I see some of that. But what I see more is confidence and teamwork.

I see people motivated not by office size and title, but by the meaning they find in their work. People don't see themselves as human resources. They see themselves as human beings. And they want tangible and consistent proof that we see them that way, too. Let me give you an example.

My first assignment as district manager was in Houston. I'd been there about a year and a half when UPS drivers went on a nationwide strike.

The next day, I rolled up my sleeves and walked onto the picket line. "Why are you out here?" I asked. "Have I given you respect? Have I made sure you got the pay you were due? Have I given you personal time when you needed it?"

They nodded and mumbled a yes. So I asked them again: "Why are you out here?" When they couldn't tell me, I said, "Let's get back to work." And they followed me back inside. Giving them respect got me respect.

Finally, leaders who want to respect culture while managing for the future must be inquisitive enough to ask the right questions. The most important is: "Is there a better way?"

And here's where we run into that big, honkin Catch-22 of a strong culture. Why look for a better way when our old way has done so well by us?

The answer is simple: If you're not curious about what might be … and if you're not—as Jim Casey would say, "constructively dissatisfied"—you're going to leave potential on the table every day.

Great companies seem to have compelling backstories that foretold a distinctive culture. You're blessed with several here in Seattle.

In Boeing's Museum of Flight, you can see the famous mail bag that William Boeing and Eddie Hubbard carried in 1919 on the first international U.S. Air Mail flight.

Two Harvard students—a couple local guys who did pretty well for themselves—convinced a computer manufacturer that their software will run its new computer—even though they had yet to write the software.

The world's largest online retailer started selling books out of its founder's garage.

Of course, I'm a little partial to our story—the one about those young men on bicycles.

If you ask executives of these companies today why they've been successful, they'll probably start with those stories. Historical touchstones for generations of employees, those stories have become emotional and romantic backdrops to distinctive cultures.

But if we're not careful, we can let stories of our glorious past get in the way of our promising future.

As leaders, we have a responsibility to understand a changing world and the consumers and businesses we serve. We have a mandate not only to manage the present, but also to imagine the future.

Those of us in leadership positions—especially those of us who have been around for a while—must ask ourselves important questions: "Are we standing in the way of truly new ways of thinking and doing?" "Are we obstructing a view of the future?"

Of course, many argue that there's no substitute for wisdom gained through experience. And I agree.

This is my 37th year at UPS. I like to think that I've gotten smarter with age, even if my hairline hasn't kept up. But I also know that culture and dominant logic cut both ways. They can provide the discipline that companies need to perform consistently over the long haul. They also can act as blinders to fresh, new perspectives.

Leaders need to make sure that neither they nor an allegiance to company culture distorts a clean line of sight to imagination and opportunity.

If Jim Casey were to visit the modern-day version of the company he started, I think he would see clear signs of the culture he helped establish. But his amazement at most everything else would underline the common trait of any great business today—a willingness to change.

Every business needs a great story to tell. Every business also needs new stories, ones that tie the narrative of the past to the vision of the future.

It's leaders who strike the balance.

I want to thank the Rotary Club for the opportunity to be with you today. It's been a pleasure.

WINNER: **PUBLIC POLICY**

"Technology, Security, Freedom"

By Charles Crawford for Sir John Sawers, Former Chief of MI6; Chairman, Macro Advisory Partners

//

Delivered to Alumni of the University of Nottingham, at the Royal Institute of British Architects, London, England, Nov. 25, 2015

Back in the 1960s US computer genius Gordon Moore made an astute prediction about exponential growth in computer power. It's now called Moore's Law.

Every two years or so you can expect double the computer power for your money.

That relationship has been borne out over nearly 50 years.

In 1975 the Cray-1 was the world's mightiest supercomputer. It had 8 Megabytes: £10 million in today's money. My Apple iPhone has 128 Gigabytes of memory, and cost £600. 15,000 times the power, at a fifteen thousandth of the cost.

Technology gets faster and better and cheaper and cheaper. Cars and roads and factories and homes get safer. Driverless cars.

New medical techniques. Need a new spare part? Do some Googling, then use your 3D printer to make one.

Data analytics is one of the new sciences. Making connections, finding solutions to problems that were previously unknowable.

The volume of data is growing at an exponential rate.

You turn on your mobile phone. Post a Tweet. Go shopping. Drive past a CCTV camera. Use your Oyster card. Watch a YouTube cat video.

Everything you do with a digital angle—everything anyone does, anywhere in the world—makes those data oceans bigger, richer, deeper.

Charles Dickens' opening of *A Tale of Two Cities* is as great as it gets.

It was the best of times
It was the worst of times
The age of wisdom
The age of foolishness
The epoch of belief
The epoch of incredulity

Today, 160 years later, Dickens' words sum up our relationship to technology.

The best of times? Or the worst of times?

The age of wisdom? Or foolishness? Belief? Incredulity?

All of them at once?

Thus my three themes tonight. Technology. Security. Freedom.

Can democratic societies have the best of times without the worst of times?

We're going to get more technology. Lots more technology! Are we going to get more freedom and less security? Or more security, but less freedom?

As democracies grapple with these issues, do terrorists and fanatics feel that they have more freedom? Will autocracies become stronger, and democracies weaker? Do the enemies of democracy feel more secure?

Dickens' two cities were London and Paris.

Just twelve days ago Paris was hit by a new horrible terrorist attack.

People from across Paris, across France, across the globe, murdered and maimed at random. Gunned down by killers whose twisted ideology sees a cheerful tolerant culture as the enemy.

Can we stop what happened in Paris happening here in London?

The honest, unsettling answer:

Yes … Most of the time.

As MI6 Chief, my top priority was identifying plans hatched abroad to launch terror attacks against the UK.

We had significant successes: working with intelligence partners in Britain, America and the Middle East, we stopped terrifying attacks.

You don't see these attacks. Because they don't happen. We don't talk about them. Why give our enemies clues to how we are stopping them?

When I joined MI6, I was trained to spot people tracking me. Telephone tapping. Intercepting radio communication. Following you by car or on foot. No school like the old school!

Today those labour-intensive techniques are supported by high-end software. Face-recognition. Footstep-recognition.

Old and new intelligence tradecraft—they all have their place. But they work when you know who poses a threat. First you have to find these people.

You dive deep into those data oceans. You look for patterns. Snippets of digital information that suggests activity worth a closer look.

Then you have to try to work out who among several thousand possible extremist sympathisers looks set to launch a terror attack next week. You also want to find disaffected people inside terrorist organisations who might switch sides.

Terrorists are using technology to change their methods and targets. We have to change the way we defend ourselves. You follow terrorists and potential terrorists where they are.

If a terror suspect enters a pub, it's reasonable if not vital that the police and MI5 have the legal power to enter the pub and monitor him there.

These days terrorists are scheming deep in cyberspace.

If the police believe that an active terrorist suspect is operating online, it's reasonable if not vital that the police and security services have the legal powers to track him online and identify who he is communicating with.

The point is this.

People who want to do you harm benefit from Moore's Law just as much as those who want to keep you safe.

As citizens, we want maximum privacy and maximum security. Unbreakable encryption is at the centre of the argument.

Intelligence agencies focus on security and worry that terrorists will be able to

evade detection. Technology companies focus on privacy and the need to ensure that for their customers.

They each accuse the other of ignoring the vital public interest they are protecting.

The reality is they both have a point.

We all want powerful world class encryption to keep our data secure. Encryption is a vital tool in defending ourselves against cyber crime.

But we have to face the fact that terrorists and extremists also benefit from world-class encryption, keeping their identities and communications secure too.

There's nothing new here in principle. Every modern technological advance—guns, cars, telephones—has quickly been used by societies' enemies.

Intelligence agencies know that unbreakable encryption can't be disinvented.

So we find ourselves trying to do something subtle and sensitive and incredibly difficult: enjoying the huge benefits that powerful encryption gives us, while working to stop our enemies using this same technology against us.

The big technology companies are transforming our lives.

We trust these hugely influential private companies in part because they are private.

The tech companies have a vital role—and a unique responsibility—to play their part in building the security that keeps us all free and safe.

I think the gap that opened up post-Snowden is narrowing again.

The next step is for all parties to find a collaborative way forward to benefit from the new technology while doing what we sensibly can to stop terrorists and others who would do us harm.

That's the sort of cooperation between the public and private sectors that's needed in free societies where security underpins our privacy, our private enterprise and our liberal democracy.

The appalling attacks in Paris show us exactly what is at stake.

All that sounds fine in general terms

But how to set clear limits on how the state and its security agencies acquire data and intercept communications?

Say you don't trust government and intelligence agencies. But you also don't want to live in fear of further Paris-style attacks.

You grudgingly accept that the agencies need to look at Internet data patterns to try to find and track networks like the Paris killers.

You sit down to devise tough laws. You come up with something like this.

• Privacy comes first! Exceptions allowed only when a minister decides that an intrusion is necessary and proportionate

• Government computers can search the world's data-oceans looking for suspicious patterns, but specific high-level authorisation is needed to access and track actual individuals

• Tight vetting: only honest, trustworthy people do this work

• Technical alarm bells if operators run improper data-searches

• We share intelligence with other governments, but with extreme caution if those governments have a bad human rights record

• All this within wider oversight by MPs and independent judges, and frequent spot-checks

Checks and balances, counter-checks and counter-balances, at every level.

The whole system is run by honourable, hard-working, careful people—people in fact just like you—doing their best.

Guess what? That's more or less what we have now.

There's never a good time for these debates. New laws passed in a rush after a major terror attack amid white-hot public anger won't strike a wise, principled balance. The key thing is to find the time to think.

This time David Anderson QC, the Independent Reviewer of Terrorism Legislation, has done just that, producing a magisterial report. The new Investigative Powers Bill before parliament is based squarely on his recommendations. It's designed to strike a wise, principled balance, ensuring our privacy, and protecting our security.

When you put all the powers of the agencies into one codified legal framework, the overall package might look ominous, if not alarming.

Do our agencies really need to be able to do all this?

Some people say that all this state surveillance did not stop the Paris attacks, so what good does it do?

There's a very good answer to that one.

