

## 2020 Ian Goldin post COVID19 230420 1830h 58'00

Fri, 4/24 4:12PM • 58:01

Checked by KA 24/04/20

### SUMMARY KEYWORDS

pandemic, people, world, governments, happening, countries, societies, global, europe, threats, question, problem, lives, book, uk, basic income, systems, led, big, economy

### SPEAKERS

Presenter, Ian Goldin

#### Presenter 00:00

Additionally, we will be offering a 20 to 30% discount on all three of Ian's books through our independent bookseller - Primrose Hill Books, which includes UK shipping. We will put that link in the chat. After the event we'll send you a link to purchase the books, including an international shipping option. We'll email you a link to the replay within 24 hours. So the event I'll be in the chat monitoring any issues. So without further ado welcome Ian.

#### Ian Goldin 00:35

Thank you very much. Good evening. Good morning to you that are on the other side of the world. Good afternoon. Wherever you are, I hope you are well. I hope that you are managing in these unprecedentedly difficult times to keep your families and yourselves well. And I hope in this talk to be able to provide some perspective of where I think we are and where we are likely to be heading, why this has arisen, what the likely outcome is and how the world will change in the years to come. This is the biggest change, certainly in my lifetime. And I believe it's the biggest thing that's happened in the world, at least since the Second World War. It changes everything. And it gives us a lot of challenges which are extremely difficult, which will bring great sadness to many of us as we lose loved ones, as we see people losing their jobs, and as we see people around the world suffering immensely. But it also I hope, provides an opportunity for a reset for a new start for humanity, for us to learn how closely we all interwoven together, how a problem in one part of the world is a problem for all of us. I hope it gives us time for reflection. And that in this reflection, not only in our individual lives, that we reset and reprioritize, but at the global level this happens, because the one thing that comes out of this, that even the most isolationist of politicians must understand is that we can only thrive as humanity - if everyone thrives. We can only prosper if the world is prospering. And we can only be healthy if people everywhere are being healthy. And so this really is a call for action. I hope that through the suffering that we are experiencing, that the world will never have to go through this again, that young people will never see a pandemic of this nature again in their lifetimes. That we will not only learn to stop the next pandemic, which could be you even more dreadful than this one. But through that experience, we can learn to stop the other great threats that we face, like climate change, like immense poverty in the world, growing inequality, biodiversity loss, antibiotic resistance, cascading financial crises, and the

other things that threaten us in our jobs, our livelihoods, and the planet. Whether we learn from this or not, is really the key question. And whether we are able as individuals in the choices we make and what we prioritize our governments and the global community to come together out of this, whether we are able to ensure that this is indeed the last great pandemic of this nature. I think about two different aspects of this. The first point of reference is the First and Second World War and as you know, those were horrendous experiences. The First World War led to austerity afterwards, those that lost had to pay more, and there was very narrow and protectionist leadership. And from that, we got the Great Depression. We got the rise of fascism and Nazism. And we of course, had an even worse war, terrible war, where over 80 million people were killed in the Second World War. But out of that war, through the vision of leadership, we got a totally different world, and it's the world we still are in today. We haven't seen another world war. That was the war to end all wars. And of course, out of that war came many other things. The Bretton Woods Institutions, new internationalism, the Marshall Plan, the rise of the United Nations with its beautiful manifesto for 'we the people'. It led to the creation of Europe and the bringing down of borders across Europe so they would never be another war in Europe, which had have been the centre of the two world wars. And it led to the creation of the social welfare state, the view that no one in our societies should be allowed to die of hunger or starvation, and that we owe the youth that had suffered so much and died in the trenches that we owe them a better future and a sustainable planet. And so the question we face today is, are we able to do that? Are we able to learn from this experience of fire on how to tame it. The pandemic has risen from what I've called in my book of this title, the butterfly defect of globalization. And the butterfly defect is a play on Lorenz, the famous physicist's experiment where he demonstrated in 1969, then a butterfly flapping its wings over Brazil could lead to tornado over Texas. That this interconnectedness of complex systems means that what happens elsewhere, increasingly shapes our lives. It's that idea of complex, interdependent systems which I take forward in the butterfly defect. And it's the reason I predicted in 2014, that we would have a pandemic of this nature that would lead to the next financial crisis, even worse than the one of 2008. That crisis was also a cascading risk of contagion of interdependent systems. The crisis that started in the Midwest of the US with subprime mortgages led to global economic collapse. And it's that interconnectedness, the fact that we are as humanity now interconnected, in so many ways that makes it more imperative that we manage, and that we care more about what happens elsewhere. There is no wall high enough to keep out the great threats that face us in our future. Whether the climate change, a pandemic cyber insecurity and certainly not the threats that face many people through poverty and deprivation, the lack of medical supplies or vaccines. But what high walls do keep out is the ideas of how to change things is the sharing of experiences of common humanity, the technologies, the people, the investment, the potential for tourism and exports, and the other things that we need, and most of all what we need is more cooperation. Because these threats require that we work together. These threats require that we don't bunker down. And if we do, we will see escalating threats. And this is why we in a corner, that we need to make sure we don't take ourselves further into an irretrievable position that we don't end up like humanity did in the First World War, that we lift our eyes beyond our national horizons, to see this as a global problem. And that in that we find global solutions. Pandemics are unusual in that they the only threat that faces all that really require that every place on earth participates in the solution. A pandemic can come from anywhere. This one happened to come from China. But it could equally have come from any part of life in America or Africa or elsewhere in Asia, Europe or the US. And as technology is evolving, and people are developing the capabilities to develop things with synthesize DNA sequencing and fly them on drones. It's indeed the sophisticated laboratories and people with

