



## DEBATE

### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Congratulations, Dominique. That was exactly what we needed in terms of a conclusion, in terms of tone, and depth of thought. I will open a short debate.

### **Jean de Kervasdoué, Professor of Economy and Health Management at the *Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers* and Co-Director of the Pasteur/CNAM School of Public Health**

I have two comments, one on aging and one on climate change. My London School of Economics (LSE) colleague was right in what he said, but we should underline two or three facts. One is that aging has a very low impact on the increase of health expenditure. In France today it is 0.6%, because as the structure for expenditure depends on age, in order to have an impact, the structure of the age pyramid has to change, and as it changes slowly, it is very low.

The second fact is that we should always be aware that we have a specific problem with aging, which is due to the baby-boom generation. If we did not have the accident of the baby-boom generation, it would not be a problem. The problem is the fact that the baby-boom generation is aging, not aging in general.

Number three, and related to that problem also, it is obvious that what is said has not so much to do with curing, but with caring. It is a fact that if a family is hoping to take care of a disabled member, we also want the community and the state to take care of itself, and that should be clear. The figures are not frightening, because when you know that health expenditure in France is 12%, and you talk about it going from 1.8% to 3%, then that is not a real problem.

I have one comment on climate change. Our Russian friend made comments, some of which I agree with and others which I completely disagree with. One was the problem of governance, and had to do with the planet's ecological problems. However, when he says the [inaudible] will be coming because of the temperature rise, it is exactly the contrary. Today it takes 11 days from evaporation to rain, and if the climate temperature increases, it will then take 10 days instead of 11 days, so we would have more water, not less.

My second point on this is that we should not take for granted the figures given about climate change. On the figure quoted earlier, 3.5 degrees Celsius, the probability of that happening is very low. I would remind you that the temperature change on the earth did not increase since 1997, and so we should not take for granted the figure given by Jacques, and other funding organisations.

### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Thank you for your contribution. Is your last book on all of those questions published in English?

### **Jean de Kervasdoué, Professor of Economy and Health Management at the *Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers* and Co-Director of the Pasteur/CNAM School of Public Health**

I recently wrote several books criticising political ecology, and the last book was about water, but unfortunately for the French it is called "pour en finir avec les histoires d'eau", and there is no translation in English.

### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Is there another contribution?

### **Park In-kook, President of the Korea Foundation for Advanced Studies**



My question goes to Professor Chalmin on the food crisis. Two hundred years ago, Thomas Malthus raised a similar warning, owing to the gap between demand and supply of crops. Actually it was proved not the truth, if we look back now.

My question is, if such a crisis is a permanent crisis or a transient crisis that is recoverable with some co-ordination? You mentioned the problem with soya bean was caused by a Russian drought or something like that, but in the case of soya beans, as you mentioned, 90% of the total amount of soya beans are exported to China. That is a strong bilateral element. In the case of corn, it depends on the US Government biofuel policies. At times we can cope with a situation, but sometimes it can be a real crisis, so we need some distinction between permanent and transient one.

My second question is how it impacts on the Arab Spring.

**Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

I think we must contain this to one question. Professor Chalmin –

**Philippe Chalmin, Professor of Economic History and Director of the Master of International Affairs at Paris-Dauphine University**

It is true that food security, in the sense of food availability, has always been a problem for mankind. The big surprise is that, in the 21st century, when we appear to have mastered everything, time, space, and so on, we still have a food challenge. I am optimistic. I think the world will be able to feed 10 billion people.

I was trying to envision the world at the end of the 21st century, and as I am a grandfather, I wrote a small book about the life of my grandchild. I was trying to imagine his world: Jules is three years old, and has a life expectancy of 78 years or more, according to my AXA colleague, and the only thing I am fairly sure of is that in 2070, Jules will eat between 2500 and 3000 calories per day, with 100 grams of protein, and if he is wise only half of that will come from animal protein.

That is one of the few things I am sure about regarding the end of the century. The other thing I am sure of is that I have not the slightest idea of what technology will be available. We always look at tomorrow with today's eyes. We also look at tomorrow with today's technologies, and that is our biggest problem. I think we will be able to feed the world, a world of 10 billion.

**Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

We have short-term pessimism, and long-term optimism. Hervé Mariton?

**Hervé Mariton, Member of the French Parliament**

One point is that it is not just politicians who want to survive. My second point: we have been talking about the ways in which we handle risks, and the discussions on global governance. We have not dwelt on the point that risk, sometimes, may be better dealt with at a local level. There is a contradiction between the idea that the Internet, new society, and all of that, says that society is not organised in the way that it was, and the idea that risks should be handled at a global level. How can we draw the divide, between the sort of risk that should be handled at a higher level, and those that should be handled at a lower level?

**Igor Yurgens, Chairman of the Management Board of the Institute of Contemporary Development, Moscow**

This is a one billion dollar question, which has been handled by a number of groups, including some academics around the United Nations, the tri-lateral commission, the Salzburg dialogue and others.

Being in full agreement with Mr Moïsi and his analysis, I would like to say that, after leaving here, I am going to meet with some interesting people in Moscow, who are thinking about Eurasianism and the Third Way, from socialism imposed on, for example, the Chinese model and the western model.



Their idea of how to handle this risk is with three forces, which could probably be united in the world government which are: the force of this space, or creator, or cosmos; the force of history and geo-politics; and the force of populism, popular force. Their concept of this government is academics and thinkers, based on their IQ, in firstly the chamber of this parliament, which is the cosmos they try to acquire, philosophical thought, the ideals, the general good, etc.

