

Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church

Dr. Timothy L. Fort

November 8, 2008

**MARY ELLISON TYPING
PROFESSIONAL TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE
4312 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22304
(703) 823-3198
maryellison@hotmail.com**

REVEREND ROGER FRITTS: Good afternoon. We invite you to come on in and have a seat and we'll get started. Welcome to everyone. My name is Roger FRITTS. I am one of the ministers here at Cedar Lane Unitarian Universalist Church. And it's good to have everyone here. If you are visiting and you don't know about Unitarian Universalism, I'll be here after the program and be happy to answer any questions you may have about our church. I'd like to extend a special welcome to Knight and Anne Kiplinger from the Kiplinger family and to David Dougherty who is the Treasurer of the Kiplinger Foundation for coming today. It's good to have you. I'd just like to acknowledge that Todd Kiplinger who came to every one of these events for the past eight years died in October. And I remember very fondly the conversations he and I would have before these events and we will miss him. But we are glad that Knight and Anne are able to be here today.

Now for the formal introduction of our speaker, we have Betty May Cleary.

MS. BETTY MAY CLEARY: Good afternoon. Welcome to the eighth annual William M. Kiplinger lecture on Ethics in American Society. I'm the current chair of the

Kiplinger Committee for Ethics Education here at Cedar Lane. These lectures arose from a generous donation from the Kiplinger Foundation made in honor of Willard M. Kiplinger, an early member of this church. We're grateful to have the members of the family and from the Foundation here with us.

Today's speaker, Timothy L. Fort, has agreed to take questions from the audience at the conclusion of his remarks. Cedar Lane member, Susan Clark, will bring a portable microphone to those of you who indicate that you'd like to ask a question. After the lecture, we invite you to join us for a reception in the church lounge which is located on the right as you leave the auditorium. We will have available for purchase copies of Dr. Fort's recent book which he has graciously agreed to sign.

In presenting the Kiplinger Foundation gift to Cedar Lane in the year 2001, Mr. Kiplinger, Mr. Austin Kiplinger, wrote and I'm quoting, "As the world moves into an era of intermeshed societies, we must find ways to accommodate global commerce and human behavior with individual cultures and beliefs." Today's lecture, "How Ethical Business Practices Can Contribute to World Peace,"

suggests that commerce itself and the humans who move it have the potential to find ways to global accommodation and peace. Our speaker today is Dr. Timothy L. Fort who is Executive Director of the Institute for Corporate Responsibility at the George Washington School of Business where he is also the Lindner- Gambal Professor of Business Ethics. He is an academic advisor for the Business Roundtable Institute for Corporate Ethics and a Fellow at the William Davidson Institute. Dr. Fort is also a lecturer at the George Washington School of Law. He holds Bachelor and Masters Degrees from Notre Dame University and Ph.D. and J.D. degrees from Northwestern University. Dr. Fort's work has been recognized with numerous awards including a worldwide award for academic leadership by the Beyond Grey Pinstripes Report. His many publications include in 2007 a book, *Business Integrity and Peace*, and his recently released book, *Prophets, Profits and Peace*. He has also contributed to numerous business and law journals. Dr. Fort's writings on ethics extend beyond business concerns. Next year, Houghton Mifflin will be publishing *The Afterlife of Dogs*, a book written for children drawing on thoughts from the world's major

religions on the question, "Where does Scoobie go?"

[laughter] You can also look forward to publication of *How God Made Notre Dame Number One and Other Spiritual Truths We Learn by Watching Sports*. Please join me in welcoming Dr. Fort. [applause]

DR. TIMOTHY L. FORT: I tried real hard to let Betty have me give the lecture today about the afterlife of dogs, but it didn't seem to be quite fitting with the venue we have for today. I want to thank all of you for having me today, the members of the committee who invited me to come, the Kiplinger family for endowing this opportunity for lectures to come to talk about ethics in America and where we're headed in the future and topics along those lines. Some of you I was with during the luncheon period and I mentioned to them that I grew up on a little farm in west central Illinois where my father was the community lawyer, succeeding his uncle who had been a lawyer in the firm going back to 1925. And I practiced law there for five years after I got out of Northwestern Law School. And so, Betty very kindly gave you some of the work that I've done in my academic career and I suppose that given the awards and the books that I've written that it's okay for

me to be giving this presentation today. But I've got to tell you that part of me is still that little farm town boy in Western Illinois who's trying to figure out how the heck he ended up getting invited to give something called the Kiplinger Lecture. I mean, it's sort of an extraordinary thing. It would be an extraordinary thought back in my family that I would be here at this moment.

In fact, because he had this family tradition of practicing law in little Stronghurst, Illinois, the assumption was - and as I indicated I did go back and practice for a while - but that I would take over the family law firm. So during summers I would work for my dad. He believed that you start from the ground up, so I filed papers and I did correspondence and I cleaned out the garbage and stuff like that. But his clients all knew who I was and they had hopes that I was going to be succeeding my dad as their next lawyer. So fairly early on, even when I was in sixth and seventh grade, the clients would invite me back to have the session with my dad and have me present because they wanted to me to know how they ran their car business or how they ran their farm or their implement company. And so they wanted me to understand what the

business was, so when the time that I would be taking over, I was fully ready for it. And so I got to meet with a lot of clients at 12, 13 years old. And I remember there was one of them who came in and he always had the Kiplinger Letter with him. And I asked - and he would talk about it. He said, "Lyman" - that was my dad, Lyman - "you know the Kiplinger Letter is advising this and this." And I said, "Dad, what is this? What are they talking about?" And Dad told me about the Kiplinger letter. And the client said, "It's a really good letter, Tim. Why don't I bring in my old ones when I'm done with them?" And so about every week or so he would come in and he would - he had a collection of them - and he would give the letters for the Fort boy to read the Kiplinger Letter.

So, to me the Kiplinger Letter and the Kiplinger family - this goes way back. So that is why this morning when I woke up at 4:00 o'clock this morning [laughter], I said to my wife - I said, "You know, I have not been this wound up to give a presentation in years." [laughter] And I give a lot of presentations and a lot of lectures. And I was telling the story - I won't go into the whole story because it takes too long - but I got my first job teaching

because I happened to be a professionally trained singer, and a guy heard me sing and he had a need for a business law professor, so he could said, "I could clearly tell - I know you're a lawyer and I can clearly tell that you're comfortable in front of a group of people, so I figured you can probably teach." I mean, I'm pretty comfortable in front of an audience. That's not a problem. But this is kind of special. And so I thank you, really, for giving me the opportunity to do this. I'm really looking forward to it and I have been for a long time and I hope it meets the expectations. Another reason why I was up at 4:00 o'clock in the morning and that is you look at the line-up of people who have preceded me, it ain't a bad crowd to be with. [laughter] You guys have had some pretty good lecturers here and so I'm quite honored to be in their company as well.

Well, I give two sort of main presentations. One is a traditional business ethics kind of lecture. It lasts about an hour and ten minutes and we don't have time for that. Then there's the shorter one that really is focused on what I've been doing my research in for about the last ten years. And that is the ways in which business behavior

could actually contribute to peace. As I was going up for tenure back at the University of Michigan where I was for 11 years before I came here, I wanted to take tenure seriously and to ask questions that were big questions that you could fail at and still keep your job. I mean, that's what tenure is supposed to be. It gives you the freedom to ask questions, knowing that you're not going to get fired if you don't come up with a great answer. And the topic that I wanted to look at was whether business practices could end up leading to peace. Because I started to read as I was finishing up my first major book with Oxford University Press, *Ethics and Governance*, reading these works of anthropologists that were talking about attributes of relatively non-violent societies. And they were matching up with the exact organizational design that I had laid out as a way for businesses to be ethical - even major multi - nationals with thousands of employees, how they could be ethical in their business behavior. I thought, "That's interesting. The anthropologists are talking that this is an attribute of peace and I'm talking about this as being an attribute of business ethics. I wonder if there's a correlation." And that launched a ten-year effort - I'm

in my tenth year of it - of trying to make these connections, and it's produced three books two of them which will be in the back afterward, trying to ask this question.

So there's an ethics component to it. But the ethics component is leading to a specific tangible result which is the reduction of violence. Now before we get into that and before I get into - that's fine, that's fine, Lyn [slide manager] - but before I get into this particular slide, I've got to tell you - and I realize I'm preaching to the choir a little bit, but I'm looking through your list of lectures. I've noticed that this is the first time you've ever had anybody directly addressing business ethics per se. And my guess is that there's probably quite a few of you here that think that that is a quite appropriate, worthy topic. I'll bet there's a few people here who have had in the back of their mind or the tip of your tongue or have heard somebody else say something along the lines of, "Business ethics - now isn't that an oxymoron?" or "Well, I'll bet that's a short subject." Over the years, I've told people what I do - that I'm a business ethicist. And inevitably - I mean, every single time - people come up

with the same response, "Business ethics - isn't that an oxymoron, professor? What do the rest of your time?" I mean it happens every single time. And I wish that they would just come up with some new kind of a put down, so I could get some new kind of information or something, but it happens every single time, it seems like.

