

Future Bound: The United States in a World of Change
CSIS Global Strategy Institute
Fourth Anniversary Conference – Thursday, April 17, 2008

**Comments by David Walker, President and CEO, Peter G. Peterson Foundation,
former Comptroller General of the United States 1998-2008, and this year's
recipient of the Strategic Vision Award**

Thank you Erik, it's a pleasure and an honor to be here. I'm pleased and honored to accept the 2008 Strategic Vision Award. I'm also humbled by this reward in many regards, because of the history of my family which I'll touch on. But let me just say I feel at home here for several reasons. One, I've had the good fortune of being able to be involved in a number of CSIS activities for several years, including the Commission on Retirement Security which I was a member of. I actually used to work in this building from 1981 to 1983. I have great respect for many people who are involved in CSIS, including Dave Abshire who helped get it going, and John Hamre who's here now, Erik Peterson and others. I've been asked today to talk to you about our future, rather than our present and our past. On the other hand I think it is important to provide a little perspective before I go into it.

The reason I am particularly humbled is because while my family, the Walker family, has been in the United States since the 1680s, to my knowledge, I am only the second Walker in my direct line to graduate from college. Our family for many, many generations were farmers, worked in the mines, worked in the steel mills and rode a minister's circuit! My father was the first to graduate from college and I am only the second. Our children and grandchildren will hopefully continue that tradition unbroken. But I consider myself very fortunate.

I am a student of history, and I believe it is very, very important to learn from the past, to face the facts, in order to try to help create a better future. And in doing that, let me share some points with you that I hope will be thought-provoking, and I will save time at the end for questions.

First, I live on land that George Washington used to own, and I am a member of the Sons of the American Revolution. I take great pride in being an American, but I also consider myself to be an internationalist. I was head of Strategic Planning for auditor generals around the world. I now have the honor to be chairman of the Audit Committee of the United Nations, and so I very much want to stay involved in international and global issues. But as I look back to the founding of this great Republic in 1789, I find that this country has strayed a great deal from the intent of the Founding Fathers. And while we have a lot to be proud of and a lot to be thankful for, including our current position as the only superpower on Earth—which by the way is temporary, as there will be at least one more superpower within the next twenty years—we need to recognize the reality that we've strayed in many ways from the foundations our Founders laid; and let me talk about a few.

When the Founders established our great republic, they believed in limited government. At that time, during Washington's term, the Federal government represented 2% of the US economy. Today it represents over 20%, and is scheduled to grow dramatically when Baby Boomers (myself included) retire in large numbers. Secondly,

when the Founders started they envisioned that other than those express and enumerated responsibilities laid out for the Federal government, that if it wasn't laid out for the Federal government, then it belonged to the states (which are incidentally the models of experimentation), and that ultimately the people were in charge. We the People. Today when you look at the composition of the Federal government, 20% is for defense, including Iraq, Afghanistan, and the global war on terrorism, 21% is for Medicare and Medicaid, and 21% is for Social Security, and that is before the Boomers retire. More dramatically, 38% of the budget is deemed to be "discretionary spending". The other 62% is on auto-pilot. Of that 38%, every expressed and enumerated responsibility for the Federal government envisioned by our Founding Fathers is included therein. National defense, homeland security, federal judicial system, foreign policy, treasury functions, postal service, Congress of the United States, Executive Office of the President—every single major function and activity, and yet they are getting crowded out, because of things that are on auto-pilot. And at least in one case, we've written a blank check. To my knowledge we are the only country on the face of the earth that's dumb enough to write a blank check for health care. And that's exactly what we've done for Medicare and Medicaid. Not even Sweden does that. With socialized medicine cradle to grave, (and I might add, much higher tax rates than we have as well,) they even have triggers and control mechanisms, because they recognize, as should we, that if there's one thing that could bankrupt America, it's health care costs. And we're headed that way, without any significant changes.

Remember George Washington's caution to not involve ourselves in foreign conflicts. And for the first time in America's history, the United States engaged in pre-emptive "war". And I put war in quotes, because under the Constitution only Congress can declare war, and yet Congress has not declared war since World War II. And we've spent a lot of money and lost a lot of lives in a number of conflicts since World War II.

At the beginning of our Republic, our Founders were concerned about factions. Today we call them political parties and interest groups. Believe it or not, our Founders were concerned that one day these factions' individual interests might trump the public interest. Can you imagine that?!