skills that could be used to manufacture pandemics that are mainly located in the rich countries that are an increasing worry as they could cause pandemics going forward, so both rich and poor countries are a potential source. Pandemics can come from anywhere. And that's why in dealing with pandemics we need a real global cooperation. For most of the other global threats that we face like climate change, a very smaller set of actors account for a very big share of the problem. About 20 countries account for 90% of global carbon emissions. And so they need to work together to ensure that we are able to deal with climate change. They need to be inclusive to ensure legitimacy but not all countries are required if the world is to sharply reduce the threat of climate change. But pandemics do require that everyone participate and that we really recognise our common humanity, that we can only be as healthy as people are everywhere. This pandemic is affecting the economies, the health systems in dramatic ways. And I believe it's going to lead to a very big reset on many, many levels. We've already seen that much of the old orthodoxy in economics has been thrown out the window. Things that were unimaginable only six weeks ago are now mainstream, in Europe and in the UK. Like basic income for everyone. Being guaranteed an income was regarded as a radical idea six weeks ago. And now it's been implemented by the government, the idea that governments would bail out any company and give them a lifeline wouldn't have happened six weeks ago, and now has been enacted. The levels of debt and deficits that governments are taking on, which are now absolutely regarded as acceptable, were regarded as heresy six weeks ago. This economic rethinking, is, I think, being matched by a new way of thinking about what the priorities are as well. Maybe it wasn't such a good idea that we ran down our health systems that we had austerity that we cut the number of hospital beds in the UK, and in many European countries, and certainly in the US, too. It wasn't such a good idea that we outsourced a lot of things to other places so we can't get them when we need them. It's this rethinking which is leading to the changing nature of the role of governments and the private sector, and what governments should decide. And of course, when a big event like this happens and people get threatened, their first reaction is to look to government. And they recognize that its only government that can deal with the problem. Companies are extremely important and can help and a lot of the supplies come from private companies, but it's government's in the end that has to deliver. One of the other things that's been dramatic in all of this is that young people are making enormous sacrifices for older people. We know from the mortality statistics, that young people are far less likely to die from COVID-19 than elderly people. Indeed, many young people don't even know and are asymptomatic when they have it. And yet, they'll sacrifice their social lives, they are sacrificing their jobs often, and their prospects, their education, to protect the lives of older people. The lockdown is rarely in the interests of older and vulnerable people. The question is, how long can this last? And what do we owe to the youth. And my view is that we owe the youth a brighter future. We owe them the promise that this will be the last pandemic of this nature. We owe them the promise that we will address climate change, that we will create jobs, employment and better prospects for them. Otherwise, what is the sacrifice for? In this process, I believe we will see a stronger role for governments and a stronger safety net where health and education will become a bigger part of the focus of societies and more important politically. And in that, we are likely to see not only a bigger role for government, but high, much higher levels of debt that have been taken on. So we're likely to see higher taxes going forward. And there will have to be a focus on more equality in our societies. What this pandemic has revealed starkly is inequality. Of course, pandemics are unusual threats as well, because they kill indiscriminately, rich and poor people. Famously in history, emperors and Pharaohs and kings and queens have died from pandemics. But when you look at the data on mortality, it's discriminating against people with low incomes, and the