So, but it does open the door for me to talk a little bit more about my approach and why I do things the way that I do. And so I tell people, well, the first time - this will resonate a little bit with Betty's introduction - that the first thing that you have to realize in the way that I do this is that I'm a lawyer. You know, this always causes a lot of concern among the people that I'm talking with because aren't lawyers the ones who need to be learning about ethical behavior as opposed to the ones who are teaching about ethical behavior? And then I go a little bit further and Betty May didn't give you the specifics, but my Ph.D. is a pretty odd combination of theology as applied to business. And when I tell people that, I get many of the reactions that I just saw on several of your faces which is some think that that's pretty interesting, some think that that's a little bit perplexing, some - and

maybe I'm over-reading this a little bit, have a look of sympathy on their face. And perhaps, again, I'm projecting a little bit much, but I sort of wonder if they are having some degree of sympathy because they feel that I'm dealing with some fairly heavy psychological issues in trying to put together business, law, ethics, theology - and they may be right about that.

But it does then, open up the door even further to tell a story that I think captures quite well what I do and the way that I do it. It seems that there was a pope who died and went to heaven. He was met at the gates of heaven by St. Peter who said, "Well, would you like to see where you're going to spend the rest of eternity?" And the pope said, "Sure. That sounds like a great idea." So they hopped into St. Peter's little Jeep and they go buzzing around the city of heaven. Dotted the landscape of the city of heaven are all these pleasant but modest-looking little homes where people are living comfortably, but simply for all eternity. And the pope looks out at those and thinks to himself, "Well, those are nice. Those are pleasant. But I'll bet I have something a little bit better than that. I mean, after all, I was the pope." And sure

enough, just as he thinks that, St. Peter drives the Jeep up this long, winding road that goes up this big hill. And at the top of the hill, is this huge, glorious, beautiful mansion. And the pope is thinking, "I was right. This is where I'm going to spend all eternity." But St. Peter keeps driving the Jeep, goes back down the hill, stops the Jeep, and in the shadow of this glorious mansion is another one of these pleasant but modest looking little homes. And St. Peter gets out and points to it and said, "Well, here it is. Here's where you're going to spend all eternity." And the Pope is a little bit crestfallen at this. But then it dawns on him that he must be living in the shadow of a great saint. And so he asks, "In whose shadow am I spending all eternity?" And St. Peter responds, "Well, that's our lawyer." [laughter] The pope is outraged at this that he's living in the shadow of a lawyer for all eternity, and St. Peter responds to him, "Well, you've got to realize that up here, popes are a dime a dozen, but that's the only lawyer we've got." [laughter]

So I tell people, I'm still the same greedy, cynical lawyer I always was, I just have a long-term interest in real estate speculation and I'm hoping by doing

what I do, I get the big house when it's all said and done. You know, Betty May indicated that I have two degrees from Notre Dame, but oddly enough I'm not Catholic. But because I use a lot of natural law in my writing, I get invited to a lot of conferences of Catholic ethicists. They think it's kind of cool that someone's playing around with their material. And so I'm the token non-Catholic at these kinds of things. And I was telling that joke as a preface to a presentation I did - it's been about 12, 13 year ago - and one of the members of the audience, shot up his hand and reminded the audience that apparently the Catholic Church has canonized 75 lawyers as saints in its history.

[laughter] I hasten to point that out because I had a student back in Michigan about nine years ago who was absolutely infuriated with me for telling that joke because she thought it was rude and insensitive to lawyers.

[laughter] I didn't think that we'd reached the politically correct stage on lawyer jokes, particularly if you're one yourself. However, her husband was a lawyer and she thought that this was offensive to him and demanded an apology in front of 60 students which I refused to give. But I'm sure that in this audience, there has to be lawyers

or people who are children of, married to, parents of, significant others of - just to be sure that no one has their feathers ruffled, remember that 75 lawyers are saints. The guy who made the comment, though, and reminded the audience of how many lawyers had been canonized, did a go a step further. He said he read my paper before the presentation and that he was sure of something. And that was if there was another lawyer who was going to be admitted to heaven after his death, it wasn't going to be me. [laughter]

As you can probably already tell by the way I like to start off presentations - I really stress this with my classes a lot - the most natural way for people to talk about ethics is not to look at philosophical, legal or theological principles although I spend time, considerable time with all of those with my classes. The most natural way for people to talk about ethics is to tell stories - to tell stories, to read novels, to watch movies, to get a point to the story, a moral to the story. It brings people's affections - affections - out. It gives them an ability to identify what they think is good and it's something that they can remember which is why I start every

one of my classes with a requirement that students write a story about something that they saw in business that they thought was good. It's very hard for them to do. It's very easy for them to say, "That was bad." "That was bad." "That was bad." "That really made me mad." It's much more difficult to say, "There's something I would like to emulate, that I value, that I admire." Because now they've got a stake in the ground. It's not just saying what makes them mad. "This is the thing I would like to see me do." And then I show them the film version, the 1957 film version of Theodore Dostoyevsky's *The Brothers Karamozov* as a way to close the class, the story from a grand master, Dostoyevsky. By the way, if you haven't seen the film, you ought to if for no other reason than it was William Shatner's first film role. And so depending on your viewing habits, it could be Captain Kirk, priceline.com man or whatever. It's sort of interesting to see him as a twenty-something year-old monk, as Alexar Alouisha. But I think that story telling is a really critical way to get into a subject because it just sort of triggers a release of affections and emotions that are helpful to build on. So I'd like to tell you a few stories.

The first one is the saga of the mad Albanian. And I'm not being pejorative when I say that. He was angry. He was an angry Albanian. I was about - gosh, what is it? About 17 years ago. I was living in the Chicago suburbs and I was at church one day and there was an announcement from our minister who said that in Albania which was still Communist at the time, that there had been refugees that had been sneaking out of the country to go to the safe haven of Belgrade, and that the State Department had approved that if there was a U.S. family that would host for three months one of those refugees, give them a place to live for three months, either in their home or rent an apartment for them, teach them some English, help them with their immigration status stuff and to help them get a job, that they would approve them coming to the U.S. And my wife and I, we had a four-bedroom house. It was just the two of us. We were young and ignorant and thought what the heck. And so we said that we would do it. And so we had a 24-year-old Albanian who I will just name as Petrov. That is not his real name, but that is the name that I will use for him in order to protect his privacy. So Petrov came to live with us. Well, you know, it's

really interesting to learn about your culture - your own culture - when you have someone from outside come in and looking at it. I clearly remember one day I came home from work, and one of the better ways for him to improve his English was to watch television. I mean, it really is because you've got visual, you've got language. It really works pretty well. He said - I came home one day and he said, "Tim, on television today I see this sport. Strange, strange, sport. Two really, really big men and they go boom, boom, boom, boom!" I said, "Oh, you saw boxing." He said, "Oh, no, no. This was not boxing. This was something else." I said, "Ah, you saw professional wrestling." "Yes, professional wrestling! That's a very strange sport you have in this country." I was like, "Got to give you that." So, but Petrov told me - and we had independent verification of this - that from the time that he was one year old that any practicing of religion in Albania was punishable by death. And so he grew up without any - his family had traditionally been Catholic in a country that was about a third Catholic and two-thirds Muslim. But he had stories of people that would read a Bible and the next day were missing. And so I don't think

that he was making this up. So one night we were out after dinner, and he said, "Tim, who is God?" I thought, okay, this is going to be a long conversation. Let's roll up our sleeves and let's talk about this, your concepts of God and everything. We weren't twenty seconds into the conversation and he said, "I hate Muslims." I said, "Petrov, how do you hate Muslims? You don't even know who God is." He said, "I hate Muslims." I said, "But why?" He said, "Because I'm Catholic." I said, "What does it mean to be Catholic?" He said, "It means I hate Muslims." [laughter] I said, "But what is it about the Islamic faith that makes you have this strong visceral hatred?" "I hate them." And we went around and around for about an hour and a half. The Yugoslavia/Serbia war broke out shortly after that. And actually it made perfect sense to me after having that conversation with Famir - used his name, sorry - with Petrov that night. And but the interesting thing was at the end of the conversation, I said, "So Petrov, where did you work?" And he worked for sort of an agricultural harvesting group. And I said, "Who did you work with?" And he started naming. I said, "No. What were their religious identifications?" He said, "Oh, about half

Catholic, half Muslims." I said, "How did you like them?"
"They're all right."

Now that's a very slender reed to build much of a theory off of and I'm sure in Rwanda there are a lot of people that live together who find themselves killing each other shortly thereafter. But at the same time, if you want to build relationships with countries and peoples who are foreign to you, what are the options that you have to use? One of the options, I think, that you have is actually presented to us in a globalized economy where people have the ability to work together on business projects. Because business is a way to link people together that may not have ever been done otherwise.

There's a story of a company in Northern Ireland called Future Ways that intentionally hires half Catholics and half Protestants to work together. It's the first time that they've worked together at any time other than throwing rocks at each other. But they find out that they have a common thing that they're pulling together on - making money. Now as a business ethicist, I want to keep making money in it's sort of - in an appropriate moral context. But at the same time, business has the

opportunity to reach across borders. It has the opportunity to offer different people of different races, different religions, different customs, different ages the opportunity to do something together and it is a way to start to break down barriers. And Petrov's comment was a slender underpinning for what that might look like and I'm going to be talking about that with you for the next twenty, thirty minutes.

