



BIFADEC
Board for International Food
and Agricultural Development
and Economic Cooperation

**THE
CITIZENS
NETWORK**
FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS



THE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
University of Minnesota

A DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR THE 1990s

**Reducing Poverty through Education
and Agricultural Science and Technology**

HIGHLIGHTS
from a
National Conference, June 17-18, 1991

Sponsored by

**The Board for International Food and Agricultural Development
and Economic Cooperation**

and

The Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

A forum for public discussion of a report of a Task Force on Development Assistance and Cooperation. The Task Force and its study were supported by grants from the Agency for International Development, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, the Ford Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation.

PREFACE

In the fall of 1989, when it appeared that several major reform efforts of the previous two or three years were losing momentum, the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD), in response to its legislative mandate to advise the President and the Congress, initiated a new effort to re-examine agricultural development assistance in the context of overall need for change in our approach to foreign aid.

After soliciting cooperation and support from a number of interested individuals and organizations, an informal organizing committee agreed to commission a Blue Ribbon Task Force of distinguished development scholars to take a new look at development strategies for the future and continue efforts to build a viable coalition for reform. Dr. G. Edward Schuh, Dean of the Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota was selected to head the Task Force and the Humphrey Institute agreed to become the "implementing organization" for the project, which initially became known as "Agriculture 2000."

The six-person Task Force, made up of internationally recognized development scholars, met regularly for more than a year and interacted with literally hundreds government officials, congressional staff, private sector interest groups and development practitioners before producing a draft report. A conference, hosted by Senator Terry Sanford and Congressman Doug Bereuter and sponsored by the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and Economic Cooperation (BIFADEC) and The Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs, was held June 17-18, 1991, to provide a public forum for a discussion of the recommendations and issues raised by the Task Force.

What follows is an attempt to capture the highlights of that conference, especially the various points of view on the main issues addressed in the Task Force Report. I am indebted to Ms. Alice Skelsey for her professional editorial assistance in preparing these highlights.

John G. Stovall
Task Force Staff Director

LIST OF TASK FORCE AND ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Task Force on Development Assistance & Cooperation

G. Edward Schuh, Dean, Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota (Task Force Chairman)

Susanna Hecht, Professor, Graduate School of Architecture and Urban Planning, University of California Los Angeles

James Henson, Director, International Programs, Washington State University

Uma Lele, Professor, Department of Food and Resource Economics, University of Florida

John W. Mellor, Senior Fellow, (On Leave) International Food Policy Research Institute

Donald Plucknett, Scientific Advisor, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, The World Bank

Task Force Staff Director

John Stovall, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs/BIFADEC

Advisory Committee

William E. Lavery, Chancellor, Extension Administration, Virginia Polytechnic Institute State University

Bradshaw Langmaid, Deputy Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Science & Technology, A.I.D.

Charles Hess, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Duane Acker, Administrator, Office of International Cooperation & Development, U.S. Department of Agriculture

Walter Coward, Director of Rural Poverty and Resources Program, The Ford Foundation

Dan Martin, Director, World Environment and Resources Program, MacArthur Foundation

Joyce Lewinger Moock, Associate Vice President, The Rockefeller Foundation

Robert D. Havener, President, Winrock International

Ambassador Robert Blake, Senior Fellow, World Resources Institute

The Honorable Orville Freeman, Popham Haik Ltd.

William Pearce, Senior Vice President, Cargill, Incorporated

James Sanford, Home Place Farms Incorporated

Max Lennon, President, Clemson University

The Honorable Terry Sanford, United States Senate

The Honorable Doug Bereuter, U.S. House of Representatives

A Development Policy for the 1990s

**Reducing Poverty through Education
and Agricultural Science and Technology**

HIGHLIGHTS
from a
National Conference, June 17-18, 1991

Wales H. Madden, Jr., Moderator
**Chairman, Board for International Food & Agricultural Development
& Economic Cooperation**

Within the past year, the Administrator of A.I.D. enlarged the role of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development by adding "Economic Cooperation" to its name and asking the Board to advise and assist on the full array of economic development problems.

The Board took the lead, with the help of several other organizations, in establishing the Task Force whose Report is the subject of this Conference today.

The timing of the Conference coincides with a renewed interest by the Administration and the Congress in new foreign assistance legislation. There apparently is wide agreement that change is needed; the problem is in reaching consensus on exactly what the change should be.

Our thanks to the official hosts for this conference: Senator Terry Sanford and Congressman Doug Bereuter, who also were associated with the Advisory Committee to the Task Force.

John Costello
President, Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs:

Our future in economic, social and environmental terms is indelibly tied to our capacity to promote broad-based economic growth in the world's emerging economies.

We in the developed world make up about 15 percent of the world's population. Less than 40 years from now, we will represent about five percent. The social and political implications of these demographic changes will effect virtually every aspect of our lives.

Without broad-based economic growth in the South occurring at some acceptable rate, we in the North face the prospect of declining markets for our products, declining opportunities for investment, and quite possibly a decline in political power. Economic development in the Third World will almost assuredly become as critical to our economic well-being as to theirs.

The solution to our current trade problems, to our capacity to address a whole range of domestic economic growth needs, lies in our capacity to trade with markets that have the most dynamic potential for growth. Those are the markets of the emerging economies.

This Conference provides an important focal point to amplify this critically important message. It is a timely opportunity to bring together this body of development experts to explore how best we can meet the challenges before us.

**Hon. Mark L. Edelman
Deputy Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development**

This is an appropriate time for a Conference focusing on development policies for the 1990s--in the midst of congressional and administration discussions on the scope and substance of America's role in the developing world. The winds of change to which President Bush often refers continue to transform the world and impact the mission and mandate of the Agency for International Development.

The United States must establish new international partnerships for development. In the future, we will not work with recipient countries but with partner countries. We will not use private sector entities--private voluntary agencies, universities, businesses--as agents but enroll their energies in the development challenge. We will not ask other U.S. government agencies to bend their activities to our purposes but to do what they already do best in cooperation with us.

This represents a fundamental shift in the way the United States approaches international development. The Agency's traditional goals--improving the quality of human life, expanding individual opportunity, reducing poverty, ignorance and malnutrition--cannot be implemented effectively by relying on traditional approaches. We are placing greater emphasis on sound economic policies and improved governance. We are strengthening efforts to establish a partnership with U.S. and developing country private sectors in advancing trade, investment, and economic growth in developing countries. Moreover, we are giving greater attention to establishing mutually beneficial trade linkages between the U.S. and developing countries.

These are the types of partnership A.I.D. must forge to be effective in this world. Partnerships are essential in creating a democratic base that gives people a role in their political futures--in protecting the environment, in enhancing food security and agricultural

productivity, in giving all people, especially the poor, children and women, a stake in the prospects of economic development.

At the same time there is a clear need to focus on a more carefully defined range of problems. New initiatives are focusing on the environment, democracy, business and development, the family, and A.I.D.'s strategic management. Closely related to these initiatives is our commitment to "programming for results," looking for results from host countries and from ourselves.

The President's proposed International Cooperation Act of 1991 would establish five clearly articulated objectives as the basis for all foreign assistance programs:

- * Promote democratic values;
- * Develop free market principles and strengthen U.S. competitiveness;
- * Encourage peace;
- * Aid other nations against transnational threats; and
- * Meet humanitarian needs.

The legislation would also provide flexibility in how and where to spend money based on the needs of each developing country, not on earmarks and directives that may be outdated even before they are enacted.

**Nelle Temple
House Committee On Banking**

Congressman Bereuter was unable to attend the Conference but has asked that the Task Force be congratulated on the thought and effort put into the Report and the caliber of the people involved. The Advisory Committee to the Task Force, including Senator Sanford, Congressman Bereuter and a broad spectrum of other people and agencies, produced a set of interchanges and ideas that are already a part of the dialogue on partnerships.

We have come to a new understanding about the role of government, the business sector, and the not-for-profit sector in the work of development. The challenge of the Task Force is to figure out how the new partnerships should be built for a fast-changing world.

The Task Force effort represents a critical piece of what it takes to make good policy both for our country and for the world. The input from outside the government about what works in various communities, in the field, in different contexts, can be critical.

Discussion from the floor:

Harold Matteson, New Mexico State University: The Report seems to imply that we should strengthen the public sector, which would then enhance the development of the private sector. What does this mean for the legislative and administrative sides?

Temple: Several trends are coinciding, providing more of a balance now. First, a number of countries are trying to figure out how to unleash private incentive in the market economy to get on the growth track.

Secondly, government does have to do some things well, which includes giving significant thought to the human resource base. One of the core functions of government is to worry about how basic needs such as education are to be met, and then provide for them in a way that maximizes the use of private initiative.

Edelman: Part of the tension between the executive branch and the Congress has to do with balancing the emphasis on the public and private sectors. Most governments now realize that they cannot perform most of these services. Government has been a major impediment to development in many Third World countries. Lack of human and capital infrastructure has been a major impediment.

The tug of war has come out with a balance that is moving in the right direction. For example, the new PL 480 legislation and the new Title III provide for involving the private sector to the maximum extent possible. It is no longer a profanity to talk about the private sector throughout most of the Third World.

Carol Capps, Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief:

If A.I.D. hopes to focus the great bulk of its resources toward countries engaged in economic and political reform, in instances when there may be conflict between the two reforms, which should be given priority?

Edelman: They are indeed in conflict, and there is no answer to which is more important. As others have pointed out, this is the first time in history that countries are attempting economic and political liberalization at the same time. If it is difficult to eliminate a subsidy in this country, how can we expect some of the small, frail countries to do so without a political structure in place? It is a key point, and there is a growing sensitivity to it.

Ed Price, Oregon State University: There seems to be a fundamental conflict in models of decision-making between A.I.D. and the universities, the former being intellectually led and the latter constituency driven. Should A.I.D. be more constituency oriented? It is notable that U.S. private sector firms--producing, processing firms--are not closely associated with any programs. A.I.D. may need to have more of an association with bona fide, private producing agricultural firms.

Don Bjork, World Relief: Is there a more effective way for the university, voluntary and church communities to work together today?