poorest members of society and ethnic groups in Europe and the US. And that is revealing stark differences. And it's not just the health emergency. And the fact that people in poorer neighborhoods have poorer medical services, and that over 25 million people in the US have no medical insurance. It's also the case that poorer people have much less to fall back on. They don't have the savings. Over 75% in the US, cannot survive for more than a week without income. And it's that which is revealing stark inequality not only within countries and we've seen dramatically in the UK and across Europe and the richer countries. But between countries as well. This pandemic is unfair. It's unfair not only within our countries on who it's effects mostly, both in terms of medical and in terms of the economic emergency, but also between countries. Richer countries have more facilities, they have more ventilators, they have more doctors, they have more capacity to print money to bail out to create a safety net that is strong. to guarantee everyone a basic income. to guarantee firm's survival. This is not an option for 80% of the world's population. This is not an option in most African countries, most Latin American and South Asian and many East Asian continents. Not only do the governments not have the money but of course they are if they are going to borrow money, they're going to have to often borrow in foreign currency. And all their income sources have been reduced. Because the exports have been reduced. Tourism has been reduced, investments been reduced. What migrants send home, remittances, have been reduced. And so poor countries are between a rock and a very hard place. Leadership matters enormously. I've seen in my country of birth, South Africa, extraordinary leadership from President Cyril Ramaphosa, locking down before the UK did in order to try and contain the spread of Covid19 and we've seen a similar thing in Vietnam. And we've also seen some extraordinary successes in locking down in Hong Kong and in other places. But the toll is in the economic impact as well. And the idea of physical distance, which is a term I prefer to social distancing, as I hope we are all closer socially, while keeping physical distance, physical distancing is an impossibility when you're sharing a small home with six other family members, or when you have to go in crowded transport to work or get food on your table. So the development emergency that's going to be caused by this is enormous. There's a medical emergency.<sup>12</sup> African countries have no ventilators at all. Many have very few ICU beds with the capacity to deal with this. But even more significant than the medical emergency is going to be economic emergency, the food emergency. We need urgently to understand of the humanitarian impact of this on people's incomes and lives. This is the biggest shock to development in the post war period, and for many countries since their independence, or since their freedom from colonialism, and imperialism. And so it's going to be a test. It's a test not only for domestic leaders everywhere, and for the solidarity of businesses and individuals, for everyone in different societies, but it's a global test. It's a global test of solidarity. It's a global test of how much we care about the rest of the world. And, of course, so far, countries have not passed this test. I've been shocked in the UK. We always talk about the Commonwealth in the UK. Now the Commonwealth is barely mentioned, and leaders are not talking about what's happening in the Commonwealth on COVID. To little attention has been given to Commonwealth governments, let alone the rest of the developed world. The UN has been largely missing in action, through no fault of its own. Let's not beat up on the Secretary General of the UN or for that matter of the World Health Organization. These people and institutions are doing the absolute best they can in the circumstance. But they are only as good as their shareholders. They are only as good as their political bosses and the people that give them money. And that's primarily the rich countries. And it's that, which is the worrying thing. The fact that the US has turned its back on the global community. After the 2008 financial crisis immediately, George W. Bush, the then president was picking up the phones to the leaders of the world, including