In the early days of our Republic, our Founders believed that people should leave their regular jobs to become elected officials in order to engage in public service for a limited or moderate period of time, and then return to their regular occupations, as Washington did to Mount Vernon. They believed that the elected representatives who represented us should be a cross-section of America, comprised of individuals who would have an understanding Americans' daily lives and how the nation really works, in the real world, which is beyond the Beltway. Today, we find that all too many elected officials—and there are many capable elected officials, don't get me wrong. However, today all too many elected officials view their position as a job, and want to make a career of it. Well most people don't like to lose their job. Therefore, the ability and willingness to make tough decisions that may not be popular, but which may be necessary to help ensure that our future is better than our past, aren't translated into needed action. That combined with gerrymandering of the House districts to where only about 60 of the 435 districts are contested, which means that if you are going to lose you're going to get passed on the right if you're a Republican in the primary and you're going to get passed on the left if

you're a Democrat in the primary, which means that there is no sensible center. And the sensible center is where America is. And the sensible center is where deals get done.

It's one thing for Washington to be gridlocked and stalemated when things are going well. That's not all bad, because after all, government is a lag indicator, especially the Federal government, and it can tend to over-react at times. At the same point in time, for the government, especially Washington, to have a stalemate, and to be at loggerheads, when things aren't going so well—and they're getting worse with the passage of time—is totally unacceptable.

At the beginning of this republic, we believed in thrift. We had debtors' prisons! Now America and too many Americans are addicted to debt, in good times and in bad. We believed in opportunity, now all too many frequently believe in entitlement. We believed in morality. Now look at the television every night. We believed in optimism, and now for the first time in America's history more Americans believe that the future for their children will not be as good as theirs. Now I'm not saying they're right, but that's what they believe. These are all warning signals.

America is a great country. We're number one in many things, but not in all things; and quite frankly we're below average in a lot of things that people don't know about, including our elected officials. If you looked at OECD statistics... (laughter)... I didn't know that would get a laugh, but that's OK! OECD statistics, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, based in Paris, thirty countries of which the United States is one, you will find on a number of key outcome-based indicators that are critical to the future of America and to its competitive position. Not only are we no longer the leader, we're below average. For example we're not even top twenty in math and science achievement in junior high and high school. We have the highest uninsured population in health care in any country on earth as a percentage of the population. We have below average health care outcomes with regard to life expectancy, infant mortality at birth, and medical error rates. And yet we spend double per capita?!

So we have a number of challenges we face, and I will just mention a few of what I consider our key sustainability challenges, which I tried to get Congress and the White House to start focusing on from GAO: our fiscal challenge, our savings challenge, our foreign policy challenge, our entitlements challenge, our health care challenge, education, energy, environment, immigration, infrastructure, Iraq, and even our basic defense strategy. All rely upon the current business model for Guard and Reserve and the all-volunteer force. All of these models are unsustainable in their present form, over the long term. When will we recognize reality, and when will we start making some course corrections? Because we must remember what Albert Einstein taught us—he was a pretty bright guy. He said that the most powerful force on earth was not nuclear energy. The most powerful force on earth is the power of compounding. When you're an investor the power of compounding works for you, and when you're a debtor—and the United States is the world's largest debtor—the power of compounding works against you. And when you're dealing with sustainability challenges that are getting worse with the passage of time, that same concept applies even though it may not be money.

In my view, we clearly need a set of key national indicators, outcome-based indicators, economic, safety, security, social, environmental, etc., to help us understand where America is, how America is trending, and where we stand compared to our competitors. Because in my view whether you are a country, a company, a college, a not-

for-profit entity or an individual, if you don't know all three of these dimensions, you don't know how you're doing. If you don't know how you're doing against standards, whether you're getting better or worse, and how you compare to your peer group, you don't know how you're doing. We don't know that. The Federal government spends three trillion dollars a year; it forgoes revenues in the form of tax preferences, deductions, exemptions, exclusions, credits, of a trillion dollars a year. It promulgates regulations of thousands of pages a year and most departments and agencies have no idea whether their programs and policies are making an outcome-based difference in the lives of Americans and for America or not. They have no idea.

