

**World Food Prize Symposium 2002**  
Friday, October 25 - afternoon session  
Laureate Luncheon

---

DR. PEDRO SANCHEZ  
2002 World Food Prize Laureate  
*A World Free of Hunger: What Needs to be Done*

Yesterday, October 24, 2002 was a good day. It was United Nations Day, and for the first time in years we are benefiting from the strong leadership of a Secretary General who is committed to move forward on development issues. Yesterday the Washington area sniper who murdered 11 people in the last two weeks was caught. But, there is a sniper out there that hasn't been caught, and it is killing 11 children under the age of 5 *every minute*. Its called hunger. We, the world community have to catch it. We can do it with political will, the application of science, and we can afford it.

There are about 800 million hungry and malnourished people who do not know where their next meal is coming from. This is more than three times the U.S. population. Most of those who survive are stunted physically and mentally and more susceptible to killer diseases like HIV-AIDS and malaria. A total of 1.2 billion people, 20% of the world's population are trapped in absolute poverty—poverty that kills. And I think this is morally and ethically, unacceptable – especially when we are so prosperous, 80 percent of us are prosperous. And I think this is also bad for business, bad for business in the United States and bad for business everywhere. I would like to describe some of the reasons for guarded optimism—the Millennium Development Goals, renewing the importance of agriculture, increased awareness about developing countries in rich countries, increasing recognition of science and technology as drivers of development, and the fact that the rich countries can afford their share of the projected expenses to accomplish these goals.

The world is beginning to get its act together. The heads of state – our presidents and prime ministers – met in September 2000 and decided to establish the Millennium Development Goals. These are our goals, because our leaders signed on behalf of all. Some of the Millennium Development Goals are just good wishes, but others have quantifiable targets to be met by the year 2015. The ones with quantifiable targets are:

First, to reduce by half the numbers of people in absolute poverty, making less than one dollar a day---that is, poverty that kills.

Second, to cut the number of hungry and malnourished people by half. For that we've got to double food production in the tropics in the next 20 years.

Third, universal (100%) access to primary education. As emphasized by Dr. Borlaug and others, we have to get everybody in school, especially the girls. You visit a school in Africa and you largely see boys. We have to get the girls there. If more girls get primary education, it's going to be a major difference in how they handle themselves.

Fourth, eliminate (100%) gender disparity in education at all levels, not only the primary by secondary and university levels.

Fifth, reduce child mortality and maternal mortality by 75 percent.

Sixth, halt and reverse the spread of HIV-AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. This is not a quantitative target, but it's a change in direction.

Seventh, added at the Johannesburg Earth Summit, provide access to safe drinking water to 50 percent of the people who don't have access now. We've had a symposium on this, and you know how important this issue is.

In addition to the Millennium Development Goals, the world is moving towards stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions. One thing that was so great at the Johannesburg Earth Summit is that Canada and Russia announced that they would ratify the Kyoto Protocol, providing the necessary majority for making operational our first international effort in arresting climate change. Unfortunately, two countries didn't sign – the United States and Australia, but the rest of the world will go ahead.

Another reason for cautious optimism in the re-emergence of agriculture as a global development priority. The "A" word is coming back. The "A" word is agriculture. Agriculture is in many people's minds a dirty word, and I'll come back to that later. The person that started bringing back the "A" word is Andrew Natsios, Administrator of USAID. At the Johannesburg Earth Summit, there were five priorities highlighted by the acronym WEHAB. "W" stands for water, "E" for energy, "H" for health, "A" for agriculture, and "B" for biodiversity.

Part of the unprecedented opportunity we have is the increased awareness that we're not alone in the world, especially by people in vast countries, like the United States, Brazil and Russia, which have sometimes difficulty looking at the rest of the world.

And we're all very aware that advances in science and technology largely drive much of this progress. Science and technology are increasingly recognized as the key to sustainable world development.

The political will is rising, and that is absolutely necessary. It's rising in this country with the announcement that we're going to increase the AID budget by 5 billion. That's great, but it is not much in relation to the need and the proportion of the GDP other developed countries invest in development assistance. But the direction is right. When I talked about political will in Johannesburg, the Uganda minister replied saying "But we have political will." And I said, "Yes, you sure do, but there are other countries who do not."