the Chinese saying what can we collectively do about this and the Chinese put more into the solution than the rest of the world put together in terms of stimulating world economy, which is why it was an economic crisis, but not another Great Depression. The Chinese saved the world economy. The opposite is happening now. We have President Trump turning his back on the global community, trying to inflame division by calling this a Chinese virus. And we have leaders in other places, not least, Bolsonaro in Brazil, and others who are making this into a nationalist thing. And even in Europe, we've seen the reestablishment of national borders and the lack of support in terms of Northern Europe supporting Southern Europe, particularly Italy when it was entering the peak of the pandemic. It's coming together now, but too little too late. And so when we looked at the future, my view is, we need to fight this. I do not believe that Covid19 will lead to deglobalisation, which is what many people are saying. Deglobalisation implies that the flows across national borders are likely to be reversed dramatically. Well, this lecture, which I'm giving and the discussion, I look forward to the questions, is happening with people in many, many countries of the world. One thing that's increased dramatically already, which I believe will be sustained, is digital globalisation. That is happening enormously fast. There's also been a globalisation of ideas and knowledge. We all I am sure are watching what's happening in other countries and aware of what's happening in other countries, far away and attentive to what they are doing in ways that we did not before. We are all aware of our interconnectedness, the ideas flow between countries has increased. And the scientists are doing an amazing job over 1000 times within a few weeks sharing the genome of COVID-19 to work together around the world on vaccines and other things. But what's missing is the supply chains, which is the manufacturing. Supply chains were already deglobalising before this happened. And that's because robotics, automation, 3d printing are making people increasingly do things with machines not with cheap labour and so comparative advantage and trade has moved away from labour to capital, or machines. Making things increasingly will be done by machine. And services like call centres, like back offices for administrative functions in banks in other areas will increasingly be done by computer servers with artificial intelligence. And that process was happening way before the pandemic happened. Increasingly customers want goods and services quickly and they want them delivered today or tomorrow and they want them increasingly customised to their own needs. And that will be done by nearby machine not cheap labour at distant locations. So I think we'll have big investments near the big markets continuing. Other flows like financial flows, I really hope continue and accelerate. And that's because we need massive financial support and new global Marshall Plan to support countries around the world in need. Even countries in Europe like Italy will need massive injections of finance. I think there'll be a lot of private flows too, because the centre of gravity of globalisation is moving to Asia, and this will accelerate it. This will accelerate it, particularly to East Asia, because East Asia is coming out of this faster than other parts of the world. But the faster growth in East Asia was happening before. So this is again, an acceleration of a preexisting trend. Travel and Tourism, I hope will rebound although there will be less business travel in the future, because we've discovered how efficient and effective internet connectivity in digital meetings can be. So when you add this all up, what you see is that most aspects of globalisation will actually be strengthened or increased, but the centre of gravity which was happening is moving and the way it's happening is changing. The key question is the political globalisation - are we going to continue to see this disconnect between the flows across national borders which are connecting us all and now economies, including our ideas, and the politics, in which the trend towards greater nationalism before the pandemic is also reinforced. It's this disconnect, the disconnect between the real flows of people, of goods of services of ideas of technologies and the

politics of nationalism, which is the cause of our insecurities. It's the reason we have this pandemic. The reason we have this pandemic is because we have failed to manage the butterfly defect of globalisation. In my book, Age of Discovery, which compares our time to the Renaissance, I look at that incredible period of 500 years ago, when there was an information revolution. Then the Gutenberg press, when there was the first globalisation of Columbus and many others. And when societies changed and genius was unlocked, then as it is today in revolutionary ways, it took Europe from the Dark Ages and the plague into the modern world. But you know what happened out of the Renaissance, it was a total disaster in the longer term. It led to religious wars in Europe in which the tolerance that was so exemplified in Florence, to Muslims and Jews, people of all sexual preferences being an absolutely central part of that renaissance. Da Vinci, famously was vegan and gay. That tolerance was completely and utterly overrun by the risks that weren't properly managed. The ships that went to the new world spreading diseases that killed most native Americans and there was growing inequality, leading most people to feel that that process was threatening them. They'd lost their moral anchor, the church had been corrupt, and the Medici's had furs and had spices and put gold on their roofs. But most people were worse off and the scribes were out of work from the new technology. So populism and protectionism destroyed globalization and the renaissance. We need to learn that globalisation can be overturned politically, and it was then. We need to learn that unless we care about those left behind, they will stop this process of progress. We need to learn then what happens on the other side of the world matters. It matters to our own lives in ways that are dramatically different. What we see with the politics of nationalism and protectionism is a real concern. We need to hear this constantly. Populism has grown because of the failure of the experts and the managers of globalisation to do their job. I do not believe we would have President Trump in the White House. I don't believe we wouldn't have Brexit in Britain if it hadn't been for the financial crisis. That was a wake up call. That was a demonstration of the utter failure to manage integrated, complex financial systems. We didn't learn from that. We became complacent, no bankers went to jail. They got better paid, and richer. And things went back to normal while many workers wages are not above the level they were in 2008. And we wonder why they angry and vote for extremists. Not as a single leader from that period except Angela Merkel in Germany is in power. And that's because we let people down badly. We didn't look after those that were left behind. And we allowed globalisation to be a threat not an opportunity. And the pandemic is the greatest and inevitable threat. So the question is, can we reform the WHO to stop the next pandemic? Can we ensure that this never happens again? That will require an urgent and massive investment. But nothing compared to what is invested in the military. If we took 5% of the money we give to the military and put it into global pandemics stopping, into WHO and to global distributed Task Force, who have NATO like capabilities of rapid response around the world, we would never have another pandemic of this nature. We've got our priorities wrong. We are fighting the last war. We need to look forward. The threats that threaten us or the threats of what Rob Muggah and I argue in our new book, terra incognita, are the threats of the new world, the world we haven't yet gone to, but we're going to fast. We create that world. The message of our book is - we're at a crossroads. This could be the most incredible century. The best one for humanity, the prospects for all of us, and for coming generations have incredible potential of longer, healthier lives, a clean planet, with zero carbon, a huge reduction in pollution, the overcoming of inequalities, and of poverty. All of that is within our grasp. We know what it would take. And it's what we can and must do. But this could also be a really terrible century. And as we see in the book, it could be a dystopian future. We seeing in this pandemic, how that would look, we're getting a real feel for what uncontrolled globalisation does. We're getting a feel

