

THESE VITAL SPEECHES

THE BEST OF THE 2019 CICERO SPEECHWRITING AWARDS

GRAND AWARD

- 3 "Go Boldly," by John La Rue for Meredith Segal, Co-Founder, African Development University

CATEGORY WINNERS

- 5 **AGRICULTURE:** "That's Very Wedgworth of You," by Chris Moran for Jack Payne, Senior Vice President for Agriculture and Natural Resources, University of Florida
- 6 **ASSOCIATIONS:** "Fulfilling the Promise of Telehealth," by Boe Workman for Jo Ann Jenkins, CEO, AARP
- 10 **BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES:** "Families, Not Files," by Raegan Weber, for J. David Motley, 2018 Chairman, Mortgage Bankers Association
- 12 **COMMERCE AND RETAIL:** "How Distributors and Reps Can Build Trust and Work Better Together to Remain Relevant in Our Markets," by Teresa Zumwald for Eddie Gibbs, Vice President, Vendor Relations, Winsupply Inc.
- 17 **EDUCATORS:** "Kent State Beyond the Shootings: Journey of the Wounded Healer," by Tom Farmer for Beverly Warren, President, Kent State University
- 23 **ENERGY:** "Changing in a Time of Change," by Lech Mintowt-Czyz for Ben van Beurden, CEO, Royal Dutch Shell
- 25 **GOVERNMENT:** "Never Be a Bystander," by Lieke Hagebeuk for Hugo de Jonge, Deputy Prime Minister, the Netherlands
- 26 **MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION:** "2018 State of Manufacturing Address," by Mark Isaacson for Jay Timmons, President and CEO, National Association of Manufacturers
- 29 **MEDIA:** "What Can a Women's Magazine Teach Beltway Insiders?" by Gary Forman for Susan Spencer, Editor-in-Chief, *Woman's Day*
- 32 **MILITARY:** "Where Are the Leaders?" by Hal Gordon for Tom Stewart, Retired New York Investment Banker and Former Naval Attack Commander
- 34 **CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED:** "#MenToo: Breaking the Silence of Male Trauma Survivors," by Megan Pope for Debra Warner, Professor, Los Angeles Campus of the Chicago School of Professional Psychology
- 37 **DIVERSITY:** "The Power of Singlemindedness," written and delivered by Janet Stovall, Manager, Executive Communications, UPS
- 39 **EDUCATION:** "The Bystander Effect: Why Some People Act and Others Don't," by Soness Stevens for Kelly Charles-Collins, Lawyer
- 40 **ENVIRONMENT/ENERGY/SUSTAINABILITY:** "In Our Hands: Let's Launch a Satellite to Track a Threatening Greenhouse Gas," by Amanda Holt for Fred Krupp, President, Environmental Defense Fund
- 42 **HEALTHCARE:** "The Hardesty Lecture: Patients I Will Never Forget" written by Norman E. Sharpless, M.D. and the NCI Office of Communications and Public Liaison, delivered by Norman E. Sharpless, M.D.
- 45 **PHILOSOPHY/RELIGION:** "Meaning," written and delivered by Jeffrey Flint, President, Flint Speechwriting
- 47 **PUBLIC POLICY:** "The Mysterious Intersection of Media and Criminal Justice Policy," by John Patterson for John J. Cullerton, Illinois Senate President
- 50 **TECHNOLOGY:** "What Kind of Society Do We Want to Be?" by Jennifer Bowles for Alan Finkel, Chief Scientist of Australia
- 52 **ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING:** "Lunch with the Chancellor," by Amanda Todd for Rebecca Blank, Chancellor, University of Wisconsin
- 56 **COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS:** "5 Lessons in Life," written and delivered by Eydna Skaale, Rhetorician
- 58 **EMPLOYEE MEETING:** "The Keys to Our Collective Success," by Teresa Zumwald for Richard W. Schwartz, Chairman of the Board, Winsupply Inc.
- 63 **EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH:** "The Japanese Hell Ships," by Leonoor Russell for Admiral Rob Bauer, Chief of Defence, the Netherlands
- 64 **HEARING TESTIMONY:** "Statement of Johnny C. Taylor, Jr., SHRM-SCP, before the California State Senate Joint Committee on Rules Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Response," by Martha Frase for Johnny C. Taylor, President and CEO, Society for Human Resource Management
- 67 **MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH:** "Work and Love and Suffering," by Kate Devlin for Lucy Kalanithi, Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine, Stanford University School of Medicine
- 68 **STATE-OF-THE-INSTITUTION SPEECH:** "That Is What a 21st Century Public University Does," by Alex D. Solis for Rodney K. Rogers, President, Bowling Green State University

SEE HONORABLE MENTIONS, INSIDE FRONT COVER

HONORABLE MENTION

"Architects, Your 'Dare-to-Be-Great Moment' Is Now!" by Jack Dougherty for Carl Elefante, President, American Institute of Architects

"Health Funders' Role in Building a Reflective Democracy," by Rosemary King for Nichole Maher, President and CEO, Northwest Health Foundation

"Winning the Game of Faculty," by Jennifer Bowles for Alan Finkel, Chief Scientist of Australia

"Miscarriage: What Do You Say?" written and delivered by Soness Stevens, Associate Professor

"Building a Culture of Health Using an Equity Lens," by Tanya Barrientos for Richard Besser, President and CEO, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

"Rotterdam, a Two-Speed City," by Lieke Hagebeuk for Hugo de Jonge, Deputy Prime Minister, the Netherlands

"Art + Science = Innovation," by Judith A. Navoy for Jeffrey W. Evenson, Senior Vice President and Chief Strategy Officer, Corning

"That's You! Who We Are at UCF," by Joe Adams for Elizabeth A. Dooley, Interim Provost, University of Central Florida

"Keep Your Eyes on the Prize," by Teresa Zumwald for Jeff Walker, Father of the Groom

"Remembering T.K.," by Jill Elish for John Thrasher, President, Florida State University

"What We Do, & Why," written and delivered by Howie Beigelman, Executive Director, Ohio Jewish Communities

GRAND AWARD WINNER

“Go Boldly”

By John La Rue for Meredith Segal, Co-Founder,
African Development University



Delivered at the University of Pennsylvania
Graduate School of Education, Philadelphia, June 29, 2018

I believe in going boldly.

Picture yourself on an airplane, on your way to a new country—a new continent—for the first time. On the monitor, you see the distance to your destination shrinking, and you don’t know how to feel. You don’t speak the language. You can’t imagine life in the second poorest country in the world. You don’t know how you’ll get home from the airport. And you don’t know you’ve just lost half your luggage.

In July a year ago, that was me. Just out of graduate school, on my way to Niger to visit my friend Kad. I wrote a little blog post on the plane, detailing all my fears and expectations.

The extent of my French vocab then was “Merci” and “Je t’aime.” Which is almost but not quite enough to convey “missing purple suitcase.”

My friend Kad also believes in going boldly. Straight away he tossed me the keys to his car and told me I’d learn about Niger best by driving around. And—despite the US State Department warnings of kidnappings and terrorism—I did.

I learned it’s a place with dirt roads clogged with cows. I learned a two-wheel drive car bogs down in sand, at night, when you’re driving by yourself. I learned that’s not very fun, when you can’t speak the language and can’t forget those State Department warnings. And I learned that just pushing the accelerator—no matter how hard or with how much hope—doesn’t get you unstuck.

Looking back, that moment feels symbolic. Niger is full of smart, driven, hard-working people pushing the accelerator. They happen to live in a place without opportunity for higher education. It’s hard to move forward.

In Niger, I met a brilliant girl named Yasmina. Orphaned as a small child,

she was raised by nuns, and took the national secondary school exit exam two years early—at age 16, earning outstanding scores. Passed the Associate’s exam without the requisite coursework. And for her education, that was pretty much it.

I met a 27-year-old woman, Nana, who spoke English that put my French to shame. As Nana tells the story, she had failed out of the national university medical program and dropped out of an English program in Ghana. Her life had gone from great promise to a living hell—her words. She considered suicide. She ultimately found a partner and gave birth to three children over four years (the average woman in Niger has eight). And through her failures, marriage, and motherhood, Nana clung to the dream of education.

At the same time that kids like Yasmina and women like Nana have no opportunity for quality higher education, employers in Niger are actively looking for smart, educated employees.

If you go around Niger and talk to businesses, to government, to development agencies, you’ll hear again and again about how they truly want to hire local talent, but can’t find people with basic skills and experience.

People who can independently write a report. Send an email that conveys information. Say hello with confidence. Ask questions. Present a professional CV. If someone says they know Excel, they often mean they learned about the program with paper and pencil—not that they’ve used the program on a computer.

It seemed to us that the way education works in Niger makes it hard for skilled workers to develop. The average child in Niger completes less than five years of schooling. More than 80% of adults cannot read or write.

Students who do finish secondary school take national exams in July—and get results back too late to apply to universities that fall. So the class of 2018 often doesn’t enroll until fall of 2019. If they go to the national university, strikes and other disruptions mean a 3 year education usually takes 6. So this year’s high school grads get diplomas in 2024 or 2025, and proceed to unpaid internships that can last years before paying work results.

A young person in Niger would have every reason to feel like they’re stuck spinning their wheels in a world where they don’t quite speak the language. Where, no matter how zealously they push that accelerator, they get nowhere.

To get my car free, it took a small crowd of children who appreciated my difficulty, understood the context, and with many hands pushed Kad’s car clear of the sand.

And to help Niger and its young people get that extra force multiplier to free themselves from their difficulties as they accelerate, it seemed to my friend Kad and I that the best thing we could do would be to start a University.

Now, there were a few challenges involved in this plan.

First, we’d never done this before. We knew people would think we were crazy. Why Niger? Why us? Why so fast?

Second, in Niger as in many places, there’s corruption. We refused to pay bribes. In the past ten years, no university had gotten its accreditation without paying a bribe. But a university with the mission and mandate to teach ethics can’t start with bribery.

And third, we had already met with enough ministries and enough people to realize that Niger doesn’t attract much investment. It’s what people call a donor orphan country.

Talking about founding a University would never work. We had to do it. We had to go boldly.

So we set out to found a university... in three months.

I landed in July. We decided to launch our university in August. In September we invited the US Ambassador to our opening ceremonies and set that date as October 16th.

We went boldly. We believed that if we produced something, however imperfect, that would make people believe us and lend their hearts and their hands.

And it's true. There is a contagion of excitement that happens when people see a project in motion. A whole world of amazing, generous people came to help.

Just like the children who pushed my car out of the sand as I pushed on the accelerator, many hands helped us move forward. Professors contributed cases, time, their credibility, and whole courses on a USB drive.

We faced a mountain of decisions. We needed a building, we needed teachers, we needed students. We needed entrance standards, a curriculum, a student handbook. We needed computers and projectors, paper and pencils.

And we addressed many of these needs in a similar way. We said yes when help came along. We set deadlines, and we always leaned toward action. Kad always says, "done is better than perfect." As a perfectionist, I still cringe a bit, but I've come to embrace this way of thinking.

For example, we needed a building—so we searched for two weeks, visiting many sites. We got our nine-person team together on Friday, held a debate about the possible locations, and did not leave until we reached a decision.

The site we picked was shabby, to say the least—so we gathered about 200 volunteers to clean it, paint it, furnish it, and adorn the walls with inspirational words.

October 16th came. The U.S. Ambassador cut the ribbon. The lead story on national news said we opened

a university. 41 undergrads, 31 graduate students, and around 100 professional students, 20 executive students. Visiting faculty from around the globe have come to teach our students—students who are hungry to learn, overflowing with questions, and prepared to grapple with the problems these same professors present to classes at Harvard.

Each of our students has secured an internship in an international NGO, a top performing company, a government ministry—or an incubator to build his or her own startup.

This fall, we'll grow to 100-some undergrads and a new crop of graduate and professional students. We hope we will have support from new donors.

It's now been a year since Kad and I were sitting in your seats, just about to graduate from our master's program. Our university has been serving students for eight months.

We aspire that the African Development University will become a world-class university. The Harvard, the Oxford University, the Ashesi University, The University of Pennsylvania of Francophone West Africa. I believe that our course is the right one.

But, even 5,000 miles from Niamey, I cannot get out of my mind the defining questions that Kad and I debate every day.

Just in the past few weeks, I've had at least a dozen people declare they want to come to Niger. An experienced coder and start-up leader from Spain. The head of Brandeis's Negotiation program. The CFO of Savannah Petroleum. The CEO of AMBA, one of the "big three" global business school accrediting associations. So we have our next challenges: How do we organize and manage all these people so our students gain value and they have a great experience? How do we balance seizing opportunities and focusing efforts?

We still don't have the money to finish our building or to hire the customary cadre of full-time faculty. How long can we depend on the generosity of volunteers to donate resources and time? How can we convince donors to

take a chance on an unknown place on the globe, to take a chance on a young institution, to take a chance on us?

What does scale mean to us? Suppose we educate only one student, the experience is exceptional, and the graduate is exceptional. But it's one student. Suppose we welcome 1,000 and we give 1,000 students access to education they would never otherwise receive. But the resources are spread so thin that no one becomes exceptional. What is the growth trajectory that sustains the A.D.U. culture we've built?

Perhaps these questions would have been answered before opening had we spent years researching and preparing. I don't know.

What I do know is that Yasmina enrolled at A.D.U. on a scholarship. We set her up with a one-time job as note-taker at a conference with Save the Children. They liked her so much, she earned a six-month internship—a six-month paid internship.

And Nana—the 28-year-old with three children? Nana gained just enough confidence to come to our A.D.U. Open House. When she went home, she declared to her husband that going back to school was no longer a question. She earned the full trust of her classmates, and faith in herself. Nana was voted the president of the student body. She applied to and won a scholarship to this year's Clinton Global Initiative University. So in a few months, she will be the one on an airplane—for the very first time—going to a new country and a new continent.

And I will urge her—as I urge you: go boldly.

Marketa, create that school of experiential education that you came here to build. John, embark upon your search for a way to reform surgical residency, and make it happen. Cindy, lead a global school network that will bring affordable education to every child.

And each of you: Lean toward action. Get your plans in motion—and inspire those many hands that together, will change the world.

WINNER: AGRICULTURE

"That's Very Wedgworth of You"

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

Delivered to Class X of the Wedgworth Leadership Institute, Orlando, Florida, July 26, 2018

Good evening, everyone, and congratulations to the graduates and their families for completing a two-year journey.

We expected a lot from you in the Wedgworth Leadership Institute. After tonight, all of us at IFAS—as well as the people who nominated you—expect you to lead.

One of the great lessons I hope you take away from Wedgworth, is that you don't have to lead by yourself. You won't see be seeing Hannah and your classmates as much anymore, but they'll still be part of your lives. You've just expanded your professional network and your circle of friends.

I come to almost all these ceremonies because I can't say enough times how important the graduates of the Wedgworth Leadership Institute are to the future of Florida.

This class didn't even wait for the future. You're already reaching higher than you were two years ago.

Let's start with JC Deriso. In a couple of months, we may be calling him "Commissioner Deriso." He's running for the DeSoto County Commission. Not bad for a guy who launched a business career not even 20 years ago with his winnings from the county fair, which he invested in a John Deere lawn mower and 500 business cards.

Ryan Atwood became vice president of the Florida Blueberry Growers Association during his time in Wedgworth. He could have been president, but class IX graduate Brittany Lee beat him to it.

So we've got the two recent Wedgworth grads in charge of the blueberry association. That happened in part because of Wedgworth. You see, Brittany as an alumna was one of the people who nominated Ryan for Wedgworth. Ryan, in turn, nominated Brittany

for president of the blueberry association—just weeks after she'd given birth. Brittany tried to discourage him from doing so. She told Ryan that she was just a little occupied, with freeze protection in her fields and caring for a newborn at home.

You know what Ryan said to that? He said, "Brittany, that's not very Wedgworth of you."

OK, so there's a couple of ways of looking at this. One is, "Ryan, man, we didn't put you through this program so you could weaponize Wedgworth!"

The other is, "Ryan, that is very Wedgworth of you to call on Brittany to lead when maybe she thought the time wasn't right. The time is ALWAYS right for a leader to step up. So Ryan, thank you for inspiring Brittany and for helping to lead what has been one of Florida's great agricultural success stories of the past 20 years.

President Lee is here. Brittany, it's very Wedgworth of you to be with us tonight. Thank you for coming, thank you for responding to Ryan's call, and thanks for being a leader in Florida agriculture.

How about Tom Mitchell? Last month I had the pleasure of attending the Florida Citrus Mutual conference at which Tom became president of the board. Again, not bad for a guy who moved to Florida less than a decade ago. Now he's in a position to lead Florida's iconic agricultural commodity through one of the toughest times in its history.

Then there's Tom's new Wedgworth buddy, Martin Hackney. Martin just became secretary/treasurer of the nation's largest state nursery and landscape association, what we call FNGLA. And that means he's in line to become its president in two years. That will continue Hannah's winning streak

in which five of the last eight FNGLA presidents are Wedgworth alumni.

That includes the current president, Will Womack, who was a member of Class IX and is here tonight. In his first president's letter to the association, he mentions Wedgworth in the second paragraph and Hannah in the third. My only question is, "What took you so long to get to the point, Will?!"

In all seriousness, I was glad to attend yet another convention where a Wedgworth alum became president this year. And who swore him in? Hannah.

They even delayed Will's inauguration until the last day of the convention so Hannah could make it back from the Class X international trip in time for the swearing-in. Hannah went straight from Glasgow to the convention hotel in Naples, a 20-hour trans-Atlantic journey. She even had an IFAS associate vice president bring her swearing-in clothes so she wouldn't look rumpled at the ceremony.

Will, I thank you, too, for coming, and for stepping up to be a leader.

I think the story of Will and Hannah is a great example of the lengths people will go to be there for a fellow Wedgworth alum.

You know, I recently featured Wedgworth alum Laurie Hurner in my column in Citrus Industry Magazine. Laurie showed inspiring leadership in the wake of Hurricane Irma last year. Among the many things she did was organize a laundry brigade to wash the utility crew's clothes.

She did this not because it was her job as an Extension agent, but because it was a job that needed doing. Men and women came from all over the U.S. to restore power to South Florida, and you can imagine their clothes got a bit sweaty and grimy.

The problem was, the volunteer washerwomen she organized were using their own money at the laundromat. Laurie needed to get them help. So what did she do? She called a fellow Wedgworth alum. The next day, someone showed up at the laundromat with \$200 worth of quarters, said, "I'm from Wedgworth," and then left. Boom! Problem solved with a phone call.

That's the power of the network you've graduated into. And that's the responsibility you have to your classmates and fellow alumni in the years to come.

I don't get to see what Wedgworth looks like during the sessions. I just know that every time through, it seems like Hannah has concocted an even more powerful "Wedgworth special sauce." The testimonials get stronger and stronger.

Hannah tries to explain to me how close you've become to each other—

and to each other's families. So I combed through the newsletters to see if I could glean what it is that makes you such a tight-knit group.

I think I found it in the newsletter that recapped seminar VIII: You've seen each other square dance. I guess I'm glad I wasn't there for that one!

But, hey, you never know, maybe square dancing will become the new golf, the bonding time when deals and decisions get made. And really, how many more times in your life are you going to play the Newly Wed Game?

Hannah, what's with this curriculum?

Graduates, when you decided to commit to Wedgworth a couple of years ago, your family and friends did, too. So I just want to take a moment to acknowledge the sacrifices they made by having you away so many times over the past two years.

Would the families and friends who've accompanied our graduates tonight please stand? Thank you for all you've done to support our graduates.

One final acknowledgement. Dr. Eugene Trotter was the founding director of the Wedgworth Leadership Institute. He passed away in 2004, but his wife and daughter continue to attend these graduations, and they are here with us tonight.

Gale and Dottie, thank you for remaining a part of the Wedgworth family.

Graduates, I'll be looking for your names on association boards, in headlines, and on the ballot. One place I hope I'll see it is on the attendee list at future graduations and other reunions.

Thank you in advance for all you'll do that will make the rest of us say, "That's very Wedgworth of you."

Congratulations.

WINNER: ASSOCIATIONS

"Fulfilling the Promise of Telehealth"

By Boe Workman for Jo Ann Jenkins, CEO, AARP



Delivered at the American Telemedicine Association Annual Conference, Chicago, May 1, 2018

Good morning everyone. I'm excited to be here this morning to help celebrate ATA's 25 years of advancing health care through telemedicine, and to represent AARP's 38 million members as a consumer voice in this increasingly important discussion.

The world has changed a lot in those 25 years, and advances in health care have contributed greatly to those changes. But as we meet here to learn, connect and discover new ways to empower patients and improve their lives, we're only beginning to scratch the surface in realizing telehealth's increasingly important role in the future of health care.

AARP's social mission—our purpose—is to empower people to choose how they live as they age.

That's why AARP was one of the first consumer groups to join ATA.

We believe that consumers need to be front and center in the telehealth discussion and a full partner in designing the future of health care.

At AARP, we envision a future where all people will be able to fulfill their real possibilities over the course of an ever-longer lifetime while living healthier, more financially secure and fulfilling lives—what I like to call health, wealth and self.

We believe that telehealth is poised to lead a change, not only in how we think about aging, but also in sparking new solutions to help us all age better.

For example:

- With regard to health—As we live longer, telehealth can challenge the norms and improve how we take care of ourselves and our loved ones.

- In terms of wealth—It can bring

lower costs, reduce risk of medical debt and help us save.

- And, in terms of self—It can improve how we live, give us more time and ability to connect with others, and help strengthen our relationships.

We believe that people of all backgrounds should be able to count on community and social connections when they want them and a safety net when they need it. And, we seek to reduce disparities in quality of life, health span and life span.

For health, this means:

- Preparing people to live longer, healthier lives,

- Providing them with the knowledge and tools necessary to help them do that, and

- Creating an emerging market of health innovations that supports their efforts to lead longer, healthier lives.

As a result, they will have access to healthcare at any age at an affordable price. And, we will all be better equipped to care for each other as we age—both goals we share with ATA.

Making this vision a reality requires some radical changes. It demands that we disrupt aging. It demands that we embrace a new vision of health that emphasizes well-being. And, it demands that we change the rules that govern the use of new and emerging health care practices and technologies—including telemedicine.

So, let me begin by stating the obvious: The world is aging.

Usually when we think of the really big or “macro” issues that affect our world—like “climate change”, for example—a lot of the debate centers around whether it really exists, or about how it is defined, or how various people believe it will or will not impact the world. But “population aging” is different. There are no aging “deniers,” or even skeptics.

In a world where consensus on any issue is increasingly rare, there exists sweeping consensus on the simple, but powerful truth that the world is aging—fast and just about everywhere.

Our ability to live longer, healthier, more productive lives is one of mankind’s greatest accomplishments. We’ve added more years to average life expectancy since 1900 than in all of human history up to that time—combined.

Consider these facts:

- Here in the U.S., 10,000 people a day are turning 65—a trend that will continue for the next 12 years.
- Over the next two decades, the number of people age 65 and older will nearly double to more than 72 million—or 1 in 5 Americans. And most 65-year-olds today will live into their 90s.
- The fastest growing age group is people 85+; the second fastest is people 100+—and the majority of them are women.

And this isn’t happening just in the US.

Today, Japan is the only country in the world where those aged 60 and over

represent 30% or more of the population. By 2050, 31 countries—including China—will reach that milestone.

Think of it another way: Picture a 10-year-old child—maybe it’s your son or daughter, or a grandchild, a sibling, a niece or a nephew, or a neighbor—that 10-year-old today has a 50 percent chance of living to 104. And the older he or she gets, the odds continue to rise.

In less than two years, people 65 and over will outnumber children 5 and under. And some have speculated that the first person ever to live to 150 is alive today.

The question for us is what do we need to do as individuals and societies, not only to adapt to that new reality, but also to help shape it?

We have to create a new mindset around aging—a new way of thinking about possible solutions. We have to disrupt aging.

We need to change the conversation in this country about what it means to grow older. The way people are aging is changing, but many of our attitudes and stereotypes about aging are not. We need to challenge those old stereotypes and attitudes and spark new solutions so more people can choose how they live as they age.

Let me show you what I mean.

[Video—What is Old?]

Disrupting aging is not only about changing the conversation; it’s also about changing the reality of aging—how we perceive, what we believe and how we behave...as individuals, as institutions and collectively as a society.

And, let me be clear: Disrupt Aging is not really about aging—it’s about living. It’s not just about adding years to the end of life. It’s about creating a plan for a 100-year life.

This has implications for all aspects of our lives. Think of it this way, if you knew you were going to live well into your 90s or 100, what would you do differently?

Now think about it from the broader societal view. If we as a society knew that huge numbers of our population would live that long, what would we need to do to adapt our public policies,

our institutions, our social structure and our infrastructure to make that possible?

Many of these—as well as many of the products and services that support us as we age—were designed for a 20th century lifestyle and don’t adequately support the way we live today, nor do they reflect the advances in technology that allow us to live better as we grow older.

Health

This has huge implications for the future of health. We have made a lot of progress with regard to health and health care.

But as we think about millions of people living longer lives, it’s clear that we simply cannot continue doing the same things we’ve been doing with regard to health. We have to embrace a new vision of health that emphasizes well-being.

We need an integrated approach involving collaboration from all sectors of society—not just those in the health care system—and especially those in the technology sector.

We are coming to realize that our health has more to do with the choices we make each day in how we live our lives than it does from an occasional visit to the doctor’s office.

We’re discovering that it’s increasingly possible to improve health in later years. We now know that changes in lifestyle and medical advances can increase our healthy lifespan and shrink the number of years spent with a disability. In fact, a healthy lifestyle adds an average of 6.5 disability-free years after age 65.

Healthcare is happening at home. Ninety percent of people 65 and over want to age in place. And, technology is allowing more people to do that.

- Mobile health adoption has increased two-fold in the last two years.
- Use of social media among people 65 and over has tripled since 2010.
- 83% of people say they are willing to share their health data.
- Telehealth is huge now—and will continue to grow.

But we need to do more. Instead of just treating ailments, we need to focus more on preventing disease and improving well-being.

Instead of just focusing on the medical and physical aspects of health, we need to also focus on the social determinants of health—things like loneliness and social isolation, helping people realize a sense of purpose, and helping them develop a more positive, optimistic outlook on aging.

We need to enable them to become empowered users of the healthcare system—not dependent patients. And we need to ensure that they have dependable access to quality care throughout their lives.

That is the promise of telehealth. It can help us achieve all of these goals.

- It's convenient and saves time.
- It offers easier and greater access to healthcare regardless of where you live.
- And, it helps people connect, not just to health care providers, but to others with similar conditions and to family and caregivers—especially those who may live in a different part of the country who can be linked into a doctor's appointment with a loved one.

There are three areas where I think telehealth can have a tremendous impact on people as they age while showing us what is possible in the delivery of healthcare.

The first is social isolation and loneliness.

- Loneliness is the “new smoking.” It is the equivalent to smoking 15 cigarettes per day—and shaves 8 years off of life expectancy.

- Loneliness has the largest negative effect on quality of life and is the single largest predictor of dissatisfaction with healthcare.

- Mortality risk for loneliness is greater than obesity.

- Social isolation among older adults is associated with an estimated \$6.7 billion in additional Medicare spending annually.

Social isolation has become such a problem in Great Britain, that in Janu-

ary this year, Prime Minister Theresa May appointed a Minister of Loneliness to measure it, determine its impact and develop a strategy to address it.

And, CareMore, in California, became the first healthcare provider group in the US to hire a “Chief Togetherness Officer” to directly address loneliness and its impact on health.

We believe that telehealth holds great promise in helping to combat loneliness and social isolation. In fact, our research indicates that people 50 and over view “connectedness” as the primary benefit of telehealth.

The second area where we see telehealth having a tremendous impact is caregiving.

It may surprise you to know that, in many cases, people will spend more time—and resources—caring for their aging parents than they did raising their own children.

This has serious implications for caregiving. We know that at some point in our lives, most of us are either going to be a caregiver or need a caregiver. While anyone at any age can require caregiving, the vast number of people needing care will be in these older age groups.

Family caregivers face unprecedented demands. And those demands continue to grow. Our research shows that family members do 90 percent of caregiving, and nearly half perform tasks that were once limited to trained nurses.

And, as the oldest segment of the population increases rapidly in the coming decades, the ratio of family caregivers to those needing help will decline dramatically—placing even greater demands on fewer family caregivers and creating an urgent need to support them with training, respite and workplace flexibility.

But both caregivers and those needing care should view telehealth as a way to help make caregiving easier and more flexible.

It can make it easier for those needing care to live independently in their homes—and for those providing care to access important medical information about the person they care for.

The third area where telehealth can have a real impact is in addressing disparities that exist throughout the healthcare system.

Telehealth makes it possible for people in rural or underserved areas to see providers or specialists who are far away.

And, it can help address language and cultural barriers by giving people access to doctors or other providers who speak their language.

Fulfilling the Promise of Telehealth

So, what do we have to do to fulfill the promise that telehealth holds for the future of healthcare as our population ages?

First, we have to change the rules. I said earlier, that as we disrupt aging, we also need to adapt our public policies to support and make longer lives possible. Nowhere is this more important than in telehealth.

We need to change outdated laws that are barriers to delivering telehealth. Most of the rules and regulations that govern telehealth are set by the states.

In 2014, we joined with ATA and others to work on a telehealth task force—the Partnership Project on Telehealth—organized by the National Conference of State Legislators. Its focus was on breaking down barriers.

Since that initial meeting, AARP has been working in states across the country to change rules in order to give patients more access to providers, make it easier for providers to get paid for telehealth services and, make it easier to provide information and monitoring.

We've also been advocating in states to broaden the definition of telehealth. In Colorado, for example, we worked to pass a bill that creates a new definition of telehealth that expands the opportunities for patients and their loved ones to utilize telehealth at home.

In Iowa, we successfully advocated for a telehealth parity law that now provides telehealth for Medicaid enrollees as well as for those covered by

private insurance and state employee health plans.

In Indiana, we helped to pass a bill that prohibits any distance restrictions for telehealth and telemedicine services under Medicaid and adds podiatrists to the definition of prescribers for telemedicine services.

In Utah, we supported legislation that requires private insurers to cover tele-psychiatric consultations between providers, ensuring greater access to mental health services for the people of Utah.

And recently in New York, we worked to expand Medicaid-covered telehealth services to home settings, making a person's home an allowable originating site.

At the federal level, we're also actively supporting the Chronic Care Act, which we believe will take some important steps to improve care for the millions of Medicare beneficiaries with chronic conditions.

One of those steps is expanding the use of telehealth in Medicare Advantage plans and Accountable Care Organizations. It expands telehealth coverage to include a wide array of services such as checking on a patient's blood pressure or changing a medication dose.

By delivering efficient, effective in-home care to those with chronic conditions, we will help to improve outcomes and reduce costs—especially for the more than two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries who live with multiple chronic conditions such as heart disease, cancer, diabetes and stroke.

Being able to access telehealth technologies can reduce the number of times a patient goes to the doctor's office. And for an older person with mobility issues, this is a huge benefit.

In addition to changing the rules around telehealth, we also have to change the outdated perception of older people as technophobes.

Our latest research on technology adoption among people 50 and over shows a lot of promise—it's now prevalent across all 50+ age cohorts. Seventy percent own a smartphone—and are on social media. There are still some issues around trust and privacy, but signs are promising overall.

Text messaging is gaining in popularity. And while only a fraction of people over 50 use technology to manage their health or communicate with providers, most have positive reactions toward using communication technology to provide care. Not surprisingly, interest is higher among caregivers and those who are more tech savvy.

So, what holds people back?

People simply don't understand the possible applications or how it can benefit them in their everyday lives. So, educating people is critical to fulfilling the promise of telehealth.

And this leads to the third thing we have to do to achieve telehealth's promise—change the language.

Our research shows that the language we use to talk about telehealth matters a lot in shaping people's attitudes toward it and their willingness to use it.

One of people's biggest fears regarding telehealth is that it will be used to replace the way we currently receive care instead of enhancing it.

It's important for consumers to see telehealth as part of the healthcare system—another tool to help them get the care they need—not a mandatory replacement for seeing a doctor in person. And the terms we use can help get that point across.

The terms “telemedicine,” “telehealth” and “digital health care” don't send the right message to consumers.

The most favorable term that emerged from our research is “connected care.” It was seen as the most appeal-

ing, and it sent the right signals that this will improve care, not replace it.

Conclusion

We're at a unique time in our history when our increased longevity is converging with unprecedented innovations in biomedical research, genomics, health and technology to disrupt aging in ways previously unimaginable—empowering us to choose how we want to live and age.

Our world is changing constantly and at an increasingly rapid pace. The future of aging will be very different. Living to 100 is a real possibility, especially for younger generations.

In 2030—less than 12 years from now—the first Millennials will start turning 50. And the first GenXers will turn 65. At the end of 2030, the first Boomers will begin turning 85, swelling the ranks of what is already our country's fastest growing age group.

That's three distinct generations reaching milestones in their adult lives. The same trend will occur in varied ways around the world.

But it's not just about living longer, it's about living better. It's about creating a future in which people will be able to fulfill their real possibilities over the course of an ever-longer lifetime while living healthier, more financially secure and fulfilling lives.

- If we disrupt aging and challenge outdated beliefs and stereotypes about growing older;
 - If we embrace a new vision of health that emphasizes well-being; and
 - If we change the rules that govern the use of new and emerging healthcare practices and technologies;
- ...Then telehealth will help us create that future.

Thank you.

WINNER: BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES

"Families, Not Files"

By Raegan Weber, for J. David Motley, 2018 Chairman,
Mortgage Bankers Association

Delivered at the National Mortgage Servicing Conference
and Expo 2018, Grapevine, Texas, Feb. 7, 2018

It's my pleasure and honor to be with you today serving as MBA's 2018 Chairman, representing both Colonial Savings and the servicing industry.

You know, sometimes servicing gets painted with such a negative image.

We're the paper pushers...

The check collectors...

The ones who follow through on delinquencies and, occasionally, unfortunately, foreclosures.

All we care about is getting our check on time—which couldn't be further from the truth!

And, from the policymaker perspective, they are perhaps understandably skeptical and cautious as the result of a few bad actors that gave the entire servicing industry a black eye.

And the fact is, even within my own company, too often, we have talked about A FILE having this or that problem, sometimes forgetting the fact that every file is really a family trying to improve their situation.

I really don't think that is WHO we are. Either as a company or as an industry.

The fact is, we care about our customers and their homes. The best part of my job is being part of a team that helps people get a home of their own. What often goes unsaid is the importance of helping those people stay in their home if something unfortunate happens. Otherwise, what's the point of helping them buy that home in the first place?

Which is why, at Colonial, we have coined a motto—"Families, not files."

Because we are supposed to be a source of information, expertise, and help.

It's not a file that needs help to avoid foreclosure...it's a family.

Let me take a moment to tell you about the Sanchez family.

The Sanchez family fell on hard times due to illness and the resulting loss of income. As with many in these situations, house payments fell behind. In order to avoid foreclosure, the family worked hard to sell their home.

They found a buyer and got all the way to the closing table, only to find what they believed was outstanding late fees, and previous tax advances that would prevent the sale of their home.

They asked Colonial to step in. We quickly worked with the settlement agent, the realtor, and the borrower, walking them through the paperwork, helping them understand that the fees were already accounted for and they should be good to close (after we forgave a small debt).

Our team at Colonial was available even at the last minute to quickly mitigate the situation and help the sale to close, relieving a great burden for the Sanchez family.