An additional dimension that marks this moment is that, although eliminating hunger will require additional resources from rich countries, we can afford it. My colleague at Columbia University, Jeffrey Sachs, says that we are so prosperous that the needed funds that can be put to work to accomplish the Millennium Development Goals do not have to alter our First World lifestyle. Now, there may be other reasons one may want to change our First World lifestyle – put less cholesterol in our veins, arrest emissions of greenhouse gases – but not for this. For this there is enough money around.

But hunger elimination is not on our "radar screens". Its not on our TV screens, it's not on our websites. We get it on TV only when there's starvation in places where you see children dying. But we're talking about the silent hunger that affects 800 million people. And that doesn't gain

the attention – it's not newsworthy. And this silent sniper, however, is still killing eleven children a minute. Shouldn't that be newsworthy?

Somehow we have to get the wherewithal – and here I appeal to our media and our public awareness people – to put this in everybody's screen. Hunger elimination should be a household word. We must catch the silent sniper.

Most of these problems relate to the tropics. I was born and raised in the tropics, and this is where I feel comfortable. But the tropics are where most of the hungry and the poor are. Is there an ecological divide? Some people have said, there's something intrinsically tropical that constrains economic growth and human well being. And is that correct?

The tropics receive twice the solar energy than the temperate region. We're not getting very much solar energy today here in Des Moines. We have in the tropics a year-around growing season, temperature wise. We also have the advantage in the tropics that we have dry seasons that do the same thing as winters do here in terms of controlling the life cycle of pests and diseases.

My colleague, Jeffrey Sachs joined Columbia University to work in an institution that in addition to macroeconomics would also tackle what he feels are two biophysical issues that are just as essential for world development.-- tropical diseases and tropical agriculture. My wife, Dr. Cheryl Palm and I are joining the Columbia Earth Institute as the first specialists in tropical agriculture.

As a soil scientist, I can tell you that tropical soils are okay; actually, they're more than okay. If we look at the proportion of soils that have enough fertility and enough rainfall to grow crops, about 53 percent of tropical soils meet those conditions. The equivalent amount in the temperate region, excluding the areas of permafrost in the far North is 61 percent. This is not a major difference.

It has been clearly demonstrated in the Cerrado region of Brazil that tropical soils can become so productive that they become serious competitors in producing crops like soybeans with Iowa and the rest of the United States. And I say, don't be afraid of that – competition is good. Imagine if only we would have only one car company in this country, our cars would be garbage. Competition is good. We need Ford and GM and Toyota and Honda and the rest of them. This business of tropical soils being poor – forget it.

Rolling back hunger has been done before. This is particularly poignant in this state, because Iowa has played a major role. In this past century, after World War I, Herbert Hoover put a plan to eliminate hunger from war-ravaged Europe before he became President of the United States. President Hoover is from Iowa. After World War II, the Marshall Plan did the same thing and fixed Europe and Japan so they now could become our trading partners and allies. This is one of the most generous and most inspired – but also savvy – foreign policy decision that this country has ever made. Imagine if we would have a poor and hungry Europe and Japan nowadays. Well, that didn't happen.

Then, in the sixties and seventies came the Green Revolution, spearheaded by Norman Borlaug, Robert Chandler, M.S. Swaminathan and a few other real heroes. That eliminated a specter of famine in Asia, which was all over seminars and lectures when I was an undergraduate student at Cornell in the 1960's. The seminars said there are 300 million Indians, and they are going to starve. Well, there are now over a billion Indians now, and India certainly has

enough food, although millions are still hungry. So that was done, headed by a native of Iowa and a tremendous group of people.

I watched this when I was a graduate student at the International Rice Research Institute. Watching Dr. Chandler, the director of IRRI saying every day, “We want a high-yielding, short-stature, nitrogen-responsive rice variety,” saying it and saying it and saying it again until he got it. I said to myself, I would love to have a job like that someday, and I was fortunate enough to have it in the 1990’s at ICRAF.

Rolling back hunger is doable in two kinds of situations that the Millennium Task Force on Hunger is trying to differentiate. We call that one Type A, as hunger and food-deficit countries, mainly in Sub-Saharan Africa, hunger in countries that do not produce enough food, parts of Central America, other parts of the world. And then there’s another one we’re calling Type B: hunger in food-sufficient countries, countries that have sufficient food and even sometimes or often export food, but you still have hungry people there – India, China, Brazil, Bangladesh, many other ones with millions of hungry, landless poor. I say it’s doable on both types. The Millennium Task Force on Hunger is desegregating this into more sophisticated analysis, but this is what I can tell you right now.