Edelman: The first problem is a commonality of purpose. Are we all heading in the same direction or not? Communication has not always been the best in terms of what A.I.D. is trying to do. Perhaps the Advisory Commission on Voluntary Foreign Assistance and BIFADEC could work on how to clarify goals so that all participants understand the direction and share in the commonality of purpose.

John Costello, Chairman, Advisory Committee for Foreign Voluntary Assistance: There is a great opportunity now to build synergistic relationships that will not only benefit A.I.D. but will have great significance to both the PVO and the university sectors. The need is to find a better and more effective way not just to communicate but to collaborate.

Temple: If A.I.D. does succeed in designing its management system around a results approach, perhaps matching grants for research or other activities based on the most effective team would be a way that A.I.D. could reward creative partnerships. There is a lot A.I.D. could do with open competition to encourage these kinds of partnerships, and with money for travel to encourage the cause of doing work internationally.

Edelman: More competition may mean that some organizations that have always been funded before will not be funded. A.I.D. is moving to impact evaluations—a "so-what" kind of evaluation, where it is not just reported that A.I.D. built a road, for example, but what the impact was of building it. We may know anecdotally that some things do not work, but hard evidence has not been developed. A systematizing approach is now being taken and the results of such evaluations will be promulgated through the Agency network and shared with the Hill.

A New Paradigm for Foreign Aid
G. Edward Schuh, Chairman, Task Force
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Foreign Affairs

The U. S. foreign aid program is rooted for the most part in the period following World War II. We then had the dominant economy in the world and were the scientific and technological leaders. The international economy was experiencing a severe dollar shortage. It made economic sense for the United States to be generous with others and help restore the international economy. It was a highly successful effort.

Later, with the United States caught up in the cold war, our foreign aid program shifted to the lower income countries with the notion that if we assisted them in development we would win them over. Unfortunately, applying the same principles that were used in Europe and Japan met with failure. These countries did not have well-educated populations nor the institutional

arrangements needed for modernization and economic development. In addition, a large share of the early efforts in agricultural development were focused on developing an extension system rather than helping develop an agricultural research system to produce the technology needed for local adoption.

Unfortunately, about the time we were learning how to do development, political support began to wane. A variety of attempts were made to revitalize foreign aid programs--changing their focus, reorganizing the development agency itself.

Despite these efforts, **U. S. support for foreign economic assistance now ranks 18th among the 18 industrialized countries when expressed as a share of gross national product.** Despite repeated pledges by the industrialized countries that each would provide up to one percent of its GNP in the form of foreign aid, the U.S. share is now at .12 percent and has been that low for a fairly long time.

The Task Force believes strongly that:

- * The first step to revitalizing our foreign aid assistance is to establish a new rationale for it.
- * The second step is to define our comparative advantage in providing such assistance.
- * The third step is to put our assistance programs on a truly collaborative basis with other countries.

A new rationale for foreign aid is as follows:

The United States will continue to provide humanitarian aid to other countries in times of natural disasters. But the Task Force believes that U.S. economic assistance programs need to go beyond humanitarian objectives. Their objectives need to be articulated more clearly in terms of U.S. economic and political interests and in terms of realistic, achievable goals.

We need to state clearly that our future markets lie in these countries; that an increasingly larger supply of raw materials for our own economic activities will come from these countries.

The international economy has changed enormously over the last several decades and our economic assistance programs need to reflect this reality. The Task Force differs from others of the genre in that it addresses these changes in some depth. A huge international capital market now exists that countries with sound economic policies can access for their programs.

An important exception: Investments in human capital development. This area is where the bulk of U.S. collaboration should focus.

Investing in collaborative research and education efforts also has a high pay-off to our society, a benefit grossly underestimated in the past. The United States now desperately needs a stronger knowledge base on the rest of the world. It also needs access to new technology arising from R & D efforts in other countries. Both these goals can be accomplished by expanding collaborative research programs in other countries. On the education side, foreign students and visiting professors help prepare our own youth for a global economy. And providing educational services to other countries is in essence exporting a service.

The United States badly needs additional foreign exchange earnings; exporting service is a comparative advantage. Collaborative ventures in health care and services and in environmental programs offer similar high pay-offs. They are, again, cases of mutual interests, where what we do to help these countries ends up being of tremendous help to us.

The perspective on international development programs thus needs to change; from one of "assistance" or "aid" to one of international collaboration and cooperation. At the same time, a target of our efforts should be to relieve malnutrition and hunger around the world.

Countries have different comparative advantages in international development. Japan, for example, has a comparative advantage in providing financial capital; the United States, with its recurring balance of payments deficit, does not. Its comparative advantage lies in developing human capital through our outstanding university research and education system. Access to these institutions must be broadened and a broader range of research organizations and universities must be included.

An expanded program of international cooperation is possible only as we are able to articulate these mutual interests to the domestic body politic and to the developing country. If the mutual interests are understood, domestic support will emerge, and collaborating countries will be more willing to participate.

A new rationale is needed to design programs that are in our best interest; to develop the domestic political support that is needed; and to engage other countries in truly collaborative efforts.

Building Democratic Institutions in Developing Countries

Raymond F. Hopkins

Swarthmore College

The focus now for international cooperation in building democratic institutions is on governments that are legitimate, efficient and can encourage entrepreneurship. Those kinds of governments it is now widely believed are not heavily centralized or Marxist-oriented

governments but rather are governments that embody in various ways the principles we associate with democracy.

There is a fundamental belief in the United States, and in many other societies that accept democratic principles, that democracy is also a good in itself--that there are certain basic values, including freedom and individual fulfillment, that are worth nurturing simply as ends in themselves, not as instruments to some other goal such as economic growth.

At the heart of building democratic institutions one has to have a set of individuals who are oriented to principles of human dignity that will make those institutions work.

There are three focal points at which democratic institutions can be built:

The first level of institution building is that of individuals and family. This level of culture is where individual rights are nurtured (or sometimes suppressed). The basic division of labor and authority are worked out at this level. It is also where individual belief systems either express (or do not) demands for rules of law, equity, rights of women. This is a crucial area but one that direct foreign cooperation can do little about nor one in which it would be profitable to try to affect directly.

The second level is the civil society representing cooperative and voluntary relationships among people. This allows people to pursue economic gain in private enterprise, to participate in voluntary non-profit organizations, to work together in churches, schools, youth groups. It is in this civic society that rights and duties are transmitted to a fair extent and individuals are able to mediate between themselves and the larger society. Here one learns societal trust--that there is a predictability of rules of law and a tolerance for other people to undertake activities not identical with yours. Thus we have pluralism, competing groups, as part of the model of democracy. Without trust and tolerance as nurtured in the civic society, democratic institutions are unlikely to find fertile soil in which to flourish.

It is in this area that the Task Force report is especially applicable in terms of investing in human values in a diffuse way; and it is here that the bulk of resources in economic cooperation can be appropriately put to work.

The third level involves the strict rules of democratic institutions--rules about voting, elections, representative institutions, division of governmental labor between the central and more local governments and between branches of government.

The World Bank over the last six months has been producing various papers dealing with the qualities that support economic development--good governance, accountability, transparency, rule of law, openness. In this area there might be some assistance in training lawyers, occasionally a consultant to help with some particularly difficult rules. Just helping look at an issue intellectually might be of assistance.

It was asked earlier if there isn't some tension between the desire to create democratic political institutions and the desire to liberalize economically. The answer is yes. Democratic rules may be put in place for electoral processes that exacerbate underlying tensions and conflicts.

More stringent kinds of political conditionalities also run some risks. If A.I.D. allows political conditionality to go forward very far, it may well be the State Department rather than A.I.D. that is taking care of allocations of foreign assistance dollars. There is also the negative reaction in LDCs if one intrudes too heavily on the sovereignty of the overseas country. Thus a strict political conditionality in international cooperation will run into some serious problems as well.

Improving the Environment and Natural Resources

Susanna B. Hecht

University of California at Los Angeles

Concerns about international environmental problems represent a powerful constituency in the American civil society today. It is a concern easily understood by Americans everywhere, a concern for their children and grandchildren as well as for the quality of their daily lives.

Ironically, in spite of its ability to capture the interest and concern of the population, this area has been historically underfunded, particularly in the Third World. It is also an area where the United States has a great comparative advantage, with a great deal to give and the most to gain.

Major areas of collaborative effort that would be useful:

- * Enhancing technical capability within the agencies that will be involved in the collaborative research. The problems are growing in complexity, and without expansion of technical capacity an agency can only respond to transitory political fads.
- * Enhancing integration with universities. An analysis by the University of California found that roughly 10 percent of the faculty has been, or is, involved in tropical research issues globally, representing all disciplines. A huge amount of talent may be available that is not being used as effectively as it might be.
- * Using a mechanism of debt-for-education to provide human resources and institutional and management capabilities. In a sense, such training through debt-for-education would facilitate "intellectual" free trade--enhancing the movement not only of students from developing countries to U.S. universities

but moving U.S. students and professors to those countries, enhancing the interaction between international institutions.

Such exchanges should not be limited to the university. Important international exchanges with regulatory personnel would be of singular interest. Air quality management experts in this country, for example, might have a great deal to talk about with counterparts in Sao Paulo or Mexico City or Singapore.

- * Rethinking our conservation and management approaches. Our historical approach, for example, has implied no people involved in the daily living of the forest. We have a lot to learn about the kinds of economies and other forms of conservation that are possible.
- * Re-analyzing implementation strategies vis-a-vis the PVO Center. PVOs and NGOs are important for mobilizing pressure and implementing effort, and they are also extremely important in coordinating the groups of university, state and popular civil societies. In a sense they provide democratic rather than bureaucratic activism.

Four basic issues are particularly important in terms of long-term resource strategies:

1) Focusing on a far more complex approach to forestry. Concerns about a whole range of forest issues--how forest cultures and institutions evolve, and what works and what doesn't--represent an important initiative that needs to be carried out.

2) Monitoring resource issues. The World Bank report of annual economic indicators on various countries is used as a way of analyzing policy and determining how countries are doing relative to one another. Something akin to this is needed for environmental issues.

3) Inventorying major and minor crops, analyzing what is available, the different forms of conservation, and the mechanisms for handling questions of intellectual property rights.

4) Focusing more on indigenous knowledge and its importance in resource management, using it as a platform for melding with other forms of science.