While this may seem like a small thing to you and me, it wasn't to the Sanchezes. But this is the sort of thing servicers do every day.

Because these are families, not files.

Luckily, in this situation, we had the ability and flexibility to quickly resolve the problems without any regulatory hurdles. But that isn't always the case.

As we work with policymakers to address the legislative and regulatory burdens that prevent us from providing the service we want to give, we should always keep our families in mind.

We continue seeking clarity in the rules with written and reliable guidance all servicers can follow, and all consumers can understand.

We need servicing alignment across all investors and guarantors—HUD/FHA, VA, DOJ, USDA, and even the GSEs. We need all federal government

agencies on board following the same standards.

Take for example the uncertainty that still exists around FHA loan-level certifications and DOJ enforcement standards under the False Claims Act. Though these have been used primarily to bring cases for origination issues, the risk is similar for FHA servicers who submit these certifications or claims for defaulted loans.

HUD Secretary Carson committed to addressing this issue at MBA's Annual Convention and we are continually following up with HUD in hopes that progress will be made in the near future. Ideally, we can reach a point where lenders and servicers will only be liable for material errors that would have altered the decision to approve the loan for FHA insurance, and good-faith mistakes will not result in draconian punishments.

By determining loan defects through terms of insurability, FHA would provide greater certainty and clarity regarding the types of errors that can expose lenders to False Claims Act risk. Limiting this risk, along with reforms to lower the cost of servicing FHA loans, would encourage more robust participation in the FHA program.

Servicers also need a cohesive framework in which to provide loss mitigation and alignment across investors and guarantors. We know what works in default servicing and should align towards those standards. Such changes would provide equitable outcomes that don't vary based on the particular government insurer or guarantor; such changes would reduce consumer confusion about available options and would provide servicers with a single playbook they need to follow.

With this in mind, an MBA Task Force comprised of over 35 members

from 20 companies convened to draw upon the experiences of the financial crisis and HAMP—to formulate universal principles that should be applied to a future loss mitigation program.

After much deliberation, the task force developed the One Mod Waterfall Proposal. It incorporates four themes that drive successful loss mitigation—accessibility, affordability, sustainability, and transparency.

Life after HAMP shouldn't be a guessing game.

A unified framework, like the One-Mod proposal, offers clarity and predictability to both servicers and consumers.

But, then there are the extraordinary, unexpected tragedies that have catastrophic impacts on people's homes and lives.

Because it's not a file that lost their home in a hurricane or wildfire...it's a family.

And MBA and our members get it...it's a family.

Immediately at the onset of the hurricanes and flooding in Texas, Florida, the Southeast, and Puerto Rico, MBA deployed consumer and industry resources on its website to help families impacted by the devastating hurricanes.

Basics like a checklist, along with tips for consumers on who to call, and links to disaster resources such as FEMA.

These industry resources are a one-stop shop for all mortgage investor, insurer and guarantor guidance related to disaster responsiveness. Because when we're prepared, we can help our customers that much better.

Many of us needed this guidance.

Colonial alone serviced about 9,000 families who were impacted by hurricane Harvey and over 5,000 families who were impacted by Irma.

We provided resources and information straight from our website for the families in need of help regarding their weather damaged homes.

Today, many families remain stuck somewhere between FEMA assistance and Hazard or Flood insurance payments; proceeds that they need to rebuild their homes.

And, we are doing all we can to assist them.

As if hurricane destruction wasn't enough, another natural disaster struck families in California. Wildfires are still burning and are noted as some of the worst in California's history. More than 1.2 million acres have burned.

The North Bay fires resulted in \$9 billion in claimed losses, according to the California Department of Insurance. Across the state, more than 5,700 residential properties were listed as total losses, while over 15,000 residential properties were listed as partial losses.

Servicers with customers in disaster-impacted areas are working round the clock to provide families what they need to rebuild their homes and their lives.

This is one of the hardest jobs for servicers and some of the most difficult times for families.

We take each situation very personally because there is nothing more personal to someone than their home.

And because these are families, not files.

Working with families also takes an understanding of who they are, their lifestyles, and their housing needs.

And in this area, our industry can always do better.

And to do better, we must embrace diversity within our own organizations and in every sector of our industry.

We need an industry that better reflects its customers.

We all know and believe in the case for diversity. Now let's do something about it.

At Colonial, we created our own Diversity and Inclusion Committee led by a cross-section of people from all over the company—new employees and veterans; Senior VPs and clerical folks; and minorities representing people of different races, lifestyles, and backgrounds.

Managers meet with their teams regularly to talk about our shortcomings and our successes from a diversity and inclusion perspective.

We encourage our folks to speak out on ways to knock down barriers and develop better ways to attract diverse talent and customers.

Whenever we recruit to fill existing or new positions, we seek out social media, publications, and schools that are known to be active in multi-cultural communities.

These types of initiatives can be applied to every business.

And here are just a couple of the things that MBA is doing to help you on this front.

MBA is providing more education on, and access to, services, tools, and other resources to help its member companies advance their diversity efforts.

MBA is aggressively promoting jobs and careers in mortgage banking through Mortgage Banking Bound and virtual career fairs to attract new, more diverse populations to our industry.

We have created our mPact and mPower programs to provide a platform for bringing young people and women into our business and giving them a network that will help them prosper and advance.

By taking advantage of MBA's diversity resources and incorporating simple, strategic diversity initiatives within our businesses, we can better serve the families who depend on us for their homes.

Folks, this is the future.

Companies that don't embrace diversity and inclusion are going to be left in the dust.

It's just that simple.

As we work with leadership in Washington, DC, to improve the servicing atmosphere, we must keep the families we serve at the forefront of our conversations.

We are closer to consumers than anyone and because of this, we have a unique perspective to advocate for the policies that affect our industry and impact consumers.

With the economy going strong and mortgage defaults low, now is a perfect time to evaluate the servicing business, seek out opportunities for improvement, and work with policymakers to make it happen.

We have an opportunity with a more business-friendly administration and Congress to make great changes.

Last year at this conference, I talked about the Basel III Accord's punitive treatment of Mortgage Servicing Rights, and how the rule was bad for the entire industry.

Largely, as the result of the efforts of MBA and its members, the three prudential regulators gave us a "pause" in the BASEL implementation timeline last fall. They subsequently proposed "a simplification" of the capital treatment that would raise the cap on MSAs from 10% to 25%.

This was a huge success story.

But, we won't back down.

We look forward to the finalization of a "simplified" rule that would "loosen the noose" of punitive capital standards that the original rule imposed.

Meanwhile, some think now would be a good time to address servicer compensation or "fee for service". I suggest we be very cautious here. There is a lot to consider.

What is the right amount of servicing fee?

Do you set the amount now and have it adjust with some index?

How do you estimate what future costs there might be?

This is a very complicated topic and one for which we need to be very thoughtful and deliberate after having received a lot of input from the entire industry—originators, servicers, guarantors, and investors.

Here's the bottom line...

There are a number of issues on

which we need to be working with regulators if we are to restore balance to the housing market;

Some of them are directly servicing related, while others could have ripple effects across the entire real estate finance industry.

And here is where you come into the picture.

To be successful, we need you advocating WITH us.

AND we can start right here at this conference.

First, if you're not already a member of the Mortgage Action Alliance, you should be. It's free and it is MBA's primary mechanism for effecting change quickly.

When the GOP tax plan passed the Senate Finance Committee, the bill contained a provision that would have required lenders who retain servicing to pay tax on their MSR's at the time the Mortgage Servicing Asset is created, not as the income is received under current law.

This change in tax accounting for mortgage servicing rights would have had a devastating impact on the flow of capital that supports a robust and competitive real estate finance market. It could have put a lot of us servicers out of business!

MBA jumped into action, and in addition to a surgical direct lobbying effort, we activated the Mortgage Action Alliance. We generated more than 9,000 letters to Capitol Hill—and

succeeded in getting an exclusion for mortgage servicing contracts in the final Senate bill and conference report.

That's the power of MAA and that's the power we have when we act as one. 9,000 letters in less than a DAY is an impressive number, but every skirmish is different—and next time we may need ten times that amount!

There are 250,000 people employed in the mortgage finance industry. We need them ALL to be MAA members.

As evidenced by this recent call to action, the MAA is fast.

It is FREE.

And it is EFFECTIVE!

To learn more, I'd like to invite you to join me this evening for the MAA/MORPAC reception at 6 PM. To be honest, this crowd has not been as actively engaged in advocacy as some of our other industry niches.

So please stop by tonight and we will discuss how you can help us continue to influence and educate lawmakers to move our initiatives forward and help our industry better serve our customers.

We need you to lend your voice to our efforts.

Bring your expertise, relationships, and experiences to the table.

Everything we do touches PEOPLE's lives.

What we do and how we serve our customers matters.

Because it's about families, not files.

Thank you.

WINNER: COMMERCE AND RETAIL

"How Distributors and Reps Can Build Trust and Work Better Together to Remain Relevant in Our Markets"

By Teresa Zumwald for Eddie Gibbs,
Vice President, Vendor Relations, Winsupply Inc.

Delivered at the Association of Independent Manufacturers/
Representatives, Inc. 46th Annual Conference, Napa, California, Sept. 13, 2018

There's no doubt in my mind that you've seen these headlines:

- "Ferguson buys master distributor Jones Stephens."
- "Home Depot will spend 1.2 billion dollars to open more than 100 distribution locations that can reach 90 percent

of the U.S. population within hours."

- "Franklin Electric—a leading manufacturer of pumps and motors—buys four distributors with 70 locations nationwide."

And probably the most chilling headline of all—from this past Friday's

NAW SmartBrief—which reads: "Sales move online, jeopardizing field reps." The Bloomberg article that follows is titled, "Death of the Salesman: Humans lose as computers close deals."

Meanwhile, Amazon keeps expanding into wholesale distribution. They're

supported by our national vendors—and often by distributors themselves.

More mechanical contractors are planning to use digital commerce to buy more products day-to-day.

And more vendors are promoting an omni-channel experience. That could mean reaching around distributors and reps to sell direct to the end user.

Threats like these are much worse than the perceived threat all of us faced in the early 1990s, with the rise of the Big Box stores. Back then, some people said the Big Boxes would destroy the traditional wholesaler! And yet, somehow our industry survived and prospered.

Here's the truth: Vendors want to sell whatever they make, however they can—which is not a knock on vendors; it's just reality. And today, vendors have more sales channels than they've had in the past—well beyond the traditional channel that relies on us: distributors and reps.

This was confirmed in a recent study by NAED, which also identified the “Great Disconnect” between vendors and their distributors.

Dirk Beveridge led this study. Many of you know him from his work with NAW and ASA.

The results of Dirk's study showed that both vendors and distributors feel like they're being abused by a 9-to-1 ratio. Distributors complained about “too many distributors and channels.” And vendors complained about “distributors wanting more of our margin, while offering little in increased benefits and value.”

All of this has an effect on you, as reps. Because it may put you on opposite ends of the spectrum with your customers and your vendors.

And what about contractors that are consolidating across the country? It means more centralized purchasing—or at the very least, more centralized decision making—and less business for some of us.

Make no mistake: Our industry is rapidly changing! And distributors and reps are feeling the brunt of these changes.

Our roles are shifting.

So there are many unanswered questions. And quite frankly, a bit of fear.

Here's something else that's changed:

Winsupply came to realize that “we loved reps”—and recognized that they are more of a key to our success than we'd previously been willing to admit.

We realized that if distributors and reps are to survive and thrive in the future, we need to figure out ways to add more value. That way, we can remain relevant in our markets.

A major contributing factor of HOW this might be done is a discovery that Winsupply made gradually, starting around four years ago. This morning, I'd like to talk to you about it—and give you some food for thought about how the working relationship between distributors and reps needs to change if both of us want to secure our future in this industry.

Winsupply's journey toward this important discovery began back in March 2014.

At the time, we were gearing up for our very first Rep Council: A two-hour meeting with a group of about 20 reps from the leading agencies Winsupply does business with.

We had one purpose for this Rep Council: To give our reps a better understanding of Winsupply and how we do business.

We have a very unique business model—unlike other distributors in our industry—so we were often misunderstood in our markets. We wanted to clear up what I called “urban myths and legends” about our organization.

If you don't know Winsupply, we're a collection of 600 local companies in 45 states operating in the plumbing, HVAC, electrical, industrial, waterworks and fire industries.

Each local company is run by a president at the local level—a decision maker. It's unique, because each local company president and their key employees can own up to 40 percent of

their operation, with Winsupply Inc. as the majority owner.

All 600 of these presidents are entrepreneurs free to decide how to make their own company succeed. And since they're local owners, they're very driven to make their local company highly profitable.

Local companies get the benefit of Winsupply's support services working with my team in Vendor Relations.

We're the organization's liaison with our preferred and large vendors, buying groups, trade associations—and now rep agencies like yours.

We negotiate preferred vendor programs, and deal with a vendor's distribution policies and access to their lines. We also negotiate baselines for pricing, buy-in requirements to distribute a new line, and things like conversion, return and co-op programs.

We do not, however, negotiate local prices.

We also monitor market trends and legislative issues facing our local companies and the industries they serve such as No Lead ... Tariffs ... and perhaps the greatest example of government overreach in our lifetimes—the California Prop 65 legislation.

Everything we do at Winsupply and Vendor Relations is designed to benefit our local companies at the local level.

We wanted to explain all this to the reps at our first Rep Council in Texas, which we did. And believe me—it was eye-opening!

Yes, we accomplished our agenda: These 20 reps had a better idea of our unique business model and how our local company presidents operated at the local level.

But we heard two comments that forever changed our thinking about how we needed to work with our reps.

First, we heard from Bill Freeman of the Spirit Group, Supply House Times Rep of the Year in 2013. He pointed out that local Winsupply companies are small businesses—just like all the reps in this room—with a local owner under every roof. “So we're just like you!” Bill said. “We have skin in the game just like your local company presidents.”

And he was right.

But for some reason, we'd never connected those dots before.

Second, we heard from Mike Smith from Mega Western Sales. He was frustrated that his vendors had never talked to him about Winsupply and how we work when he said, "Who was supposed to tell us all this stuff?"

Mike's comment was a surprise to us, too.

We figured everything we were sharing with our key vendors and their National Account Managers was being passed on to you, the reps, since you are their sales force. But that wasn't happening. So there was this huge disconnect resulting in a huge breakdown in communication.

(A year later, in 2015, we got a clue why this may be happening. As we were preparing the invitations for our second Vendor Summit, we learned about the fairly high turnover in the executive ranks of our vendors. It's 6 to 7 times higher than the turnover rate of rep agency changes by vendors.)

Nevertheless, after our first Rep Council, the takeaways for us were very clear:

Independent reps like you are more like our independent local company presidents than we ever knew.

And for the most part? As reps, you have staying power since you—just like our local company presidents—are local owners committed to your agencies and to your markets.

We realized that you, as reps, were a key audience for us—potentially a very strong partner—that we'd been overlooking.

We concluded pretty quickly that it would be good to work closer with our reps and improve our communication with them.

But the question was this: How could we work better with our reps? What would we need to do differently?

After all—let's face it—there's often a lot of baggage between distributors and reps. It can happen with any distributor and any rep, anywhere.

We knew from talking with local company presidents and with reps

that trust issues had piled up over the years.

Both of us were guilty of not being completely transparent with each other. Both of us had violated each other's trust at one time or another. And as a result, both of us had sometimes been burned.

Frankly, some of us at Winsupply's parent company and many of our local companies viewed reps as a "necessary evil." And I have no doubt that some of our reps felt the same way about some of our local companies.

This was no way to view a potential partner if our goal was to work better together!

So there were lots of hurdles and barriers to overcome.

We had to get rid of all this old baggage. So we decided the next thing we had to do was keep our Rep Council going so we could keep the conversations going.

In 2016, we held another Rep Council, this time in Orlando. We wanted to come up with real answers to this question: "How can local companies in the Winsupply organization establish a closer partnership and work better together with reps?"

We had five breakout tables. Reps got to rotate from one table to another to give their honest opinions about real issues we faced together in the field—like how to grow our businesses.

We also talked about ethics, integrity and honesty ... joint sales calls and marketing ... new product launches ... inventory and training ... and vendor programs.

After it was over, we'd collected plenty of feedback.

We had clear direction on things we do well—and things we don't do so well.

We also had a long list of things we ought to do together to make business work better at the local level.

Once again, this Rep Council was eye-opening!

And—just like the reps did during our first meeting back in 2014—they shared with us another comment that once again changed our thinking about working with reps.

This Rep Council told us: "You need to share this message with more reps like us—and you need to share it faster."

We took their advice to heart and decided to do a road show so we could take our message nationwide, just as our reps suggested.

We may have been talking with our vendors regularly—but we clearly needed a better model for communicating with our reps.

Remember what we learned back in 2015 about the high turnover in the executive ranks of our vendors?

I can't tell you how many times I'd get a call from a rep and asked him what he was up to, only to get this reply: "Eddie, I'm training another VP of Sales from XYZ Manufacturing, giving him (or her) the tour of our territory so they get a feel for what we do, and how we do it."

As you well know, this kind of turnover does not happen at rep agencies!

So getting our message to our reps—directly—is something we thought was pretty important to do.

That 2016 Rep Council taught us a very important lesson:

That the relationship between local company presidents and reps is the most important relationship in the supply chain.

So I got with Michael Souders, our VP of Sales, and together we planned our road show program and itinerary. Michael comes from a rep family that is still in the business today.

We set up 9 Rep Summits. These were two-day meetings in nine major areas where we do business—from Hartford to Kansas City to Los Angeles.

We held our first one in June of 2016, and our last one 14 months later, in August of 2017. Our purpose was to set the stage for more communication between local company presidents and reps at the local level.

Day 1 was for reps, and Day 2 was for local company presidents. Our message on both days was basically the same, because we wanted both groups to hear the same things.

We had two goals for the summit:

- To begin removing the barriers that were getting in the way of building a closer relationship between reps and local companies.

- And to begin asking each other hard questions about value and relevance, and where we fit into the other's plans.

We wanted to be completely transparent.

Take on tough issues.

And begin tearing down walls so we could begin building bridges.

We talked about the Winsupply business model, including operations, ownership, finances and marketing, as well as Vendor Relations and our distribution centers.

In the end? Both reps and local companies learned what each of us expects of the other, how to be more professional and how to treat each other with more respect. As Michael pointed out: The things we were talking about would work for ANY distributor.

Many of our vendors got wind about what we were doing.

One of these was Rob McDonald, president and CEO of A.Y. McDonald.

Rob said our Rep Summits were a great idea—and that a lot of distributors could benefit from opening that kind of dialogue with their reps.

At Winsupply, we were finally sharing critical information directly with the people on the front lines: local reps and local company presidents. They could get good and important information from us. And we could get good and important information from them.

At the end of each Rep Summit, we left both reps and local company presidents with this challenge: “Guys, we’ve set the stage. What you do with all this information is up to you. The ball’s in your court.”

It was an important moment for reps and local companies that had trust issues in the past.

They had to decide whether they wanted to pick up the phone, have a conversation and agree to bury the hatchet.

If they did, then they could finally sit down together. Really talk. And decide how to start pulling the rope in the same direction, together.

An interesting thing happened during our third Rep Summit in Richmond, Virginia. After it was over, a rep said to us, “We had a falling out with one of your presidents five years ago. He has been successful, and I have been successful—but I think we may have been more successful if we’d have worked together. I’m going to give him a call.”

Michael and I didn’t say a word.

We kept that information to ourselves. And then the next day, the very same president that rep was talking about said to us, “I get the message. I’m going to give my old rep a call. We’ll go to lunch.”

And before long, that actually happened!

But how many other reps and presidents would do that?

How many other reps and presidents would take the next step?

We did not know at the time.

When our Rep Summits were over, 450 reps and 300 local company presidents from the east coast to the west coast had heard our message. Some of you were there! To us, the 9 Rep Summits seemed like a huge step forward. It felt like we’d laid the right foundation for building a better relationship between reps and local companies.

But all we could do now was wait.

Meanwhile, we kept talking with our key vendors, and kept educating our National Account Managers about the issues.

In fact, right now we’re in the preliminary stages of planning our next Vendor Summit to update our National Account Managers, and the regional managers from our top vendors.

We also took action on other ideas from our reps. For example, we built a dedicated website—just for reps—with information reps told us they want and need to know. Things like news from Winsupply on acquisitions, new local companies and new presidents; what our product managers and area leaders are responsible for; and our vendor and rep expectations.

We also kept our regular Rep Council meetings going.

Earlier this year in March, we had another Rep Council meeting in Nashville. This time, 10 of the 20 reps on our council were new, and as usual, our agenda was a little different.

We sent out a survey ahead of time, and asked reps to email us their most burning questions. Then, during our Rep Council meeting, we’d have a panel of senior executives from Winsupply address these questions.

We talked about everything—from sales projections ... to the rep’s role in our digital commerce strategy ... to how we decide to add new lines in our distribution centers ... to pricing and rebates.

For the most part, no question was off limits, and every question was answered.

Some of the newer reps on our council told us they’d never sat down with a distributor our size to talk about issues like this. Even reps who’d been on our council for a couple of years said it was the best council meeting yet!

Everyone got a better understanding of each other so they could work closer together in the field.

One rep said, “This information is really going to help us when we call on local companies.”

Another rep who’s been in the business for more than 30 years said, “No one in the industry is doing what you’re doing—being this open and this transparent with reps.”

More than four years has passed since our first Rep Council meeting, and our Rep Summits wrapped up a year ago last month.

So what has changed?

A lot!

Because we took new steps and showed interest in our reps by hosting Rep Councils and Rep Summits, reps have shown more interest in us.

I can speak for myself and for Michael Souders: We both get more phone calls, emails and text messages from reps than we ever have before. We’re getting information from reps that we did not get in the past. And as vendors make changes? We’re hearing things sooner than we used to, and learning their potential effects on the local market.

All of this is helping us guide our local companies so they can make better decisions in their markets.

But we also wanted to know:

What's changed in the field?

What's changed for reps?

What's changed for local companies?

So earlier this summer, we sent out an informal survey, and asked 28 of our current and former Rep Council members to tell us—in their own words—if anything was different in the field.

Here's what they said.

First—reps and local companies seemed to understand each other better.

One rep said: "I've explained to our team that the local company president needs to be personally involved in conversations with our agency."

Another rep said: "The local company we work with wants to grow market share the right way by providing better service. They don't want to be a low-cost wholesaler."

We also heard this from a rep: "In the past, we were always perplexed about how to really partner with local companies in our area. Knowing the nuts and bolts of their world has made this much easier."

Second—reps and local companies have improved their communication.

One rep said: "Now we tell local companies which products of our manufacturers are being stocked at Winsupply's distribution centers. This is working! Our sales and market penetration of several products are up tremendously year-to-date over sales at your competitors."

Another rep said: "We decided to revisit local companies where we have traditionally underperformed. In almost every case, the results have been positive. Local companies have been more transparent about their go-to-market strategies and the exact areas to partner on."

We also heard this from a rep: "We usually have annual planning and strategy meetings with some local companies in our area—but since the summits, we've held these with the majority of locations."

Third—the survey told us that reps and local companies are begin-

ning to build deeper, more personal relationships.

You can see what I'm talking about here in this picture of one of our local company presidents and his customers. [slide]

Some of you may recognize Bob Mycoff of Harry Warren in the middle. (I suspect there's one reason Bob has the biggest smile: He's thinking about the new relationship he's going to have with the money from all those other gentlemen at the end of the round!) But back to our survey results.

One rep told us: "We've spent more time training local company employees—so now they know a lot more about our products."

Another rep said: "Our level of trust has increased. We now share more proprietary information related to job tracking and specification writing."

We also heard this from a rep: "Our new mutual trust and alignment has allowed us to partner with a local company and win a lot of new business with a developer's national hotel chain—and there's much more to come. This would not have happened without the new, closer relationship we share."

It all adds up to more trust.

One rep told me this: "Your outreach to reps is working. I can't say it any other way."

So what's next at Winsupply in our journey to help our reps and local companies build better relationships?

The conversations we're having will continue. They'll happen at our future Rep Council meetings, which are now a permanent fixture for us here at Winsupply. We're planning our next one for the first quarter of 2019.

And we continue to encourage more conversations in the field. Reps and local companies need to continue talking about delivering value and being relevant in their markets—and where they can mutually align.

When we talk about value to local companies, we mean this:

"Are you doing the things your customer needs or expects you to do?"

And when we talk to local companies about being relevant, we mean this:

"Are you just an order taker? Or are you working every day to sell something on purpose?"

Because to be relevant, you don't have to be the biggest in your market; you just need to deliver value, and we feel you do that by having a growth strategy and executing on it.

And reps? You need to ask yourselves similar questions about what it means to bring value. What it means to be relevant. And how our local companies and other distributors might help you achieve that.

At the end of the day, here are the questions that distributors and reps must be able to answer:

- If you did not exist tomorrow, would your customers notice?
- Would your key vendors notice? Would your partners notice?
- If you weren't around, would they say, "What in the heck am I going to do now???"

Make no mistake: Changes in our industry will continue to disrupt traditional channels in wholesale distribution.

What we don't know is how these changes will play out, and the impact of those changes on traditional relationships in the supply chain that involve us: distributors and reps.

We can't predict the future.

But we know this much is true:

Vendors that aren't meeting their sales goals through reps and distributors now have OTHER channels that will allow them to make their numbers by reaching around and going direct. In fact, we learned about a vendor doing that just this week.

As time goes on, there are more chances for reps and traditional distributors to be eliminated from the picture.

So the real question is this:

What are we going to do about it?

Clearly both of us need to maintain close working relationships with our key vendors. And we need to know what vendors expect of us so that we can meet those expectations.

Some vendors tell me that they expect their reps to be specialists in very niche products. They want reps to do more solution selling to move

higher margin products out the door. And they need reps to work every day with engineers and builders to get their branded products specified.

Right now, at this moment, your key vendors are meeting to figure out where their growth and their profits will come from in 2019 and beyond.

Are YOU a part of these plans?

Do you know EXACTLY where you fit into your vendors' businesses over the next one or two years? The next three to five years?

Because vendor expectations are changing!

Distributors like Winsupply are influencers with strong contractor relationships.

So what can WE do to help YOU meet your vendors' expectations?

What role can WE play to help you create more awareness of your new products in the marketplace ... train more local company employees ... and help you get access to contractors ready to buy your higher margin products?

Here's some advice: If you work with our local companies, make sure that the local company presidents understand where THEY fit into YOUR plans—and always ask them where YOU fit into THEIR plans.

Now is the time for both distributors and reps to redefine our roles so we can secure them for the future.

To do this, we need to have deeper conversations so we can figure out new ways to provide more value and be more relevant in our markets by working together.

It doesn't make sense to go it alone. Whether you've been around for 20 or 30 years—or even more than 62 years like Winsupply!—there's no guarantee you'll be around next year.

Tim Morales—past president of AIM/R and Supply House Times Rep of the Year in 2014—is a member of our Rep Council.

In November 2016, during our sixth Rep Summit in Atlanta, Tim stood up and said this:

“I want to make sure everyone in the room understands: Winsupply is on our side. These guys are the best advocates for reps that we have in the industry.”

Tim, we really appreciate that acknowledgment, so thank you.

And to everyone here, let me say:

All of us at Winsupply believe that YOU—our independent reps—are a key ingredient to the success of our 600 local companies.

A rep responding to our recent survey about the Rep Councils and Rep Summits told us this:

“Eddie, we appreciate the local nature of your organization, and the opportunity to deal directly with decision makers. As it's been said many times:

We have a lot in common!”

Indeed, we do.

And with that, I'd like to thank Mike Mullen for inviting me to speak to your group today.

Thank you.

WINNER: EDUCATORS

“Kent State Beyond the Shootings: Journey of the Wounded Healer”

By Tom Farmer for Beverly Warren,
President, Kent State University



Delivered at the Chautauqua Institution,
Chautauqua, New York, Aug. 15, 2018

Good morning. It is such a pleasure to be with you today in this beautiful, idyllic environment. This is my first time at Chautauqua, and I feel I have been transported to a magical place. It's really great to see so many people interact with such respect for each other, even when we differ. And don't you know, we need that more today than ever before.

I am deeply honored to have this opportunity to share my reflections on this week's theme: “The Forgotten: History and Memory in the 21st Century.”

It is also my deep pleasure to say thank you to the many Kent State alums, who are in the audience today. You warm my heart. You make me feel

so proud. We have very special guests among us, including Tom Grace, John Cleary, Chic Canfora, Laura Davis and Mark Seaman. So, it is wonderful to be here to share the Kent State story in true Chautauqua spirit.

Meet Dean Kahler

The first thing I want to do is tell you about a friend of Kent State University named Dean Kahler. Dean is a senior citizen. Warm, funny. He laughs a lot. He has lived a life of consequence, and in Dean, you see no trace of bitterness. He radiates peace. In May 1970, Dean was a Kent State freshman. A six-foot-three, 190-pound athletic farm boy from East Canton, Ohio.

He was curious to see his first rally against the Vietnam War. To many on

campus, the events leading up to May 4th did not seem like a major protest. Demonstrations broke out nationwide starting on May 1st, in reaction to the sudden American invasion of Cambodia. Other colleges and universities had bigger shows of dissent with more media coverage.

Kent State had two predominantly peaceful rallies. But there was vandalism in the city of Kent, and on May 2nd, the campus ROTC building was set on fire. Ohio Governor James Rhodes mobilized 850 members of the Ohio National Guard. The Governor was running for Senate that year, and the primary election was set for Tuesday, May 5. He vowed to restore law and order to Kent

State, in his words, “by any means necessary.”

Now tanks and armed members of the National Guard were rolling through the city of Kent and onto university grounds. This was new. This was disturbing.

Monday, May 4, 1970

Still, on Monday morning, May 4th, the core group of protesters numbered only around 500. There was tension. Rocks were thrown. Tear gas canisters were fired, picked up by protesters and thrown back. There was angry shouting.

Around noon, it was time to change classes, and more students came to the Commons. Perhaps 1,500 more. Some were curious to see what was happening. Many were merely passing by or going to lunch. Dean Kahler would remember thinking: I expected a bigger protest.

At 12:24 p.m., shots were fired. 67 shots.

Four students were killed. Allison Krause, Jeffrey Miller, Sandra Lee Scheuer, and William Schroeder.

Dean was 300 feet from the National Guard—the full length of a football field. When he heard the rifle fire, Dean hit the ground. Lying prone, he was shot in the lower back. He was among nine wounded. Tom Grace fell nearby, hit in the foot. Alan Canfora went down, shot in the wrist. John Cleary, shot in the chest, and five more.

Faculty marshals pleaded with students to leave the Commons, and with the Guardsmen to cease fire. Without their intervention, it might have been worse.

Now, as a Boy Scout, Dean had learned first aid, and as a Kent State freshman, he was taking zoology. He knew a thing or two about spinal cord injuries. As he lay there, Dean knew he had walked his last steps.

How did that strapping freshman athlete—body damaged and life disrupted by a random bullet and a grievous wound—become the serene and peaceful man in our midst in 2018? I will come back to Dean’s journey in a moment. In many ways, it mirrors the journey of Kent State University itself.

The Challenge of the Wound

Like the students we lost, Kent State suffered a terrible, indelible wound. Since 1970, we have seen every emotion on the spectrum, from rage and despair to perhaps unaccountable serenity.

Frankly, we have not always honored all those honest reactions. We have seen the impulse to erase history, to move on. We have seen the high price of remaining chained forever to one terrible minute. But now, we approach the 50th commemoration of the shootings in 2020. My community is setting out to seize the day, so to speak, to remember May 4, but also to move forward.

Kent State is the reluctant custodian of an indelible mark on the American landscape. The Commons at Kent State, and the Prentice Hall parking lot, are in that awful pantheon along with Dealey Plaza and the Lorraine Motel. Watts and Selma. And Jackson State, where two student protesters were killed just 11 days after the Kent State shootings.

We live with our wound. The question we ask today is: What do we do with it?

In prior times, we saw it mainly as the atrocity it was. A horror. Today, a new generation asks: Can our wound also be, somehow—a gift? What might the experience of May 4 equip us to accomplish?

We are not the first to contemplate the duality of wounds.

The Persian poet Rumi wrote about pain and sorrow. He said, “The wound is the place where the light enters you.”

And the modern essayist Robert Bly tells us: “Wherever the wound appears in our psyches... that is precisely the place for which we will give our major gift to the community.”

Any great university, of course, wants to deliver major gifts. Since I assumed the presidency of Kent State in 2014, I have thought deeply about this. I have devoted much of the power of my office to the stewardship of May 4, 1970 for this new century. It is a moment in history, yes, but it is also a call to action.

Today, I will share my thoughts about how the university I lead can use its history as a healing force. For ourselves and the world, we are called to assume the role of the wounded healer.

The presentations at Chautauqua this week remind us that we must all engage in the hard work of remembering. Where Were You?

One way to begin is by considering our own individual relationships with history. When we gather to do that, to trade stories, we tend to start with one question. Where were you? For the Pearl Harbor bulletin? When JFK was killed? When Apollo 11 landed on the moon?

We have in our history a few seismic events ... events recalled vividly by everyone alive at the time. We always ask: Where were you?

The trouble is, as time passes, there are fewer who can answer. Our incoming class of 2022 cannot answer the “Where were you?” question for 9/11. The attacks were 18 years ago next month. Most of our freshmen were not yet born.

Many of you in this room may remember where you were on May 4, 1970, but not all. The average American is 37 years old. The Kent State shootings occurred 48 years ago. So remembrance is vital.

I know where I was on May 4, 1970. I was a senior in college in North Carolina. I was keenly aware of Vietnam protests nationwide. I had an older brother destined for a low draft number. The night of the Kent State shootings we had a curfew on our campus. There was tension, anxiety and fear. I thought about those Kent State students, and realized, “That could have been me.”

A deep sadness washed over me about where we were going as a country. We had torn ourselves apart over Vietnam; lost Bobby Kennedy and Dr. King; had a divisive election in ‘68; invaded Cambodia, which ignited the May 1970 protests; and now this.

What happened at Kent State on May 4 sparked national outrage. Fresh protests shut down hundreds of campuses coast to coast. Public opinion

turned against the invasion of Cambodia. Nixon staffer H.R. Haldeman would later say Kent State marked the beginning of the end not only of the Vietnam War, but of the Nixon presidency.

Kent State would stay closed for six weeks and has grappled with the shootings ever since. I could not have foreseen fate leading me to the presidency of Kent State University or that the upcoming 50th anniversary of the shootings would take place during my tenure.

This anniversary is more than a chance for a retrospective. It is an exceptional, maybe final, opportunity to connect original witnesses to a new generation. Think about it. On the 75th anniversary in 2045, there may be few remaining for whom May 4th, 1970 was a personal experience. I may have no more important mission as leader of Kent State University than getting this right.

To me, remembering is only part of the challenge. As the date recedes into history, as the event grows less vivid in our communal memory, we have to do more than ask: Where were you? We risk allowing May 4 to become one more dusty, abstract date in history, and we are determined to avoid that.

We have to keep it relevant. Make it mean more. Put our wound to work. So the task we have set for ourselves is to not only remember, but reflect, and renew.

Remembering

Let's talk about the hard work of remembering.

All people and institutions have episodes in their past they might prefer to forget. For many years after 1970, that was how Kent State coped with its wound.

At first, of course, the community rallied to deal with the political, emotional, and logistical crises.