for how it can exacerbate inequalities within countries and between them. But we also must know that this is not inevitable. We have choices. The WHO is not effective, because it hasn't been allowed to be effective. I was on the UN reform task force that Kofi Annan ran. And we looked into it and the other UN organisations and we knew what had to be done. It has to be given a strong reform mandate, the US and China and the Europe have to really give it the power. They need to give it the technical capability, the resources, and we need to ensure that globally, it's able to do its job. That what stops the next pandemic. And the same is true on climate change. It's not a very complicated problem. We've got to get to zero carbon. So my hope is we will recognise through this terrible ordeal we going through how important it is to cooperate to form institutions which stop these risks. And if we can do it for pandemics and we have to, we don't have an option. We would have learnt to do it for others. If we can learn to cooperate and work together to stop the next pandemic, we would have learned to cooperate and work together to stop climate change. To stop the other great threats that we face. We would have learnt to create a much brighter future. We would have used this opportunity to reprioritize. We would have used this opportunity to reflect on what makes humanity precious. What makes our lives precious, and that is the contracts we have with others. The health of all of us needs to be our top priority at the moment. But we can only be as healthy as people elsewhere in the world. That's what we've learned. And we can only prosper if others around the world prosper, too. I hope you found this helpful in thinking about where we are. I hope it's given you a sense of positive possibilities, because there's such suffering. I really do believe that this terrible time, the ordeals that we all going through and that we've seen, could lead to a better world. I believe it's up to us to decide and to work towards that. Thank you.

**Presenter** 35:04

Thank you again, for a great talk. We've had so many questions coming in, over 90 of them. And so I've picked a few of them and obviously won't be able to get to everyone. So I apologise in advance for that. But let's start with this one. What will be key growth industries and key skills required in post COVID-19 world?

**Ian Goldin** 35:33

Okay, that's very practical. We've seen some big winners already. The digital industries are clearing it up. Zoom, that facilitated this webinar, is you know, making a mint out of this and I read that Jeff Bezos, his income has gone up by \$24 billion since COVID19. So some are doing very well in the digital companies, Netflix and others are doing very well. My view is that we are likely to see reprioritization of many things, I'm optimistic that if they can get through this, and that's going to be a big challenge. The services that are so precious to life and to what we miss, be at restaurants with theatres, be it travel, tourism, hiking, nature, parks, all of these things will thrive. Because we recognise what's important and I think we recognise that actually, consumerism isn't necessarily what we really need, like another shirt or, you know, another, this or another that, but the experiences, the experiences that we do with others will get higher value going forward. In terms of the skills I think what we're all learning is the skills of resilience are incredibly important. I'm pushing for restructuring of global accounting practices, because I think the mark to market short termism, just in time systems are driving out resilience and are part of the problem. The skills that are going to be proved to be very resilient are those people that are able to find ways of doing things in difficult circumstances, people that are able to give each other satisfaction and meaning in difficult circumstances. On skills I get asked this as I'm a professor at Oxford, I get asked this question all the time by people who want to study, what skills are important? My view is it

doesn't really matter. Just be curious and keep learning and never stop learning because the pace of change is going to accelerate. And so the one big danger is learning a skill and think that you got it as you very rapidly are going to be deskilled. So the main skill is the skill to learn the skill to be curious the skill to explore and the skill to reach out to other human beings. I think I was clear in my lecture, that what I really believe in is that we need to listen to each other and empathise with people and that skill is one which is in short supply, not least amongst our political leaders.