There is a convergence in the types of environmental problems from developing countries and the questions are increasingly similar. Environmental concerns are not simply aesthetic ones today but lie at the heart of any strategy of economic production.

Improving the Climate for the Private Sector Through Development
Edward Bullard, TechnoServe, Inc.

The climate for the private sector in two-thirds or three-fifths of the world is not on the bandwagon of economic growth and development and cannot provide a sound living and well-being for the children of these countries.

Non-profit organizations have an advantage in overcoming deficiencies in many environments that otherwise would stymie private sector development. An obvious difficulty is that the for-profit private sector cannot afford to pay for the failings in these environments.

The prerequisites for the private sector to step in and be able to make a profit include: Free markets, commodity prices competitive and consistent with world prices; availability of technology appropriate for the environment; stable government; a policy climate that is pro-private initiative; banks; national and local institutions; the sanctity of contracts; private property rights.

There must also be success models--one has to see with one's own eyes that increased productivity leads to increased income, profit, well-being. People have to actually see such connections before they, as the private sector, will be significant players in the development process.

The pieces cannot all be put together at once; the fledgling systems are overwhelmed. An iterative process, one that is slow but allows learning from mistakes, is necessary. A four step process toward enhancement of the environment for the private sector:

- 1) Look for special situations where private sector initiatives can be fostered and some subsidies can be brought in to provide a boost for a trial initiative. Concurrently,
- 2) Begin developing the institutions, markets, climate, human capital--the enabling environment--that will interact with the fledgling private sector enterprise.
- 3) Improve and refine in a testing process.
- 4) Slowly withdraw the subsidies, the external support, that made up for the initial lack of human capital.

Mutual Benefits of Cooperation in Science and Technology
Donald Plucknett
Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research

One of the great stories of this century, largely unrecognized, has been our ability to produce continuing larger harvests, thereby ensuring food stability and security for constantly growing populations. **The change to a science-based agriculture has meant higher and more stable food production and a better way of life for hundreds of millions of people.**

Modern scientific agriculture had its origins in the latter part of the 19th century. Higher fertilizer use was one key to improvements in developed country agriculture. An outstanding advance was the development of hybrid corn in the United States just before World War I.

The adoption and spread of new semi-dwarf wheat and rice varieties in the 1960s and 1970s dramatized the potential of a productive agriculture. The increased production from semi-dwarf rice alone is conservatively estimated to feed 700 million people. The Green Revolution was one of the reasons Asia did not succumb to massive famine and starvation in this century. It also proved that national investments in agriculture research and development could pay big dividends. It showed how international agricultural research could benefit developing countries.

Support for agriculture was given high priority by governments, with good results. **Countries once considered hopelessly behind have reached, or are nearing, self-sufficiency or self-reliance in basic staples.**

History tells us several things concerning productivity and agricultural technology:

- * Higher yields are still obtainable in most crops provided the technology is available and adopted.
- * Once higher yields are obtained, it takes more and better research just to maintain those yields and keep them advancing, even slowly.
- * Future gains in productivity can be expected through a combination of plant breeding and improved crop and natural resource management.
- * Plant breeding and crop improvement efforts have paid off handsomely. Cereal improvement has meant productivity gains of one to two percent per year in most cases.
- * Gains in productivity, in cereals in particular, have largely come through improvements in harvest index not through increased production of plant biomass.

- * Crops can be tailored more and more to conditions under which they will be grown.
- * Needed gains in productivity must come through research that is well supported and has continuity.
- * Research should be linked closely from national to international levels to insure greatest benefit to all partners.

As Vernon Ruttan has noted: "By the end of this century there will be no significant areas where agricultural production can be expanded by simply adding more land to production. Expansion of agricultural output will have to be obtained almost entirely from more intensive cultivation in areas already being used for agricultural production. Increases in food and fiber production will depend in large measure on continuous advances in agricultural technology. **It is imperative that over the next several decades we complete the establishment of agricultural research capacity for each commodity of economic importance in each agro-climatic region of the world.**"

**The Title XII of the Future
Paul Findley
Member, BIFADEC**

In December 1977, an ailing Senator Hubert Humphrey pulled himself out of his sick bed to address the Famine Prevention Symposium on Capitol Hill. (Senator Humphrey and I had co-sponsored Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act signed into law in 1975.)

Senator Humphrey's address was inspiring. He challenged the diplomats, university leaders and A.I.D. officials who were present to banish the age-old problem of famine and malnutrition worldwide. He expressed confidence that they could accomplish the goal within this century by marshalling the unique and enormous resources of the American land-grant system of education.

Humphrey declared the need for the continuing education of the masses of farmers worldwide and spoke out for the modernization of a third-world agriculture that lagged seriously behind food production in industrialized nations. He told his audience that **the best contribution the United States could make to the challenge of world hunger was the U.S. model of land-grant education.** Organized, sustained instruction in the field, in the classroom and in demonstration research would abolish famine and malnutrition.

One of the dreams Senator Humphrey and I shared about Title XII was that U.S. universities would acquire special competence in relationships with various countries, including the history, culture and language, and continue the relationship indefinitely into the future. Libraries in both the host institution and the U.S. would maintain documents of the cooperative

relationships that would be a rich record of inspiration for students, teachers, agribusiness and political leaders, and those who design plans for the future.

We could see the day when every developing nation would have long-term productive links with at least one major U.S. teaching institution. Data from research and development projects in these countries would be available for students, teachers, scientists worldwide, who could, through computer retrieval, benefit endlessly from the experience of yesterday.

. . . The United Nations estimates that 35,000 people die worldwide each day from famine, malnutrition and disease. That is about 1,500 people an hour. From that sad statistic, I must conclude that BIFAD (now BIFADEC) and the Title XII community have not yet measured up to their opportunity--and responsibility.

Human suffering from disease, parasites and manmade strife continues unabated. Seven hundred million people are chronically or seasonally hungry. And, recognizing population growth prospects, the world must prepare to feed the equivalent of another India in the next 10 years.

The U.S. response to this challenge is totally inadequate. Success stories can be cited, of course, but the aggregate problem gets worse, not better. I speak in plain language. Our progress is small measured against the need. It is almost anemic when one considers the enormous resources our country could marshal to this noble cause.

Our great comparative advantage lies in our great system through which farmers are educated. No other country can match it in history, size or quality. Now more than ever the hungry world needs America's help in getting down the road to self-sufficiency.

I fear that A.I.D., for whatever reasons, is trying to do too many different things in too many places and consequently is losing its crucial focus on the essentials--that is, helping to establish systems through which small-scale farmers receive continuing education.

In most developing countries, ignorance is the greatest barrier to progress. Most peasant farmers lack communication skills. They are illiterate. They do not use readily available farming practices that would make better use of existing resources.

Extension as it is being carried out in developing countries is usually ineffective. The fault is not with the U.S. model; it is sound. It can be adapted in any developing country where the local government has the will to cooperate. Where that will is lacking, I suggest we wait. We do no favors to starving people abroad or to U.S. taxpayers when we try to establish development programs we know are flawed or in countries where the political leadership is unwilling to make long-term basic commitments.

The victory over famine will not be easy. We must act effectively on two fronts: We must make sure that our government stays on the correct Title XII course; and we must rally public support.

Those aroused to the horror of famine must learn that resources are now in place through which this educational process can move forward--that this vast university community is ready and eager to help developing countries travel this essential road--and that legislation is in place through which our institutions, under long-term contracts, can provide this assistance.

While rejoicing in the progress achieved through Title XII, I regret that more has not been accomplished. We should be further down the road. All of us can do better in our effort to eliminate famine. For the sake of starving humanity, we must.

Those of us in positions of responsibility must apply our talents as if lives depend on our endeavors. Because they do. In the few minutes since I began speaking, more than 1,000 human beings--most of them children--have died of famine. Every minute counts.

A Public Dialogue on the Task Force Recommendations Defining the U. S. Interests in Foreign Aid

Task Force Recommendations G. Edward Schuh

Identifying U.S. interests in international cooperation is critical to developing political support for it. Those interests include:

1) Gaining New Knowledge from Other Countries. Collaborating in international research and education programs is an important way of strengthening our knowledge base. As a nation we have not done much to find a means for tapping into the knowledge that is being generated in other parts of the world.

2) The Economic Importance of Food. The increase in demand for food as the international economy recovers will be significant. The United States will share in the consequences of the resulting world food problem because it cannot cut itself off from the international economy. At the same time, development agencies are pulling away from agricultural scientific, technological and production collaboration--a serious mistake. Not only does this misjudge the issue of whether the world food problem has been solved, it fails to recognize how the development of agriculture contributes to general economic growth and development.

The real economic importance of agriculture is that everybody consumes food. If you lower the price of food by the introduction of new technology, you increase the incomes of most people in the society, and in favor of low income groups because they spend most of their incomes on food. In addition, the potential gains from the miracle wheats and rice, which have driven much of the international economy for almost 20 years, is nearing exhaustion. Nothing

appears to be coming along to replace these technological breakthroughs. To downgrade the need for agricultural development and production is folly of the highest order.

3) Expanding Markets Abroad. The United States has accumulated a large amount of foreign debt that needs to be serviced. At some point you have to begin exporting to earn foreign exchange for that. **The future markets for the United States are primarily in the developing countries, and they are not going to be realized unless those countries have significant increases in their own per capita incomes.** Thus, the United States has a vital interest in their economic development.

4) Strategic Materials. The United States now imports over 50 percent of the 13 raw materials deemed critical to our manufacturing and industrial sector, not to mention over 50 percent of our petroleum. Collaborating with developing countries can help assure that the supply of these materials is available to our own economy.

5) Free Trade. The United States has a vested interest in trade liberalization and economic collaboration can be an effective way of promoting that, and of making the global economic pie larger. There is a real complementarity between international cooperation and trade liberalization efforts.

6) The Environment. Many of our environmental problems are now global problems and the solutions to them global as well. Collaborating to that end is in the best interest of the United States.

Panel Discussion

D. Gale Johnson, University of Chicago: The major interests of the American people in foreign assistance over the past 40 years have been its humanitarian and security aspects. A significant component of assistance after the mid-1950s was motivated by our relative position vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. That issue today plays a diminishing role, and assistance now returns to issues primarily related to humanitarianism.