No goalkeeper has a 100% record. Even the finest goalkeeper who makes save after save is beaten by a top-class shot or a freakish deflection. That does not make him or her a bad goalkeeper. Or make the very idea of goalkeeping redundant.

I don't want to downplay reasonable concerns.

But let me put this as bluntly as I can.

Technologies that empower us, empower our enemies.

You link to anyone in the world. Anyone in the world links to you.

The good news is that we can track down people like Jihadi John and ensure he can no longer brutalise and murder his captives.

The bad news? You and your family are only a couple of clicks away from people who print 3D guns, or make synthetic drugs. Or from ISIS and Al Qaeda and paedophiles, all pumping out disgusting videos and propaganda.

An acute policy dilemma. Is it better to shut down this ghastly material, even if you drive it on to new websites and deeper into the Dark Web? Or should we accept that this poison is in society's bloodstream and quietly watch what's happening and who might be infected?

Public servants in the intelligence and security services face this dilemma every day.

Your choice as free citizens here tonight is unambiguous and unrelenting.

You can try to avoid reality. Reality will not try to avoid you.

You can trust the skill and restraint of the people working day and night to protect you.

Or you can pray that the people working day and night to destroy our societies don't hit your town or your family.

Today's security means working with technology to guarantee huge areas of freedom for all of us, by making difficult compromises on the margins.

That's not an attack on privacy.

It's the only way to safeguard privacy while acting against the enemies of our free society who scheme to bring it down.

What about how technology is changing foreign policy?

A Tale of Two Massacres

Syria, February 1982

The Syrian army under the first President Assad attacked Hama, Syria's fourth largest city, to put down a local Islamist uprising.

They killed about 20,000 fellow Syrians, torturing many more.

Three times the death toll of Srebrenica. Seven times 9/11.

These horrendous events went largely unknown to the rest of the world. Even as news seeped out, global reaction stayed muted. There was little public pressure. It suited most governments to look away.

Compare that crime against humanity with the shooting down of Malaysia Airlines flight MH17, blown from the sky over Ukraine in July last year.

Swarms of amateurs and experts alike around the world gathered on the Internet.

They drew on live satellite imagery and other open-source Internet sites. They narrowed down with amazing accuracy the likely launch-point of the missile, the type of missile used, and the likely people responsible. They punched big fast holes in the official story coming from Moscow, or appearing on the Internet.

In this case the finger of guilt pointed straight at Moscow-backed separatists.

James Gibney at Bloomberg calls this a "citizen-driven open-source intelligence revolution". Citizens have formidable network power to scrutinise and check what is going on across the planet.

Two months ago, bombs fell on a Médecins sans Frontières hospital in Afghanistan. Crowd-sourced indignation and investigation forced rapid American acceptance of responsibility.

It's harder and harder to keep things secret or concealed or even delayed, as the bringing down of the Russian plane in Sinai has shown.

The immediacy and intensity of today's technological transparency gives our political leaders painful problems.

First problem. Time

Harold MacMillan was asked about the hardest challenge of government: "Events, dear boy, events".

These days, events and sensations and disasters come thick and fast. The 24/7 media cycle and incessant Internet arguments put leaders under huge pressure.

Politicians feel compelled to react quickly, often through actions offering immediate appeal that look likely to shut up the noisiest critics.

When the World demands an instant response it's harder to show real leadership. Taking people along a path that is tough and slow and uncomfortable and unpopular to achieve a greater, wiser goal.

Back to Syria

President Assad the son, as brutal as his father. In 2011, when the Syrian people demonstrate against his rule, he turns the army onto them.

The West is torn: "How many more crises in the Islamic World are going to demand our attention?" "Let the Syrians sort this out themselves!"

In 2013 Assad uses chemical weapons against his own people. A breach of international conventions set up after the horrors of World War One.

This war crime demands a swift, strong response: it's vital to hold the line against such horrendous illegal weapons.

Our government takes a clear position that military action is required, but then seeks approval from Parliament. Reflecting public unease about yet another Middle East intervention, Parliament says no to military action. President Obama now has doubts whether he can go ahead without Congress's support.

This left the UK and our Western allies in a hopeless position. 'Demanding' the departure of Assad without tackling his clear breach of international law.

What's happened since then?

Syria's raging civil war has created space for the rise of ISIS, who now pose the worst terrorist threat in living memory. Appalling refugee crises in Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey. Refugees coming to Europe in unmanageable numbers, undermining European solidarity. Now Russia is involved, unconstrained by democratic pressures or concern for civilian casualties, using air power and missiles to prop up the dismal Assad regime.

None of this is easy. It's agonisingly hard.

I was part of the Whitehall system trying to find a coherent way forward.

We all share some responsibility for the grim outcomes we now see.

When time-lines are so short and technology gives a deafening voice to all sorts of critics, well intentioned and ill-intentioned alike, thinking strategically becomes next to impossible in a modern democracy.

Studied caution is one thing. Paralysis another.

In the wake of the Paris attacks, we now have another chance to develop a strategy to put an end to the misery of the Syrian people, and remove ISIS from its strongholds.

It will require both military and political action.

A new diplomatic process for Syria has started. It deserves our every effort.

The outcome of that process will be shaped by the relative strength of the forces on the ground. If we want moderates to have a voice, we need to support them militarily.

Second problem. Trust

Technology makes us all more accountable. MPs expenses. Bankers and financial risk. The media and phone tapping.

All healthy, proper exposure of abuse.

But this spills over into unbridled cynicism.

Anything confidential or secret must be a cover-up! If the establishment was not forthcoming on that one, why trust it on anything else?

Patient diplomacy relies on confidentiality.

For years the Iran nuclear talks were stuck.

Both the US and Iran faced forces at home rejecting compromise. It all got too open.

The Obama Administration made a sustained new effort with Iran through

secret meetings in Oman, far from the public eye.

It led to a breakthrough and then an agreement. Not a perfect one. But much better than no agreement.

If you want more jaw-jaw and less war-war, sometimes transparency has to sit back and give diplomacy a chance.

Suspending cynicism. Trusting the government to do an honest job properly.

Wait. What did that former Chief of MI6 just say? Trust the government! Was he having a laugh?

That sort of cynical response gains traction across the Internet, playing into every nutty conspiracy theory.

When technology allows non-stop sneering and jeering against people in public life, everything gets more stupid.

That makes it ever harder to attract good honest people into politics and public service.

Final problem. Disruptive change

Every leader everywhere, good or bad, wants to reap the benefit of new technology and big data.

What if today's turbulent technology is just too disruptive for free societies?

What if democratic societies start to look weak, uncertain?

What if autocratic systems or oppressive systems somehow avoid the worst disruptions?

Autocratic systems can think strategically and act decisively, because they don't worry about transparency. Because they close down debate and argument, and become skilled in manipulating public opinion.

What if George Orwell's 1984 becomes reality?

No country is more strategic than China. I've met some of China's leaders. They think in decades, even centuries. They find it curious that we appear not to do so!

As we are seeing in Ukraine and now Syria, President Putin is projecting power and his ideas of global order to create new realities.

What if autocratic states start to look stronger, more effective, more orderly than democracies?

For all their fumbling and scandal and confusion, democratic societies have one huge advantage as technological change races ahead.

They are flexible. Open. They embrace new ideas and opportunities.

It's our greatest strength.

But we can't take success for granted.

We are at a moment in history like the industrial revolution. Who gets first mover advantage, as Britain did in the 18th and 19th centuries?

Societies that work out how to master and use big data sets will enjoy a massive head start, whether they are democratic or otherwise.

They'll lead the way in artificial intelligence and robotics.

They'll reap exponentially growing benefits in health and education, simply by knowing more.

They'll learn faster how to adjust to new skills and ways of doing things.

Nations that veer away from new technology will fall behind.

Radical new inequalities in wealth and power and capability will emerge fast.

A Bank of America report:

The pace of disruptive technological innovation has gone from linear to parabolic … a whirlwind of creative disruption.

Robots and artificial intelligence will transform the world beyond recognition, as soon as 2025.

As soon as 2025? That's only 500 weeks away!

Pioneers of science like Stephen Hawking urge us to consider now the ethical questions posed by self-learning computers displacing people, not to wait until these questions are right upon us.

They're right. And it's not just the moral questions. We need to think through the implications for our politics too.

To think hard about how technology can support freedoms won over centuries, and not erode them.

We don't want the next generation to face a ghastly choice between keeping our freedoms with much less security, or retaining our security at a cost to our freedom.

We must think ahead now, so we protect the order that is essential for our free societies.

This takes us back to the beginning of my presentation.

Exponential growth in computer power is changing everything. The accelerating ability of computers to learn from all those oceans of data is set to re-model everything.

Our health. Our education. Our travel, our streets, our sense of space. How we're born. How we die. Our government. Our safety. Our sense of responsibility.

Back in 1973 I went to Nottingham to study physics.

I soon swerved to avoid computer science. I took philosophy modules instead. That took me into my career in foreign affairs and security.

I drew on my nuclear physics when negotiating with the Iranians.

Foreign policy and intelligence work have echoes of physics. Balance of forces. Momentum. Pressure. Optics. Parallel worlds. Things working on one scale, but not another.

The issues raised by the new technologies for our long-cherished freedom and security are really hard.

None of us knows where all this is heading. But in a free society we have dynamism and flexibility.

Let's do what we're good at. Let's shape our own destiny intelligently.

I started with Charles Dickens. I finish with another great writer. A Nottingham alumnus, D H Lawrence:

If only we could have two lives. The first in which to make one's mistakes, which seem as if they have to be made. And the second in which to profit by them.

With clever DNA engineering from Nottingham's labs, perhaps we'll soon have that luxury?

WINNER: COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS

"I Didn't Follow a Dream"

By Aaron Hoover for Kent Fuchs,
President, University of Florida

//

Delivered at the Stephen C. O'Connell Center,
University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., Aug. 7, 2015

Graduates, we have now reached the part of the program known as the commencement address. The cartoonist Garry Trudeau has remarked that the commencement address was "invented largely in the belief that outgoing college students should never be released in the world until they have been properly sedated."

If you've been to other commencements, you know that too many speakers dispense advice you've heard before to … learn from your failures … listen to your inner voice … and follow your passion and dreams.