Second, several little vignettes from Baghdad and the research that I've been doing on peace through commerce over the years. One of the things that I've really valued about coming to Washington is that while Ann Arbor, Michigan is a wonderful town and a fabulous university, if peace through commerce is what you're interested in, you can't do better than having a position in Foggy Bottom because I can network with so many people getting a cup of coffee or whatever, and I've really valued that. And so I've gotten to know several people who have worked with the Pentagon and the Army in Baghdad to try to build businesses in Baghdad. And some of these stories come from them. One is that there was a fellow from the Department of Commerce who was sitting together with a Sunni and a Shiite who if

you listen to any news account are going to be compelled to kill each other within the first three minutes of interacting with each other, or at least that's what you are led to believe. And it took my friend Steve not very long to hear from each of them, "Look, I don't care what your belief is, if you can help me with my business, I want to get to know you." Or from a bit of a different perspective, is someone wandered through the Army's headquarters looking for - not headquarters, but, you know, one of their bases - and was interested in what the plan was for resurrecting the economy. And he said, you know, I get offers to plant roadside bombs all the time. I don't want to do them, but I'd get \$200 for it, and if I don't get \$200 for it, how am I going to feed my kids? These are anecdotal. I'll build in a richer theory here in a second. Third, the entrepreneur. There is - based on another individual in the sort of economic redevelopment program in Baghdad - a saying that when someone comes into Baghdad in order to figure out whether to invest their dollars in a business in the city - they have three questions. The first question is, "Does my cell phone work?" when they get off the airplane. Because if their cell phone works, they

can communicate with the outside world, they can made deals, they can move things around. The second is, "Does my ATM card work? Because if my ATM card works, I know that I have a banking system that I can move capital." And the third, "Is there a good hotel so that I can come in, have a place to stay and have meetings, do business, you know, a place to call home?" Those are very garden-variety kinds of businesses, but they do have an impact of developing an economic structure that would lead people more away from violence and toward peace, and I'm willing to bet, in fact, that I know that every culture, every religion in the world values peace. They may also at times say that we have to resort to war, but that's always an unpreferred alternative to a state of peace.

And so again, there's abilities for business very practically to build kinds of structures and contribute to societal developments that might end up achieving what I think everybody would agree is some sort of a moral ideal, of less killing, less bloodshed, less children dying in the street. So those are just a few vignettes.

A couple of others, the importance of rocks. It's not a bad idea when people stop throwing rocks around

and that's what happens, for instance, in Future Ways in Northern Ireland where they're working together rather than throwing rocks around. A great story, again, going back to the Middle East is when religions cooperate in carrying them. There is a legend - I believe that it is true - although I'm going to characterize it as a legend because I'm not absolutely sure of all the evidence for it, although I do include it in my book - that when the Codestone, the sacred stone that Abraham, the Prophet Abraham, brought to Mecca as within the Islamic tradition, it was - it is in a central place in Mecca and was sacred to many different religions at the time that the Prophet Mohammed was just forming Islam. It was falling into disrepair and so the question was, well, one, we're going to have to repair it, which they did. But then, after it was repaired, who was going to have the honor of taking the Codestone back to its sacred spot? And they started bickering. "Well, my religion's better than your religion. I should have the honor. And so the Prophet Mohammed, however, devised a compromise that they put the Codestone on a blanket and then each member of the religion leaders would take a part of the blanket and they would bring it

together back to the central area. So there's times when rocks and cooperating of religions in order to bring the rock to a sacred place, can be a good thing, too.

Or a third image for you. I'm sure that nearly everybody in this audience is familiar with the Ancient Greek myth of Sisyphus. Sisyphus was condemned to push a rock up a hill knowing that it would never get to the top of the hill and it would slide and roll back down to the bottom. And to the Greeks who believed that it was good or an essential part of humanity to achieve atylos, an ultimate goal, this was punishment. Albert Camus's commentary on it was that Sisyphus at least knows what he's supposed to do. [laughter] My friend and late colleague at the University of Texas, Robert Solomon, used to say that I give a particularly rosy interpretation of Camus, but Camus said that, "Look, he knows what he's to do. He's to push the rock. And he may not get it to the top of the hill," but then switching metaphors a little bit, "he knows that he's going to improve things by just pushing the rock." I don't want you as I talk to you in more detail about the evidence that I have uncovered, to connect ethical business practices and peace to walk out of here thinking that I'm

going to claim what we are going to have perfect world peace. I'm not running for the Miss Universe contest, and so I'm not looking for that, but I am saying that businesses can make things better than they otherwise would have expected. And if we encourage businesses to practice ethical business behavior, they'll have a bigger impact than any of us expected. Will it be perfect? Absolutely not. Will we have complete world peace? Absolutely not. Will we make things better than what they are? I think so. So, I think that what we have is business fostering peace is a new, perhaps surprising story. And it still has an unwritten ending. Lyn.

So, I want to talk for a second before I get to the evidence again to make sure that I'm not being interpreted as going too far. And as I've been talking, sort of wandering here for a little bit, let me stop and tell a little story of why I think this is important. About twelve years ago as a junior assistant professor at Michigan, I was going around doing the circuit of making presentations at different universities on my concepts and one year - I think it was 1996 or so - I did a presentation at University of Iowa and at Georgetown. And it was

basically the same presentation. But at the University of Iowa - (This was just on business ethics. It wasn't on peace. I hadn't even thought about that yet.) - the reaction at the University of Iowa was the model that I provided was just a sellout to big, corporate capitalism that wasn't going - what my model was wouldn't do anything to prevent the worst kind of corporate misbehavior. I was sort of startled by that. But okay, that's feedback. I need to hear this. So I give the same presentation at Georgetown about two months later. And the first question from one of the audience members, "Tim, when are you going to run up the red flag of Socialism because you're talking about a Communist revolution?" I was like, how can both of these be true - that it's a sellout to capitalism and it's a Communist revolution at the same time? Now it could be that I varied my emphasis so one came across one way or the other, but I really don't think so. But what it taught me was that people come to these kinds of subjects - of ethical behavior and business in particular - loaded with presuppositions of what it means. Is it good treatment of employees? No. It's about whether you're environmentally responsible. No. It's about whether you're attentive to

the religious sensibilities of the country in which you're working with. No. It's whether you violated a strict corporate governance regime that's been proposed by Sarbanes Oxley. I mean, people - you say the word and it means a lot of different things. And so I want to be very careful of what I'm arguing here in order to try to avoid any kind of misapprehension. One has to acknowledge that businesses in some ways are the worst institutions to be asking in order to promote peace. I mean, don't they sometimes exploit local populations with sweatshop labor or abusive behavior, take money out of a country? Don't they sometimes try to dominate local cultures and take away natural ways of life and replace them with a western or a corporate way of life? And haven't we all been warned enough of the military industrial complex that presumably runs everything?

On the other hand, as I was indicating before, businesses might be the right institutions because they can cross borders. They can find mutual ways for people to work together. Most businesses benefit from peace, not war. One of the speakers at a big conference that I am hosting next week that I would like to invite you to - and

I'll have more information about that or a website for it - next Thursday through Saturday - one of my speakers is an entrepreneur from Australia, Steve Kalalia who claims to be the largest source of foreign direct investment from Australia outside of the Australian government. And he developed in conjunction with *The Economist* Intelligence Unit - you know, *The Economist* Magazine and their intelligence unit that they use in order to do country ratings - what he calls the global peace index. And so he's even developed an identification of the peace industry - of businesses that thrive with peace as opposed to war. Think about it and they're no surprise - the tourism industry, how benefitted is that by war environments? Not very much. Commercial aviation. And then he goes down the list of all kinds of other industries. Most industries benefit from peace rather than war. And so there really is an inherent reason for business to be concerned about this, and it becomes essentially a kind of track-two diplomacy. Track-two diplomacy is the unofficial interaction of parties outside of government, a government kind of interaction, that tries to promote more favorable relationships between the countries. Think of the old

ping-pong democracy of Richard Nixon, you know, how do we build relations with China? Let's send some ping-pong players over and let them play, so that they get to know you. I mean, it's the musical exchanges and things like that. And so it's not just any business that is going to foster peace. It's going to be a particular kind of business, one that brings with it a lot of economic benefits, but also does things so that it avoids exploitation and cultural insensitivity. And so in my model, it's a particular kind of business, an ethical business, that leads to peace and steers you away from war.

Now the evidence that I'm about to provide to you. I want to talk just for a second about burdens of proof, particularly those of you who are lawyers, I know that this will resonate with you. But, you know, as a lawyer, depending on the case that you have there's a different burden of proof. If it's a criminal case, you have to prove your case beyond a reasonable doubt. If it's a civil case, you have to prove your case with a preponderance of the evidence which is how both - although I don't think they were - but both O.J. Simpson verdicts could have been right. Was the case proved beyond a

reasonable doubt? Maybe not. Glove didn't fit. Or in the civil case, was there more evidence that he did it other than not? Probably so. There's also something known as a prima facie case which is a case that before you even take it to the jury, it has to be good enough to actually seem plausible, seem to make sense, seem to be worth the time for a jury or a judge to consider. That's where we are. I do not have a definitive case to present to you that ethical business behavior will product peace. But what I will suggest to you in a second is there is an awful lot of evidence that seems that those two are positively linked together. And my challenge to my fellow academics is to drill down on the empirical research in order to refine exactly what those relationships look like. Lyn.

So, that actually has happened. The idea of economics and trade being connected is a long standing one. Presidents from both parties have been talking about economics and trade for a long time. Kant and Montesquieu talked about the benefits of the commercial republics and how those seemed to be more peaceful. But the idea of specific businesses and specific business practices is pretty new. When I started looking at this research ten

years ago, about the only thing that was out there was a small book by Jane Nelson, then at the Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum and now at Harvard's Kennedy School of Government, and Virginia Hawthorn at the University of Maryland. They were sort of almost wondering, you know, what businesses could do. The U.N. Global Compact was starting to talk about these issues too right about that time about eight, nine years ago. And then a colleague of mine in Michigan, Cindy Scapani and I started to host a series of conferences and write that first book together where we tried to put the evidence together that there seem to be links between business and peace. Since we started that ten years ago, there's been more than ten conferences around the country that I know of - maybe more than that - there may be more than that - at least five special journal issues and multiple panels like at academic meetings of the Academy of Management or the Academy of Legal Studies and Business, things like that. There's been multiple solely authored books. I've got two solely authored, one co-authored and then there's about another six or seven edited books, all trying to explore this. What we have seen is a birth of a new field in academia - looking at business and

peace. And I'm going to claim sort of fathership of this, because it just didn't exist at the time. And it's like watching my child that's growing up at this point.

