



PN-AAF-211

15N-33221

BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Agency for International Development
Washington, D.C. 20523

November 30, 1983

MEMORANDUM

TO : Title XII Representatives

FROM : Frederick E. Hutchinson *F.E.H.*
Executive Director

SUBJECT: Statements Before The U.S. House of Representatives Agriculture
Committee

Enclosed are three statements given by our colleagues October 25, before the subject committee. These statements highlight U.S. university and AID involvement in the prevention of world hunger through technology transfer, institution building, human resource development, research and development, and other related areas.

Enclosures:

1. Statement by E.T. York, BIFAD Chairman
2. Statement by Sherwood O. Berg, President,
South Dakota State University
3. Statement by John R. Campbell, Dean,
College of Agriculture, University of
Illinois at Urbana - Champaign

Remarks by Dr. E. T. York, Chairman of the
Board for International Food and Agricultural
Development Before the National Bipartisan
Commission on Central America

November 3, 1983

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Commission.

I am E. T. York, formerly Chancellor of the State University System of Florida and currently serving as Chairman of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development. BIFAD, as the Board is commonly called, was created by Congress through the passage of Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act in 1975. The purpose of the Board and the program it directs, is to help strengthen and mobilize the resources of U.S. universities for the purpose of helping U.S. AID in its development assistance efforts -- especially in the area of agriculture and nutrition.

In passing this legislation Congress recognized the tremendous contributions which U.S. universities -- especially Land Grant institutions -- have made to the development of American agriculture and expressed confidence that these universities could help accelerate the development of agriculture in Third World countries as well.

This Title XII program offers significant potential for contributing to the long-term solution to the problems of Central America with which you are concerned. However, let me refer to another effort which is more directly related to the specific interests of this Commission.

In early 1980, I was asked by the Carter Administration to organize and lead a "mission of knowledgeable private citizens" to study and recommend ways to strengthen the agricultural economies of Central American and Caribbean Island countries. This so called Presidential Mission on Agricultural Development grew out of the increasing concern at the highest level of U.S. Government over the deteriorating economic conditions in Caribbean Basin countries and a recognition that agriculture must play a major role in strengthening those economies.

Our Mission spent several weeks visiting most of the countries of the Caribbean Basin and produced a report which is available to the Committee. The report was presented not only to President Carter toward the end of his tenure in the White House, but also to the Reagan Transition Team as it made plans for the new administration. We were delighted to note that one year later President Reagan addressed a number of the concerns raised by our Mission in his Caribbean Basin Initiative proposals.

Let me comment briefly on some of the principal findings and recommendations of our Mission and their possible implications to this Commission.

We found most of the countries of the Caribbean Basin to be facing serious economic problems -- far worse, in fact, than we had anticipated. (And I'm sure you have found that the problem is even worse today than it was three years ago). In several countries we found that these serious economic difficulties were contributing to problems of political unrest and instability.

Serious balance of payments problems confronting many countries resulted from the failure of agricultural exports to keep pace with the spiraling cost of petroleum and other imports, including food commodities. In many countries, agricultural sectors were relatively stagnant, with export earnings having actually declined in recent years.

We found that as expenditures, imports, and debt burdens continued to outstrip income, most of the countries of the region were finding it increasingly difficult to extricate themselves from an accelerating downward economic spiral that, if not reversed, could, we concluded, end in disaster.

Agricultural products, on the average, accounted for over 70% of all export earnings while also accounting for a substantial part of import costs. Our Mission expressed the strong belief that the nations of the

region must revolutionize their agricultural sectors to achieve two parallel goals: to export more while, simultaneously, achieving a higher degree of self-sufficiency in the production of many agricultural commodities.

Our Mission found that the countries of the Caribbean Basin, and especially those in Central America, have great potential to expand their agricultural sectors and to make them more productive and economically viable. In fact, we concluded that they must make a major effort to realize these potentials if they hope to solve their serious economic difficulties.