**Presenter** 38:33

And from Joyce, what implications does the withholding of funds to the WHO by the Trump administration have for the projected strengthening of globalisation?

**Ian Goldin** 38:43

I think that's a really absolutely counterproductive thing. It could not be more wrong. It's 180 degrees from what we need. They I think are withdrawing about 300 million dollars out of the organisation. The organisation provides about 400 million to African countries. Remember the WHO isn't only a Covid19 fighter, that's its new role, but it's fighting cholera, is involved in Polio eradication, it's involved in the rolling out of anti retrovirals for HIV AIDS, it works on public health it's active on all the basic stuff. And it's just an anti humanitarian thing to do, to try and starve this organisation and blame it for a pandemic. Really the US should be throwing its weight behind the WHO and as should all our governments. It needs reform but this isn't the time to do it. It's in the middle of a war now. But we do need a completely revitalised WHO, it's far from perfect, it needs radical reform. That can only be done by supporting it in that reform, not allowing it to wither and killing it.

**Presenter** 40:03

Thank you. Do you believe that the political systems of the world has failed at being a vehicle to serve the needs of the common good?

**Ian Goldin** 40:13

Yes, I believe absolutely they have failed. The system is totally unfit for 21st century purpose. I think part of the problem is that the term global governance is slightly over ambitious. Most problems don't require everyone to be part of the solution, I think we should have a much more variable geometry we should have more variable structures. Some problems can be solved by private companies, by cities, by small groups of countries, or by groups of key actors, by communities, by civil society. And some problems like pandemics really do require all governments as well. But most of the issues need constellations of actors and I think creating these coalitions of people and institutions that are creative, that are prepared to work together is where the focus should be. We certainly also need reform of the system. But believing that the system needs reform is different to saying that we're going to starve it. And my view is that we our governments should be throwing their energy into making the system more effective. And they also need to be throwing their energy into that without necessarily having unanimity. The fact that the US is not prepared to come to any global table of significance, whether it's the climate, or the others that would be helpful should not be a reason why other great powers don't do that. And I think we need to move and try and drag them along. But the fact that they are being obstructive is not a reason not to get on with it, because that would lead to a disastrous future for all of us.

**Presenter** 41:59

Thank you. You argue that the response to this crisis must be international. But should China be included in such a response as it was following the 2008 financial crisis, given the role that China is alleged to have played in the outbreak?

**Ian Goldin** 42:17

Yes. There is no global problem that I can think of where China cannot be part of the solution. Of the climate change, with a global pandemic, antibiotic resistance, poverty eradication. You know, China is soon to be the biggest economy in the world if it's not already, depending on how you measure it. With India, with Europe with the US, it's going to account for a very significant part of global economic activity and population. So it has to be part of any solution. My own view is that it was extremely negligent and wrong to be covering up the pandemic for as long as it did and not to be publicising it and alerting the world to it. But since then, since early January, it's been, I think, extremely effective, not only in controlling the pandemic and slowing its spread, which has given the rest of the world time to catch up, but now also in ways of which are showing solidarity, sharing medical equipment, ventilators, and its scientists sharing the genome. So it made massive mistakes. But we should not blame China for the pandemic, this pandemic happened to come from China, it could have come from 1000 other places in the world, other cities in the world. We need to understand that this pandemic was in a sense, inevitable. A pandemic of this nature was inevitable. This is the simple fact of more and more proximity between animals and humans, particularly wild animals, and humans, but not only, because swine flu and many others can come from domesticated animals. Airport hubs are super spreaders of the goods of globalisation, like financial centres, like cyber systems are also the super spreaders of the bads. And so to say, it's China's fault, I think is to completely misunderstand this pandemic, previous pandemics, and the next pandemic.

**Presenter** 44:32

Thank you.