#### Paradoxes and misconceptions

We have a paradox about the perception of agriculture in the First World – not as much here in Iowa but certainly in many parts of the developed, urban world. The term “agriculture” evokes perceptions of overproduction, pollution and subsidies; and in a way, it’s a dirty word. That probably influenced the tremendous decrease in investments in agriculture by donor agencies since the early eighties.

But agriculture is the engine of economic growth everywhere. This country started with agriculture, and so did just about every other country. In developed countries, agriculture directly employs only 2 to 4 percent of the population, but in the developing world it employs about 70 percent of the population.

Agriculture is not a dirty word; it’s great that the “A” word is coming out of the closet. When I was asked to determine what my title would be at Columbia University – they said, “You have to be director of something” – and I said, “OK, tropical agriculture.” Not sustainable agriculture, not natural resource management, not any other euphemism, but plain agriculture.

Now, there are many misconceptions that I have heard in the last year I have been back to the States after ten years in Africa, coming to grips with First World audiences from high school students to senior managers. I’ll list some of them.

Food comes from the supermarkets. There are many teenagers saying that. Food does come from the supermarket; that’s where Mom gets it. We’ve got so much food here; let’s send it to the hungry. We have plenty, and we’re generous people. Other people say that we should only eat indigenous foods. Other people say that all agricultural chemicals are bad – they poison the soil, the water and the people – and that organic farming is the only way. Other people say that GMO crops are Trojan horses; they’re in there to wipe out biodiversity.

Let me try to correct some of them. I don't think we have to spend much time on the idea that food comes from the supermarkets. Supermarkets are just part of the food chain. But we have an education job to do on this point in this country.

Food aid is emergency room surgery – that's what it is. We don't want any people to starve, so when there are starving people due to wars or natural catastrophes sure, let's send food. But food aid also can create dependencies and we are all addicted to food. Food is the ultimate drug – we need it – and free food can become a dependency. I have seen several times, the first time in Colombia, when food aid came in at harvest time, and then the prices of the crops produced by the Colombians dropped. This was a perverse intention of the government to keep the urban population happy with low food prices, but pulling the rug under the farmers. So I'll go by the old saying, "Don't give a person a fish if you can teach her how to fish." And I say "her" because most farmers in Africa are women.

Another point to consider is that people must have money to pay for imported food in the developing world. The demand for imported food from the United States, Europe, etc., will continue to increase according to IFPRI studies. Even the increased exports of soybeans from Brazil have not decreased soybean exports from the United States. If you're going to trade, people have to have money to buy. Poor people cannot buy food from the developed world.

I haven't met anybody in Africa or anywhere else that would like to eat indigenous foods only. Indigenous foods in Africa are limited to some sorghums and yams. Would you like to eat indigenous foods here in the US? Well, you would be eating sunflower. You would be eating squashes. You would be eating some acorns and walnuts and buffalo as we did the other night, deliciously. But that's about it. No. I think what's important is not indigenous foods but the desirability of growing locally produced foods that are more accessible, taste better and may be safer. That's a different argument. But don't tell me about indigenous foods.

On chemicals, applications of plant nutrients are absolutely necessary for agriculture to maintain a nutrient balance – there's no question about it. Crops require nutrients and take large amounts away from the soil when harvested. The plant doesn't care whether the nitrate or phosphate iron that it absorbs from the soil comes from a bag of chemical fertilizer, a decomposing leaf or a piece of manure. The plant doesn't care. There are good reasons why we should add organic inputs, because it adds carbon to the soil, so the soil does care.

Plant nutrients are essential; pesticides are not. Farmers can handle pests and diseases and weeds in many, many other ways of integrated pest management, which includes judicious quantities of pesticides. But they're not essential. Plant nutrients are.

Organic farming is okay, especially if it pays premium prices. I think it's a great tool to increase farm income. But it's usually best if you combine organic inputs with fertilizer inputs.

Genetically modified organisms– GMO's are at the center of great controversy. Genetic modification has been done by chance by nature, and by plant breeders for a couple of centuries, but now we have a predictable basis with genomics. I think the current debate that we have with GMO's worldwide was sparked by the loss of trust in science in the United Kingdom during the mad cow disease crisis and also by the lack of institutions like the Environmental Protection Agency and the Food and Drug Administration in Europe.