Next week, if you want to take a look at www.peacethroughcommerce.com, you will see information about a conference that I'm hosting down at G.W., a three day conference, that is bringing to bear the best research that has been done on it as well as some business people who are actually talking about how they go about doing it as well as some people from the Department of State and the U.S. Institute of Peace talking about how they partnered with businesses in order to do that. Lyn.

So this has become a field. Now I realize that that slide is a little bit mind-boggling. And even illegible. It really isn't too worrisome whether you know about that or not because the red stuff that's the most illegible, I'm not going to cover anyway. [laughter] However, in a shameless, shameless act of self promotion, if you want to read more, look for the green book out there, the *Business Integrity and Peace* because this slide is the green book. And the red part in here I won't go into now, but it basically - that's much better; thank you

Roger - basically talks about the ways that anthropologists and primatologists have studied the way that primates, chimpanzees as well as throughout human history, hunter/gatherer societies and pre-industrial societies have tried to fashion their societies in a way to foster peace. So my argument is this idea that peace is deeply rooted in our bones and that we have specific techniques literally in our bones and our genes of the ways that we go about doing them, of putting things together. And so if you want to read more about that, there's a way to do that.

But what I'd like to focus on is sort of three kinds of what I call value clusters that are in every human being, in every non-human animal anyway - this is drawn from the research of William Frederick, a friend of mine at the University of Pittsburgh. They're called power-aggrandizing, ecologizing, and economizing. Power-aggrandizing is the natural inclination for creatures to compete for being the pride of the lions - the head of the pride of the lions, the most important, most powerful lion. Or in human terms, the fellow or the woman who has the corner office in the law firm - the really most powerful person. And we quest for that, we compete for that, we

want to be the top dog. We just saw two years of people wanting to be the top dog, and the amount of energy and money they put into wanting to be that, and part of that is that you want to do good for society, but part of it is that you want to be the top dog. You want to be in the Oval Office. And so there's the quest for power and the allocation of power. It's much - it's about what power - be thinking in terms of power. The economizing is the way in which we convert natural substances in order to give us the energy to keep going. At a most level, this is what photosynthesis and metabolism is about. Some of my colleagues have said that businesses are the metabolism of society. Businesses take natural resources and convert them into things that we can use in order to run our lives whether that's energy, whether that's food, whether that's consumer products. They are the ones that take the natural stuff and convert into useable forms that we want. So there's an economizing level, too. And an ecologizing level is community - the sense - and it could be ecological sense of community, the mutual dependencies that creatures have in the natural world in order to be able to survive.

And so those are at the very top, those three

levels. And if you drill down - and then the red is how I show how various primatologists and anthropologists have characterized how those three value clusters play out in specific kinds of institutions in those worlds. But I wanted to start getting into the orange and the yellow. Walter Mead is a political theorist who has differentiated three kinds of power. This is just in terms of foreign affairs. This has nothing to do with ethics. This is in terms of foreign affairs - sharp power, sticky power and soft power. What's sharp power? Guns, tanks, bombs - that you're able to project those things in order to get people to do what you want them to do. That's sharp power. What's sticky power? Sticky power is the economic institutions that bring people together and bring your way of doing - of living in the world to other people as well. And once you're into that, it's sort of hard to get out of it - once you're in the free market, it's hard to get out of the free market. And so there's sticky power. And then there's soft power which is the power of ideas - Joseph Nye's idea of soft power, the power of ideas that compel people to think a different way, compel them to live their lives in a different way. So that's within foreign

relations. And it actually matches up with this naturalistic material that I have worked with and it ends up also then being the way completely independently, that I approached business ethics.

Skip this Fort Scaconi for a second, but in terms of business ethics, I basically use a model that I call trust. The reason that - a reason why you trust a business is because of different things that it does. One, it - what I call hard trust - it obeys the laws. And so you trust a business because you know that if it doesn't obey the law, that someone will get after them, someone will prosecute them. That could be even in terms of public opinion, too. If you've got bad enough public opinion so that you are forced, like sharp power, forced to do something in order for people to repose trust in you. The second is what I call managerial alignment or real trust which is the good ethics is good business argument. There's a lot of studies out there - and studies of the studies - that show that there is a weak correlation between ethical business behavior and profitability - that if you're ethical, you're more likely to be profitable - weak correlation. There are lots of exceptions. You can

also be a jerk and make a lot of money, too. But it really becomes a choice. If somebody says, "I have to be unethical in order to make money," the response is, "No, you don't." There are different choices. I had a very spirited conversation with a group of MBA students about eight years ago at Michigan where they got latched onto Hooters. They said, "You know, sex sells. And because sex sells, if you're going to be successful in the restaurant business, you got to go to the Hooters way." I said, "Now think about that for a second. That makes no sense. Yes, sex can sell, but there's a lot of restaurants that don't have women in very skimpy costumes that do reasonably well. And so it's a choice. You can chose to run it the Hooters way, or you can chose to run it some other way, too. And so you're not forced to be ethical nor are you forced to be unethical. It's a choice that you can have.

So this is - good ethics is good business. It's whether you've got alignment between what you say you're going to do and what you actually do. Give you a couple examples because I realize that's a little esoteric. And fortunately, we're in the middle of the afternoon, so none of you just had or are going to be eating soon. Well, it's

not Starbucks, but I teach a class, a class called the bug infested cookie case where there was - it's a real case - that there was a department store in San Francisco - you know, kind of a Macy's, Marshall Fields, Hudson's kind of a thing. And they had a gourmet food section. They found that with imported cookies sealed and wrapped from England, they found that some of them had bugs in them. And so a recent MBA graduate was wondering to her boss what she should do with them. And her boss said, "Well, we're going to need to get rid of them." The MBA graduate said, "Well, yeah. What should I do? Should I throw them away?" And she said, "Oh, no, no, no, no, no. We're not going to throw them away. I know of a convenience store in the Inner City of Los Angeles that we can take them to and get a little bit of money back on our dollar." Now, there's a whole bunch of things that are problematic with that.

[laughter] But from a certain, twisted standpoint, it made all the sense in the world. And the reason it made sense was that manager's compensation was based on a formula of profitability per square foot. And so - and her future allocation of square footage that she controlled was the same formula. So while the company said - I'm sure that

the company would say, "We don't want you to sell bug-infested cookies," all of the incentives were for her to do that which is why business ethics isn't just about personal integrity and hiring the right people. Those are important things, don't get me wrong. But it's also how you set up the incentives in your organization for rewarding people for doing what you think is the right thing to do. That's what I call real trust - that people trust you because you thought this thing out, and you walk the talk. When something goes wrong even though it's going to cost you money, you back it up and you do the right thing. And then good trust which is the inspirational leadership which is where you don't have to do anything, you're not obligated to do anything, but you've got a new way of thinking. You've got a new way of saying, "We're going to come up with a new level of behavior." And so you trust someone because you know that they're committed to a higher standard of behavior. So that's the way that I've been thinking about business ethics for a long time. And it pretty well summarizes the field.

Now, let me move back to the middle and then I can get to the final slide and then we can get some

questions and answer, although this will take a while for me to get through because this is the point. This is really the point of all this. Cindy Scapioni and I said that what is it that business can do in order to contribute to peace? Again, deriving out of all these things, three things. One - I'll start in the middle - economic development. Both the United Nations and the World Bank have done studies that show a correlation between poverty and violence. Two reasons that are given typically for that - one is those countries where there's a lot of poverty the quest for resources is so severe you may have to resort to violence in order to obtain them. Second reason is that countries that have lots of poverty also have lots of unemployment. And so unemployed individuals like the roadside bomber that I was talking to you about are particularly susceptible to the overtures of others who will give them money to do some sort of a violent thing in order to promote their cause. So, business is doing what businesses do - create jobs, be profitable. Some ethicists really like to attack profitability. I think it's not a bad scorecard. You know, there's something to be said - you've got to stay in business. And I don't think there's

anything inherently wrong with profitability per se. I don't think it's the only thing you can look at, but I think it's a reasonable thing to look at. And businesses do what businesses do best - shift countries away from poverty particularly if they can do it outside of an extractive context. The World Bank has also done a study that one of the best predictors for a Civil War is if the main export product of a country is an undifferentiated commodity - oil, timber, diamond. Because then the whole game is who has control of that geographical location where that commodity is located? And so I tell my MBAs, if you go into a country and you provided a differentiated sort of a market - differentiated sort of a product - you are shifting it away from all of the indices that show that it's more likely to promote violence. You are doing that whether you know it or whether you don't. And so, that's one thing businesses can do.

