

FACING GLOBAL HUNGER: FOOD AS A RIGHT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

—————
MARCH 11, 2010

—————
Official Transcript

Produced by the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission

CONTENTS

	Page
WITNESSES	
Ambassador Tony Hall, Director, Alliance to End Hunger	3
Ms. Heather Hanson, Director of Public Affairs, Mercy Corps.....	7
Mr. Rick Leach, Senior Advisor for Public Policy, Friends of the World Food Program....	13
Mr. Robert Zachritz, Director of Advocacy and Government Relations, World Vision	19

STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

The Honorable Frank R. Wolf, a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia and Co-Chairman of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission: Prepared Statement.....	2
Ambassador Hall: Prepared Statement.....	5
Ms. Hanson: Prepared Statement	8
Mr. Leach: Prepared Statement	15
Mr. Zachritz: Prepared Statement	21

**FACING GLOBAL HUNGER:
FOOD AS A RIGHT**

THURSDAY, MARCH 11, 2010

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C.

The Commission met, pursuant to call, at 2:27 p.m., in Room 2255, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Frank R. Wolf [Co-Chairman of the Commission] presiding.

Mr. WOLF. Let me welcome the panel, and I appreciate Mr. McGovern being here, who has probably done as much as anybody in the Congress, other than Congressman Hall, since I have been here with regard to hunger. And I think if he is here as long as Tony will be here, he will be. So I appreciate Jim being here. I want to thank the witnesses. I will just introduce them, but before I do I want to say first it is good to see my friend, Congressman Hall. If there is anyone here from the administration, I am not going to ask you to raise your hand, but what I would urge you to do is go back and either tell the Secretary of Agriculture that they ought to appoint Congressman Hall as the national kind of person to deal with this hunger issue for the United States by mobilizing, you know, for food, or if you want it internationally, tell Secretary Clinton to do the same thing with regard to having Congressman Hall to be the person -- I know that -- to do that. I just think it is very, very important. And I am going to end before -- I have a longer statement I am just going to submit in the record.

Tony Hall asked me to go to Ethiopia in 1984. And I was in my kitchen and I got a call. I had one of these ugly yellow phones. If you remember the yellow color thing. And he said, go to Ethiopia. I went to Ethiopia and it changed my life. And so I think Tony, with his -- either whether internationally or domestically, for the administration not to use Tony for this nonpartisan issue is sort of just kind of crazy.

With that, let me just thank all the witnesses for being here, for the patience as we worked to reschedule this hearing because of the snow. And I am sure, Bob, you had a lot of snow in your driveway too. Now I know where you live out there in Lovettsville.

I am pleased to introduce my good friend. Ambassador Tony Hall is currently serving as the Director of the Alliance to End Hunger. Ambassador Hall has long been the leading advocate for hunger relief programs and improving human rights worldwide. During his time in Congress Ambassador Hall has worked on all these issues with regard to the Hunger Caucus, human rights religious freedom, and I am pleased that he is here.

Second witness, Heather Hanson, who serves as Director of Public Affairs for Mercy Corps. And I think Mercy Corps does a great job. I have been with them around the world, and they couldn't be a better group. Thirdly, working with Ambassador Hall, Ms. Hanson has convened an NGO working group that wants to draft a Roadmap to End Global Hunger.

Also we will hear from Richard Leach, the Senior Advisor for Public Policy at Friends of the World Food Program. And I know, I appreciate the great job that the World Food Program does.

And lastly, Bob Zachritz, who used to work for Tony Hall or with Tony Hall, I guess Tony would say, who is Director of the Office of Advocacy and Government Relations at World Vision, and his primary area of specialty includes agriculture development, food security. And after I got back from Ethiopia, I went down to El Salvador and we were in a little refugee camp and there were some people there feeding people. And I went up to them and they said, we are with World Vision. And so the combination is sort of interesting. Tony was the one that got me

to go to Ethiopia with regard to the famine, and World Vision just sort of came along a few months later when we went down there. Remember when we did the thing in Ethiopia?

So it is great to have the four of you there. And with that I will turn it over to Mr. McGovern.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Wolf follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE FRANK R. WOLF, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF VIRGINIA AND CO-CHAIRMAN OF THE TOM LANTOS HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

I would like to welcome everyone to today's hearing on global hunger.

I spent a week in Ethiopia in 1984—when nearly one million people died of starvation—including two nights in a feeding camp. I went at the urging of my good friend Ambassador Tony Hall, who at the time was a Democratic Member of Congress from Ohio. I am pleased that he was able to be with us today. The squalid conditions of the camps and the suffering faces of the children, mothers and elderly was haunting and unforgettable. What I saw—and experienced—changed me forever.

When I returned from Ethiopia, I worked across the aisle to fight hunger both at home and abroad. In 1993, I helped found the Congressional Hunger Center with Ambassador Hall and the late Representative Bill Emerson and served on its board for many years. I am pleased that the Hunger Center remains so active under the leadership of my fellow Tom Lantos Commission co-chair Jim McGovern and Representative Jo Ann Emerson.

In the spring of 2008, rising food and fuel prices drove the prices of staples such as corn and rice to unprecedented levels, and pushed an estimated 100 million people into poverty worldwide. The price of basic food commodities has risen 83 percent in the last three years.

While food prices began to fall in late 2008, the world was hit with a global economic crisis. Unlike previous crises which have been confined to individual countries or regions, the current economic crisis is affecting large parts of the world simultaneously, including the United States. The shelves of food banks in my own district in northern Virginia are bare.

Unfortunately, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization, worldwide hunger has been on the rise for the last decade, even before the onset of the consecutive food and economic crisis. Increased hunger over the past decade threatens the achievement of the UN Millennium Development Goal of reducing the number of hungry people in the world by half by 2015.

We have an obligation to reduce hunger for moral and humanitarian reasons, for economic reasons, and for security reasons. According to an article by former USAID Administrator Andrew Natsios, over thirty countries experienced riots linked to higher food prices from 2008 to 2009.

We are honored to have with us such a distinguished panel of witnesses and I look forward to hearing from them on these matters.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, thank you, and I want to also commend my Co-Chair, Congressman Wolf, for all he has done on this issue. He has been an extraordinary leader, and it is a privilege to Co-Chair the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission with him. And I am also very pleased to welcome everyone to today's hearing on the right to food.

I especially want to thank my former colleague, Tony Hall, for all of his incredible work, and everybody here on the panel. I have worked with all of you on so many issues, and you are incredible. Last year I had the privilege of addressing the U.N. General Assembly at a forum looking at the right to food. On the panel with me was Olivier De Schutter, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. It was an eye opening experience for me to hear about the special attention so many nations around the world are giving to enshrining, as a right, the very basic human need for food, adequate daily nutrition.

When I was speaking before the U.N. General Assembly, interestingly enough my topic was what the United States was doing to end hunger in America and provide for our own citizens with food security. It was my first time to talk about ending domestic hunger in an international setting.

We at the Commission view today's hearing as just the first in a series of hearings on this issue, and hopefully later this year we will be able to hold a hearing and hear directly from the

U.N. Special Rapporteur on the Right to Food. Over the past year he has visited many countries and issued reports specific to their efforts to end hunger, increase nutrition, and become food secure. And last week he released reports on Brazil, Guatemala and Nicaragua, capturing the initiative's accomplishments and challenges unique to each of those countries and yet universal to all nations that are striving to become food secure.

A little over a year ago, along with my good friend and fellow founder and Co-Chair of the House Hunger Caucus, Congresswoman Jo Ann Emerson, and I introduced H.R. 2817, the Roadmap to End Global Hunger and Promote Food Security Act. This bill tries to encompass the recommendations put forward by a broad NGO coalition about what the U.S. Congress and U.S. policy need to do in order to end global hunger, increase nutrition and promote global food security and sustainable agriculture. There are a lot of things we can't solve in our lifetime, but ending hunger isn't one of them, and that is what makes this issue so frustrating, is that we can do this if we had the political will.

Our panelists today were leading participants and contributors to that roadmap coalition. I am happy to welcome you all here again. Tony Hall, Rick, Heather and Bob, I appreciate all the work that you do every day on behalf of the vulnerable people around the world. And I see my friend Ed Cooney from the Congressional Hunger Center. I mean, all of you played a role in putting this legislation together.

And along with Congressman Wolf, I would also like to take a moment to express to Bob Zachritz and all of his colleagues at World Vision our shock and deep sorrow over yesterday's attack in northwestern Pakistan against World Vision humanitarian aid workers. Six of World Vision's employees were killed, all of them Pakistanis, and several others were wounded. And I hope that you will accept the Commission's condolences and convey them to the families and coworkers of your lost comrades in Pakistan. This terrible loss reminds us all of the perils faced in the field by the men and women who engage in humanitarian work, including efforts to make sure that people have enough food to eat and have the means to produce or purchase that food for themselves.

I am just going to close by saying I think one of the reasons why Congressman Wolf wanted to do this series of hearings and one of the reasons why I was so eager to join with him is that we need to do more, and we can do more. And I think if, through hearings like this, we can create the noise and the pressure and sometimes even the shame on some of the people who are empowered to make a difference, then we might actually make some progress here. So we are going to keep on doing hearings until this issue goes away, and I hope that that is sooner rather than later.

But I want to thank the chairman again for hosting, for coming up with this idea. And if I excuse myself in a few minutes, I have to go to the Rules Committee but I am going to come back. This is a crazy week. Anyway, thank you very much, and I yield back my time.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Jim. We will start first with Ambassador Hall, then Dr. Hanson, Mr. Leach, and then Bob Zachritz.

Mr. HALL. Well, I want to thank Congressman Wolf for his very kind remarks and his friendship over many, many, many years, and just thank him and Congressman McGovern for being the conscience and the light of this Congress. We need more of you. And just really appreciate both of you very, very much.

By the time I finish my statement today 30 children under the age of five will have died from hunger. And that is six children every minute, 8,400 people a day, more than 3 million a year. That is, when you add it all up, including women and children and older people, it comes to about 25,000 every day that are dying from hunger.

As Frank said, I traveled to Ethiopia during the famine in 1984, and what I witnessed there

changed me forever. I saw thousands of starving people, many dying children. And during that trip, children actually died in my arms. I never got over that, and I still think about that all the time, and it is one of the reasons why I have dedicated myself to fighting hunger.

Though chronic hunger was reduced during the 1980s and 1990s, hunger has been steadily rising for the past decade, and over the past 2 years the problem of hunger has gotten worse. The global food price crisis, the worldwide recession has pushed the number of hungry people above one billion for the first time.

Hungry people are being denied the most basic human right, the right to feed themselves and their families. That creates explosive, unstable political climates. In 2008, a spike in food prices ignited a wave of violent protests and uprisings in more than 30 countries.

American voters believe that the U.S. has both a moral obligation and a strong self-interest in helping hungry people around the world, and at the Alliance to End Hunger, which I direct, we do a lot of polling. We probably do more polling than any nonprofit in the country about the issue of hunger, and we have found that two out of three voters believe that fighting hunger and promoting economic opportunity increases stability around the world and makes the United States more secure from the threat of terrorism.

I will never forget the time I was traveling in Pakistan and I met a man who sent his son to these madrassa schools. And I asked him, why do you send your son to this school? I mean, they teach hate and they can't be doing your son any good. He says, I don't like sending my son there, but I have no other choice. I don't have the means to feed my son, and the madrassa provides him with food every day.

When I tell this story, I can't help but think of what would happen if that boy had benefited from a school feeding program like the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program. And as this story shows us, anti-hunger efforts are directly tied to global security and stability. They are truly one of the best diplomatic tools that we have. If you want to fight terrorism and security, one of the best ways to do it is with humanitarian aid, and the school feeding program, the McGovern-Dole feeding program, the feeding program in schools in well over 40 countries, really works. I mean, it gets kids back in school, especially women for the first time, because, you know, the farmers, they need their kids. And they have got to help them with the harvest and with all the things that they need to do. But when we feed them, you know, the moms and dads really love that because they get a full meal, something that they can't do at their home. You want to compete with these madrassa schools, school feeding, McGovern-Dole really works.

Though ending global hunger is morally important and in our own strategic interest, we have made little headway on our commitment to cut global hunger in half by the year 2015. As a matter of fact, it is embarrassing. You know, I was in the Congress with you men, and I was Ambassador to the World Food Program, FAO, and I continue to see delegation after delegation come to Rome and come to the U.N. system. We say we are going to cut hunger in half by the year 2015. We said that in 1990 and 1996, I think a couple years after that we said we would cut it in half. We are not even close. We sign these documents and we come home and we forget about it. And it is embarrassing.