Breeding GMO's for traits that are not important to the poor has exacerbated the argument. We need GMO's with traits that help the poor – drought tolerance in corn, rice with vitamin A precursors, for example. Let's put this tremendous scientific tool at the disposal of Third World farmers. I have a dream. I'd like to see corn with the root system of sorghum so it would be more tolerant to droughts.

A gene can always escape – that's nature. We must be careful, but we should not be afraid. And I can assure you that most African scientists are all for GMO's.

There is another paradox which I call a vicious cycle, and it goes like this, round and round – “farmers in poor areas do not produce because there are no accessible markets and agro-industry – there's no investment by the private sector, and there is no rural infrastructure – the government doesn't invest in rural infrastructure because the private sector is absent – and farmers do not produce”. Round and round and round and round we go. We've got to break that.

### The Perfect Storm

Now I want to bring you to what Carol Bellamy of UNICEF called in Johannesburg “The Perfect Storm.” I think most of you have seen the book or the movie, “The Perfect Storm,” fishing off the North Atlantic. We have a perfect storm that has already started in Southern Africa this year, and here are its components.

Southern Africa often has droughts, and there's a terrible drought now in which 16 million people are facing starvation. I must say I had to change this number yesterday. I thought it was twelve, but after the speeches of yesterday, it's 16 million. These are people in countries like Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola, Mozambique, Swaziland, north of South Africa. There is extreme water scarcity in these countries and horrible sanitation, and I'm sure you dealt with that in the symposium.

Now, on top of that, to make it more of the perfect storm, there is an El Niño coming in 2003, for sure, hundred percent certainty. El Niño in Southern Africa means more drought, so we're faced with two more years or so of drought. On top of that, 30 percent of the people in this area are HIV-AIDS positive. The parents are dying. Coffins are the biggest business in towns. AIDS is such a perverse disease because it kills the people in working age, as opposed to most other diseases that kill the very young or the very old.

On top of that, there are self-destructive government policies in one important country, Zimbabwe. And on top of that, Zimbabwe and Zambia refused GMO maize as food aid for their starving people. Maize or corn is the staple food in most of Africa. It is grown for food, eaten as “ugali” or “mealy meal” similar to grits in Southern United States. So all this food aid coming from the States would come as ground corn. You can't grow that. But even there is that negative feeling. So we have the perfect storm.

In the middle of it, however, there are about 22,000 farmers in Malawi and many others in neighboring countries who are practicing agroforestry now. And they're not hungry. They're not hungry at all. They grow leguminous trees during the dry season to fix nitrogen because fertilizers are too expensive. And they get the nitrogen, doubling or tripling their corn yields; they also get firewood to cook with, but in addition to that, those trees increase the water-holding capacity of the soil.

We have in the audience Dr. Freddie Kwesiga one of the originators of this technique – and if somebody deserves the World Food Prize, it's him, not me. We had a drought in Southern Africa in 1992, Fred, and you showed me that farmers there, when they were using the tree fallows, they were getting about one ton per hectare of corn, a very low yield. But those farmers who were not using fallows were getting zero. With these fallows in normal years, you'll get two to four tons per hectare of grain – good yields a major change.

So the farmers who are using agroforestry are not starving in the midst of the perfect storm. They're not going to get great yields where they are not starving. Their neighbors are starving. What's going on? What's happening here?

We know that Sub Saharan Africa is the only region in the world where per-capita food production has been steadily decreasing. And you may ask, why didn't the Green Revolution varieties work in Africa? Well, we have a very good study last year produced by Hans Gregersen the University of Minnesota and Bob Evenson from Yale University. They looked at the adoption of improved varieties of eleven major food crops and the contribution to yield increases from 1960 to 1998, almost 40 years in developing countries. They found that the percent adoption of improved crop varieties in Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Sub Saharan Africa, was about the same – something on the order of 60 to 70 percent. In other words, African farmers are adopting the high-yielding varieties and the hybrid corn and so on the same way.

However, the contribution of these improved varieties to yield increases were 88 percent in Asia, 66 percent in Latin America, 69 percent in the Middle East but only 28 percent in Sub-Sierra in Africa. What's going on? What's going on is largely soil nutrient depletion. Farmers have been taking too many nutrients out of what were good soils. Africa has some pretty good soils; it's a little bit better than Latin America, for sure. And it's similar to Asia in terms of soil constraints.

So farmers have taken too many nutrients off. The usual way to get them back to the soil is to use fertilizers, but fertilizers cost two to six times as much of the farm gate in Africa as they do anywhere else in the world. We've got a major problem there. In Uganda a ton of urea costs \$500. In Iowa it costs \$180. In Afghanistan it costs \$120, even with all the misery and upheaval that country is going through.