The report of our Mission addresses in some detail problems and constraints which were limiting the realization of these potentials and set forth a wide range of recommendations aimed at removing these constraints. I shall not take your time in reviewing these recommendations. They are in the report. But let me emphasize our principal, overriding conclusion and recommendation -- that a much greater U.S. commitment to the countries of this region is vitally needed.

Throughout the region, we heard many express the view that a lack of such a clear commitment by the U.S. was having a serious destabilizing influence -- contributing to difficulties in achieving both short and long-term development goals.

5

And let me emphasize that we were not speaking three years ago of a greater U.S. military commitment. We were speaking of the critical need for the U.S. to make a much greater commitment to helping the countries of the region strengthen their economies and improve the plight of their people -- where hunger, sickness and poverty were major contributors to the problems of social unrest and political instability.

About noon of the day our forces landed on Grenada last week, I was in a cab riding up to Capitol Hill and the radio was tuned in to a talk show where the conversation was centered on the military action. The announcer was talking to a native Grenadan, who was expressing her delight over what was happening. She went ahead to emphasize that her fellow citizens were freedom loving people who strongly believed in democratic institutions and that the only reason the earlier Bishop government had been supported was that the peoples' basic living standards and economic conditions were so poor they were willing to try almost anything that seemed to offer any promise for improvement. I'm afraid that many people in Central American have no better living standards than those in Grenada.

Several years ago, Pope John XXIII put it well when he said, "In a world of constant want, there is no peace."

Although I alluded earlier to the U.S. military action, for the record, let me say I am in no way critical of the U.S. military

presence in Grenada or Central America. At times there may be circumstances when we have few realistic options but the use of military force. I am critical, however, of our failure to do more to address the root causes of some of today's problems which some believe now call for some form of military intervention.

The U.S. has been very generous in helping other countries throughout the world. In many respects, I am afraid we have taken for granted some of our closest friends and neighbors and have not reflected the level of interest or provided the level of support commensurate with the importance of our relationship.

So my plea today, Mr. Chairman, is in effect a restatement of our Mission's plea three years ago for a major U.S. commitment to the improvement and development of the region. This commitment should reflect our need as well as theirs for a close mutually beneficial relationship. It should be viewed as a joint public and private sector commitment to long-term economic and technical cooperation as well as a moral commitment by the U.S. to strengthen social and cultural ties with our neighbors -- neighbors no longer in the simple sense of geographic contiguity, but as integral members of a single community.

I would add that we Floridians especially feel this sense of community since these Central American countries are closer to our State than many parts of our own country.

1

The major commitment to which I refer will obviously take several forms. I think President Reagan's CBI proposals are a step in the right direction -- but only a step. We must go much further.

A vital part of that commitment should, in my opinion, be a major development assistance effort aimed at helping these countries strengthen their weak economies and begin to build their own self-sustaining capacities to help themselves. Particular emphasis should be placed upon strengthening and building indigenous institutions especially in such areas as agricultural education, research and extension aimed at developing human capital and improving the productivity and returns from the region's abundant agricultural resources.

Commitment to such efforts offer no short-term panaceas. Yet long-term, sustained assistance in this area offers some of the best hopes for any meaningful solution to the critical economic, social, and political problems of the region.

I hope that this Commission might place a very high priority on this type of development assistance as a means of addressing the serious problems of our Central American neighbors. BIFAD and its constituent U.S. university community stand ready to do anything that we can -- working with and through USAID -- to assist in such efforts.

We wish you well in your endeavors.

4

Statement of
Sherwood O. Berg
President
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota

HEARINGS ON WORLD HUNGER

United States House of Representatives
Agriculture Committee

Longworth House Office Building

Washington, D.C.