And that is one of the reasons why this group, along with 50 other nonprofit groups, got together and formed this Roadmap to End Global Hunger. I am proud to say that I was one of the conveners of the process, and it was a very long and difficult process, but we succeeded, I think, for the first time when all the NGOs got together and produced a bill that I think is hopefully a roadmap, a bull's eye for the next 3 years, which our friend Jim McGovern has introduced and is a big part of.

There are three pillars to the Roadmap to End Global Hunger. The first pillar is the creation

of a White House Office on Global Hunger, the appointment of a Global Hunger Coordinator. The U.S. Government, like the Congress, we have a broad range of hunger alleviation programs, policies that are spread among multiple government agencies, and no single entity responsible for coordinating them. They are just not coordinated. Once this initiative is finalized, a permanent point person is needed to ensure our investments in food security are coordinated, efficient, and effective.

The second pillar is the rebirth of the Congressional Select Committee on Hunger, and I really think this is important. I don't know how many standing committees we have today in Congress. 30? I really don't know. It could be more, could be less. But I remember at one time the reason why we formed it, of all those standing committees, three-fourths of them were connected with hunger in some way.

You know, somebody had food stamps, so the SNAP program, somebody had WIC, somebody had the appropriations of food aid, somebody had foreign affairs, I mean, it was spread among 22 committees. Well, when we had the Select Committee on Hunger, we were able to have hearings and focus and get ideas and bring the best people, like some of the people here at the table, bring some of the best people in our country and overseas as to what was going on. And from that we developed a lot of legislation, of which is in law today as a result of that committee. So that is the second pillar. I hope you think about that. I really think that is important.

The third pillar of the Roadmap to End Hunger is the development and the implementation of a comprehensive strategy to address hunger and food security. The administration has made headway on incorporating the first and the third pillars of the roadmap. You know, they have got a long way to go, but at least they are working towards it. But we are missing that critical second pillar. I would urge Congress to create a permanent, either bipartisan, bicameral Select Committee on Hunger. And if the Senate doesn't want to do it with you, do it here in the House.

I want to conclude my remarks today by applauding the leadership of Congressman Frank Wolf and certainly Congressman McGovern, Congresswoman Emerson for introducing H.R. 2817, which is the Roadmap to End Global Hunger and Promote Food Security. And I want to recognize Congresswoman McCollum for introducing H.R. 3077, which is the Global Food Security Act of 2009.

As Congressman McGovern often says, and as I firmly believe, hunger is a political condition, and if we have the political will we can end hunger in our lifetime. Freedom from hunger is the most essential of human rights, and we have tolerated violations of this freedom far too long.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Hall follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF AMBASSADOR TONY HALL, DIRECTOR, ALLIANCE TO END HUNGER

I want to thank Congressman Wolf and the committee for inviting me to testify today on an issue that is close to my heart.

Hunger is a direct threat to the life and health of millions of children around the globe. By the time I finish my statement today, 30 children under the age of five will have died from hunger. That is six children every minute... 8,400 a day... more than 3 million a year.

I traveled to Ethiopia during the famine in 1984 and what I witnessed changed me forever. I saw thousands of starving people and many dying children. During that trip, children died in my arms--a horrifying experience that I will never forget and it is the reason I have dedicated my life to fighting hunger.

Though chronic hunger was reduced during the 1980s and 90s, hunger has been steadily rising for the past decade. Over the past two years the problem of hunger has gotten significantly worse. The global food price crisis and the world-wide recession have pushed the number hungry people above 1 billion for the first time.

Hungry people are being denied the most basic human right – the right to adequately feed themselves and their families – creating a potentially explosive and unstable political climate. In 2008, a spike in food prices ignited a wave of violent protests and uprisings in more than 30 countries. This kind of political instability is a breeding ground for human rights violations and it also presents a serious threat to international peace and U.S. national security.

American voters believe that the U.S. has both a moral obligation and a strong self-interest in helping hungry people around the world. In a Hunger Message Project poll conducted by the Alliance to End Hunger, a plurality of voters said the best reason for reducing hunger is that “it is the moral and right thing to do.” Americans also understand that fighting hunger and promoting economic opportunity makes our country safer. Two out of three voters believe that fighting hunger and promoting economic opportunity increases stability around the world and makes the United States more secure from the threat of terrorism.

One time when I was traveling in Pakistan, I met a man who was sending his son to a madrasah. I asked this man, “Why do you send your son to that school?” He responded by saying, “I don’t like sending my son there, but I have no other choice. I don’t have the means to feed my son and the madrasah provides him with food everyday.”

When I tell this story I can’t help but think of what would have happened if that boy had benefited from a school feeding program like the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program and didn’t have to attend a madrasah for food. As this story shows us, anti-hunger efforts are directly tied to global security and stability. They are truly one of the best diplomatic tools that we have.

Though ending global hunger is morally important and in our own strategic interests, we have made little headway on our commitment to cut global hunger in half by 2015.

A coalition of 40 non-governmental organizations came together in early 2008 to lay out, in concrete terms, what the U.S. must do to meet its global commitments. The product of their effort is the Roadmap to End Global Hunger. This document outlines the U.S. contribution toward meeting the first Millennium Development Goal. As the convener of this process, I have to say that it was long and often difficult; but we succeeded because we were united by our shared determination to reach a consensus. It is one of the most impressive undertakings I have participated in during my 40 years of public service.

There are three pillars to the Roadmap to End Global Hunger.

The first pillar is the creation of a White House office on Global Hunger and the appointment of a global hunger coordinator. The U.S. government has a broad range of hunger alleviation programs and policies spread among multiple government agencies, and no single entity responsible for coordinating them. The Obama Administration’s Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative is being developed by a wide range of government agencies including the National Security Council, USAID, the Department of Agriculture, the Treasury Department and the Millennium Challenge Corporation. Once this initiative is finalized, a permanent point person is needed to ensure our investments in food security are coordinated, efficient, and effective.

The second pillar is the rebirth of the Congressional Select Committee on Hunger. The programs addressing hunger are under the jurisdiction of several congressional committees, making it difficult to address this issue in a comprehensive and coordinated way. As former chair of this select committee, I know how important it is to have a single congressional committee focusing on the issue of hunger.

The third pillar of the Roadmap to End Hunger is the development and implementation of a comprehensive strategy to address hunger and food insecurity.

The Administration has made headway on incorporating the first and third pillars of the roadmap into the Global Food Security Initiative. This initiative is the most comprehensive and thoughtful plan for fighting hunger that I have seen. I am particularly pleased that refocuses our attention on agriculture and maternal and child nutrition – critical areas that have been neglected for many years. I urge Congress to work with the Administration to support this initiative.

But we are missing the critical second pillar. I urge Congress to create a permanent bipartisan, bicameral Select Committee on Hunger. Reestablishing the select committee is essential for supporting an efficient, effective and coordinated approach to global food security.

I want to conclude my remarks today by applauding the leadership of Congressman McGovern and Congresswoman Emerson for introducing H.R. 2817, the Roadmap to End Global Hunger and Promote Food Security Act of 2009. I would also like to recognize Congresswoman McCollum for introducing H.R. 3077, the Global Food Security Act of 2009.

As Congressman McGovern often says, and as I firmly believe – hunger is a political condition and if we have the political will, we can end hunger in our lifetime. As the director of the Alliance to End Hunger, I lead a coalition of more than 80 corporations, non-profits, universities, and faith-based organizations dedicated to building the political and public will to end hunger at home and around the world. And I am honored to say that all of the witnesses at today’s hearing are members of the Alliance.

On behalf of the Alliance members, let me urge you to make ending hunger your top priority. Right now, Congress could take immediate steps toward this goal by supporting the Global Food Security Initiative, passing the global food security bills that have been introduced, and establishing a bi-partisan, bicameral Select Committee on Hunger.

Freedom from hunger is the most essential of all human rights. We have tolerated violations of this freedom for far too long.

Thank you.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Hall.

Ms. HANSON. Well, I want to express my appreciation to Representatives Frank Wolf and Jim McGovern, the cochairs of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, for this opportunity to testify today on the problem of global hunger and the challenges before us. I applaud your leadership.

I am here today as the Director of Public Affairs of Mercy Corps, a humanitarian and development organization that works in 40 conflict-affected and transitional countries around the world. We help to rebuild secure, productive and just communities.

In 2009, Mercy Corps implemented food security programs in 22 countries, which reached over 3-1/2 million people; 1-1/2 million of those we provided direct food assistance to. We also worked with nearly one million smallholder farmers in over 30 countries to help them improve production and increase their incomes.

As you have already heard, in July 2008, Ambassador Tony Hall and I convened a group of people from various organizations here in Washington, D.C. We wanted to put our heads together and figure out what the U.S. Government could do to end global hunger. Since then I have had the great honor to work with a big group of people I now call hunger heroes from organizations like Bread for the World, Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Friends of the World Food Program and Save the Children. Over 40 other organizations have joined us in what we call the Roadmap to End Global Hunger, and we have had great support along the way from the Congressional Hunger Center, from the Alliance to End Hunger, and also from Interaction. And this document is now the basis for legislation which you have already heard about.

All of us laud the Obama administration's commitments to increasing global food security and particularly efforts of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, in convening an interagency task force to examine this issue and now in proposing what is in the new budget request, the Global Food Security Initiative. At the same time, we know that, despite all the past U.S. commitments, the total number of hungry people in the world continues to increase. For this reason, I want to talk about some of the continued challenges ahead that Members of Congress are well positioned to influence positively.

The first is ensuring coordination. The Roadmap to End Global Hunger has always called for a coordinator to be named to provide leadership for U.S. efforts. The role of coordinator is even more essential now as the administration prepares to begin implementing this new Global Food Security Initiative. This is an issue not only of effective implementation, but also of oversight. As long as no one is named to this position it is not clear who will report back the results to the Congress and to other constituencies in the United States. To make these efforts sustainable, it will need to be clear that they are bearing fruit, and for this reason the role of the coordinator is very important. We have urged the administration to move forward in naming this person as soon as possible, and we encourage Members of Congress to join us in that.

There are also steps to be taken to improve coordination here in the legislative branch, and Tony has already mentioned our recommendation about reviving the Select Committee on Hunger and making it bicameral, so I won't go into that further.

The second challenge is promoting local ownership and sustainability. The administration

plans to promote country-led strategies where countries themselves will take ownership of a process of eliminating hunger in their own countries. However, these country-led strategies to date, the plans have failed to address the limited capacity and overwhelming needs facing government officials in many of the countries where most hungry people live. In these places, a lack of political will to end hunger combines with serious institutional weaknesses and often with corruption. Because the hungry are usually seen as politically marginal, governments that are responding to many complex demands and grievances at once are unlikely to prioritize their needs. In short, while the development of country-led strategies offers clear benefits in terms of local ownership and sustainability, we remain concerned about the overwhelming number of hungry people who live in countries where weak institutions must be strengthened in order for country-led plans to prosper.

The third challenge is effectively engaging civil society. It is not yet clear how the comprehensive strategy will engage civil society actors in planning and program design within the country-led strategies. This is of particular concern because civil society organizations, including local producer groups, community-based organizations, and advocacy groups normally enjoy a level of access and communication with a broad range of people who have profound understanding of local problems and local capacity. This positions them very well in terms of contributing to the development of solutions that are tailored for success in the local context. In addition, civil society involvement is key to assuring accountability of programs.

For all these reasons, meaningful participation of civil society organizations across the world so they feel real ownership of their country's strategies will be a cornerstone for success.

The final challenge is ensuring programs are flexible enough to meet needs. Mercy Corps' field experience shows that in the aftermath of natural disaster or conflicts, immediate food assistance is often needed to provide lifesaving relief. However, as soon as possible Mercy Corps aims to transition emergency programs to longer term programming meant to increase income, rebuild vital infrastructure, spur the revival of markets, and lay the groundwork for long-term sustainable development.

It is this experience that leads us to advocate so strongly for flexible approaches in U.S. Government foreign assistance. Because our field teams work closely with USAID missions around the world, we have seen how chronic underfunding has weakened the ability of USAID staff to identify and fund flexible programs that are individually adapted to address context specific problems and dynamics. We urge Members of Congress to support the rebuilding of the U.S. Agency for International Development that is laid out and funded in the administration's most recent budget request.

I have a fuller written testimony, which is available on the table. In closing, I thank you all again for your leadership and commitment to addressing global hunger. The opportunities are before us. If we rise to meet the challenges, together we can enable millions of people to build secure, productive, and just communities for themselves and their families.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Ms. Hanson follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HEATHER HANSON, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS, MERCY CORPS

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission:

I want to express my appreciation to Honorable Representatives Frank Wolf and Jim McGovern, Co-Chairs of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission, for the opportunity to offer testimony today on the problem of global hunger and the challenges before us. I applaud your leadership in tackling this critical issue.