Why are we asking farmers in Africa to pay the highest fertilizer prices in the world? There's a policy problem there. It has to do with transportation, it has to do with corruption, has to do with other things. Nevertheless, the cost of fertilizers in Africa must come down. Africa urgently needs large quantities of reasonably priced fertilizer. Maybe we should start building nitrogen factories in the interior of Africa, nearby hydroelectrical dams in Uganda, Zambia, and Mozambique or gas and oil refineries in West and Central Africa where energy is cheap.

Africa has to fix its soil fertility, because that's a biological imperative. You're not going to get anything done with your best GMO's, the best policies in the world, the best whatever, if the plants don't get enough nitrogen and phosphorous, period. This is one of the few absolutes that we can say in agriculture.

Using the leguminous tree fallows to provide nitrogen and indigenous, high-quality rock phosphates to replenish phosphorus, soil fertility is often "fixed". When that happens, we hear

farmers who are telling us, “We’re no longer hungry.” Some of them, one farmer in Zambia, told me “I have my dignity back now because now I can feed my family, and I can help my neighbors. Imagine – how would you feel as the head of a family if you cannot feed your family? Think about that. Well, now they’re coming out of that.

After you get food security, then this is a chance to bring the full brunt of all agricultural technologies – put them in there. GMO’s, integrated pest management, better water management, conservation tillage, the works.

The problem with this particular case is that about 150,000 farmers only use it across East and Southern Africa, and very few in West Africa. There are a lot more poor people in East and Southern Africa than in West Africa anyway, but it needs to be extended to West Africa. And these people tell you, “We’re no longer hungry.” But it’s 150,000 farmers. Okay. Multiply it by seven, which is the average size of a farm household in Africa. You’re talking about almost a million people. We have to reach hundreds of millions of people in Africa with this and other soil fertility replenishment technologies. They have to benefit about 150 million people. So how are we going to put three zeros to that number in the next ten years? That’s what we have to do.

Then, when food security is achieved, then you’re going to the second order problem. Even though you can grow high yields of corn in a two-acre farm, you’re recycling poverty. Your belly may be full, but you’re not going to make any money. Markets are so poor that prices collapse. You’ve got to shift to higher-value crops, leaving a portion of your land to keep growing your corn so you have food security.

And here’s a shift into vegetables, into dairy, into trees that produce fruits, that produce timber – in agroforestry systems– and also trees that produce products that rich people anywhere in the world want to buy. We’re working at the World Agroforestry Center with one tree that produces a substance that is used for treating prostate cancer. That’s an important issue, especially for us males; 60 percent of us have the chance of encountering that problem.

There are other trees that only grow in the tropics that have “femto” fibers, very short fibers, which are perfect ingredients for alternatives to fiberglass. And they’ve been used right now experimentally in things like airplane fuselage, tennis rackets, snow skis. So if you use those trees, and develop agro industries that are based on adding value there, you don’t ship the raw materials to Europe or to the United States but you ship them to the next provincial town or provincial capital. I can see snow skis being made on the Amazon and tennis rackets being made in Africa and components for airplane components being made in Southeast Asia. That’s possible.

Steps out of poverty are: Poor countries need something to sell so they can buy other stuff, probably a lot of food; they will need policies, better policies, roads markets; we need a level playing field in terms of tariffs and subsidies. And this is where, with enough prosperity, I think places like Africa can be great importers of food products from the First World. But trade on an even playing field while Africans sell you high-value products.

Then there’s a third order issue, how to adapt to climate change – we must tackle this in the tropics where all predicted impacts of climate change are negative, and may put us back to square one in a few decades.



So how are we going to do that? Well, let me add one more thing. It's not only poverty that we're concerned but this is also our deteriorating environment. Norman Borlaug said, "Nobody can be an environmentalist with an empty stomach." These people who no longer have an empty stomach who are beginning to make some money, can become good stewards of the environment.

Some of these new practices are also very good for the environment. They sequester more carbon out of the atmosphere than any other agricultural system. When you grow trees in the tropics that grow fast and trees are 50 percent carbon, farmers easily understand carbon sequestration. When your soil is 40 percent depleted of carbon and you can bring that carbon back with the proper use of organic inputs and fertilizers, then you can fix carbon. Carbon sequestration rates in degraded lands shifting into agroforestry systems in the Amazon and in Africa are on the order of ten times as much as carbon sequestration rates right here or in crop fields in the tropics. I would like to see some way the farmers would get compensated for that; they're helping us.