As I mentioned, the campus closed for six weeks after the shootings. The faculty stepped up in extraordinary fashion—holding classes in their

homes, and at local libraries, to ensure the senior class could graduate, on time, in June.

Over the next few years, university leadership continued to struggle with the impact of the tragedy. The wound remained raw. The university was hurting on many sides, including financially. May 4 had become too difficult.

In early 1975, President Glenn Olds said it was time to end official commemorations. Perhaps everybody would forget May 4, but no one forgot—especially not the artists.

Only a few weeks after the shootings, Crosby, Stills, Nash, and Young released the powerful protest song, “Ohio.” The refrain cut through America all that summer, and for years to come: “This summer I hear the drumming. Four dead in Ohio.”

That was us they sang about.

The shootings produced art in even more direct ways. In the crowd on the Commons on May 4 was a Kent State student named Chrissie Hynde. She dropped out soon after, moved to England, and founded the Pretenders. Hynde became one of the strongest rock-and-roll voices of her generation.

Also in the crowd was 20-year-old Mark Mothersbaugh. He soon formed the band Devo with his friends Jerry Casale and Bob Lewis, who were also there that tragic day. Mark, Jerry, and Bob said Devo was their reaction to Kent State.

Jerry said, “We challenged illegitimate authority.”

Devo had a string of Top 40 hits, pioneered music videos, and influenced countless other bands committed to social commentary. Jerry and Mark had 40-year creative careers. Mark is not only still working today as a musician, composer, author, and artist. He remains a friend of Kent State.

More music came. More writing, more books, more gestures of remembrance, more voices.

In 1975, when Kent State announced the end of official remembering, a self-organized group of students, alumni, citizens of Kent, and other activists formed the May 4 Task Force.

They took over the job of remembering, of commemoration.

And then, in 1977, there was another effort to consign May 4 to the past. The university announced it would build an annex to its athletics facilities on the site where our students fell. Activists occupied the space with a Tent City. There were nearly 200 arrests. Strong opposition continued for almost two years, and actually continues to this day. It taught an important lesson in the power of proactive remembering.

Then, in the 1990s, official attitudes began to change. A courageous and forward-looking Kent State president, Carol Cartwright, finally opened the door to official acknowledgement. Under President Cartwright, a small but meaningful step was taken.

The four students killed—Allison, Sandy, Bill, and Jeff—fell in or near the Prentice Hall parking lot. Until the year 2000, you could park your car on the very spots where they lost their lives. Under President Cartwright, those spaces finally received the recognition lacking for so long. They are now marked off with illuminated pillars.

If President Cartwright cracked the door to official remembrance, her successor, Lester Lefton, opened it wide. In 2013, Kent State opened a visitor's center on the ground floor of Taylor Hall, the epicenter of the shootings. Dr. Lefton and his team worked hard to tell the story with down-the-middle objectivity. You can tour the exhibits, watch a powerful film—and then step outside into what was, on May 4, 1970, the line of fire.

President Cartwright made it all right to remember. President Lefton made it all right to memorialize. Today, I work to honor all the people affected and all their views and emotions, across the spectrum.

If Presidents Cartwright and Lefton flung the door open, my role is to turn the lights up and invite everyone across the threshold.

Here is one way we continue to keep that promise today. Every year, on the evening of May 3, we hold a candle-light vigil. Hundreds of marchers,

their small flames bobbing in the dark, retrace the protesters' steps around campus. We end at midnight in the Prentice Hall parking lot. Our candles are set around the spaces where our students fell, and caring people keep silent watch until noon on May 4. Some marchers are alumni. A few wear the same clothes they wore on that fateful day. Some are students. Some, residents of Kent. And some of us are university officials. But few words are spoken, few introductions made. In the flickering darkness—in the weight of the moment—we all look the same. Together, we invest in remembering.

Much more has changed in the past four years. On May 4th this spring, we commemorated the designation of the 22 acres where the protests and shootings occurred as a National Historic Landmark. The Interior Department granted us that status after years of lobbying in Washington, thanks to the tenacity of members of our community like Laura Davis, Carol Barbato, Mark Seaman, Jerry Lewis and many others.

Dividends of Remembering

All this is the story of an institution facing up to the hard work of remembering. I think this hard work pays two dividends. Two insights I want to share.

First: remembering, however fiercely and conscientiously done, does not resolve all questions, nor calm all critics. Whatever you think you know about the Kent State shootings is likely incomplete. Nearly fifty years later, we still lack one authoritative narrative for the shootings. There are thousands of unique perspectives and voices, and they often conflict. We acknowledge all the shades of gray that color the narrative.

Some protestors were aggressive, shouting obscenities or throwing tear gas back at the National Guard. But our dead and wounded were not, by and large, subversive radicals. They were students first and foremost, exercising their First Amendment right to assemble and protest.

Sandy Scheuer was not even protesting. She was killed walking to her next class.

Bill Schroeder, an Eagle Scout and an ROTC student, was also killed on his way to class.

The National Guardsmen were not all eager to engage; many later professed, themselves, to be against the war in Vietnam.

We still do not know for sure who gave the order to open fire, or why those rifles had live ammunition.

And not everyone mourned our losses. Not all citizens; not all law enforcement.

During the shootings Laura Davis, at the time a freshman student, took shelter in a nearby building. When the campus closed she returned home, where Laura's father told her, "They should have shot them all."

Laura replied, "Don't you know that one of those people would have been me?"

Laura's father was far from alone. In the aftermath, a Portage County Ohio grand jury was convened. A special prosecutor, Seabury Ford, told them the Guardsmen "should have shot all the troublemakers."

It is a messy narrative. But as conscientious stewards of the story, we cannot aspire to neat resolution. Because it is inconclusive, some of this remembering hurts, even now. Which brings me to my second insight: this wound has not healed.

I talk with victims and their families. Many continue to feel searing pain, and so does the university—a university that could not keep its students safe, and out of harm's way.

What I wish for them is healing, closure peace. I know we do not have the power to bestow it, but my presidency does have the power to honor their perspectives and acknowledge their loss.

So if we are to truly move forward together, there is limited solace, and limited power, in remembering. We must find another way. Travel another path. You will recall I talked about remembering, reflecting, and renewal. I believe we must embrace all three for Kent State to tread the ground between memorializing and forward motion.

Reflecting

When we reflect, we consider what the Kent State experience can mean for the current moment in American life.

One way to view the shootings is as a terrible product of missed signals and failed communication. That doubles as a fair description of the environment we find ourselves in today, where our leaders talk past each other. Our rhetoric is top-volume and polarized. Outrage is normal. Insults and mockery blow away civility and compromise.

As we learn to live with the wound of May 4, 1970, we at Kent State strive for different values. Values that Chautauqua in particular may recognize and appreciate.

The most tangible, institutional reflection of that goal is Kent State's School of Peace and Conflict Studies. My university has learned much, in costly ways, about conflict management and resolution.

As a culture, we pay a high price today for practicing angry politics. If all we do is hunker down in bunkers alongside like-minded people, attacking the opposition, our divisions only grow.

So we reflect on what May 4 teaches us, and these are the lessons we try to pass on about the world at large.

We understand that dehumanizing others, particularly political foes or any cohort "not like us," is a slippery slope that can lead to tragedy. After all, it is easier to hate from a distance.

We have learned that violence never provides an answer. Violence never deescalates tension. We have also learned how to be more thoughtful about managing crises that carry potential for violence—how to back away from the brink. Civility is the best foundation for human interaction.

The School of Peace and Conflict Studies bears in mind the words of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.: "It is no longer a choice between violence and nonviolence in this world: it's nonviolence or non-existence."

Kent State has another way to reflect on May 4 that is perhaps a little less tangible—but just as important

and effective. We are a community that defends our First Amendment right to self-expression but also encourages people to share their voices respectfully. We attract students who want to find their purpose and use their voice to make a life of meaning.

We at Kent State feel called to play the role of convener—to broker conversations that are more civil, braver, and more productive. We are called to challenge conversations and practices, in or out of politics, that have a dehumanizing effect. We oppose rhetorical violence. But it is possible to do that without suppressing or demonizing opposing points of view.

In April of this year, just a few days before the shooting anniversary, there was an on-campus demonstration in support of Ohio's open-carry gun laws. Second Amendment defenders came to campus with handguns in holsters and rifles slung casually across their backs. Given our history—our wound—you might predict tension, confrontation, raised voices. If so, you would be off base. The Kent State convening spirit was on full display that day.

There were bright and respectful students on both sides of the open-carry issue. For hours, they engaged the outside demonstrators. They listened as hard as they talked. Opposing points of view drove meaningful conversation.

The spirit of the discourse was perhaps not so different from what is done right here at Chautauqua.

On the grassy plaza at the center of campus, they shared space with other students playing games or drinking their Starbucks. The demonstrators stuck around until twilight. They told us afterwards they felt respected and appreciated. Perhaps they also felt surprised; it may not have been the reception they were expecting. Against many peoples' expectations, there was no rancor. No raised voices. That is the power of convening. That is reflecting on May 4 as well as remembering.

David Hassler is a Kent State professor and author who directs our Wick Poetry Center, which has a storefront here at Chautauqua. And David is here

with us this morning. Some of David's poetry is inspired by the shootings. He tells us that clear voices are the best mechanism for real change, and he has helped give voice to feelings we have had trouble articulating.

Echoing the ancient poet Rumi, and Robert Bly, David Hassler says when we speak through the wound of May 4, in all its complex pain, we acquire unique power.

Face the wound, urges David. Understand it. Remember: one hallmark of trauma is silence. Victims of abuse can silence themselves.

But we have the capacity to heal each other, not only with strong voices, but through the quality of our listening.

Kent State has progressed from trying to forget the shootings to owning that horrific moment—and honoring the whole spectrum of emotions they inspire.

We can make art out of it, as David and others have done. In the Wick Poetry Center up on Bestor Plaza, you can visit the Traveling Stanzas interactive exhibit—and create poetry in response to each Chautauqua theme of the week.

You can share your poem on the spot—either digitally, through videos, or on postcards printed right there. As part of your reflection this morning, I would love for you to visit the Traveling Stanzas exhibit and share your thoughts.

We can make a healing force of the shootings in our history. We find power in the archetype of the wounded healer. And for an institution to function as a wounded healer is a great thing. A great gift to our community and the world.

Renewal

After remembering and reflection comes renewal, but how do you get there?

Alan Canfora, shot in the wrist, had his lowest moment, not on that day, but years later—when he saw the justice system he grew up trusting would ultimately render little justice for him. Alan himself was charged with second-degree rioting. For years, he did not register to vote. But over time, Alan

was coaxed back into the political process by others, including his dad and Arthur Krauss, the father of Alison Krauss, killed that day.

Today, Alan believes again. He looks at today's landscape, frayed and full of lost faith, and reminded me, "The system works if we make it work."

After all this time and all his pain, Alan believes again. Remembrance, reflection—renewal.

For any individual, or any institution that suffers a terrible loss, a philosophical question comes around, sooner or later. When the worst, most debilitating grief finally subsides, the question becomes: What will you do with this? You still have a life to live, changed though it may be. How will you make your trauma part of a productive life?

May 4, 2020 gives us a unique opportunity for renewal. A unique vantage point for looking backward and forward simultaneously. We hope the date will be an opportunity for renewal and not just on the Kent State campus. We are developing mobile museum installations to send across the country, for this is a moment for all to embrace. We will distribute teaching materials for middle and high schools. At Kent State itself, we are planning a teaching workshop, and a forum for diverse perspectives. No one, and no one's pain, will be forgotten. And we will bestow our Voices of Change awards on some exceptional people who affect positive and peaceful change in our world. Which is, after all, our ultimate aim.

If you have history with Kent State, I want to invite you back. If you do not have history with us, I think your affiliation with Chautauqua matters. Your commitment to civil discourse, exploring all sides of an issue in peaceful ways, aligns beautifully with Kent State's values and goals. I think you, more than many people, may also appreciate our journey. You, too, are invited to come see how we honor the past and how we are building for the future.

So there is a good deal of renewal under way. Tom Grace, the student who almost lost his foot after the shooting, felt awkward and a bit re-

sentful about being known mainly for getting shot.

“That”, he says, “is not an accomplishment.”

But he is more at peace now. Tom’s path to renewal comes with a focus on other achievements, in arenas beyond politics. He says he’d rather be known as a great teacher and scholar than a Kent State gunshot victim. But he knows he will always be the product of his experience. As will we all.

And finally, there is the story of Dean Kahler, friend of Kent State. The strapping freshman farm boy we left lying on the ground with a bullet in his lower back. Dean did not walk again. He had to get used to a wheelchair. His life plans changed. Yet he woke up in the hospital feeling grateful. He was thankful to be alive and to have a chance at a future.

Dean had some right to be consumed with anger. But as he says, “Hatred has a way of changing the dynamic. Of making things go in the wrong direction.”

Dean went in a different direction. Even his rehabilitation—the challenge of exercising and staying in shape without working legs—was, he insists, a fun challenge. Dean finished his degree and pursued a life in politics. He was elected to public office, but made his biggest mark pushing for wheelchair-accessible public spaces across Ohio. When he went to a county courthouse and couldn’t find a way inside, he called the officials he came to see to join him outside on the lawn. His advocacy led to accessibility ramps, which meant access to social services and voting places and many daily rituals most of us take for granted.

Today, Dean is retired, but people still come up and want to shake his hand. Dean told me, “In this country,

with a little bit of effort, a little bit of work, you, too, can do something about the political environment.”

Dean Kahler is a man renewed. That is the kind of energy, the kind of future, we aim to have for Kent State University itself.

We want noble, inspiring, productive things to arise at Kent State thanks to the wound of May 4, 1970.

The Wounded Healer

Yes, the country today suffers from broken politics and vast challenges, but we also have hope. In many ways, today’s young people are even more likely than the Vietnam protest generation to fight for worthy causes, demand corporate responsibility, and seek change. At Kent State, we have young people who have joined the May 4th Task Force. And obviously, they weren’t even born in 1970. In some cases, not even their parents were born, but they’ve stepped up to this role.

Around the country, today’s young activists are speaking their truth with confidence. In a time that cries out for engagement and change, they are unwilling to remain silent. They exercise their First Amendment rights. They are not out to shut down the American political process. They are out to register more young voters.

Alan Canfora admires that about the Parkland generation. He says he wishes his generation had done what these kids are doing in 2018. Alan said, “We gave up trying to make the system work for us. We didn’t stay involved, and we should have.”

What is happening today is inspiring. The youth revolution we anticipated in the 1960s may actually be happening now. Kent State will be there—calling on both the voices in our midst, and

more powerful voices around the globe, to rise up and drive change.

Kent State itself intends to lead. That is our destiny: To emerge as the wounded healer. To use the wound at our core to help create a brighter future for the world.

Let me close with a question embedded in a poem that forms a challenge for us all. Especially those of us concerned, as we are today, with “the Forgotten”—being stewards of history, memories, stories.

The Pulitzer Prize winner Mary Oliver has a poem called “The Summer Day,” in which she asks this beautiful question:

“Doesn’t everything die at last, and too soon?”

Tell me, what is it you plan to do
With your one wild and precious life?”

Kent State will not merely remember May 4, 1970, in an endless loop that never satisfies, the wound rubbed raw over and over again. We choose to remember, reflect, and renew.

We will remember vividly, but not live in the past; we will honor the emotions that forever resound around us, but be consumed no more by anger or grief; and we will raise our voices—using the lessons of 50 years to convene people, heal conflict, and create a more inclusive, more peaceful future.

If we do that, we and Kent State are transformed. That, then, is our plan for making our history forever meaningful, and to make the most of our “wild and precious lives.”

Having spent time here at Chautauqua this week, I see you share these values. You are perhaps uniquely attuned to what we seek to do at Kent State. Our 48-year journey goes on. I invite you to join us.

WINNER: ENERGY

"Changing in a Time of Change"

By Lech Mintowt-Czyz for Ben van Beurden,
CEO, Royal Dutch Shell



Delivered at CERAWEEK,
Houston, Texas, March 7, 2018

Ladies and gentlemen, Time flies. It seems like only yesterday that I was on this stage. But it is good to be back here, to see Dan [Yergin] again, to see all of you again... even if that does mean I am another year older...

As time flies, some things change and some things stay the same. Today, I would like to mention three things. Something that has changed since I was last with you... something that will always stay the same... and something I hope that will never change.

They touch on Shell's answers to the big questions I believe we are all facing. And in that sense, I hope they offer a helpful perspective on the future of our industry.

There are plenty of questions facing our industry. The ongoing impact of shales. OPEC. The debate on LNG supplies. Geopolitical shifts. Plenty of questions. But I believe the biggest of them is climate change.

There may not be total unity behind the Paris Agreement any longer, but there is no other issue with the potential to disrupt our industry on such a deep and fundamental level.

In response, I think we have to change... and that is what Shell is going to do.

In November Shell announced an emissions ambition. In a nutshell, it comes down to this.

If society is to meet the aims of Paris, we believe it will have to stop adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere by 2070. That path is likely to require society to roughly halve the amount of greenhouse gases produced for each unit of energy used by 2050. Shell's net carbon footprint ambition is aimed at keeping the company in step with society's progress towards Paris.

This means Shell will aim to bring down the net carbon footprint of our energy products by around half by 2050. In other words, about 50% fewer greenhouse gases per unit of energy when used by our customers... and around 20% less by 2035.

This covers not just emissions from our own operations but also those produced by our customers when they use the energy products we sell. And we will do so in step with society, reviewing and reporting on our progress every five years.

The crucial thing is this: the ambition is about the products we sell, not just the facilities we operate. We do still need to address our operational emissions... but the ambition goes far beyond improving our own energy efficiency.

Focusing on the use of the products does make the challenge bigger for us. Because, of all the greenhouse gases associated with each unit of energy, less than 15% comes from bringing it to the market. The rest come from customers using the products.

So, it is through our products that we can make the biggest difference on emissions... what we actually sell within society. Because what matters is the effect we have on the world... and most of that is down to the products our customers rely on to live their lives.

Of course, our customers, like your customers, rely on oil and gas... and oil and gas will continue to be core to Shell for many decades. If that wasn't the case we wouldn't be investing in oil and gas, such as the new petrochemical facilities we are building in Pennsylvania and Louisiana. But, over time, this net carbon footprint ambition will transform the company's product mix. I cannot tell exactly how, but I can give you an idea of the scale.

Meeting the ambition could mean switching the company's product mix of oil and natural gas from 50% gas to 75%. It could mean selling the energy from 200 large offshore wind farms. That is equivalent to more than nine times the amount of offshore wind in the world today.

Just to emphasise, I am not talking about building 200 windfarms. Shell doesn't have to own the kit to sell the electrons to customers, we can buy them and sell them on... just like Shell doesn't have to own the oil well to sell the gasoline, we can buy the crude in.

The ambition could also mean selling some 50 billion litres of biofuel a year, which is enough to fill up every vehicle in the US about three times over.

It could mean selling enough electricity on Shell's forecourts to meet the power demands of Australia and Argentina combined... storing over 20 million tonnes of CO2 each year using carbon capture... and the planting of forests that, if you put them together, would cover the whole of New Mexico and Oklahoma.

That's not a shopping list, it is an illustration. But I do not just mean one of these... I mean Shell doing all of them by 2050.

Maybe that sounds like a lot of change... and it is. But change is opportunity too. And it is also the scale of the change needed across the world to meet the aims of Paris. That is the reality... and the reality is change.

But this is not the only question facing our industry. We are businesses, not charities. For me, the second big question is how our industry can succeed through all this change.

And that is why I also want to mention one thing that will always stay the same. It is the vital importance of financial strength and resilience. At

Shell we express it as our drive to be a world-class investment case. That means financial discipline of the sort that delivered our strong results last year... the end of the scrip dividend... and is bringing us close to a share buy-back programme.

But how does this drive to financial success sit alongside the drive to a lower-carbon future? In my view, they are inseparable...

Becoming a world-class investment case is the first of Shell's three strategic ambitions. That has meant, and continues to mean, discipline in operational expenditure and in capital expenditure, as well as a successful programme of divestments and the ramping up of new projects.

It means ensuring a continual pipeline of opportunity for the company, which we manage through our seven strategic themes. They are designed to address the energy system of today, the energy system that is coming soon and the energy system of the future. First there are the three cash engines of conventional oil and gas, integrated gas and oil products. These provide strong and reliable returns and free cash flow today and well into the next decade.

Then there are the two growth priorities of deep water and chemicals. These should become cash engines in the next decade. They should provide improving returns and cash flow as the investment made now flows through into production. And finally, the two emerging opportunities of shale oil and gas and new energies which should become significant growth areas for Shell.

Being a world-class investment means strong free cash flow, high returns on investment and lower debt. All of these add up to a financial strength which maximises distributions to shareholders. And achieving the best total shareholder return in the sector is what Shell is aiming for. Sustaining that over time should result in Shell becoming and remaining the most valuable company in the sector.

Shell's next strategic ambition is to thrive through the coming changes to the energy system. If we cannot do this, the company will not be a world-class investment over the long-term. The net carbon footprint ambition is about exactly this: thriving as the world's energy system changes by being both financially and environmentally sound. Not by abandoning oil and gas, the world will still need it, but by finding business opportunity in the changes taking place. It is about making excellent returns by doing the right thing... selling the right things... by being in step with society... by being in step with our customers.

And this brings me to the third big question facing our industry... how can we secure society's support for what we do?

Having a strong societal licence to operate is Shell's third, and final, strategic goal: being valued for making a real contribution to people's lives.

Achieving it means dealing with the challenges that drag our reputation down... such as those connected to Nigeria. Not just managing the impact on our reputation... but dealing with them in a way that brings them to resolution. It means getting into a position which allows us to put these challenges behind the company for good.

This is complex... I am not pretending it will be easy. But we have to build up trust. And to do this I think we must also refocus on our products.

I feel that we, as an industry, have let this point slip. I confess, it is true of Shell. As engineers, we love speaking about our achievements in deep water, our sub-surface modelling skills, our ability to drill sideways. But most customers don't care how clever we are.

Instead, we have to remember that we enable modern life, we bring together families and friends, we help people improve their living standards. We have to remember this, and to remind people of it... because if we do not, nobody else will do it for us.

And we also have to be known for the care we take with our products. Unless, for example, we ensure action on the overall methane emissions of the entire natural gas system, the argument that natural gas is a lower-carbon fuel is undermined.

Finally, being valued by society means being a good neighbour. Paying billions in tax, providing jobs and training for thousands, enabling supply chains that spread economic well-being. Yes. All that, and more. Providing more energy with less carbon. Contributing to the communities in which we operate.

Creating viable business models that provide access to cleaner, affordable, reliable energy for those who do not have it. Access to energy. And by that, I do not just mean providing energy wholesale in the expectation it will reach those who need it. That is not wrong but it is not enough. It is about access for individual families who need the energy. It is about establishing businesses that deliver energy to them. It is about customers.

Is this? All of this? The future of our industry? Thriving from a position of financial and social strength? I hope so. I believe it should be.

And this brings me to the final thing I mentioned right at the start... something that I hope will never change. It is the pride I feel, and I hope we all feel, for what we do as an industry. Quite simply, our products improve people's lives.

But the energy landscape is changing fast.

So we must change, where change is what the world needs. We must stay financially strong so we can make that change. And we must walk in step with society... and make a real contribution to people's lives... so that the pride we feel in what we do... is pride we have every right to feel.

Thank you.

WINNER: GOVERNMENT

"Never Be a Bystander"

By Lieke Hagebeuk for Hugo de Jonge,
Deputy Prime Minister, the Netherlands



Delivered at Remembrance Day Commemorations,
Camp Amersfoort, the Netherlands, May 4, 2018

Your Excellencies,
Ladies and gentlemen,
And how marvelous to see so many
boys and girls here today,

For Edmund Wellenstein, Thursday
March 12, 1942 began just like any
other day. At least, just like any other
day he'd spent so far in Scheveningen
prison, where he'd been held for the
past two months, during World War II.

Several weeks earlier, Edmund had
been arrested by the police in the Dutch
town of Delft. They suspected him cor-
rectly of being a member of the Dutch
resistance. Edmund had gone on strike
when the Nazis barred Jewish professors
from his university. He did not want to
be a bystander, looking on while history
unfolded before his eyes.

During his interrogation, Wellen-
stein was able to spin the Germans a
yarn. But still they didn't let him go.
And on a frosty Thursday, March 12,
he was driven by truck into the woods
somewhere between the towns of Leus-
den and Amersfoort.

Wellenstein had no idea what to
expect. Above all he was impressed by
the beauty of the area. 'A country lane,
with woods on either side covered in
snow, stretches ahead of the vehicle,'
he later wrote. 'It looks glorious.'

But beyond that peaceful landscape,
where the only sounds were birds
chirping and the wind rustling through
the trees, lay a living hell. Like hun-
dreds before him and thousands still to
come, Wellenstein had arrived in the
'guilty landscape'. A landscape where
a life was worth nothing more than an
identification number, a bowl of watery
soup, and a quarter-pound of bread a
day—less than two slices.

Edmund Wellenstein was one of the
35,000 resistance members, hostages,
Jews, 'antisocial elements' and people
who'd tried to escape forced labor

deployment, who were imprisoned
here for brief or longer periods dur-
ing World War II. Prisoners who were
humiliated because of who they were.
Tortured because of what they thought.
And starved by way of reprisal for other
people's acts of resistance. Edmund
was one of the prisoners who refused to
stand by and watch others suffer.

This evening we are gathered to
remember the sacrifice these 35,000
people made. And the sacrifice of
the more than 1,300 war dead buried
here at Rusthof cemetery and at the
adjacent Russian war cemetery. Pilots,
soldiers, civilians. Young and old.
Every one of them someone's father.
Every one of them someone's son.
They died for freedom back then, and
for our freedom today.

Those sacrifices were immense.
Some of you experienced the suffer-
ing first-hand. The endless, grueling
roll calls, in all kinds of weather. The
humiliation. The torture. The gnawing,
all-consuming hunger. You saw fellow
prisoners eating tar from the roofs and
earth from the ground. You saw fellow
prisoners taken from their barracks to
be shot in the woods or on the firing
range. And you saw prisoners leave on
trains to camps in Germany—Neuen-
gamme, Sachsenhausen, Buchenwald.
Only a handful returned. Prisoners
might not have had their numbers tat-
tooed on their arms in Camp Amers-
foort, but what they went through was
etched on their souls for life.

Tonight our entire country pauses
to remember the people who lost their
lives in World War II, and in the fight
for peace since then. We remember
the people—the children—who didn't
survive the war. Who didn't stand a
chance against the cruelty of others.

Imprisoned here in Leusden and
Amersfoort were people who would

not resign themselves to the hatred,
the inequality and the injustice that
triumphed in this country during the
war. Here were people who refused to
be bystanders. People who resisted, and
tried to save lives.

In the history books, that role has
mainly been attributed to young men,
but the reality was more diverse. When
the transports from Amersfoort to Ger-
many stopped in the town of Zwolle
for the night, an eight-year-old girl—
her hair in two blond pigtails—would
sneak up, together with her mother,
and bring them a milk can filled with
soup. Real, nutritious soup, made using
bones that a butcher stole from the
Germans he was forced to work for.

And when, as a propaganda exercise,
101 unkempt, emaciated and abused
prisoners of war from the Soviet Union
were marched—stumbling and stagger-
ing—through the center of Amersfoort,
the population's response was primarily
one of sympathy. To the amazement of
the SS officers, several people refused
to stand idly by and watch this terrible
suffering. Instead they ran back into
their houses to get the poor souls some-
thing to eat, even though the Germans
ordered them not to.

And here too, even some SS officers
quietly rebelled against the degrading
treatment of the prisoners. For instance
by giving them some bread or sausage
when no one was looking.

In the fall of 1942 Edmund Wellen-
stein was released from the camp,
having served his time. Reduced to skin
and bones, but unbroken, he resumed
his resistance work. Once again, he
chose—despite the many dangers—not
to be a bystander.

And after the war, he continued to
fight for freedom, peace and democra-
cy. Together with Max Kohnstamm—a
student he'd met in the prison camp—

Edmund stood at the cradle of the European Coal and Steel Community—the predecessor of the European Union. The idea was that, if you depend on each other for your income, the last thing you'll want to do is go to war with each other. And this proved true, for there has never been another war between the countries that joined the European Community.

2018 is the Year of Resistance, and today is a particularly fitting moment to reflect on that. Edmund Wellenstein's story encourages us to ask ourselves, what would I have done, what would we have done, in his situation?

And although we no longer live under occupation, but in an open democracy governed by the rule of law, that question remains relevant, because the fight for freedom never stops.

Today, our freedom remains fragile. Of course, our laws ban discrimina-

tion, prohibit hate speech and affirm that we can say what we think, and believe what we want.

But laws do not make our society. People do. Therefore, it is up to all of us, together, to shape and defend the freedom to be who you are, to believe what you want and to say what you think.

Our freedom still needs protection. And protecting that wonderful value is a task that starts anew every day. In the schoolyard, in the street, in the House of Representatives. It starts with me, with you, with all of us. We can all take responsibility for the values that seem so self-evident nowadays, but are in fact so very fragile.

And it doesn't take much effort.

We can do it by not excluding people, but embracing them. By not magnifying our differences, but emphasizing our similarities. By spouting our

opinions a little less, and listening to one another a little more.

And by telling the stories of Edmund Wellenstein and all the other people who witnessed World War II. Stories that show us that evil, that injustice, that hate, are given a free rein if good people just stand there with their hands in their pockets and their eyes looking away.

Thankfully those stories also show us that there will always be people who do not look away, but step up in the face of injustice. Together with those people, we can go a long way. And that is the path we must choose every day anew. Only then can we carry our freedom and democracy aloft. Only then can we do justice to all those people—here and elsewhere—who gave their lives so that we might live in freedom today.

Thank you.

WINNER: MANUFACTURING AND PRODUCTION

"2018 State of Manufacturing Address"

By Mark Isaacson for Jay Timmons, President and CEO,
National Association of Manufacturers

//

Delivered at Automation Alley,
Troy, Michigan, Feb. 21, 2018

Good morning, and thank you, Tom, for the introduction. It's a great day to be here in Michigan to kick off the 2018 National Association of Manufacturers' State of Manufacturing Tour.

Over the next two weeks, we're going to barnstorm this incredible country of ours, going from here to Kentucky, Indiana, Alabama, New York, Kansas, California and Missouri.

Our goal is simple: to spend time with the amazing men and women who make things in America so that we can be their voice as we tell the story of modern manufacturing.

And there's no better place to start than right here in Michigan, where America's manufacturing roots run deep and where manufacturing workers are building our future like no place else.

On this beautiful, frigid morning, we couldn't ask for a better place to get our blood pumping!

To get started, I'd like to salute a few folks who are with us today:

Chuck Hadden, president and CEO of our partners at the Michigan Manufacturers Association

Oakland County Executive L. Brooks Patterson

Irene Spanos, for championing Oakland County manufacturing and for being instrumental in bringing us here

I also want to thank Bruce McDonald from Adient for being part of our panel this morning.

And it's good to see our friends from American Axle & Manufacturing, DENSO International America, GM, Magna International, Meritor—and a special shout-out to Mahindra.

The NAM team was proud to be a part of the opening of Mahindra's new facility last November, the first new auto plant in the region in 25 years.

Many tremendous educational institutions are also represented here today.

And best of all, it is great to have the students who are here with us today. I am so excited for you because you are the ones who get to live the future of modern manufacturing and see it in action.

But before we get too far ahead of ourselves into the future, ladies and gentlemen, let's talk about the present.

What is the state of manufacturing today?

Today, manufacturing in America is a confident industry. We are growing, investing, hiring and raising standards of living in communities all across our nation. That is a very different place

than just a few years ago. And it didn't happen by chance.

This success is thanks in large part to the work of leaders in the White House and Congress who have made the American manufacturing worker a top priority.

For manufacturers, it's not about politics or personality or process. It's about policy. The policies of the last year have produced tremendous results for manufacturers. That's a fact.

But most importantly, it's about the people who make things—and providing the best environment for their success.

As the business climate improves, the need to fill jobs grows. So, there's another challenge before us: building the modern manufacturing workforce.

The work that happens here at Automation Alley is mission critical to the continued success of manufacturing in America. You are developing talent and forging partnerships to accelerate job-sustaining innovation.

Today in America, manufacturers need to fill some 364,000 jobs. Over the next seven to eight years, we'll need to fill around 3.5 million, according to a study from Deloitte and the NAM's Manufacturing Institute.

But 2 million of those jobs could go unfilled because we haven't upskilled enough workers—2 million!

Now, outside this room, there are probably people who will wonder: How can you talk about job creation at a place called "Automation Alley"?

But here's what you might not read in the news: automation and job creation are not at odds—not in the least. American workers and American technology are not enemies. Innovation and automation are expanding what American workers can do, making the impossible possible and transforming this industry for the better.

We've seen, for example, how automakers use technologies like augmented reality to test new assembly methods and improve ergonomics for their workers, improving both health and efficiency.

Automation means jobs. Here in Oakland County, home of Automation

Alley, you've added more than 19,000 manufacturing jobs since the Great Recession. That's growth of more than 40 percent.

Innovation is changing the way our industry looks. But it doesn't change what's at our core: men and women who have lent their talents to build something bigger than themselves—people finding purpose in making things that matter.

So, the challenge today isn't a shortage of manufacturing jobs. Far from it.

The challenge is that the type of work in manufacturing is shifting. It's not about white collar or blue collar. It's about "new-collar" jobs—jobs that are high-tech, 21st-century, rewarding, well-paying—many that don't require a four-year degree.

But, ironically, if I ask a roomful of parents if they want their kids to go into manufacturing, the best I usually get is a couple of raised hands.

At the NAM, we launched our "Creators Wanted" campaign last year for exactly that reason: to have real people from real manufacturing jobs talk about what their jobs really mean.

Manufacturers are making life-saving medicines and life-changing technologies, revolutionizing food production, making our societies more sustainable and transforming the way we commute and communicate. You don't have to be a politician or a lawyer to make a difference.

If you want to create change, be a manufacturer. You might work for an iconic brand or maybe an upstart small business, but the opportunity is there, whether you're unemployed or underemployed, looking for a new career or your first career.

Today looks different from yesterday. Tomorrow will look far different still and in ways we can't imagine.

How will artificial intelligence further augment the jobs of a talented workforce?

How will augmented reality enhance a worker's ability to solve complex problems?

How will quantum computing power a quantum leap into the future?

How could blockchain revolutionize the supply chain?

We can't answer those questions just yet. But there is no question that reaching our potential and harnessing technologies for good will require lifelong learning and technical literacy.

The nature of work is changing, so we have to rethink models of learning as well.

We were very encouraged last year when the White House and the Labor Department announced they would prioritize apprenticeships in America.

It's a model that has served other countries well. It gives people the chance to earn while they learn—both on the job and in the classroom.

At the NAM and The Manufacturing Institute, we've been asked to partner with the Trump administration to create a new, NAM-recognized system that promotes flexibility and participation.

The demand is there, but we are nowhere close to having the number of apprenticeships or the robust system we need in this country.

According to Oakland County's skills assessment survey, almost half, 48 percent, of manufacturers say they need more trained engineers and designers on their teams.

An apprenticeship program is one of the ways to help fill that need.

We often talk about "workforce issues" as though they exist in a vacuum, detached from other policies that also impact day-to-day operations and the business climate.

But the fact is, all policies that manufacturers care about are workforce issues—all of them. They're about getting workers bigger checks, better jobs, better technology and more opportunities to sell the products they make.