In the past several years there have been many public presentations, events and hearings in Washington on the topic of hunger. I am particularly pleased to be here today to discuss food as a right, since I believe it is all too easy for us to forget the absolutely essential nature of food as a building block for every other right we may have. As

many of you here know, prior to my job at Mercy Corps I worked directly on civil and political rights, which I believe are crucially important. Yet without a healthy, nutritious diet in the first years of life, stunting can permanently and irreparably impair brain development, limiting an individual's ability to exercise political rights and stifling their freedom of expression. And when people spend all their time working just to cover the food needs of their families, they often have very little time to participate meaningfully in civic life. In short, nothing is more basic, more necessary, than food. It is a prerequisite for all else in our lives. I thank you for holding this hearing on the topic.

The current political moment in Washington and beyond presents us all with a tremendous opportunity: the clear, welcome international consensus on the importance and the benefits of tackling global hunger head on gives us all a very real possibility to do what others before us have not yet been able to do. Across the globe – and in part due to the serious wake-up call that came from the food and financial crises of 2008 – there is more political will and more serious resolve than ever before focused on steadily reducing the number of hungry, malnourished and undernourished people. If we can effectively maintain this momentum and harness this emerging political will, we can end hunger in our lifetimes.

About Mercy Corps. I am here today in my capacity as the Director of Public Affairs of Mercy Corps, an international humanitarian and development nonprofit organization that currently works in 40 conflict-affected and transitional countries, helping to rebuild secure, productive and just societies. Mercy Corps works in some of the world's most challenging and dangerous environments, including Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Sudan, Somalia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Sri Lanka and Colombia. Our efforts are supported by a wide range of public, private, and international donors, including a strong partnership with USAID. Our team works under difficult conditions in places where natural disasters have destroyed what little people have, where crops have been ruined, where markets have failed, and where civil strife has disrupted supply chains. They work in areas where chronic poverty takes a constant toll, and where hunger is an everyday problem facing those we aim to serve.

In 2009, Mercy Corps initiated \$135 million worth of new food security-focused programming in 15 countries, to make a total portfolio of more than forty programs in 22 countries worth approximately \$173 million. These programs reach over three and a half million people, roughly 1.5 million of whom receive direct food assistance. Mercy Corps now has 18 programs operating in 14 countries to specifically address the impacts of the food price crisis: these programs have facilitated increased access to inputs for over 11,000 farmers, assisted in establishment of 843 small and medium size enterprises to produce and distribute nutritious foods, allowed producers to access almost \$200,000 in new loans and catalyzed over \$30,000 in new savings. As a result of these programs, we estimate that 15,869 families have increased their dietary diversity and therefore improved nutrition.

Given the importance of agriculture to household food security and the fundamental role it plays in spurring both household-level and local economic growth and development, Mercy Corps works extensively to improve the performance of the agricultural sector in the countries where we work. Specifically, we work with smallholder farmers, agri-business, financial institutions and governments to decrease hunger, increase incomes and improve environmental practices.

In 2009, Mercy Corps worked with nearly 1 million smallholder farmers in approximately 30 countries. Mercy Corps' approach to agricultural development is one that first studies market opportunities and then combines strong technical assistance with access to savings and credit services in order to help smallholder farmers and agribusinesses improve their production practices, increase their marketing capacity, and improve their overall business management, no matter what the size. Mercy Corps specifically focuses on increasing productivity and profit across "high impact" agricultural sub-sectors (such as rice, potato, livestock) —in other words—those sub-sectors that offer the greatest social, economic, and environmental impact for the greatest number of smallholder farmers.

In addition to reaching nearly a million farming households in 2009, these programs assisted 1,717 agribusinesses and resulted in \$4.3 million in small-scale agricultural infrastructure improvements. All tolled we estimate a \$14.3 million increase in the value of production for the farmers we work with. Our seven most established value-chain programs alone have increased profit margins for farmers by 35 percent and increased sales by 30 percent. Our agriculture programs have loaned out \$890,907 to promote increased production and have stimulated savings of \$119,925 through working with 272,000 clients. A total of 70 percent of our agriculture program beneficiaries are from marginalized groups, including women and youth.

Impacts of the Global Food Crisis. In the Spring of 2008, when news of the global food crisis hit the U.S. press, Mercy Corps reached out to our field programs all over the world to ask how the rising prices were impacting people on the ground. What we found will hardly be surprising to those of you attending this hearing. Staff from 23 countries responded, reporting that poor and vulnerable populations were experiencing three main negative impacts as a result of the world food crisis: 1) declining health conditions, 2) increasing poverty, and 3) risk of civil unrest.

Declining health conditions. Mercy Corps field staff reported that declining access to food was producing strong negative impacts on local diets. In Kyrgyzstan, poor households were increasingly buying lower quality staple foods, while those with more income were reportedly stocking up on flour in anticipation of further price increases. In Mongolia, poor and middle-income households had begun to reduce consumption of more nutritious foods like fresh fruits and vegetables in order to afford basic staple foods. This was also true in other countries where Mercy Corps works – where middle income people were buying lower quality food, and poorer people had begun to skip meals. Surveys conducted in Tajikistan in February and March of 2008 showed that between 42% and 61% of those surveyed reported they had eaten only one or no hot meals the day before, and 72% of parents in one area reported that their children under five years of age were not getting enough to eat.

Mercy Corps' Indonesia program reported that poorer households were forced to choose between spending limited income on food or on clean water and sanitation programs: rising food prices had led families to cut back on expenditures for water, a decision that could increase vulnerability to infectious diseases, particularly diarrhea and stomach infections among children.

Increasing poverty. We also found that poor households were spending more and more of their limited income to meet their food needs. The strain this placed upon them cannot be overestimated. Before the 2008 spike in food prices, workers in Afghanistan were spending an average of 50 to 70 percent of their income on food: during the height of the crisis some reported spending more than 100 percent of their income on food, and many were going into debt in order to feed their families. In Sri Lanka, rapid inflation of food and other prices led the government to revise the expenditure-based poverty line upward from about \$18/person/month to \$27/person/month.

In Gaza people reported that they had exhausted their savings and had begun selling off jewelry to pay for food. In Mongolia people were taking out loans to meet consumption needs, thereby increasing their risk of future homelessness by using their property as collateral. In Tajikistan 61 percent of people surveyed by Mercy Corps reported that they had borrowed money to pay for food, and 24 percent said they were forced to sell even their most productive assets – like livestock – to meet daily needs. As poorer households plunged further into these cycles of indebtedness and risk, full recovery seemed less and less likely.

Risk of civil unrest. Mercy Corps' program staff also reported concern about the increasing possibility of civil unrest. In some countries – like Honduras – there had already been general strikes calling on the government to lower food prices. In others, widespread discontent was threatening the continued legitimacy of governments. In Afghanistan the rising food prices had exacerbated tensions related to popular perceptions regarding the inefficiency and corruption of the government. Because many more people were being pushed into poverty, most Mercy Corps program staff also reported concerns over the potential for a general increase in crime.

In addition to these impacts on program participants in communities where Mercy Corps works, our program staff also reported challenges in implementing quality programs because of increased costs and greater difficulty promoting community involvement.

Roughly 95% of Mercy Corps' worldwide staff are host-country nationals. In the wake of the global food crisis, many local staff asked for pay increases, transportation stipends, increases in their per diem expense allowances during field trips, or bonuses to assist them in offsetting increased costs for food and transportation. In Afghanistan alone, Mercy Corps estimated that the total cost increase for a year of operations would likely exceed \$350,000. Increased costs also forced cut backs on programming. In Colombia, Mercy Corps had to decrease food assistance programs serving internally displaced populations because of the rise in food prices and the fall in dollar exchange rates. In Syria, Mercy Corps staff was forced to decide between cutting needy families off the food distribution list or providing a smaller packet of food to each family.

Finally, the food crisis made it more difficult to promote community participation in economic development programs more generally. Field staff in Indonesia reported that people there were being forced to work longer hours to meet the needs of their families, leaving them little time for participation in community improvement programs, livelihood trainings or peace-building activities. Likewise, the rising food prices also impacted all programs based upon the production and processing of food, making it more difficult to diversify incomes, especially in rural areas.

The Call to Change. Seeing all these impacts across our field programs motivated Mercy Corps to think very seriously about how to contribute to producing the positive changes that we knew hungry people needed. With this in mind, in July 2008 Ambassador Tony Hall and I convened a small group of people from various organizations and advocacy groups here in Washington, DC. Since then I have had the great honor to work closely with a number of “hunger heroes” from Bread for the World, Catholic Relief Services, CARE, Friends of the World Food Program, and Save the Children. When we started out, we had no idea where we would end up – which makes it more than a little bit ironic that now we are known as the “Roadmap” group.

What we knew was that almost a billion people were going to bed hungry every night. What we decided to do together – what we committed ourselves to doing – was to figure out how the U.S. could best make progress towards

changing the lives of as many of those hungry people as possible: increasing their earnings, building their food security, reducing the risks they face, and helping them to build brighter futures for themselves and their families.

We have been supported in our work by colleagues at the Congressional Hunger Center, the Alliance to End Hunger, and Interaction. Over 40 other organizations have signed on to the document we produced, “*The Roadmap to End Global Hunger*”, which outlines a series of recommendations and is now the basis for legislation in the House of Representatives – H.R. 2817 – with the co-sponsorship of Representatives McGovern and Emerson. As Co-Chairs of the House Hunger Caucus, they have each distinguished themselves as exemplary leaders in the fight against hunger.

In addition to all the great leaders in the U.S. Congress on this issue, we also have an Administration that has made substantial commitments to ending global hunger. We laud all the steps taken by the Obama Administration to increase global food security, particularly the efforts of Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton in convening an Interagency Task Force to develop and implement a comprehensive strategy for US assistance in this area. As I said earlier, the level of commitment we see across the world – and at every level of the U.S. government – is cause for great hope that we can significantly reduce the total number of hungry people.

Outstanding Challenges. At the same time, we must remember that despite the significant commitments the U.S. has always made to this cause, the total number of hungry people in the world has continued to increase. For this reason – because the task before us is not easy – I want to talk today about some of the challenges ahead in terms of implementation of the current comprehensive strategy. I will talk briefly about four main challenges that Members of Congress are well positioned to influence positively: how to ensure coordination across the U.S. government both in Washington and in the field, how to promote ownership and sustainability of these efforts in other countries, how to effectively engage civil society actors, and how to ensure programs are flexible enough to meet real needs on the ground and adapt to changing conditions.

Ensuring Coordination. For U.S. contributions to be efficient and effective at ending hunger, adequate coordination and integration must be assured both in Washington and at field missions all over the world. While the comprehensive strategy developed by the Interagency Task Force is a solid step forward in promoting unity of efforts among the many agencies involved in global hunger programs, further steps to guarantee coordination remain warranted.

In the “*Roadmap to End Global Hunger*” we called for a Coordinator to be named to provide leadership to U.S. efforts. The role of Coordinator is even more essential now, as the Administration prepares to begin implementing the comprehensive strategy. This is an issue not only of effective implementation, but also of oversight: because no one has been named to lead this initiative, it remains unclear who will be reporting back to the Congress on what has been accomplished. Given the tight fiscal environment in the U.S., reporting back on accomplishments from prior funding must be done well or it will be difficult to sustain the support for the comprehensive plan. We encourage the Administration to move forward on naming this person immediately, and hope Members of Congress will join us in this effort.

There are also clear steps that could be taken to improve coordination and integration across the legislative branch of the government. Because many committees of Congress have jurisdiction over programs to address global hunger, the *Roadmap* group has always called on the U.S. Congress to revive the Congressional Select Committee on Hunger and to extend it to include the Senate. This step would greatly enhance the U.S. Congress’ ability to perform adequate oversight. More importantly, a bicameral Select Committee would also allow for the broadening of Congressional leadership on the issue of hunger, which is essential to guaranteeing the sustainability of these efforts.

The transparency of the budgeting process, as related to food security, could also be improved. Because food security programs cross cut with global health and other development accounts, it is often difficult to see what is being spent and, therefore, to evaluate the results of the comprehensive strategy.

Finally, coordination at the field level is also important to guaranteeing that a range of programs – including emergency, nutrition, safety nets and agricultural development programs – are employed to sustainably meet the needs of hungry people. Through decades of experience with agricultural development programs, Mercy Corps has found that some of the most promising approaches involve the private sector in programs promoting commercial development of agricultural market linkages, allowing smallholder producers to reap greater benefits from participation in local and regional markets. When combined with savings, credit and insurance programs, we have found that incomes can be increased at the same time as the risks facing food producers are minimized. In short, to effectively address both the chronic and acute causes of hunger this initiative must focus not only on agriculture, but on the full range of needs facing those smallholder farmers who produce most of the world’s food. We all know the importance of women in food production, and their needs are rightfully a focus of the Administration’s comprehensive plan.