So what ends up happening on that? If you're a public policy maker and you want to show you care, you throw more money at it. You throw another tax preference at it. You issue another regulation. But sometimes those are counterproductive. For example: savings. We spend a lot of money on savings incentives. We have the lowest savings rate of any industrialized nation. And the people who save are the people, frankly, who have the ability to save, and therefore gain the tax preferences. In health care, the largest tax preference in the internal revenue code. That's two hundred billion a year, attributable to the fact that very few Americans pay income tax or payroll tax on employer-provided and employer-paid health care. So if you're a CEO—which I am, but not at a for-profit entity, I'm in the greater good business—if you're a CEO with a very lucrative plan, in a very high tax bracket you get great taxpayer subsidies. But if you're near poor, and you don't have a plan, you get nothing. Now what kind of policy is that?

So we have a number of challenges and, in my view, America faces four serious deficits. Number one, a budget deficit and mounting debts. And it's getting worse, not better. Yet the tsunami of spending has yet to hit our shores associated with the retirement of the Baby Boom generation. It will hit, and we are not prepared. Secondly, a savings deficit. Thirdly, a balance of payments deficit. We are increasingly relying on foreign lenders, and more and more of our nation's mortgage is held by others. We don't owe it to ourselves any more – I'll come back to that. And the most serious deficit this country has of all in my view: a leadership deficit.

What has happened since 1789? In 1789 we had way more than our fair share of great leaders on this planet. And in my view, we now have fewer than our fair share of great leaders on this planet. Where are the Washingtons, the Jeffersons, the Madisons, the Adams, where are the Franklins, where are the Hamiltons? Where are they now?

We suffer from three maladies: myopia, or near-sightedness; tunnel-vision, looking at one issue at a time without understanding the bigger picture, the collateral effect, the integrated relationships; and self-centeredness. This has to change. Stated differently, a good friend of mine, Dr. Jack Rowe who used to be CEO of Aetna, on the board of the Rockefeller Foundation, and on MEDPAC, the Medicare Payment Advisory Commission, which I appointed him to; both he and I agree that we suffer from mural dyslexia. That is a medical term which means an inability to read the handwriting on the wall. It's rampant, and it's at epidemic proportions.

So, again, I talked about the budget deficit. The problem is not the current deficit, the problem is not the current debt, the problem is the \$44 trillion in off-balance-sheet obligations that grow by \$2-3 trillion a year. The savings deficit, I've talked about, the balance of payments deficit I've touched on, the leadership deficit is evident. And that is

a nonpartisan statement – by the way it’s a statement that doesn’t just apply to government either.

Lee Iacocca recently wrote a book which you ought to read, I commend it to you, *Where Have All the Leaders Gone?* It’s a short book, it’s a quick read. It deals with lack of leadership in business.

So we need more leaders who possess at least four key attributes. Courage. The courage to state the facts, to speak the truth, to tell it like it is, to do the right thing even though it may not be popular, and even though it might be countercultural. Secondly, the integrity to lead by example, to practice what you preach. Thirdly, creativity – the ability to help learn from the past, the ability to help see new ways of addressing old challenges, and ways to capitalize on new opportunities, and ways to help others to see the way forward. Because after all, leadership is about getting things done with and through others, not by yourself. And last, stewardship, a word that I believe strongly in, but which has largely vanished. Stewardship means not just generating positive results today as a leader, no matter what your position is, not just leaving things better off when you leave than when you came, whether it be your job or this planet, but also leaving things better positioned for the future. And my generation, the Baby Boom generation, is the first in the history of this great republic that is on track to not leave this country better positioned for the future—not just fiscally, but environmentally and in a whole range of ways. That is unacceptable to me, and I will continue that fight at the Peter G. Peterson Foundation to change this.

In summing up, let’s learn some lessons from history. First, the mortgage sub-prime crisis. There are four common denominators between the current mortgage sub-prime crisis and our much bigger Federal super sub-prime crisis. First, the disconnect. With the mortgage sub-prime crisis, the people who originated the loans and earned the fees benefited, but they weren’t the ones who bore the risk of default. So there was a disconnect between those who benefited and those who bore the risk. The same thing is going on with current Federal policy. Current taxpayers benefit from low-tax, high-spend policies; tomorrow’s taxpayers will pay the bill. And tomorrow’s taxpayers in many cases are people that are too young to vote and may not even have been born yet. They’re my grandkids...and future generations. That’s not only fiscally irresponsible, it’s not only unethical, it’s morally reprehensible.