The humanitarian interest is still strong in the United States, but increasingly with a show-me attitude. People increasingly ask the question: Does our assistance have the effects we hope it will? Three massive efforts in one decade to help the starving in Ethiopia underscored that the underlying factors resulting in people being hungry were still there. **The Task Force makes an important contribution by pointing to areas where A.I.D. can have the greatest impact-- in human capital development, essentially public-good activities.**

Success in generating economic growth in the developing countries has several important implications for the United States, including the improvement in world food security and the increased volume and value of international trade. The United States is much more dependent on international trade than in the past and will become increasingly dependent in the future.

This was seen in the 1980s. One of the reasons for the deficit in our trade account since the mid-1980s was the location of our markets. They were much more adversely affected than those of Japan or Western Europe by the downturn in world economic activity. That was because Latin America and other developing countries were far more important as outlets for our products, particularly agricultural products, than they were to our other major trading competitors. If a lesson is needed of the importance of growth and expansion among our markets, we have it from what happened to us in the 1980s.

Charles William Maynes, Foreign Policy Magazine: The Task Force recommendations are sensible and helpful but perhaps do not go far enough. Our aid program is in a crisis for several reasons other than financial ones.

The importance of the anti-communist struggle in holding this program together can hardly be over-emphasized. If communism is dead, then what is the common theme?

The Task Force says we should try to create a new constituency from the academic community, environmentalists, PVOs and the private sector. That is a good start and those are good groups but that is not enough.

We need to refocus our aid program in a way that stands some chance of uniting all Americans not just particular groups.

Themes that might attract not only the groups mentioned by the Task Force but other Americans as well:

- * Disaster relief remains something that most Americans understand and support.
- * An equal start in the global competition also has some appeal, and the emphasis on education or self-help is important here.
- * Cooperative research that will also benefit us can be important: For example, research on new products derived from tropical forests with application for modern medicine; new technologies for environmental controls to help the developing countries; global medical phenomena that have an adverse reaction on the United States as well as the developing countries; development that enlarges domestic markets rather than creating export platforms.
- * Programs to strengthen democratic accountability, not in a forced interventionist way but in a cooperative sense, also have some appeal in this country, along with support for the creation of political parties, a free press, labor unions.
- * A.I.D. projects within this country would also help build sense of cooperative development. For example, other countries use water better than we do.

Maybe we could learn something from them if they came here. Other countries do a better job at adult literacy programs. There are other areas where the emphasis is cooperation not charity, and we could learn as well.

- * Private voluntary cooperation might be given even more emphasis. These groups have a vitality and commitment that helps in the political task of rallying support.

The Report does not differentiate enough among developing countries. **There is still a category of countries that desperately need help; that cannot participate in the global capital markets; that have few trade opportunities.**

There is also the dilemma the United States faces in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. The relationship has dramatically changed, and it does have implications for our aid effort.

Greater detail could have been given to the trade-not-aid issue. It is central to our problem. Our sugar program vastly outweighs anything we do for the Caribbean countries in terms of aid. If we quadrupled the aid program, we still would not offset the damage to these countries by our own domestic programs. **We have to look a little more coldly at what we are doing with one hand while trying to compensate for it with the other.**

Confronting the debt issue is probably much more important than a long-run aid program in terms of developing markets in Latin America. It has been their heavy debt, their need to increase their exports over their imports, that dried up our markets in Latin America. We have lost an enormous market there.

While the end of the cold war has deprived us of the cement that held together various coalitions, it is doubtful the U.S. government will ever forego aid as a political purpose. Aid has been used as an equalizer in diplomatic efforts for decades and will continue, although it may be more focused toward regions of the world where we have a special interest for domestic reasons.

Despite the fact that there is fatigue and discontent with accomplishments, or non-accomplishments, of not only the U.S. aid effort but those of the international financial institutions and of other bilateral donors, **the moral call is still strong if it is well focused. It still has to be made.**

Richard E. Bissell, Assistant Administrator, A.I.D.: The Task Force report is helpful in presenting a powerful statement for several justifications for foreign aid. It does not, however, create the complete dialogue necessary for putting together a new consensus to support programs in place and those envisioned for the 1990s.

In sorting out our approach to foreign aid as universalisms versus particularisms, one finds a broken dialogue about the programs.

Among the common themes involved in a program of economic cooperation, anti-communism has been most powerful when it came time to vote in the Congress. With that theme disappearing, a series of replacement candidates have already been described that draw upon our prior experience as well as our potential. Trade competitiveness is well laid out in the report. So is the whole thrust toward technological change--the United States bringing to the world stage its relatively unique, entrepreneurial, adventurous approach to change, in which science and technology play a crucial role.

What is not strongly explored is the concept of one world in a global environmental sense. This universalism is being expressed strongly by a large American constituency that could easily turn A.I.D. and the foreign assistance program into one large environmental agency. **But the fact that communism is withering does not mean that issues of democracy and peace would or could not be an important universal theme for our assistance programs. The turn from anti-communism to building peace and sustaining democracy is a very simple 10-degree turn.**

These two themes are competing with one another intensively, and if there is an identity crisis about foreign assistance, it has to do with the contest between the two. Each is quite willing to claim a monopoly over the future of foreign assistance rather than a compromise.

It is easy to be distracted by the particularisms--how much aid goes to one country or another, how much of a role ethnic blocks should play--instead of trying to build in a universal approach. Professionals sometimes help create the problem of particularisms by recognizing how different the contexts are becoming in developing countries, and arguing that the American role in the world varies tremendously country by country. That breaks down the sense of an overall mandate and focuses people on detail--on the trees rather than the forest. This makes sense in the field; it does not make sense in putting together a political rationale in Washington, which must be based on certain generally accepted universal reasons--common themes--for foreign assistance.

As we think about a new world order, or whatever one wants to call the major transition underway, **we must nail down what the common themes are going to be and which ones can co-habit in a foreign assistance program (it is unlikely that all can) before arguing about how to do business.** Those particularisms, those sections in the Foreign Assistance Act that preoccupy committees and subcommittees, matter a lot less at this time than Section I dealing with the common theme of where the program is going.

Without the universalisms we will not have a logical base from which to discuss what we want to accomplish. In the decision process, from setting foreign policy, to setting common themes and then to getting the business done, A.I.D. does the business. It is the caboose. It gets

the snap at the end of the train as it rockets through Mongolia, Eastern Europe, various parts of the world where it has never operated before.

Pieces of this Report on where our national interest lies need to be put into the hands of a group of people--Congress, senior levels of the executive branch, and so forth--where the decisions on basic themes will be made and where they can put together the political coalition to make it work. Then we can begin to have a program that really operates.

Discussion from the floor:

Chuck Antholt, World Bank: The proposal for a Center for Scientific Collaboration is attractive because it builds on mutuality and gets away from the patron/client approach. But it will be dead-on-arrival if developed within the Agency. The interest is much broader than A.I.D. It requires a level of intellectual and professional leadership that A.I.D. no longer possesses; trying to obtain such human resources would involve displacing other people in the bureaucracy. It would also be hamstrung by rules and regulations within the bureaucracy. Scientific collaboration has to be built on flexibility.

Schuh: The issue goes to the fundamental question of how to bring about reform or change. A similar institute was proposed a few years ago to be outside the Agency and it did not come off. The Task Force decided to be gradualists, and move the process from within the system. The prospects might be brighter for the alternative suggestion if universities in general were providing more leadership on the issues than they currently are.

Capps: The Task Force talks in terms of national and regional levels. How do community level groups fit into the thinking about the future of a U.S. foreign aid program?

Schuh: The creation of an Institute for Private Voluntary Cooperation within the Agency is proposed for two reasons: Many of the NGOs seem to have entitlements, and the Task Force believes that they ought to experience the same kind of peer review and competitive bidding that others do. Secondly, NGOs can become stronger and more able to carry out their role in developing countries. Development efforts at the local level in the United States involve combinations of NGOs, private sectors and universities, particularly land grant universities, working together. That is the kind of linkage that ought to get more attention in the developing countries at the local level.

Setting Program Priorities

Task Force Recommendations

Uma Lele, University of Florida

I want to focus not so much on what we should do because there is agreement on what to do. So, why don't these things happen?

The absolute number of poor in the developing world is increasing rapidly. The growing interest in Eastern Europe has displaced concern for growing poverty and regional instability in other parts of the world.

Secondly, U.S. assistance has been extremely effective in some ways but large amounts of donor assistance, including U.S. assistance, has been ineffective. Studies show there is massive misallocation of foreign aid. Senegal gets \$85 per capita; countries like India and China get less than \$2 per capita. Yet to stimulate given growth would require reallocation of aid to countries where it would do well. In looking at the substance of aid to Senegal in particular, but Africa in general, a large amount of that aid is wasted. Little of it goes to building human capital. A large share goes to Africa in the form of technical assistance, largely of poor quality. Aid to Africa needs reform, namely involving lesser quantity and higher quality.

A large amount of instability in U.S. assistance is because of its past tie to security assistance. Yet the U.S. has shown a much more consistent philosophical commitment to building human and institutional capacity than any European donor. There is a paradox: In order to build human capacity, stability of aid is needed. U.S. assistance has been the most unstable while showing the greatest capacity and willingness to build human capital.

Strategic considerations that led to instability are now changing, and the question is whether U.S. assistance will be more stable than it has been in the past. And if so, to which parts of the world is it going to go? If most of it goes to the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, where per capita incomes are high and calorie consumption is over 3,000 calories per day compared to parts of Asia and Africa where there are starving millions, there will continue to be massive misallocation of aid.

There is no lack of intellectual documentation to show that the United States has tremendous expertise in building human capacity, including to build science and technology capacity in the developing countries. Is it going to do that? Universities have no interest in working on problems of developing countries. The best minds in the universities respond to incentives, too; and since there is so little money in foreign aid, the best minds are not necessarily working on problems of developing countries.

If the United States is to use its comparative advantage in building human capacity, it must start thinking of building centers of excellence within the United States. But if one looks at the politics of aid allocation including to universities, one realizes that there are a large

number of constituencies important in keeping support for foreign assistance, and they change as the nature of assistance changes. Donor agencies cannot risk alienating potential lobbies; rather than building centers of excellence, they like to give assistance to as many universities as possible.