Promoting local ownership and sustainability. The Administration's plans to promote "country-led strategies" to address hunger will need to take into account the limited capacity and overwhelming needs facing government officials in many of the countries where most hungry people live. In these places, a lack of political will to end hunger combines with serious institutional weakness, and often with corruption. Because the hungry are usually seen as politically marginal, governments that are responding to many complex demands and grievances at once are unlikely to prioritize their needs. In short, while the development of "country-led strategies" offers clear benefits in terms of local ownership and sustainability – and is highly appropriate in countries with sufficient capacity and will to develop and implement such strategies – we remain concerned about the overwhelming number of hungry people who live in countries where weak institutions must be strengthened in order for "country-led plans" to prosper.

Mercy Corps works in many countries where an intersection of conditions creates unique challenges. These countries, which are often transitioning from natural disasters, economic shocks or conflicts, are characterized by three dynamics: a large gap between the population's needs and the available institutional capacity to meet them; an urgent imperative to meet those needs or face increasing risk of renewed instability; and a requirement that those needs be met through sustainable changes in indigenous capacity and institutions. We have found that the combination of these three dynamics creates special difficulties for humanitarian and development programs.

Taken together, they create an inherent tension between whether to use external or indigenous capacity to meet immediate and long-term needs. When a state is teetering on the brink due to uneven development, delegitimization of the government, declining economic opportunity, and collapse of public services, aggressive outside assistance is important – yet it is at best a stopgap solution. Transitional aid strategies that take a humanitarian approach, focused on expediently meeting needs via international provision of goods and services, tend to create dependency instead of developing effective local capacity. Large-scale infusions of foreign aid may thus actually impede the development of indigenous capacity. The disparity between local needs and local capacity requires sustainable, locally-based solutions. Yet taking a developmental approach, which relies on local structures for management of aid efforts, can overtax weak indigenous capacity rather than build it, creating bottlenecks and fueling corruption.

To address these difficulties, implementation options for use in these transitional environments should also be incorporated into the Administration's comprehensive food security strategy. If this is not done, there is a risk that the strategy will only improve the lives of hungry people who live in countries with sufficient will and capacity to assist them, leaving the poorest and most vulnerable people to fend for themselves.

Effectively engaging civil society. It is not yet clear how the comprehensive strategy will engage civil society actors in planning and program design within the "country-led strategies." This is of particular concern because civil society organizations – including local producer groups, community-based organizations, and advocacy groups – normally enjoy a level of access to and communication with a broad range of people who have a profound understanding of local problems and local capacity. This positions them well in terms of contributing to the development of solutions tailored for success in the local context. In addition, civil society involvement is key to guaranteeing the accountability of programs. For all these reasons, meaningful involvement of civil society organizations across the world – so they feel real ownership of their country strategy – will be a cornerstone of success.

The budget request recently submitted by the Administration includes funding for a new multi-donor agricultural and food security trust fund to be administered by the World Bank. We believe it is a positive sign that civil society representatives will be invited to participate as observers to the decision-making process of the fund. However, we believe that full and meaningful civil society involvement would require inclusion not just as observers but as regular members of these decision-making bodies. We urge Members of Congress to support this kind of inclusion.

Ensuring programs are flexible enough to meet needs. Mercy Corps' field experience shows that, to address the impacts of both chronic and acute hunger, a combination of program approaches is often required. In the aftermath of natural disasters or conflicts, immediate assistance is often needed to provide life-saving relief. However, as soon as it is possible, Mercy Corps aims to transition emergency programs to longer-term programs meant to increase incomes, rebuild vital infrastructure, spur the revival of markets and to lay the ground work for long-term, sustainable development. Because conditions vary so widely from place to place, we find it necessary to shift strategies as recovery processes take hold. It is this experience that leads us to advocate so strongly for flexible approaches in U.S. government foreign assistance.

It is heartening to see the dramatic progress and future plans being laid to rebuild staff capacity within the U.S. Agency for International Development. Because our field teams work closely with USAID missions around the world, we have seen their struggle over the last decade to support and administer funding while their core of talented and qualified personnel dwindled steadily due to the lack of U.S. government investment. This chronic underfunding has weakened the ability of USAID staff to identify and fund flexible programs that are individually

adapted to address context-specific problems and dynamics. It has led to an increase in contracts – rather than grants – as a primary mechanism of funding implementing partners, and with this to more top-down approaches. We support the rebuilding of the U.S. Agency for International Development that is laid out and funded in the Administration’s most recent budget request.

The capacity for fast and flexible emergency response has been a hallmark of USAID programs managed through the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA). In the wake of the devastating earthquake in Haiti, we have seen the need for quick Congressional action to replenish emergency funds that have been drawn down to meet urgent human needs there. To responsibly cover the commitments in Haiti, OFDA has had to find available funding in their currently approved budget. If an emergency supplemental is not developed and efficiently approved by the U.S. Congress, OFDA will be required to cut back on urgent and essential humanitarian assistance programs in the rest of the world by up to 40%. We all have seen the urgent human needs in Haiti and are grateful for the generous response on the part of the U.S. government. However, we remain concerned that this not cut into equally important humanitarian commitments we have made in Africa, Asia and beyond. We ask Members of Congress to take up the task of an emergency supplemental that includes adequate support given the scale and magnitude of the current crisis in Haiti.

Recommendations to the U.S. Congress:

1. Support the Administration’s FY11 budget for international programs related to hunger and food security.
2. Encourage the full inclusion of civil society representatives in the multi-donor agricultural and food security trust fund to be administered by the World Bank.
3. Encourage the Interagency Task Force to further develop a range of options for “country-led strategies” to account for and effectively provide assistance in those difficult transitional environments with limited capacity and political will.
4. Increase USAID’s ability to implement flexible food security programs around the world by supporting the FY11 O&E request in the 150 account.
5. Move forward immediately on development and passage of a supplemental to cover costs of the relief effort in Haiti so that this effort does not negatively impact food security and other humanitarian commitments.

I thank you all again for your leadership and commitment to addressing global hunger. The opportunities are before us. If we rise to meet the challenges, together we can enable millions of people to build secure, productive and just communities for themselves and for their families.

Mr. WOLF. Well, thank you. And without objection we will put your whole statement in the record, too, your in-depth one.

Mr. LEACH. Thank you for the opportunity to be here today. And I wanted to acknowledge the incredible leadership that you have provided and Congressman McGovern and Tony Hall, who is always a pleasure to be with. I think almost everyone in this room and so many people throughout the NGO community and Congress actually worked for Tony at one point. I know I did. I think everyone has. I mean, if they haven't they wish they could, almost anywhere I go. So you have all provided a voice for those who are often not heard. So on their behalf, thank you.

Mr. WOLF. What do you do? Is this your full-time job now, or what do you do?

Mr. LEACH. I do work for the World Food Program on policy issues and also work for the World Health Organization.

Mr. WOLF. Are you employed by them? Who are you, are you an independent?

Mr. LEACH. Yes, unless you have some other ideas.

I think we all know the data that Tony and Heather referenced. 2006 we were talking about 870 million hungry people. Now it is over a billion. The progress we achieved from the sixties to the nineties, where we moved from 37 percent of the proportion of the population suffering from hunger to 17 percent, is now being threatened. And we have all, for years and years and decades, throughout your entire time in Congress and since my birth, talked about the issue of hunger as a problem that we know how to resolve, that we have the sufficient food, the knowledge to defeat this problem. The only thing that was lacking is the political will, the political will to step up and do what needs to be done.

I am happy to be here today to say I think that political will is now here. This administration, through the Secretary, through the President, and through the initiative that we have been talking about, I think is that opportunity to have the high level leadership exerting the political will to actually make a difference and turn the tide. I think the initiative that they have put on the table that they have been working to, in this planning phase and moving toward implementation, is both unprecedented and transformative. I think it is unprecedented in the sense that it is, in fact, comprehensive.

The things that we have talked about in the roadmap, that is in the roadmap bill, looking at four categories of activity that address both the immediate, intermediate and long-term effects of hunger, are part of their initiative. We are talking about emergency response, which we have always as a nation been committed to. We are talking about expanding the nutrition programs, especially for newborns, zero to 2-year olds and pregnant and lactating women. They have expanded the support for safety net programs similar to what we have in our food stamp programs so that countries can actually develop assistance to provide for those who are on the margins so they don't fall off the edge and therefore needing emergency assistance. And the area where they have significantly rammed up support is in agriculture development and access to markets to really deal with some of those underlying causes of hunger.

As many of the GAO reports and others in looking at what we have done as a government in years past have said, we have done a great job in the emergency response. It is in these other areas that we have not been as strong. I think what they have put on the table, what they are moving toward implementing is in fact comprehensive and is unprecedented.

I think it is also unprecedented in terms of the support that they have garnered throughout the world. Countries, the G20, the G8, we were up at the U.N. General Assembly in September, Bob, you were there, I remember, and Tony. 100 countries came together, a meeting co chaired by Secretary of State Clinton, Ban Ki-moon, where these countries, civil societies, foundations, private sector were there, and they embraced this initiative and they committed to help make it a reality.

It is also unprecedented in terms of the level of support they have sought from the United States Congress and the monies appropriated for 2010 and also the budget request that is now pending. It is unprecedented funding levels for ag development, for the nutrition programs, and also added flexibility in dealing with emergency response with additional cash to allow for flexibility in local and regional purchase.

It is transformative I think, as Heather was indicating, and Tony, in that they are in fact bringing together all of these agencies, the alphabet soup of those who touch the issue of hunger who never actually sat in the same room together, AID, State Department, PEPFAR, MCC, Treasury. There are still some who aren't at the table who need to be at the table, like USTR and Commerce, to help develop those markets where this added production hopefully will have access. So they, in fact, did bring together all of those players who really should be at the table developing this comprehensive approach.

They have also, in addition to doing this work in Washington, what they have done in the embassies in these target countries is to definitely support the aid mission, which has to play the lead role, but also to say that the U.S. ambassador has to also be involved and that the trade officers and the agriculture officers need to be part of whatever this plan is going to be. And that is a marked change.

I think the Secretary of State has talked at length about integrating development and diplomatic goals, and this is part of that process that we are seeing take place.

It is also transformative in terms of how the planning process has unfolded. All of us at this table, I think probably everyone in this room has sat with this administration since January of last

year in meetings talking about what should be in their plan, and I think we can all applaud the fact that this is our plan. That plan that we saw when they first unveiled it is markedly different than what they now have, and they will tell you it is based on the good input from all of the people in this room and throughout this city and throughout the country. So it is, in fact transformative in that sense.

The other, as Heather mentioned, is country level planning process. What they are intending to do, and it is still at the planning phases so we don't now how it will actually unfold, but what they are really seeking to do is to engage all of the key players in these countries with the governments, the host governments in the lead so we develop these country-based plans where governments will be held accountable, where they will, in fact, be totally transparent. And one of the remarkable things, if, in fact it works, and that is, to ensure that all of the other donor countries and the multilateral institutions are part of this planning process so that, in country, they will in fact be integrated and support each other in terms of their role in implementing these plans, so it won't be, as all of you have seen in your visits around the world, where you find the DFID project, which isn't related to the AID project, which is maybe working counter to an NGO project.

So if this in fact works as planned and we have no reason to believe it won't, this is in fact transformative. We are at the initial stages of this initiative, and I think that if in fact it works, and I have no reason to doubt we will remain involved, this will in fact transform the world. It will do what we have all hoped and dreamt about achieving.

Two final points. One is really to all of us and that is we need to remain engaged. They want us to be engaged. We need to remain engaged and help develop these country-based plans. We need to be engaged to help with the monitoring and evaluation to bring good ideas to the table, to identify things that aren't working, to bring, in my case, mediocre jokes to the table. So we have to remain involved and to continue -- yes, I had to do that.

The other is here in Congress. I think it is critical to pass legislation. There are various bills pending, the McCollum bill, the Roadmap bill, the Lugar-Casey bill, critical to take what we now have as a presidential initiative and institutionalize it, so that we in fact, the U.S. Congress, authorizes the actions that they are undertaking. It acknowledges the comprehensive elements that are required and, in some cases, to create the authority to do some of the things that they want to do. We are all here to help make that a reality.

The other thing that that would accomplish, in moving forward and actually passing the legislation, is ensuring that the general public and members up here actually understand what the elements are and to hopefully build the base of support so that the resources will be forthcoming in years ahead.