All are fine ideas, and all worth trying to live by.

But what if your failures just seem like failures? What if, when you listen to your inner voice, you don't hear anything? What if … despite having just spent years earning your valuable UF degree … you're still not quite sure about your passion … or your dreams keep changing?

If this describes your predicament right now… just an hour or so from leaving the comfort of the UF campus and entering the uncertain world … let me be the first to tell you: It's going to be OK. More than OK. In fact, it may even be preferable not to be hearing voices or having dreams!

Uncertainty, in our lives and in our careers is good, whether we work in science, the arts … and yes, even higher education leadership. The important thing is not to have needless anxiety about uncertainty and not to let uncertainty paralyze you.

Instead, choose action. Start down any one of the several good paths before you, and let your journey reveal your direction and shape your dreams.

Ride your uncertainty, discover your new course, and enjoy your developing and maybe surprising new dreams.

I come to this advice from my own personal experience. I went to high school in Miami, at Miami Killian High School. There, I had a spectacularly good physics teacher. He inspired me to enter college with a dream of becoming a scientist, and I started as a physics major at Duke University.

It didn't last. By my sophomore year, my physics classes were difficult, and my roommate convinced me electrical engineering would be easier. So, I changed my major, hoping college would become a little more fun. I know none of you ever did anything like that!

For me, an even bigger transformation came when I began attending a church that was popular with college students. My time at this church proved so powerfully enriching that when it came time for graduation, I didn't want to be a scientist anymore. I had earned a degree in engineering, but I didn't want to be an engineer. My new dream was to become a minister.

I pursued this dream by enrolling in a three-year Masters of Divinity degree at Trinity Evangelical Divinity School in Chicago. There, I took a homiletics class on the art of writing and preaching sermons. It didn't go so well.

What I learned was this: I was not very good at stirring people's emotions and reaching their hearts … but that I could reach their minds. I was a better teacher than I was a preacher.

So, my dream changed yet again. I didn't want to be a scientist or engineer. I didn't want to be pastor. I wanted to be a college teacher.

Off I went from Divinity School in Chicago to the University of Illinois in Urbana-Champaign, where I spent another five and half years earning a doctorate in electrical and computer engineering and then eleven years as a professor.

During my years as a professor, I knew for certain that I did not want to ever become a university administrator. I only wanted to teach students and work in my lab with students. I rejected suggestions that I become a department chair, and I told my friends and family that I would never be a dean or provost … and certainly not a university president!

I have found over the 30 years of my career that the uncertainty in the future has been the best part of my life's path. I didn't have a dream that I have been following since I graduated from college. Rather, my dreams and passion developed and grew with my opportunities and circumstances.

I didn't follow a dream or a passion. My passions and dreams followed me, emerging and developing based on my actions.

I have the utmost respect and admiration for those whose life path is straight and sure. But I bet your parents and other loved ones in the audience today would agree with me that first zigging this way, and then zagging that way, is the more common path—and often the zigging and zagging is the better path.

Certainly that was true for the woman who spent years trying to be a writer, and then worked in advertising and did research for the military, before discovering a love for French cuisine in her late 30s. We can all toast Julia Child's late arrival to her success in popularizing gourmet cooking in the home.

It's a very good thing for science and humanity that a young man named Charles Darwin gave up on his pursuit of a medical degree, much to his family's deep disappointment.

Millions of readers should count themselves fortunate that John Grisham

didn't continue his career as a small-town Mississippi lawyer and state legislator.

America's best-known folk artist, Anna May Robertson "Grandma" Moses, spent her life as a rural New England homemaker before finally picking up a paint brush in her late 70s.

These icons, and many others, took winding paths to their achievements and contributions. But here's the really important thing: None of them were the worse for it. Quite the contrary: Their experiences shaped their direction and what they became.

As John Grisham has said, "I seriously doubt I would ever have written the first story had I not been a lawyer. I never dreamed of being writer. I wrote only after witnessing a trial."

In my own case, my three years in divinity school were a complete waste of time from a resume-building perspective. But I took classes in counseling, public speaking and fundraising, and they taught me a great deal about interacting and working with people.

That sensitivity toward people, and those communication skills, have proved immensely valuable to my career in university leadership, including as president of this university. On a personal note, it was also in divinity school where I met my wife of 34 years and the love of my life, Linda!

Picasso once said so beautifully: "To know what you are going to draw, you have to begin drawing."

As you set out from the University of Florida and into our world of constantly evolving challenges … whenever your inner voice changes things up on you … or worse, when it doesn't seem to say anything at all … I want you to hear my voice.

Hear this one-time aspiring scientist and minister reminding you that if you're unable to follow your dreams or passion, let them follow you …

Ride the uncertainty …

Find your new course …

Enjoy and believe in your new dreams …

We knew you were prepared for anything when we accepted you to the University of Florida, and you have proven us right. I could not be more pleased to wish you Godspeed as you move forward—eyes and hearts open to your changing path and its many wonderful possibilities.

***

I pray that although you may leave Gainesville, the University of Florida will always be your home, and that you will return home often.

An old Irish blessing expresses my personal affection for each one of you.

May the sun shine gently on your face.
May the rain fall soft upon your fields.
May the wind be at your back.
May the road rise to meet you.
And may the Lord hold you in the hollow of his hand.
Until we meet again.

Thank you and Congratulations, Class of 2015! …

WINNER: **DEDICATION/GROUNDBREAKING SPEECH**

"Treating Zorro, Treating Me"

By Chris Moran for Jack Payne,
Senior Vice President for Agriculture & Natural Resources,
University of Florida

//

Delivered at the Clinical Skills Laboratory,
University of Florida College of Veterinary Medicine,
Gainesville, Fla., Aug. 4, 2015

I want everyone who's ever loved a pet to experience what I experienced in the UF small animal hospital a few weeks ago.

Jim Lloyd helped me get my canine companion of 15 years, a friend through three different jobs in three different states, from the back seat of my car to the other tower in this building.

The dean's job description doesn't say "answer calls from SVP at 7 a.m. on a Sunday to comfort him as his dog is euthanized."

But he's a professional empathizer. When he got the call, he immediately called the small animal hospital and told them that I was coming. I drove in, with my dog Zorro, from Cedar Key that Sunday morning and Jim Lloyd was waiting for me by the front door.

What he told his staff, though, was something really important—to "treat" me as well as my dog. "Do what you do every day," is what he told them.

I tell you this because facilities are important, but what's going to make this place really work is the people. It's where we'll train people to be like Jim Lloyd.

To be a competent veterinarian, you need to be able to read an X-ray, examine an animal and administer medications. To be a great veterinarian, you've got to know how to communicate with someone who's in tears and emotional pain, like I was that Sunday morning.

This new facility has a communications skills room. I'm here to tell you that it's as important to me as any of the machines. It's one of those places where observers can stand behind glass unseen and watch colleagues and students play out scenarios.

Like how to deal with those difficult conversations about cost of treatment. Or even worse, talking about a problem money can't solve.

So kudos to the visionaries behind this space. Like the rest of the educators here at Vet Med, they haven't settled for just producing technically proficient practitioners. They've

created an environment where the next generation of veterinarians will learn how to manage not just the terminal illness of my Australian Shepherd, but the anguish that I brought along with my dog.

Dr. Bobbi Conner gave me all the time I needed to say goodbye. Then she let me hold Zorro as she euthanized him.

A couple of weeks later, I got a card from Dr. Conner. What a classy gesture.

She wrote: "The tragedy of dogs is they never live long enough, but they do pack a lifetime's worth of love and devotion into the precious years they spend with us."

This card [Payne holds up card] told me that she understood that what happened in the small animal hospital that Sunday didn't end when Zorro breathed his last. I still carry him with me, and her note showed me that she gets that. I want everyone to have a veterinarian like Bobbi Conner.

This new floor makes that more likely. So I'm not only proud of what you're opening here, but I'm personally grateful for it. Zorro is, too.

In fact, Dr. Conner will be teaching in this space. Students will get to practice and observe end-of-life scenarios in here. By the time these students meet people like me, they'll be people like Bobbi Conner.

That, too, is a great comfort to me. After all, I've got three more dogs.

WINNER: **EMPLOYEE MEETING**

"Tell Stories with Your Heart"

By Aaron Hoover for Kent Fuchs, President, University of Florida

//

Delivered at Emerson Hall, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla., Jan. 9, 2015

Thank you, Tom. And good afternoon, everyone! It's a pleasure to be with you.

I was excited to learn about this workshop because I love stories. I believe in the power of stories.

The best way for me to convey this enthusiasm … and make clear my feelings about why this endeavor makes so much sense to the University of Florida … is, of course, to share a couple of personal stories.

I've got two for you, one from my father-in-law, and another from my own father.

My father-in-law, Mikal Moskeland, is an immigrant from Norway and a great storyteller. He grew up in the country in Southern Norway, and thanks to his stories, I have a sense that I grew up there, too. In fact, because he is such a vivid storyteller, I feel that I have a personal relationship with a cow he once owned.

I don't know if the cow had a name, and in the world of storytelling, I've heard that would get me into big trouble with Professor Foley over at the journalism school.

But I do know that this cow liked nothing more than to chew on leather. One day, when Mikal wasn't looking, she poked her nose into his pocket and ate his wallet. Luckily, Mikal realized what happened. As he tells the tale, he reached down her throat and rescued his wallet straight out of her hungry stomach.

My own father, Calvin Fuchs, is no longer living, but his family were farmers also. They lived in rural western Oklahoma, near a small town called Sayre. Unlike Mikal, my father was not a storyteller. Perhaps that's why telling stories has never been easy for me. It's one reason I became a college professor rather than a pastor.

There is one family story, though, that has stuck with me for decades.

My dad did not go to college, but he was a self-taught ham radio operator, piano player and pilot. I admired my father's self-reliance, but it sometimes got the family into difficult situations.

This story begins on a family trip from Oklahoma to Alaska in my dad's four-passenger plane.

There were five of us in the plane's little cabin—me, my two little brothers, my mother and my dad. If you're counting, that's five people … in a four-passenger plane … on a three-day trip.