Secondly, go over to that side, your left. What I call external evaluation of corporate actions. This is rule of law stuff. And particularly, I want to focus on corruption for a second. Now, given my background as a J.D. and a Ph.D. in Theology, I can't do an empirical study

to save my soul. I mean, if my daughter's life depended on doing a regression analysis, I'm afraid the poor child would die. I mean, it's just not what I - I can't do it. But I did one study. It's one very, very simple study and it seems to hold up with other people who specialize in this. I took the corruption perception index that Transparency International does every year where it lists the countries that are perceived to be the most corrupt, and then I matched it against an index from the Heidelberg Institute and particularly a peace research - in particular, this index that they call the Cosmo Index that looks at how particular countries resolve disputes in their country between the government and an organized group. So we're not talking about crime, but we're talking about organized opposition to a government - and whether it's done violently or non-violently. And then I did a comparison. And what I found was that there is a perfect correlation between those countries on a quartile basis - those countries that are the least corrupt resolve disputes by violence 14 percent of the time, next least corrupt, 26 percent of the time, next least corrupt or second most corrupt, 44 percent of the time, most corrupt, 60 percent

of the time. Now, those are correlations. There could be a third, underlying cause that explains both of them.

But if you think about it, in order to maintain a highly corrupt government, you're probably going to have to resort to some sort of violent mechanisms in order to keep the system going. People just aren't going to cooperate with you. If you get all the money and they don't get anything, there's probably going to be some violence in order to undergird that. And second, people get angry. People get angry when they see inherent corruption. And so there are flash points.

So here's a concrete thing the corporations can do. The corporations say, "Oh, this is great esoteric, philosophical theory that you've got here, Tim. What can we do about that?" I said, "Have a strong anti-bribery code." Now that may not solve the problem, but it'll probably move you along the line because at least it will give you a backbone for the employee who is being told by someone they're negotiating with, "I will only do the job if I get a bribe." And the employee can say, "I'd love to give you a bribe. It would make me the happiest boy in the world to give you a bribe, but you know what, I'll get fired if I

do." The auto companies have been onto this for years. And so you transfer it not to, "No. I think you're a wrong, corrupt scum in order to ask me that" - that's probably not friendly - but it says "I'd like to do it, but I can't do it." And you're not going to solve all the questions, but you're going to move things away. And so - and the less corrupt you are, the less violence there is.

This goes - similarly there are studies that will show - and you can see more of these in the book - in terms of copyrights, contract rights, dispute resolution mechanism. If there is some external, third party way in order to resolve things, that leads away from violence.

And then the last one, the community dimension. It's sort of my favorite one actually. Community dimension is both whether the company is a good corporate citizen, where they are located, and this is the usual corporate citizenship stuff, you know, you're respectful to the community, you're environmentally friendly, you're fair to the people that you're working - wherever it is.

The more interesting one to me is the internal dimension. When companies set themselves up as a community themselves - and there's dimensions of that. Now, again,

I'm not saying that you just wholesale go in and practice all of these wherever you are, but one dimension, there are clear correlations between gender and violence - that the more there is gender equity, the more those countries are nonviolent. Now, I'm not saying that when you're expanding into Saudi Arabia that you go in and you say that we're going to practice this way with perfect gender equity. You may not get anywhere. But at the same time even if you can't get anywhere on that issue, you probably can get someplace on better treatment of women, more fair treatment of women, more protection of women from harassing kinds of behavior. All those are steps along the way of gender respect - clear correlations that the more you've got respect for both genders, you shift away from violence.

Or voice. There are lots of studies that show that Democratic countries don't go to war with each other. Democratic countries may go to war with a lot of other non-democratic countries, but they don't typically go to war with each other. One of the reasons - and this is a really complex area and I spell it out in more detail - but one of the reasons that's given for that, is that if people in the community have voice to speak up when there is something

that they'll be affected by, they feel more empowered and that tends to shift you away from violent alternatives.

Well, you know, there's a lot of contemporary management strategies that are taught by the very best business schools that say if you want to produce quality products and have return sales, you need to equip your employees with the ability to speak up if they see a product defect. That's voice. And I'm trying to get an empirical friend of mine to chase down whether there is a potential spillover effect of companies that go into countries practicing these - I'm not talking about corporate democracy, but I am talking about the ability of individuals to speak up when they see a defect. See if there's a connection between that and the kinds of political institutions that spring up around it. We've got some anecdotal evidence, but it's so scattered that there's not much that you can do with it at this point. Human rights, what I call mediating institutions of whether you've got people that can feel a bonding of community when they go to work - all those things anthropologists tell us are attributes of non-violent societies.

The interesting thing is - so we've got three

things - economic development, external evaluation and building a sense of community both internally and externally. Those are confirmed as being attributes from anthropologists and political economists that lead toward peace. They also represent generally accepted ethical advice to businesses of how to practice your business. Avoid bribery, give voice to your employee, respect their rights, be a good corporate citizen, be environmentally responsible, don't be corrupt, make your profit. These are not off-the-wall things. And so my argument is that corporations don't have to change all that much. They do have to change, but they don't have to change all that much. What they need to do is to more seriously practice the ethical business behavior that everybody, both business leaders and academics and everybody else say are good ethical practices. So by doing this, I get myself out of the hole of - well, which ethical philosopher is right? I don't care! What I care about is what the evidence suggests are things that lead away from bloodshed. I'm happy with that. And if we know what those things are and they happen to match up with common sense, consensus-based ethical values, I think we just made a lot of progress. So

it gets us out of the whose ethicist is better, whose religion is better? I'm just talking about practicing the things that makes it less likely for a kid to have his head blown off. I think you can get some consensus that most people think that that's a problem. And if they see it's a problem and they're convinced by the evidence, then they'd be more likely to practice ethical business behavior which would then in a virtuous cycle may lead to more peace which will then lead to more ethical behavior and things get on their own. Lyn.

There's one more slide after this, but I'll go real fast on this. Some sequels. There's a lot of work to be done. This is a plausible argument. But there's a lot of things that a lot of people need to do. One - I'll start with my own folks, the academics. One of the reasons that I'm doing *Afterlife of Dogs* and *How God Made Notre Dame Number One* is that I've sort of said what I came to say. And now that I've got a whole bunch of people that are really working with us and sort of inspired this new academic field, I'd like to just sit back and see what they come up with. Because it's time for those skills of empirical researchers, not a conceptual thinker like me.

I've got the concept pretty well out there that's been pretty much unchallenged to date. It will be challenged at some point and it should be, but, you know, right now it's a working hypothesis that people have. And so academics need to drill down on the empirical research. They need to develop case studies. There are some out there and in the question and answer - if you want to have some, I can give you some case studies on that. But the case studies are going to have to be a little bit different.

The biggest problem with this area with these first two points, is that no company is so big to be able to bring peace to the country where it's located. You're only going to have a small, incremental effect. Walmart, no matter how big and powerful Walmart is, is not going to create peace in Somalia. It's still just a company. And you're going to be able to have incremental change, but it's going to be very tough to actually measure what that change is. And that's going to be something that challenges all the academic research on this. And then I think that we have to build this more into our curriculum and certification and we've actually got some pretty good steps going on that. I think businesses need simply to

make business people aware that there could be a connection - most of the business people that I talk to - first they look at me like I am a failed contestant for the Miss Universe Contest of yes, I want world peace. And then they look at me as a failed 60s hippies liberal and I was too young for the hippy movement at the time, too. And so I'm not that either. I said, "I'm serious. And here's the evidence." Then they stop and they take a broad look and they say, "You're really serious about this. And I can sort of see it." And we're just at the very beginning of really introducing this. This has been percolating in academic fields and I've just finally gotten the academic energy on this off and going.

We've got a lot of work of businesses just sort of hearing this, thinking about this, seeing how it's in their benefit and then telling their stories, their new stories. NGOs - NGOs are the great connectors and accountants. They connect people together - businesses and other NGOs and academics and government and things like that. They're also what I call accountants. One of the things that has made an impact on corporate responsibility more than anything in the last ten years are these. Where

out of your pocket, you can pull a video camera on your cell phone and take pictures and post them on the internet of what the corporation is up to. And so that is one big reason why corporations have big corporate social responsibility offices these days. And so NGOs have been the leaders of doing that. And then government. The Secretary of State has an interesting award (It was started by Madeline Albright who spoke at my first conference at Michigan on this topic seven years ago. It's been continued by Colin Powell and Condoleezza Rice so it's got a bipartisan field.) where it specifically recognized corporate behavior that is so good that it's helped diplomatic relations between the U.S. and that country. And there's lots of other things. So modeling that behavior, rewarding that behavior - there may be some issues of reforms like litigation reforms. For instance, one of the reasons that U.S. companies have given for not wanting to sign up for the U.N. global compact, in being one of the corporations, is that they're afraid of being sued - that if they commit to the principles of the global compact and fail or are perceived to have failed, that they may be subject to a lawsuit. And in our litigious-happy

society, they therefore won't join. That's at least the story that's been given. And so there could be some reforms that are out there that are important. I think actually that the Justice Department in terms of enforcing things like the Federal Sentencing Guidelines which ask corporations not to just comply with the law but to develop, quote "ethical cultures," or organizational cultures that lead to ethics and compliance. Same with the Securities and Exchange Commission. To the extent that they are enforcing and encouraging business ethics, the impact then follows. So you don't necessarily have to win all your business hearts by the fact that we're going to contribute to peace, just make them ethical. And the more you can create these organizational cultures, that will, I believe, then lead to the other teleological end of peace. Lyn, now we're ready for the last one.