October 25, 1983

HEARINGS ON WORLD HUNGER

United States House of Representatives
Agriculture Committee

Statement by Sherwood O. Berg, President
South Dakota State University
Brookings, South Dakota
October 25, 1983

I welcome this opportunity to tell you about the commitment that this nation's colleges and universities have to aid in the fight against world hunger. While we are conscious of the current hunger "hot spots" around the world, we should also bear in mind that it is estimated that in just 17 years--the year 2,000--the world will need twice as much food as today. We are eager to help in the continuing fight against world hunger. We think we have something to offer.

Role of United States' Colleges and Universities

Dr. E. T. York and former Representative Paul Findley have spoken of the pressing problem of world hunger and of BIFAD's unique capabilities.

Dean John Campbell has outlined some of the major challenges facing United States colleges and universities and has discussed the evolving relationships among the Agency for International Development (AID), the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) and the universities.

I certainly concur in these expressions. The solution of world hunger is a key to world tranquility and peace and to an improved quality of life for the peoples of the world.

I also will speak to you from the perspective of the nation's public higher education community. I represent a relatively small Land-Grant University. My perspective will be from that segment. We in the higher education field, particularly those of us representing the Land-Grant system with its responsibilities to agriculture--but also other areas--want to share with others in other lands the successes that are possible through the coordination of, and appropriate focusing

of, the functions of teaching, extension and research. It is a formula that certainly has worked in this country and is being tested, modified and adapted in many regions of the world.

The creation of the partnership between the Land-Grant universities and the U. S. Department of Agriculture for research and education for agricultural improvement was a major step in the development of this nation. Few other such direct steps in public promotion of economic development have been undertaken by the nation over the last century.

More recently, in the fight against world hunger, the partnership has been extended to include a working relationship with AID. National policy enlarging the base for resource development in this country became possible through the implementation of the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Amendment (Title XII) to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

At the outset, however, we should recognize that the special relationships to which we are addressing ourselves are not the sole set of actors on the stage. The United States has had four decades of experience in food assistance and developmental programs. In addition, we must acknowledge the United States government's contributions through direct emergency relief, such as the Food for Peace program, and through its support of multilateral assistance programs. Moreover, one cannot overlook the substantial efforts undertaken by voluntary agencies, private philanthropy and private business firms.

We, as a nation, on occasion, have made excellent use of our food abundance to offset world hunger situations. These efforts are particularly effective in the short term. Each kernel of corn sent abroad in emergency food relief is a yellow-jacketed diplomat serving to alleviate hunger and to further United States' objectives of world peace.

However, for the continuing struggle against hunger, malnutrition and poverty, we must call upon a "cadre of hunger fighters." This is a group of modern scientists and leaders who through the application of mindpower assist in bringing about the transfer of appropriate technology and scientific knowledge and in establishing the economics and social

11

institutions that lead to increases in the production or output of a country's food and fiber. Only in this way can a nation build indigenous capabilities for meeting its own needs on a long-run, self-sustaining basis. In the later category, we feel United States' colleges and universities have an important role to fulfill.

The Expanded Partnership with BIFAD

We in the educational community are supportive of BIFAD's efforts to enlarge upon the United States' universities effectiveness in the campaign against world hunger and are appreciative of the assistance and understanding of the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development.

BIFAD has markedly improved the communication processes between AID and the universities. We feel that we are not only now better understood by AID, but we understand better some of the very difficult problems confronting AID.

The relationship is excellent. This umbilical cord between universities and AID nurtures a strong and dynamic working relationship.

BIFAD has encouraged and assisted in implementing new and innovative administrative, contractual and staff patterns to deal with specific problems that require a slightly different mix than any one university is able to devise. BIFAD has brought universities together to solve problems.

BIFAD has also been able to freely advise AID and to react to policies and practices of AID in the area of agriculture and nutrition.

Finally, BIFAD has been able to develop a more balanced awareness of the value of institution-building and human capital investment as critical components for meaningful, self-sustaining growth.