So, taxes, infrastructure, regulations, energy, trade, immigration—all of these will determine the success of the modern manufacturing worker.

Over the last year, leaders in Washington, driven by the vision from the White House, have transformed the business climate in America in rapid fashion.

They made 2017 “The Year of the Manufacturer,” not just with their words, but with their actions. Manufacturers and manufacturing workers haven’t had a President or administration so focused on our success in quite a while.

For instance, it is not possible to overstate how much tax reform matters to the future of manufacturing.

For decades, we weren’t playing on a level playing field. While we assumed America’s economic engine couldn’t be challenged, other countries got smart. They lowered their rates so they could win jobs, win business. But now, manufacturers are empowered to compete and win.

In fact, in our latest Manufacturers’ Outlook Survey:

63 percent said they would spend more on their facilities and equipment because of tax reform;

54 percent said they would hire more workers; and

Half planned to increase wages and benefits.

We’ve seen a lot of great headlines and stories of businesses investing in their workers and communities. That’s just the beginning.

We want to look back 10, 20 years from now and be able to see what a difference tax reform made in the lives of working families.

We will create more jobs and hire more skilled workers. We will invest in more plants and attract more investment to our shores. And we will enhance pay and benefits.

For now, the most important fact is that the manufacturing economy in America—from Michigan to Mississippi, Maine to California—is on a more solid foundation.

“You may have also heard about the breaking news coming this morning on the White House plan for investment in infrastructure.

And no doubt, for manufacturers, infrastructure is the next big thing. Roads, bridges, ports, pipes, pipelines, waterways, broadband and the electrical grid. You name it, it’s time to build it and re-build it. The painful truth is

that America doesn’t lead the world on infrastructure. Not anymore. Not even close.

That has big consequences. Shipments delayed, customers inconvenienced, work hours lost. Above all, it’s a risk to our families when we’re relying on infrastructure built for another generation. A bygone era.

The NAM released our Building to Win plan more than a year ago, an agenda that was warmly embraced by the Trump campaign and administration and used as a guidepost by them and Congress.

It’s estimated that until 2025, families will lose \$3,400 every year because of deficient infrastructure. By 2026, just eight years from now, that cost will rise to a staggering \$5,100 wasted every year.

The administration has already delivered on some important permitting reforms. To get projects back on track, now the President is calling for a substantial \$1.5 trillion investment. It’s the kind of leadership manufacturers have wanted for a very long time...and it could help us reclaim our rightful place as a global leader on true 21st-century infrastructure.

Manufacturers are ready to work with Congress and the Trump administration to deliver a tremendous plan that will literally get America moving again.”

Infrastructure is also a critical part of improving manufacturers’ access to reliable, affordable energy. Over the last year, the administration has taken bold steps to expand energy development in the United States.

That’s game-changing for manufacturers because we’re an energy-intensive industry, though at the same time, we have made great strides in efficiency and sustainability.

Over the past decade, the United States has made greater reductions in greenhouse gases than any nation on earth. Manufacturers have reduced emissions by 10 percent in that time, even as our value to the economy has increased 19 percent. We’re proving that environmental stewardship and

economic growth can go hand in hand.

But it’s not just about consumers. It’s also a national security imperative. To restrict our ability to develop our domestic energy resources is equivalent to subjecting our national economy to the whims of hostile regimes.

Today, thanks to new technology and a more balanced regulatory climate, the United States is on track to be a net exporter of energy for the first time in our lifetimes.

Energy manufacturers aren’t alone in wanting to increase exports. Indeed, much of the manufacturing growth we’ve achieved in recent years is a direct result of our existing trade relationships, which support more than 6 million manufacturing jobs in our country.

U.S. exports of manufactured goods to Canada and Mexico alone support the jobs of more than 2 million people at more than 43,000 manufacturing companies across the United States.

Let’s be clear: manufacturers always want America to negotiate the best deal possible. After all, 95 percent of the world’s customers live outside the United States.

So, as our negotiators are working to update NAFTA and challenge harmful market distortions in China and elsewhere, we need to do so with an eye to securing strong tools to enforce the rules.

The goal must be to ensure manufacturers and manufacturing workers in America are not forced to bear new costs or burdens that would make us less competitive. We know that can be done.

Oakland County is a perfect example of the benefits of trade in a global economy. In just the last four years, you’ve seen more than a billion dollars of foreign investment from 13 countries—accounting for nearly 6,200 new or retained jobs.

We want more of that. And we want more chances to sell our products outside America so that we can create more good jobs right here in America.

America is a trading nation, and we are also a nation of immigrants. And those immigrants, our friends

and neighbors, are part of our workforce. They lead some of our greatest companies. They founded some of our biggest brands.

For manufacturers, getting immigration reform passed—and, most urgently, finding a solution for the “Dreamers”—is a moral issue and an economic issue. We cannot rob people of the only country and communities they know, and we cannot rob our country of some of the hardest-working people we know.

And so, I join manufacturers across this country who have united to say to Congress: stop playing politics with people’s lives.

Get this done, so we can build an immigration system that rightly ensures our security, while also welcoming hardworking people who want to contribute to this country.

Now, with all that in mind, there’s a lot of opportunity ahead of us. But there also are those who want to hurt

manufacturing in America, who want to profit at our expense.

There’s a growing trend, an alliance of activists, plaintiffs’ attorneys and politicians going after manufacturing companies with frivolous, misguided lawsuits. The lawyers want to make money; the politicians want to make headlines.

At the NAM, we’re not letting this attack on our companies and our workers go unchallenged. We launched the Manufacturers’ Accountability Project to hold the bad actors accountable.

We’re going to fight back because there’s too much at stake. Jobs, communities, the economic might of our country—it’s all potentially in jeopardy.

Ultimately, the goal of manufacturing in America is to improve the human condition.

Manufacturers want to be in the business of lifting everyone up, leaving no one behind, of advancing the values that make America exceptional: free

enterprise, competitiveness, individual liberty and equal opportunity.

That’s our history, and that’s our mission for the future. If you want to learn more and join us in this work, text MFGJobs to 52886.

Manufacturers build better lives with the products we make, and we provide good livelihoods with the jobs we create.

We give people work that provides meaning and purpose, that offers not just a paycheck, but the satisfaction of having created something that matters.

Anyone can imagine the future. Anyone can be a visionary. And America has been blessed with some of the best minds the world has ever seen.

But while anyone can imagine the future, it takes a manufacturer to build it.

So, we are determined to do everything in our power to ensure manufacturers are ready to build the best future anyone can imagine.

Thank you so much.

WINNER: MEDIA

“What Can a Women’s Magazine Teach Beltway Insiders?”

By Gary Forman for Susan Spencer,
Editor-in-Chief, *Woman’s Day*



Delivered at Elevate Summit: Bringing Women Together to Find
Solutions, Newseum, Washington, D.C., Nov. 27, 2018

I know that polls are near and dear to many of your hearts, so let’s start with a quick poll:

Raise your hand if you’ve read an issue of *Woman’s Day* in the past year...

Looks like less than 10%. I’m not surprised that our readers are underrepresented in this group. Fortunately for me, each month some 17 million people read *Woman’s Day*, making us the 9th largest magazine in the nation. If you add up the circulation of all the women’s service and lifestyle titles, you get 46 million women, which is 36% of adult females.

So while most of you might not be browsing a magazine like *Woman’s Day* on a regular basis, more than a third of all woman in the country are. And for the most part, these women are overlooked by the political class.

We don’t often hear from or about them. They’re not newsmakers, they’re not the rich and famous, and they’re not especially powerful.

But they deserve to be heard and understood, particularly by people in the Beltway. Because even as our national politics are bogged down in partisanship, *Woman’s Day* readers have found ways of getting things done in their communities.

So I’ll do my best in the next few minutes to represent our readers, and to share what we’ve learned at *Woman’s Day* about who these women are, what they value, and how to earn their trust.

Who are these women? Let’s start with some demographics:

Her median age is 59. She’s a member of the sandwich generation and is likely to be caring for both children and parents.

Her median household income is \$63,000. That means she’s always looking for ways to stretch her dollars. For example, shopping at mass retailers like Walmart and Target.

She’s not a coastal elite—2 out of 3 readers live in the south or Midwest

And finally, she loves magazines and TV, especially HGTV, cooking shows, pro football, and most of all, Hallmark movies!

Demographics alone can’t capture the full story. So we’ve made it a point over the past several years to get closer

to our readers. We've done that through research, including a series of dinners at which we brought small groups of our subscribers together for informal conversations with our editors.

Here's what we know...

The typical *Woman's Day* subscriber is a positive and resilient woman.

She has a sense of openness and tolerance of others.

She values kindness and has a strong sense of faith.

She's not that interested in global issues; those aren't problems she feels she can impact.

But when it comes to issues that directly impact her family or community, she gets things done. For example, she probably doesn't know who Betsy DeVos is, but she knows what's working and what needs fixing in her local schools.

Where does she stand politically?

My guess is that our readers are split pretty evenly between red and blue. But in reality, we don't know. And we will never, ever ask.

Because one thing that *Woman's Day* readers have made abundantly clear is that they DON'T want our magazine to go anywhere near politics.

We respect their wishes: when it comes to politics, we don't go there. And it makes for a remarkably good relationship! At the core of that relationship is trust. Our readers count on us to respect their values and priorities, and we do. We focus on the things that matter to these women, bringing them content that helps simplify and enrich their lives.

The sections are what you'd expect in a women's service magazine: food, home, health and so on. It's our approach to these topics that makes *Woman's Day* unique. We're guided by a core principle: lead with joy and positivity. We work hard to enhance our readers' lives in meaningful and practical ways.

We aim to be inspiring, not aspirational. You won't find \$250 shoes featured in a fashion spread. Instead, we include items that can be found at Kohl's, Walmart, or J.C. Penney.

Our recipes include a cost-per-serving estimate, because so many of our readers need to manage a household budget.

You won't find designer kitchen renovations in our Home section. Instead, we'll run a piece on painting ideas to refresh a room.

We won't just highlight the latest developments in heart health research; we'll also provide clear how-to's for preventing and managing heart disease.

At the top of the Contents page in every issue is a short bible quote. And lest you wonder about how readers feel about the bible quote, I'll tell you that the most frequent comment we get in letters is "thank you" for including it.

We have a section called "Inspire" that features stories of seemingly ordinary women who have accomplished extraordinary things. It also includes our Kindness Project column, in which readers share first-hand stories about acts of kindness they've witnessed or experienced.

We try to reflect their lives accurately. That means providing ideas for everyday tasks like cooking, cleaning, and staying fit. But our readers' concerns don't stop there, and neither do we.

I'm proud of the fact that over the past several years, we've stepped beyond the normal purview of women's service magazines and taken on some serious issues that impact readers' lives. In doing so, we can't entirely avoid getting into issues that have political implications. But we always approach the issues from a personal perspective. By focusing on how women are dealing with these challenges, we humanize the issue and steer clear of partisanship.

One example: we featured the story of an unlikely environmental hero, Cheryl Lumsden Josza of Bradenton, Florida. After her sister died of leukemia, Cheryl began researching the high death rates among other alumni of her local high school. Cheryl's work helped bring this long-overlooked issue

to the attention of her state department of health.

We covered the opioid epidemic through the story of Melissa Wilson and her husband Rob, an Army veteran who was wounded in Afghanistan. Melissa recounts the heartbreak of discovering that Rob was addicted to painkillers, as well as the hope represented by his recovery and volunteer work helping other veterans.

We waded into the issue of gender identity with the first-person story of Gina Kentopp, a mother coming to terms with her child's decision to transition from female to male.

Woman's Day approached this story with some trepidation: how would readers react to a story about such a hot-button topic? We were careful about our approach. We stayed away from the legal and political aspects of transgender rights and focused exclusively on one mother's journey.

It's a beautiful story, the highlight of which is the author, a devout* Christian, discovering a line in a memoir written by a woman in a similar position. That line was, "Instead of asking God to change your child, why don't you ask Him to change your heart?" Gina took that suggestion and found a path forward. It meant changing her own beliefs and changing churches. But it brought her to a place of acceptance and support for her child.

We braced ourselves for reader blowback, but it never came. In fact, *Woman's Day* received widespread praise on this feature, including an Eddie Award from *Folio Magazine*.

In our October 2018 edition, *Woman's Day* took the leap into the topic of gun violence. It was a big leap for us.

Our approach centered around school safety. We featured the story of a student survivor who supported giving teachers the option of being armed...a teacher who survived Columbine as a student and founded a network of online support groups for school shooting victims and survivors...and one of the first responders to enter Marjorie Stoneham Douglass High School after the Parkland shooting.

In my letter to readers that month, I invited them to weigh in on the topic. And they took me up on it. We received a record number of responses on the school safety story.

Most of the letters included positive comments about the stories. Some readers included their own ideas on improving school safety. One reader wrote, “It was so nice to read the different point of views that were not filled with a political agenda.”

Another reader saw it very differently, writing “Please do not ruin the magazine by bringing your own political issues into the magazine...I beg you.”

Taken together, the responses indicated that we found the right tone. We contributed to an important conversation. We struck a balance that seemed fair to most readers.

I’ll share one more letter we got on this, from a woman named Paula, who wrote, “What a fantastic idea for a section! What this country needs more of right now is to find common ground. Thank you for leading the way on that. I’m also loving your Halloween décor ideas!”

I love that letter because it captures a central truth about our audience: they are more than just one thing. The same woman who wants to decorate her house for Halloween is eager to engage in a respectful conversation about the most pressing issues facing our country. She can be both those things with no contradiction.

I have to confess, when I was initially invited to speak at this conference, I wondered how my experience at *Woman’s Day* could possibly be relevant to a group of political strategists and

other beltway folks. And who knows, maybe it’s not...

But I know we’re doing something right at our magazine. We’ve found a way to connect meaningfully with 17 million women every month. They have choices, and they vote with their dollars. I’m particularly proud of the fact that for two years running, *Woman’s Day* has been the top selling monthly magazines on newsstands. If purchases are votes, we’re winning elections on a monthly basis!

If you were to ask me to translate my experience at *Woman’s Day* into political advice, I would try desperately to wiggle out of it. And if you really pressed me, I’d encourage you to take a few pages from our approach:

First, Know your audience. Speak with them. And listen carefully.

Second, find practical ways to make their lives a little better.

Third, respect their values, which include kindness and civility.

Fourth, think locally, because that’s how these women think. They were into localism long before David Brooks started writing Op-Eds about it.

Fifth, remember that trust is your greatest asset: don’t do or say things that will violate that bond.

Lastly, when it comes to the heated issues that divide us, to whatever extent possible, don’t go there. I know sometimes that’s not possible, but I can tell you that what these women want is to come together around practical solutions.

I find it interesting that the oldest mass medium—print—is able to bring people together in a way that other media can’t.

We see broadcast media being splitting off into red and blue camps, a trend that started with talk radio and has spread not only into cable news but into late night and primetime shows, some of which are happy to wear their political bias on their sleeve.

And then there’s the internet. We know that social media is fueled by a business model that rewards sensationalism and extremism. That formula may work for Facebook’s bottom line, and it often works for politicians who are willing to divide the public in order to secure victory. But it certainly doesn’t work for the readers of *Woman’s Day*, or for our nation as a whole.

There is one piece of advice that I can offer with complete confidence: go to amazon.com and get a subscription to *Woman’s Day*. A year’s subscription will set you back a whopping \$6. Each time a new issue arrives, take a few minutes to browse through it. You’ll probably find a few things that catch your interest, so maybe you’ll spend a little more time with the magazine. More importantly, you’ll have a window into the lives of millions of women who have so much to offer and are too often forgotten.

To sweeten the deal, we’re giving each of you a copy of our December issue. It includes our usual mix of practical tips and uplifting stories. You’ll also find some great holiday decorating ideas!

I’m so grateful to be part of this event, and I look forward to working with you on solutions that will empower women and elevate our politics.

Thank you very much.

WINNER: MILITARY

"Where Are the Leaders?"

By Hal Gordon for Tom Stewart, Retired New York Investment Banker
and Former Naval Attack Commander



Delivered at the University of Oregon,
Eugene, Oregon, May 18, 2018

Good evening. I'm going to begin by springing a pop quiz on you. Who can name the man who became the youngest U.S. Secretary of Defense—and then, some years later, became the second-oldest U.S. Secretary of Defense?

Here's a hint: He was an ROTC grad, a member of the U.S. Congress, a naval aviator, and a flight instructor.

Anyone want to venture a guess?

He was Donald Rumsfeld. Mr. Rumsfeld served as this country's youngest Secretary of Defense under President Ford from 1975 to 1977. Then, from 2001 to 2006, he served as the second-oldest U.S. Secretary of Defense under President George W. Bush.

But tonight I'm going to talk about something Mr. Rumsfeld did in between those two spells at the Defense Department. In 1984, he was awarded the prestigious George C. Marshall Medal by the Association of the U.S. Army.

On receiving the Marshall Medal, Mr. Rumsfeld gave a speech that I have long admired, and that I think is particularly appropriate to quote from tonight.

Mr. Rumsfeld said that throughout his career in public life he was asked again and again,

"Where are the great leaders?

Where are the giants today?"

To that question he always answered,

"They are there, and they will be there when they are needed. Let there be no doubt."

He added that people had asked that same question in the 1920s and 30s—the decades between the two world wars. Where were America's great military leaders then?

In reply, he said that it was only in hindsight that we learned the an-

swer to that question. He said: "They were people

... whose names we had never heard,

... who were being paid a few thousand dollars a year,

... who were posted in dry, unpleasant forts across the country and the world,

... moving their families every few years,

... bringing up children in difficult circumstances,

... stuck in the same rank for eight, 10, 12 years,

... neglected by Congress, and

... whose patriotism, dedication and service were at great cost to themselves, and

... were essentially without appreciation by the people, whom they served."

"It was not until World War II, when the need was urgent, that the people discovered that the great leaders were there."

And what leaders they were!

Because it was from this small pool of nameless, selfless, and neglected patriots that our country was able to call forth a Dwight Eisenhower, an Omar Bradley, a Patton, a MacArthur, a George Marshall and all the other larger-than-life commanders who led our forces to victory in the greatest war the world had ever known.

Mr. Rumsfeld concluded that it says a lot about the U.S. Army that it can "attract, develop, foster, retain, encourage and motivate individuals of that brilliance and stature."

And it does.

Was it simply good fortune that we had all these great leaders when we needed them? I don't think so, and I'll tell you why. Because if someone were to ask me right now "Where are the great leaders? Where are the giants?"

I would have an even easier time than Mr. Rumsfeld did in giving an answer.

All I would have to do would be to point a finger in your direction and say,

"There they are, they are sitting right in front of me."

I'm not flattering you. I can say that in all sincerity because I was once sitting where you are myself.

I know what I and my fellow ROTC cadets were made of in our day, and I'm willing to bet that you're made of the same stuff that we were.

Like you, we were young, we were adventurous, and we were patriotic. We were green, of course, but we had potential. And it was ROTC that started to develop our potential and turned us into soldiers and leaders.

Each generation has its own story to tell about how it qualified for the challenges it faced.

For the great commanders of World War II it was the story of dry, unpleasant forts across the country and around the world, bringing up their families under hardscrabble conditions, being stuck in the same rank for years, doing their duty faithfully while being underpaid and unappreciated. Those experiences hardened them, sharpened their abilities and instilled in them the discipline, fortitude and self-denial they needed to prevail in the great struggle to come.

My generation's story started with being brave enough to sign up for ROTC in the first place. When I was your age, it was at the height of the Vietnam War. In fact it was just after the Tet Offensive, when soldiering was held in contempt by many of our fellow students. To wear a uniform was to be called a "hired killer" by our more left-wing peers.

Our story started at a time when about 200 Americans a week were

being killed in Vietnam. So we had no illusions about what we were signing up for. We knew that we were putting our lives on the line. We knew that we had a real chance of dying in action.

And if we ever needed reminding of that grim fact, we had US Army instructors who had recently served in combat in Vietnam. They made it very clear that they were not preparing us for Boy Scout camp. They were preparing us for war.

And we rose to their challenge with willing and eager hearts.

I was a member of a core group of about 30-40 cadets who called ourselves the “Marauders.” That’s right—the Marauders. How’s that for being politically incorrect?

We deliberately chose to make our ROTC training as tough on ourselves as we could. We went out into the field as often as possible: Day and night, all weathers, and in as many different terrains as possible.

We practiced small-unit tactics, going out on patrols, staging ambushes and learning how to repel ambushes. Sometimes we stayed awake for 36 hours at a stretch—basically all weekend, Friday evening through Sunday afternoon return.

It was as realistic as we could make it. We couldn’t use live ammunition, but the blanks we used in our weapons had the loud noise of an engagement and the cardboard wads in the blanks were powerful enough to destroy a beer can, and this was at a time when beer cans were a lot tougher than they are today.

Speaking of cans. Our efforts to get as close as we could to actual combat conditions meant that we ate the army’s leftover Combat Rations—or “C-Rations” as they were called. They were in use from 1959 to 1980 and were nowhere near as appetizing as today’s Meals Ready to Eat or MREs.

The C-Rations came in these little brown cardboard boxes. Inside these little brown cardboard boxes were these little dented cans. Sometimes the cans leaked, which suggested that something really gross was happening inside. We used to speculate among ourselves as to

what that something gross might be, but hunger usually overcame our misgivings and we ate the stuff.

Our realistic training approach also included infiltrating the camps of “enemy” units—gathering intelligence and taking prisoners. Being taken prisoner in one of these exercises meant being subjected to periods of tight bondage, sensory deprivation, relentless interrogation techniques and other battlefield captivity scenarios.

I recall that I was on both ends of those experiences. Once, I managed to sneak into an “enemy” camp and make off with as many of their boots as I could carry. That was amusing mischief for me, but given the rocky and sometimes muddy terrain, it was no fun for them.

It was also a warning for me not to get too cocky.

Because the guys in that ‘other’ camp got their revenge when they took me captive the next day. And when they discovered that I was the joker who had stolen their boots, they hit on a particularly nasty way of paying me back: They used their muddy socks to gag me—stuffing those socks into my mouth. That day still cracks me up—I took that sock episode as a badge of honor.

Yes, we were kids, and we did have fun, but we all took this training very seriously. I learned some very valuable lessons about how to cope with brutal confinement and how to keep a cool head in high-pressure situations.

The Duke of Wellington once famously remarked that the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton. I don’t go back quite that far, but I have no doubt that he was right. The mental discipline I learned in ROTC stood me in good stead later on.

Ironically, when my actual combat experience came it wasn’t in Vietnam. Rather, it was in the Middle East in the late 1970s and early 1980s, serving on U.N. peacekeeping missions.

But just because they were called peacekeeping missions didn’t mean that my ROTC training was any less valuable. There were still occasions

when I found myself in fierce combat, fighting for my life.

A moment ago, I quoted the Duke of Wellington. Now, since we’re on a university campus, I’m going to get really fancy and quote one of his contemporaries—a guy named Karl von Clausewitz. Clausewitz was an 19th Century Prussian general and military theorist. He had a famous maxim of his own. He said that “War is the continuation of diplomacy by other means.”

And it is. That’s why I needed my ROTC foundation of training—even on peacekeeping missions.

Being taken captive in ROTC exercises helped me not to give way to panic when I was taken captive for real in the Bekaa Valley in Lebanon. I was able to stay cool because I had experienced this situation in training. And my cool head enabled me to extricate myself from captivity in short order.

I was an operations and administrative officer for the U.N. in the Golan Heights, with liaison responsibilities in Damascus and Beirut. This was a dangerous area during a violent time. I was directing a group of military observers and I was investigating reports of unfriendly activity, and a potential threat to my personnel.

The reports proved accurate. I was traveling alone when my vehicle was ambushed by some very ugly characters with their AK’s. I was hit on the back of the head, knocked to the ground and quickly beaten under the muzzles of AK-47’s. I remember thinking at the time, “This could be interesting.”

I refused to stay down, but there I was. I had four men pointing their AK’s at me—with others in the background. One thug attempted to clear my throat with the muzzle of his AK. Not very good odds. Training does not prepare you for every single situation that you will encounter, but it gives you some general principles to follow that will enable you to improvise effective responses on the spur of the moment. These include: Keep cool; if you’re afraid, don’t show it. Be resourceful and look for ways of narrowing the odds or reversing the situation.

I did keep calm in this case and, perhaps because they thought I was a successful capture, the background thugs barked some orders in Farsi and suddenly departed.

Now don't laugh, but I was able to divert a couple of the terrorists by pointing to some Marlborough cigarette cartons in the back of my truck. Two of the four bad guys made for the cigarettes—thus reducing the odds against me from four to one, to two to one. Luckily, I was then able to distract one of the other terrorists long enough to grab his weapon. That enabled me to regain control of the situation and get on my way.

My point is this: maintain your mental toughness. Don't give up, no matter how difficult the odds against you may seem. Keep thinking. Keep looking for alternatives. It is never over until it's over.

On another occasion I was suddenly confronted with number of terrorists armed with knives. I was allegedly in a safe area and so I was unfortunately without a firearm. The bad guys demanded that I surrender to them. I didn't.

This again was a situation that I hadn't rehearsed in ROTC training. But once more the training fundamen-

tals, combined with ingrained mental discipline, enabled me to improvise a response on the spot.

In this case, I would say that my training had prepared me in a number of useful ways. Yet again, it helped me to keep a cool head. It gave me a sixth sense concerning danger. It sharpened my peripheral vision and it helped me to perceive those elements of the situation that I might be able to turn to my advantage.

I edged towards a stone wall where my back would be protected. I wound my jacket around my left hand and forearm as a shield. I kept my distance and retreated towards the stone wall, and then, I pulled out my own knife. As I did, I drew on the self-confidence my training had instilled in me. I looked for mental advantages. I reminded myself that though I was outnumbered I was a good deal taller than any of my adversaries. Also, I was probably more fit and better trained. Finally, I had a longer reach—something that really mattered in a knife fight.

Bottom-line, I didn't discount my ability to make these thugs pay a price—even if I went down.

First, I moved quickly to lower the odds. I attacked—and disabled the terrorists who were closest to hand. That

had an impact on the rest that I didn't expect. They not only fled, but I ended up chasing them.

Does that make me Captain America? I didn't think so at the time, and I still don't. As I saw it, I was just doing my job. I was trained to be a warrior, and when the time came, the training paid off. I was ready.

That's the advice I would give to you tonight. Be ready. Learn as much as you can. Sharpen your instincts. Broaden your skills and your experiences. Challenge yourselves on every point. The more experience you have in getting close to the real thing, the better prepared you will be, and the more resourceful and self-confident you will be during those real-world situations when it's life or death.

We were ready when the time came, and I have no doubt that you will be ready as well.

Let me end where I began, with a question and an answer.

Question: Where are the great leaders today?

Answer:

I'm looking at them—all present and accounted for.

Thank you, good luck and God bless you all.

WINNER: CONTROVERSIAL OR HIGHLY POLITICIZED

"#MenToo: Breaking the Silence of Male Trauma Survivors"

By Megan Pope for Debra Warner, Professor, Los Angeles Campus of the Chicago School of Professional Psychology



Delivered as a TEDxTalk, San Antonio, Texas, Sept. 15, 2018

Hello everyone, thank-you for being here today. I want to bring up a difficult topic, but an important one. It seems the news is littered lately with stories of sexual assault.

Harvey Weinstein, Roy Moore, Bill Cosby. (Pause). When you picture these men in your head, I'm sure you think of news articles about the accusations women have made against them. Women have been stepping out of the shadows, and talking about their

abuse and assault. This is important, the #metoo movement is long overdue. But, when we think of victims of domestic violence or rape, we probably think of a male perpetrator and a female victim. But there is another population that is incredibly overlooked... male survivors of trauma. Statistics show that 1 in 6 men will experience sexual abuse in their lifetimes. And it is my work with that population that I would like to share with you today.

~Now, before I go much further, I want to give a trigger warning. This talk will discuss graphic topics of sexual assault, physical and emotional abuse so if you feel uncomfortable, please feel free to leave the room. (Care)

~ I am a Forensic Psychologist and a professor in Los Angeles. My research focuses on violence and trauma related to males, and I use psychology in the legal environment to help with offender treatment. Some days I teach, but

other days I go into prisons and evaluate offenders. Because of my experiences in this field, I am able to speak for these male survivors, because I have been witness to many of their stories.

~In 2017, the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics stated that men have an equal chance as women of experiencing a violent crime. (pause) Does that shock you? It shocked me, and yet after hearing hundreds of stories from male trauma victims, I am no longer in disbelief. Let me tell you the story of a man I interviewed. His name is Robert.

~Robert is 49 and stands 6 feet tall and weighs 300 pounds. His size makes him sound tough, right? Well, even the biggest and strongest men can be victims. As a child, Robert was molested by several perpetrators at 3 different points in his childhood. At 4, at age 7, and lastly by his maternal aunt by marriage when he was 15. Each time he was abused, he stuffed his pain down, because he was taught to “suck it up” and “be a man.” On the last occasion his aunt convinced him they were to get married and live happily ever after. Sometime afterward, he was so distraught he slit both his wrists. At this point he told his mother about her sister-in-law’s abuse. Imagine if your 15 year old daughter told you that (get angry) her older uncle was touching her. Would you believe her? Of course you would! And you would be beyond furious! Cops would be called, arrests made, and families split. But how do we respond when a 15-year-old boy tells us he was sexually abused? Robert’s mother didn’t call the police, and she wasn’t outraged. She told him that no woman could force a teenage boy to have sex if he didn’t want it. (Put on a bit of a different voice...) “You cannot take sex from a teenage boy.” His mother assumed he had consented. But he was just 15 years old when his aunt started molesting him. Such (pause) is the injustice of what (pause) has been done (pause) to our men. (huge pause). While women are applauded as the heroines they are when speaking up about assault, men are not believed, are ostracized, or are called weak if they

speak up. Our culture does not validate men who speak out, but silences them. Perhaps the reason why lies in how we indoctrinate our children.

~Who has ever heard someone say to a little boy, “Don’t hit girls!” By singling out little girls in this way, we are teaching our little boys that women are weak. Why don’t we just say, “Don’t hit anyone?” Men are conditioned to protect women and think of them as less powerful than men. However, we never (draw this out) think of our men as needing protection. We think of them as powerful. (pause) Robert’s mom thought of him as a strong grown man, not the 15-year-old child he was. In our culture, men are some of the MOST silent victims of physical, emotional, and sexual abuse because we rarely believe they can be the victims. (pause) Remember, research gathered from the 1 in 6 organization shows that on average, 1 in 6 men are sexually abused. 1 (pause) in (pause) 6.

~Richard Gartner, a psychologist who treats men with trauma histories, says that our society holds the false belief that men cannot be victims of sexual abuse. But men CAN and Robert is far from alone. Male sexual abuse happens more than it should.

~Perhaps another reason why, is illuminated in the documentary “The Mask You Live In.” The documentary sheds light on why we rarely hear men discuss their abuse. The film discusses how men cannot live up to society’s traditional masculine expectations. No man can be all the things society says are masculine: the star athlete, (pause) financially successful, (punch), the top executive. Television and the cultural narrative of societal gender norms encourages men to be masculine and strong. Societal gender norms are the unspoken rules of what it means to be masculine and feminine. When men cannot be “strong,” their perceptions of themselves might be painful and self-rejecting. We teach little boys to not cry, be tough, “suck it up” and “be a man.” These responses teach little boys a blueprint or an interpretation of what it means to be masculine.

However, this is dangerous because it teaches boys that they can only be one way, tough. So, when 1 in 6 men are abused, they literally don’t know how to tell anyone about their trauma because admitting vulnerability would bring too much inner shame. This is why Robert didn’t say anything for years about his abuse, and why many men stay silent, and in the shadows.

~ Here is another story that greatly impacted me. It is about how male trauma affects men and their spouses. I am changing the name and a few details to protect the man involved. I was called to a prison once to evaluate Marco, who was incarcerated for domestic violence. The day before he had slit his own throat from ear to ear in his cell. When I evaluated him, I could not understand why he was incarcerated, and in so much internal pain. He seemed like a gentle soul. His wife visited weekly and he had no other history of depression or violence that would make him more likely to slice his throat. It takes a lot of depression and self-loathing to do such a thing. I thought “there has to be a trauma or something that caused him to act out.” So, when I interviewed him, I sat across from him, and softly asked, “So what happened to you” (make us feel the gentleness in your vocalics and body). His eyes widened in surprise, and he answered “nothing, nothing,” but then he averted his eyes and looked down. After 2 minutes of sitting in silence and him looking at the floor, (pause) he told me an uncle raped him when he was 5 years old. He was raped again when he was 21 by rival gang members. (pause) Many survivors of sexual assault have Post Traumatic Stress Disorder, PTSD, (pause) like veterans coming home from war. But instead of being triggered by loud noises, sexual assault survivors can become triggered by words, scenarios, or touching. (pause) Marcos says the day he was arrested, he and his wife were in the shower, and she touched his butt. It triggered his PTSD, and suddenly, he wasn’t with her anymore in the shower, he was back in the moment with his perpetrators.

~His PTSD, and those trauma memories materialized in his mind, all spawning from that touch. He felt victimized, and in that moment he assaulted his wife. He had never told her about his rapes. As he sat there recalling his story, he cried and violently shook with emotion. Once he was done with his story, I told him what I say to all my survivors, “This assault was not your fault” and “thank you for telling me your story.” Like many men, he had guarded his story because men have been taught to protect like a dragon protecting their gold. Later, Marco called his wife at my prompting and shared his history of the sexual assaults. He had never told anyone because he felt ashamed and feared being viewed as less than a man.

~Men like Marco often do not disclose their abuse for years. Researchers O’Leary and Barber found 44% of men wait more than 20 years to disclose child sexual abuse. Imagine carrying that kind of shame and pain, alone, inside of you for all those years. Men often feel responsible for their sexual assault because they believe they should have been able to stop it. Those gender roles kick in, and Marco’s blueprint for masculinity told him that he was to blame for his assault, that it was somehow his fault. He felt that he should have been “man enough” to stop it. Our society allows women to be vulnerable, but it does not allow men that same luxury because of the stigma of being sexually assaulted as a man. It is this atrocity of men not being encouraged to speak up that has inspired my research of working with male trauma survivors. Hashtag metoo is important, but what about hashtag mentoo? (Pause)

~While some male survivors do come forward, it is very few. One such brave man that I had the pleasure of hearing speak was Greg Holtmeyer, an educator at Lincoln University, and a male survivor himself. He discussed how disclosure can be a freeing experience for men and can help them not feel so invisible in the world. By encouraging men to talk about their

assault, we can break the culture of silence, and free men to come out of the shadows. But for men to feel comfortable disclosing, they need support. Think about all the funding that goes into creating shelters and programs for abused women, but there is very little for abused men. And why would there be funding for it when even our media ostracizes male assault survivors?

~A few years ago, I was watching a popular news pundit tell a satirical news story of a female teacher who had had sex with a male child in her school. The comedian joked how “lucky” the young man was. Lucky? Lucky? (indignant). Why was he lucky? Consent does NOT change because of your genitalia. It’s this very dichotomy, of favoring female victims over male victims, that creates so much shame for male trauma survivors. This shame usually turns to pain, which men never disclose because of the stigma about manliness and strength.