It didn't help that my brothers and I were prone to air sickness!

I was about 10 years old, and my brothers were about six and two. We were bored and tired and eager for the journey to be over. And then, somewhere over the Yukon territory of Northern Canada late in the day, my dad realized we were lost.

This was before GPS. My dad had been navigating by following the Alaska-Canadian highway, which was a gravel road back then. It was snowing and hard to see. Without knowing it, he had started to follow another road. By the time he realized his mistake, we were low on fuel … we were out of radio contact … and the sun was setting.

I remember my hollow feeling inside. I remember that my mother was fearful, and how her fear scared me. I remember understanding that our family was alone, in the winter, lost somewhere over the Yukon, with night coming on.

I'll never forget the moment my dad saw the lights of a vehicle on the logging road beneath us. He quickly landed our plane ahead of its path. A truck rumbled up. Out spilled a group of men who turned out to be miners prospecting for silver. They cheerfully offered us a spot in their tent for the night.

They made stew for dinner. That stew is still the best I have ever tasted.

The next day, the prospectors plowed the logging road and gave my dad some gas. We flew off to that road to resume our trip to Alaska.

Why has this story remained so alive to me despite the passing of nearly 50 years? This is what I think.

It's a story about my father, and the double-edged sword of resourcefulness and risk-taking. It's a story about childhood, and awakening to the very adult sense of one's mortality. Most of all, it's a story about something going wrong, and the challenge and triumph of overcoming it.

I know that this audience is composed of people from all over the university, including development officers, admissions professionals, university communicators, faculty and academic leaders. I'm sure some of you are great at telling stories to further your important work, and some of you are a little less comfortable with the notion. For those of you who are new to this approach, I appreciate your willingness to step off your traditional path and try out fresh directions and possibilities.

The simple lesson in my tale of my family's trip is that the stories we remember are often the human stories, those centered on real people coping with real challenges. If we keep this at the forefront … if we put students and professors, their struggles and triumphs, and the lives that they are changing, in the center of our vision … we can tell the stories that people will never forget.

We can get across the power of a child's fears … the relief when it turns out OK … and the wonder of being taken in by a bunch of silver prospectors on a snowy night in the Yukon.

And don't be afraid to relate the funny story, too, when a cow eats your wallet.

As a community committed to telling the University of Florida's story, my sense is that we should not only bring our minds to our task—but also our humanity and our hearts. I thank each one of you for being here, and I wish you all great stories.

WINNER: **EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH**

"The Man Who Made Winston Churchill"

Written and delivered by Hal Gordon, speechwriter

//

Delivered at the World Conference of the Professional Speechwriters Association, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., Oct. 7, 2015

Winston Churchill was once asked on whom or on what he had based his oratorical style. He replied—and I quote—"It was an American statesman who inspired me and taught me how to use every note of the human voice like an organ … He was my model. I learned from him how to hold thousands in thrall." End quote.

The statesman to whom Churchill referred was in fact an Irish-American statesman named William Bourke Cockran.

Who?

You've never heard of him, right? Nor have most people. He's been almost completely forgotten. And yet without him, Churchill might never have acquired the soaring rhetorical power he needed to sustain the British people through their darkest hours.

Cockran was born in Ireland in 1854, but emigrated to America at age 17. He settled in New York.

There, he became a successful lawyer, a member of the U.S. Congress, and a friend and confidant of some of the leading men of the time; men like inventor Thomas Edison, publisher Joseph Pulitzer, writer Mark Twain and Presidents Grover Cleveland and Teddy Roosevelt.

He also became known as America's greatest living orator.

But how did this man become the model for Winston Churchill?

In the spring of 1895, Cockran visited Paris. There, he met the beautiful and vivacious widow of an English lord. The widow was Jennie Churchill, widow of Lord Randolph Churchill and mother of Winston.

Cockran and Jennie were instantly drawn to each other. They had a brief but torrid love affair. And though they ceased to be lovers, they would remain devoted friends until Jennie died in 1921.

Some months after Cockran returned home from Paris, he heard from Jennie. Her son Winston—then 20 years old—was making his first trip to America. Would Cockran please host the young scamp when he passed through New York?

Cockran was then 41 and a widower. He had always wanted a son of his own. It was natural that he would have fatherly feelings towards the son of his beloved Jennie. And young Winston, who had just lost his own father, certainly needed a father figure at that time in his life.

I wonder: Is it possible for us to clear our minds, even for a few moments, of all we know of Churchill the great man, and imagine him as he was at 20, when he first met Cockran?

In 1895, Churchill was a newly-minted subaltern, just out of Sandhurst. He was short, lean, brash and athletic, with a full head of copper-colored hair. Up to that time, he had shown few signs of his future greatness. He excelled at subjects that engaged his interest, and funked those that bored him.

During one of young Winston's rare conversations with his father, Lord Randolph asked him what he knew about the Grand Remonstrance—Parliament's challenge to King Charles I in 1641.

After some hesitation, Winston replied, "In the end, Parliament beat the King and cut his head off. This

seemed to me the grandest remonstrance imaginable."

Lord Randolph was not amused. He would regularly send his son severe letters, chiding him for his "total want of application." But these parental admonitions seem to have had little effect on young Winston's restless spirit or his cocky self-assurance.

In short, when Churchill met Cockran, he rather resembled another thoroughly exasperating young man, a character from a play by Bernard Shaw: "He knows nothing; and thinks he knows everything. That points clearly to a political career."

Nevertheless, Cockran saw in Churchill the potential that even his nearest and dearest had missed. Churchill's son Randolph, in his massive biography of his father, said this about young Winston's first meeting with Cockran:

"Bourke Cockran must certainly have been a man of profound discernment and judgment of character. As far as we know, he was the first man or woman Churchill met on level terms who really saw his point and his potentialities… Cockran in some ways fulfilled a role that Lord Randolph should have filled if he had survived."

Churchill was Cockran's guest for a week early in November of 1895. According to Churchill, they had "great discussions on every conceivable subject from economics to yacht racing."

They found that they had certain principles in common. One was a passionate love of liberty.

Because they loved liberty, Churchill and Cockran believed in free trade.

Free trade would be crucial to Churchill's career after he was elected to parliament in 1900. When Churchill met Cockran, Britain had free trade, but there were prominent Tories who wanted to make the British Empire a self-contained, closed market.

Churchill would leave the Tory Party over this issue in 1904. He would return, twenty years later, only when the Tories themselves had returned to free trade.

America at that time had staggeringly high tariffs—nearly 50 percent on average. Tariffs were favored by the Republicans, who represented manufacturing and moneyed interests, and were opposed by Democrats like Cockran, who represented the farmers and the workers.

Churchill and Cockran were free traders for similar reasons; chief among them was the fact that free trade meant lower prices for the working poor.

How much influence did Cockran have on Churchill's free trade stand?

Let me quote from a major speech that Cockran delivered at the National Liberal Club in London on July 15, 1903. Cockran said: "Since Government of itself can create nothing, it can have nothing of its own to bestow on anybody … If it undertakes to enrich one man, the thing which it gives to him it must take from some other man."

Now let me quote from a speech that Churchill gave in Birmingham just four months later.

Churchill said: "Governments create nothing and have nothing to give but what they first have taken away—you may put money in the pocket of one set of Englishmen, but it will be money taken from the pockets of another set of Englishmen ... "

Was Churchill "plagiarizing" Cockran? No. Churchill had not been present at Cockran's Liberal Club speech and Cockran did not send him the text until after Churchill had spoken in Birmingham. But the striking similarity between their two speeches demonstrates just how deeply Churchill had absorbed Cockran's arguments.

Churchill left the Tories for the Liberals at the end of May the following year. Shortly afterwards he wrote to Cockran. "I beg you," he said, "to send me as much of your political literature as you can—particularly your own speeches. As I have told you before you have powerfully influenced me in the political conceptions I have formed…"

So Churchill wanted Cockran's speeches. What else did he get from Cockran? How, exactly, did Cockran help Churchill become one of the greatest orators of all time?

For one thing, Cockran introduced Churchill to his own favorite orator—the great Anglo-Irish statesman Edmund Burke. Cockran told Churchill that Burke "mastered the English language as a man masters a horse."

Burke was also a man of wide learning. Churchill's own education had been spotty. In 1896, about a year after meeting Cockran, Churchill was posted to India. There, he spent much of his free time trying to fill the gaps in his knowledge by extensive reading. And Cockran advised him on what to read. One biographer has determined that nearly every book that Churchill read in India could be found in Cockran's own considerable library in New York.

What about rhetorical devices?

Cockran told Churchill that the key to making a speech or addressing a jury was this: "Make one simple bold point and keep pounding on it with many illustrations and examples."

Churchill would repeat this admonition throughout his own career. Once, he said a speech was like a symphony; it could have three movements but must have one dominant theme.

And he would pass on this advice of Cockran's to other young, up-and-coming parliamentarians who were struggling to find their own voices. When Harold Macmillan, the future prime minister, gave his first speech to the House of Commons in 1923, he asked Churchill for his opinion.

Churchill replied, "Harold, everyone in the gallery is saying, 'Young Macmillan's giving his maiden address.' Then they ask, 'What's it about?' And Harold, no one can say in one sentence what the speech is about, and if you can't say in one sentence what the speech is about, it is not worth giving."

What else did Churchill learn from Cockran?

We get some strong hints from an unpublished essay that Churchill wrote in 1897. He called it, "The Scaffolding of Rhetoric."

The essay begins: "Of all the talents bestowed upon men, none is so precious as the gift of oratory. He who enjoys it wields a power more durable than that of a great king. He is an independent force in the world. Abandoned by his party, betrayed by his friends, stripped

of his offices, whoever can command this power is still formidable."

When we read that passage today, we think immediately of Churchill himself—Churchill during the so-called "Wilderness Years" leading up to World War II. Churchill was out of office—shunned, belittled and widely regarded as finished. Yet by the sheer power of his rhetoric, he was able to awaken his countrymen to the Nazi threat and, ultimately, to become prime minister.

Yes, today we think of Churchill. But who was Churchill thinking of when he wrote those words in 1897?