Secondly, the issue of transparency—or the lack thereof. There was totally inadequate transparency with regard to the nature and magnitude of the risk associated with many of these instruments. And we have the same thing going on with the Federal government’s books. The bonds that are in the so-called “trust funds” of Social Security and Medicare—which aren’t trust funds by the way, they ought to be called “trust the government funds”—they’re in a locked file cabinet in West Virginia. But at least it’s locked! (laughter) So the bonds are not even a liability on the balance sheet of the US. There’s \$44 trillion in off-balance sheet obligations. That’s our real problem, and they grow by \$2-3 trillion a year. Even if we balance the budget, they grow by \$2 trillion a year because of health care costs and demographics.

Thirdly, the importance of confidence and cash flow. Bear Stearns found out the hard way that if you’re in the trust business and you’re counting on the confidence of your customers and lenders, that when they lose their confidence, things can spiral downward very quickly. And if you don’t have adequate cash flow, you can end up

having to sell for a fire sale price even though your book value or your market cap was much higher. Well the US is counting on confidence in our credit worthiness; the US is counting on the ability to borrow whatever we want, whenever we want at low interest rates; and yet cash flow is already negative for Medicare, and the cash flow is going negative for Social Security within ten years.

And last but certainly not least, the fourth factor: the lack of effective oversight and the lack of action until a crisis hits. Well I think it's pretty evident, that we're not paying enough attention to this, and that little to no action is taking place. So the next President must, absolutely must, make fiscal responsibility and intergenerational equity one of his/her top priorities.

We have a ticking fiscal clock. In my view we have five years, or maybe a few more, to demonstrate to our foreign lenders that we're going to get serious about our fiscal future. That means the next President's got to do it. We need a true leader. Somebody who is willing to acknowledge the problem, make it a priority, use the bully pulpit, go directly to the American people, work on a bipartisan basis, and do the right the for the future of this country. And guess what, if they do, and they go about it in the right way, they'll be rewarded. Because I've been to forty-plus cities and over half the states in this country in the past two years conducting town hall meetings, and the American people are starved for two things: number one, truth, and number two, leadership. And they don't get enough of either one quite frankly in my opinion.

Before I close, I'd like to mention two other things. Remember what happened with the Suez crisis. In 1956, the President of the United States called the Prime Minister of England and encouraged them to withdraw from the Suez Canal, or else we might reconsider our support for the pound. Within a week they were G-O-N-E. That was an ally.

And lastly, remember the lessons from the Roman Republic. We are not the longest standing republic in the history of mankind; Rome is. Over five hundred years. Think about these four factors that led to the fall of Rome. Number one, decline in moral values and political civility at home. Number two, a military overstretched around the world. Number three, fiscal irresponsibility by the central government. And number four, inability to control one's borders. Do these sound familiar? Can we learn from history?

We must—and when I say we, I'm talking about the first three words in the Constitution, which are the most powerful—We the People must become more informed and more involved, because we are responsible for what does or does not happen in Washington, DC. And Washington is badly broken. It's out of touch, it's out of control, it needs a wake-up call, and it's the people that are going to have to do it. And I can tell you this even though I have changed venues, and am no longer Comptroller General of the United States—which is a nice fancy title, and I loved my job, and I loved the GAO. I became convinced that I was going to have to be in a position to advocate specific solutions, to build strong coalitions, and to engage in extensive grassroots efforts in order to try to achieve change. Change is going to have to come from outside the Beltway. We're going to have to have a multi-front strategy.

So while I've changed venues, I have not withdrawn from the fight. In my new position, I will have more flexibility and financial firepower to bring to the target. And if we work together collectively—and we're going to emphasize several key issues and three key groups: youth, the business community, and media—if we work together, we

can do what it takes to make sure the future of this country is better than the past. And it's really important that we do it sooner rather than later.

Thank you for your attention, thank you for the award, I'm honored and humbled to be here with you today. Thank you.

Questions

Arnaud de Borchgrave, CSIS. Thank you for that remarkable diagnosis of our problems. I think that's why we're increasingly referred to as a freshly-minted bilingual capital where truth is a second language. (laughter)

David Walker: I have heard that one.

AB: But sir, you didn't mention the media once. I've been in the media sixty-two years, I've known great leaders, like de Gaulle, Churchill, and I've seen a decline in leadership as the media gets more powerful. And many people—as you know there are thousands of people eminently more qualified to lead us than the ones we have today, but they won't touch it because of what has happened in terms of media interference in absolutely everything. What is your reaction to that?