~Because of men like Marco and Robert, I created an annual conference to help bring awareness to this issue: the Summit on Community Resilience, Intervention, Prevention, and Training (SCRIPT). Every year in July, in Los Angeles, we celebrate the resiliency of men who have experienced male violence and trauma. This conference is open to the public and was created so we come together as a community to discuss all issues related to trauma and leave the conference with something to implement in our own individual environment. So far, the conference has had over 800 attendees and provides a place for male survivors to tell their stories. This last year, we had four brave survivors disclose their abuse for the first time. They were immediately embraced with love, support, and put in touch with resources that will help them.

~The rest of the year, I continue my work, going into prisons, and working with male trauma survivors. I have realized something sadly profound: very few people are researching or talking or writing, about male trauma victims. Because of this, I wanted to write a book about this issue. It’s called His History,

Her Story, and it’s written for spouses of male survivors of sexual abuse and trauma. (pause) Remember Robert? I interviewed him for my book.

~Once, he and his wife and their son were spending her birthday in Orange County, California. Robert hated Orange County, but he never really told anyone how much he disdained it. As the family was driving back to their home, the normally calm Robert became angry when a car cut him off. Instead of calmly allowing the driver to pass, he revved on the gas and seemed like he was going to hit the other car. His wife, freaking out, yelled “STOP IT!” (pause) before the near accident. He looked at his wife and yelled, “Don’t tell me what do!!!” with disdain and resentment. Terrified, she started sobbing and stayed silent the rest of the way home. She was so fearful for her son in the car or he would see his father arrested.

~Robert’s wife could not understand what had happened to put Robert in such a rage that day. In time Robert began to disclose to her more of his childhood. She finally realized that the Robert’s rage in the car that day was triggered by spending the day in Orange County. You see, Orange County is a wealthy area, and Robert grew up incredibly poor. His mother had to work, which left him with minimal supervision at times and vulnerable to sexual predators. He used to dream of a life of privilege so he could feel not alone. Being in Orange County reminded him of his childhood, the solitude and the abuse he sustained from a lack of supervision. His wife yelling at him to STOP! made him feel he had no control, reminding him of how he had been abused, and no one had helped him. Robert had stuffed his pain down so deep, it had fallen into the shadows. Over time, his wife learned his story, and it troubled her how he still felt so much pain from his molestations. And I should know his pain, because I am Robert’s wife. (long pause) He is here today, supporting me.

~If I could dream up a world where wonderful men like my hus-

band were never abused, I would. But until we get there, let's listen and pay attention to how we socialize our boys and adolescents. Let's get rid of traditional gender roles and teach boys that being vulnerable is not weakness. Let's stop tying emotions to genders. It's not feminine to cry, it's human. By limiting the range of emotions boys and men can safely express, we are setting

them up for failure. Stop limiting the emotional expression of our men and boys, creating an expectation of masculinity they cannot live up to. This is my mission, to stop the culture of silence. My mission started with love, love for the men who suffer in silence, and love for my husband.

~My experiences mean I raise my son, who is also in the audience today,

with the full range of emotions he is allowed to express, in his pocket, and his ideas on gender are not set. Let's allow men to be vulnerable. Let's allow male trauma and violence victims to come into the light, and not have to suffer alone. Let's listen. Let's love. Let's break the silence together.

WINNER: DIVERSITY

"The Power of Singlemindedness"

Written and Delivered by Janet Stovall,
Manager, Executive Communications, UPS



Delivered at TED@UPS,
Atlanta, Georgia, July 19, 2018

Everybody has that one friend—you know, the single-minded one, the one who, no matter what the question is, always finds a way to make the answer whatever it is she's single-minded about. I'm that friend.

And the thing that I'm single-minded about is racism. If someone were to ask me, "So, Janet, got any plans for the 4th of July?" I'm subject to answer, "Yeah, I'm going to binge-watch 'Roots.'"

Or if they said, "Janet, I've got a joke for you: Why'd the chicken cross the road?" "Uh, was it a black chicken? Probably gentrification."

But for me, single-mindedness is not just caring about something. It's caring about something enough to do something about it. It's not just thinking, it's doing. It's not just praying, it's moving your feet. And the reason I'm single-minded about racism is because I know single-mindedness can destroy it. I learned that many, many years ago.

Back in 1984, I was a junior at Davidson College in Davidson, North Carolina. Now, Davidson is a little-bitty town, Southern town, split by railroad tracks, with white Davidson on one side, black Davidson on the other side, and, as black students lived on the white side of the tracks, we got used to being stopped in downtown and asked for ID, until the police memorized our faces. But fortunately, that didn't take

too long, because out of 1,200 students, only 52 of us were black. There was one black professor and one black assistant dean. Things weren't a lot better on campus.

Well, I wasn't OK with this. And so, I started writing things. And then I started yelling things. And after about three years of that, I got tired. So I decided to write one more thing; I wrote something called "Project '87."

Project '87 was really just a challenge to Davidson: in three years, by 1987, enroll 100 black students, hire 10 black professors, create five Black Studies classes and hire one black dean. It didn't seem particularly revolutionary, but what was different about it was, we also challenged Davidson to say that if you don't do this, we will question your commitment to diversity. It was a real problem. We put some real numbers to it. We gave them some real consequences.

Well, the campus went absolutely nuts. But fortunately, in the middle of this, Davidson got a new president, and that president was single-minded about racism, too. And so, he created a task force to address the issues in Project '87. And several months after that, we produced a 77-page report. That report was the foundation for all the change that came after it. Now, I wasn't there to see that change, because, actually, in 1985, I graduated.

However, the change did happen, and today, there are 185 black students, there are 16 black or multiracial professors, there are four black deans, and there's an entire degree-granting Africana Studies Department.

Project '87 changed Davidson. But it also changed me, because what it taught me was there's a lot of power in single-mindedness.

Well, today, I'm an executive speechwriter for one of the biggest companies in the world. It's a profession that is 92 percent white and predominantly male, which makes me a little bit of a unicorn. But I'm a single-minded unicorn.

The thing about speech writing is, it's very personal. So I spend a lot of time in deep conversation with the CEO and senior executives, and a lot of times those conversations turn to diversity and inclusion, which, of course, I'm always happy to talk about. But after quite a few of these conversations, I've come to a conclusion: I believe that business is in a position to do something that no other entity can do. Business can dismantle racism. Now, colleges can't do it. There aren't but 5,000 of them in the United States and only 20 million students enrolled. Church can't do it, either—only 35 percent of us go on a regular basis, and when we do, eleven o'clock Sunday

morning is “the most segregated hour” in America. But business? There are a 162 million people in the US workforce alone—people of all races, united in the spirit of wanting a paycheck and having to show up to get it.

Now, I’m aware that diversity is bigger than race, and racism is bigger than America. But racial discrimination is the most prominent form, and Lord knows America is the absolute best at it. So what if, though, what if we worked in diverse and inclusive environments that we had something to do something with? And since we spend one-third of our lives at work, what if we did that with people who didn’t look like us? I think the world would be a totally different place outside of work. That can happen if business gets single-minded about racism.

But the question is: How is that supposed to happen?

Well, I think there are three things that business can borrow from Project ‘87: real problems, real numbers, real consequences. Like it or not, diversity is not really a problem for business—yet. I mean, it’s a nice thing to have, it’s the right thing to do, but for decades, we’ve been trying to make the case that diversity fuels innovation and customer insight. I mean, at this point, it’s kind of a no-brainer, a little bit like hearing a smoke alarm going off and standing with your hand on the hot door, waiting for some data to tell you that your house is on fire. Because the data is already there. Ethnically diverse companies perform 33 percent better than the norm. Forbes’s best workplaces for diversity enjoy 24 percent higher revenue growth. And yet, here we are

in 2018, and there are only three black CEOs in the Fortune 500. And if your name is Molly or Connor, you’ve got a 14 percent better chance of getting a callback on your resume than if your name is Shanice or DeShawn. And all of this, despite the fact that by 2045, America is projected to be a minority-majority country.

Here’s the thing: the business case for diversity, as it stands today, doesn’t really speak to any problem. And the only way business is going to get single-minded about racial diversity is if it has a problem that is urgent and relative to somebody other than people of color. I got one: How about employees and customers? Because no matter what business you’re in, you’re going to need those, right?

Well, let’s talk about some real numbers. If you have employees and customers, wouldn’t it make sense if they looked a little bit like the people that work for you? So if that’s the case, maybe your employee base should be 13 percent Black and 18 percent Hispanic, because that’s what the population looks like. Maybe that’s what your customer base looks like.

But let’s be clear: diversity and inclusion are not the same things. Diversity is a numbers game. Inclusion is about impact. Companies can mandate diversity, but they have to cultivate inclusion. And if inclusion is what you’re after, you’ve got to calculate some slightly different numbers. How about 30 percent? Because that’s the point that research shows at which the voices of minorities actually begin to be heard. If you want a real problem, you’re going to need real numbers to fix it, and if you’re not

willing to set real numbers, then maybe you’re not real serious about diversity and inclusion.

That brings me to my third point: real consequences. Think about this: when salespeople forget what they’re doing and don’t come up with their numbers, what do we do? We give them a little time, maybe we give them some training. But then if they don’t hit those numbers eventually, we fire them. However, when you start talking about diversity and inclusion, we use terms like “accountability.” And maybe we scold, and maybe we hold back an incentive or two. But you know what the best incentive is? A job. And you know what the best disincentive is? Losing it. Accountability should be a given. Consequences are what happen when you don’t do what you’re accountable for.

Imagine this: imagine a place where people of all colors and all races are on and climbing every rung of the corporate ladder; where those people feel safe—indeed, expected—to bring their unassimilated, authentic selves to work every day, because the difference that they bring is both recognized and respected. And imagine a place where the lessons we learn about diversity at work actually transform the things we do, think and say outside of work.

That is what happens if we all work together to fix what’s broken.

That is what happens if we stop praying for change to happen and actually start moving our feet to making it.

That is the power of single-mindedness.

Thank you.

WINNER: EDUCATION

"The Bystander Effect: Why Some People Act and Others Don't"

By Soness Stevens for Kelly Charles-Collins,
Lawyer



Delivered at TEDxOcala,
Ocala, Florida, Nov. 3, 2018

When I was in law school, a friend came to my apartment. She was wearing a long sleeve turtleneck sweater. I thought that is strange; it's almost 80 degrees outside. Then as she moved her head I saw a bruise on her neck. She told me that her husband is beating her. She made me promise to keep her secret. Contrary to my morals and values, I complied. I stood by and did nothing. Apparently, I wasn't the only one who knew the secret and did nothing.

I was just another example of the social psychological phenomenon called the bystander effect: When everyone is waiting for the other person to act, we just keep waiting.

It's when we all think, "Someone else will pay the bill."

The truth is: The opposite of action is not inaction, it's indifference.

For me—that realization changed the direction of my life.

Why do some people act, and others don't? Studies show what we choose to do is based on many factors, including fear, ambiguity, affinity, and diffusion of responsibility.

As an officer of the court, a lawyer, a trainer on bias and harassment for over 20 years, and personally, I wonder...

How often do we just stand by and do nothing when we know we should something?

Are we allowing fear of judgment or retribution to compromise our morals and values?

Fear breeds inaction. And inaction is what? — Indifference.

Lemme tell you about ...

A 15-year old boy was dragged out of a store in the Bronx. He was repeatedly stabbed by gang members wielding a machete. As he fought for his life—a crowd of bystanders watching—did nothing. As the attackers fled,

this boy lay there bleeding. He had blood gushing out of his neck. And what did the crowd do to help stop the bleeding? Nothing. They just screamed at him to run to the hospital—Knowing the hospital was blocks away.

Nobody stood up for him. No attempts to stop the bleeding. Not even help to get up. Instead, he staggered on his own blocks to the hospital, only to collapse in front of the emergency room and later die.

What if that was your child or loved one? How would you want people to respond? As a mom, I, unfortunately, know the answer firsthand.

My son, Jordan, was in a crowded restaurant when he was put in a headlock, lifted off his feet, and slammed to the ground...by a police officer. One young woman, a complete stranger, witnessing the whole incident, despite being threatened with arrest and repeatedly cursed at, she stood up for my son and challenged the officer.

She moved past her own fear, putting my son, a stranger, above her own personal safety and wellbeing. But not just right then and there, she also spoke up at the internal investigation. With her help, Jordan also challenged the officer in court. And won.

Being a bystander is not limited to witnessing an event on the street. There are bystanders in the workplace and on the world wide web.

As a lawyer, I worked on a case where a female employee claimed the owner sexually harassed her. It turns out this was the best kept "non-secret." Although almost everyone, from executive management on down, knew about the owner's behavior with her and others, they did nothing to stop it. Not even one person spoke up. Yeah, partly, they were afraid of retaliation,

but mostly they had just accepted this is who he is, ignoring his behavior and the potential consequences.

Normalization equals acceptance. In our silence lies complicity.

This same normalization occurs every day on the internet.

We probably all agree that cyberbullying is wrong. Yet, research shows that we rarely intervene—especially online.

Social media allows us to interact, but also to victimize.

Researchers estimate that between 10-40% of adolescents are victims of cyberbullying. And 70% of adults have witnessed some form of online harassment.

And then there are situations like this:

A high school girl witnessed her friend being raped by a 29-year old man they met the day before at the mall. Instead of intervening or calling for help, she just live-streamed the rape, allegedly to help stop the attack. But then, viewers encouraged her to keep filming. Giggling, she got lost in "likes," foregoing her friend's safety for her own popularity. And this isn't isolated to teens, recently a 36-year-old woman did the same thing!

People just watched a girl get raped on social media. How many viewers do you think did something? One. A friend of theirs happened to see the video and called 911. It took, just one person to act. Like the one young woman who stood up and spoke up for my son.

Social media promotes a psychological need for approval, a way to gauge self-worth, that may outweigh empathy. These bullying, physical violence, rape, and suicide videos get views, comments, likes, and shares. Seriously, when did we become numb to all this? When crimes and cyberbullying become entertainment, victim empathy

declines. This group voyeur mentality lends perfectly to the bystander effect online: we don't feel pressured to intervene because nobody else is. This is pluralistic ignorance gone viral.

The next time you get the urge to like, share or comment on one of these videos, ask yourself should I or could I be doing more?

Hashtag: "Likes" don't save lives.

They say, there's strength in numbers, but not so when it comes to the bystander effect--the more people there are in-person or online, the less likely we are to act. We diffuse our responsibility.

Bystanders are not just those who witness and don't intervene. Bystanders include those who are told and don't intervene. And those who heard it through the grapevine and don't intervene.

In this day and age of "empowerment," why do we give away our power?

When we allow others to make decisions for us, we give away our power.

When we defer to someone else to take action, we give away our power.

When we fail to act when we know we should, we give away our power.

But ... when we create safe and inclusive environments that encourage

people to stand up, speak up, and act up without fear of retribution or judgment we STAND in our power.

Whether it's witnessing violence, or—in my bias training in the workplace, discrimination, bullying, illegal activities, the METOO movement, the circumstances for us to act are vast.

We want to intervene but don't know if we should or even how. Ambiguity, insecurity, our past experiences may creep in. We notice things are happening.

Do we interpret the situation by asking ourselves, "Is this an emergency? Do they need help?" Are they deserving of help?

We often look at others to see how they are responding to decide whether it's our responsibility to act. Is there someone more qualified to help? Are they intervening?

Our values guide us in decision making. If we decide based on following the flock, we might end up compromising our own values. Here's where we need self-reflection.

Who am I? What would I want done for me or those I love? What are my values? How will my taking action change the outcome?

We can determine that regardless of what everyone else is doing, it IS our responsibility to act.

And once we determine there is a need for some kind of action, we have the power to choose how we will act and to what extent we are capable of doing so.

I'm not saying it's easy. I understand feeling helpless, our instinct for self-preservation, or simply just not wanting to get involved.

There are risks to getting involved: time, effort, workplace issues, personal safety, and maybe even death.

So, in that moment, you may wonder, should I fight, flee, or freeze?

I know we can't all fight, but in times of need, we also can't all freeze.

There's a spectrum from "Doing Nothing to Doing Something": ask someone to get help, report it, call for help, create a distraction, intervene.

Honestly, I'm not ready to die for causes I believe in. But I'm also not willing to just stand by and do nothing. There's so much room for action between nothing and death.

Knowing this, as you do now,
You will spring into action.
Stand up. Speak up. Act up.
IT'S TIME.

WINNER: ENVIRONMENT/ENERGY/SUSTAINABILITY

"In Our Hands: Let's Launch a Satellite to Track a Threatening Greenhouse Gas"

By Amanda Holt for Fred Krupp, President,
Environmental Defense Fund



Delivered at TED2018,
Vancouver, British Columbia, April 11, 2018

We have a big problem on our hands with global warming.

A lot of people, probably many of you, are watching that destruction happen, wanting to help, but feeling little hope for real change in our lifetimes.

You've seen the floods, the droughts, the storms, the fires.

When I leave the stage today, I don't want you to have hope.

I want you to have certainty.

Real certainty that we can make a

dent in the problem of climate change and live to see it.

I want to give you a vision of what that looks like.

This is the first time we've shared this publicly. You are the first audience to hear it.

We're going to launch a rocket.

On that rocket is a satellite.

That satellite will gather data about a pollutant that's warming the planet.

We'll put that data in the hands of people who can make simple fixes that

will change the course of global warming in our lifetimes.

Maybe that's a lot to take in. I'll back up.

First, let me introduce myself.

I'm Fred.

I've been an environmentalist since I was a kid, when I watched the fish and frogs in my neighborhood pond die from a chemical spill.

That bothered me.

Later, a college professor inspired me to think about environmentalism

differently—he told me that solutions come when you answer people’s aspirations for prosperity.

Aspirations like being safe and healthy and thriving in this world.

When you align that with business and science, you get solutions that scale.

So I joined the Environmental Defense Fund to build those kinds of solutions.

And I’ve worked my whole career for a moment like this.

The moment when we stop fighting headwinds and start to have the wind at our backs because of the power of information.

Information from technology that is coming down in price and going up in precision.

You see, there was something we didn’t grasp about climate change just a decade ago.

There’s been so much focus on carbon dioxide that the world overlooked another important gas.

We didn’t appreciate methane.

Methane pollution creates a quarter of the global warming we’re experiencing right now.

Pound for pound, its immediate impact is far greater than carbon dioxide.

Eighty-four times greater over a twenty-year period.

So we need to keep cutting carbon dioxide for the long term and start tackling methane to slow warming right away.

The oil and gas industry is one of the biggest sources of methane.

But it’s not obvious, because methane is invisible.

Take a look at this natural gas storage facility near Los Angeles.

Do you see methane here?

Neither do I.

How about now?

We shot this with an infrared camera at the same spot, exposing one of the worst methane leaks in US history.

That’s a very different picture.

On the one hand, natural gas decreases our dependence on coal, which emits far more carbon dioxide.

But natural gas is mostly methane and as it’s produced, processed and

transported across America, methane escapes from wells and pipes and other equipment.

It gets up into the sky and contributes to the disasters we’re experiencing.

That doesn’t have to happen.

But nobody had paid much attention to it, until we launched a nationwide effort to understand the problem.

We collected data with drones, planes, helicopters, even Google Street View cars.

Turns out, methane pollution is far higher than what government is reporting.

It also turns out that when we find where the gas is being vented or leaked, most of the sources can be fixed easily and inexpensively, saving natural gas that would otherwise be wasted.

It’s that simple.

We published our research and shared it with everyone.

And we learned that when you get information like that in people’s hands, they act!

Leading companies replaced valves and tightened loose-fitting pipes.

Colorado became the first state to limit methane pollution.

California followed suit.

And the public joined in.

Tweets started flying. #plugtheleaks!

Everyone’s paying more attention.

We’re doing it because we can’t wait for Washington—especially not now.

In fact, it’s time to take what we’ve done and aim higher.

To the sky.

The U.S. has only about one-tenth of this methane pollution, so we need to go global to find the rest.

Remember that rocket I mentioned?

It will launch a compact satellite, called MethaneSAT to do what no one has done before: measure methane pollution from oil and gas facilities worldwide with exacting precision.

Its data stream will let us map the pollution so people can see it.

Then it’s about turning data into action by getting it into the right hands, just as we did in the U.S.

That means oil and gas companies, governments and citizens.

We’ve seen that when we present them with hard data, many oil and gas companies will cut the pollution.

Citizens will be empowered to take action, governments will tighten regulations and because all of our data will be free and public, there’s transparency.

We’ll all know how much progress is being made, and where.

That leads me to our goal: cutting these emissions 45% by 2025.

That will have the same near-term climate benefit as shutting down 1,300 coal-fired power plants.

That’s one-third of all the coal plants in the world!

Nothing else will have this kind of near-term impact at such a low cost.

The fact that a single satellite can actually move the dial on global warming is remarkable.

This is our chance to create change in our lifetimes.

And we can do it now.

Thanks to generous giving by The Audacious Project we’re on a path toward liftoff.

My time is almost up and I promised you a vision of what a critical piece of the solution could be.

Can you see it?

Can you see how this satellite leverages the best of science and technology and data?

Can you see we’ve entered an era of innovation that is supercharging progress?

Can you see that it’s in our hands?

We have an aggressive target of three years to launch.

And when the satellite is ready, we’ll have a launch party. A literal launch party.

Imagine a blue-sky day.

Crowds of people.

Television cameras.

Kids staring up at a thing that will change their future.

What an amazing day that will be.

What a big opportunity we have.

I can’t wait.

WINNER: HEALTHCARE

"The Hardesty Lecture: Patients I Will Never Forget"

Written by Norman E. Sharpless, M.D. and the NCI Office of Communications and Public Liaison, delivered by Norman E. Sharpless, M.D.

Delivered as the Hardesty Lecture, West Virginia University, Morgantown, West Virginia, Oct. 18, 2018

Good afternoon. First off, I would like to add my congratulations to David and Susan Hardesty. What a wonderful event. I can tell your fingerprints are all over it. A round of applause for them.

There is a palpable sense of momentum around cancer research and cancer care here, and this is a state that has a large burden of cancer. West Virginia University is bringing in great leadership with the goal of developing a world-class cancer institute. That's a wonderful vision that the NCI shares with this university.

Being here on campus reminds me of my last day of school, 25 years ago. If I close my eyes, I can recall the day I graduated from the University of North Carolina School of Medicine.

There were family members, hugs and tears, and buckets of dubious fried chicken. My peers and I recited the Physician's Oath. This is a modified version of the Hippocratic Oath, which is about 2,500 years old. The Physician's Oath includes solemn commitments to certain principles of being a good physician.

We committed to treat not just a disease, but the whole patient.

We committed to ask for help when we need it.

That part has served me well in federal government.

We committed to the sharing of knowledge. We committed to teaching our peers and our patients.

And then there's the last line that I've always kept with me. It is: "May I long experience the joy of healing those who seek my help."

The joy of healing.

The joy of patient care is really what drove me to practice medical oncology. When a former patient comes

back to see you, and they are healthy and happy—the joy is profound.

But you also see patients at their sickest. Staring death in the eye. And they astonish you with their sense of humor and dignity under the most terrible circumstances.

I once took care of a patient with leukemia who was treated heavily with chemotherapy. She was eventually cured of her disease, but physically, she went through hell first. The treatment ruined the taste of all food, so she developed chemotherapy-induced anorexia. As a result, she lost weight, and became very weak and debilitated. We tried lots of stuff to help her regain her appetite, and nothing really worked. She looked so frail and I was concerned about her. I said, "How are you doing?" She said, "Well, Dr. Sharpless, I would really like to thank you for this highly effective weight loss program you put me on." I was awe-struck that despite the circumstances, she was trying to make other people laugh.

But not every patient is healed. You take care of some patients for a very long time, you get to know them, and you get your hopes up that you can help them. You use the best research you can find. But despite your best efforts, sometimes there are terrible outcomes. There are no answers why. There is no joy and no healing. There are some terribly dark and difficult days for both patients and physicians.

Eventually, I felt that the needs of my patients outpaced the information that was available. So, the pursuit of the joy of healing drew me back to the lab so I might get closer to finding the answers that my patients, my colleagues and I so desperately needed.

So as both a clinical oncologist and a cancer researcher, I've been able to see

how these two worlds work together. Today, I'll honor my commitment to share information. I will tell you about three patients who changed the way I think about the field of cancer research.

The first patient I'd like to talk about is someone I met in 1997, when I was an oncology fellow at the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston. I'd done my internal medicine training for three years, and now I was a would-be cancer specialist. And those of you who remember the late 1990s, that was the height of the AIDS epidemic.

It's hard to explain to young doctors today what it was like back then. Half of an internal medicine service in those days, in a big city like Boston, would be patients dying of AIDS, in the most baroque, Gothic ways imaginable—with these terrible infections, with organisms we'd never heard of. And normally harmless microbes, like bread mold, could make them sick. It was an unbelievably difficult time, because AIDS was so new.

Constantly, there were new clinical situations that we'd never encountered. We learned how important the immune system is to keep all these infections at bay, and there were a lot of young patients and a lot of patients from vulnerable populations. It was a dark time in American medicine.

I remember one young man, an artist, who had not thought of himself as sick. He'd never been ill, and he came to the hospital because he was having trouble breathing. He did not know he was HIV-positive at that time. He went from being someone who thought of himself as a well individual to being critically ill in just a moment. He was rapidly diagnosed with this disease called pneumocystis pneumonia. It's this weird organism

that didn't really cause illness until the AIDS epidemic. He needed a breathing tube, so he couldn't even talk with us. We treated that disease, and he got a bit better, and he was extubated. He could finally tell us about the terrible headaches he was having.

He then had a lumbar puncture and turned out to have a disease called cryptococcal meningitis, which was another AIDS-defining illness nobody had ever really treated before. So, he had been diagnosed with two extremely rare conditions within two days of each other. We treated those, and he started feeling better.

Then, we noticed he had enlarged lymph nodes. One of these was biopsied, and it turns out he had non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, an AIDS-defining illness as well-- at least this subtype of it.

The oncology service was called in so that's how I became involved. I remember that I had never taken care of such a patient. There wasn't a lot of literature on how to treat lymphoma in patients with AIDS at that time, and I was a fellow-in-training.

From an academic perspective, this was a fascinating educational challenge. I read up on HIV lymphoma. I talked to one of the greatest lymphoma doctors I've ever worked with, Mike Grossbard, who was, at that time, my attending.

We discussed it a lot, and we decided that this patient was way too sick for standard cancer therapy. We couldn't give him the heavy doses of drug we normally would in this situation, so we found this unusual regimen. We cut the dose in half, and we gave him this therapy.

As a result, his cancer melted away. It was marvelous. Mike and I felt so self-congratulatory. We were already figuring out how we were going to write this guy up as a case report. We thought we were really clever.

Well, there was a lot we didn't know back then. About retrovirology, immunology and biomedical research. The AIDS epidemic was a tremendous teacher, but we learned those lessons in the worst way.

After about a month of therapy, our patient's immune system was shot. He developed sepsis and shortly after that, he died.

It doesn't really benefit someone if we make their cancer go away, and we don't make them better. Sometimes the treatment is worse than the disease.

I learned another lesson from this patient that only becomes obvious in the context of time. When I think about this patient I took care of 21 years ago, and what would happen with him today, I realize how much times have changed. We have drugs like rituximab that are much better. We have a regimen called EPOCH, that was developed by Wyndham Wilson at the NCI—that's better. We would sequence his tumor and molecularly characterize it. We know now that these tumors are largely caused by Epstein-Barr virus.

We know a lot more about the cancer, but most importantly, this patient would probably never get lymphoma in the first place, because we have highly-active antiretroviral therapy. So, we have all these treatment options which didn't exist back then that have made HIV lymphoma really rare in the United States now. We have made an unbelievable amount of progress in that area in just 21 years. We've totally transformed that disease, and its therapy, and its prognosis. It shows how fast cancer research can go. We can make great progress in short bits of time.

The next patient I'd like to talk about is someone I took care of at the University of North Carolina Medical Center in Chapel Hill in 2010. She was a Hispanic woman who didn't speak much English. She was about 24 years old and she had a few young children. She came to our emergency room for chest pain and trouble breathing. She had a scary-looking chest x-ray. She got a biopsy, and it turned out that she had lung cancer.

This was very odd, because this was a young woman, 24 years old, and she never smoked cigarettes. It was a strange presentation for lung cancer. She was stabilized on the inpatient service, and then started on routine chemotherapy

for lung cancer--carboplatin/Taxol. She was sent back home, where she was going to get cyclic chemotherapy. Every three weeks, she'd come in and get another round of treatment.

I met her a couple of months into her therapy, when she came in for her fifth cycle of this regimen. I was doing what we called the "Doc of the Day," which meant that I would see the patients who were getting established therapy, and make sure they were doing okay, and then give them their next round of therapy.

A young oncologist-in-training came to me and said, "Yeah, here's this patient who is getting treated for lung cancer, and she's 24, and she never smoked, and sign here." He handed me the chemotherapy orders, and I said, "Wait, wait. Did you say 24 years old?" He said, "Yes." And I said, "Did you say, 'Never smoked?'" And he said, "Yes." And I said, "Well, that's really unusual. What do you think is going on? Did you sequence her for this gene called EGFR?" And he said, "Yeah, we did that. She didn't have that, so, you know, she's getting this regimen." Also, it was also clear the chemotherapy that had worked for a while, and helped her, was not working anymore. So, it was time to start thinking about what to do next. I asked, "Well, did you sequence the other genes, like ALK, and ROS-1?" And the fellow looked at me and said, "What's ALK?" I said, "Oh, well, let me tell you, because I'm a scientist. I'm in the lab a lot." I had just been in a meeting a week before and heard a talk by Jeff Engelman, a prominent lung cancer researcher and doctor at the time.

Jeff was one of the people who was starting to use ALK inhibitors for a rare lung cancer called ALK-translocated lung cancer. It's only a couple of percent of patients, but they tend to be young women who have never smoked. This patient had the demographics for ALK-translocated lung cancer, but we would need to sequence her tumor again to find out for sure.

This kind of sequencing was not routinely available at the time, but we did it. We sent a tumor specimen to

a special lab, and we were told that it would take five or six weeks to get the results back.

In the meantime, our patient's treatment stopped working. She got sicker and sicker, and finally, she decided to stop treatment and enroll in hospice care.

Coincidentally, that very same day, we got the lab results back. She had a classic defining mutation that showed what I suspected: she had ALK-translocated lung cancer.

At the same time, a clinical trial for an ALK-inhibitor drug was taking place just a few hundred feet from the emergency room door where this patient first entered. We did not know then, but we know this now: an ALK-inhibiting drug can give patients with ALK translocated lung cancer about four more years of good quality life as opposed to a few weeks. She's exactly the kind of patient they were looking for.

The molecular diagnostics would have helped her, but we got this information about five weeks too late.

This was not even a result of malpractice. She didn't get bad care. She got standard care. She got what she would've gotten at most any other institution in the country at that time. But the point is that sometimes the standard of care is not very good.

That was one of the worst days of my career. I was frustrated and upset. I remember thinking that this was going to happen again. These patients are going to come here. They're going to have mutations that we can treat, but we're not going to identify them in time. We're going to give them the standard of care, which may not be good. How are we going to prevent that from happening?

At that time, I also had a leadership role at the UNC Cancer Center, and I was in a position to make some changes. I went straight to one of the cancer geneticists at my cancer center, Dr. Neil Hayes. We hatched a plan to implement some changes.

Almost immediately, we made this kind of sequencing a reflex. If a patient had a new diagnosis of lung cancer, the

pathologist wouldn't have to think about it. They would just test for EGFR, and ALK, along with some other genes that indicate a cancer subtype.

Also, over the course of a few years, Neil and I developed a protocol called UNCSEQ. This is a panel of about 300 genes we would sequence in cancer patients. We went on to sequence 3,000 patients, and we followed them to find out what happened to them. In addition, we did something that was considered really innovative at the time— we shared the results with the patients and their doctors, so if there was a meaningful event, the therapy could be changed.

This allowed us to learn a lot, scientifically, and publish a lot of papers. We created new resources that helped patients with cancer, but it was all instigated by a bad outcome in a patient.

So, what did this patient teach me? If you think about our options in 2010 versus 2018, again, you will realize how fast cancer progress can be. If this patient came in today, to virtually any hospital in the United States, she'd get sequenced automatically for, not three genes but, hundreds of genes, for 10 or more driving events that all have therapeutic implications in lung cancer.

What's more—the government will now pay for this testing. CMS has decided they cover next-gen sequencing for this for all Medicare patients. Some of these mutations and tests were unheard of in 2010. In 2018, they are standard of care. That was only 8 years ago.

Plus, the results of these new tests will come back in three days, not two months. The treatments that are done after identifying these genes are so much better now. In some types of lung cancer, we believe we are curing some of these patients in the metastatic setting with immunotherapies. So, our ability to treat non-small cell lung cancer has improved markedly in the last eight years.

So, I don't think we would've been able to cure that woman, had she come in today, but we certainly would've been able to do much better than we did.

Another thing I learned from her is that we can't accept the status quo. When patients like this present to us, we have to fight for them. We have to advocate for them. We have to continuously work for them, to provide the best care possible, and not be satisfied with the standard of care if it's not good care. And we have to do this for all our patients. We have to do this for our rich VIP donors, but we also have to do this for patients who are poor, and don't speak English.

The third patient I'd like to talk about is someone I took care of just a few years ago, in 2016, at the University of North Carolina. As Richard mentioned, I used to treat acute leukemia on the inpatient service, and this was a very charming 60-year-old African-American man who lived in Durham. He was a father, a husband, and a journalist, and he was diagnosed with acute myelogenous leukemia—AML. AML in a 60-year-old is generally a pretty bad disease. I had not seen his bone marrow biopsy results yet, but I assumed he was going to have an incurable cancer. I was preparing to tell him and his wife about how this was a really tough disease. He was going to need very aggressive therapy. If he was lucky, we might be able to get him into a bone marrow transplant, which was the only chance at a cure, and that was a very slim chance.

So, the bone marrow is tested for the cytogenetic abnormalities that drive the cancer, and in someone who's 60, most of the news you get from cytogenetics is bad—adverse cytogenetics. A few patients will have intermediate cytogenetics, and rarely—very rarely—will someone have good cytogenetics.

We got the results of the bone marrow biopsy, and to all our surprise, he came back with what's called "good cytogenetics." This meant the disease is actually very curable, and he would need much less therapy. I remember the day told his family that the results were surprisingly good. His two adult daughters were crying and happy, and his wife was crying and happy, and the patient was a little overwhelmed. It was a moment of joy for all of us.

We treated this patient with standard chemotherapy, and it wasn't terribly difficult. And then he promptly went into remission. Most of his treatment was out of the hospital, and he's in remission now. I had coffee with him a few weeks ago when he came to visit me at the NIH and he's doing well.

This story makes a point about molecularly-precise therapy. Our clinical decision-making can be informed by having the diagnostic molecular information. That is a real movement in cancer. We need to understand the molecular biology of everybody's cancer to treat them right. No two patients are alike.

But the other thing it taught me is that sometimes things turn out much better than you expect in cancer. This was a patient where I expected the worst, and he's doing great.

And that surprised me and motivated me and continues to motivate me now.

I have shared stories of three patients who have had an impact on my career and my life. Every one of these patients would have had a better outcome if they needed care today instead of 1997, or 2010 or even 2016. Options and outcomes continue to improve with every passing day. Every patient benefits from the discoveries that came before.

And tomorrow will be better than today in the fight against cancer.

So, I'll sum up what I learned from them:

I've learned that cancer progress happens really fast.

I've learned not to accept the status quo.

I've learned that the standard of care might not be good care.