So we are all here together. We will not relent, and I am confident that we will in a year's time talk about the achievements that we all collectively have garnered.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Leach follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF RICK LEACH, SENIOR ADVISOR FOR PUBLIC POLICY, FRIENDS OF THE WORLD FOOD PROGRAM

Chairman McGovern and Chairman Wolf, other distinguished Members, ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to participate in this hearing on global hunger.

I want to acknowledge and thank Congressmen McGovern and Wolf for their leadership and longstanding commitment to addressing hunger. You have seen the face of hunger in your travels to countries where the scourge of malnutrition plagues the population. You have authored legislation to help address hunger both here at home and throughout the world. You have provided an important voice for those who are often unheard.

Global hunger and poverty have proven to be one of humanity's most intractable problems, present throughout history and persisting today. Yet in the 20th century, the international community reached a point where we possess the collective resources and knowledge to end global hunger. What has been lacking is the political will and sustained leadership at the highest levels of government. The Obama administration's Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative (GHFSI) appears to provide both the needed political will and global leadership.

As Secretary of State Hillary Clinton said in announcing last year's recipient of the World Food Prize, "By working together, I believe we can show the will necessary to end the hunger crisis, to usher in a new era of progress and plenty. That is our goal. That is our challenge."

I. Statement of the Problem. We gather here today as both the absolute number and the overall percentage of people experiencing chronic hunger have increased for the first time in decades. Roughly 870 million people suffered from hunger in 2006 and that number now exceeds 1 billion.

The increase in the number of hungry people is due in large part to the global food, fuel and financial crises of the past two years. In 2008, global food and fuel prices skyrocketed, with some people facing market increases as high as 75 percent. While prices declined in late 2008 and early 2009, they remained higher than in previous years and markets continue to be volatile.

On the heels of the food and fuel crisis, the global economic crisis of 2009 rippled through the developing world, lowering incomes, reducing remittances, decreasing trade, slowing investment, tightening credit and increasing the number of people living with hunger.

The World Food Program was compelled to expand its operations from targeting approximately 70 million people at the beginning of 2008 to more than 100 million in 2009 to help those in greatest need.

Now with some of the primary drivers of the food price crisis still present, including growing demand for commodities and fluctuating energy prices, we are seeing food prices increase again. Leading up to January 2010 there were five consecutive months of food price increases and the highest price levels since September 2008. This trend prompted the leaders of the World Food Program and the World Bank to warn that another food crisis is possible in 2010.

The increase in global hunger during the past few years threatens to reverse the progress achieved by the global community between the 1960s and the 1990s in reducing the overall proportion of the world's hungry from 37 to 17 percent. These hard-fought gains were achieved in large part due to U.S. leadership. In spite of the difficult challenges the world now faces, I am confident that U.S. leadership – through the GHFSI – will ensure that even greater progress is achieved in the years ahead.

II. Growing Consensus on How to Address Global Hunger. A consensus has emerged regarding the key factors that limited the success of previous U.S. efforts to address global hunger. Reports released by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Chicago Council on Global Affairs, the Center for Strategic and International Studies and others have highlighted these factors, which include: (1) a primary focus on addressing emergency needs without sufficient attention to the underlying causes of hunger; (2) insufficient coordination among the many U.S. agencies and programs with a role in addressing global hunger; and (3) the lack of a comprehensive U.S. Government (USG) hunger-alleviation strategy that addresses immediate, intermediate and long-term needs.

Similarly, a consensus has emerged regarding the specific actions needed to address global hunger, as reflected in the GHFSI. The UN High Level Task Force on the Global Food Crisis, GAO reports, the Chicago Council Report and the Roadmap to End Global Hunger – which united more than 40 NGOs for the first time in history around a plan to improve U.S. hunger-alleviation efforts – have all called for the development and implementation of a specifically- defined comprehensive USG strategy to address global hunger. Legislation introduced in 2009 – the Roadmap to End Global Hunger and Promote Food Security Act (H.R. 2817) and the Global Food Security Act (H.R. 3077, S. 384) – draw heavily from these reports and also set forth a comprehensive approach.

III. The Administration's Plan. The administration's plan focuses on the world's poorest, most food insecure countries. By investing in country-driven, comprehensive food security plans, the GHFSI seeks to address the full spectrum of hunger: urban and rural, chronic and acute. The Initiative is *unprecedented* in its comprehensiveness, its mobilization of the international community and in its marshalling of new resources. It is *transformative* in its "whole of government" approach and efforts to engage all of the relevant stakeholders in the planning and implementation of the Initiative.

A. Unprecedented. At the heart of the administration's Initiative is the development of comprehensive food security plans within the target countries. Never before have U.S. efforts to address global hunger sought to achieve immediate, intermediate and long-term goals in such a coordinated and well-funded manner, based on the guidance and input of local governments and stakeholders.

Comprehensiveness. The administration's Initiative incorporates the four cross-cutting pillars of a comprehensive strategy, as set forth within the Roadmap, the Comprehensive Framework for Action and the legislation previously referenced. These pillars are emergency response and management programs, safety net

programs, nutrition programs and agricultural development programs. All four of these cross-cutting pillars are necessary to target the different groups who collectively comprise the 1 billion people suffering from hunger. Moreover, adopting these pillars will enable the U.S. and international community to address both the immediate and long-term impacts of hunger.

Emergency Response and Management Efforts – Emergency response and management efforts target the world’s most vulnerable populations in times of urgent need, whether provoked by natural disaster, man-made conflict or acute economic difficulties, when their governments lack the capacity to provide the assistance on their own. These programs seek to save lives by providing food assistance to people affected by an emergency, including direct food distribution, food vouchers and cash transfers. Based on current trends, it is estimated that 100 million people will continue to require emergency food assistance annually.

The administration’s Initiative seeks to maintain the longstanding U.S. commitment to providing a significant portion of global food aid while enhancing flexibility through the increased provision of cash-based emergency food assistance. Such assistance can be used for the local and regional purchase of commodities, voucher programs and other forms of emergency support.

Safety Nets – Safety net programs are designed to limit or mitigate the impact of shocks on vulnerable and food insecure populations who could become destitute without assistance. Like the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (formerly Food Stamps) in the U.S., safety net programs can include vouchers, cash and other resource transfers to help vulnerable populations meet their basic needs, retain meager household resources that they might otherwise sell and develop resiliency to future shocks. By helping vulnerable populations maintain a basic level of self-sufficiency and food security, these programs reduce the need for more costly emergency interventions and help provide a foundation for future development efforts.

It is important to ensure that U.S efforts in this area focus on supporting the development of safety net systems in developing countries with high-levels of food insecurity. Virtually all countries seek to establish safety net programs, but many lack sufficient technical capacity and resources. In fact, less than 80 percent of the global population has access to any form of a safety net program.

Nutrition Programs – These programs ensure that nutritionally-vulnerable populations, particularly mothers and young children, have access to the required calories and nutrients needed to live healthy, productive lives. Specific interventions include targeted feeding programs, micronutrient supplementation and breastfeeding promotion.

There is widespread consensus regarding the need to provide adequate nutrition during pregnancy and a child’s first two years of life to avoid irreversible damage and to promote proper physical and cognitive development. Nutrition programs also support the unique needs of those suffering from HIV/AIDS and other severe chronic illnesses. Evidence demonstrates that proper caloric and nutrient intake strengthens immune function and improves the absorption and tolerance of antiretroviral drugs and other medications.

Market-based Agriculture and Infrastructure Development Programs – As previously referenced, U.S. and global efforts to alleviate hunger have underemphasized longer-term agricultural development programs during the past two decades. These programs can increase the productivity and profitability of smallholder farmers, which is critical to breaking the cycle of hunger among the vast majority of the world’s poor who live in rural areas and rely on agriculture for their livelihoods.

These efforts seek to expand and enhance: a) rural infrastructure, such as farm to market roads, storage facilities and irrigation; b) access to markets and availability of financial services, so that smallholder farmers can afford inputs and investments needed to expand their capacity; and c) extension services, research and training so that seed varieties and other technologies are developed and disseminated to meet the needs of poor, rural farmers.

In summary, a comprehensive strategy that combines emergency assistance, safety nets, nutrition assistance and agricultural development is necessary to address all elements of hunger. Hunger takes many forms, from those devastated by hurricanes and disasters, to urban slum dwellers on the verge of destitution, to poorly nourished mothers and children, to smallholder farmers struggling to produce enough to feed their families and earn a profit. By integrating the categories previously outlined, we can help ensure that those in need receive the appropriate type of assistance.

Mobilizing the International Community. The U.S. commitment embodied in the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative extends to the highest levels of government, including President Obama, Secretary of State Clinton, Secretary of Agriculture Vilsack and other members of the Cabinet. Through this leadership, the administration is catalyzing global efforts in an unprecedented fashion. Not only does the GHSFI encompass the full-range of actions needed to address hunger, but it is mobilizing other governments and world leaders around this comprehensive approach.

Beginning with his inaugural address, President Obama articulated his support for reinvigorated U.S. leadership in addressing global hunger: “To the people of poor nations, we pledge to work alongside you to make your farms flourish and let clean waters flow; to nourish starved bodies and feed hungry minds.”

A few months later at the G20 meeting in April, 2009 President Obama formally announced a U.S. initiative to strengthen the nonemergency elements of U.S. hunger-alleviation efforts.

Then at the July G8 Summit in L'Aquila, the U.S. and other leading industrialized nations unveiled a 3-year, \$20 billion pledge to support country-driven, comprehensive food security plans. By stepping forward with a \$3.5 billion commitment, the United States helped foster support from Spain, Canada and other G8 members.

Another key outcome of the G8 Summit is the creation of a World Bank multi-donor trust fund, which will provide a mechanism for donors to support the country-driven food security plans. The initial Framework Document governing the Fund's operation was approved in January by the World Bank's Board. The U.S. has pledged an initial commitment of \$475 million, which will help spur additional contributions from the international community.

One of the most visible examples this past year of the U.S. catalyzing the international community to bolster global hunger-alleviation efforts occurred at the UN General Assembly in September. At a high-level meeting co-hosted by Secretary Clinton and UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon, more than 130 heads of state and ministers joined with leaders from the corporate, foundation and NGO communities to embrace the specific elements of a comprehensive strategy and committed to take action to address global hunger.

New Resource Commitments. To ensure that the longstanding U.S. leadership in the area of emergency response is matched with robust support for intermediate and long-term efforts, the administration has sought unprecedented funding levels in the FY2010 and FY2011 congressional appropriations. Based on the levels appropriated in FY 2010, Congress appears to support the administration's FY2011 requested funding levels.

To respond to pressing humanitarian emergencies, the administration's budget has sustained high levels of funding for commodity-based food aid while also increasing cash-based food assistance to support voucher programs, the local and regional procurement of food, and other related activities that enhance flexibility. Increased funding has been sought for the McGovern-Dole School Meals Program, nutrition programs for mothers and young children, and safety net efforts. The NGO community is working with the administration to identify mechanisms to increase support for building safety net systems in countries that presently lack such programs. Most significantly, the administration has tripled funding for agricultural development, to more than \$1 billion annually, to support the development of sustainable local food production and agricultural systems, thereby addressing the long-term impacts of hunger.

B. Transformative.

Whole of Government. To address the lack of coordination highlighted by the GAO and others, the administration has initiated a "whole of government" process that has engaged the relevant government agencies, offices and personnel both in Washington, DC and within the target countries.

To coordinate efforts in Washington, Secretary Clinton formed an interagency food security task force, chaired by her chief of staff, that has brought together the governmental agencies with a role in addressing global hunger, including the State Department, USAID, USDA, MCC, NSC, Treasury, PEPFAR and others. This task force has developed the strategy and implementation plans for the Initiative. The administration's announced intent to appoint a government-wide "Global Hunger Coordinator" will help institutionalize this collaboration moving forward.

The administration has also been working to foster a whole of government approach at the target country level. This "whole of embassy" approach seeks to involve the U.S. ambassadors and all other relevant agencies represented within our embassies in the target countries. This will expand the focus on food security beyond the traditional purview of the USAID mission and help ensure that our diplomatic and development goals are integrated.

Planning Process. In addition to integrating the efforts of governmental agencies in Washington and the target countries, the administration has also adopted a similar planning process that engages other relevant stakeholders. The administration has been actively seeking the input and guidance of NGOs, multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and WFP, businesses, foundations, education and research institutions, farmers' organizations, and many other stakeholders with a role in addressing global hunger. The Consultative Document and other materials developed by the administration clearly reflect the input of this wide range of stakeholders.