I'd like to submit to you we are at the baboon moment. Robert Zupulski is a Stanford anthropologist who wrote an article in *Foreign Affairs* about two years ago about the "baboon moment." I make a little bit different use of his evidence, but it's a story worthy of repeating. Zupulski was studying a group of apes - I'm trying to think

of the specific kind of primate it was, but I'll just leave it at ape at this point - called the Forest Troop. The Forest Troop lived on the outside of a tourist camp where people would come for an outdoors experience. And, of course, they'd throw their garbage away. And the apes would just feast on this garbage. Now, the Forest Troop's leadership hierarchy was a bunch of really aggressive alpha males who would fight each other for the food and not share it with the other members of the troop. Then tuberculosis ran through the Forest Troop and killed all the alpha males - tuberculosis that came from the humans that threw away their food and then went through the Forest Troop. So all the alpha males died. What then happened was that the hierarchy, the leadership of the Forest Troop, devolved to the females of the group and the less aggressive males. They didn't become more aggressive. They were engaged much more in food sharing, in cooperation and got rid of the alpha male syndrome. Well, apparently - I never knew this - but apes, the male apes, circulate with other groups of apes. Probably some instinctive avoidance of incest or something like that. So they circulate to other apes. So a new group of apes came in, alpha males, came in. And one

might say, "Well, okay, there was a one off - you had a bunch of apes die and so the others just took over and did what they normally did. One would expect then, when the new alpha males come in, that they're just going to reassert being an alpha male. That's what they are. Not what happened. What happened was that they adapted to the culture that had now been established of food sharing and cooperation as opposed to the alpha male kind of seizing and fighting. And it has continued according to Zupulski for an ongoing period of time. So he says, "Baboons change." Why did I think of apes when I've got on the slide, "the baboon moment." [laughter] So "the baboon moment" - these baboons - as he says, the culture changed. But you think that apes and baboons are going to be the same. No they don't. They change. It's malleable. So the same thing happens with countries. So if you look through history, Sweden and Switzerland weren't quite so pacific as they are now. They were rather violent. Germany and Japan look a lot different than they did 70, 80 years ago. And he says, "Baboons change. Countries change." It's a matter of changing your culture and it's within the ability of those populations to do it. They did

it.

So my argument is if a baboon can do it, why can't a corporation? Seriously. If baboons can figure it out, then I think that corporations can do it too. And I think as I indicated, I'm not asking for a wholesale change of business organizations. I'm asking for businesses to promote ethical business behavior with a specific kind of ethical business behavior that's correlated with peace. And if they do that, we will have more ethical businesses, and I think that we also will reduce the amount of violence that we have in our society today. Thank you for your time and attention. I welcome any questions. [applause]

MS. SUSAN CLARK: Thank you very much. As Betty May told you at the beginning, I will come around with a microphone to people who put up their hands and indicate that they have questions. And I try to do some sort of geographic distribution. I'll start over here.

MS. : I understand that within different religions there are different concepts about what's ethical in terms of, for example, charging interest and that in Muslim cultures you don't charge interest, or - I don't think you charge interest at all, and yet in

Christian cultures, it's considered to be ethical. And I'm just wondering in terms of the model of people from different countries and different cultures getting together and work together on business enterprises. What role does the fact that there are these differences in business culture - people with different religious backgrounds - what role does that have to play in all this?

DR. FORT: That's a great question. Thanks. Well, that's the Yale book. That's the blue book back there - *Profits with the "ph," Profits with an "f," and Peace*. That's the name of it. And one of the things that I do in the first chapter - I used to teach a course at Michigan on comparative religions and business. And so we went through six major religious traditions over time. And then the students were supposed to write papers on instances where religion bumped up against business. And the argument is - and the argument in the first chapter is whether you like it or not, businesses have to deal with people who have religious sensibilities. And it's important to them. And so you're going to have to deal with them. Interest is one of those because, you're right, that in Islamic cultures you're not supposed to charge interest whereas in, you

know, western cultures, it's the norm. If you drill a little bit deeper, you will find that when Islamic banks - they'll partner with the real estate developer or something like that or a home owner and there will be a partnership division so that there will be an amount that flows back to the bank and an amount that is the individual's. And it closely approximates what you would expect to be the amount that would be captured by an interest rate. And so the form is different. The form is - and I don't want to say, well, you're just doing the same thing in a different name. I don't want to do that because I do think it's a different concept, a partnering understanding as opposed to a debtor/creditor relationship. And those are different kinds of relationships. But at the same time, when you drill down, they're not quite as far apart as what you might think. And so I think that - I had a paper that was sent to me - I can't remember the fellow's name - from a university over in Indonesia about two years ago with a fascinating concept. And I talked this with the State Department, too. And they're - I'll tell you maybe a little bit later of a project they're doing with State - that argues that the western ideas of corporate social responsibility really

don't connect with Islamic tradition. However, if you look at the principles of Islam, they're very similar to what corporate social responsibility is. It's a different language and a different starting point. One starts with the individual and what responsibility that they may have is extended philosophically. The other with Islam is that Allah is present everywhere. And if Allah is present everywhere, then you need to acknowledge Allah's presence in the employer, in the customer, in the environment. And so he argues that actually he thinks that - I'm not sure if I'm quite ready to go as far as he is, but it's an interesting premise. He argues the corporate social responsibility/Islamic business is a connecting point between western tradition and Islamic tradition that would foster a much greater degree of social harmony. Now it's a fascinating - and I want to drill down with that because, I mean - it's a fascinating idea. But - and that's very much his departure point. Things that sound very different, once you drill down on them, you can find a meeting ground or a partnering place. Now, the premise of my book, the Yale book, is that if you have businesses that are committed to this idea of practicing in a way that would be

peaceful using those exact criteria that I gave you earlier, that they will inevitably then be places that are open for the kinds of discussion between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland or Muslims and Catholics in Albania that would then foster more religious tolerance, which is why the subtitle of the book is about religious tolerance. And so I really think that if we think through this that there is a way that corporate responsibility can be a way for those two otherwise cultural perspectives that are having a lot of trouble interacting with each other constructively these days to find perhaps some degrees - not always - you're never going to have complete - but ways to find some common ground.

MS. SUSAN CLARK: All right. I saw this one first. Then I'll be looking for one from the other side of the room, and I'll get back to you, because I saw you too.

MS. : I wanted you to comment a little bit more on the role of regulation. You touched on it, I think, but in order to curb excess appetites of corporations.

DR. FORT: Okay. Yeah. The other lecture that I do - what I call "Total Integrity Management," which if you

notice, that's a very serendipitous acronym for me to be able to use - TIM - that is three kinds of trust - hard trust, real trust, good trust. And the hard trust is I put on my lawyer hat and I say, look, you need to comply with the law - both comply with the law and also to have clear corporate policies to tell people what's expected of them when they come into business.

I had a very good friend at the University of Texas, Robert Prentice, who after the Enron debacle, there were all these calls for more ethics education in the business schools. He said, "Ethics education? We don't need ethics education. There wasn't ethical impropriety here. They just flouted the law." And so he said, "There's no philosophical issue here. They just ignored the law." And so I do think that there is a strong role for regulation because in many instances, it's the power of regulation either through law, or through cell phone public opinion that I was talking about either, that gets businesses to behave. I mean, sometimes, to draw on the wisdom of my grandfather who was a carpenter back in Stronghurst, Illinois, you have to hit somebody upside the head with a two by four in order to get their attention.

And sometimes you've got to do that. Sometimes you've got to whack them around and say, "Know what? You're going to jail if you do that." And so I think that there is a dimension of that that is important, but it's not the only part. Because if it is, then everybody just says, "I obeyed the law. What more do I need to do?" And the problem is what if the problem - too many problems here - the difficulty is what if the problem isn't fully addressed by the law? Because the law is always imperfect. It's always either over broad or under broad and there are too many exceptions. And that's where you get into the - what kind of a reputation do you want and what kind of an inspiring thing do you want to be? But I certainly would say - give you a very - it takes me back to another farm story and you've had enough of those. I'll just say that I think it is really critical for companies to tell people who come in from all different parts of the world with all different traditions and customs - these are the rules if you want to work here. Sexual harassment has had a real problem with that over the years because different countries have very different expectations. You go some countries and you're going to be hugged and hugged and

hugged. And if you do that in the U.S., you're going to get sued and sued and sued. [laughter] And so, I mean, you need to be clear what's allowed and what's not allowed. And so I think that there is an important point both for government regulation of business and for business to be clear of the codes of conduct that are appropriate within the business organization. But then there's more beyond that.

MR. : I'd like to ask you a question about national champions. And I know you're a sports fan, so you'll quickly get the metaphor. I'm thinking of Air Bus and I'm thinking of Boeing. And you're speaking about subjects that are near and dear to my heart because I served at our embassy in New Delhi and as you know, the Indian government and the national air carriers compete for purchase of new aircraft. We regulate in the United States in a piece of legislation called the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, the behavior of American-based corporations. Now the French have a somewhat different attitude about business practices that Air Bus can engage in in overseas markets. My friends at Boeing thought that this was definitely to their disadvantage in competing in India. So

I guess my question turns on the ethical business practices that we would like to see are not universally enforced because we don't have a universal enforcement mechanism. And as long as national governments believe in supporting their national champions, I think we have a slight dilemma. But I'd very much enjoy hearing your comment.