I've learned that we have to keep pressing and fighting, and I've learned that sometimes, we'll be pleasantly surprised, and that we should always keep hope.

I will close today with that special line from the physician's oath again.

"May you long experience the joy of healing those who seek your help."

Thank you.

WINNER: PHILOSOPHY/RELIGION

"Meaning"

Written and Delivered by Jeffrey Flint, President,
Flint Speechwriting



Delivered at Crownmasters Speaking Club,
San Francisco, California, Dec. 13, 2018

The great William Shakespeare, through his character Macbeth, declares:

"Tomorrow, and tomorrow, and tomorrow,

Creeps in this petty pace from day to day

To the last syllable of recorded time,
And all our yesterdays have lighted fools

The way to dusty death. Out, out, brief candle!

Life's but a walking shadow, a poor player

That struts and frets his hour upon the stage

And then is heard no more. It is a tale

Told by an idiot, full of sound and fury,

Signifying nothing."

Shakespeare points here to the vanity of humanity, our hubris. But more than that, my take is that Shakespeare highlights the great potential of human beings to realize meaninglessness.

For when Macbeth states that life, "is a tale told by an idiot," I hear

Shakespeare say that (1) We (humanity) don't know what we are doing, that collectively we are the idiot; and when Macbeth adds that we, the idiot telling this tale, is, "full of sound and fury," Shakespeare is adding, (2) Yet, we think we do know what we are doing; so that therefore, (3) Life is meaningless and pointless. Life signifies "nothing."

Most of us are not MacBeth. Most of us do not receive and pursue a prophesy to be king. Still, many of us can feel at times that our grand plans, our expectations and dreams, our lives, like MacBeth's, have been reduced to pablum. We go to the same job. We sleep in the same bed. We kiss the same spouse. Our garbage cans go out the same day. And when we look across the street, our neighbors are doing the same thing! Wash, Rinse, Repeat. And then we die. What is the point?

In my talk today, I intend to confirm that my take of Shakespeare is correct, that our lives can be reduced to pablum, but maybe not in the way you expect. Most people define nihilism as having

nothing to believe in; today I want to convince you that nihilism is defined by believing too much and that more meaning can be found by believing less.

Let's begin with the well-known allegory of the dog chasing a car, albeit with a self-aware dog. Full of sound and fury, the dog chases the car, barking, yelping, pleading. And then the dog catches it. The dog did not expect that. What to do now? Can I mate? No. Can I tear it with my teeth? No. Can I join the car's pack? No. It is at this point the dog realizes that he does not know what he is doing. When he was chasing the car, full of sound and fury, the dog knew exactly what he wanted. But now that he has it, he is confronted by the unknown, the perplexity of a dog's life. Despairing, the dog yearns for meaning. Hearing another car coming, the dog finds it. The dog quickly chases, again full of purpose, again full of sound and fury.

We see this pattern of pursuit all over the human world. The Perfect Mate. The Perfect Job. The Perfect Vacation.

That person seems like my mother. And he my father. I'd like that to be right. And that wrong. When confronted with what we do not understand, we choose to perceive so that we do understand. We remake the world by creating shiny beliefs to pursue, perfections that if only we possess them, our lives will have meaning. It is that difficult for us not to know. And if and when possession occurs, and we are exposed to the fact of our ignorance, we risk despair and depression unless we quickly find another shiny belief to pursue.

People want to believe. Something. People need to believe. Something. Even if it causes them despair.

I remember I was very excited when a few years back the New Horizons spacecraft was due to fly by Pluto. Would there be rings? Would its moon Charon have an atmosphere? Would there be more moons? And when the spacecraft got there, there were no rings, no new moons; the photos that came back were of ditches and hills, and I remember feeling, "Hey, Pluto is a rock!" We flew all that way for a rock! The same thing happened when the European Space Agency landed on a comet to check it out. Would there be water? The foundations of life? The probe crash landed. It crashed behind some sort of overhang so that its cameras couldn't see too much. Just plain, flat desert. So ordinary. Another rock. It's a rock! Just like what the dog felt when it reached the car: it reached a meaningless, lifeless rock. So depressing. What's the point?

I was being unfair to Pluto.

Of course it is fantastic that we launched the New Horizons satellite; it is fantastic that we crashed on a comet. But what made it fantastic in each case wasn't our expectations and dreams of what we might have found on Pluto or the comet. What made it fantastic, what makes it fantastic, is captured in the photograph of Earth taken by the Voyager spacecraft as it heads out of the solar system. The Earth is a tiny, tiny blue dot in a vast vacuum of blackness. We didn't expect that.

This photo also coincides with the moment when the dog catches the car.

The difference is humility. It took humility to take this photograph. To turn the lens around. We feel that humility when we look at this photo. The silence. The complete lack of sound and fury. I propose that it is this moment of humility that gives life its meaning, because it is the moment when we can choose to let go of the car.

For it is not belief that makes life worth living, not certainty. It is mystery. Check out for yourselves what you enjoy doing. When we like them, what is it about road trips, new jobs, and love we like? We like them not because we know exactly what is going to happen. Rather, we like them because we are excited by the prospect of what we cannot expect, of what we cannot know.

Similarly, why do we like the rituals of our lives? When we like them, why do we like yoga, lighting candles, or feeding pigeons? When we like them, we find comfort in them because with them we reveal the silence and stillness, the mystery, in our midst. With a focus on simplicity, rituals reduce our river of thought, reduce our sound and fury of belief, to produce this relief. It is not because we are precisely faithful to how we practiced them previously.

We do mistakenly conflate the goal of our doing with the doing itself, the excitement we feel in the chase for certainty with the certainty we chase, because we can more easily admit that which we do not know, when in pursuit of that which we do not yet know.

The only certainties in this world, the only things we can know for sure, are our thoughts and our feelings. But our thoughts and our feelings are not the world. When we peer solely into our minds it is easy to feel righteous and certain; our hearts harden and we lose our sense of mystery and wonder. When we peer into the infinity of space it is much easier to admit the mystery. We soften and our hearts open.

I'd like to wind down with a couple of examples from our ordinary lives.

Imagine that I am walking down the sidewalk in San Francisco all by myself. Eventually, I see another person walking toward me. How do

I brace for this event? I begin telling myself some plausible stories about this upcoming stranger. "She is rich." "She is poor." "Seems to be a little out of shape." "Sort of hot." "Her dog is annoying." What happens, when by chance, the stranger is in line behind me at the coffee shop at the end of my walk, and we actually meet? I'm totally surprised by the mystery of who she actually is, and my life is richer for it. I did not expect that.

My other example has to do with cell phones. Who here has a cell phone? With a cell phone, we have access to the entire quantity of humankind's knowledge, knowledge that has been built over the centuries, in the palm of our hand. Are we dumbstruck? Full of awe? No, we want to know why it takes so long for the Uber to get here. As with all of our tools, they are tools because we do not need to know how they work to get work done. Most of us do not know how our cars work either. Even physicists don't know what gravity is, but they do know how to launch a space probe to Pluto. We know how to push stuff around, but we have no idea why we can or what it is we are pushing. When a phone is a rock, all it takes is for the cell network to go down for us to realize that we don't know what we are doing. It is at this moment that we can choose to believe a little less, and so choose then to experience stress, a little less.

Getting back to our Shakespeare analysis. It is logical that if (1) We don't know what we are doing, and, (2) We think we do know what we are doing, that (3) Life seems pointless. But Shakespeare here has given to us the architecture of our dilemma and hence the architecture of the solution. The way out: Ease up on #2 by being less steadfast in your beliefs, and you'll never get to #3! Try to practice that you do not know. Look for the moments when you reach the car. Weddings, funerals, and little babies are good places to look. Nihilism is just a name for having little humility. It is the lack of humility that turns the world

into a rock; it is certainty that makes us depressed. Beauty has no name.

I'd like to end with a favorite passage of mine. It's from Mark Twain's "Roughing It". In it, Twain describes his experience waking up with a companion (his brother, I believe) on a stage-coach in motion. For me, it is a great expression of the enjoyment of life.

"Another night of alternate tranquility and turmoil. But morning came, by and by. It was another glad awakening

to fresh breezes, vast expanses of level greensward, bright sunlight, an impressive solitude utterly without visible human beings or human habitations, and an atmosphere of such amazing magnifying properties that trees that seemed close at hand were more than three miles away. We resumed undress uniform, climbed a-top of the flying coach, dangled our legs over the side, shouted occasionally at our frantic mules, merely to see them lay their ears

back and scamper faster, tied our hats on to keep our hair from blowing away, and leveled an outlook over the world-wide carpet about us for things new and strange to gaze at. Even at this day it thrills me through and through to think of the life, the gladness and the wild sense of freedom that used to make the blood dance in my veins on those fine overland mornings!"

Thank you.

WINNER: PUBLIC POLICY

"The Mysterious Intersection of Media and Criminal Justice Policy"

By John Patterson for John J. Cullerton,
Illinois Senate President



Delivered at Illinois Justice Project and McCormick Foundation
Journalism Seminar, McCormick Foundation, Chicago, Oct. 25, 2018

I want to thank you for inviting me to be part of your event.

I've been asked to talk about an issue I find fascinating and, frankly, often times frustrating.

It's that mysterious intersection of the media and criminal justice policy.

As the old newsroom saying goes ... "dog bites man" is not news.

But, "man bites dog,"—that's news.

What few know, however, is the journalistic adage doesn't stop there.

And that's what we're here to discuss.

Because, if in indeed "man bites dog" makes headlines, it means it is inevitably followed by ...

"Local lawmaker vows to crack down on dog biting." And when the legislative session begins ...

"proposed law would put dog biters behind bars"

and one side can't get all the attention, so this, in turn, spurs an uprising ...

"conservative groups defend dog biting as constitutional right"

and now we're off and running with a full-blown media frenzy of competing interests, news conferences, headlines and before long gubernatorial candidates and mayoral hopefuls are asked to state their positions on increased penalties for dog biters.

Next thing you know, Bruce Rauner has issued an amendatory veto rewriting the entire bill and, out of the blue, proposes bringing back the death penalty.

All because somewhere, one man bit one dog, it made a headline, politicians wanted attention, and, after all, reporters have to write about something.

Too far-fetched, you say?
(I'll let that "fetch" pun sink in for a moment, it's still early.)

Of course I made up this scenario, and then took it to a seemingly illogical extreme just to make a point.

But is it really that far off from what we see all the time? As I mentioned, I was invited here to discuss the impact of headlines and data on criminal justice legislation. Let's start with headlines.

I don't think I'm revealing any secrets when I tell you that publicly elected politicians tend to have a natural desire to see their names in the news—unless it's bad news.

And part of an elected official's job is to respond to things happening locally. That's how voters know they're doing something, which is vital if you want to get re-elected.

Reporters operate under the pressure of needing to justify their existence every single day, all day long,

even as there are unfortunately fewer and fewer of you doing the work.

Your success is measured by clicks on posts, subscription numbers, ad sales that you have nothing to do with, and, of course, ratings.

Let's face facts. Policy discussions don't tend to generate viewers and readership.

If information and data were enough, textbooks would be best sellers.

Sure, lawmakers and the media should be more policy and data driven.

But asking the media to be boring with its coverage is like recommending politicians show restraint with their pr.

It's just not in our DNA.

Look, you can get a room full of legislators to all agree that there are better alternatives than incarceration for

Many crimes and that money we spend on prisons could be better utilized and better prioritized.

That same group will then vote, without hesitation, to increase penalties on any given crime.

Why?

Who here remembers the Willie Horton ad? Raise your hand.

For those of you who don't, Willie Horton was a convicted murderer serving a life sentence in a Massachusetts prison in 1986 when he took

advantage of a weekend furlough program. He walked out of prison and didn't report back.

He broke into a suburban Washington D.C. couple's home, stabbed the husband and raped his wife.

Massachusetts governor Michael Dukakis supported the furlough program.

In 1988, Dukakis was the democratic nominee for president of the United States.

Republicans turned the situation into one of the most controversial campaign ads of the modern era.

It played on thinly veiled racism and, unfortunately, was quite effective in painting Dukakis as soft on crime.

It didn't just help George Bush win.

That blunt, crude ad has come to define political communication on criminal justice issues, and not in a good way.

In 2009, the Boston Globe Sunday magazine took a look at the impact of that ad. The article began with these two sentences:

"more than two decades ago, a governor showed a prisoner leniency with horrifying results. Our justice system hasn't been the same since."

From a political standpoint, it's a lot easier to vote to be tough on crime than it is to step back, look at the data, evaluate the costs to taxpayers and consider reducing penalties or deferring incarceration for people who—don't forget—are criminals.

U.S. senator Dick Durbin mentioned the Willie Horton factor in a New York Times article two years ago in explaining why a popular, bipartisan criminal justice reform plan was stuck in limbo in congress.

It's still in limbo in congress.

Now, someone here is undoubtedly thinking, "but the data says reform plans are needed and rehabilitation and deferments save taxpayers money and reduce recidivism and crime. Willie Horton was a statistical anomaly and you shouldn't base policies on anomalies."

All true.

That's why Massachusetts had a furlough program in the first place. Research showed it helped inmates

transition back to society and reduced repeat incarcerations. The benefits outweighed the risks, which were deemed acceptable.

And here's what the husband who was stabbed and whose wife was raped by Willie Horton said to that:

"Whoever said I was an acceptable statistic?"

Data doesn't win that argument.

As an elected official, you are potentially putting your career in the hands of a criminal and hoping that nothing goes wrong.

If something does go wrong, you risk being portrayed as an accomplice to that crime.

Just watch any newscast, or scan any front page.

When a crime happens, there are emotional demands for justice.

From a media and political perspective, that emotion carries a lot more weight than policy reports and data regarding prison budgets, prison conditions, incarceration rates and so on.

So, just as emotion spurs headlines, those emotional headlines spur legislation that potentially becomes law regardless of policy and data.

Ok, what do we about it?

How do we flip the scenario and get data to influence the headlines?

Admittedly, that's something we struggle with.

But I would suggest that it begins with a recognition that good policies can make good politics, which can then drive a different type of media coverage.

From a legislative standpoint, the challenge is finding a balance, being mature and professional enough to show restraint, and creating a mechanism to enforce or police all of this.

Personally, I've always invoked the so-called "Cullerton rule," which is a somewhat tongue-in-cheek check on overzealous lawmakers. For those of you unfamiliar with the Cullerton rule, it works something like this:

Freshman lawmaker files legislation making some low level crime a Class X felony, touts it in press releases and then brings that bill to the senate judiciary committee.

"Great idea," I tell the lawmaker. "but if we take this misdemeanor and elevate it to the worst felony possible right now, skipping all steps in between, what are you going to do next year? Are you only seeking one term?"

It's been known to cause some bewilderment for freshman lawmakers.

The idea is to get the lawmaker to think beyond their own self-interest and hopefully consider the big picture ramifications of what he or she was proposing. It's a polite, passive aggressive way of suggesting they do a little more work and come back with something a little more practical.

Ideally, they would then be open to discussing the underlying problem and how we might go about addressing it in an effective manner that might not explode the prison population for the sake of a headline back home.

I'm not alone in my thinking on this issue.

A little more than a decade ago, people like Paula Wolff were growing increasingly concerned with the ever-growing criminal code, chock full of headline driven enhancements.

In response, we created the clear commission and gave it the task of sorting it all out and restoring commonsense to our laws.

It's full name is the criminal law edit, alignment and reform commission, or clear commission. It was established in 2005 to revise, restructure and reform the Illinois criminal code.

It pulled in people from a variety of criminal justice interests. There were lawmakers, judges, prosecutors, defense attorneys and law enforcement.

Commission members were tasked with sorting through the voluminous criminal code for needed revisions. They looked for little things, like whether the laws did what they were intended to do?

In 2012, based on the commission's work and recommendations, the general assembly approved 12 new public acts reforming the Illinois criminal code. I sponsored or cosponsored most of them.

Since then, two things continue to keep alive the work of the commission.

One is the Illinois sentencing policy advisory council, or, SPAC.

SPAC was created to collect, analyze and present data from all relevant sources to more accurately determine the consequences of sentencing policy decisions and to review the effectiveness and efficiency of current sentencing policies and practices.

It previews sentencing proposals to analyze the cost to the state and society.

The other is the senate's subcommittee on clear compliance.

As proposals are filed with the senate and the criminal law committee, this group reviews them to make sure they comply with the commission's standards of constitutionality, neutrality, clarity, consistency and proportionality.

If they don't, we try to make suggestions to the sponsor on how to better address whatever concern they are trying to address and strike a balance between what are often media-driven efforts to change criminal laws and the actual issue at hand.

Ok, so we've got some mechanisms in place. But that's not enough.

Somebody has to tell people what we're doing and what it means.

And that's not nearly as easy as it sounds.

When I first went to Springfield, there might be 50 reporters working at the capitol.

Today, on any given day, I might have as many people on my staff with statehouse reporting backgrounds as there are reporters at the capitol. And for the record, i have three.

What we've lost are media gatekeepers who have practical experience, the people who can spot press release bills when they see them and aren't so quick to jump on proposals that might not be serious in nature or policy. You lose a level of professional skepticism with the downturn in journalism.

Trust me, these are things the political side of me wants to exploit but the policy side of me finds deeply troubling.

So, what can we do to improve the situation?

Well, we can all hope and wish for a resurgence of statehouse reporting. But I'm not going to hold my breath.

If I had the answer, I wouldn't be here, I'd be meeting with Jeff Bezos.

From a practical standpoint, there are steps that we on the policy side, those of us with data, to learn how to communicate better.

These are lessons learned from my efforts with former republican leader Christine Radogno to end the state's budget impasse last year through a proposed deal we called "the grand bargain."

No, this doesn't have to do with criminal justice, but I think the lessons learned still apply.

The grand bargain consisted of workers comp reforms, a property tax freeze, pension reform and additional revenue to balance the budget. We dealt with a lot of complex, intricate things, things that are tough to explain to the public. Things that too often aren't properly explained to the media or public until after it's been voted on.

So, on the day we announced our partnership we also gave details to the media. We constantly updated reporters on the information. We went to media outlets to talk about the details, the policies and the politics.

We took the time and tried to distill our policy proposals into language that made sense to those who don't follow this kind of stuff on a daily basis.

In my opinion, we were able to defuse the political conflicts by providing information. This allowed us to have a more mature policy debate. It got people talking about solutions rather than knockdown soundbites.

It was an external undertaking the likes of which we'd not previously done in my office. And while that specific deal wasn't approved, I'd like to think the time and effort we spent providing information to the public and media helped build pressure to finally end the impasse.

We all get caught up in the inside baseball of our interests and issues.

Someone on your team needs to be aware of how things look to the outside world. Someone needs to be able to cut through the inside baseball and explain to the real world what you are doing and why it's important.

Make good policy into good politics.

Be open with your data, but that data needs a message. And you need to be able to distribute that message yourself if needed.

Can you boil the point of a new criminal justice report down to a tweet?

You better, or you better employ someone who can.

Because if you can't, the media, or your critics will. Or even worse ... You'll be ignored.

You can't just send around spreadsheets and hope everyone sees the numbers the way you do and finds them interesting.

Like it or not, this is the world we find ourselves in.

It is a fast-paced, ever-evolving, fractured society in which ease and speed of communication makes instant winners and losers.

But there's no reason policy and data can't win in this world.

We just need to get better at making small talk about big data.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak to you this morning and I'd be happy to try to answer some questions.

WINNER: TECHNOLOGY

"What Kind of Society Do We Want to Be?"

By Jennifer Bowles for Alan Finkel,
Chief Scientist of Australia



Delivered at the Human Rights and Technology Conference,
Sydney, July 23, 2018

A few weeks ago I took my mother and her best friend, whom I fondly call Aunt Rosa [not her real name], both in their nineties, to Saturday lunch.

They love to hear about the state of the world and what the Chief Scientist is up to, so I decided to tell them about Artificial Intelligence.

First, I pulled out my iPhone and demonstrated how I can use Siri to place a phone call.

Then I explained that Siri was just a plaything compared to Google's new tool, called Duplex.

Duplex will place your call, perhaps to a restaurant, or a hair salon, and then speak in a natural voice to the human who answers, to make your booking.

What sort of natural voice? they wondered.

Any voice! I said. You could stick with one of Google's—or maybe, in the future, you could give Google your voice-print, so the voice could sound just like yours!

I told them about an email I'd received from a personal assistant named "Amy Ingram". Initials: A.I. Artificial Intelligence.

Just think, I told my Mum, right at this minute, Amy and her brother robot, Andrew Ingram, are emailing and setting up meetings on behalf of tech-savvy people all over the world. Top executives! People in research labs and hospitals and schools and maybe even government departments!

Amy and Andrew have access to all their contact lists and diaries and emails!

Whoa! Alan. Slow down, I said to myself. I told them that there would be consequences if Amy and Andrew were hacked to reveal financial secrets and identities... or if we passed a law requiring Amy and Andrew to spy on

their employers and report anything deemed suspicious.

It's amazing, I said, how much information we're willing to give up in exchange for a bit of convenience.

Think, for example, about all the photos we upload to Instagram and Facebook. All those photos can be used to train algorithms to recognise human faces.

And in China, this technology has taken off.

Do you know, I told them, that facial scanning in China is used for everything from dispensing toilet paper—so you can't go back multiple times in a day—to picking out individual people in the crowd in the streets and at concerts.

In some cities in China, people are assigned what's called a Social Credit Score. And you gain or lose points depending on your behaviour, including any bad behaviour caught on camera and then picked up by AI, like littering, or jaywalking.

If your score gets too low, you might not get a job, or a bank loan, or permission to leave the country.

And maybe, I said, we could use AI to go one step better: not just to punish the offenders, but to pre-empt the crimes.

Police and security agencies in some countries are already using AI to pinpoint the people most likely to make trouble, so they can place them under closer surveillance.

And welfare agencies are using algorithms to work out which children ought to be separated from their parents.

As I talked, Aunt Rosa grew tense. Tears welled in her eyes.

I don't like to make my mother's friends cry—so I asked her what was the matter.

But of course, I should have known. Aunt Rosa was a Holocaust survivor.

For four years she lived in hiding in Lithuania, a young Jewish woman persecuted for the crime of being alive.

And as I drew my little pictures of the future, she saw only the brutal truth of the past.

A life lived in fear of being watched. By neighbours. By shopkeepers. By bogus friends.

And to this day, her fear was so overwhelming that she would not consent to let me use her real name, in sharing something of her story with you today.

She didn't know at the time, and I'm not sure if she would want to know now, but it was data that made a crime on the scale of the Holocaust possible.

Every conceivable dataset was turned to the service of the Nazis and their cronies. Census records. Medical records. To the eternal shame of scientists, even the data from scientific studies.

With a lot of data, you need a sorting technology.

And the Nazis had one. Not computers, but their predecessor: tabulating machines using punch-cards.

Little pieces of stiff paper, with perforations in the rows and columns, marking individual characteristics like gender, age... and religion.

And that same punch-card technology that so neatly sorted humans into categories was also used to schedule the trains to the death camps.

So Aunt Rosa suffered from data plus technology in the hands of ruthless oppressors.

But she survived the war and she came to Australia. And here she found a society where people trusted in government, and in each other.

She saw the same technologies that had wrought such terrible crimes in eastern Europe used here for the collective good.

Yes, data in a humane society could be used to help people: to plan cities and run hospitals and enrol every child in school.

You could get a driver's licence without fear. You could carry a Medicare card, and feel grateful. You could live quietly in your own house, free from surveillance, and safe.

People weren't perfect. But for the most part they lived peacefully together, in a society governed by manners and laws, using technology to make life better.

And in that kind of society, artificial intelligence could surely be put to the service of human rights.

I think of the right to ease of travel.

What might self-driving cars mean for the elderly, or people living with disability?

I think of the right to freedom from slavery and forced labour.

Border security agencies are using AI to find the victims of human trafficking.

They can collect the images of women reported missing, and compare them to the faces of women crossing national borders, or appearing in any of the millions of advertisements posted online.

I think of the right to found a family.

Researchers based here in Sydney are using AI to improve the outcomes of IVF.

In the standard procedure, embryos are assessed by the doctors to choose which ones to implant to maximise the likelihood of a successful pregnancy.

AI can make that choice far more swiftly and reliably.

So we can spare families at least some of the trauma and expense of IVF cycles that fail.

A caring society could not possibly turn its back on all that potential.

I know that my mother and Aunt Rosa would agree.

As I told them about the power of AI, they wanted only to know that a future Australia would still be the place they had grown to cherish. Where you could be happy, and safe, and free.

"How," Aunt Rosa asked, "will you protect me, my daughter and my grand-

daughter from living in a world in which we are constantly monitored?"

"How, dear Alan, will you protect our liberty?"

Aunt Rosa's question to me is, in my words, my challenge to you.

What kind of society do we want to be?

I look around the world, and it seems to me that every country is pursuing AI its own way.

It's true: there are some questions that we can only resolve at the level of global agreements—like the use of AI in weapons of war.

But the way that we integrate AI into our societies will be determined by the choices we make at home.

Governments decide how companies are allowed to use data. Governments decide how to invest public funds in AI development. Governments decide how they want to harness AI, for policing and healthcare and education and social security—systems that touch us all.

And that means nations like Australia have choices.

We are capable technology innovators, but we have always imported more technology than we develop. That's inevitable, given our size.

However, that doesn't mean we have to accept the future we're handed by companies in China, or Europe, or the United States.

To the contrary, we can define our own future by being leaders in the field of ethics and human rights.

And that is my aspiration for Australia: to be human custodians.

In my mind, that means showing the world how an open society, a liberal democracy, and a fair-minded people can build artificial intelligence into a better way of living.

Am I asking too much? Perhaps.

But let's not forget: we've been pioneers of progress, with ethics, before.

I've been reflecting this week on IVF.

Tomorrow, the world's first IVF baby, Louise Brown, will celebrate her fortieth birthday.

It's fascinating now to look back at all the things that were written and said when she arrived.

People thought that it was unnatural. That the babies would be deformed or somehow less than fully human. Or that we would start making humans in batch lots, in factories.

But here in Australia we listened to the patients and the clinicians who saw the real promise of this technology.

No-one could hand us a readymade rule-book. There wasn't one. So we had to create one. And we did.

We were the first country to collate and report on birth outcomes through IVF.

We built a regulatory model that kept our clinics at the leading edge of the science, whilst keeping their patients safe.

We published the first national ethical guidelines on IVF, anywhere in the world.

We harnessed the Medicare system to help families to meet the costs—and clinics worked closely together, so that success rates improved steadily, right across the country.

And so IVF became a mainstream procedure, getting better over time.

There are lessons here for the approach we take to AI.

The first and most important: don't expect a single answer or a one-shot, set-and-forget AI law.

That wasn't the secret to adopting IVF.

No: we had a spectrum of approaches that worked together and evolved in line with the state of the technology, and the levels of comfort in the community.

There were laws and regulations, there were industry codes and practices, and there were social norms.

We will need to develop a similar spectrum of responses to AI—so that we can strike the balance between opportunity and risk.

I've been thinking in particular about the low-risk end of the spectrum.

By this I mean products like smartphone apps and digital home assistants that promise to make your life a bit easier.

What if we had a recognised mark for ethical technology vendors: like the Fairtrade stamp for ethical suppliers?

In my mind, it's called the Turing Certificate.

The standards would be developed by a designated expert body, in close consultation with consumer groups and industry.

Then companies that wanted to display the mark would submit both the specific product and their company processes for an ethics audit, by an independent auditor.

So you as a consumer could put your purchasing power behind ethical developers—and developers would know what they need to do to make the ethical products that people want.

This could be an idea that Australia could pilot and help to spread.

But I emphasise: this voluntary system would be suitable only for low-risk consumer technologies.

What about technologies that touch more directly on our freedom and safety?

Where else could Australia be influential?

I point you to the public sector.

We have a cohort of leaders right across government squaring up to their responsibilities as AI adopters and human custodians.

Just last week, the secretary of the Department of Home Affairs, Michael Pezzullo, went on the record with his agency's approach to AI.

And he went further, proposing a line in the sand not just for border security but for every decision made in government that touches on a person's fundamental rights.

He called it "the Golden Rule".

No robot or artificial intelligence system should ever take away someone's right, privilege or entitlement in a way that can't ultimately be linked back to an accountable human decision-maker.

To me, this Golden Rule is a partial answer to my question. It is the mark of a public sector fit to be an ethical custodian. And I know, from my

conversations with leaders in many agencies, that they are looking to the Australian Human Rights Commission to help them interpret that custodianship.

Today we are launching a three year process to consider these issues. To identify the manners, ethics and protections that will work for all of us, not just the early adopters.

I applaud the initiative of Human Rights Commissioner Ed Santow and his colleagues.

We must all be involved in this national discussion.

And every time we come to a decision point about the technologies we allow into our lives we must ask ourselves:

What kind of society do we want to be?

To start, let's be a society that never forgets to ask that question.

WINNER: ANALYST CALL/INVESTOR MEETING

"Lunch with the Chancellor"

By Amanda Todd for Rebecca Blank, Chancellor,
University of Wisconsin



Delivered to the University of Wisconsin's Boards of Visitors,
Madison, Wisconsin, Oct. 18, 2018

Thank you Sarah. Good afternoon and welcome. It's wonderful to see you all.

We're just past mid-terms here at UW. We had more than 3,000 parents and family members in town last Saturday for Parents' Weekend. Badger hockey opened last Saturday as well...both men and women...and football has a homecoming game on Saturday against Illinois. The leaves are peaking in Madison and it's the usual busy fall semester.

Over the summer, as many of you know, we welcomed back two major units that were split off from UW-Madison more than 50 years ago: Cooperative Extension and Wisconsin Public Radio and Television.

The members of their advisory boards are joining us today for the

first time and I want to say a special welcome to:

- The Cooperative Extension Board of Visitors
- And the boards of directors of:
 - Friends of Wisconsin Public Television
 - And the Wisconsin Public Radio Association

Welcome back to UW-Madison!

Thanks to all of you, for being here today and all that you do for this university. And let me again congratulate our Distinguished Alumni Award winners. It's an impressive group!

An anniversary you should all know about: 2019 marks the 150th year since women first earned undergraduate degrees at the University. We'll be celebrating that in a number of ways

over the year so if you see a few '150s' around campus, you'll know why.

I. Introduction

Two years ago, I gave you all a quiz at the beginning of my remarks to test your Badger knowledge. People seemed to like that so much that we did it again last year. By popular demand, here is this year's quiz to test your Badger loyalty.

Please grab a piece of paper and a pencil from the middle of your table. You'll have 5 questions to answer. Ready?

1. Give yourself a point if you've been to see Alumni Park since it opened a year ago.

2. Give yourself a point if you've made a donation to UW in the past year.

3. Give yourself a point if you've talked with a current UW student since the semester started in September.

4. You'll get a point if you can correctly identify the year that UW was founded.

5. You'll get a point if you can correctly identify the building in which the Chancellor's office is located.

Finally, I have an extra credit option. Two years ago I asked this and not everybody got it right, so I'm going to see if you learned from that experience: Give yourself a point if you are wearing something red.

II. Good News from Campus

A couple of weeks ago we received the latest data on our educational outcomes from last year.

I am delighted to tell you that they look great.

- More than 95% of our freshmen return to us for sophomore year—that is one of the best retention rates in the country among public universities.

- Time to graduation has fallen again, and has been falling steadily for a number of years. It now averages 4 years and 4 days.

- And over half of our students graduate with zero student-loan debt. Let me repeat that, because people usually don't believe it—over half of our students graduate with no student debt.

These numbers would be impressive in any year ... but they're even more impressive this year, because we also awarded the highest number of degrees in our history. And, by the way, more than half of our degrees last year were in STEM and health-care fields.

So we're improving our quality while increasing our numbers at the same time. That's a reflection of the investments we're making in great teaching ... better academic and career advising ... and outstanding out-of-classroom experiences.

So it's no surprise that we continue to be a 'hot school' nationally.

- We just welcomed the largest and most diverse freshman class in our history—6,800 students selected from a record-setting 43,000 applicants.

- o Applications were up 20% this year.

- o Our new students come from 43 countries outside the U.S. ... 47 U.S. states (missing Mississippi, West Virginia, Wyoming—so if you know someone from one of those states, send them our way) ... and 71 Wisconsin counties (missing Iron).

- I also have great news to share about our research enterprise. After falling for 3 years in a row, our federal research dollars have increased by 11% in the past 2 years. That's not by chance...we've been working hard to put our research funding on a strong growth path.

- o Our faculty have brought in some record-setting research grants.

- o And our research was featured more than 100 times last year in major national news outlets including the Washington Post, the New York Times, and the Wall Street Journal.

- Finally, no highlights list would be complete without a mention of Badger athletics.

- o The NCAA has announced that five UW teams posted academic results in the top 10% of their sport last year, earning NCAA Public Recognition Awards. Those teams are Wisconsin football, men's soccer, men's tennis, women's golf, and women's hockey.

- o Our football team has joined a small group of elite schools—Duke, Northwestern, and Stanford—as the only Division One football programs to earn these academic awards for 5 years in a row.

- o I am very proud of our commitment to ensuring that our student athletes are successful both on and off the field.

In short, we continue to be an excellent educational institution.

III. A New Chapter

Most of my first four years here were spent dealing with budget cuts. State

cuts, combined with a tuition freeze, put us \$87 million in the hole. We dealt with that, but you don't stay competitive for very long if you focus only on what to cut rather than where to grow.

It's clear that if we want investment revenue at UW, we have to generate it ourselves. So I told our deans and department chairs that they had to start thinking like entrepreneurs (and I tried to be clear that I meant the kind of entrepreneur that makes money).

We have been implementing a series of strategies to grow revenue. We're expanding the summer term and creating new degree programs for working professionals. The current fundraising campaign is part of this effort, as is our work to right-size tuition for out-of-state and professional-school students.

Let me tell you what we're doing in 2 key areas.

First, we're investing in our students.

I told you earlier that we've just enrolled the largest freshman class in our history. We take more incoming freshmen every year than Harvard, Chicago, Yale and Princeton combined.

But creating access is a whole lot more complicated than just accepting students. We have to make it possible for those students to come here, and we haven't always done a great job of that.

So we've launched two new programs to create affordable pathways to a UW-Madison degree for Wisconsin students.

You might have heard about these.

Badger Promise started last year and it's serving about 150 students this year. It provides tuition funding to first-generation students who transfer into UW.

Bucky's Tuition Promise started this fall. It provides four years of free tuition to any student whose family income is below \$56,000...the median income in Wisconsin. Bucky's Tuition Promise is already covering about 17% of our freshman class.

One reason we can offer these programs is that we've more than tripled the number of our own dollars we're making available for grants and scholarships—from \$17 million in 2008 to \$62 million this year. Much of this

comes from our campaign efforts.

In just the past 5 years our alumni have created 3,400 new scholarships for all groups of students across the campus.

That's the impact of the All Ways Forward campaign, and it wouldn't be happening without you. Thank you!

Second, we're investing in our Faculty

The reputation and the quality of a university rests on its faculty.

Many departments are smaller now than they were a decade ago, due to reduced budgets. But as I've told you, our student body has not shrunk. We have a number of departments such as Computer Science where the growth in faculty hasn't begun to keep up with the growth in majors.

So we're going to need to make some significant investments in faculty if we're going to be a top university.

We've made three important steps in the right direction this year.

- First, we hired 112 new faculty this year... the largest number we've hired in 6 years. And thanks to the investment revenue we've been able to generate, we've made money available to our schools and colleges to hire additional faculty in high-demand areas.