Assisting in Investments of Human Capital

Dr. Theodore Schultz, 1979 Nobel Laureate in Economics and a graduate of South Dakota State University, has spent his

life studying the human side of economics. If one were to sum up the many studies and research projects that Dr. Schultz has undertaken over the years, the thesis that evolves might be packaged into this statement: "That mankind's future is not foreordained by space, energy, or cropland. The most important economic resource in the world consists of the acquired abilities of people--their education, experience, skills and health."

Money spent on human learning is money well invested. Dr. Schultz contends that perhaps governments and individuals are over investing in fixed capital and spending too little on human capital.

When the concentration is on creating or improving a nation's infrastructure without attention to the human side, problems develop.

Some speak of a people infrastructure--people to operate and maintain the physical infrastructure--to perpetuate the system and to integrate it into the functioning of its economics and social dynamics.

People are the real engines of progress.

Investments in people are what make improvements in technology and in the human condition possible.

Higher education is in "the people" business. While other factors will, of course, help dictate the successes or failures of the efforts against world hunger and malnutrition, the experience, the talents and the expertise of this nation's colleges and universities can be a mitigating factor.

Let me cite just one small example of how the forces of the Land-Grant System and governmental agencies worked together to solve a problem more-or-less indigenous to the state I represent. It is a small problem by national standards, but it illustrates my point.

We have always had a particular problem with Hessian fly damage to our State's spring wheat production. Plant scientists set out to explore the world's spring wheat gene pool in the hopes of finding a strain resistant to the insect and to develop

13

promising strains that could survive and flourish in the soil and climate of the State I represent. Federal funds that regularly provide dollars for on-going research at all Land-Grant colleges and universities were earmarked to help in the Hessian fly research. The State Legislature appropriated funds to employ a scientist specializing in spring wheat research. Spring wheat farmers, through their state associations contributed funds to assist in the effort.

A resistant strain was finally developed. When the seeds were in sufficient supply for distribution for commercial and private use, yield tests revealed that the new variety produced an average of 2.7 bushels more per acre, state-wide, than existing varieties. This one victory over nature meant about \$37 million more dollars per year in the pockets of the wheat producers in our state. Just as importantly, it can mean more food each year for a hungry world.

In fact, the circle was completed this past week when a delegation from the Far East was in South Dakota to purchase from South Dakota farmers 34,500 metric tons of wheat having a value of more than \$6.2 million. The teaching, research and extension process proved productive--and the outcome of the effort was evident. People made it happen.

This is a graphic example for which there are literally hundreds of similar successes in our nation every year. We have--through the wisdom of our elected representatives here in this Capitol and in the various states--developed an infrastructure for agricultural research and information delivery--a capability to react rapidly. We have as a nation provided the classroom and laboratories in which we have prepared an army of scientists having a wide variety of expertise. They are at work now, taking on the challenges Mother Nature places in our paths as we seek the answer to more food production.

It does little good to engage in the research if you are unable to deliver the results to the farmer and ranchers.

Our system has developed the cooperative extension arm composed of information bearers--the extenders of new technology to farmers.

14

And the scientists involved in research and extension also teach the future researchers and the future county agricultural agents and home extension agents.

While a part of the answer to the world hunger problem is through expanded trade, like the 34,500 metric tons of spring wheat sold recently to the Far East, a more permanent solution might be to enlist the help of the people within the colleges and universities to establish and train personnel in the less developed countries in an integrated food and fiber system.

There are needs to carry the results of agricultural research and technical advances to the farmers of the less developed countries. There is a need to invest in human resources. We can continue to help in the development process--if the opportunities to do so remain.

Of course, the need is not merely to carry "our" research results overseas, but to establish teaching, research and extension systems to develop and supply technology "appropriate" to the lesser developed countries.

Dealing with Development Problems in Africa

Dr. York and Mr. Findley mentioned the particular problems of Africa. The "worst case" is the description that they made of that continent's food and malnutritional problems.