The previous year, 1896, had seen one of the most dramatic and fiercely-contested presidential elections in American history.

The crux of the campaign was the gold standard. The Republicans were for the gold standard and monetary stability. The Democrats wanted a gold and silver standard—cheaper dollars, easy money, inflation.

The Democrats had nominated a little-known, 37-year-old former congressman named William Jennings Bryan. Bryan was a spellbinding orator. He is still remembered for the white-hot convention speech that won him the nomination: "You shall not press down upon the brow of labor this crown of thorns; you shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold."

Byran's incendiary rhetoric ignited a political prairie fire; he had a real chance of becoming president. And he might have made it, but for the intervention of the one politician in America who could out-talk him: William Bourke Cockran.

Cockran was a gold-standard Democrat. He opposed cheapening the currency for the same reason that he opposed tariffs. Both meant higher prices for working people, while their wages would stay the same.

Cockran undertook a nationwide speaking tour on behalf of the Republican candidate, William McKinley. When McKinley was elected, Cockran was called the "Warwick of the Democratic Party"—after Warwick the Kingmaker in medieval England. He was truly "an independent force in the world"—a man who could make and unmake presidents by the force of his eloquence.

Churchill took note. He followed Cockran's speaking tour, writing to him, "please send me press cuttings of your speeches."

Churchill says much more in "The Scaffolding of Rhetoric," and Cockran's influence is evident throughout.

Churchill talks about oratory on the grand scale. He talks about correctness of diction—the importance of using the best possible word.

He talks about rhythm—the use of "long, rolling and sonorous" sentences to appeal to the ears of the audience.

He talks about the accumulation of argument; he says that "The climax of oratory is reached by a rapid succession of waves of sound and vivid pictures." And he notes the "tendency to wild extravagance of language" that is evident in most perorations.

All of this he would have observed in Cockran.

I'll give you just one example. I've already mentioned Cockran's speech to the Liberal Club in 1903. In this speech, Cockran moves to his conclusion with this full-throated aria extolling the blessings that accrue to Britain from free trade:

"At this moment, in every quarter of the globe, forces are at work to supply your necessities and improve your condition.

"As I speak, men are tending flocks on Australian fields and shearing wool which will clothe you during the coming winter. On western lands, men are reaping grain to supply your daily bread.

"In mines deep underground, men are swinging pickaxes and shovels to wrest from the bosom of the Earth the ores essential to the efficiency of your industry.

"Under tropical skies, dusky hands are gathering, from bending boughs, luscious fruits which in a few days will be offered for your consumption in the streets of London.

Now don't those rolling sentences remind you of Churchill?

But in "The Scaffolding of Rhetoric" Churchill also talks about simplicity, intimacy and sincerity. He says that a speaker, wherever possible, should employ "short, homely words of common usage."

He talks about how a speaker can persuade by means of analogy … an apt analogy, he says, "appeals to the everyday knowledge of the hearer."

And he talks about the importance of sincerity. For an orator to convince others, says Churchill, "he must himself believe."

Here, let me note another bit of advice that Cockran gave Churchill: "Speak the simple truth."

And, yes, Cockran himself used simple, down-to-earth language and illustrations in his speeches—juxtaposed with his more florid passages.

In the Liberal Club speech from which I just quoted, Cockran also said: "I have a farm on Long Island. I require plows. I am told that if I don't have protection from foreign plows they'll be dumped on me. If that means I'll get plows cheaper than my own country can produce them … I say, dump on!"

In 1943, Harold Nicholson summed up the secret of Churchill's rhetorical power in a single, laser-beam insight. "The winning formula," he said, "was the combination of great flights of oratory with sudden swoops into the intimate and conversational."

We see this especially in Churchill's great wartime speeches.

I will quote two brief and familiar examples.

First, his tribute to the RAF during the Battle of Britain in 1940. Churchill said:

"The gratitude of every home in our Island, in our Empire, and indeed throughout the world … goes out to the British airmen who, undaunted by odds, unwearied in their constant challenge and mortal danger, are turning the tide of the world war by their prowess and by their devotion."

And then:

"Never in the field of human conflict was so much owed by so many to so few."

Second, Churchill's response to President Franklin Roosevelt in

February of 1941. FDR had sent Churchill an expression of support for Britain. Churchill said:

"We shall not fail or falter; we shall not weaken or tire. Neither the sudden shock of battle, nor the long-drawn trials of vigilance and exertion will wear us down. "

And then:

"Give us the tools, and we will finish the job."

Now of course I must acknowledge that Churchill's great oratory was the product of many influences.

Churchill had read Gibbon and Macaulay. He was intimately acquainted with the King James Bible and the plays of Shakespeare. He had memorized reams of poetry. He had studied the speeches of all the great parliamentary leaders who had preceded him—Pitt, Burke, Disraeli, Gladstone—and his father, Lord Randolph Churchill. He was a journalist; he had an eye for detail and a flair for vivid language. He is supposed to have read over 5,000 books and had a vocabulary of 65,000 words—two or three times as many as the average person.

And yet ……..

And yet for all that it was Cockran whom he credited for his prowess as a speaker.

I began this talk with a quote from Churchill, in which he said of Cockran, "He was my model." I did not tell you when or to whom Churchill said that.

He said it in 1953, at the end of his career. And he said it to Adlai Stevenson. Stevenson had been the Democratic Party's candidate for president a year earlier. (He lost to Dwight Eisenhower.) According to Stevenson, Churchill then went on to quote—from memory—long passages from speeches that Cockran had given over half a century before.

But there is even stronger evidence of the esteem in which Churchill held Cockran. In 1946, at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri, Churchill gave the single most important of his post-war addresses. He called it, "The Sinews of Peace." We know it as the "Iron Curtain" speech: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the Continent."

Churchill had been turned out of Downing Street the previous year. He was then leader of the opposition. But he knew that his speech in Fulton would put Churchill back where Churchill knew that Churchill belonged—smack dab at the center of world affairs.

The speech was a major news event. Churchill was introduced by the President of the United States, Harry S. Truman, and his words were broadcast throughout the whole nation.

And it was in that speech that he chose to honor the memory of his mentor and model. He said this: "I have often used words which I learned fifty years ago from a great Irish-American orator, a friend of mine, Mr. Bourke Cockran. 'There is enough for all. The earth is a generous mother; she will provide in plentiful abundance food for all her children if they will but cultivate her soil in justice and in peace.'"

That was Churchill's favorite quote from Cockran.

Cockran had told Churchill to imitate Burke—to "master the English language as a man masters a horse."

Churchill did more than master the English language; some said that he "mobilized it and sent it into battle."

Would he have been able to do that if he had never met Bourke Cockran? We'll never know. We know only this: To the end of his days, Churchill was conscious that that he owed Cockran a great debt. And, through Churchill, so do we all.

Thank you.

WINNER: **INAUGURAL SPEECH**

"A Legacy Born of Hope"

By Mark L. Kelly for Elizabeth Davis, President, Furman University

//

Delivered at Furman University, Greenville, S.C., March 19, 2015

Thank you, Robert.

What an extraordinary week this has been.

And what an honor to be formally installed as the President of Furman University.

I am grateful to each and every one of you here, and to those who are viewing the broadcast on and off campus, that you have come together today to celebrate all that is extraordinary and wonderful about this University.

Charles Tompkins and Gary Malvern, I kept trying to sneak into the auditorium to hear the prelude selections. Thank you for setting the tone for our ceremony. Les Hicken and the Wind Ensemble, Hugh Floyd and the Furman Singers, you all are amazing. Thank you for stirring our souls with your music. And Jay Bocook, your Gloriana is beautiful and a fitting accompaniment for official university processions. I'm humbled that it was commissioned for today's ceremony.

Mayor White and Mayor McCall, thank you for representing the local communities in which we live and work. Your spirit and vision are models for us all as we seek to be meaningful partners in the community.

To my colleagues representing sister institutions and societies, thank you for honoring Furman with your presence. Educating a nation, indeed the world, is accomplished through the collective energies of institutions with different missions and

competencies to meet the needs of a variety of learners.

Furman Trustees, past and present, we are humbled by your service and care for our beloved university.

Faithful Alumni, your enthusiasm and love for your alma mater is infectious. I look forward to strengthening the ties that bind you to Furman and bring you home again and again.

Faculty and staff, your dedication to our students is inspiring to me, and was one of the most influential reasons that I wanted to be part of this university.

Students, you are a true source of joy for me. I am so proud of the ways that you are growing, questioning, challenging, and enjoying the many opportunities afforded to you these four years.

To my dear friends who have travelled across the country to be here today, I so appreciate your support and friendship.

And of course, I wouldn't be here today were it not for the unconditional love of my family. My brother, Douglas, my sister-in-law, Mary George, my in-laws, Shirley and Cedric—thank you for being here today. And Charles, Chad, and Claire, words cannot express what you mean to me. Thank you for being co-travelers with me in this new adventure.

This day—with its pomp and circumstance, its reminders of tradition, and its ceremony rich in symbolism—this day is not really about me.

This day is about Furman.

This day is about Furman and the many lives it touches, its historic role in American higher education, and its dedication to serving the world at large through what has been—and always will be—our greatest hope for progress: the education of the mind, and the enrichment of the spirit.

Today is also a day to renew our commitment to the qualities that have allowed Furman to flourish for nearly 200 years:

Courage.

Creativity.

Compassion.

And Community.

For those of you who passed through our gates for the first time today, you now know why I am never in a bad mood when I come to work on this undeniably beautiful campus.

Those gates, protected by our majestic trees and framing a view of the mountains just beyond, reflect an aesthetic that has inspired talented and ambitious women and men to seek out this distinctive community, challenged them to engage in the advancement of knowledge, and prepared them to depart confidently for lives of purpose—always knowing that they can return, and alma mater will welcome them home once again.

Those gates—indeed, this entire campus—are the legacies of hope… of the courage and creativity of those who came before us.

The courage and creativity of our founder, Richard Furman, who envisioned a classical and theological seminary in South Carolina with a priority of educating ministers.

Of Furman's son James, the University's first President, who when faced with a national economic crisis that threatened the very existence of the University declared he would "lash himself to the mast and go down with the ship."