These are some of the realities of why a lot of things we think should be done cannot be done.

Panel Discussion

Robert O. Blake, World Resources Institute: We have made little progress on a problem of enormous urgency--the problem of feeding 40 percent more people within 20 years. There seems to be no sense any place of the real urgency and real problems that confront us.

At a time when natural resources are declining all over the world, the development of sustainable agricultural systems has to be the important focus of our efforts. There is little political support for it, and a true focus for it does not now exist. Part of this is due to a sense that other more important problems have to be solved in this country; or people do not see that money is being spent in a way that makes a real difference; or many accomplishments do not get publicity or attention.

A whole new rationale must be developed. We must identify why it is important for us to have better relations with developing countries, what interdependence means in practical terms for all of us; what it means to neglect this problem as well as pay attention to it.

A vocal, loud, effective constituency is needed. It must be broader than universities and environmental groups. It must represent the churches and their important impulse for humanitarian relief, and agricultural research and farmers concerned with sustainable production systems.

It is unlikely there will be many more resources for A.I.D. in the next five years or more. A.I.D. will have a narrow agenda and should be using its money mostly for what the United States can do best--building the capacities of these countries to solve their own problems.

Leo Walsh, University of Wisconsin: The Task Force points out some of the problems in recent years with the shift toward short-term solutions, which do not sustain the capacity of the countries to deal with longer-term problems.

The case for long-term needs and priorities for education and agricultural science and technology includes:

1) The importance of building human capital expertise has been demonstrated time and again in other parts of the world where developing countries have moved into graduate status as modestly developed nations. But tremendous problems still exist, especially in Africa, where the human capital expertise problem has not yet been well addressed. A.I.D. programs have done a good job at the graduate level, but there is concern that the pool of well-educated students coming through the educational system, from K-12 through undergraduate programs, is growing smaller and smaller. Many of these students seem to be less able to handle the physical and biological sciences they need in order to do well in graduate programs. This requires a re-look.

2) The absolutely essential nature of agricultural productivity as an engine of growth is emphasized in the Task Force report. A promising suggestion is the development of a Center for Scientific Collaboration. The Center would develop and fund programs on a competitive basis, thereby insuring higher quality programs and bringing together PVOs, NGOs, and the university community in a collaborative mode to compete for funds.

3) The Agency must reorder some of its priorities and programs and recommit itself to long-term programs in research and education and institution building. Successful programs include the Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs), which have brought in some of the best scientific talent in the country. But they are underfunded and additional CRSP activities are needed.

4) A power base similar to the grass roots base that supports agricultural extension and research in this country is needed. Relying on disaster to disaster support will never produce the long-term support necessary to carry out the essential long-term development programs that can benefit this country as well as the developing world.

5) A meaningful role needs to be developed for the newly-established University Center for Cooperation and Economic Development. Thus far it seems to be filling a service role for the Agency and the universities by being assigned tasks such as developing a linkage program, overseeing the Joint Career Corps, and improving university access. If the Center is to provide leadership and have influence on Agency programs, it will need a very substantial increase in budget. To be successful it must address issues identified by the Task Force, and hopefully be an integral part of the proposed Center for Scientific Collaboration.

Larry Minear, Overseas Development Council: In the context of broad support for international development and cooperation along the lines the Task Force proposes and for a continuing bilateral assistance program, five points of difficulty regarding the approach the Task Force takes are:

1) The Task Force seems to down play some of the structural issues that need to be addressed. While our economic relations with developing countries will never be completely free from short-term foreign policy objectives and manipulations, unless some greater

protections for basic, human needs-oriented foreign assistance programs are structured in, they will not be able to attain the success needed. Some kind of structural discussion needs to take place.

2) The Task Force assumes the continuation of A.I.D. as we know it, and talks about rebuilding its technical capital. **A much more difficult set of issues is viewed by some: Rekindling A.I.D.'s intellectual leadership and its grasp of what is happening in the field and the obstacles to grass roots development that are interposed by A.I.D. itself.** Many are also concerned that A.I.D.'s programs are becoming so expensive (\$450-plus million just to operate them) that the issue may not be how to rebuild A.I.D.'s technical capacity but do we need A.I.D.?

A more creative alternative than the Task Force offers on this point is the Overseas Development Council's alternative budget. It proposes the creation of a Sustainable Development Fund, which would begin at \$2 billion in FY 92, and rise to \$5 billion by FY 96. It says in explanation of this new venture: "Unlike U.S.A.I.D., the Sustainable Development Fund would be a source of funding for global cooperation, not an operational agency. It would introduce an element of badly needed competition into U.S. bilateral cooperation, channeling its resources through U.S. government agencies, multilateral institutions, private and voluntary organizations and other entities." In other words, A.I.D. would itself compete for bilateral resources rather than having the inside track.

3) The Task Force report does not readily address the need for more multilateral cooperation. **It would be helpful if the Task Force were to recommend support for multilateral cooperation as a preferred channel for U.S. involvement.**

4) While the idea of a partnership mode with the countries is clearly one that the religious community and other development advocates would support, it is unclear what is meant by the "complementarity of interests" called for. It is unclear to what extent that preserves a priority status for the needs of developing countries and their institutions or whether U.S. domestic self-interest will predominate. For example, when universities come to the table are they prepared to make a commitment to self-help development in Third World countries or are they simply looking for a way to solve some of their own financial problems in funding their programs here at home?

5) A more effective constituency for the kind of reform the Task Force recommends already exists but is not attracted to current aid programs. There is a constituency for effective programs that benefit the poor. Look what has happened in recent years for funding for child survival activities, for UNICEF, for the International Fund for Agricultural Development.

The issue is not the lack of a constituency but the lack of a foreign aid program that merits and generates enthusiasm. **The issue the Task Force needs to address is not just that of putting a conceptual and substantive package together (and the paradigm offered of**

nurturing human capital is a good one) but working with and in some ways goading the Administration and the Congress to help us get there.

Discussion from the floor:

Sue Schram, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges: We need specific and realistic strategies for universities to get behind. We need to identify the leadership in the Congress and in our universities. However, university presidents are interested now in a broader picture for international scientific cooperation, including but beyond agriculture. The challenge will be to address all that the panel has identified as needed in agriculture as well as deal with the desire, particularly at the universities, to have a broadened agenda.

Ralph Getz, Consultant: Because we have the precious gift of democracy, we should try to foster within all the developing programs an increasing pluralism and sense of participation. Countries in the Latin America region may be called democracies but they are not.

Blake: A.I.D. is full of first class people, thoughtful, experienced, dedicated. The universities have the same kind of talent. We must not be too pessimistic. We do have the talents; we just need to mobilize them correctly.

Minear: A.I.D. has a good complement of engaged and conceptually strong staff but much less than four or five years ago. Many of the first class people have left for international organizations and the private sector. It is time to take a closer look at what we are paying for when we spend \$150,000 a year to outstation an A.I.D. person in a developing country, or what we get when we spend \$450-plus million a year for operating expenses for bilateral aid.

Lele: Having worked for a multilateral institution and done intensive study of the comparative performance of bilateral and multilateral donors over a long period of time, I can say that **the technical capacity in all donor agencies is declining, not just in A.I.D.**

It should be of great concern that **bilateral donors in general have totally relinquished responsibility to multilateral agencies.** When the multilateral decide what to do in structural adjustment then bilateral agencies leverage their money in structural adjustment. That is an irresponsible thing to do. Technical capacity in donor agencies in general needs to be looked at much more seriously, not just in A.I.D.

Studies repeatedly show that multilateral agencies do not have the comparative advantage in building institutional capacity and human capital. They do not have the institutions to fall back on that bilateral agencies do. Multilateral agencies spend very little money on technical capacity and large amounts of that on physical capital, which ends of being misused because there is not the necessary backup support in an institutional and human capital sense.

The difference between the quality of technical assistance A.I.D. provided to countries in Asia and Latin America in the 1950s and 1960s, and the kind of technical assistance it is providing now, is that some of the best people the United States had sent to the developing countries then. There are no such giants now working on the problems of development. One of the reasons is there is no money to create the needed giants. That comes back to the question that the more bilateral aid is dissipated and handed over to multilateral agencies, the more the United States reduces its capacity to build its own capacity.

The CGIAR has a very impressive machine that collects a huge amount of money, while **American universities have lost the ability to mobilize themselves even to use the talents they have to solve the problems of the developing world.** The United States has much more to contribute than it is using at the moment.

Reforming U.S. Institutions to Meet the Challenges of the 1990s
Task Force Recommendations
Jim Henson, Washington State University

The concept of internationalization is being embraced increasingly by U.S. institutions and organizations. In our study of universities, 84 percent of the presidents indicated that they were committed to internationalization. But in interviews, many lacked a concept of what internationalization might mean to their own institution, how one might go about it, and the impact it might have.

The most important factor influencing the international dimension of a university is not the curriculum but the faculty and administrators.

Development cooperation must be incorporated as one of the components that contribute to the international makeup of the institution. **At 66 percent of the universities examined, international development activities are completely isolated from other international activities. As long as that is the case, they will never be supported and never be institutionalized.**

Universities benefit from development activities but it takes extra effort to integrate them into the mainstream. Some universities have done so. But university cooperative extension programs have virtually no programs directed at educating the public about international development activities.

Panel Discussion:

Charles Hess, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture: In the 1990 farm bill, Congress authorized an enlarged role for the Department of Agriculture in terms of

collaboration with institutions throughout the world engaged in agriculture and related research and extension activities.

The Department recognizes that its talent and that of the land grant university system can contribute to the development process. And the information and experience gained by U.S. faculty or scientists participating overseas can be of inestimable value to U.S. agriculture.

Although there has been some discussion about whether multilateral activities are the best investment, the international research centers are a powerful system. We should take advantage of that and work more closely with it. They are crucial in terms of the collection, preservation and management of germ plasm; low-cost effective technology development; collaborative networks; and training and management--all things of keen interest for our own agriculture.

We need to become as effective as other nations are in placing our scientists in the international research centers. We should provide opportunities for junior staff to take post-doctorals there.