- Second, we launched a new program this fall to recruit faculty from historically underrepresented groups. It's called TOP, for targets-of-opportunity. It's going to give departments new tools to go after the people they'd like to recruit who represent groups that aren't well-represented within their discipline.

We're also working to leverage one of our biggest advantages at this university: A tradition of collaboration and interdisciplinary research.

Cluster Hires

To address the big scientific and social questions facing our society, we need teams of people with multiple skills and multiple perspectives. So we've restarted our Cluster Hire Program.

A cluster is a joint hire of 3-4 faculty who work on similar scientific issues but from different academic disciplines. The idea is to build research strength

in areas where we can make a profound difference.

Over five years, we want to hire 70-75 new faculty as part of these new clusters, each focused on building depth in important areas of research and teaching.

The investments we're making are designed to make UW an even better place for a student or a faculty or staff member.

As any business person knows, investments are much more effective when they build on areas of strength. And we have a LOT of strengths around UW.

Our students testify to our quality.

Hannah Lider

One of our Fulbright scholars who graduated last May tells the story of how reluctant she was to come here. She grew up in Appleton. Her mom's a hairdresser and her dad works in a factory. She was the first in her family to go to college and she wanted to go out of state, but the family couldn't afford it.

She says the thing that surprised her most about UW is how very small it actually felt, and how she could get to know her professors, and how—every time she needed help, she found it.

And that's no accident. We've been very intentional about building programs that allow our students to grow and thrive here without getting overwhelmed.

Our faculty testify to our quality as well.

Mikhail Kats

One of our newer faculty members in engineering is a great example. Mikhail Kats came to us from Harvard. He was recently named to the Forbes '30 under 30' list of rock-star young scientists.

We asked him what it was that attracted him to UW-Madison ... and

believe it or not, it was not our gorgeous weather.

It was two things, and we hear this again and again:

First, the presence of big, expansive research projects that take decades to build ... that attract world-renowned scholars ... and that simply don't exist at most universities.

And second, the opportunity to be surrounded by, and collaborate with, first-rate scientists with interests related to his own.

We're also working to grow our industry connections as well as our Federal research dollars. Our partnership with Foxconn is good example.

Foxconn

Many of you saw the announcement in late August that we'll be working with Foxconn on a number of research projects in engineering, health care, and computer and data science.

They're making a gift of \$100 million to UW-Madison—the largest investment a research partner has ever made in our university. The majority of that will go toward a jointly funded building on the Engineering campus. They'll pay around \$75 million and we'll need to raise an additional \$75 million to get the building built.

The remaining \$25 million will go into some combination of support for faculty, students and research in engineering, computer and data science, and human health.

This partnership will open up some wonderful opportunities for our faculty and our students.

Let me give you another example of a very different interdisciplinary project.

Functional Ice Cream

Our Center for Dairy Research is bringing scientists from multiple disciplines together with trainers from the Athletic Department to

figure out how to make what they call a ‘functional’ ice cream—an ice cream that will help athletes recover faster. High protein ... anti-oxidants ... probiotics ... less sugar. And it has to taste good.

They’ve tried a lot of flavors that haven’t gone over so well. But now they think they have a winner with a combination of hibiscus and tart cherry ... so keep an eye on our players at the game this weekend. If their performance kicks up after half-time you’ll know they got some of this ice cream in the locker room.

I told you about the revenue we’re generating that’s helping to give us a margin of excellence. But we are still a public university and we need the support of the state to remain a world-class institution.

IV. Budget

Right now, we’re spending a lot of time preparing for the new state budget cycle that will officially begin in February when the governor releases his spending plan.

- The UW System submitted a request to the governor last month requesting \$107.5 million more in state funding over the next two years.

- o Most of this will be tied to achieving certain outcomes such as graduation rates, for example.

- o But \$25 million is for Capacity Building Initiatives to get more students into high demand fields

§ We submitted proposals for funding for Engineering, Computer Science, Business, and Nursing

§ If full \$25 million is approved, our share will be about \$9 million

- Capital Budget

- o The System is also requesting \$1.4 billion for construction projects — mostly renovation and maintenance

- o UW-Madison projects include the badly needed Vet Med renovation and expansion

After the governor introduces his budget in February, the legislature will deliberate through spring/early summer, and send a final version back to governor around July 1.

You will be hearing from us at critical times in this process, and I hope you’ll be willing to advocate for UW. Legislators and the Governor hear from university administrators all the time—they need to hear from people like you about the important role UW-Madison plays in keeping Wisconsin’s businesses and communities strong.

Here’s one easy way to help. The Wisconsin Alumni Association is circulating an online petition that they’ll deliver to the governor in November asking for continued investment in UW. It will also appear in newspaper ads. Whether you live in Wisconsin or not, I hope you’ll go online and add your signature to demonstrate the breadth of support for the university.

You will find a handout in the gift bag you’ll receive on your way out today that will tell you how to find the petition on the web.

V. Conclusion

Let me leave you with a story.

A couple of weeks ago I spoke at a meeting of business leaders we hosted from across the state and around the

Midwest. During my talk, I mentioned that more than half of our undergraduates graduate with zero student debt, and that those who do take out loans pay them back.

I told the audience that our student default rate is just over 1%, compared to a national average of more than 11%.

The reaction was interesting.

The people who didn’t go to school here were surprised and impressed.

The people who did go to school here weren’t surprised at all.

One of our alums who was present runs a multi-national firm based in Chicago. He said:

That’s the way Badgers are. That’s how I was as a student. They’re hard-working, dependable, and they’ve been trained as problem-solvers.

That’s why I’ve hired so many of them.

That’s why my daughters are there now.

And that’s why my friends want their kids to go to UW-Madison.

There are lots of reasons why I enjoy being on this campus every day. But I think the best part of my job is the opportunity to see all of these amazing students launched into whole new worlds of learning and opportunity.

Thank you for the work you do to make all of this possible.

You are the best ambassadors for the value of this great university. Thank you for your dedication to UW, for your work on advisory committees across campus, and for the many ways you support this university and our students.

I hope to see you all at the game on Saturday.

On Wisconsin!

WINNER: COMMENCEMENT/CONVOCATION ADDRESS

"5 Lessons in Life"

Written and Delivered by Eydna Skaale,
Rhetorician



Delivered at graduation ceremony at Glasir College,
Tórshavn, the Faroe Islands, Denmark, June 28, 2018

Ladies and gentlemen,
Dear guests,
and most of all, dear students.

Finally, the hour has arrived.

This is actually a day that will be written into history since it is the very last time the graduates from “Studen-taskúlin í Hoydølum” will have their commencement in this traditional manner. Next year the fusion of the different schools will be a reality and the graduates to follow will create traditions of their own.

However—this is your graduation, and I would like to take the opportunity to give you 5 pieces of advice.

I will tell you about 5 lessons life has taught me since I stood here as a graduate myself.

I am going to ask you to think of the day when you started as freshmen. The very first day of school. Do you remember the feeling?

Before you, three long years were waiting. Three years! It seemed infinitely long. But now, as you stand here on the other side of those three years, I’m guessing they flew by. Am I right?

Because time flies.

And the velocity of time only increases with the years.

Last summer, I received an invitation. It read: Hi—we have a special anniversary this year—let’s have a reunion this summer for all of us in the class of 99.

And I turned to my husband and said—I cannot believe it has been 10 years already, since I graduated from high school.

And he started laughing. 10 years? he said. No, my dear—that would be 15 years!

You say: 3 years—I raise you 12! 15 years have gone! Like a snap.

So, the first lesson I have learned, which I want to pass on to you is this: Time just slips through our fingers like sand. We have it—and then it’s gone. Never to return.

And this leads me to the second piece of advice, I would like to give to you. Because time flies by, and that means that all things come to an end.

Today is the last time you will be standing here, united as a class. With this ceremony, you are made very aware of that fact.

But that also means that many other “last times” have already gone by—perhaps without you noticing them passing at all.

The last great discussion in class has gone by—but perhaps you did not know at the time that it was indeed the last one. The last swing into the canteen—you have probably been there a million times these years, but suddenly one day, it was the last time. And you were probably unaware of it in that very moment.

And I’m sure your parents know this all too well. Maybe they used to scoop you up onto their lap and read you stories—or they would lie down on the floor and play with you. Suddenly, one day, it was the last time they did so; but they didn’t know it—at the time.

And anyone who has experienced loss is familiar with the merciless very-last-time. You talked to someone dear to you, or hugged someone you knew well—and afterwards you realised that it was in fact the last time.

If you would have known, perhaps you would have said or done something different.

I am not saying this to spread doom and gloom on this day of celebration.

But this ought to remind us to enjoy our days, our moments. Moments of celebration, like this one today—but certainly also the little moments, which at the time may seem insignificant, but which later remain in the palm of your hand like pearls—when time—like sand—has slipped through your fingers. We just need to notice them. To value them.

The fact that things come to an end often means that room is made for new beginnings, which is good.

But it is nevertheless bittersweet to accept that some things have gone and will not come back—even swings into the canteen Tuesday mornings in the rain—because suddenly, they are not an option any longer.

And that leads me to the third lesson life has taught me.

As these facts of life sink in, they ought to serve as a reminder to look at the big picture.

I know that right now your minds are occupied by questions of the future and dreams of higher education. What will you become? Which path should you choose?

To that question, I will answer this: In the big picture, it does not matter so much, **WHAT** you are!

On the other hand, what is essential, is **HOW** you are—**WHO** you are.

I know that recently you have been working very hard on getting your **QUALIFICATIONS**. Which is good, of course. But what’s much more important is that you also work on your **QUALITIES**.

I am not referring to examination grades here but to your personal character—your personality. That you consistently work on improving your attitude, your awareness of values and what is meaningful.

This is a life-long job.

Because the title—what you may call yourselves by virtue of your education—is nothing compared to what others may call you—by virtue of your behaviour.

And therefore, you need to contemplate what you wish to stand for. Who you want to be.

Also—or perhaps especially—when no one is looking.

That you may call yourself a rhetorician, a captain, a carpenter, or a doctor in a few years, is fine. It's great.

Just remember that it is more consequential if others may call you reliable, for example—or engaged—hard working—loyal—helpful—honest—kind.

And this leads me to my fourth piece of advice:

These personal qualities are what makes us fellow humans rather than mere individuals.

And that is significant because first and foremost, life is about relations. About community. About the relationships we have with other people. This is without comparison the most essential thing in life.

Not titles, not recognition, salary, or likes.

Because we, as human beings, so often fall through.

Maybe we do not get accepted to the university we want to attend. Maybe we don't win the heart of the person we love. Maybe we get a diagnosis that changes the course of our life; maybe there are social conditions, that we cannot change.

And I have learned that when life or destiny throws these dirty hurdles

at us, it is our relationships with others that hold us above water. They help us through. To regain our footing and to see the beauty in life once more.

The Golden Rule, which tells us, that we are to do unto others what we would have others do unto us can easily be sharpened and rephrased to: whatever we do unto others, they will also do unto us.

And the only tool we have to build our relationships with is time. Moments. To stop and talk. Knock on their door, remember to call or provide a helping hand when needed. In other words, it's essential that we respect and treasure others by spending our own time on and with them.

And this leads me to the fifth and last lesson I will mention today.

Because if we are to build relationships with others—if we are to help and support them and be helped and supported in return—we must be present. We must be aware. We must turn off the screen and the noise from the web.

And the advantage is that it's only when we lock out the noise that we also truly can listen to our hearts. As corny and naïve as it may sound, it is when we listen to our hearts that we are happiest.

It is only then we discover whether we are on track or not. Whether we really love what we are doing or not. If the answer is not—then we need to make a change.

But if we love what we do, we also become skilled. And if we are skilled on top of having good personal qualities, well, then we are the employee of any CEO's dream.

But to be present and live in the moment is hard. I know the future is tugging at you.

You have probably also heard many times that **YOU ARE THE FUTURE**. But I say: forget it!

You are not the future. You are the present! You should not go and stand in line behind “the grown-ups” and wait your turn—sometime in the future.

Your time is now. Be aware of it, use it.

The Faroe Islands in 2018—indeed, the world in 2018—desperately needs you, the youth; your thoughts, your plans, and your perspectives. We need you to value and choose what is right, good, and true.

So, to sum up:

1: Time flies.

2: That means that all things come to an end, and therefore it is vital that we notice and appreciate the small, valuable moments—as well as the big ones.

3: That all things come to an end should remind us to look at the big picture and ponder over **HOW** we are and **WHO** we are rather than **WHAT** we are. Think of the qualities rather than the qualifications.

4: Because life has its ups and downs, and it is our relationships with others that will save us when we are down. Therefore they have the most important significance—and therefore we need to help others when we can. So be kind and respectful towards others; be decent, reliable, present.

5: And only when we are present, can we hear the advice coming from our own heart. I promise you: this is the best advice you will ever be given.

Your time is now. Take it and use it well.

Congratulations to all of you—and best wishes for your future.

Lastly, I would like to speak for all the graduates that have come before you the last many decades—and express our deepest gratitude for all the good that has come from our school in Dalurin Fagri, (the Fair Valley).

Thank you!

WINNER: EMPLOYEE MEETING

"The Keys to Our Collective Success"

By Teresa Zumwald for Richard W. Schwartz,
Chairman of the Board, Winsupply Inc.



Delivered to Advisory and Support Services Staff at Winsupply Town
Hall Meeting, Dayton Masonic Center, Dayton, Ohio, Sept. 28, 2018

The other day I was browsing the web and came upon an interesting article about the Wright Brothers and their inventions.

Most people say offhand, "The Wright Brothers invented the airplane!"

But in reality? That's not quite true.

The Wright Brothers invented a flying machine they could control in the air. Their invention was all about control.

They did it by figuring out the fundamentals of flight.

- They had to roll the wings right or left.

- They had to pitch the nose up or down.

- And, they had to "yaw it" from side to side.

Once they mastered these three fundamentals, the Wrights flew in 1903.

And then they began to innovate.

They perfected their invention so they could fly longer, farther, higher, faster—even carry a passenger.

These and many other innovations allowed the Wright Brothers to achieve collective success—for themselves and for the world.

Think how the world changed after the Wrights applied the fundamentals of flight!

Suddenly, aviation became possible and practical!

Over time, the fundamentals of flight allowed us to operate Space Shuttles ... navigate satellites ... pilot the International Space Station ... program robots ... even create 3D animations.

This idea—that our ability to master a set of fundamentals leads to innovation and collective success—is what I want to talk to you about today.

At Winsupply, our fundamentals are found in our philosophy, business model and key principles, which you see here. [slide]

These fundamentals—outlined in Procedure B-815—are based on free enterprise capitalism, which has fueled our company's philosophy, our business model and our collective success.

Since 1956, free enterprise capitalism has made it possible for hundreds of people to own a Winsupply location, create jobs and add value to our society. Free enterprise capitalism sparked the Spirit of Opportunity.

I believe this:

That your ability to master the fundamentals at Winsupply will free you to innovate—and contribute to our collective success.

It sounds easy—but the fundamentals here are unique and different.

You won't find them in any textbook on business or business management.

And—as the Wrights discovered!—mastering the fundamentals of anything unique and different is hard work.

It took Wilbur and Orville more than seven years before they were able to discover and apply the fundamentals of flight!

I remember my own experience trying to understand what our organization was all about.

I was just 23 years old—younger than most of you!—when I was hired here in 1972.

Back then, we had about 38 local companies, and we were adding more.

I'd been asked to help grow the group services companies. That way, our investment company Primus could scale and expand the number and size of our local companies.

Yes, I had rules to follow. But the reasons for those rules were neither

clear nor explained to me. Often, they were downright confusing!

Since I'd just transitioned from the military after serving in the Air Force and the Reserves, hierarchy and top-down management were very familiar to me—although that was not the culture here.

Like anyone who's been in a top-down structure like the military or at a private company, I wanted to think of this organization like it was a big and growing wholesaler.

I wanted to believe that whatever we did for local companies would flow down and back up, just like in a normal company. Just like in a branch operation.

So I kept trying to "normalize" what I was hearing from Dick Schiewetz, our co-founder.

I made plenty of mistakes. I tried to do things that I was told later on wouldn't work—or that I couldn't do.

Dick used the Socratic method to teach young employees like me the fundamentals.

We learned the hard way: by desperately trying to answer hundreds of Dick's questions—one right after the next!

His teaching method was slow and sometimes painful—but the learning stuck.

Over time, I began to appreciate WHY our fundamentals are so important.

And exactly HOW they lead to innovation and collective success—the chance for all of us to pursue the Spirit of Opportunity, and claim the American Dream.

The structure of Winsupply is no accident.

You may not know it, but our company's founding purpose in 1956 was not wholesale distribution!

Instead, we started up for a different reason: to eliminate obstacles and provide support to help courageous, capable, hardworking entrepreneurs succeed.

Wholesaling just happened to be the first and best opportunity that excited our original investors!

So we're in the business of helping entrepreneurs. The business of growing people.

This idea of helping people is our philosophy. It's our purpose. And it's the reason we exist.

Because when we invest in courageous, capable, hardworking entrepreneurs, we help people earn their own success.

THIS is what we stand for!

And THIS is what differentiates us from every other competitor in our markets.

Supporting our philosophy is our business model with three pillars, which you see here. [slide]

The first pillar is equity partnerships.

The entrepreneurs we help are equity owners of their own wholesaling location, with Winsupply as the majority owner.

So when I talk about equity partnerships, I'm really talking about shared ownership.

Like our philosophy, it's something else that makes us unique and different.

Think about it:

We're not a franchise. We're not family-owned. And we're not a typical organization with a headquarters and branches that share little—if any!—equity or stock ownership.

Instead, almost every wholesaling location is a separate business with a local owner: the local company president.

Each location has a separate Profit & Loss statement, a separate balance sheet and a separate board of directors.

Our local owners take pride in their local company because they own a

substantial part of it. And it all starts the day a new president buys stock to invest in their local company.

We invite a new president to own 30 to 40 percent of the equity in their company, while Winsupply invests in the remaining 60 to 70 percent.

- On that day, the president and sometimes a few key employees become minority shareholders.

- Our majority shareholders include people outside the organization as well as the Winsupply Inc. management team, area leaders and many of you in advisory and support services.

All of us have the opportunity to be co-owners in this business—and many of you are.

So as equity partners, our interests are common!

Because we share ownership, we share the risk, and we share the rewards.

Winsupply is always willing to enter into new equity partnerships.

We are always willing to offer new entrepreneurs the Spirit of Opportunity—whether they want to take over an existing local company, or open a new one.

The second pillar of our business model gives local owners local autonomy.

That means we place maximum authority, flexibility and responsibility at the local company level.

So there's a "local owner and decision maker under every roof."

And that's big!

Because it reflects our trust in local owners, and captures the spirit of free enterprise capitalism.

Again, it makes us unique and different.

We have two beliefs:

- That decisions to support and serve customers are best made by local owners ...

- And that local owners must control the major decisions that affect their company's success.

Unlike branch managers in top-down organizations who take orders, local owners of local companies are free to make many decisions:

- They choose their markets, their

vendors, their products and their customers.

- They choose their employees.

- And they choose the level of service they'll deliver to their customers.

They even get to choose which of our additional support services they want to use and pay for—like whether they want to buy products from our distribution centers, or not.

Local decision making empowers local owners. And it lets them control their own destiny.

- As they make their own decisions, they get training on best practices to help them succeed. These are listed in the Procedure Manual.

- They also receive oversight, guidance and approvals from their local company board of directors—and not from Winsupply Inc.

Local owners are responsible for the outcomes of every decision they make. That's why it's so important for everyone to honor local autonomy.

Because unlike the top-down management and decision-making you see every day at most companies, there IS no alternative manager or decision maker at Winsupply to make the decisions we expect local owners to make.

The third pillar of our business model describes how we deliver on our promise to eliminate obstacles and provide support to hardworking entrepreneurs.

And that's by providing high-quality, low-cost, centralized support services.

These services exist for one reason: to help local companies succeed. It's one more thing that makes us unique and different.

Most everyone here today is involved in advisory and support services. So you know that local companies pay a small fee to Winsupply for things like accounting, marketing, training and IT.

This lets local companies spend more time making sales and serving their customers.

This idea to provide support came about in our earliest days.

After Dick and our other founders invested in their first local companies, they saw the entrepreneurial spirit alive and well!

So they wanted to protect that spirit by developing a support organization that was innovative and entrepreneurial.

- They wanted it to be a profit center, with the same ownership and bonus incentives as the local companies.
- They wanted to create efficiencies. That meant specializing and standardizing processes to help local companies.
- They also wanted to use “pattern management” to evaluate and compare how local companies were progressing.

These same three aspects of support are still true today:

- While other wholesalers operate their support services as cost centers, we still run ours as profit centers. If you work in a support services company, we expect your expenses to be less than your income.
- Since support services can’t behave like “headquarters overhead,” all of you have incentives to control costs, increase efficiencies and innovate. You know very well that any investment you make in people or equipment—which increases your expense!—must make local companies more competitive and profitable. That’s because your income grows only when the organization’s income grows. You also know well that you have to entice local companies to buy or subscribe to anything new—just like an outside consulting company has to do.

• A minute ago I mentioned pattern management. One early outcome of this was the managing ratio sheet, which our area leaders and local company board members still use today to provide coaching and counsel to local company presidents, and advice for continuous improvement.

Without pillar three of our business model—this ability to offer high-quality, low-cost, centralized support services—we could not have achieved the efficiencies or applied the patterns needed to scale our philosophy and business model.

We would not have been able to repeat our process—and infuse the Spirit of Opportunity in hundreds of entrepreneurs over 62 years.

Supporting our business model are five key principles, which you see here. [slide]

Our first key principle says that because we are equity owners in an equity partnership, we must maintain a fair balance of interests between the majority and minority shareholders at Winsupply.

That means the risks and rewards for both equity partners must remain in balance.

If one equity partner takes on too much risk, then things get out of balance.

And when things get out of balance, sustaining our philosophy and our business model becomes a lot more difficult.

Our need to maintain a fair balance of interests makes us unique and different compared to other companies. That’s because we have to make sure our local company presidents AND our majority shareholders each feel rewarded for the level of risk they assume.

First, we have to maintain a fair and balanced compensation structure for both equity owners.

- Local company presidents are compensated through their modest base salary, growth in their equity investment and their unlimited bonus potential.

- Majority owners—which include most of you!—are compensated through growth in your equity investment, and increases in your dividend income.

With this structure, local company presidents receive dividends based on their ownership level, and majority shareholders receive dividends based on their ownership level.

All this is fair balance.

And it’s a fair deal:

Winsupply contributes most of the capital, and local companies put in the sweat equity.

Second, to maintain fair balance, we have to protect local company decision making.

That means Winsupply Inc. cannot make decisions that violate local company autonomy.

The minute this happens, fair balance is disrupted!

Any overreach by Winsupply would threaten the president’s ability to run

their own company like an independent entrepreneur.

The president would then become less responsive to local customers and the local marketplace.

Ultimately, that would threaten the local company’s success.

Third, to maintain fair balance, we have to pay attention to the quality and cost of our support services.

Because if quality deteriorates, or costs become too high, then fair balance is disrupted.

If this happens, the support services become a burden on the local companies instead of a benefit to them.

So we can’t make mistakes here. We have to make sure we are investing in local companies—not subsidizing them.

We know from experience that any investment in support services that won’t provide future returns shouldn’t be made, because it disrupts the fair balance of interests.

Our second key principle says timely and accurate financial information must be available to all equity owners and employees.

These financials include balance sheets, Profit & Loss statements, and comparative ratios for each local company.

When we say “timely,” we mean that financial statements are ready in three or four days after month-end.

That’s unique and different, since our competitors take 10 to 15 days or more to issue the same reports.

Getting the monthly financials out within a few days is a game-changer because local companies can respond faster—as trends emerge.

When we say “accurate,” we mean that financial statements show what happened last month—as precisely as possible. And, we expect proper accounting that eliminates all year-end adjustments—as much as possible.

This way, local company presidents can trust the reports they receive, along with their company’s share price and profit sharing calculations.

Key principle three calls for a flat, matrix organization for free and open communication.

That means we allow and expect communication to go across, up or down the organization freely and openly.

Instead of being a hierarchy with top-down reporting, Winsupply decided from the beginning to organize in a matrix. It's another example of how we are unique and different.

A matrix has horizontal structures and teams. "Chain of command" and "lines of authority" are all but discouraged. So instead of plowing through layers of bureaucracy, anyone here can go directly to the source to get whatever help they need.

Today, our matrix lets us deliver help, services and advice to 600 local companies.

We do it as trusted advisers—by providing the kind of help that entrepreneurs might get from their hometown CPA, financial manager, IT consultant or any other confidant.

And we do it by exercising influence—not authority. Because at Winsupply, we can't use command and control to get things done! That would require another layer of management that we don't have.

The goal is to keep the organization as flat as possible, and focus everyone on maximizing service and value to customers.

Flat organizations can move fast because they have fewer layers to manage. That reduces complexities and costs.

Monte Salsman, for example, has only one layer of management between himself and local company presidents.

Likewise, most local company presidents have no more than one layer between themselves and their customers. That empowers people on their team to make immediate decisions—and respond faster to customers.

Key principle four says we will reward owners with generous compensation, but only for results.

Many organizations pay people for hard work, longevity, advanced degrees and titles.

But again, we're unique and different!

From the beginning, Winsupply has always paid for results.

And we believe ownership drives results.

As owners, local company presidents are responsible for their own company's Profit & Loss statement and balance sheet. So it doesn't matter how other local companies perform, or what the earnings of Winsupply Inc. are, because none of that affects a president's equity investment or bonus potential.

As a result, local company presidents are free to achieve without limits!

There's no cap on their compensation, because they're rewarded for results.

The better their results, the more money they earn to reinvest or redistribute.

And not just to themselves as owners—but also to their hardworking employees—in the form of profit-sharing checks.

Key principle five says we follow a code of conduct based on honesty, trust and accountability.

We also make this covenant:

That our word is our bond to customers, fellow employees and shareholders.

Quite simply—we do what we say we're going to do.

This overview of our fundamentals that I've shared with you today is really a 60,000-foot view.

Right now I'm working on a book with the details behind our philosophy, business model and key principles—among other things.

Once I finish it, you'll be the first to know!

But in the meantime, I have to tell you: The fundamentals of this organization haven't changed in 62 years.

All you have to do is ask people who've been around here for a while—like Monte, Roland, John or Vickie.

And our fundamentals shouldn't change.

Because they've kept us strong.

They've allowed us to differentiate ourselves.

And they've led us to innovate:

- In the 1970s, we wrote custom accounting and other business software that worked with our unique and different business model.

- In the '80s and '90s, we developed and expanded WISE, and opened distribution centers to help local companies accelerate their growth.

- In the 2000s, we launched our first online system for customers, and built our first local company websites.

- And recently, we began offering new services—like Shared Office Solutions and Shared Purchasing Solutions—so local companies could offload more back-office work to focus even more on customers.

Our fundamentals have allowed us to achieve collective success.

Since 1956, we've never had a year when we lost money.

But more importantly?

In six decades, we've applied our fundamentals to change the lives of nearly 1,000 entrepreneurs ... thousands of their employees ... and hundreds of people like you, in advisory and support services.

I said it earlier:

That mastering our fundamentals will free you to innovate—and ultimately contribute to our collective success at Winsupply.

Your ability to master these fundamentals will sustain the future of this organization.

Because staying true to these fundamentals is the only way to deliver the American Dream to a lot of people.

That includes everyone at our local companies—and all of you.

But first we have to acknowledge that building entrepreneurs is a complex business—a whole lot harder than the very simple and repeatable business of wholesaling.

At Winsupply, we pride ourselves on building an "entrepreneurial machine":

- One that combines capital from our shareholders ...

- With sweat equity from our local companies ...

- And help from all of you in advisory and support services.

YOU are a big part of delivering value to local companies!

YOU are a big part of this entrepreneurial machine!

We could not do what we do without you.

We could not deliver services as systematically, or as fast.

And we could not continue to scale this organization.

Now and in the future, our collective success depends on how good we are at:

- Embedding Winsupply's fundamentals into the fabric of this organization ...

- Keeping them intact ...

- And then passing them on to the next generation, so more people like you can continue to innovate.

Because this organization will always need more good ideas to achieve even more efficiencies and more scale.

Like our local company presidents, you are entrepreneurs, too!

Because of the advantages you give to local companies, you help them become more competitive and more profitable.

And every time you do?

You contribute to our collective success.

Many of you are Winsupply Inc. shareholders.

Every time you see growth in your equity investment, and increases in your dividend income, you're getting a piece of the collective success you're helping to build.

That's the **ONLY** reason we offer stock to Winsupply Inc. employees—because we want to share a piece of the American Dream with you.

We don't do it for the money, because we'd do better financially if we simply borrowed from a bank!

We do it because we know the more people here who own stock—the more people here who have skin in

the game—the more all of us share a common purpose and goal.

It's a way for you to earn your own success, just like our local company presidents do.

Last month, we announced a restructuring of Winsupply.

One reason we did it was to reinforce this fundamental—the Winsupply philosophy!—that says we're in business for one reason:

To eliminate obstacles and provide support to help courageous, capable, hardworking entrepreneurs succeed.

We're all in this together.

When you help local companies succeed, you succeed—and indeed, we all succeed.

That is what we mean by collective success.

I like this quote from Peter Drucker, the famous management consultant, who said:

"The best way to predict your future is to create it."

As people in advisory and support services, that's your job: to create the future at Winsupply by continuing to innovate.

But you can't do that unless you master the fundamentals of our philosophy, our business model and our five key principles.

In that article about the Wright Brothers that I found on the web, Darrel Collins of the U.S. Park Service said this:

"Before the Wright Brothers, no one working in aviation did anything fundamentally correct. Since the Wright Brothers, no one has done anything fundamentally different."

Mastering the fundamentals makes all the difference.

If the Wright Brothers had not mastered the fundamentals of control, the airplane would have never been a safe or practical means of transportation—across the country ... around the world ... and into space.

And if the first and second generations at Winsupply had not mastered the fundamentals of our unique and different philosophy, business model and key principles—we would have never been able to create and sustain an organization where opportunity exists for everyone.

THIS is the genius of our culture.

THIS is what we are here to do.

Because what we do at Winsupply changes lives—just like Wilbur and Orville changed people's lives with their flying machine back in 1903.

Orville once said:

"The desire to fly is an idea handed down to us by our ancestors who, in their grueling travels across trackless lands in prehistoric times, looked enviously on the birds soaring freely through."

Likewise, I believe:

The desire to build entrepreneurs is an idea handed down to us by our co-founders who, more than anything, wanted to help people earn their own success and claim the American Dream.

As our third and fourth generations take the reins at Winsupply, what happens next is your hands.

It's up to YOU to protect and defend this unique and different opportunity—the Spirit of Opportunity!—that's been handed down to you.

It's up to YOU to master the fundamentals.

It's up to YOU to continue to innovate.

It's up to YOU to work hard ... together, as equity partners! ... to build collective success—now and in the future.

Thank you.

WINNER: EULOGY/TRIBUTE SPEECH

"The Japanese Hell Ships"

By Leonoor Russell for Admiral Rob Bauer,
Chief of Defence, the Netherlands



Delivered in Bronbeek, the Netherlands, Sept. 8, 2018

*We will always bear witness
To what the sea is still telling us.
We must never yield.*

To injustice and violence.

Ladies and gentlemen,

These are the final words of the beautiful song that musician Wouter Muller just played for us.

And they are the first words I want to address to you.

Because they sum up perfectly what the commemoration of the Japanese Hell Ships is about.

Today we commemorate a dark, sinister part of history.

We commemorate events that only a few people are still able to recount.

Events that—once you've heard about them—will never escape your mind.

They leave an imprint on your soul.

It baffles you...

When you learn of the evil people are capable of.

And of the strength that was mustered by the prisoners of war, to bear the pain that was inflicted on them.

In a time span of three-and-a-half years, 185 Hell Ships transported over 100,000 prisoners of war and Asian forced labourers (the *rōmusha*).

Among the prisoners of war were British, American, Australian and Dutch people.

Mainly military personnel. And a small number of civilians.

Over 22,000 prisoners of war and thousands of *rōmusha* did not survive these transports.

This was mainly due to the abominable conditions on board.

"We lived like animals" observed a soldier in his diary.

But he could not say so out loud... for fear of being beaten.

The prisoners were packed together so tightly, that there was hardly enough room to sit or lie down.

You can't even begin to imagine...

Unbearable heat.

Hardly being able to breathe.

Raging thirst... up to the point where you can't even eat the little food that is given to you.

Disease spreading like wildfire.

All around you, you see men crumbling, physically or mentally.

It's impossible to comprehend...

The term 'hell ships' basically says it all.

In addition to the appalling conditions on board, the prisoners of war had to deal with yet another danger. A danger that came from the Allied forces themselves...

The Hell Ships were also frequently targeted by bombs or torpedoes.

With horrific consequences...

Many prisoners of war went down with the ship.

And many of those who were able to jump ship died in the water...

... by drowning...

... through exhaustion...

... or by Japanese bullets...

All of this took place between May 1942 and August 1945.

We know a lot about what happened in those years in the Netherlands and Europe. Through books, through films and through everything that is passed on to new generations at school.

So how is it that we know so little of what took place during those years in Southeast Asia?

How is it that we know so little about what our own countrymen went through there?

I personally only heard of the Japanese Hell Ships in 2000, when I was sailing south of Sumatra with a Dutch-Belgian squadron.

We were sailing past the place where the famous Hell Ship 'Junyo Maru' and her thousands of passen-

gers sank. And there, on board the HNLMS De Ruyter, we laid a wreath on the water.

Five surviving relatives were present at that ceremony.

And what makes this very special is that one of them—the person who initiated that commemoration and who also designed the monument here in Bronbeek—is present here today: Ms. Anneriet de Pijper.

So from that day on, I knew of the hell ships' existence.

And the more I hear, the more surprised I am that this remains such an unknown and unrecorded piece of history.

Only a few people are alive to tell the tale...

When I say this, I am reminded of the words Wim Kan spoke in his 1973 New Year's eve performance.

I'm sure many of you still remember how he sang (or more accurately: spoke) with a quavering voice:

"Only few people are left, who went through it.

Only few people are left, to tell the tale.

Who remember everything that took place back then.

What happened here, no one could have ever predicted."

Thousands of our fellow countrymen suffered the Japanese Hell Ships.

The vast majority did not survive them.

Or died soon afterwards, as a result of forced labour.

And of those who did return to the Netherlands—as far as we know—only a few dozen are still alive.

I am truly honoured—and I say this from the bottom of my heart—that three remaining survivors of the Japanese Hell Ships are present here today:

Mister Willem Punt.

Mister Dick Buchel van Steenberg.
And mister Maurits Baal.

All three of them are helping us—in their own way—to pass on knowledge about this dark piece of history to future generations.

Mister Willem Punt does this through the book his grandson's wife wrote about him, so lovingly. This book tells us his incredibly moving life story.

Mister Dick Buchel van Steenberg does this through the various interviews he has given to national and regional media, and to the Veterans' Institute.

In his interviews, he describes how the prisoners were crammed into the hold of the ship, like sardines in a can.

Fearful of what was to come...

Not knowing where the journey would take them...

Or how long it would last...

And whether they would survive...

His way of dealing with that pressure was to let it all wash over him.

Almost apathetic.

Because he knew that if he really let it sink in, he would be beyond salvation.

And he managed to live through it.