Biodiversity can also increase with these more complex systems. I must say, with trepidation, they're very simple, simplified systems that I see around Iowa. Soil conservation and watershed protection are issues here as well as in the tropics, basically an issue of caring for the land. There's a movement called "Land Care" in Australia and several tropical countries. Farming is not an assembly line operation. And I've got a feeling that, frankly, the farms here in Iowa are a bit too large. Farming requires tender loving care, and I think that will help both productivity and the environment.

The Secretary General of the U.N. has established a Millennium Development Goals Hunger Task Force. It's co-chaired by the first World Food Prize winner, M.S. Swaminathan, and the latest-me. We have people from science, because science and technology really drive this changes, we have people from civil society, from the private sector, from African governments and from U.N. agencies. We had to have a meeting in New York last week that was very successful. The next one is going to be in Kenya, Malawi in March. We want everybody to see what's going on there, even though we're all sort of experienced in this business. The following year we'll go to India.

Secretary General Kofi Annan wants implementation. He doesn't want another erudite analysis on why the world is hungry. What he wants is implementation, and we're going to suggest four or five key issues. We don't have them now. I don't know if there are members of the task force here, but I would like them to stand up, those who are here. Chris Dowsell here, Freddie Kwesiga, and Dick Behrs— any other members of the task force here? We have two or three. Chris comes from the NGO community, Fred from science and Dick from the private sector.

The way forward, in summary and to conclude. Put hunger reduction on our screens. We have to have hunger continuously on our screens and not just after the World Food Prize. Most countries need to develop the political will to tackle hunger. We need to triple research investments in tropical agriculture. The CGIAR Centers, or the International Agricultural Research Centers, are the only successful example of true donor collaboration that has lasted for years. Let me tell you, the CGIAR sure looks even better from the outside than from the inside. Having been out of it for a year, it sure looks a lot better. Per Pinstrup Andersen, you may feel that way in a couple of months as well.

The fact that the last World Food Prizes were given to people belonging to the CGIAR Centers attest to their importance. Its resources should be tripled – its budget should be a billion dollars a year, not \$350 million dollars a year.

In the case of Africa, nurseries for seedlings of these new trees and improved crop varieties are necessary. It costs only \$3,000 to have a community nursery that will provide sufficient tree seed for 100 farmers or 100 hectares, and it's a one-shot deal. So it is perfectly possible to take \$3,000 from each of you and name a nursery after you. My family, when our father and mother died, we decided to do that, and there's a Pedro Sanchez Sr. nursery in Makoka, Malawi as we speak.

I am asking farmers of the First World, who benefit from government subsidies to help, you as farmers and other people associated with agriculture, could you help your fellow farmers in Africa, in Asia, in Latin America?

And I was seeing in Johannesburg how the farmers of the First World were being beaten around by people who even said, "Oh, these subsidies actually cause suicides in some farmers, because they couldn't compete." Well, that's probably an exaggeration. But I was thinking when I was addressing there, I said, my god, Pedro, in six weeks you're going to be in Iowa doing exactly what I'm doing right now. What am I going to say? And then I blurted it out there. I said, "Look, these farmers are no bad people, and they'll be foolish not to take the subsidies that the government gives them." How about if we appeal to their better nature? How about if we ask them, "Could you devote a week of your subsidies, or two percent of them, in a fund that will directly help African agriculture, tropical agriculture and scientists and really help reduce hunger?"

I'm not a farmer, but I'm the son of a farmer, and I'm putting my money where my mouth is. And that's why the World Food Prize of \$250,000 is going to be put in a fund to do exactly that. We call that the Sanchez Tropical Agriculture Foundation in memory of my parents, and I am very glad to tell you that I already have a farmer who has said, "I'll put my week's worth of subsidies there." And that is Dean Kleckner. Dean, please stand up. He is former president of the American Farm Bureau, an Iowa farmer and probably the best-known farmer in America. So I hope other people follow suit.

Where to get the money, we don't know yet. But my wife Cheryl has a bunch of calling cards there, and you can get in touch with Ken Quinn, and we will figure this one out.

I want to thank you very much. I think we can do it. And the World Food Prize is a great stimulus to do that. But the time is right now. We can get the world rid of hunger and finally catch that sniper.

Thank you very much.