The Task Force report might have given a little more emphasis to the role of the Extension Service. Its feed-back mechanism needs to be emphasized, bringing back to the research centers the problems that farmers or the community are facing. Extension also can be used more effectively in communicating to the public the benefits of international collaboration.

The Report encourages close collaboration between A.I.D. and the Department. A work group has been established with a joint steering committee looking for greater collaboration between the two agencies. Five areas of mutual interest have been identified: Agricultural information data bases; soil and water management; plant genetic resources; high value cash crops; and plant and animal pests and disease management.

Lane Holdcroft, Consultant: The chances for significant reform within A.I.D. are not optimistic. Interviews with 50 mid-level and senior personnel last fall and winter reveal extraordinarily low morale among the career professional. It was felt that the leadership of the Agency gives too much attention to short-term programs and priorities not in the interest of long-term economic development. Priorities with regard to manpower development and building basic institutions in agricultural research, extension and training were not getting much attention. The staff was unable to communicate effectively with the leadership. The recent reorganization paper suggests that little attention is being given to agriculture.

If the Task Force is going to have impact in reemphasizing agricultural development, particularly with regard to long-term training and institution building, it would appear there must be a great change in the attitudes of A.I.D.'s current leadership.

Doug Siglin, InterAction: A.I.D. is a political institution. The Congress is a political institution. **Why has money for development assistance fallen off? Because nobody cares about it and nobody lobbies for it.**

If you really believe in the recommendations of the Task Force then you must lobby for them. You must figure out a way to do it--through your universities, through Bread for the World; through the Committee on Agricultural Sustainability; through InterAction; through NASULGC; through somebody who is willing to get up to the Hill and talk to people. Or it is all going to go away. You had better go out and fight for what you want. It is all politics.

**Comments
Hon. Terry Sanford
U. S. Senate**

Conferences such as this one cultivate and promote collaboration among universities, A.I.D. and other groups and thus reinforce and multiply the efforts of the entities involved.

Having seen first-hand the benefits of foreign assistance in Central American development and in other parts of the world, I have also observed opportunities for improved effectiveness of our foreign assistance programs. The capacity of A.I.D. has not been used effectively partly because of the emphasis on the military rather than on development assistance, but also because **the program has been too responsive to whims rather than concentrating on the kind of aid we can give best: Long-term sustainable development with the emphasis on human development.** Our American universities are a tremendous resource that should be more fully utilized in these efforts.

I applaud the emphasis the Task Force report gives to partnership.

**Luncheon Address
Hon. Lee H. Hamilton
U.S. House of Representatives**

Although the world has changed dramatically in the last several years, the U. S. foreign assistance program remains largely unchanged. But those remarkable developments do provide an extraordinary opportunity to take a fresh look at this program.

The question is whether the foreign aid program is prepared to meet challenges like the emergence of the new democracies in Eastern Europe and Central America; the rising concern, even anxiety, with respect to U.S. competitiveness; the increasing reliance of Third World countries not so much on aid but on trade and investment as engines of development; the effectiveness of our security aid; and new demands for reconstruction aid as several long-running regional conflicts wind down.

Many transnational challenges also make demands on U.S. assistance budgets. Environment, population, mass migrations, AIDS, drugs.

Many current aid recipients fear that new claims upon U.S. and other aid resources will crowd them out. Requirements of the new aid recipients, particularly for example, the countries of Eastern Europe, may put the poorest people in a very precarious position.

Each of these developments raise questions about what we seek and what we can achieve with our foreign aid program.

We spend about \$15 billion a year on foreign assistance. Military aid is by far the largest component, \$4.8 billion. Economic support funds, the next largest component, about \$3.1 billion. These two security related elements together account for more than half of the U.S. foreign aid budget. Bilateral development takes about \$2 billion; food aid about \$1 billion; an assorted group of other humanitarian programs for Eastern Europe and the Philippines about \$2 billion. The total economic assistance then is roughly \$7 billion.

The distribution of that assistance: The Middle East region takes over half of it in bilateral assistance; Asia takes about an eighth; Latin America about a seventh; and Africa about one-tenth. The top four recipients of aid--Israel, Turkey, Egypt, and the Philippines--receive almost half of all U.S. bilateral assistance. And military and economic assistance for nations that host U.S. military installations take about \$1.6 billion, or about 10 percent of the total.

Our aid program has been developed traditionally with a strong security assistance tilt. It has favored a handful of countries generously; others have much less. The key question is: Is this the kind of program that best serves U. S. national interests today?

There have been several efforts to reform the foreign aid bill. It has become an exceedingly complex piece of legislation, now reaching over 500 pages. There are 33 objectives and 75 priorities. More than 90 percent of the security related assistance is ear-marked. Many of the amendments are contradictory, ambiguous and obsolete. **We cannot respond effectively to new needs, opportunities and problems when our programs must fit these rigid country and program allocations, restrictions and objectives.**

Our leverage over recipient countries is also sharply reduced if their funds are secured by earmarks. The Congress also focuses too much on plans rather than results. It requires 700 notifications, and it is absurd to think that members of congress read these notifications.

In efforts to reform the program a Task Force of the Foreign Affairs Committee reached a few conclusions: **The Foreign Assistance Act should be rewritten to create a more precise and comprehensible statute.** The statutory objectives for economic assistance would have to be simplified. Four objectives were identified: Equitable economic growth; poverty alleviation; sustainable development; and the encouragement of political, social and economic pluralism.

Accountability could be improved by focusing on program results. **Earmarks should be eliminated, and other restrictions reduced so that the President has more flexibility.** Measures to improve policy coordination not only within our government but among governments was urged. And it was proposed to replace A.I.D. with a new Economic Cooperation Agency that would draw simultaneously upon U.S. private and public sector expertise and the extraordinary talent in the PVOs.

These recommendations were adopted by and large by the House last year by a vote of 314 to 101. The Senate did not act on the companion legislation.

This year parts of an Administration draft bill were incorporated into the House FY 92-93 authorization bill. The House bill is still replete with earmarks, restrictions, reporting requirements and conditions, and dozens and dozens of amendments have been added to it. Even if the bill should pass, the President's support is much in doubt.

Reform efforts have also come from other groups including the recommendations of this Task Force. The Overseas Development Council, CARE, the Alternative International Affairs Budget, the Environmental and Study Institute have all produced excellent reports as well.

Some common themes emerge from these efforts:

- * U.S. assistance should shift from short-term military and economic priorities to longer-term development priorities;
- * The promotion of environmentally sustainable and equitable development is in the U.S. national interest;
- * U.S. assistance policies, like other foreign policies, should reflect our changing and broadening understanding of national security;
- * The political and environmental consequences of failed development and uncontrolled population growth pose important threats to the quality of our lives.

Reform should be guided by these themes and from the lessons of our aid successes.

Why have foreign aid reform efforts not made more progress? There are several reasons, and it is important to understand the dynamics of the process.

Many supporters of foreign assistance focus on parts of the program, not the sum. Their interests are widely divergent and sometimes even at odds.

But without the support of these various constituencies and without an accommodation to their interests, there would not be a bill. The Congress would not pass one. Trying to satisfy

divergent interests simultaneously has produced an unwieldy and inefficient program, and many of the constituencies are reluctant to see it reformed.

While most Members of Congress would in principle support reforms to streamline management, they are reluctant to give the President a free hand on policies that most concern them. Members often believe that specific legislative mandates are needed to ensure that the President addresses their foreign policy concerns.

It is important to understand that the foreign aid authorization bill offers members their only legislative vehicle for foreign policy initiatives. Members take a great interest in foreign affairs today, and they simply cannot resist the temptation, or opportunity, to attack the hot button topics of foreign policy whenever foreign aid legislation comes up.

We have also had a very uncertain trumpet from the President on the question of reform. Top officials did not become sufficiently involved in the process to see that the reform legislation passed in the House in 1989 was enacted. This year, A.I.D. sent draft reform legislation to Congress only a few weeks before the authorization process was underway. There was very little time to review the draft although many of their proposals were incorporated into the bill. Foreign aid reform does not seem to be very high on either the agenda of the Congress or of the President.

We need to do a better job of persuading the American public that a properly designed and executed foreign aid program can be an important, even powerful, tool for American foreign policy. If we convey this essential message and succeed with reform, then we can broaden public support for foreign aid and promote a more even distribution of it.

Persons such as yourselves are a major source of support in this effort. Very few voices come to Members of Congress in support of fundamental reform in the foreign aid legislation. Yours is by far the most important in the groups you represent.

We have an opportunity with the international changes that have occurred and with the rising interest in reform in the executive branch and the Congress to make some fundamental changes. It requires us to concentrate on the whole bill and not just the parts of it that have a particular appeal.

Discussion from the floor:

Paul Findley, BIFADEC Member and former member House of Representatives:
Many of us are concerned about the fate of Title XII in a rewrite of the foreign aid bill. Where does Title XII stand?

Congressman Hamilton: Title XII has been an important aspect of the aid program because it taps the marvelous resources in the university community throughout the Nation.

I hope it remains as part of the final foreign aid bill; our task will then be to make it more effective.

The Board's work should remain a part of the program; it has been effective and the talent is there. A big aspect of reform is the blending of the private and government sectors in order to be effective.

An Action Agenda for the Future

Task Force Recommendations

G. Edward Schuh

There seems to be much misunderstanding about support for the private sector and how it might work. We are not talking about paying a subsidy to firms in the private sector. **Support for the private sector means that certain social infrastructure must be in place and maintained in order to provide a climate where the private sector can operate.** This would include support for that part of research and development that has to be publicly supported--in the case of agricultural research that means biological research for the most part. Support for education has to be there because the private sector will not invest adequately in education. This is an important part of what development policy is all about. Some public investments are important and we ought to remind ourselves of that.

Regarding food aid, the Task Force recommends that it be used to get more children into school. Food aid used as an income transfer to poor families pays them for sending their children to school who otherwise would be kept out in order to help earn income to sustain the family. The results would include a more well-nourished family; a healthier family; and an investment in education by addressing a very basic impediment to going to school. Such use of food aid is an important part of the Task Force recommendations and certainly part of the issue of investing in human capital in particular ways.