Similarly, the administration is working with target country governments to build on and strengthen existing efforts with the goal of developing "country investment plans" that reflect broad-based stakeholder engagement and ownership and upon which governments can be held accountable for results and outcomes.

In countries, such as Rwanda, where government plans have already been developed through the CAADP process, the administration is working with in-country stakeholders to examine these existing plans and strengthen them where necessary. A key component of this effort includes working with other donors to coordinate the funding of the various elements of the plans, balancing the specific needs outlined with the strengths and capacities of donor governments, multilateral institutions, NGOs and other stakeholders.

IV. Steps Ahead. As noted, the administration's Initiative is unprecedented and transformative. However, in order for this effort to be fully successful, we all need to continue to be engaged and help the administration achieve

these laudable goals. The administration has already consulted with a wide-range of stakeholders in the planning and development of the GHFSI and we need to continue to work with the administration both in Washington and in the target countries.

Remain Engaged. Just as we have been involved in the planning process, we must maintain our engagement in the implementation of the Initiative. This includes participating in developing the country plans and assisting the administration in monitoring and evaluating the on-going operation. As stakeholders and implementing partners, we need to help the administration assess progress and suggest changes as needed. Further, we need to ensure that the general public and U.S. Congress understand and remain committed to the Initiative.

Pass Legislation to Institutionalize the Initiative. We will not achieve the goals of the Initiative in the next year or two. It is essential that Congress pass global food security legislation to help ensure that the Initiative is institutionalized – thereby helping to build long-term support for the Initiative’s goals and for the needed resources. The bills currently pending before Congress can provide the vehicle to achieve this goal.

The administration has taken a large step forward to address global hunger. This Initiative represents the true spirit and heart of America. We must continue to be engaged and steadfast in our support for this effort. This unprecedented opportunity to finally alleviate global hunger is at hand. Through our combined efforts we can transform the world. We must not relent.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Mr. Leach.

Mr. ZACHRITZ. Thank you, Congressman Wolf. And I want to extend my thanks to you, Congressman Wolf, and Congressman McGovern for holding this hearing. And on a special note, on a personal note, I want to thank Congressman Hall because I was, again, I was on his Congressional staff for 10 years. And I think one of the things that really impact is the amount of staff that he has mentored and taught on how to engage politically. So thank you. And it is interesting to note that when I was on the staff for 10 years I worked on his Human Rights Commission staff work. So it is great to be here.

Again my name is Bob Zachritz, and I am Director now of Advocacy and Government Relations with World Vision. World Vision is a Christian relief and advocacy organization in 100 countries, serving millions of families and children. The bedrock of food as a right, as this Commission knows, is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which was established by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10 of 1948. So we celebrate Human Rights Day on December 10.

Two of the main articles in that bedrock that deal with hunger would be Article 3, which states everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person. And it is important to note that inherent in the right to life is the ability to be nourished.

As well in Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, section 1 states that everyone has a right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food. Then it follows up in section 2 of Article 25, motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance.

This right has been affirmed in various other United Nations documents, including the U.N. Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 1996 World Food Summit.

The numbers we have been talking about, we just want to affirm. You know, over a billion people are at risk of hunger. But 15 percent of those billion, or 150 million, are children living under the age of 5. And I would say, as well, malnutrition is a major underlying cause of the 9 million children who die each year of preventable causes.

I realize this is a tight budget environment up here on Capitol Hill this year, but I want to argue that interventions around global hunger are low cost interventions with a high rate of return. And as an example, I want to bring forward a commission of economists, including five Nobel laureate economists, that were raising this case. And in the business world we always talk about a rate of investment and a rate of return. And I think there is a high rate of return for the type of aspects we are looking at here on global hunger. And again, as of May 2008, eight global

economists, including five Nobel laureate economists, were invited to Copenhagen. They were looking at the most cost effective interventions to address 10 global problems. Those 10 problems they were looking at: Air pollution, conflicts, diseases, education, global warming, malnutrition and hunger, sanitation and water, subsidies and trade, terrorism, women and development. They accepted proposals from around the world, and they had 30 proposals and they reviewed them. They came up with their top 10 most cost effective interventions. Five of the top 10 all deal with malnutrition.

The number one proposal was dealing with micronutrient supplements for children, vitamin A and zinc. You saw on there as well the micronutrient fortification, including iron and salt iodination, biofortification, deworming, nutrition programs in school, and community-based nutrition programs. So it is not just the NGO community saying this. These are economists saying they are cost effective interventions.

As well as you are looking at the Lancet study in 2007. They were raising that on the child malnutrition, it is not only a short-term problem, it highlighted the long-term consequences on cognitive development, lower economic productivity, and greater ability to die of other diseases.

And let me highlight some of the solutions. They are not that complicated, but you need coordination to move forward in some very difficult areas. For example, how do you prevent stunting? One is you need to target the mother. You need to work on adequate diet for pregnant and lactating mothers. You need to look at appropriate birth spacing. For the child, one of the aspects is to focus on 2 years and under. That is a critical time of development for children. So you might want to encourage exclusive breast feeding the first 6 months, appropriate complementary feeding and weaning of foods, intake of sufficient micronutrients. Other things like promoting healthful sanitation and promoting appropriate feeding practices during illnesses.

Now I want to flag one thing. Complementary feeding is easy to say, but hard to do, and you need to make sure it is culturally appropriate. For example, in Asia one of the first things that might start with rice. What does that mean on the nutrients as they look to go beyond there? Or in Africa, many times they look at maize and like a corn or a corn-soy blend. Those are a couple of areas you add. And as a father, I have a 4-year-old, and even here, think of how many parents struggle to get their children to eat nutritious food. Recently my 4-year-old, he likes to eat the butter but not the beets. He likes to eat the goat cheese but not the lettuce. So there is a desire to really help children and be creative and walk alongside parents on how to do this type of intake.

The Lancet study had compared two different World Vision programs and it was under Public Law 480, Title II, but I want to show you, because part of the aspect is how do we get more effective and efficient programs. One is the additional resources, but how do you spend the resources you have to most effective means possible. So they compared two programs in Haiti, and one was the traditional program of targeting children under 5 years of age who are malnourished. The other program targeted all children 2 years and under. So one was preventative and one would only come alongside once they were undernourished. And you saw both models targeted pregnant and lactating women, and other components included interventions as health education, growth monitoring, supplementation, mothers clubs, food distribution points of monthly food rations, prenatal, postnatal consultations and home visits for newborn infants. The study concluded that the preventative model was four to six times more effective. I am looking at overall nutrition over a 3-year period.

So I have the whole Lancet study. It is 8 pages with my testimony. That can be submitted into the record.

Mr. WOLF. Sure. Without objection.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Zachritz follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT ZACHRITZ, DIRECTOR OF ADVOCACY AND GOVERNMENT RELATIONS, WORLD VISION

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing on food as a human right. My name is Robert Zachritz and I am the Director of Advocacy & Government Relations for World Vision, a Christian relief, development, & advocacy organization working in nearly 100 countries serving millions of children and families. World Vision is dedicated to working with children, families, and their communities worldwide to reach their full potential by tackling the causes of poverty and injustice.

Food as a Right. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights is the bedrock of establishing this right and was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948. Two articles in particular declare the right to food:

- Article 3 states, “everyone has the right to life, liberty and security of person.” (Please note that inherit to the right to life is the ability to be nourished.)
- Article 25 states in section 1 that “everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food.....” In section 2 it states, “motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance.”

This right has been affirmed in various other documents, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and the 1996 World Food Summit. However, there is a big difference between stating a right and ensuring that a right is preserved.

The numbers around global hunger are staggering – over 1 billion people at risk of hunger, which means one in every six persons on the earth. Globally, over 150 million children under the age of 5 are stunted and another 19 million are severely wasted. Nearly 9 million children under the age of 5 die every year of preventable causes and malnutrition is the underlying cause of over one-third of these preventable deaths. Thus, the statistics starkly show that while it is a stated right, access to sufficient food for a healthy, productive life has not been secured for millions and the consequences are increased morbidity and mortality.

Fighting Hunger is Cost Effective. In this tight budget environment improving nutrition is one of the most cost effective ways to address global problems. In May 2008, an expert panel of 8 economists, including 5 Nobel Laureates, were invited to Copenhagen to rank the most cost effective interventions to address ten major global challenges: 1) Air pollution; 2) Conflicts; 3) Diseases; 4) Education; 5) Global Warming; 6) Malnutrition and Hunger; 7) Sanitation and Water; 8) Subsidies and Trade Barriers; 9) Terrorism; and 10) Women in Development.¹ After reviewing papers analyzing the challenges and possible solutions, the experts ranked the results. Out of 30 proposals, the panel ranked the top ten solutions that would have the greatest cost/benefit impact for our world as follows:

SOLUTION	CHALLENGE
1. Micronutrient supplements for children-vitamin A & zinc	Malnutrition
2. The Doha development agenda	Trade
3. Micronutrient fortification (iron and salt iodization)	Malnutrition
4. Expanded immunization coverage for children	Diseases
5. Biofortification	Malnutrition
6. Deworming and other nutrition programs at school	Malnutrition & Education
7. Lowering the price of schooling	Education
8. Increase and improve girls’ schooling	Women
9. Community-based nutrition promotion	Malnutrition
10. Provide support for women’s reproductive role	Women

The number one most cost-effective intervention with the highest rate of return was micronutrient supplements for children. Also, 5 of the top 10 most cost effective solutions related specifically to nutrition. Three of the five explicitly target undernutrition of children and two, fortification of food with iron and iodine and community-based nutrition promotion, are critical for children and would benefit the general population, as well. The conclusion is clear, fighting hunger and child malnutrition is a cost-effective intervention.

Given the “rights” framework of special care and assistance for mothers and children, I want to focus the rest of my comments around child malnutrition.

Child Malnutrition. The January 2007 Lancet series reviewing the literature on child development showed that beyond the short-term consequences of increased mortality, morbidity and disability, childhood malnutrition has debilitating long-term consequences of stunted physical and cognitive development, lower economic productivity, and greater susceptibility to disease.

¹ <http://www.copenhagenconsensus.com> (accessed February 8, 2010)

Among the developing countries, approximately one third or over 150 million children under five years of age are stunted. Specifically, Africa has the highest prevalence at 40% while the greatest number of stunted children are found in south-central Asia.²

How to Prevent Stunting. There are several effective interventions that will prevent stunting, including:

For the mother:

- Ensuring an adequate diet for pregnant and lactating mothers,
- Appropriate birth spacing (greater than 24 months).

For the child:

- Ensuring appropriate diet of children under 2 years of age (Encourage exclusive breast feeding until 6 months, appropriate complementary feeding and weaning foods, and intake of sufficient micronutrients, such as vitamin A and zinc.)

- Promoting healthful sanitation practices and effective prevention and treatment of common child illnesses like diarrhea, malaria and respiratory diseases.

- Promoting appropriate feeding practices during illnesses.

Adequate complementary feeding is critical to preventing stunting. This is also the most complex intervention, because complementary foods for children 6-24 months need to be contextually appropriate, both in terms of using locally available foods and optimizing positive culture beliefs and behaviors, while minimizing or changing negative behaviors.

Program Example: Lancet Study of WV's Child Undernutrition Program in Haiti:

On February 16, 2008, the Lancet published a study comparing two different World Vision child and maternal health programs which were funded through USAID PL 480, title II non-emergency programs. Food-assisted maternal and child health and nutrition programs usually targeted underweight children younger than 5 years of age. However, evidence suggested that targeting nutrition interventions earlier in life, before children become undernourished, might be more effective for reduction of childhood undernutrition.

The three-year study compared two programs for maternal and child health and nutrition. One a preventive model, targeting all children aged 6-23 months and a second recuperative model, targeting underweight children aged 6-60 months. Both models also targeted pregnant and lactating women. The programs included such interventions as health education, growth monitoring, supplementation, mother's clubs, food-distribution points for monthly food rations, prenatal and postnatal consultations, and home visits for newborn infants or severely undernourished children.

The study concluded that the preventive program was more effective for the reduction of childhood undernutrition than the traditional recuperative model by 4-6%. The full Lancet article is attached to this testimony.

Recommendations:

- Fully fund the authorized level for the Food for Peace Program (PL 480, title II) at \$2.5 billion in FY 2011, and assure that the minimum levels for non-emergency programs are provided each year.

- Fund McGovern-Dole International Food for Education program at \$300 million in FY 2011.

- Support the Global Hunger and Food Security Initiative. President Obama requested \$1.76 billion FY 2011 package to fulfill the U.S. G8/G20 commitments to food security of \$3.3 billion over three years. (The total G8/G20 commitment was \$20 billion over three-years.) The request adds a new \$200 million element specifically focused on nutrition to the \$1.15 billion proposed for agriculture development programs.