Let me tell you about the efforts of South Dakota State University to assist the democratic nation of Botswana, a small land-locked country near the tip of Africa that gained its independence in 1966.

Over 50 percent of Botswana's people are below that nation's established poverty level.

Of the poor, the poorest 10 percent have an annual income of less than \$300.

The dietary status of the rural poor is marginal, fluctuating seasonally and very dependent on changing moisture and climatic conditions.

15

During drought periods, protein and energy malnutrition can affect 25 percent of the rural poor.

Life expectancy in Botswana is 56 years. But the lives of the poor are shortened to an average life expectancy of 50 years.

Aside from the humanitarian considerations, we as a nation cannot overlook the value of having strong democratic allies on that fiery continent.

We at South Dakota State University felt fortunate when, nearly five years ago, we were selected by the government of Botswana and AID to assist that nation in strengthening a small, recently established agricultural college there.

Many of the conditions in Botswana are similar to those in South Dakota: the size of the human population; the reliance upon dry land farming and ranching; the emphasis placed upon livestock industry; the reoccurring periods of drought; the dominance of agriculture in the total economy; and the lack of a highly developed industrial-commercial sector.

The faculty at South Dakota State University accepted the assignment with enthusiasm.

This was our first program of this type, and we took the responsibility very seriously.

Here again, people made the difference.

The Botswana Agricultural College opened in 1967. Its Agriculture program provided for training agricultural demonstrators (county agents). In 1970 the school was expanded to include an Animal Health program. In 1972, a Community Development course was started. When the present expansion program involving SDSU was begun in 1979, there were 33 teaching staff and a student enrollment of 180 in the three college programs.

The need for the project with USAID was based on shortages of lower and middle level personnel in Animal Health and Agriculture.

The project has focused on improving and increasing the capacity of the Botswana Agricultural College to train agricultural manpower. The program has had the following objectives:

1. Upgrade courses, curricula and facilities to support doubling the annual number of certificate graduates in Animal Health and Agriculture.
2. Institutionalize new diploma programs in Animal Health and Agriculture, with a goal of approximately 30 graduates annually.
3. Develop a largely localized teaching faculty whose skills have been significantly upgraded through both long and short-term training programs.
4. Develop a local administration capable of education planning and administration in all key areas.
5. Establish curricula and teaching techniques to provide practical training in skill areas relevant to Government of Botswana needs.

To meet these objectives, South Dakota State University committed itself to involving professional personnel for:

1. Nineteen and one-half years of long-term technical assistance in vocational administration, animal husbandry, extension, range management, agricultural communication, science and agronomy.
2. Eighty person/months of short-term technical assistance in areas such as animal breeding, horticulture, rural development and extension.
3. The identification, orientation and supervision of Botswana personnel for 41.5 years of long-term training to upgrade the Botswana Agricultural College teaching staff and administration.
4. Planning the construction and equipping of expanded facilities in which to house and instruct the increased Botswana Agricultural College enrollment.

This project has had continuous strong commitment by the University administration and by the faculty. Recruitment of both long and short-term personnel has been carried out with little difficulty and has resulted in involvement of qualified and enthusiastic professionals who have also possessed the temperment to work in a different education environment.

Much credit for this success goes to the Chief of Party and to the long-term personnel. They were able to specify clearly staffing needs. In-country personnel have enjoyed cordial working relationships with AID/Gaborone and with the Ministry and other persons in the Botswana government with whom coordination for project progress has been important.

A continuing problem has been that of identifying Botswanans with sufficiently strong previous education to equip them for further training. In some cases funding and being able to obtain records of earlier school work was extremely difficult. This effort had required much time, repeated communication and patience.

Title XII Strengthening Program Highly Valued

The "Strengthening Grant Program" under Title XII has been an extremely vital factor in the maturation process, particularly at the smaller schools such as South Dakota State University, where experience in working with other countries has been limited.