DR. FORT: Okay. Great. It's a great question. I was wondering where the national champions was - but I get it now. There are several responses on that. One is that I early on discovered that what my students wanted was a way to be ethical in business that was easy. I want to be ethical in business, but you know what? I want to be sure that I don't lose anything as a result. And unfortunately - this is one of the reasons I show Karamazov at the end because Dostoyevsky is a master at showing how messy life is. And so I think the first response is that if you're going to follow the Corrupt Practices Act or a series of ethical edicts that you think are important, you may have to work harder and be a lot more creative and sometimes you'll still lose. And so I think that that's one response. Second response is that there are studies that show that on the whole, U.S. businesses believe that

following the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act ends up being better for them in business. Now, you certainly can come with the specific time where it is costly. I mean, those undoubtedly, happen. But on the whole, it gives them - they feel that it gives them - more credibility around the world of people trusting what they're going to be doing.

A quick anecdote. Bob Galvin who's the retired chairman of Motorola, and he came into my class to speak to the class when I was adjunct professor back at Loyola University in Chicago - on his birthday - I was impressed with that. It was an evening class and he came in. And he told a story and he told this story in other places, too, where when he was a young rising executive at Motorola, they were bidding for a telecommunications contract in South America. His assistant came to him and says, "Look, we got the job, but we have to pay another million dollars to the foreign affairs officer in order to sign it up. What do you want me to do?" And Galvin said, "One, we will not pay it." He said, "Two, negotiations are now off. And three, you will tell that individual that there will be no further negotiations as long as the current regime is in power." And I throw that out to my class, they say, "This

guy was stupid." But Galvin's argument - Galvin wasn't particularly a stupid guy. His argument was, "One, it violates" - this was before Foreign Corrupt Practices Act. He said, "One, it's against our beliefs to bribe. Second, if we pay this bribe, there's going to be another bribe down the road. And so we're never going to get off this. It will be one after another." And he said, "We could, I suppose, say, no, we'll still do the deal but we won't pay the bribe." He said, "But that won't help because everybody will assume that we paid the bribe to get the bid. And, of course, everybody's going to deny that they paid a bribe even if they did. And so our denial that we didn't pay the bribe is going to say, yeah, right. And so the only way that we can get out of this is to not negotiate with that government further." And so, they lost the bid. And it would have added 10 percent to the net revenues of the company at the time, so it was not insignificant. I have to say, though, that I had a student in the back of the classroom. After he said that, he said, "Mr. Galvin, that is a wonderful story. I think that we're all inspired by your story of how you just did that, but isn't that a lot easier to do when your Dad happens to be

the CEO?" [laughter] Which was true. And Galvin, to his credit said, "Yeah, it is." But it's still the point. It's still the point you need to have a tone from the top that this is the way we're going to do business to support the people when they make their decision consistent with those values. The third thing I would say to that is that many times people - bribery is the issue that everybody wants to challenge me on. Not without reason, too. But, usually, actually you were kind. Usually when people pose the bribery issue, they say, "Look, I'm a young, rising manager. If I pay the bribe and we get this business, I will get a promotion. If I don't pay the bribe and we lose the business, I'll lose my job. And did I mention that I have 47 children at home? And they're all going to starve to death if I don't have a job. Wouldn't it be okay for me to pay a bribe in this instance?" And my response to him, I said, "Look, make your choice." I said, "I have my view of it, but, you know, that's as an academic sitting in a nice office. Make your choice, but recognize that you just presented a dilemma which will never have a clear answer. That's why they're classified as being a dilemma. But there's something that happens before the dilemma and after

the dilemma. And just because you've gotten through the dilemma, doesn't mean that there's something that you can't do before in order to make it less likely it's going to happen again or to do something afterward that will make it less likely it would happen again. I mean, Kant who believed that we should be honest with everyone, once said, that, you know, I say that we should always be honest, but if someone comes up - what's your name?

MS. : Kate.

DR. FORT: If Kate came up to me with a knife and put it to my throat and said, "Where's your money?" Do I as an honest person have an obligation to say, "Well, it's at Chevy Chase Bank and it's account number 426532." He said, no, you can lie there, but - this kind of sounds kind of screwy - but we should regret that I had to lie, and that what I should do, though, is to in the future try to set up some sort of preventative mechanism so I don't run into Kate again or that she's in the slammer or something like that so that we have tougher stealing laws or tougher bribery laws. So I would sympathize with the position that Boeing is in. I do think in the long run, it ends up being a better strategy not to end up in the bribe because it may

open up another market. But then the question is, whatever they do with this particular situation, what are they going to do tomorrow in order to try to limit the likelihood that that repeats?

MR. : This is related to the last question. Would you say a few more words about the military industrial complex which includes a lot of industries that benefit from preparations for war even if they're not involved directly in armaments.

DR. FORT: Yeah. It's a good question. I've heard different stats - is that part of that question, too? Okay. I've heard different stats. Some people say the military industrial complex is less than 3 to 4 percent of the economy. And I don't know. It may be bigger than that. I would suspect that it's bigger than that, but I've heard people use that figure. I would love to be Gandhi, but I can't. I would love to be Gandhi and be able to say that I never see a role for Gandhi. Sometimes I think that there is. And so I don't want to be perceived as someone who says that everything that - I think any kind of war is regrettable, but that it's got to be there. At the same time, if it's going to be there, and even if it's going to

be powerful, there are still things that you can do if you're not part of that complex. And particularly at this point, the more that you can do things that make peace more likely and make military action less necessary, then you will by doing that lessen, I think, the military industrial complex.

Let me get another little anecdote. At the beginning of the slides, I was talking about the stories from Baghdad. Let me do it this way. One of the more interesting programs that I have been involved with and I'm the most proud of since coming here is a program with the State Department. And the State Department has - I'm on an advisory subcommittee to the State Department called Economic Empowerment and Strategic Regence - and so they've set up a website where they invite business ideas from entrepreneurs primarily targeted at the first from Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iraq. These folks send in their ideas to State - and these are back of the napkin kinds of ideas - and with the promise from the State Department that once they have those ideas, that they will try to get them upgraded into at least business proposals - business plans has some legal implication, so you don't want to go there -

but business proposals, and then State Department will try to find investment partners for those ideas, either investors or business partners. How do they do that? How do they upgrade the plans? They get a bunch of volunteer MBAs to consult with those entrepreneurs. And so I was the first one since I was on the subcommittee. So I had 20 MBAs from G.W. last year that were working directly with entrepreneurs in Afghanistan, Pakistan and Iraq to help develop these ideas. And some of them were quackery. Some of them were suspicious. But there's a few nuggets in there. And we had so much business, that I had to go to my alma mater, Notre Dame, to bring them in on it, too. So they have MBAs from Notre Dame and G.W. I think Cornell has some and I think, North Carolina. It's really sort of mushroomed. When the guy who runs the program for State Department, a guy named Steve Caplet - he went to the Pentagon to present this - what we were doing. And at first he said he was getting nowhere and then - and I'm going to get the terminology wrong, but when he tried to characterize this as something that might be complementary to a seize and control machine, he said it was like pfft! However, when it was part of a hold and secure, he said

they absolutely got it. He said because the Pentagon, when they go to Baghdad or wherever, you can only have so many guns in so many places. At some point, the society has to start developing its own business, its own trusts and so if you want to reduce the number of soldiers that you have on the ground, one of the ways is to have a trusting, functioning business environment where people are invested in its continuity. And so he said, "Once I shifted into that, even the military" - I shouldn't say even the military, I respect the military, but "the military said, 'This is a good idea for our mission.'" And so I don't doubt that the military industrial complex has more power than what I would like for it to have. At the same time, I think they play a necessary role and that this stuff that I'm talking about is not necessarily opposed to it. And so I think that there are ways that you can blend the two together, make it less likely that you'd have to resort to military kinds of action.

MR. : Going back to the other question of regulation, I think one can make the argument that on a very high level, law and regulation as social institutions came as a response to the lack of ethics. And I wonder - I

mean, it seems to be that you're hoping that your ethical arguments will be so persuasive that corporations will chose to do that. And I wonder have you given thought to how to deal - if that starts to be a movement - how to deal with corporations that are not persuaded. And another thought along the same line is one of the problems in the ecological area is that we don't account for negative consequences.

DR. FORT: Yeah.

MR. : So I wonder, have you thought about how to start accounting for the negative social impact of violence and war and corruption.

DR. FORT: Okay. Both good questions. One is - there's an argument that if the individual's moral compass is - it goes back to Kohlberg's moral development stuff if nothing else - if you're like my son Steven who is five - Steven really doesn't - he is starting now, actually, this was more true when he was three and two - Steven didn't necessarily take pride in treating his sisters well. He took comfort, though, that he wasn't in a lot of trouble with his mother and me. And so, I mean, there is a conformity, there is a level of a moral maturity of "I have

to follow the law." And sometimes I describe business - this isn't very positive, but sometimes I describe businesses as toddlers because they do what they can get away with and as long as they don't get yelled at by their parents, they're going to go ahead and do it. And so there's some level of that. I'd like for us to think bigger than that, beyond complying with the law as being requisite moral opportunity. And so I spend more of my time not even in real trust where good ethics is good business, but in good trust. That's where my contribution to the academic world - and I talk about media institutions and peace and story telling which are really, really soft if you think about it. But I think that those are - that people have more capability of achieving those than what they think, once they're exposed to it. So that's what I like to talk about. However, I am still a lawyer. And so like I was saying earlier, I think that there is a very strong need to have some stiff regulations on industries that aren't able to self-regulate themselves. And so I would love if there were institutions that were just able to run on their own and be ethical and not have a lot of laws, but, you know, the other part of this that's going

on, is if you've got liquid markets, that the pressure on short-term profitability is excruciating. And I have a lot of sympathy for managers who say, "Yeah, Tim, I know you talk about in the long run that it works. And I believe that in the long run it works and reputation and good will, Alan Greenspan said, are the main assets that a company had. And if you don't have reputation and good will, you're Arthur Anderson at Enron and you don't have a company. And I believe all that, but, you know what, you've got to get through the short term. And short term investors are wondering, 'What happened in July? We didn't like it. You're out of a job.'" And so the pressures with liquid markets and decision-making make my aspirations for great ethical behavior, really hard to achieve. And in that kind of environment, then I think that you do have to rely more upon the law to say, "I know that you would like to do whatever criminal thing that you want to do in order to make money. You can't do it anymore." So I do really see a pretty strong - I see a strong role for the law. But I think that it sells short what people can do and I think that we need to think of more that they can do other than follow the law.