DW: There's no doubt in my mind that we have some leaders out there, and there's no doubt in my mind that it's not necessarily because of the media, although they're part of it, but because of the scrutiny and the labyrinth that you have to go through in order to attain public office, that many people don't want to be involved. One of the things I've sensed in these town hall meetings around the country—and this is amazing to me—is the percentage of Americans, who frankly in the last few elections, felt like they were voting against somebody rather than for somebody. Now when you think of a country that has over 300 million people, and when you're voting for CEO of the United States, Commander in Chief, and Leader of the Free World, that you're voting against somebody, rather than for somebody. I think that's a sad indictment of where we are. You know, the media in some cases may be contributing to that, but frankly, the confirmation hearings can be a challenge with regard to confirmed positions rather than elected positions, and frankly I think there are just a lot of people that don't want to pay the price to do it. We need to change that.

The media on the other hand has not done a good enough job of looking beyond today. They're so focused on what's going on today. And my view is they need to spend 90-95% of their time focusing on what their listeners, their viewers, their readers, etc. care about today. They need to spend 5-10% of their energy on what they need to know that will help to create a better tomorrow, including rethinking whether they're going about presenting their issues in a constructive manner, rather than in a destructive manner.

Anonymous Questioner: (inaudible)...In my speeches referring to you, as I've said, as an Old Testament prophet warning the children of Israel to shape up or ship out. They shipped out to Babylon, it did them good, we ship out, we don't know who will take over

but we suspect. But you're performing a great service to the country and I'm delighted with your repositioning. Let me ask you: as you look at American history and our ability to really move the clock; we did it in the anti-slavery movement, we did it in the progressive movement, (inaudible) distant relative of mine history of the Standard Oil...uh, T.R. Roosevelt took it up, changed the country. It's very hard to get those movements going today...and it's been attempted, the Concord Coalition, so forth...It seems to me...I want to get you a little bit into the methodology of these things. You know you and I have talked about the possibility of the next president...sort of like Eisenhower did in the Solarium exercise but broader...120 days, drawing Congress and others in to look at all this. That's one attempt. We have on Capitol Hill, you've supported it, the House started it, there are about seventy members on the retirement crisis to set up a commission that would be like the bases closing commission, up and down...and it's interesting that the leadership wouldn't sign on in both sides, but that's...(inaudible). Then you've got the grassroots, you've talked about youth, you encouraged us at the Linesberry Foundation to make that first grant on video games for youth, trying to forecast their own future. And Obama has shown the power of youth, I mean it may be possible....But how do you see the mix of methodologies in...you say we've got five years...so that's how much time...so we gotta move on all of these fronts and maybe more.

DW: Well first, process matters. You can have the best ideas in the world, but if you want to be successful in achieving positive outcomes, the process that you follow is of critical importance. And I will give you an example of a process that was fundamentally flawed, and that was President Bush's approach on Social Security reform. And even though he deserves credit for recognizing that we needed to do something, and that it was better to do it sooner rather than later, because of the process he employed, public support for what he wanted to do was less after two hundred public events, including sixty with the President and/or the Vice President than before he started. Alright?

I think the idea that you have in your book—which I've read by the way and thank you for your kind comment in the book—is a good one. I think you need to involve key players that are knowledgeable, that are capable, that are respected; you need to make sure that you have Congressional leaders and also leaders in the new administration as well who are independent of elected office and of the next administration involved and to see if you can come together.

Secondly, I strongly support the concept of a capable, credible and bipartisan commission or task force to make recommendations to the next Congress and the next president on four things, at a minimum. Budget controls – they expired in 2002, and we've been out of control ever since. Number two, comprehensive Social Security reform in which we're not preprogrammed to have to come back, like we were in 1983. Number three, round one of tax reform, which among others things would include which Bush tax cuts are going to be extended in whole or in part, which ones aren't, AMT, and other things. And number four, round one of comprehensive health care reform, which, among other things would include a reconsideration of the tax preferences for health care as well as a better targeting of taxpayer subsidies for Medicare part B and part D, among other things. For an up or down vote, like in the BRACC (Base Realignment and Closure

Commission) voting process, because the regular order is broken. And you would like to think that, the committees will be able to do this...forget it.