Eventually, he was transferred to Nagasaki to work in the Mitsubishi factory. There he witnessed how the atomic bomb destroyed an entire city in one fell swoop.

It beggars belief that he managed to live through all that...

And that he is in our midst here today.

Mister Maurits Baal passed on his story directly to new generations. In other words, to his children and grandchildren. Of whom his son, daughter-in-law and grandson are present here today.

His son told me that the family used to gather around the radio (and later the television) on Sunday evenings, to listen to G.B.J. Hiltermann.

And every time Hiltermann had finished discussing 'the state of the world', the family would have a discussion that resulted in mister Baal telling them about the war.

One of the most gripping stories he told was how he heard that an airstrike was about to happen when he was on board a hell ship.

Suddenly everything went quiet.

The engines stopped.

The lights dimmed.

And for a moment, there was a deafening silence.

The ship's passengers heard and saw the planes flying over them.

And after what seemed like forever, a loud reassuring voice informed them that they had been spared...

The sound of that voice has always stayed with him...

Mister Baal has experienced the horrors of war in many guises.

And luckily he was able to cope with that.

He was able to talk about it.

Not everyone is able to do that.

Or wants to.

There is much unspoken misery.

And that is why I realise how valuable the words of these three men are.

There are questions that will always remain unanswered.

Our past will never be 'past perfect tense'.

So it is up to us—the new generations, the children of freedom—to make sure we pass on their words. To keep telling each other what we do know.

That is the value of remembrance.

And that is also an important function of Bronbeek: remembering our history, together.

And we have every reason to do so.

Because even now, there is much injustice in the world.

People are still capable of meaningless cruelty.

Even now, peace can all too easily turn into war.

The men and women of our armed forces work day in and day out to prevent that from happening.

To protect our freedom.

And to bring peace and freedom to areas where almost all hope is gone.

We will always bear witness

To what the sea is still telling us.

We must never yield.

To injustice and violence.

Those words say it all.

We must never forget.

WINNER: HEARING TESTIMONY

"Statement of Johnny C. Taylor, Jr., SHRM-SCP, before the California State Senate Joint Committee on Rules Subcommittee on Sexual Harassment Prevention and Response"

By Martha Frase for Johnny C. Taylor, President and CEO, Society for Human Resource Management



Delivered at Hearing on Best Practices for Changing Culture on Sexual Harassment, Sacramento, California, Jan. 24, 2018

Chairwoman Friedman, Chairwoman Mitchell, and distinguished members of the committee, I am Johnny C. Taylor, Jr., President and Chief Executive Officer of the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM). I appear before you today on behalf of SHRM, the world's largest

HR professional society, representing 290,000 members, including 25,000 in California. Our members, in turn, influence the lives of over 100 million individuals in the workforce—about one in three Americans.

For nearly 70 years, SHRM has been leading organizations in their

people management, including creating workplaces that foster a culture of respect. We are committed to eliminating all forms of harassment in the workplace including sexual harassment, educating our members not only on complying with the law, but on building a positive and productive workplace

culture. We believe that creating and maintaining a harassment-free workplace is not just a legal priority, but a business one that all employees share.

I am pleased to have the opportunity to be here today to discuss how these concepts apply to high-profile and dynamic workplaces such as the California State Senate and Assembly. Most importantly, I will address the role of workplace culture in preventing and addressing sexual harassment in all workplaces.

Power-Driven Workplaces at Risk

Exactly 20 years ago this week, we watched this country divide itself over an ethical crisis involving a U.S. President and a young intern. Fast forward to today, and we find ourselves still struggling with the same issues around sex, power and consent—all of which intersect in the workplace.

Let's remember that even after impeachment, that President finished his final term with the highest end-of-office approval rating since World War II, and he continues to rank high in popularity among Americans. Clearly, we have a long way to go as a country before our aspirational words are consistent with our collective actions.

Like Hollywood and Wall Street, the legislative environment is uniquely susceptible to sexual harassment situations. What they all have in common is that these workplaces are driven by complex power dynamics. A few people hold the careers and futures of many others in their hands. Some of those people are deemed "too big to fail."

Also, these workplaces tend to be male-dominated. I want to be clear that sexual harassment is not a woman's issue alone. Not by a longshot. Men are also victims, and women are also perpetrators. Sexual harassment is about power and is committed by whoever is in control. It just so happens that in many workplaces, much of the power belongs to men—at least for now.

Another commonality among high-power workplaces is a wealth of young, aspiring, competitive employees

enthralled by powerful, often older, people. This culture creates perfect conditions for sexual harassment, but one that is also ripe for positive transformation. It's time for a cultural transformation in your legislative workplaces. And as a leader in workplace change, California must start right here, right now.

Culture Always Trumps Compliance

SHRM's perspective is unique because we represent not just one segment of the employment sector, but a profession that spans all industries, including companies and workforces large and small. Our members have seen it all, and they let us know what works—and what doesn't.

Here's what doesn't work: relying solely on compliance—rules, education and training—to prevent or address sexual harassment. In its 2016 Select Task Force Report on Harassment, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) recognized that, "Even effective training cannot occur in a vacuum—it must be part of a holistic culture of non-harassment that starts at the top."

Compliance is a key component of a harassment-free workplace, but in reality, we could demand that every employee take 10 hours of sexual harassment training every week, and accusations would still happen. By the same token, we could enforce the strictest policies forbidding workplace relationships, but office romance would still happen. You simply can't legislate human behavior.

We have also seen case after case where problematic behaviors and situations never rise to the legal definition of harassment. Professor Kim M. Cobb of the Georgia Institute of Technology, who is active in helping more women advance in the sciences, said it perfectly in her recent interview with the Chronicle of Higher Education: "There's a big gray zone between legal sexual harassment and a culture of inclusion.... In that gradient, real

damage is done on a daily basis that changes people's lives and changes people's careers."

This is why I urge that you not be lured by the cottage industry springing up around sexual harassment compliance programs. Consider that 94 percent of U.S. workplaces have sexual harassment policies, and yet, here we are.

Let me be clear: Rules, education and training are necessary. In fact, SHRM is working with the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) to cohost a free training for NCSL members on harassment and establishing a culture of respect in their legislative offices. Last week, we conducted a similar webinar with EEOC Acting Chair Vicki Lipnic. SHRM also provides numerous programs at conferences throughout the country on creating and maintaining a harassment-free workplace, including in California through our State Council, CALSHRM, and our 17 chapters.

But rules, education and training will never be enough. Even zero-tolerance policies have no effect when people don't feel safe to report harassment, when there is no mechanism to protect people who report, and when there is no trust in what will eventually happen to the person who reports. These individuals are too often marginalized, distrusted, bullied and even forced out. Manuals and training are useless in workplaces where bad behavior is silently tolerated. It is culture, not compliance, that guides workplace conduct.

Understand that an organization's culture is more than being a nice place to work, where everyone is engaged and happy. We must take the concept far beyond that, to where culture—not HR policies—represents who we are and what we believe as an organization. The bottom line is: Culture will always trump compliance.

Culture Steps in Before Compliance Is Needed

Now, let's bring this discussion here to this state and this legislative body. Both the State Senate and the As-

sembly have an ethics committee and standards for reporting sexual harassment; however, these standards are not aligned, are unclear and obviously didn't work.

Employers in California with more than 50 employees must provide two hours of anti-sexual harassment training every two years to supervisory employees and must distribute information to all employees. New supervisors must engage in this training within six months of taking their position. Yet, according to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing, 554 sexual harassment claims were filed in 2016.

In any case, none of this would have mattered if the culture had been the right one. Situations would have been averted or resolved long before getting to the level of committees and claims being filed.

The organizational culture is like a human body. When it is working properly, viruses and toxins are naturally expelled. In a healthy workplace culture, when sexual harassment is observed or experienced, the community takes over and shuts it down collectively, with a message that such behavior will not be tolerated by anyone at any level. Ideally, sexual harassment doesn't occur at all, because the "body" is inoculated with healthy norms, expectations and standards.

Let's Be Practical

One way to get to a healthy culture that will not tolerate sexual harassment is by choosing to be practical about people.

Let me ask you, what is your policy on workplace relationships? Here in the Capitol, you employ a lot of young people—many of them single, most of them ambitious. They will pursue each other or their mentors and role models. That's just human nature.

If workplace relationships are forbidden, the "outlaws" will go underground, contributing to a culture of

dishonesty and secrecy. If they are discovered, you are faced with the choice of firing one or the other, or both, and you have lost key talent.

Instead, you could follow a policy of disclosure when two coworkers become involved. Think of it somewhat like a conflict of interest disclosure. Allowing them to come forward without fear of reprisals gives them another pathway—honesty. And honesty is a key element of a healthy culture.

Two other elements in establishing a healthy culture are swift action and transparency. Claims of harassment should be investigated immediately, quickly, and ideally by an independent panel. If a behavior is found to violate the culture of the organization, that individual should be subject to progressive disciplinary procedures up to and including firing.

This brings up a critical point, however. In the zeal to root out sexual harassment, organizations must not swing too far in the other direction, creating a culture of "guilty until proven innocent." Many sexual harassment allegations are found to be unsubstantiated and, in some cases, outright untrue. A trustworthy due process should protect the accused until he or she is found either responsible or innocent of wrongdoing. I recommend that you take every allegation seriously, investigate it promptly and adjudicate it fairly, quickly and appropriately, always maintaining the highest possible standards of confidentiality.

SHRM has developed many best practices and resources for sustaining a healthy workplace, including a member toolkit for understanding and developing organizational culture. Chief among these practices is having a strong statement of values. But mainly, they come down to people—who you bring in, who you retain, and who you allow to move up. You must be willing to get rid of bad actors, no matter where they rank, with no second chances.

That takes courage, but there is no other choice anymore.

How do you know your culture is working? When it mostly runs on its own. Healthy cultures self-police bad behavior, self-select good people, self-regulate effective policies and self-perpetuate—no matter who comes in or out.

Conclusion: Culture Is a Competitive Gamechanger

In the end, a healthy culture is a competitive gamechanger, allowing you to get and keep the best people to meet your mission of serving the people of this great state. Isn't that why you are all here today?

Sexual harassment in the workplace wreaks havoc on your ability to do your jobs as legislators. Even if a situation never reaches the level of a complaint, but it pushes good people out or down, you have lost the talent game. With California's unemployment rate down to 4.9 percent and falling, this is a risk you cannot afford.

This body now has the opportunity to transform its culture, and as the bellwether state for the country, the nation beyond. As you go about this critical work, I urge you to remember that compliance matters, but that healthy culture staves off sexual harassment.

Cultural change is the most important thing you can do—all of us can do—to make sure that all people in the workplace are respected, valued and empowered to succeed. SHRM, CALSHRM and our members stand with you in putting an end to sexual harassment at work and in building better workplaces for a better world.

SHRM pledges to work with the committee as it addresses this important issue. I thank you for the opportunity to appear before the committee, and I look forward to your questions.

WINNER: MOTIVATIONAL SPEECH

"Work and Love and Suffering"

By Kate Devlin for Lucy Kalanithi,
Clinical Assistant Professor of Medicine,
Stanford University School of Medicine



Delivered at the International Association for the Study of
Lung Cancer World Conference on Lung Cancer,
Toronto, Sept. 24, 2018

I am so honored and happy to be here among this community of clinicians, researchers, advocates, patients and families. While I would never have chosen the circumstances that brought me here, being part of the lung cancer community has brought such meaning into my life. And that meaning is what I want to speak about this morning.

I am a physician, but I'm here today in a different role—because in 2013, my husband, Paul Kalanithi, was diagnosed at 36 with stage IV EGFR-mutant non-small cell lung cancer.

Paul and I had met twelve years earlier as medical students. He was smart and kind and super funny. I fell in love with Paul in part because he used to keep a gorilla suit in the trunk of his car, and he'd say he kept it there, "you know, just for emergencies."

Paul lived with lung cancer for 22 months. During that time, he finished his training as a neurosurgeon, I gave birth to our daughter Cady, and Paul wrote the manuscript for *When Breath Becomes Air*, a memoir about his transformation from physician to patient. In his writing, Paul reflected on his own life and on what makes human life meaningful, even in the face of death.

To keep a promise to him, I shepherded the book to publication after he died, and it has since become a #1 New York Times bestseller translated into more than 40 languages.

When your husband writes a book like *When Breath Becomes Air*, you get asked a lot of questions like:

- Has doing a book tour helped you through grief? Yes, definitely.
- Has this experience changed how you practice medicine? Yes and no.
- How's your daughter doing? Great! She is feisty and funny, just like her dad.

But there's only one question that really scares me. Well, other than being asked, "So, who would play you in the movie?" The most difficult question I'm ever asked is point-blank is: "So, what is the meaning of life?"

It's a question, like many others, that I wish Paul were here to answer, too. But lately, I've considered this question for myself—and especially for myself as a physician.

Reflecting on the moment of his initial diagnosis with lung cancer, Paul wrote, "The future I had imagined, the culmination of decades of striving, evaporated."

Until that moment, I hadn't quite realized how much of our identities are tied up in our imagined futures, in who we plan to become. When you're faced with a life-threatening illness, the perennial question "How long have I got left?" can also mean "Who am I still?" And the question "What's the meaning of life?" becomes both urgent and quotidian: "What's the meaning in my life?"

For Paul, that crisis of identity was almost as great as the challenge of facing mortality. He was fighting for survival and fighting to rediscover a purpose and the meaning that would sustain him through illness.

So what exactly is meaning, and how do we create it? Well, one of the best answers I've come across is by Dr. Viktor Frankl.

Dr. Frankl was a psychiatrist and neurologist living in Austria who, in 1942, was arrested and transported to a Nazi concentration camp. Three years later, he was one of the few who survived to see the camp liberated, and he reflected on his experiences in his book titled, *Man's Search for Meaning*.

Frankl shared the stories of fellow prisoners whom he counseled while in the camps. For example, one was a scientist with a series of books still left to write. Another was the parent of a young child who awaited him in a foreign country.

Frankl came to believe that for a person to maintain even the slightest chance of survival while living in the camps, she had to hold on to her sense of meaning. And he hypothesized that there are three main sources of meaning in our lives. The first is work: in other words, the deeds we do, the things we create. The second is love—the love that we feel for our experiences and, of course, for our fellow human beings.

One of my favorite book reviews of *When Breath Becomes Air* says that the book crackles with life.

If you had seen Paul at the time that he wrote it, the phrase might have seemed preposterous because he had become physically debilitated. But Paul was crackling with life. He had nurtured those first two sources of meaning—work and love—in his growing manuscript and in our growing family. In a sense, he was thriving. As Nietzsche said, and Viktor Frankl believed, "he who has a why to live can bear almost any how."

Though we had always planned to have children toward the end of Paul's residency, it wasn't part of our plan for Paul to become ill at the same time. After his diagnosis, we wrestled with whether to try have a child.

I remember asking Paul, "Don't you think having to say goodbye to a child would make dying more painful for you?"

His answer astounded me. He said, "Wouldn't it be great if it did?"

I really wish I knew what Paul thought about Viktor Frankl, and I

don't. But I imagine they might have agreed on this last thing:

Dr. Frankl believed that the most significant way we create meaning in our lives is through the way we respond to unavoidable suffering; he believed that suffering ceases to be suffering at the moment it finds a meaning and that the pure fact of enduring hardship can be intrinsically triumphant. I saw that in Paul as he set out to face his mortality and put it to paper. The task was immensely rewarding, in part because it was so hard.

Just like having a child. Just like working in medicine. At its best—and especially when we focus on patients first—working in health care connects us to all three sources of meaning: work and love and suffering.

When Paul died in 2015, I received probably a dozen floral arrangements in sympathy, and I also sent one in thanks—to Paul's oncologist, Dr. Heather Wakelee.

I was grateful to Dr. Wakelee not just because she gave Paul state-of-the-art treatment for lung cancer—though she did—but because she made sure that his time was meaningful. She convinced Paul that he could return

to work and then tailored his therapy around that. And she focused his care not only on survival but on the things that mattered to him: maintaining the physical energy to work, the mental focus to write, and the agency to make his own choices.

Scientific progress made that possible. Today's first-line therapies hadn't existed when we graduated from medical school just a decade prior, and those novel therapies made it possible for Paul to simultaneously be both a stage IV lung cancer patient and a practicing neurosurgeon. I'm so thankful to the scientists and patient-advocates speeding that progress.

Finally, I'm grateful to Dr. Wakelee for another reason, too—because even when treatments stopped working, she didn't leave our side. Neither did Team Draft or the Bonnie J. Addario Lung Cancer Foundation or many more of you. And I've come to believe that being witnesses to each other's hardships, even and maybe especially when we can't completely fix them, is one of the most important things we do for each other.

We have chosen a profession that provides us this challenge and privilege.

And you didn't just choose to work in health care. You chose oncology and lung cancer, which requires its own special kind of grit. My guess is that you didn't choose this field because it was easy. Perhaps you chose it, in part, because it was hard.

I know some of you chose it because it was personal.

On behalf of your patients and their families, thank you. You are lengthening lives and expanding them.

I know this because I am now raising Cady, a fierce, funny—and, at long last, potty-trained—four-year-old girl who already has a rock-solid moral compass, just like her dad. And while I used to think that above all I wanted to raise a happy child, I realize now that what I want more is to raise a resilient child. My biggest task in doing so is teaching Cady how to take on these big concepts—life and love and loss and suffering—and make meaning out of it all.

In the end, though, I think she'll be the one who teaches me—just like her dad did.

Thank you so much for what you do. I'm so glad to join you.

WINNER: STATE-OF-THE-INSTITUTION SPEECH

"That Is What a 21st Century Public University Does"

By Alex D. Solis for Rodney K. Rogers, President,
Bowling Green State University



Delivered at Bowling Green State University,
Bowling Green, Ohio, Dec. 5, 2018

Thank you, Chair Keller. And to the Board of Trustees and Directors of the BGSU Foundation, we are very grateful for your leadership and commitment to Bowling Green State University. I would like to take a moment to recognize Bowling Green Mayor Dick Edwards, who is here. Thank you for your continued partnership. I also appreciate that my wife, Sandy Earle, is in attendance, along with my son Isaac. My other son is watching the live stream in New York. Hi, Spencer. I requested that both Sandy and Isaac

be here because I wanted to make sure that at least two people showed up today. But, I am humbled that in fact we have so many here with us. To our students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends, thank you for being here today.

In the early part of the 20th century, The Ohio General Assembly passed The Lowry Normal School Bill—legislation to establish two institutions of higher learning to serve the northern part of the state, meet teacher training needs and expand educational opportunities in Ohio.

On November 10, 1910, a small rural community was selected as home for one of these “normal” universities—Bowling Green.

Since our founding, BGSU has been no stranger to innovation. We've made substantial advances in the way we teach, conduct research, recruit and engage students, leverage technology and approach collaboration and partnerships.

However, one thing has remained constant—we've always aspired to be a vibrant learning community.

In recent years, we've accomplished much.

Throughout the first phase of our campus master plan, we constructed and renovated more than 30 buildings, representing a half-billion-dollar investment.

For the sixth consecutive year, we have admitted the most academically prepared class to date.

We have developed new programs such as software engineering, mechatronics, data science, forensic science, PPEL, health services administration and many more.

We have increased our research productivity and the level of externally funded initiatives.

We have invested in faculty and staff, ensuring our salaries and benefits are more competitive.

Recently, Business Insider ranked Bowling Green State University Ohio's No. 1 university for quality and affordability.

The American Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities named BGSU as an Innovation and Economic Prosperity University. We are one of 63 institutions to earn this recognition.

We rank 10th in the NCAA for our student-athletes' graduation success rate in Division 1 programs. And the women's soccer team won the MAC regular season and conference tournament title and competed in the NCAA tournament this fall. Our Head Coach Matt Fannon was named MAC Coach of the Year.

That success has also spread to our club sports. Our women's bowling and men's rugby club teams both won national championships this past year.

Most importantly, we are achieving the highest levels of student success in our history, including our four- and six-year graduation rates.

The state of our university is strong. It is strong indeed. Thank you for coming.

We could end today's talk there, because we are indeed in a strong position, but we must never be complacent or satisfied—we must focus on our future.

We have recently reaffirmed our strategic plan, and I want to thank the hundreds of individuals who participated in that shared process. I am pleased to announce the creation of the President's Advisory Board for Strategic Plan Implementation, led by our newly appointed Vice President for Partnerships and Chief of Staff, Sue Houston, and Vice President for Faculty Affairs and Strategic Initiatives, Bill Balzer. My office will begin fielding nominations and recommendations for this group and it will be responsible for guiding our progress. It is our plan that I wish to share with you today.

As I reflect, eleven of my predecessors have led this institution before me. Presidents like Mary Ellen Mazey, Carol Cartwright and Sidney Ribeau have pushed us forward and positioned BGSU for success. I thank them, as well as former faculty, staff and students who have made this institution what it is today. However, it is our immense responsibility to lead BGSU to be the institution for tomorrow. I am reminded of a speech given by our fifth president, Dr. Ralph Harshman. He said:

"Thousands have passed through these halls of learning. Thousands upon thousands want the same opportunity. We must not fail those who have passed this way. We must not fail those yet to come."

There is no question that, today, we live in the most challenging time that higher education has ever seen.

We are in a period of great change and disruption—a moment that will define the future of higher education and Bowling Green State University. However, throughout history, in periods of great change come great opportunities. Institutions that embrace these challenges and disruptions make immense strides and achieve new and higher levels of success. Bowling Green has that same opportunity, if we can come together and harness the creativity, diligence and imagination of our students, faculty, staff, alumni and friends.

We face a stark reality. Beginning in 2024, there will be a significant decline in the number of high school graduates across the state and in the Midwest, a student population that has been the historic mainstay of our university. That is a dramatic shift in demographics, and we must adapt and differentiate our educational experience so that it is clear why a degree from Bowling Green State University is one of value for both traditional and post-traditional students.

Along the way, and though it was never our intention, I fear, higher education has lost the trust of a large percentage of the public. Many think college is too expensive and that student debt is insurmountable. They don't see the impact of our research. Some wonder if college is even worth it.

There are people who question our purpose. Is it to prepare graduates for their careers and thus drive productivity? Is it to produce a broadly educated person to support democracy and create a vibrant society? Is it to educate and move the human condition toward creating a more just society? I believe the answer to all those questions is yes. Bowling Green State University needs to act to support a productive society, a good society and a just society. If we do that, we will regain the public trust by demonstrating why higher education matters and why we matter. If we do that, we will create public good.

Now, more than ever, we must not be timid. As a public university in the 21st century, we must embrace our role to act in the public interest and create public good. We must prepare our graduates to live meaningful and productive lives. We must empower them to control their destiny. And that starts with the quality of our academic programs.

For years, there has been this tired, old debate on how we must prepare students. Is college for the discovery and pursuit of thought, or for career preparation? Is it one or the other? The answer must be both.

If we are not preparing our students for their careers, they will not be

prepared to live productive lives. If we don't broadly educate them, they will not be prepared to lead meaningful lives. We must always remind ourselves that our work is not simply awarding degrees based upon a series of required courses, but it is to intentionally create and design educational programs that empower our students to achieve success after they leave here.

To be a university of first choice, Bowling Green State University must redefine student success. This will only happen if we continue to transform what we are teaching, how we are teaching and where we are teaching.

Without a doubt, our students face the most complex world and work environment ever. To ensure each of them is positioned for success, we must target our learning outcomes to be focused not only on knowing, but also on doing. We must move from a learning model of the past that was built upon memorization of facts and choose to put value in our students' ability to construct and deconstruct knowledge. We say we are educating lifelong learners, so we must intentionally focus on the mastery of competencies that allow students to learn...to learn.

Together, as a university community, we've had great success with high-impact practices that, when our students engage in them, they do better. These practices share common ground—they all exemplify doing. Education abroad, internships and co-ops, undergraduate research, learning communities and service-learning all have a positive impact on students who choose to participate.

With almost 20,000 students, we have to increase accessibility so these hands-on educational practices can be for all, not just the few. Our challenge is to continue to support and develop programs such as these—but, most importantly, to involve more students.

However, to take these practices to the next level, we must expand on these educational experiences. It is essential that we require every student to complete an interdisciplinary signature project that addresses an important issue.

As our students graduate, they should be able to demonstrate their ability to share, apply and create new knowledge. Today, it is more than active learning, it is discovery-based learning that will position our students for success.

The bottom line is that degree completion is absolutely necessary, but not sufficient preparation for life after college. We must integrate academic and career advising to provide our students with a holistic and intentional approach to their education. Their advisors and career mentors will work with them individually to review and update their life and career plan starting when they first arrive at Bowling Green.

Now, that addresses what we teach and how we teach, but we cannot afford to leave out where we teach. We need to continue to learn from BGSU Firelands and build upon the strength of existing programs so adult, part-time and other post-traditional students feel supported. Dedication to the success of these students means taking a step back and assessing services, academic policies, advising roles, mobile technology and even our hours of operation. We must remove any barriers that obstruct post-traditional students from learning at Bowling Green State University.

Knowing the demographic challenges we face, we need to reach these new student populations if we want to thrive in the future. It is our commitment to identify, grow, and maintain robust enrollments in 25 to 30 online and hybrid programs to meet the needs of post-traditional students.

Graduate education needs to remain a strong component of our academic portfolio. We must focus on several key programs that can achieve national and international recognition for excellence to position us for our future. We must also be more creative and innovative on how we meet the needs of working professionals. There are just countless opportunities for us to provide graduate education to allow these individuals to move their careers forward or change professions while balancing family and work life.

Earlier this fall, Bowling Green State University and Mercy Health announced the intent to explore a partnership involving Mercy College of Ohio.

As Ohio's largest health care provider, Mercy Health will allow us to expand our educational offerings in the health care arena, create additional clinical sites at various Mercy Health locations and broaden our educational reach to meet the critical demand for nurses and other health care professionals.

In January, Dr. Joe Whitehead will assume the role of provost and senior vice president for academic affairs. He will help lead these initiatives. I would like to thank Dr. John Fischer for serving in the interim provost role since the start of this year. His leadership and counsel have been invaluable to me, and John, we are very grateful for your work.

As a public university, we have a duty to be open to all who are willing to work hard and who have the desire to control their destiny. It is our commitment to meet those students where they are and take them where they strive to go. We want our university to be home to Ohioans, out-of-state, international, underrepresented and first-generation students alike.

We will strive to be representative of the global community we reside in. Gone are the days where society and students come to universities for knowledge. We must go to them. It is on us to develop pathways to serve all students—those who want to start at Owens Community College or another two-year partner, those who feel the Honors College is for them, or those working professionals seeking graduate degrees. Our message to our prospective students is that we have a pathway for you and we are committed to your social mobility.

That is what a 21st century public university does.

Our faculty's reach goes beyond the classroom. Their research and creative activities enhance BGSU's reputation, attract strong faculty and staff and lead to a better education for our students.

As a comprehensive public research university, we have a responsibility to conduct research and creative activities that create public good.

It is research that demonstrates our relevance to the public and rebuilds trust. In October, we announced that our faculty received a \$5.2 million grant from the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health to create the Lake Erie Center for Fresh Waters and Human Health. This is a new federally funded research center that will allow us to better understand and prevent toxic algal blooms that plague portions of the Great Lakes and impact freshwater sources around the world.

This major research grant shows that our faculty and students are committed to leading the national research effort to address a major public health crisis. The Center will bring together the best minds in the nation, and their research impacts not only the communities in our own backyard, but throughout the world.

I would like to recognize and thank the new director of the Lake Erie Center for Fresh Waters and Human Health, Dr. George Bullerjahn, along with Dr. Tim Davis, who are driving these efforts. Our Department of Biological Sciences, Department of Chemistry, and the School of Earth, Environment and Society are working to provide answers to one of our region's most pressing problems.

This is one example of our ability to articulate how our research is connected to creating public good. In a little bit, we will be hearing two musical selections from Voices at BGSU, a student organization. This is an example of how creative activities are embraced by every member of our community and enrich the social and cultural vitality of our community.

That is what a 21st century public university does.

The strength of Bowling Green State University is that of its people—our students, faculty, staff, alumni, friends and partners. It is you who make Bowling Green what we are

today. We must support each other to enhance our learning community so it fosters diversity and inclusion, collaboration, creativity and excellence.

To do that, it starts with investing in our people. I am calling today for a university-wide strategic diversity plan—a plan that is intentional, comprehensive and outcomes-driven. That plan will need to focus on the recruitment, retention and success of a diverse student body, faculty and staff. Jennifer McCary, assistant vice president for equity, diversity, and inclusion, will lead this university-wide task force, and work will begin in the coming days.

Teaching and learning evolves. There will always be new technologies and new approaches that we must embrace and leverage. But, here is what I know—some things simply don't change. We must always implement student-centered initiatives, which include setting clear expectations, providing appropriate levels of support, intellectually engaging and involving students in the learning process, and providing meaningful and timely feedback. While this is not easy and it is hard work, we must ensure that this is done in every course, in every class meeting, in every interaction, by each one of us.

We will coordinate and improve systems and programs that support the mental and physical health and well-being for our community. It is on us to support and care for one another.

That is the type of society that we wish for all members of our learning community. We must help create it here.

That is what a 21st century public university does.

To truly position Bowling Green State University for future success, we cannot do it alone. We are a national leader in public and private partnerships and we need to come together to work with anyone who shares our vision. We cannot be the closed-off monasteries of the past. We will seek out and be supportive of external organizations who are willing to partner.

It is our efforts with Mercy Health, Cedar Fair and other institutions that enrich Bowling Green State University. Whether it is establishing a new bachelor's program in resort and attraction management, or renewing a 50-year-old agreement with the University of Salzburg, these mutually beneficial partnerships are essential because with each of them come opportunities to enhance the quality of our programs, support research and creative activities, develop and improve facilities and serve the interests of our region, nation, and world.

Just as our faculty are seeking new streams of funding, we are counting on additional support from our alumni, friends, donors, corporations and foundations. We are in the public phase of the Changing Lives for the World campaign. I want to share just what that means for us.

In this campaign, we have raised more than \$141 million. With that have come 158 new scholarships. There have also been additional gifts to support endowed professorships, chairs, coaches and leadership positions. We received transformational gifts to renovate facilities like the Maurer Center, the new home of the College of Business. In this campaign alone, 37,442 people have donated to Bowling Green State University. And of those donors, 10,915 made their first gift. They committed for the first time to our mission to change lives.

I previously shared my thanks to Mike Kuhlman at a recent donor event. But, I would be remiss if I didn't thank Dr. Bill Balzer for his interim leadership during the advancement transition. Bill stepped up in a time of need. Not only did he keep his vice president responsibilities with faculty affairs, he gave more of himself than what was asked and led University Advancement. Because of both of them, we were able to keep moving forward aggressively.

In October, we welcomed Pam Conlin to our campus. She is our newly appointed vice president for university advancement and president

of the BGSU Foundation. Pam will marshal our alumni and development efforts. We have so much to be proud of in raising \$141 million, but to reach our goal of \$200 million, her leadership will be essential. We will develop strategies to creatively engage our more than 183,000 alumni and our friends to increase annual giving and provide them opportunities to support our students.

I want to share a story about a student and scholarship recipient named Remey Schneider. Remey is a sophomore and has majors in environmental policy and analysis and international studies. He is a member of the Sidney A. Ribeau President's Leadership Academy. He is involved in the Center for Community and Civic Engagement, along with many other areas on campus.

I met him during his freshman year through PLA. Like many of our students, Remey is making the most of his BGSU experience. He wants to work for a global non-profit that focuses on environmental issues in developing nations. Simply put, his education is preparing him to achieve his dreams. You see, growing up in Cincinnati with parents who are both social workers, Remey has two great examples of people who live purposeful lives, people who care about their communities, and people who create public good. And here we want to keep it going.

If you had asked Remey his thoughts about college before coming to BGSU, he would have said that he didn't know if it was possible due to his family's ability to afford it. But because of scholarship support, Remey is here with us today. I speak to his story, because as President, I have seen firsthand the impact of scholarships. It is more than just dollars raised. It is our promise to graduate more Remeyes. Remey, it is great to have you at Bowling Green State University.

It doesn't stop there. I mentioned that he is a member of the Sidney A. Ribeau President's Leadership Academy. That is just one component of our Center for Leadership. This

Center builds the next generation of leaders and supports and engages our students. It is also currently working with the College of Education and Human Development on a major and minor to integrate leadership theory and application inside the classroom. We are excited to announce that upon approval from the Board of Trustees, we will name the C. Raymond Marvin Center for Student Leadership.

Because of alumnus Ray Marvin's commitment and generous contribution, we are able to expand the Center's reach and impact even more students. Gifts like these will ensure that BGSU students are prepared to lead in their careers and in their communities.

Our students never cease to amaze me. This next generation is intelligent, bold and selfless. To the students here today, we see you wanting to make a difference. Time and time again, you put others ahead of yourselves—it is in your DNA. And the Marvin Center for Student Leadership is our statement that we believe in you. We will always believe in you, and we will support and empower you to be the future leaders.

That is what a 21st century public university does.

We have our sights set very high. And no matter what we do, we must remain a great value.

To accomplish that, we must think creatively and differently, but never compromise quality.

To me, value is where quality and affordability meet. We need to address the cost of a BGSU education and implement practices and systems to become more efficient in all areas of our campuses. And we must do everything possible to address the rising student debt. It is our goal to ensure that the issue of affordability never deters a student from learning.

It will require us to reimagine and eliminate some academic and non-academic programs so that we can be more effective and efficient to better serve our students.

While we've made great progress in our campus master plan, let's come

together to dream of the second phase. There is more work to be done in transforming our facilities.

BGSU's infrastructure is only as good as our willingness to sustain it. We have a responsibility to make the right choices so generations after us are in a better position. We will reaffirm our participation in the American College and University Presidents' Climate Commitment. This comprehensive plan will inform our sustainability actions and will ensure that we are doing all that we can do.

Value drives universities, and it drives student success. It is connected to the public trust and should remain at the core of everything we do.

That is what a 21st century public university does.

It was on November 10, 1910, that we started writing the first chapter of our story.

Today, we are nearly 110 years old. When we glance backward, it's only to catch a glimpse of where we started, reflect on how far we have come, and to gauge how far we still have to go. Bowling Green State University has the opportunity to drive the social, economic, educational and cultural vitality of our region, nation, and world.

If you don't believe me, take a look around. It's our students, it's our faculty, it's our staff, and it's our alumni and friends who are changing the world. It's you.

If there were no Bowling Green State University, what would that mean for Ohio? What would that mean for the nation? And what would that mean for the world? It is on us to answer those questions.

We are fortunate that our homes are in the communities of Bowling Green and Huron. We are proud of the town-gown relationships we have built and recognize that there is always more work to be done to improve. It is that same spirit that we will take to our state and federal officials and agencies to improve community and governmental relations, increase awareness of BGSU, gain access to resources, enhance our public relevance, and tell our story.

Today was our first step toward defining our mission as a public university—creating public good.

Whether you are a student, faculty, staff, alumnus or friend, I am asking for your help in implementing our strategic plan. I recognize that I don't have all the answers, nor does a single person in this room. However, collec-

tively, we do. I am asking you to join me in writing the next chapter in our story.

With a deep sense of humility, I stand before you as President. I see a university community that is vibrant and relevant today and will continue to be in the future. It is the role of a 21st-century public university to be

woven into the fabric of its region, its nation and its world. We will be seen as absolutely essential in creating a productive society, a good society and a just society, because we are a public university for the public good. We are Bowling Green State University.

Thank you.