Of President John Plyler, who led the move from our downtown campus—where we had been located since 1851—to this site, assessing that the risks of departing from a campus in the heart of Greenville would be countered by the opportunities to achieve true distinction on a national scale, an abiding goal of his predecessors.

Of Gordon Blackwell whose insistence in the face of often unbending opposition led to the racial desegregation of the University in 1965, a milestone we have commemorated as a University community this year.

And the courage of John Johns, who came into office vowing to strengthen ties with the South Carolina Baptists, but who ultimately decided that the fractiousness born of fundamentalism would not serve Furman well. Under his leadership, the Trustees amended the Charter to permit the Board to elect its members, and the convention ultimately voted to sever ties with Furman.

In each of these courageous moments, Furman discovered newfound strength, bolstered by the confidence of its past achievements, and sustained by hope for what was yet to come.

Having survived near-death experiences and crises of conviction, Furman was in a position of strength when David Shi took the helm. David, then, set the course for how—to this day—we understand a Furman education.

In his inaugural address on April 19, 1995, exactly one month short of 20 years ago today, he officially coined the term "engaged learning."

His notion, as he said in his remarks that day, was that engaged learning would "breach the walls of the ivory tower stereotype," giving our students greater responsibility for their own education, sharpening their self-confidence, and honing leadership and communication skills.

From the moment I arrived on campus, I have been told, with great pride, that we were the first university to use the term "engaged learning." It is a testament to David's vision, and to the work of the faculty, that the term engaged learning has been co-opted by nearly every other university in the nation. It kind of reminds me of the song that Barbara Mandrell made famous: I was country when country wasn't cool. Well, engaged learning is now cool, and so is country music, much to my dismay!

Two decades after David Shi's prescient call, we still talk about engaged learning. It's the shorthand way we describe the web of internships, research, and study away, all conducted within the close intellectual partnerships between faculty and students, that have immeasurably enriched our students' experiences. In my judgment, we still do it better than our imitators.

But we need to ask ourselves: What's next for engaged learning? How do we continue to breach the walls of the Ivory Tower in an era when education—and liberal arts education in particular—is under increasing and intense scrutiny for its value and, I daresay, its utility?

As I've pondered that question—what's next?—I've considered what

makes sense for Furman. Recently, we celebrated a $500,000 gift from Susan and Alec Taylor to support the engaged learning aspects of our Poverty Studies minor.

Why do we consider it important to offer a minor in Poverty Studies, and why is it now the largest and most popular minor among our students?

What is in our ethos that drives us to develop a national model for innovation in sustainability education, with its cross-disciplinary approach that encompasses the sciences, humanities, social sciences and the fine arts, and involves nearly one third of our faculty?

How have we attracted over 1,400 of the state's civic, educational, and business leaders to the Diversity Leaders Initiative of the Richard Riley Institute, whose graduates are making tangible progress in addressing important issues of opportunity and economic development in their communities?

And how does a leading national liberal arts university sustain a program like Bridges to a Brighter Future, which is raising the sights of underserved high school students and making the seemingly impossible dream of attending and graduating from college a reality?

And then it became clear. Underlying the courage and creativity that have previously defined Furman are an abiding compassion for humanity and a clear sense that the work of Furman University is inextricably tied to community—be it the larger community outside our gates, or our own academic community and its daily presence in our lives.

From our very first day, we have been in the business of hope—the promise of what education coupled with a commitment to transforming lives can accomplish.

So today, we must turn our attention with the same seriousness of purpose, the same courage and compassion, to the important work of carving out our own ambitious legacy. What imprint will we leave behind for those who follow us in the next 200 years?

Maybe it's time to rethink engaged learning. Not the pieces that enhance a student's education beyond the classroom, but rather the focus. For much has changed in the world, and today's students have grown up in a time markedly different than many of us experienced.

Rapid advances in technology, the increasing interconnectedness of nations and economies, the rise of terror as a political weapon, and deep-seated disagreements over ethnic, social and cultural mores have created a context that is confusing in its pace, and deeply complex.

Is it any wonder that today's students show a marked inclination to volunteer service? Just consider that the Heller Service Corps attracts over 1,800 student volunteers every year to its expansive array of community service programs in the upstate —making it the largest student leadership group on campus.

Today's students are seeking meaning in a world that is fractious.

So how do we balance the desire to make a difference with the messiness that we face when it comes to the challenges of the 21st century? Maybe it's time to move from the idea of service and service learning to equal partnerships and mutual stewardship of place. Our place is Greenville County. Whereas we were once a part of downtown Greenville, where there was no distinction between where Furman ended and the city began, we should strive for that same co-existence.

My predecessor, Rod Smolla, articulated this sentiment in the Vision 2020 Strategic Plan developed four years ago:

"The relationship between Furman and the surrounding community ought not be articulated as relations between "town and gown," as this phrasing accents separateness, as if the University and the community are neighboring countries. The better imagery is to conceive of Furman as an integral part of a complex and vibrant community."

As this week's faculty-led series of discussions about Public Engagement have demonstrated, our work in teaching, research, service and institutional partnerships represents an already rich tapestry of involvement with the community in which we live and work. We should, as my colleague and friend Nancy Cantor said in her thoughtful and inspiring talk, begin to formalize our work, and embrace the power of our place in this community and our capacity to contribute to meaningful change and the democratic ideal of America.

When I consider the spectrum of minds at work at Furman—faculty and students from the humanities to the sciences to business and the arts—I think we miss the mark if we do not tap the richness of their expertise, insight, and dedication. We fall short if we fail to create avenues by which our intellectual capital can be applied to solve our common burdens.

However, for public engagement to work, we need shared conviction of mutual benefit. Are we ready to be equal partners in identifying the questions worthy of study? Are we ready to pivot the expectation that engaged learning is designed to benefit the student and focus on the benefit to the community? Either way, the student will benefit. The question is, are we committed to our place, to our community? If so, we must change the focus of our engaged learning efforts.

I'm not suggesting anything that will be a problem for our students. Students tend to take more pride in their work and the outcome when they become important contributing members of groups working together towards common goals, and ones that will contribute to something much larger than self.

To the students who are here today, I challenge you to imagine your own legacy of engagement—not only at Furman, but in whatever endeavor you decide is worthy of your time, and your passion.

The world is full of need, and you are being equipped with the knowledge and skills to meet challenges. How you go about it is up to you. But my fervent hope for you is that you think beyond yourself.

There is power in leaving a legacy, no matter how small it may seem.

You may leave a legacy of engagement with seven streetlights in the New Washington neighborhood that makes it safer for residents to walk at night.

You may leave a legacy in a musical performance that touches the hearts of your audience.

You may leave a legacy studying cancer cells in a lab in the Townes Science Center, work that in some small way advances our understanding and furthers our search for a cure.

You may leave a legacy of engagement as a coach or teacher or parent, where your rewards will not be immediately seen but will without doubt affect lives.

So where's the courage in all of this? As an academic community, we have to agree that public engagement has value. To do so, we must acknowledge that advancing public knowledge is as valuable as advancing academic knowledge. Advancing public knowledge is not merely service, it's scholarship. It makes a difference today and is no more or less important than basic research for which the benefits often have a longer horizon.

And that means bucking a trend in higher education. As scholars for whom teaching is both an imperative and a passion, we are in the best position to demonstrate the applicability of theory to practice. We cannot be content to let others interpret the results of our academic scholarship or try to scale innovation in an uninformed fashion.

Ultimately, if we are not willing to engage in the fullest sense of our mission, if we are not willing to imagine with courage and creativity what could be, then we have no recourse for dissatisfaction with what is.

When I arrived at Furman, one of my first visitors to the office was John Plyler Jr., son of the former President. He told me that his conversations with his father always focused on Furman's future. In particular, he said that one of his father's dreams for Furman was that it would be regarded as one of the most beautiful campuses in the country. Back in the mid 1950s, that might have been hard for people to imagine. The campus was in the midst of a barren cotton field.

I love that story; and it is a true one. There is a letter in the University's archives, dated May 1955, that confirms it. Written by Dr. Plyler to Richard Webel, a noted landscape architect and arborist from New York, the letter discusses landscaping and new plantings, and President Plyler wrote:

"We should make general plans for the location of from 5,000 to 10,000 trees and then emphasis could be placed on which trees should be planted first." He went on to list specific species that would provide beauty and instructional opportunities.

President Plyler had a vision, and it has been realized. He saw beyond the present moment and imagined a University and a campus that would serve a world he could not know, a faculty he would never meet, students as yet unborn.

Sixty years ago, he thought about us.

Vision requires constant tending if it is to flourish. Just a month ago, our Trustees approved a long-range plan to replace trees on our Mall that had reached the end of their natural lives. Their roots were crowded, the canopy had become a hazard. Pruning was no longer an option.

Under our plan, we will plant trees with a life expectancy of 200 years.

Ours is not to know what Furman University will look like two centuries hence. We will not know the manner of faculty and students who will be engaged in teaching and learning on this campus, nor the subjects of their inquiry and discernment.

All we can hope is that as they pass through those front gates, they will be inspired by the same beauty that inspires us today, and reminded that theirs is an inheritance of courage and compassion that forever remains the hallmark of a place called Furman.

What a legacy we have an inherited. A legacy born of hope.

Thank you.

WINNER: **MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH**

"Lullabies on the 4 Train"

Written and delivered by Tommy Fernandez, owner & Speechwriter, Y&R Communications

//

Delivered at DeVry University Keller Graduate School of Management, New York City, N.Y., Feb. 24, 2015

My parents sang lullabies to me on the 4-train.

DaDa Da DaDa, Da Da Da.

For me, it was magic. Straphangers turned into dancers. The ratta-tat-tat of the train wheels became drums. The conductor on the fuzzy intercom, a clarinetist {"Next stop Wha-Wha-Wha"].

Some riders sang along. "This is ridiculous," others said.

Ridiculous. Honored Toastmaster, guests and judges. I want to sing to you my ridiculous lullaby. Because people will sometimes tell you your dream is impossible. That your dream is as ridiculous as singing to a baby on the subway. Well, my parents taught me that sometimes, ridiculous can be brave.