I've been on the front line, forget it! It isn't gonna happen. So we've got to think outside the box, we've got to have new ways of getting things done, and we ultimately have to hold people accountable for results. If they're starting to get results, then great, let's recognize and reward them. And the people who have the courage to step forward and offer proposals, even though you may not agree with the proposal, they deserve support and recognition because they have the courage to try to be a leader. And we don't have enough of those.

Anonymous Questioner: Thank you very much for your insightful talk. I just heard a talk by Jeffrey Sachs addressing the kinds of issues that you're talking about from a global perspective, in terms of the convergence of environment, poverty, fiscal issues that present simultaneous challenges. And the theme that you had emphasized, I just want to get you to perhaps amplify on that here... I study change from a behavioral standpoint, and try to differentiate short term behaviors which occupy one part of the brain from longer term habitual behaviors that may have incremental effects that happen to reside in another part of the brain. And the news media, as was noted before, seem to stimulate the short term rather than the long term part of the brain, and the leadership potential is really to transfer that emphasis from the short term to the long term. And I guess the question I would like to ask is how can we as a society redirect our attention to the behaviors that have long term impact, the consequences that have long term impact, to enable ordinary individuals to see into the future with more clarity than the media presently encourages them to do?

DW: I've found in my town hall meetings around the country that the American people are a lot smarter than people give them credit for. That if you state the facts and speak the truth to them, if you help them to understand why we're on an imprudent and unsustainable path, the need for tough choices, the fact that we're going to have to restructure entitlement programs, reprioritize and constrain spending, reform the tax system, and generate more revenues—we're not going to solve it at 18.5% GDP (that's what we're taxing at now)—but I will tell you that the longer we wait, the higher it's going to be. So we need to start seeking solutions now to maintain low tax burdens for economic growth, disposable incomes, competitive advantage, a lot of reasons like that.

They get it. But they're not getting any leadership. They're not getting any leadership from elected officials, they're not getting any leadership from the business community, they're not getting any leadership from the media, alright? And that's why we picked the three target audiences at the Peterson Foundation very carefully.

Youth—they're the future of this country. Plus, they will pay the price and they will bear the burden if others fail to act. Youth has different ways of getting information and interacting. And that's why you have to use not just traditional media but new media, including the internet and a variety of other applications there.

Secondly, the business community. The business community was in the forefront of demanding change, fiscally and otherwise, in the late eighties and early nineties. They are missing in action, in part because they're so focused on quarterly earnings and on their competitive posture in the global marketplace.

And thirdly, the media. The media is so focused on ratings, just like many politicians are focused on polls. As I said, I think the most we can hope for is to get the information out there and use all the mediums and mechanisms we have to try to develop a few leaders, a few leaders in Congress, a few leaders in the business community, a few leaders in the media, a few leaders among young people and other stakeholder groups. All it takes are a few who are committed, who are persistent, who will persevere over time, who will endure the pain, before we prevail.

Anonymous Questioner: I run the energy conversation which we're getting all of the government and everybody engaged in. I have a model that I want you to think about. I think we are a society that basically is interested in what I call one-off solutions. So my new paradigm is context, cause, choices, and then consequences. And we need to think about second, third, fourth, fifth order consequences in terms of the choices we make. Nobody, as far as I can tell, thinks that way. When I talked to a very smart economist here in town and asked him about it he said, "But see that's just too hard." (laughter)

DW: Well sometimes things that are worth doing are hard to do. I noticed back in the back you're talking about how things are going to be for the class of 2025. One of the things that we're planning to do at the Peterson Institute is to conduct a forum of leading minds, as well as maybe do a piece for television. By the way we bought a commercial documentary called *I.O.U.S.A.* which will be coming out in August in selected cities around the country in advance of the general election campaign in order to try to raise the visibility of some of these issues. But my point is, we're focusing on 2020. There are lots of reasons and a lot of things you can do with 2020, and we're going to talk about what the country will look like in 2020, domestically, and what our international position will be in 2020 if we don't start making some tough choices now.

And I think you have to have some who try to discern the future to help people understand that we can't continue the way that we are. You know humans don't like to change. I've been in the change management business in the private sector, the public sector, the not-for-profit—they don't like to change. And the more seasoned you are, typically the less likely you're going to want to change. But you're not going to be able to convince people to make tough choices unless you convince them that we're on what I call a burning platform—that the current path is unsustainable and unacceptable, and that the consequences of not changing are much worse than the pain that one will suffer through changing. No pain, no gain. Thank you. (Applause)