The Title XII grant of \$100,000 per year for five years has been used to encourage faculty to become more aware of, and proficient in, helping to deal with the problems of less developed countries and, moreover, has dove-tailed very nicely with the Botswana project.

We have built up a strong cadre of researchers, teachers, extension personnel and administrators having experience in overseas agricultural development. They are "on board," ready and eager to respond.

The agricultural faculty is joined by others in engineering, home economics, nursing, the social sciences and the arts who wish also to be a part of this primary effort to aid the less fortunate and alleviate hunger in other lands.

With the Title XII funds we have strengthened library holdings that deal with selected less-developed areas.

We have strengthened our foreign language efforts and in the years ahead hope to stimulate even higher enrollments in this area. Many additional faculty now also have skills in the

application of remote sensing to agricultural planning and development, as a result of the Title XII grant.

Before this program was available, there were among our staff of approximately 350 classroom teachers less than 20 who had experience in international development efforts.

Most of these had gained that experience prior to coming to us.

Now, because of the Botswana program and the Strengthening Grant, we have over 80 staff who have had experience in international programs and are willing to become involved further.

These teachers and scientists, I might add, have expertise in areas critical to countries having agricultural resource conditions similar to South Dakota.

I might add that the Botswana project and the Strengthening Grant Program have engendered a multi-discipline perspective on agricultural and rural development. Natural and social scientists are working in an integrated fashion on the joint problems of food production, nutrition and rural employment. Experience has shown that this approach is essential for long term food and employment solutions in the developing countries.

The maturation process made possible by Title XII also includes several spin-offs.

In 10 years our enrollment of foreign students has also increased. These individuals bring with them new perspectives that enhance the classroom experience for both the teacher and the other students.

We have made concerted efforts to internationalize our curricula, to include wherever possible the international perspective.

We have attempted to instill in our students an international perceptive. Many, I am sure, will one day be among the cadre of teachers and scientists to continue the battle against world hunger. And they will be better prepared than those of us involved in this effort today.

The Botswana opportunity and the Strengthening Program have, finally, given the faculty and staff confidence in realizing that there is a place in this noble endeavor for the smaller schools. We are not about to drop the ball you and AID handed to us. We have, I believe, tried harder.

Title XII and experiences such as those in Botswana have whetted our international appetites. We want to do more. We hope that we and the other people-oriented colleges and universities throughout the nation will be given the opportunity to serve not only our states, but to become good citizens of the world as well.

20

STATEMENT OF
JOHN R. CAMPBELL
DEAN OF COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

RELATIVE TO

THE ROLE AND COOPERATIVE EFFORTS OF
U. S. LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES,
THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND
THE BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT
IN ALLEVIATING WORLD HUNGER PROBLEMS

OCTOBER 25, 1983

LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D.C.

TESTIMONY PRESENTED BEFORE
THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE

by

Dr. John R. Campbell
Dean, College of Agriculture
University of Illinois
Urbana-Champaign

October 25, 1983

Chairman de la Garza and members of the House Agriculture Committee. I welcome the opportunity to participate in this important hearing on the roles and responsibilities of U.S. land-grant universities, the Agency for International Development (AID), and the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD) in working together to alleviate problems associated with world hunger. Solving these problems constitutes one of the greatest challenges facing humankind in the world today. But, it is a challenge that must be met successfully, if we are to achieve peace, justice, and human dignity for people throughout the world. I believe U.S. land-grant universities have, can, and will continue to play a crucial role in these noble efforts.

Today, I want to highlight briefly: (a) the continued responsibility and importance of this topic to U.S. land-grant universities, (b) the on-going international agricultural development programs at the University of Illinois, and (c) areas warranting improvements in relationships among universities, AID, and BIFAD.