The train doors of this musical open {Act out} at the 167th Street station in the Bronx. It is the 1970s. Two kids with a loud baby get on-and-off the trains to-and-from Manhattan.

When the door closes {Act out], they start to sing. The baby's favorite is "Bridge over Troubled Water," by Simon & Garfunkel.

"When you're down and out. Feeling small."

The song quiets the baby. He starts to nod with the ratta-tat-tat of the

train wheels. He smiles at the dancing straphangers. He closes his eyes by the refrain, "Sail on Silver Girl." Ratta-tat-tat. "Sail on By." In the tunnel under the Harlem River, the baby imagines the violins. Da Da Da Da! He falls asleep.

Ridiculous! What parents sing lullabies on the subway? Poor ones with big dreams.

Dad gets haircuts once a year. His only shoes are the combat boots that took him through Vietnam. Mom sews her own coats, with buttons all over the place, and saves for a month to buy the Dad four White Castle burgers.

With no money for babysitters, they take the baby everywhere. And they sing to him.

The boy gets frightened by heroin addicts in the neighborhood, always swaying, never falling. DaDa Da DaDa. He cries when he hears the pop-pop of firecrackers down the street. The parents know they aren't firecrackers. {Act out gun.] Sail on By

They sing to him through at least five jobs and three community colleges. The boy draws space ships on chalkboards as Pappa takes organic chemistry tests. DaDa Da DaDa. He spins on office chairs as Mom punches little holes in program cards for giant office computers. He watches Mom run a supermarket cash register and Dad translate Spanish for doctors. Da Da Da Da!

No one approves. Friends, neighbors, professors, bosses, even strangers on the street walking little dogs. [Act out shaking finger.] "Ridiculous. Ridiculous."

Here's where ridiculous can be brave.

With a silly song, you can laugh off the scary days. Like when the landlord once cut the heat and flooded the apartment. DaDa Da DaDa. Or when Dad had to sell textbooks for food. Sail on By!

With a silly song, the ridiculous can beat the impossible. When a community college tries to close night school for Mom, Dad and hundreds of other students, they protest and put the boy on stage during a demonstration. The toddler screams [Raise fist] "Sail on Silver Girl!"

That college maintains night courses to this day.

Ridiculous. Ridiculous. Silly things can be brave.

Ivan and Milagros Fernandez sing Simon & Garfunkel to that boy for over five years on the subway. And that train ride leads to others.

[Act out door] Madison Square Garden, they graduate. [Act out door] Union Street and 4th Avenue, they buy a house.. [Act out door]. Cranbury, New Jersey, they buy a farm.

"See how they shine!"

Your dreams may not belong on other people's subway maps. They may seem ridiculous. But which is more ridiculous, dreaming or doing nothing?

Here is the sound of doing nothing.

[Hold hand to one ear, and then the other]

And here is the sound of something ridiculous. Please sing with me.

"Sail on Silver Girl. Sail on By!"

Anything you do, anything you dream, will always be more beautiful than the silence of doing nothing.

This is your life. This is your train ride. What will you sing on it?

I hope it's ridiculous.

{Act out closing door]

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

WINNER: **STATE OF THE INSTITUTION SPEECH**

"Purpose and Northwestern Mutual"

By Mark Lucius for John Schlifske, Chairman & CEO, Northwestern Mutual

//

Delivered at Annual Meeting of Network Representatives, Milwaukee, Wis., July 20, 2015

Good morning, everyone. Thanks for being here. Wow!

Welcome to Milwaukee, and welcome to the 2015 Annual Meeting. It is so great to see all of you here. For my wife, Kim, and me, this is one of the highlights of our summer.

We look forward to the chance to reconnect with so many of you at this meeting. I think that's one of the best parts about this meeting—the way we connect with one another. And there are so many ways to connect. The race yesterday morning. The garden party last night. The company show on Tuesday. And all the meetings in between.

And for me, I also get in a little golf as a way to reconnect with some of you.

This year was no different. In fact, I was playing golf with your FRA president, Ted Sangalis. I am a competitive person, and we were playing for a little money on the side. Our match was tied going into the last hole.

I had the first shot, so I hit my drive. For me, pretty good, about 240, 250 yards down the middle of the fairway. Not bad. Ted gets up, and he hooks his ball across the fairway way into the left trees and tall grass. So at this point I'm thinking I'm in pretty good shape, but being the sportsman I am, I follow Ted into the woods to help him look for the ball. Well, we were there for about two or three minutes and weren't having any success, so Ted said, "John, I don't know if we're going to find it. Go back, hit your ball. When you're done, if I haven't found it, I'll declare my ball lost and concede the match."

So I go back out to the fairway and hit my shot. It's a workmanlike shot. Lands short of the green, kind of dribbles on. I'm 40 or 50 feet away and just as I'm getting ready to move down the course, I hear Ted yell from the woods, "I found it." A couple seconds later, I

see this incredible shot fly through a gap in the woods, land on the green, bounce once or twice, and roll up an inch or two away from the cup.

So now I have a moral dilemma.

Do I pull Ted's ball out of my pocket, and tell him he hit the wrong one? Or do I give him the point and concede the match? What would you do in that situation?

I'm kidding. It wasn't in my pocket. I kicked it in the water when no one was looking.

No. I tell that story simply to point to something, and that's the competitiveness of our field force. It's something I admire about you. You are so competitive. You compete with each other for awards, honors and ribbons. You compete with yourselves for your personal goals every year. And you certainly compete with the home office in the Roots and Wings Run, in golf, in whatever.

But underlying that competitiveness is our sense of reliance on each other. It's a friendly competition. There's a huge amount of respect in it. And this underlying respect, loyalty and integrity we have with each other has been part of our company for years.

If you consider the very first annual meeting of your association, in 1877, and you look at the meeting notes from that meeting, you'll see they talked about the "inseparable community of interest" that exists between the home office and field. That got me thinking that there must be something about the home office and field together that creates this "inseparable community of interest." And I believe it springs from our common purpose.

This year, as I've been going around meeting with you, I've asked many of you, why do you come to the Annual Meeting each year? What is it about this meeting that brings you and your family to Milwaukee year after year, decade after decade?

The most frequent answer you share with me is that it helps you reconnect to why you're in the business—and why you work with Northwestern Mutual. It creates and defines the purpose in your working lives. That's what I want to talk about today, this nobility of purpose that that helps us do great things together.

I believe we can sum up our purpose in three concepts. One is our identity, who we are. The second is where we're going as a company, our vision for our future. Lastly, it's our culture; what separates us from every other company in our industry.

When we talk about our identity, we have to start with mutuality. For us, mutuality isn't simply a form of ownership. It defines who we are. It permeates every decision we make. It's impossible to attend a meeting in the Home Office without hearing somebody ask the question, what's in the best interest of our policyowners?

Now, mutuality takes different forms in how we run our business. But one we don't we get enough credit for is the way we treat policyowners. It's the fact that we give equitable treatment to all policyowners—whether they bought policies 30, 40, or 50 years ago. Or whether they're part of an unborn generation that will someday become policyowners. Plain and simple, we treat all policyowners the same.

Now, that's not true for a lot of companies. They "wall off" old business. They create closed blocks of business to move aside old policyowners so they can treat new policyowners better. I was reminded of that recently in a letter I got from a major policyowner.

This person has been a policyowner of Northwestern Mutual going on 50 years, with cash value well into the six figures. He saw an article in a financial publication. The article quoted someone many of you know, a man named Peter Katt. Now, Peter is perhaps the leading fee-based insurance adviser in the industry. He can't sell our products, of course, but he has a high regard for Northwestern Mutual.

In this particular article, Peter was talking about how Northwestern Mutual treats all policyowners equitably. So this policyowner wrote me a letter, and I want to read it for you right now.

He writes, "Dear Mr. Schlifske: Equitable treatment is important to me. Many years ago, I surrendered a whole life policy from another major mutual." (Anyone want to guess where that company is headquartered?) "I discovered that that company was providing a higher dividend to new policies than older policies. I concluded that that company was serving its best interests, not mine. I thank you and Northwestern Mutual for your long-term commitment to treating everyone the same."

This is what I mean about mutuality. For us, it's like the golden rule. We treat our policyowners the way we would like to be treated ourselves.

Another aspect of our identity is our financial strength. We are the strongest company in the industry. Now, I know I talk about this all the time, and some of you are probably saying "Yeah, yeah, yeah, I've heard it all before." But we cannot forget what that means.

Standing here on this stage, in July 2015, I can assure you that Northwestern Mutual has never been stronger. You can look at our assets, our investment portfolio, our reserves, our capital ratios, our business model—everything comes together to make Northwestern Mutual the strongest company in the industry. And I made that point recently to Moody's Investors Services, one of the major credit rating agencies we deal with.

Every few years, we to go to New York to meet with the entire Moody's rating committee, and this was one of those years. We were in the midst of our annual review, and in that meeting I made the point that our goal as a company is to be the strongest company in the industry, bar none. At a break, one of the senior leaders at Moody's took me aside and said, "That's quite a bold statement, John. I've never heard another CEO say something like that."

Of course, I pointed out that is because we are the strongest company, and no other CEO can say something like that.

But I also pointed out that we are not strong simply for the sake of being strong; we're strong because our financial strength helps us make an unwavering commitment to our promises.

We never let our financial situation get in the way of doing what's right.

And we never let profits get in the way of keeping our promises to our policyowners.

That is what I explained to Moody's, and that's also why I like to say: We are the company for all economic seasons. Whether economic times are good, bad, or in between, your company keeps its promises and thrives.

(IMAGE)

The New York Times recently ran an article about "Risky moves in the game of life insurance." While your company is getting stronger and stronger, the rest of the industry is getting weaker and weaker.

The article reports how many of our major industry competitors are doing things with their reserves and capital to weaken them—to prop up ridiculous pricing on indexed universal life policies or to drive more profitability to shareholders in the low-interest-rate environment. But I can tell you one thing: if everyone else is getting weaker, we're getting stronger. And that's also a key part of our identity.