**Ian Goldin** 44:33

If I may just add, I think the blame game is the exact exact opposite of what we need to stop the next pandemic and other threats. We have to cooperate with other countries. So if you want to get in a blame game, you want a downward spiral race to the bottom, where we will have bigger pandemics escalating climate change, and more global threats and I don't think anyone wants that scenario.

**Presenter** 44:59

And could you expand on your point to divest from militaries? What role would you like to see them playing in a post pandemic future?

**Ian Goldin** 45:08

I'm not suggesting, I'm not a pacifist, I'm not suggesting that we don't have militaries, even though some of these I certainly wouldn't like to have. But I am suggesting that we need to get our proportions right in terms of risk analysis, that the fact that we spend more money, 500 to 1000 times on average in countries on military preparedness than on pandemic preparedness is a complete failure to understand what the risks are to all of us in our future. Some of the intelligence agencies that publish

their data, like the Canadians, show this in their risk matrices, that if you look at what the greatest threat all of us is, and we're seeing it now too our economies and to our health, people will recognise that it's pandemics. And they will be in the medium term, as well as climate change and some other threats which are very high as well. So it's the proportionality. It's the amount of attention we give. It's the amount of money we give. It's the political power of our ministers of defence in our governments, compared to our ministers of health. It's the prestige. It's the global responsiveness. It's comparing the strength of NATO compared to the WHO. I'm not saying, you know, I think any military should be shrunk to x, y, z as that very much depends on where, what, how, what type of military, what they're doing, etc. But the general point I'm making is that we need to get our priorities right. And we need to give pandemics the attention they deserve, and certainly as much attention as we give to the military.

**Presenter** 47:00

Sweden asserts that the global response to this pandemic has been an overreaction with dire consequences. Evidence and science do not support this experiment of shutting down society. What are your thoughts?

**Ian Goldin** 47:12

I've been fascinated and there's going to be incredible research projects and many, many many doctoral thesis written out of examining how the different countries have approached this and the lessons learned and it's too early to tell. But I've been fascinated by the Swedish response. And as the Swedes would argue, this is not new to this pandemic. It's been one that they've adopted over the last hundred years, which is to roll with the process rather than to obstruct it. I'm not a health expert. You know, Mike, my expertise is in economics and other areas. But it is seeming to me to be the case that their numbers on mortality are really picking up very strongly. And I think the jury is still out, not only for Sweden, but for other countries that have similarly adopted their strategy. I think the same is the case in the UK, where we were very late in locking down. Although we were watching what was happening in Italy, it looks like we've now approaching Italy in the mortality statistics. I think the jury's still out on how these different trade offs compare. And of course, the jury is also out on the knock on implications for economics for people's lives and livelihoods, not least in developing countries. So I agree with the with the question, and it's very different. Different countries in Europe have approached it differently and around the world. But I think my own view at this point is that very strong early lockdowns are likely to be most effective, both, in dealing with the economic and the medical emergencies, because the economic emergency will come from elsewhere. The question is, can you sustain it? And how long can you sustain it for if you have a peak that comes much later. But the one thing you don't want to do if you're a political leader is gamble with people's lives. And, so we'll see how these different approaches play out and what the political consequences are.

**Presenter** 49:28

Thank you. From Angela, do you think universal basic income will become a reality?

**Ian Goldin** 49:35

No, I don't. I actually object to universal basic income. I think it has five shortcomings. One is that if you give everyone a decent income, everyone that's what the word universal means. It's simply unaffordable. You're talking about the basically the entire budget, and I've done the numbers. Secondly,

I don't think rich people should be getting money, which is what universal means. It should be targeted towards those that most need it. The OECD has done great work on this, showing that if you remove targeted interventions for unemployed people, for homeless people, for single parents that need it etc, you end up giving everyone less, which means those that really need it are much worse off. So it increases poverty and inequality through that. The third reason is that people tend to get meaning and from work and I believe what we should strive towards is full employment societies. The diseases of despair of the Midwest of the US are what happens when people are dependent. I think dependent relations are necessary when people are in hardship, but shouldn't be your economic model for society. Fourth are the ethical factors of giving to the rich, and fifth is that it distracts from focusing on the big picture of how do we get jobs for the future. And so I don't like the fact that we say we'll pay everyone not to work. However, I do believe in basic income. So I believe in BI, not UBI because I do believe that we should be guaranteeing everyone in our society, a decent life and minimum income. And I think we should ensure that no one in our societies dies of starvation and everyone has the means for livelihood. But that is very different to universal basic income. It's basic income, it's a safety net for anyone that needs it.