The Center for University Scientific and Technological Cooperation in Development is one of the centerpieces of the recommendations. The proposal is that it be created within the Agency for International Development. There is a University Center there now, and one could build on that.

A number of people are persuaded that putting such a center for scientific collaboration in the Agency is not the way to get the proper status for it. The Task Force is willing to consider alternative ways. One proposed alternative is that it be completely independent of the government; that it be an institute created by the coming together of a number of private foundations that might be interested in supporting it. Eventually the Agency might contribute money to it, but it would still be completely independent. Multilateral aid might even be possible from the World Bank and other institutions.

It is important that the Center involve matching funds from both sides. The U.S. universities or research institutions and the developing country or institution on the other end of the relationship would both put up part of the money for it. That is important for the integrity of the program and is consistent with other granting institutions that require a certain amount of matching money.

Another centerpiece of our recommendations is the Institute for Private Voluntary Cooperation, to involve the PVOs, the private sector and the universities in linkage efforts. Part of the money would go for strengthening the private voluntary organizations so they can be more effective in those kinds of activities.

Panel Discussion

John Byrne, President, Oregon State University: Uma Lele talked about the fact that faculty, in a sense, are attracted to where the resources are. The land grant universities existed and survived because there was something free—a parcel of land, the proceeds of which could be used for a new kind of education. The reason for this Conference is that we recognize there are resources available for one thing or another. Politics do play a large role.

Lee Hamilton said that whatever we do in foreign aid should be to the U.S. interest and that each group comes to this with its own bias. The topic we have to address is an action agenda: **How do we accomplish the reform, the direction of resources, that best serves U.S. interests and also addresses the biases we have, each based on good motives?**

This is a valuable meeting--the public unveiling of the Task Force report. A number of specific recommendations have been made, but they have not been debated publicly. The next agenda item should be a public debate to arouse the interest of the community that has foreign assistance or economic development as part of its mandate, including the private sector and other agencies. As part of our agenda, we need to figure out a way to get these people involved in the debate.

A second action is to identify the change-makers. We can attempt to develop a constituency from our universities and organizations, but more importantly we need to identify that handful of individuals who will actually make a change. We need to identify them, help them learn what we know about international development, assistance, economic cooperation, and convince them, if they are not already convinced, that there is a need for change.

We have to identify the mission we think important for our particular cause. If you read the most recently published mission statement for the Agency for International Development, you may find that the statement, drafted on September 14, 1990, is not exactly what you see as the mission for A.I.D.

Politics are important and must be addressed if we are to be effective. We already have the skills and talents to be effective, but we have to play the game according to the rules, to work within the system, to make the changes we would like to see made. We have to identify the needs of the customer, in this case the Congress, the leadership and the various agencies, and attract them to do the things we want them to do.

Temple: A critical element for all groups trying to influence the process, either in the legislative or the executive branch, is to figure out what they really want to bring to the process. If they see that more research is needed in the world, it is often because they are in institutions that are attuned to what good research is and how it can be done.

It is important for each institution and individual trying to influence the process to identify what they bring to it--special insight, wisdom, vision of the future.

A lot of procedures are involved in making authoritative decisions, but the groups and individuals who are most conscious of what they want and how it can be gotten will always have disproportionate influence because they have a sense of how to go from here to there, and what their piece of the joint effort is.

Timing is an important part of the process. It does not help to be on the scene two weeks after the bill passed. You have to be there six months before, when people are beginning to talk about it. Speaking up, making yourself known and advocating are important. You must get your idea communicated through a meeting, a letter, a visit, to someone who needs to know about it. Do not underestimate how much influence even one person can have, and even more that of a small group of organizations that really knows what they are about.

The time to influence the process goes up significantly the more change is happening. No one has a script. Those who come with a plan of where we should be going will have an advantage. If the plan comes out of core values and can be explained by any congressman back home, all the better.

The influence point often will be the staff member with that assigned area of expertise in the individual member's or senator's office. Get to know these people. As educators, consider that you have a graduate seminar of one: The staff member. What does this person need to know to see the world the way you see it? To see the opportunities for the future the way you see them? To help communicate your vision to his or her boss?

A major convergence has taken place around the importance of human capital and the poverty agenda, coming from many different places. It is reflected in the World Bank's World Development Report, 1991; in the first two Human Development Reports out of the United Nations Development Program; in the incredible summit meeting on children that UNICEF catalyzed last September, where 71 heads of state came together around a basic agenda on health and food and vulnerable groups; CEOs from the Business Round Table testifying in Congress on the importance of the WIC program and the education agenda. It is a significant

development, somewhat like the way environmental consciousness began to come up in many different places. The Task Force should be aware of the reports in this area and try to link its study into that broader set of developments.

A general point: Think of yourself as the change-maker, and the Congress as the implementors of the change you want to make. The Members of Congress are not the change-makers generally. Congress is usually the responding institution, responsive to concerns and opportunities provided by constituency groups. If you think of yourself as a change-maker and the people on the Hill as those who can implement and shape, you can identify what your own responsibilities are; define the kind of change that needs to be made; do a lot of the background work; present a coherent agenda. Be as clear as possible: What would the thing look like if it came out the way you want it?

Blake: The Task Force proposals are the groundwork but must be elaborated on. A broader coalition needs to be organized, composed of interested PVOs, environmental organizations, population groups, various consumer groups.

Work is needed on how to electrify the university community into taking a position that will be parallel with, or similar to, the other organizations. We have the participation of NASULGC, but it should be broader than that. We need a vision of common language. An organizational approach will require some language, and then a justification and a way to go ahead.

We should aim toward a group broadly representative of the university community in all its aspects--as broad as possible--and with as many people as possible who are willing to write to members of congress, to senators, and to lobby the administration, particularly on the question of the long-range human resource development.

The challenge to this group is the university aspect. Find a way to get together informally or in an ad hoc way, get perhaps 10 people willing to spend a little time and broad enough in appeal that they can bring along big parts of the university community.

Costello: A strategy is needed that will encompass the range of interests sharing common ground discussed at the Conference, and an action agenda for both the short and long term.

AGENDA

MONDAY, JUNE 17

Dirksen Senate Office Building
Room G-50

1:15 p.m.
Welcoming Remarks

Wales H. Madden, Jr., *Moderator*
Chairman, BIFADEC

John H. Costello
President
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

1:30 p.m.
Opening Comments

Hon. Doug Bereuter
U.S. Congressman

Hon. Mark L. Edelman
Deputy Administrator
Agency for International Development

2:00 p.m.
"A New Paradigm for Foreign Aid"

G. Edward Schuh
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of
Public Affairs

2:30 p.m.
"Building Democratic Institutions in
Developing Countries"

Raymond Hopkins
Swarthmore College

3:00 p.m.
Break

3:20 p.m.
William E. Lavery, *Moderator*
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and
State University

"Improving the Environment and Natural
Resources"

Susanna B. Hecht
UCLA

3:50 p.m.
"Improving the Climate for the Private
Sector Through Development"

Edward P. Bullard
TechnoServe, Inc.

4:20 p.m.
"Mutual Benefits of Cooperation in
Science and Technology"

Donald L. Plucknett
Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research

5:00 p.m.
Adjourn

6:30 p.m.
Reception and Dinner
Hyatt Regency Hotel
400 New Jersey Avenue, N.W.

Master of Ceremonies:
John H. Costello

"The Title XII of the Future"

Paul Findley
Former Congressman and Co-author of
Title XII Legislation

TUESDAY, JUNE 18

Dirksen Senate Office Building
Room G-50

A Public Dialogue on the Task Force
Recommendations

8:30 a.m.
Wendell G. Rayburn, *Moderator*
President, Lincoln University

"Defining the U.S. Interests in Foreign Aid"

Task Force Recommendations
G. Edward Schuh

Panel Discussion
D. Gale Johnson, University of Chicago
Charles William Maynes, Foreign Policy
Magazine
Richard E. Bissell, A.I.D.

9:30 a.m.
"Setting Program Priorities"

Task Force Recommendations
Uma Lele, University of Florida

Panel Discussion
Robert O. Blake, World Resources
Leo M. Walsh, University of Wisconsin
Larry Minear, Overseas Development
Council

10:30 a.m.
Break

10:45 a.m.
"Reforming U.S. Institutions to Meet the
Challenges of the 1990s"

Task Force Recommendations
James B. Henson
Washington State University

Panel Discussion
Charles E. Hess, U.S. Department of
Agriculture
Lane Holdcroft, Consultant
Doug Siglin, InterAction

11:45 p.m.
Break

12:00 Noon
Lunch

Master of Ceremonies:
Christopher Hicks
Anderson, Hibey, Nauheim and Blair

Comments by: Hon. Terry Sanford
United States Senator

Speaker: Hon. Lee H. Hamilton
U.S. Congressman

1:30 p.m.
"An Action Agenda for the Future"

Task Force Recommendations
G. Edward Schuh

Panel Discussion
John V. Byrne, President, Oregon State
University
Congressional Staff

2:30 p.m.
Closing Comments

John H. Costello

2:45 p.m.
Adjourn



BIFADEC
 Board for International Food
 and Agricultural Development
 and Economic Cooperation

2201 C Street, N.W.
 Room 600, SA-2
 Washington, DC 20523



1634 "Eye" Street, NW
 Suite 702
 Washington, DC 20006



THE HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
 INSTITUTE OF PUBLIC AFFAIRS
 University of Minnesota

Humphrey Center
 301 19th Avenue South
 Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

CONTACT: Wendy Grassi
 202/639-8889

**MAJOR CHANGES IN U.S. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE
 DISCUSSED AT WASHINGTON CONFERENCE**

Washington, DC Major changes in the U.S. approach to foreign assistance were recommended today by a blue-ribbon Task Force in a report entitled, "The U.S. Interest in International Development: A Basis for Building Long-Term Collaborative Relationships With Developing Countries."

The Task Force report was released as the centerpiece of a national conference sponsored by the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development and Economic Cooperation (BIFADEC), whose members are appointed by the President; by the Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs, a Washington-based nonprofit educational organization; and by the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs of the University of Minnesota. The conference took place on Capitol Hill on June 16-17 and was hosted by Senator Terry Sanford and Congressman Doug Bereuter.