- Assure that the World Bank Global Agriculture and Food Security Program is Effectively Designed and Administered. As part of the Administration's FY 2011 food security package, the Treasury Department would contribute \$408 million to a new World Bank Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, which includes country-led plans. Currently, the framework for this Program calls for funding interventions through government agencies and, to a lesser degree, for loans to the private sector. The development and implementation of the country plans should also assure involvement of and assistance through community-based organizations, civil society organizations and other non-governmental organizations and actors that represent or effectively work with low-income and underserved populations.

- Support passage of the HR 3077 - Global Food Security Act of 2009 which was introduced by Reps. Betty McCollum (D-MN), Donald Payne (D-NJ) and Jo Ann Emerson (R-MO).

- Support passage of HR 2817 – "Roadmap to End Hunger implementing Legislation introduced by Reps. Jim McGovern (D-MA) and Jo Ann Emerson (R-MO).

² Victoria CG, Adair L, Fall C, Hallal PC, Martorell R, Richter I, Sachdev H, for the Maternal and Child Undernutrition Study Group. Maternal and child undernutrition: consequences for adult health and human capital. *The Lancet* 2008; 371: 340-357.

Mr. ZACHRITZ. Just in conclusion, I want to affirm the aspects of other members of the panel. A lot of key opportunities. I am looking at addressing short and median and long-term solutions on global hunger. So a couple of those would affirm, you know, the Public Law 480, Title II, the \$2.5 billion that was authorized including the nonemergency programs, 300 million for McGovern-Dole, the President's budget on global hunger and food security, if you notice, he is moving forward on longer term agriculture development. There is a \$200 million aspect for nutrition. There is \$300 million for the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance for local cash purchase, and that meets the U.S. commitment that was made at G8, G20. The U.S. can't do this alone. You know, the other G8, G20 countries made commitments and it was a \$20 billion commitment. The U.S. commitment was only 3.5 billion of that. You know, to hold the other nations as well to move forward with those resources. And then of course to pass the legislation you are considering in the House and the Senate, the Global Food Security Act that McCollum has introduced and Senators Lugar and Casey, and then of course the Roadmap to End Hunger that Congressman McGovern has introduced.

So thank you very much for your time and your commitment.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you very much. I am going to thank all of you for your testimony. My own sense is, and this is just me speaking. I may be in the minority. The interest in this issue, I think, is diminishing, unfortunately, I believe, here in the Congress. Mr. McGovern, God bless him, is very, very good. Jo Ann Emerson, Barbara McCollum and there are some others. But it really is diminishing really quite rapidly. I appreciate the fact that the leadership set up this Human Rights Commission. Because the interest in the whole area of human rights was sort of kind of rapidly diminishing with the loss of people like Henry Hyde and Tom Lantos and others. And so I see that.

Secondly, I know in my own area, because of the sensitivity of what Congressman Hall has said kind of sensitized us to, we started and I appreciated being there, the Hunger Caucus and the center. We started visiting, based on one of your reports that we did about 2-1/2 years ago I started visiting all of my food banks and I visit them about every 3 months. We are doing different things to help. The need in our area, Bob, in your area, I was out 2 weeks ago in Purcellville. They just opened up a new food bank, Tree for Life. The need in Purcellville and Round Hill and Lovettsville and Lockett is very great. And yet it is one of the most affluent areas of the country. Now, when people were asked, they rush in to give. But to think that even in our area the need, the food banks were telling me that people who used to come by and drop off food are now coming by, in Loudoun County, a very affluent area, were coming by to pick up food, to get food.

So as I transfer this from what is taking place in Northern Virginia and I talk to others, other Members of Congress to ask different things, Congressman Pitts has been visiting his food banks. He is now finding the same thing. A couple of months ago I saw the fellow with Feed the Children, who we have seen, Tony and I have seen at some camps at different times. He was in Elkhart, Indiana doing a food drive, feeding the people of Elkhart, Indiana, which I think is Congressman Souder's district. So if you take that what is actually taking place in the United States, the most powerful nation in the world, what is taking around the world that seems to me, unless we are, I am out of touch and don't realize it, and I could be on that. But I see the need here. So I have got to know the need in Ethiopia and Zambia and all these other places must be even, even greater.

Secondly, here in the Congress it is not particularly, I think if I went down to the floor this afternoon and offered a motion to set up a committee on hunger, you know, I just don't know how many would go. And so I think there is a great educational process that needs to be begun.

That is why I appreciate what the four of you are doing.

I really believe, and I am glad to hear that the administration is doing well. I am glad to hear that you are impressed with their budget numbers. But now you are at a point that really personnel is policy. Without having the personnel, without having someone like one of you, without having somebody like Mr. Hall, who has the credibility, both domestically here in the country but internationally, it sort of gets, it kind of gets lost. I mean, you have a White House Office on Science and Technology. You have a whole series of people in the National Security Council that are involved in this. Unless you have somebody there, and the AID office, Administrator was vacant for maybe 10 months. I am sure the fellow who has the job now is a very good guy, and I understand he did a pretty good job in Haiti. So if you don't have the personnel always somebody there speaking up and advocating, both here in the Congress and particularly in the administration and particularly in the international forums, you know, it really, I think, has a problem.

So I was going to ask you, but I think you have said, by having that number one, somebody, a White House coordinator, of where, I mean, is that one of the recommendations? Is that under consideration now? Is there, and who would appoint that? Would it be the President or would that be under the auspices of the Secretary of State and would that be domestic and international or just international? So how is that appointment being -- you say the recommendation has been made. Who made the recommendation? Who is looking at it to see where it is happening? And what is the status of it happening? And lastly, would it cover both domestic hunger and international?

Maybe kind of go down the line that way. Bob, can you sort of fill us in?

Mr. ZACHRITZ. I would add part of it was coming out, if you look at the G8, G20 meetings from 2009 you saw different meetings. When the President went to the G20 focusing on agriculture development in April, you saw the G8 in Italy, you had a major document where had you the 20 billion in pledges from various different organizations move forward, and then they followed up with the G20 summit in Pittsburgh in September. So that was some of the momentum. And so I think on that aspect, and so one of the aspects was the World Bank creating that fund to report back on the country driven.

One of the things, because our church in Purcellville was one of the ones that did that food bank. So sometimes one of the aspects is country driven plans because hunger is localized. It is different in Loudon County, which is different from, say, Zambia, which is different from India, and so some cases you need to have a different plan. And so that is the international side, but that is only a small overall point. Overall, the administration was looking at, say, a global strategy of integrating the different pots of money that were responding. And so I think that is really officially coming out on and the interagency task force is meeting.

I will let others comment as well.

Mr. WOLF. Well, how about, who is recommended, whether it be I looked at White House office, Global Hunger Coordinator? Where is that now, do we know where that is?

Mr. LEACH. I think, a few things. One, the recommendation initially came from the Roadmap group, it came from the Lugar-Casey bill, it came from CSIS. So everyone has recommended, and GAO, when they did their study they said there are so many agencies with no coordination. So everyone, there is unanimity of opinion that there needs to be a coordinator.

Mr. WOLF. Well, I agree. We have a White House, we have a council for drugs, we have the drug czar. Is that recommendation that was done on a piece of paper sent up and now it is out there, or is it actually at a place? Are they now looking to appoint someone to have that job? What is the status of -- how long is the recommendation to do this from CSIS and all of you, how long has that that been out there? And then what is being done with regard to the

recommendation that has been made?

Mr. LEACH. Well, I think the recommendation has been out there since before the administration even came in, before the inauguration. And what the administration has said is we embrace this and we are actually in the process of, quote, identifying someone. The question as to where that will be housed, the White House, State Department, AID is still up in the air. It is our belief, I think, that it needs to either be in the White House or in a senior level in the State Department, envoy level. We have all, I know I have recommended Tony Hall to be in that slot. I think it would be a brilliant move. But there is a concern if it was within AID, how would someone within AID coordinate State Department, Treasury, Millennium Challenge Corporation, and so on?

Mr. WOLF. Yeah. I think it would have to be almost be in the White House, because if USDA is not going to respond, they don't go to the meeting with AID because they don't work for the AID Administrator and of course the Secretary of State carries tremendous clout. But then the others who aren't answering there. So I do believe, you know, the White House drug czar, or the office of the drug czar was under the White House at one time.

The National Security Council, the different people that they are having, they are now having a cyber terrorism person and the cyber terrorism person is going to be based in the National Security Council in the White House because that is the only way -- I worked for a cabinet secretary at one time. That is the way that you get the cabinets to kind of focus. So USDA and Secretary of State all come together. So it does seem that it really has to be there.

But is there a place, like, you know, there is 45 days and the recommendation is made and there is three people working on it and they are down to two people. Or is it that close or is it just we made a recommendation and now we are waiting for somebody to kind of pick this thing up to see if we are going to do it? Where is it exactly?

Ms. HANSON. We don't know exactly where it is. One of the first things the Roadmap group did together, even before the Roadmap document came out, was to do a collective letter which we got a lot of organizations to sign on. Actually it was a Dear Colleague letter. We got 117 signatures in the House of Representatives, and Mr. McGovern made sure that Rahm Emanuel delivered that to President Obama on his first day in office.

And so this has been out there, as Rick said, from the beginning, even before the election, even before we knew Obama would be the President. It is something that we have pushed quite hard on. And one thing we do feel quite positively about is that Secretary Clinton has actually been able to do a very good job of convening across the different agencies for the interagency task force. And we have seen that there has been good levels of coordination and collaboration between all of those different agencies involved in developing the Global Food Security Initiative.

Now, would a person housed at State have that same capacity in the long term? We don't know. For that reason, I think most of us, right now, we are calling for the coordinator, and we would feel comfortable with the administration making a couple of different kinds of decisions about where that person is placed. The key for us is really just to get that person in place as quickly as possible, I think.

Mr. WOLF. Now, I had asked you, but would that person, and I guess that would make a determination as to what kind of, would that person deal with international global hunger or would they deal with domestic hunger or would they deal with both? I mean, would it be a hunger person? That is the kind of one-stop, so somebody, or would it be, and then there they would have somebody dealing with hunger in the United States, which is important because we represent, I mean, and also international hunger, or was the recommendation just one person dealing with international?

Ms. HANSON. The recommendation from the Roadmap group, and we debated this actively, most of us are supportive of the U.S. having a sort of coordinated hunger effort that deals both domestically and internationally. But because of the jurisdictional issues and because of the slice of it that we were taking on, we really focused our recommendation on a global coordinator, with the understanding that others like the Alliance to End Hunger that has also done their own domestic roadmap may also produce that same sort of recommendation.

Mr. WOLF. Okay.

Mr. HALL. I agree with a lot of things you said, Frank, and I wouldn't use the word "diminishing." I would use another word. You said maybe that the issue of hunger is diminishing. And I would use the word "ambivalence." And you know, when you look at the issue of hunger and you look at our polling, you look at polling that I have looked at for years, hunger ranks up there actually above HIV/AIDS. It ranks up there high. When you give the voters the issues -- HIV/AIDS, malaria, hunger, polio, heart disease -- hunger ranks up there number one. The ambivalence is that hunger is an issue. And I think Members of Congress believe that it is an important issue. But there is also many important issues up here. And as a result, this is an issue that gets thrown off the table. And I think the issue, what it lacks, it lacks passion. It lacks energy. It doesn't have energy or passion like it used to. And we think, through the Roadmap, the thing that we worked on all last year and the year before, we think that issue, that bill has passion because you should put somebody in there, in that position, if they ever come around to this with passion and energy for this thing. And I think there is no reason why this issue should not be addressed in this Congress and in this administration.

So why isn't it? If it is one of the number one issues, if it is, it ranks high in the voters eyes, it ranks high among politicians, it ranks high on our polling, it is, you know, there is over a billion people that are hungry. So what is the problem? Why isn't it a priority? And maybe we are not doing our job here. Maybe we are not finding out the right ways to touch our elected officials, because when we touch our elected officials, when we take them overseas, when we show them this, when people are touched like you and Jim, they do things. They make things happen. And we haven't touched enough people in the Congress about this issue. And it could be our fault, I don't know. But this issue is a big issue, but it lacks passion and it lacks energy.

Mr. HALL. And if it is a priority in the minds of the people of this country it ought to be a priority in the Congress. And it is because we have not found a way to make it a priority.