In terms of your ecological argument, I had - I did one chapter of my first book with Cindy - water and oil as being scarce products and how people acquire them and how they're both flash points in the future and how the misuse of them can end up being ecological catastrophes. So I've done just a little bit on it, but environmental, ecological stuff, comes with it, if you're going to do it well, really need to be grounded in some really strong ecological science, and I don't have that. So for the most part what I do is I listen to people who have done that more and am inviting them to try to - I'll probably do a conference next year, I'll probably do a conference on religion and business. The year after that I'll probably do a conference on environment and business and peace. But I think that that's a critical omen as well.

MS. SUSAN CLARK: We have three questions. I've seen three people. I have this gentleman here and then there and then there. And I happen to know that these people will ask you questions all afternoon, but you can tell us to stop whenever it's time.

DR. FORT: Yeah, I can talk too. [laughter]

MR. : Two short questions. One, do

organizations or specifically corporations go through stages of moral development?

DR. FORT: Like Kohlberg?

MR. : Yes. Kohlberg. And what about the - you mentioned the transparency index. Would you advocate that as a key indicator in a green investment decision?

DR. FORT: Can you elaborate on that last one a little bit? A key indicator in a green investment?

MR. : There's the transparency index a guy in Berlin puts together and when you're making a green investment, you have to look at indicators of corporations' impact.

DR. FORT: Okay. Got you. Let me start with the second one. I probably would, but a lot of people wouldn't with TI. TI's index, corruption perception index has been challenged by a lot of people in its methodology because they say that it underplays the amount of corruption that actually exists because the way that they do the studies is to ask business people who are in those countries, how corrupt are things here? And the fear is that those business people will underplay the amount of corruption

that they think is okay and just focus on the things that they really think are extreme. And so there people who say that TI really underplays the amount of corruption that exists. I think it's a starting point. Will there probably be some improvements on that? My guess is that yes. But if you wanted to have a starting point, I would at least use it as a starting point of, well, here as an indicator of exactly how corrupt a society is and that's important information. It might be worse, but at least I have some sense of what's going on. So I would - I think that that would be possible.

In terms of the Kohlberg moral development, I think often it works the other way around. I think it's moral decline in corporations. But I'll speak to both of them. The reason I say its moral decline is that a lot of my early work was to show about how if you're in a relatively small organization that people are aware of the consequences of their action. And if you're aware of the consequences of your action, you have to modify your behavior. And so I'm not saying that small corporations or family businesses are more ethical than non-family businesses - I've seen a lot of really crappy family

businesses, frankly, but I've seen some pretty doggone good ones, too. And so I think that the time when you have your best shot of developing a moral culture, is when you're a privately held small company. Now, there are some companies that at the time that they went public, made a statement like a corporate credo like Johnson & Johnson did or Timberland is another example, or even think in terms of like *New York Times*. If you want to invest in us, this is the way that we play the game. We play the game so like Johnson & Johnson shareholders are last after we have taken care of the families, our customers, our employees, our suppliers, our community, our government. And then if we do all those things, shareholders will get a fair return on their investment. And so to investors of the world, you want to invest in us, this is the way that we play the game. Know that. Now, that can always be overturned because of the property rights of the shareholders, but it at least lets people know this is the culture. The way that that culture developed was because of the family. And when they went public, they were able to try to institutionalize that. It's hard to do, though. It's hard to continue. But that, I think - and so the more likely

result is that you start off as a family business and then you go public and now you're subject to all the pressures of all the various investors and venture capitalists and you get a bigger and bigger organization that becomes less aware of the consequences of their action and things get worse. I think that's a more likely scenario.

However, I do have a good friend who is consulting for corporate social responsibility. And she says, you know, we have clients at three levels. One are the ones that are trying to keep their butts out of jail. There's another who sort of have things - they follow the law, but they'd like to do a little bit more. And you've got a third level of companies that just want to set new standards, they're just passionate about it. And I use that very much in my hard trust, real trust, good trust kind of stuff. And she says, yeah, there are changes, but they're very slow and they happen one at a time. And they probably happen with a change of leadership. And then the question is even if you've got a transformational leader, can you sustain that after that transformational leader is gone? So it's hard to take a big company and move it up although I wouldn't say it's necessarily impossible. But I think it's a lot

easier to take a small company and bring it down.

MS. : Hi. Do you have any reflections on corporate responsibility for employees in terms of which do you think is more conducive to better ethical behavior - the old model where you had lifetime employment and pensions and an expectation that your employer would take care of you, and the new independent model where you're on your own with your 401(k) and whatever - and the freedom to go seek a new job if you don't like the ethical climate you're in?

DR. FORT: It's a good question and I do have some comments on it, and I would come down with a third alternative because I think that mobility - labor mobility brings with it some advantages, too, of people who are trying to find their way in life and want to do different jobs at different times in their life and I think that - and I think that there's some flexibility for employers, too. But what I would say is that rather than - I mean, I think that - well, just go ahead and say it - I think that companies to the extent that they can bring what I call the affective dimension of the people that are working for them to light, the more they develop a sense of community that

can be ongoing even if a person has to lose their job. Let me give you some specifics that - and I realize that this is really, really soft stuff, but I did a consulting gig for a company several years ago. It was a family business. It was an industry leader. And it's very business to business model. And they're going into the fourth generation of business ownership. They were an employer that every company - every business ethicist would love to work with. They had wonderful employees who loved the company. They were very involved in their community. They were very philanthropically inclined. They were great. The only problem was that all the shareholders, the family members, absolutely hated each other's guts. [laughter] I mean, they hated each other. They wanted to turn each other into the police. I'm not making this up. They just hated each other. And they heard me give a speech and then they hired me. And it was very clear after I started to interview them, that they all agreed that I was going to side with their side as opposed to the other side although they all disagreed of which one I was going to end up doing. And so what I did, though, was I gave them that assignment that I told you that I give to my students. I

made them sit down and write a story about something that they thought was ethical in their business, and then made them sit around and talk about them. And it completely changed the whole company. And the reason it changed it is because suddenly those things that they didn't understand and they were going to demonize, now became things that were really a part of a value system of a human being that were sincerely important to that person. And even though I disagree with them, I understand that that's important and I understand that that human being is important and that those things are important to them and I want to work with that person then. And so my prediction is that corporations have retreats for all kinds of things these days. I would bet that if you put people in groups of 30 - and if you read the books, you'll see why 30 is the number that I picked. It's based on some anthropology of the optimum size of groups that we work together in. If you put people in groups of 30 and then every two years, spent a half day of everybody talking about things that were important in their life or things that they admired in business, you would completely transform the communal dimension of the organization. Now, some organizations

already do that because they so much encourage people to, you know, they're interested in their families. And of course, you can do too much. I mean, we all know the people who give you too much information about everything that's going on in their life. There's balance in here. But I think there are other ways to build a sense of community in the organization beyond pension and benefits and lifetime unemployment, although I think those are valuable. Don't discount that. And if a company can do that, I think that that's fabulous if they can do that. But I think that if companies feel pressured that they're not able to do that, there are other ways that you can build a sense of community in the organization. So I think there are multiple ways that you can go about doing it.

MR. : Question about a kind of violence we all know about and whether business can do anything about it. We look at the second section of the *Washington Post* just about every day and the violence we see is somebody shot and killed somebody - often in the inner city, sometimes in the suburbs. And you get the idea that the perpetrator is often male and unemployed and probably poor. Sometimes the business community has been asked to

somehow help in that way and tax credits have been offered, but I haven't seen any models that work on a large scale. Is there something business could do to take the person who might be inclined to be a perpetrator, to give them a job so they're no longer unemployed and are maybe no longer poor, and be able to do this in a large scale in inner cities in the U.S.?

DR. FORT: I don't know. I mean, certainly there have been things like the ones that you just mentioned that have been tried. Certainly you can think of and see instances where there has been redevelopment of depressed business districts - Times Square, Silver Spring - that have transformed the way that the community is and my guess is - although I can't point you to the statistic - probably did end up reducing the amount of violence that occurred in those particular areas. And it wasn't what happened, though, because you ended up employing those people who were there, and so they're now gainfully employed as opposed to shooting someone or whether they've just gone someplace else to shoot somebody. I think that's an open question. And so I think that those kinds of strategies are the best strategies at least that I have seen to date -

to go into a poor community to provide new businesses and with that jobs and those kinds of redevelopment even with the tax credits. I think that those are beneficial for those areas. But in terms of the overall sociological and economic impact, I don't know. I don't know. I'm an ethicist, not a politician, so I don't - I mean that positively - politicians have to think about that. And I really haven't addressed the scope of sort of the overall kinds of political government dynamic. It's an interesting question and a question that sorely needs a better answer than the one I just gave you.

MS. SUSAN CLARK: And that is our last question today. We've come to the end of our time. [applause]

DR. FORT: Thank you.

[END OF RECORDING.]