(IMAGE)

A third aspect of our identity is our exclusive distribution system—all of you. As you know, we only sell our products through you, the Northwestern Mutual Financial Network. This is our commitment to you, and the reason we invest so heavily in you. We invest tens of millions of dollars each year on systems, product upgrades, training and technology, all to ensure that you are the best-equipped, most competitive field force in the United States.

Every now and then, I get a question from an industry analyst or somebody who doesn't really know our business. They ask me, John, outside of exclusive distribution, what is Plan B?

I always tell them, there is no Plan B.

Folks, not only are you Plan A, you are also Plan B, C, D and so on. For us, this commitment to you pays big dividends. It creates an incredible loyalty between the home office and the field. I believe it is one reason why you're the most productive field force in the United States and the envy of our industry.

The final aspect of our identity is the strength of our products. We have the best long-term product values of any company in the industry, and it's been that way for a very long time.

(IMAGE)

I'll bet nobody in the room knows who this person is. And no, it's not a young Ron Joelson. (Sorry about that, Ron.) No. This is a man named A.J. Flitcraft. Besides being very comfortable with facial hair, A.J. is known for something else.

A.J. Flitcraft was the father of dividend illustration history summaries. Back in 1927, he began the process of analyzing the dividend performance of all major life insurance companies. Over the years that task has gravitated from Flitcraft to A.M. Best to the Blease Report and now to LIMRA.

But despite all those changes over that time, one thing is a constant. And that's the performance of the best company, Northwestern Mutual.

(IMAGE)

Take a look at this chart. This shows the 20-year actual histories from 1927 to 2013, and it shows the number of times our major competitors have ranked first in that study.

You'll see one competitor ranked first eight times. A second, twice. Big doughnut for a third competitor. But look at your company—76 out of 86 times. Now, you know what I like best about this chart? We ranked first in 1927, the first year this survey was done, and we ranked first the last year this survey was done. And we ranked first 74 times in between.

That's a winning percentage of 88%. Think of your favorite sports dynasties, the Yankees, Celtics, Bulls, Packers. None of them have come close to that kind of a winning percentage.

And you've heard me say before: in corporate America, the best predictor of future results is your track record. Track record, track record, track record. And with a track record like this, is there any doubt who the best performing company will be in the future? Not in my mind there isn't.

So there you have it. That's our identity. The strongest company selling the best products through the best salesforce in America—all to benefit our policyowners. Nothing about that is ever going to change.

What is changing is how we interact with our clients.

I was talking with one of your colleagues, a 30-year veteran of your field force, a perennial Forum qualifier, and he told me, John, I wish I could start all over again. I'd put up with all the hassles of business as a young rep, building my practice, meeting clients, all to be able to be young—and have this future. He said, "This is the most exciting time I've ever seen to be at Northwestern Mutual."

And I couldn't agree with him more. Our future is so bright, and there are many reasons why that's true.

Take demographics. From a demographic perspective, the market opportunity is outstanding for your company.

(IMAGE)

Look at this graph. This shows the breakdown in age of the U.S. population, oldest on top, youngest on the bottom. And what you see at the top is the boomer generation, those people between the ages of 51 and 69. There are 74 million of them in the United States, and they get most of the attention.

But here's what I love about this chart: Look at the millennial population, people between the ages of 19 and 37. It's actually a bigger age cohort than the boomer generation. And what's really intriguing about this is that few companies are paying attention to the millennials.

(IMAGE)

You may have seen the article in Bloomberg Business, all about how everyone in our industry is chasing the baby boom generation. They noted that "Financial advisers just don't care about millennials." The boomer generation is where the money is, so that's where everyone is going. But nobody sees the potential, the income, the assets, the pure growth inherent in the millennial generation.

Ignoring millennials is not true of Northwestern Mutual. When we

recently bought LearnVest, and I was on the media circuit, several reporters asked me if the reason for the acquisition was to get "a toehold" in the millennial market. I told them no, it's not. As a matter of fact, the average new Northwestern Mutual customer is younger than the average LearnVest customer.

(IMAGE)

In fact, look at the breakdown of our new clients last year. This shows Northwestern Mutual's new clients in 2014.

Forty-three percent of our new clients were millennials—those between the ages of 18 and 34.

Sixty percent of our new clients were under the age of 35.

And you know and I know the beauty of this is we're going to maintain these people as clients for 10, 20, 30, 50, even 70 years.

So while every other company is off chasing the boomer generation, our business model works great across all life cycles.

And the best part about this millennial mix is diversity. Our focus on multicultural markets is creating a customer base that's more diverse than it's very been in our history. That's why I like to say that millennials are the foundation of your company's future.

(IMAGE)

But the future of your company goes well beyond demographics. It extends to the sheer size of the market. All available research on the United States marketplace shows us that there are about 40 million U. S. families who are either uninsured or underinsured, who are interested in buying insurance, and who have either the income and/or assets with which to make a purchase. That's 40 million families, about 6,000 families for each and every representative in this room. Think about that. There's nothing about the marketplace that's holding you or your company back. It's right there for the taking.

But there's another part of our future that's even more important than market availability, and that is the simple fact that people need you. People need what you do. They are looking for someone to help them find the way to financial security.

You've heard me talk about the nagging gap that exists in the industry—the gap between what people need, and what others are offering. Most companies in our marketplace are offering either product solutions or investment-only solutions. As a result, consumers in America are feeling frustrated and vulnerable. They don't quite know why, but they know they're not financially secure.

Now, think what you bring to the picture. You help all these families build confidence, and you do it in two important ways. First, you bring discipline into the equation. You help people reduce their vulnerability to risk. But you also do something else. You bring foresight into the equation. You help people plan, save and manage their money to achieve these goals.

Now, you know how important planning is to our business model. But I can tell you one thing. You're not going to be able to read a financial publication about individual investors without hearing about planning. Planning is becoming the new buzz word.

(IMAGE)

There was a sarcastic article about a broker-dealer recently. The headline was about a company "discovering goals-based advice (and thinking it's new.") If you look at that article, basically what they were saying is that company is simply repackaging their investment advice and calling it planning. It is neither holistic nor comprehensive.

This is where we stand out. Our business model is built on the holistic integration of insurance and investments—all on a robust planning chassis.

(IMAGE)

And we know that planning leads to results. This chart shows the difference in productivity gains between planners and non-planners. We know that in our system, representatives who use planning daily are significantly more productive than representatives who don't. Look at the data. Whether you're talking about new clients, repeat clients or total compensation, people engaged in planning are significantly more productive than people who don't.

And what I think is best about this is it doesn't matter where you are in your career. The data is equally compelling whether you're an under-five-year rep or whether you're a veteran and have been in business for more than five years.

This is why we say we're at the center together. Nobody is approaching the marketplace like us. Nobody is holistically integrating insurance and investments with trusted advice and enabling technology—all on a platform of financial strength and product values.

This isn't just about the best getting better. This is about the best creating the future.

So I've talked about our identity and our vision. But ultimately, it all comes down to our culture, what separates us from every other company. And I believe you can sum up the culture at Northwestern Mutual with four words: Do the right thing.

We do the right thing. Our goal is to be first in benefits, not first in size.

We brag about paying claims, while many companies are using lapse rates and other things to avoid paying claims. But we proudly step up to the plate to make sure our policyowners and clients get what we promised them.

Do the Right Thing

Now, in preparing this speech, I came across a recent claim story that I believe is special, and I want to share it with you. One of your colleagues, a representative out of Chicago, Chuck Volpentesta, was working in the northern Indiana market. He came across a prospect named Luis. Luis had just gotten back from the Marines in Afghanistan, was in his late twenties and had three daughters.

Luis was about to join the Gary, Indiana fire department. He decided he wanted to take out a policy on his life for the protection of his daughters—for $500,000. In the context of putting that policy together and submitting the application, a few issues arose on the medical part of his application.

When we shared the issues with three of our reinsurance companies,

three out of four turned it down flat. They would not issue a policy to Luis. The fourth company rated him with a substantially higher premium. And when Luis heard this, he said: I still want to get life insurance. But I can't afford $500,000. I'll apply to get a $250,000 policy.

But Chuck and his team did not give up. They kept working, trying to find a way to get Luis the full coverage he needed, $500,000 of life insurance. In the middle of all this, a tragedy occurred. Luis was murdered in his hometown of Gary.

Now, for every other company in our marketplace, I believe that would have been the end of the story. After all, the case was unresolved. The reinsurers had turned it down—or rated it highly. Luis had mentioned that maybe he'd take a lesser amount of insurance.

But we resumed our efforts, working aggressively with the reinsurance company. And eventually, we issued a policy for $500,000 on a man who who was deceased—and immediately paid a death benefit to his family. Now his daughters have had trust funds set up, so they can go to college.

This is why I say our culture is special. We do the right thing. We keep our promises to ourselves, all of you and our policyowners.

So there you have it. Purpose at Northwestern Mutual. Who we are, where we're going and how we think, act and live each day. So I want to return to those questions I asked you at the beginning of my talk.

Why do you do what you do, and why do you do it with Northwestern Mutual? I think I know the answer. I think it's the same reason so many of you have signed up for the 100 Lives Challenge, that commitment to write 100 lives between now and next year's annual meeting.

It's because you know that bad things happen to good people. And you also know that if those people work with you, in the face of tragedy, you can look at their family members and tell them—you are going to be okay.

Remember those 40 million families I mentioned, the 40 million who are underinsured or uninsured?

They don't know what to do. They don't know who to see. They don't know where to go. Many don't even know they need you.

Folks, that's your opportunity. In fact, I'd say that's your obligation—to reach out to as many of those 40 million families as humanly possible to make sure they're protected and well-positioned for the future.

That's what separates you and Northwestern Mutual from every other company. While our competitors are expanding overseas, building their asset management services, or buying retirement plan businesses, we are focused on individuals.

We're focused on families. And together with those of us at the home office, you will reach out to everyone you possibly can—one by one, life by life.

So yes, you are in the right profession. Yours is a noble profession, and people need you now more than ever.

And yes, you are with the right company, because your company will make sure you can deliver what you promised to your clients.

So that's our future, working together, reaching out to every family we can to make sure they are financially secure.

So go out there and help all of those families enjoy the journey. And while you're at it, have a great annual meeting.

Thanks everybody. I appreciate it.