The report calls for the U.S. to adopt a new rationale for foreign aid based on a changed global economy and a realistic assessment of U.S. self-interest.

"The words 'foreign assistance' and 'foreign aid' would no longer apply," says G. Edward Schuh, Dean of the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs and Chairman of the Task Force. "The new stance would be that of a partner looking for collaborative relationships and shared benefits."

Wales H. Madden, Jr., an Amarillo, Texas attorney and BIFADEC Chairman, termed the year-long Task Force study "unique in its focus on the enormous changes that have taken place in the international economy over the past 20-30 years and the implications for international development programs."

For example, the report points out that the international capital market can now provide for investment needs of developing countries pursuing sound economic policies. But when it comes to human capital development -- provisions for education, health services, family planning, environment, research and technology, and other public sector institutions -- the countries cannot

go to these markets and borrow money for these purposes.

"At the same time," says Schuh, "the U.S. needs to gain access to new technology from growing R&D efforts in other countries. Our future export markets also lie in the developing world. The supply of raw materials we need for our own economic activities will increasingly come from these countries."

John H. Costello, President of the Citizens Network, termed the report "an excellent public education piece. The Task Force makes a compelling case for international development serving this country's best interests."

The Task Force report concludes that there is now a base to build a new coalition to support international development, which in the past has been one of the least popular government programs. This coalition would include the U.S. academic community, the environmental movement, private voluntary organizations, agricultural organizations, the private sector, and those concerned with sustainable economic development.

The report takes to task the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) and other donors for deemphasizing agricultural development in recent years. This has been a "serious mistake" the report states. Agricultural development should be considered a top priority not only by A.I.D., but by the multilateral development agencies; and a higher priority should be given to technology development in agricultural programs.

To help combat the "disastrous" decline in technical expertise within A.I.D. and to serve as a focal point for international collaboration, the Task Force recommends the establishment of a prestigious, grant-making Center within A.I.D., comparable in scientific stature to the National Institutes of Health. The Center would make resources available on a competitive, collaborative basis with a requirement for matching monies from participants.

An Institute for Private Voluntary Cooperation is proposed to facilitate cooperation among PVOs, colleges and universities and the private sector, and to dispense funds on a competitive basis.

The Task Force also sees a broader role for the U.S. Department of Agriculture in international development. It calls for USDA to intensify its efforts to internationalize domestic science and education programs, building on its close historical ties with land grant universities.

Other issues highlighted in the report include: Sustainable development, natural resources and environment, population, and questions of equity involving women, children and ethnic groups.

In addition to Schuh, members of the Task Force include Susanna Hecht of UCLA; James Henson, Washington State University; Uma Lele, University of Florida; John Mellor, International Food Policy Research Institute; and Donald Plucknett, Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research. An Advisory Committee, chaired by William E. Lavery, former BIFADEC Chairman, worked with the Task Force throughout the study.

#####

**A DEVELOPMENT POLICY FOR THE 1990s
REDUCING POVERTY THROUGH EDUCATION AND
AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY**

A National Conference

**June 17-18, 1991
Washington, DC**

Participant List

Joseph L. S. Abbey
Ambassador
Embassy of Ghana

Hideki Abe
Resident Representative
Japan International Cooperation Agency

Claude D. Alexander
Director, Government Affairs
Ralston Purina Co.

Celeste Scheib Angus
Program Coordinator
ORT International Cooperation

Charles Antholt
Senior Agriculturalist
The World Bank

Gordon Appleby
Director, Environment and Natural Resources
Academy for Educational Development

Verna L. Armstrong
Senior Consultant - Educational Resources
American Association of State Colleges and
Universities

David Bathrick
Director, Office of Agriculture
Science & Technology Bureau
Agency for International Development

David Benz
NASULGC

Doug Bereuter
U.S. Congressman

Richard E. Bissell
Assistant Administrator for Science and Technology
Agency for International Development

Don Bjork
Associate Executive Director
World Relief

Robert O. Blake
Chairman
Committee on Agricultural Sustainability for
Developing Countries

Russell H. Brannon
Associate Vice Chancellor, International Affairs
University of Kentucky

Edward P. Bullard
President
Technoserve, Inc.

Greg Butera
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

John Byrne
President
Oregon State University

C. Stuart Callison
Deputy Executive Director
BIFADEC/AID

Carol Capps
Director, Office on Development Policy
Church World Service/Lutheran World Relief

Alex Carpenter
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

John H. Costello
President
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

S. K. De Datta
Director, Office of International Development
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

David Diggs
International Programs Director
Evangelical Association for the Promotion of
Education

Job Dittberner
Vice President for Programs
Atlantic Council of the U.S.

Robert G. Dyck
Professor of Urban Affairs/Planning
VPISU

Mark Edelman
Deputy Administrator
Agency for International Development

Xavier Equihua
House Agriculture Committee

Monka Esher
NASULGC

Margaret Fahs
Deputy Executive Director
The Debt-for-Development Coalition

Robert A. Fearey
Special Assistant to the President
Population Crisis Committee

William Fenster
University of Minnesota

Paul Findley
Former Congressman and Co-author of
Title XII Legislation

Orville L. Freeman
Advisory Committee Member of BIFADEC &
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs
Former Secretary of Agriculture

Wendy Grassi
Director of Communications
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

Peter Gubser
President
American Near East Refugee Aid

Eric A. Haines
Director, Career Development Exchanges
Association for International Practical Training

Gretchen Hall
Education Director
Trade & Development Program
Bread for the World Institute

Lee Hamilton
U.S. Congressman

Michael D. Hammig
Professor of Agriculture & Applied Economics
Clemson University

Steve Hayes
A.I.D.

Susanna B. Hecht
Professor
Graduate School of Architecture and
Urban Planning
University of California, Los Angeles

Kristine Heine
A.I.D.

James B. Henson
Professor & Director, International
Development Program
Washington State University

Reed Hertford
Executive Director
South-East Consortium for International
Development

Charles E. Hess
Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for
Science and Education
U.S. Department of Agriculture

Christopher Hicks
Partner
Anderson, Hibey, Nauheim and Blair

Gail A. Hochhauser
Director, AID/AASCU Linkages Program
American Association of State Colleges
and Universities

Randall A. Hoffman
BIFADEC/AID

Ralph P. Hofstad
Hofstad Consultants

Lane Holdcroft
Consultant

Dave Holder
Extension Service
National Association of Wheat Growers Foundation

Raymond Hopkins
Swarthmore College

Donald R. Isleib
Associate Dean & Director
Institute of International Agriculture
Michigan State University

Irene Jillson-Boostrom
President
Policy Research

D. Gale Johnson
Eliakim Hastings Moore Distinguished Service
Professor
of Economics Emeritus
University of Chicago

Wm. Frederick Johnson
International Research Advisor
BIFADEC

Michael S. Joshua
Associate Director, International Agriculture
Programs
Virginia State University

Rev. Charles Kennedy
Treasurer
Community of Caring

Sister Mary Beth Kennedy
Executive Director
Community of Caring

Hal Kosiba
Director of Programs
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

Jim Kunder
Deputy Director, Office of External Affairs
A.I.D.

Bradshaw Langmaid
Deputy Assistant Administrator
Bureau for Science and Technology
Agency for International Development

William E. Lavery
President
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Uma Lele
University of Florida

Frank M. Lemay
Department of State

Wales H. Madden, Jr.
Chairman
BIFADEC

Heidi D. Marinaccio
Program Manager
International Fund for Agricultural Research

Harold Matteson
Assistant Vice President, International Programs
New Mexico State University

Charles William Maynes
Editor
Foreign Policy Magazine

Joe McMahon
Rodale Institute

Leigh M. Miller
Chairman
International Science & Technology Institute

Larry Minear
Overseas Development Council

William R. Miner
Chief, Institute & Human Resources Division
AID/BIFADEC/S&T

Louis L. Mitchell
Chief Executive Officer
Pact, Inc.

Joyce Moock
Associate Vice President
The Rockefeller Foundation

Wendell Morse
Agricultural Economist
BIFADEC/AID

Michael F. Nolan
Associate Dean
University of Missouri

Jirgis S. Oweis
BIFADEC/AID

Lynn L. Pesson
President
CSLA, Inc.

Donald L. Plucknett
Consultative Group on International
Agricultural Research

Gareth Porter
Program Director, International Program
Environmental and Energy Study Institute

Boyd W. Post
Forest Biologist
Cooperative State Research Services
USDA

Ed Price
Vice President, International Research
Oregon State University

Wendell G. Rayburn
President
Lincoln University

Carla W. Ricci
Associate Provost for Research
Director of Government Resources
Tufts University

Bryant Rossiter
Chairman, Research Advisory Committee
A.I.D.

Onno Ruhl
Second Secretary, Economics
Embassy of Netherlands

Terry Sanford
United States Senator

Dave Schmeling
Associate Director
Florida International Volunteer Corps

Susan Schram
NASULGC

G. Edward Schuh
Dean
Hubert H. Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs
University of Minnesota

Doug Siglin
InterAction

Irma Silva-Barbeau
Acting Director
Office of International Development
Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University

Ralph H. Smuckler
Executive Director
Agency Center for University Cooperation in
Development
BIFADEC/AID

Darl E. Snyder
Associate Vice President for Services
Director of International Development
University of Georgia

John Stovall
Staff Director
BIFADEC

Lynn Stratford
Administrative Director
Citizens Network for Foreign Affairs

Richard Stuckey
Director
National Association of Wheat Growers Foundation

Paul Von Ward
Chairman
The Delphi International Group

James L. Walker
Coordinator for International Science and Education
Office of the Secretary/S&E/USDA

Leo M. Walsh
Dean and Director
College of Agriculture
University of Wisconsin at Madison

Delane E. Welsch
Assistant Dean & Director
International Agricultural Programs
University of Minnesota

Morris Whitaker
Director, International Programs
Utah State University

Dana Wichterman
A.I.D.

Floyd J. Williams
Executive Director
International Fund for Agricultural Research

E. Morgan Williams
Williams & Associates

Yvonne L. Williams
Tuskegee University

George Wilson
Office of Sen. Terry Sanford

Samuel A. Worthington
Executive Director
The Delphi International Group

John M. Yohe
Program Director
INTSORMIL/University of Nebraska