Mr. WOLF. I had a meeting a number of years ago with Interaction, and again a meeting, I think you were there, I made the comment, and now you are coming up to another opportunity now with the elections, to really have all of the groups who were part of Interaction and your coalition to adopt one or two, a Republican and a Democratic Congressman, freshman initially, whoever is in the class, and take them, take them to Ethiopia and let them live in a little tukul and experience and serve. I mean that is a life changing experience. Now you are into the situation that Members are sort of going away from traveling. But I think no one is going to get attacked in a campaign if they travel. The trip that Tony asked me to go on I flew on a World Vision aircraft, a Twin Otter, up to Almat'a. You have been to Almat'a. And nobody everybody thought it was good that I was doing it. It was life changing.

So I guess what I would do, I think what Mr. Hall was saying is accurate, all of the groups just raise your right hand and take a commitment, not the four of you, but anybody that is listening or if this gets any coverage, that you are going to find one or two Congressmen and bring them to Ethiopia or bring them to Chad or let them go to Darfur. And I think it will be almost a transformation one night in a camp, the morning, hearing the wailing of the women who are waiting with their babies going into the feeding program. And I think you need to create -- guys like me are getting older. Jim is still a young. So you got to get to newer people that are

coming in and you got to make sure that it is bipartisan, and bring them in a camp somewhere.

What I would like to do, and maybe, Elizabeth, we can do this letter, everyone in Interaction, if we can get the names in at the beginning of next year. Would you at least take one member or perhaps two? Ideally it is bipartisan. There really isn't a lot of bipartisanship in here, too. So if a Republican and Democrat were to travel together, have that experience together, it would just sort of come about. But what we are going to do is on this hearing, and I am glad you raised it, is write everyone in Interaction, from World Vision, to Save the Children, to whatever, asking them to come to have it done over by next April, to have someone, at least one, perhaps two, to come in and take a trip. I don't think a Congressman is going to get attacked for traveling to Ethiopia with Save the Children. It is not like you are traveling to Ethiopia with the beer wholesalers or the gambling interest or the tobacco interest or General Electric, you are going there with Save the Children or World Vision. So we will write everybody in Interaction to ask them.

Secondly, with Jim coming in, I am going to go over to Jim. But maybe Jim and I, of course they will listen to Jim more than they will listen to me, but maybe we should do a letter down to the Obama administration asking and say, we had this hearing, four people that came before us. I mean, I would like to ask them to appoint Tony, but we won't do that, but would they appoint a coordinator, the White House coordinator, within the next 30 to 60 days so that all the recommendations on policy, you got have that personnel person there. Obviously you know it might be the kiss of death if I wrote to the White House and asked if they would put Mr. Hall in there. But if Jim McGovern did.

So maybe what we should do is, when you were out, one of the major recommendations they all felt was that there needs to be a White House coordinator to be the hunger person for the administration, and they were very complimentary of the administration for the budget numbers and for everything that they are doing. So it wouldn't be a negative, it would be a congratulatory thing saying we appreciate very much the numbers that you put and what you are doing, and now to sort of put the, you know, the great car, to put the engine motor in or to connect the carburetor, let's put this one person or this team in that would do that. So maybe we can talk. Hans was here when we did. We are going to see if we can do that.

The last thing is you said there was a plan for every country. Does each country do their own plan and where is the breakoff? I mean you don't have a plan for Portugal? I mean who is in the category that they are supplying for? Is it based on per capita or what?

Mr. ZACHRITZ. They are still working -- we are waiting for the official plan to come out from the administration on which countries would be the highest burden and where they might have a country driven plan. Part of the country driven plan would be as well from this World Bank fund on food security.

So one of the things I wanted to highlight was I think you are absolutely right on the increased resource. But you look at the budget request from the President, the fact that the highest increase in say the State Foreign Ops bill came under for the Food Security Initiative in percentage terms. In this budget environment I always like to give credit where credit is due to stick out. I also know the political environment. But again, to compare those numbers I think the total for international hunger, but you got the Ag approps, you got State Foreign Ops and then you have Treasury manages the World Bank. It is only about \$4.5 billion. In the U.S. we spend about \$50 billion to \$60 billion on food stamps. So I wanted to just put that in context. The country driven plan would be coming out of really coordinating with the World Bank.

Mr. WOLF. Now, is Bob Zoellick helping?

Mr. ZACHRITZ. Yes, he is engaged.

Mr. WOLF. Are they with you, are they excited about it? He used to be with State.

Mr. ZACHRITZ. You see the World Bank working very closely with the World Food

Program on really trying to drive this process. And it was the G20 leaders who asked the World Bank to take that lead.

Mr. LEACH. If I could, I think Bob Zoellick has been incredible. I think in terms of World Bank leadership there has never been anyone at the World Bank providing the type of leadership and commitment on hunger that we are seeing from Bob Zoellick.

In response to your question about the country driven planning process, they have identified 20 countries, and these are the poorest countries in the world.

Mr. WOLF. For the record can you submit the 20 countries?

Mr. ZACHRITZ. It is actually in the -- they listed them in the congressional budget justification for the monies that they are seeking in the Foreign Ops bill. So they are doing them two different tiers. But the intent is to work with those countries to develop their own plans, their food security plans, drawing on, the goal is, civil society, the government's own initial efforts working with CDP and others, looking to the all the multilaterals, looking to all the other donor countries to help that country develop their own food security plan and then coordinate the resources that might be coming in from other donor countries and from the U.S.

So it is in fact that country's plan that they will be held accountable to that we would all coordinate in helping them implement.

Mr. WOLF. And lastly, is the most important thing now then to have one person to sort of be, is that the catalyst that sort of gets the thing moving? Is that -- or the administration to have one person somewhere who has the credibility and the respect of the White House obviously and the support. Is that number one, number two?

Mr. HALL. I think you could have one person, you could have two or three people. I mean they all have to have positions.

Mr. WOLF. Right. But one office.

Mr. HALL. One office. And to me it wouldn't matter whether it was in the White House or under the Secretary of State. And the reason why I say Secretary of State, they are the ones that are really talking a lot about hunger, and especially under Cheryl Mills and Hillary Clinton. I mean, they are really out front on it. The Agriculture Department, you know, they do a lot on domestic hunger, they do some on international hunger.

But if I was going to put it anyplace, if I had to make the political decision, I would put it in the State Department.

Mr. WOLF. And I think with Secretary Clinton's record in the Congress and in the administration she carries a lot of clout, so that would be certainly the place to be other than the White House.

With that, let me go to Jim.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you, and I apologize. I had to go to a Rules Committee meeting. But we have all worked together and I know all the things that you believe and you know the things that I believe. And this issue of kind of a point person on hunger has been something we have been talking about before this President got elected and something that we have been urging on the administration. But I think if there is good news here, and I think Ambassador Hall mentioned it, and I think some of you have talked about it during your testimonies as well, is that the State Department I think for the first time is actually getting it. And Secretary Clinton with Cheryl Mills convened an interagency gathering to say, okay, you know, you have a little bit of fighting hunger in your administration, you have a little bit in this department, that department, let's all come together and see if we can connect the dots to see if we can come up with a plan, which is still evolving. I think at this particular juncture in time the most important thing would be to kind of finalize that plan, you know, get buy-in from the Congress. I think the Secretary of State has the stature and the powers of persuasion to do that, you know, and then

hold us accountable.

You know, I mean, the great thing about what they are talking about at the State Department is not about getting food to people who are hungry but how do you create sustainable agricultural development, you know, in places that are always dealing with the issue of hunger and lack of food. So you know maybe one of these we ought to do is to maybe convene a meeting with the State Department, the Secretary, and say, look, we want to support this, how do we get this moving. Part of it is the funding, which is tough in this economy. And there are a lot of demands domestically, so we are always kind of competing. And granted, in the scheme of things what we are talking about is miniscule in terms of our budget. But there is always that battle, and there are always people who kind of demagogue any kind of foreign aid package. Even if it is going to feed the hungry, it doesn't make any difference, it is foreign aid and it is not domestic aid. But I think we need to make sure what comes out of these appropriations bills are in fact robust numbers for these accounts that will actually be very helpful.

The other thing is hungry people don't vote. Whether they are hungry in the United States or hungry in other parts of the world, they don't have the kind of lobbying power that some of the other interests do down here. And I would like to think that priorities are always determined by, you know, what is morally correct, but we all know that that is not always the case.

And sometimes I think amongst the advocacy groups, and I expressed this earlier before, that I think everybody is too nice. Sometimes I think what needs to happen is we need to adopt the tactics of some of the Chamber of Commerce or the NRA or, you know, pro or anti-abortion rights groups or whatever. But basically have a report card, you know, and grade Members of Congress and Senators on their voting records on these key issues. You will find nobody who will ever say to you that they are pro hunger in the House or in the Senate, and yet we routinely see the underfunding of important budgets that combat this issue.

I think it is important, you know, and this worked obviously with Frank when Tony went out to Ethiopia, it is important to try to get Members to go to places. It is also important to make sure that people are held accountable. And you know, I think there is a good start within this administration. I want to put some wind behind the sails of what the State Department is doing and really say, look, we want you to finalize this, we want to get behind it, you are going to have a lot of people and we want to help sell this for you. You know, because again, it always comes down to political will. This is a political condition, it is not do we have the food, we have the -- you all, you have this Roadmap. Is it credible? It is a lot less expensive than I thought it would be. I mean it is all there, everything is there, except just kind of providing the necessary funds and the direction.

So those of you who are on this table were instrumental in the Roadmap and it is the document, and it is obviously having a big impact over at the State Department. But I think we need to empower Hillary more and let her know that this is really something we want the State Department to champion. She has brought all the players together from Defense and Agriculture and National Security, you know, she talked to some of the groups. This should be the legacy of the State Department if they could coordinate this. And I think there is bipartisan support up here, you know, to try to help provide the money, because if the money is not there this is therapy, it is not real. I mean at the end of the day we need to have the funds to do it, as well as a plan, not 100 plans but a plan.

And you know I was looking, the cost of one soldier, American soldier in Afghanistan, you could build 30 schools in Afghanistan. You know we all read that book Three Cups of Tea. You think about it. I mean if you want to empower women in that part of the world, education is the way to do it, providing school lunches and breakfast and getting people into schools, as Tony said, and Rick has been great on this stuff, you all have been. This is a national security issue as

well, and we shouldn't be shy about talking about this as a national security issue because I have this kind of radical idea. I think if we are there to help people be able to feed their families and to have it done in a sustainable way then they will like us, and if people like us they won't want to hurt us. You know, every parent is the same, whether you are in the United States or you are in Ethiopia or in Afghanistan or wherever, we all want to make sure our kids have enough to eat. That is our primary responsibility. And when you live in a situation like so many do where you can't even provide meals for your kids, I mean, you know, you go out of your mind.

And let me end with one story here, and that is I was in Colombia a few years back and visited a displaced persons community outside of Bogota. And we were visiting the McGovern-Dole school feeding program. And I was with the ambassador. At that time it was Anne Patterson. And this young mother came up to us and introduced us to her 11-year old son. And she said I want to thank you, the people of the United States, for what you have done here. And she says, my son is 11 years old, I can't feed him, there are days when he doesn't eat, we have nothing. And she said in this community every day one of the armed actors comes through. One day it is somebody from the FARC, the next day it is someone from the paramilitaries. And they come to me, his mother, and say give me your son, let him join with us, let him carry a gun, let him join in this armed conflict and we will guarantee you that he will be fed every day. And she said, well, I have come so close to giving up my son to live that kind of life because it is better than what I can give him, and now you, the United States, have provided this program, and my son will not only be able to eat, he might be able to learn how to read and write and get out of this slum, and I will never forget you for that. And I told Anne Patterson, I said, please cable the State Department that this program works, you know, which she did. And then the next year McGovern-Dole got cut from \$300 million to \$50 million, which is a whole other lecture.

But I appreciate the work you do, and I want to continue to work with Frank. This is the issue, this is the ultimate human rights issue, this is the moral issue of our time. And if we can't do this, you know, if we can't lead the world in this effort then you know shame on us. And I think you have helped provide the roadmap to just exactly how we do it. We don't have any more excuses, we know how to do it. And so I just wanted to say thank you. And I am sorry for rambling on so long. And I apologize that I had to leave for this hearing, but these are nutty times here.

So anyway, with that I will yield back my time. Thank you.

Mr. WOLF. Thank you, Jim, very much. I want to thank the panel for your testimony. This will all now be printed, and we will do the letter to Interaction and ask the different groups if we can do the -- yeah, we will do it joint and ask that they invite at least two Members of Congress in the next Congress to begin the voyage together, hopefully Republican and Democrat. So by the time the baton is passed there will be a lot of people here just like Jim McGovern.

Anyway, the hearing is adjourned. Thank you.

[Whereupon, at 3:55 p.m., the Commission was adjourned.]