Then it goes to the second chamber, which is the chamber of history, geopolitics, and realities combined with academia and historians, and people who know how the world worked before them.

Then we have the populists, the people who are elected the way the present parliaments are elected, and they take care of this short-termism, as you rightly say. That gives us an opportunity to combine short-termists and long-termists. It is an interesting concept, and for the next World Policy Conference, I hope to bring you the results from some very interesting people who are thinking very hard on the Third Way.

#### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Thank you, Professor Yurgens. I think you should insist that, for the Sixth Edition, to adopt the term 'glocal governance', because the divide between local and global is a major problem. Perhaps that can be a centre of focus.

#### **Susan Liataud, Visiting Scholar at the Stanford Center on Philanthropy and Civil Society, Founder of Susan Liataud & Associates Limited (SLA) and Imaginer Consulting Limited**

Thank you. My question is actually for Mr Beauvallet, but I think it relates to everyone, and that is, what I see when I work with organisations and leaders is that, there is a failure to look at how all of the different kinds of risks interact. Whether or not they are sequenced? Whether or not they are all simultaneous? How this all plays out, and how it affects the risk analysis? Even something like weather, for example, could have extreme consequences. I am wondering if your research teams look at the question of multi-dimensionality, because I think it informs policy. It certainly informs budgetary questions, at the organisational level, it informs strategy, and at the individual leadership level, it informs leadership decisions.

#### **Godefroy Beauvallet, Head of the AXA Research Fund**

Thank you for the question. When you look, for instance, at the recent World Bank report on Climate Change, there is a whole section which deals with non-linearity and interactions, because this is actually one of the most difficult complexities. You could say that interactions can be a stabiliser because they are, but they also introduce complexity and shifting points in systems.

My answer is that we work with researchers on that and, for example, we have a Chair at the ETH Zurich, on complex systems and notably, industrial complex systems and their way of dealing with multi-failures. It is actually a growing research interest in itself.

In health and biology research, there are scattered communities, and they are quite separated in the scientific literature, whereas in Environment you can see much more continuity. This shows that these types of questions are at the core of environmental research, be it climate, natural catastrophe, or whatever.

The problem is, if everything is in everything, and everything is so complex, we require people who take the role of simplifying, create a way of saying that someone has to lead, and someone has to go for the metaphors, the short-cuts, the emotional commitment that allows for individual and collective action. This is the role of policy makers, and even if scientists enter this realm, then they are working with policy.

#### **A participant**

I am on the board of the Pasteur Institute, and we have a lot of work in funding research on emerging diseases. There are a lot of things that the scientists can do together, but I am not sure that I share the view that the Internet fragments things, because in the scientific community when you come to working together on emerging diseases, what you see is the Internet integrating the scientific community at a level which is absolutely exceptional. It is not a substitute for



policy-making, obviously, but it feeds policy-making with proper information, a proper dimension of the risks. It can be coming from anywhere, and when I say anywhere, it could mean a remote laboratory in a little country, or in a failed state, which is now contributing to collective co-operative research everywhere. In a sense, you can mobilise new resources, and this is somewhat independent from the policy makers.

#### **A participant**

On this last point, on the Internet and society, the interesting thing about the Arab Spring is that when the Egyptian government cut off [inaudible], 10 people went to Tahrir Square and congregated, and this is the opposite of what we used to think.

Two general remarks: I do think the session was a little bit depressing. I think there are perhaps too many economists around, and we continuously hear the environment is a big problem, but renewables are too expensive, so we cannot do that. I know this is a long-term question.

The other point is on food security. After all, perhaps food speculation is a good thing. I think this is the high [inaudible] which has been proved wrong again and again. It is too easy to manipulate markets, and therefore we get the wrong results in the end. Thank you.

#### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Thank you very much. We will reserve the debate on long-term speculation for next year. It may be that the phenomenon will not have disappeared by then.

Mr Ambassador, perhaps you would like to conclude, and have the last word of the debate.

#### **Rakesh Sood, Ambassador of India to France**

Mr Chairman, thank you. I was just trying to look for a theme which seems to run through this, and one of the things which strikes me is that we see today a de-legitimisation of institutions. We heard Pascal Lamy mention it, and also Professor Chalmin just now give a stinging criticism of the FAO, and all of us, who have dealt with international institutions, in one capacity or another, have been part of groups, notice that.

Professor Moïsi talked of the need for that leadership. We do not know how we are going to create that. It will have to emerge out of the political processes, but one reason why I think we see this de-legitimisation, and therefore the inability to address challenges and risks, is also because many of these are out of date. It is easier to reform them, perhaps, than to create new institutions, because new institutions carry with them the challenge of establishment of legitimacy. If you recall, during the last two days, we have heard references to G20 Summit and its informal character, and we have heard references, therefore, to the need for some kind of institutionalisation, as distinct from Britain's old institutions, which have a certain legitimacy associated with them.

The United Nations, perhaps, is considered the most legitimate, but yet it is seen in many ways as somewhat lacking when it comes to implementation, and dealing with challenges of reform. I do think that, if we want to look forward, we want to give our future leaders the platform on which they can address challenges, and thereby establish that role as a leader. Some of these institutions, which already have a track record of legitimisation, would need to be reformed in order to ensure that their legitimacy continues in the future. Thank you.

#### **Lionel Zinsou, Chairman of PAI Partners**

Thank you, Mr Ambassador, for an excellent conclusion on the way forward in terms of institutions, and it was good to have an Indian angle on that.

Please join me in congratulating the panel members, and thank you very much for your patience.