**Presenter** 51:37

Thank you, and from Andy, do you think we should be using this as an opportunity to secure our Commonwealth network especially as trade with them has been cited as a way to bolster the post Brexit economy?

**Ian Goldin** 51:51

Yes. Whether it's going to bolster the post Brexit economy or not is another matter but my own view is that the UK has this historical bond that comes in most cases, but not all, out of a colonial bond. In some cases like Mozambique, it isn't colonial but it's established. The UK as a starting point, not as an ending point because it should be supporting all countries in need to the best of its ability, should be reaching out. What I've found startling is the just the lack of that bond that we're hearing, whether it's about trade or whether it's on medical supplies, whether it's in other areas, I think what we should be saying to countries around the world, this is the time for solidarity. This is the time where we stand by you. We've always said we stand by you. Now we need to demonstrate it. And that demonstration is what I'm not seeing.

**Presenter** 52:53

Thank you. From Christophe: The Global authorities are evidently trying to counter a major global demand shock with a massive fiscal boost. Do you believe that this will ultimately be inflationary on the other side of the crisis?

**Ian Goldin** 53:10

This is an extremely important question. Because this is a crisis, economic crisis, unlike any in history. It's not like the Great Depression, where you had a demand problem. And it's not like that because we have both supply and demand broken. Supply because everyone's in lockdown, because no one can provide the goods and services. The factories aren't open. Supply chains have been broken. And demand because we can't go out. We can't go to the cinemas. We can't go to the shops, we can't buy things. We can't travel, we can't do things. So there's so there's a real question of how do you do a

fiscal stimulus or indeed a monetary stimulus? How do you print money and try and get the economy going, if no one's allowed to do anything? Because they're in lockdown. And that's, I think, a really important question. My answer is that you should be providing two things, you should be guaranteeing food and a basic income for people. So basic needs should be supplied and governments need to ensure they supplied by mobilising the necessary resources. So you need to give people basic income to buy basic goods. And you should be using the money to keep firms alive, that would be alive if it wasn't for COVID-19. Now, that's a judgement call, but especially small and medium scale enterprises, micro enterprises. What you don't want is to find that after this crisis, not only has the economy put in a coma, but it's actually dead, that everyone's unemployed, that the firm's have gone bankrupt, they can't get started again, they've lost their resource and capability. So what you want is a sort of induced coma, but you don't want people to starve and that and you don't want firms to go bankrupt in that. And that's what I believe stimulus should be for.

**Presenter** 55:00

Thank you. From Jasper. Can we redesign our systems and cities to make them more resistant to future pandemics?

**Ian Goldin** 55:11

Yes, absolutely. And Rob, the co-author in *Terre Incognita* is focused on this question. But there's clearly much that we need to learn about the way that cities are going to be redesigned. And this is very coincident with the climate agenda and with the environment agenda and sustainable city agenda, of which many things are happening around the world. For example, the conversion of car parks into vertical vegetable farming and food farming would be something I would welcome. The making of living spaces within our cities. There's some suggestion that there's a connection between pollution levels for example, and susceptibility to COVID-19 and we know anyway, that pollution levels are associated with ill health and walking and other things are associated with good health, both physical and mental. So redesigning city so that they are human focused, they're not vehicle focused is important. I think high streets and malls are going to be hit terribly by COVID-19. And we're really going to have to think about how we regenerate high streets and what's going to happen in malls that have been over built. How do we make them community centres? How do we ensure that our schools and our public spaces become the thriving centres of society, and that children and adults, elderly can have been healthy lives in these cities around the world. This is absolutely central. A growing share of the world's population is in cities. It's where we have our futures. And we need to make sure that the places where we thrive and want to be.

**Presenter** 57:03

Thank you. And I think we're out of time for questions. But I'm going to pop this back up here and say thank you, Ian, so much for today's talk. And for everyone listening, we will have a link for the replay out to you within 24 hours, along with links to Ian's website, follow him on Twitter and buy the books, but you can see on your screen. Once again, thank you so much.

**Ian Goldin** 57:28

Thank you, and thanks for you all for participating.