Responsibility and Importance of Land-Grant Universities

Agricultural and rural development programs in less developed countries (LDCs) are vitally important to the well-being of millions of people throughout the world. They focus on improving the quality of life of people striving to escape poverty, malnutrition, and illiteracy. The land-grant

universities recognize this responsibility and have had a firm commitment to serve productively in these important efforts through teaching, research, extension, and technical assistance. The resources of U.S. land-grant universities have been tapped more effectively, and their contributions made more abundant, through the 1975 Title XII--Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Because Title XII universities are major world resource centers for expertise in agriculture and rural development, their responsibilities in this global effort are particularly important.

University efforts benefit and serve the people of this nation and the states that support land-grant universities. Agricultural and economic development is a critical element in building stable political and social systems. No nation can achieve sustained economic and social development unless it has a dependable, safe supply of food at affordable prices.

Agriculture is developing an international dimension in terms of both trade and scientific and technical development. Western Europe and Japan no longer represent the primary potential growth areas for U.S. agricultural exports. Instead, the major potential lies in trading with the LDCs that are experiencing relatively rapid economic and population growths.

When U. S. agriculturalists assist an LDC in developing its agriculture, there are not only the humane and political benefits from such an effort, there are also economic benefits to U. S. industries. In our view, the University of Illinois is in an ideal position to lend international expertise to the industries of Illinois and the nation, as we work together to expand present and develop new export markets. Without question, exports will be the largest growth area for our nation's agricultural businesses in the years ahead.

23

If an LDC uses inputs from the research of U. S. land-grant universities, in addition to the import of seeds of crop varieties and breeds of livestock, it will need to purchase value-added products such as fertilizers, disease and pest control materials and equipment, harvesting equipment, storage facilities, packaging machinery and products, feeding apparatus and farm to market equipment.

Most developing countries require agricultural development as a basis for sustained economic development. During FY 81, 41 percent of all U.S. agricultural exports went to developing countries, a significant increase from the 30-percent level of FY 76.

Some question whether it is in the best self-interest of the United States to help other countries increase their domestic agricultural production. Their rationale has been that, if the U.S. helps other countries grow more food and non-food agricultural products, those countries will then import fewer agricultural products from the United States.

Aside from a rather selfish viewpoint, that rationale, on the surface, seems logical. However, ongoing research at the University of Illinois indicates that developing countries in which agricultural production is growing rapidly, import significantly more agricultural products per capita than do those where agriculture is experiencing slow growth.

Some relatively simple arithmetic vividly illustrates the enormous economic potential of world agricultural development. The U.S. produced 2.1 billion bushels of soybeans in 1982 and consumed a little over 1 billion--an average per capita consumption of 4.5 bushels. If the standard of living and rate of consumption of the rest of the world's population were equal to ours, it would take over 21 billion bushels of soybeans to meet the demand--six times the current level of world production. A similar potential demand exists for corn and many other agricultural products. If our research and development efforts are successful in providing new uses for grain, including

24

use for fuel and chemical feedstocks, the potential demand will be even greater.

The moral of this story is that the affluent countries are the best markets for U.S. exports. U.S. farmers and Americans in general have a great vested interest in helping the rest of the world develop and prosper.

Our studies show that ten representative developing countries among those with the fastest domestic agricultural production growth during the 1970s (Group I) increased their food production by an average of 68 percent during that period. Ten developing countries among those with the slowest domestic agricultural growth rates during the same period (Group II) increased domestic food production by only 3 percent (Table 1).

Nearly all the Group I and Group II countries increased agricultural imports during the decade. However, preliminary results indicate that the countries with the greatest domestic agricultural production gains (Group I) increased agricultural imports (measured in current U.S. dollars) by 587 percent. In contrast, Group II countries increased imports of agricultural products by only 318 percent (Table 1).

Thus, developing countries experiencing rapid domestic agricultural growth increased imports of agricultural products by 84 percent more than did those where the agricultural sector grew more slowly.

This phenomenon occurs because most developing countries have a substantial proportion of their total resources in the agricultural sector. Thus, where their agriculture does not grow or grows slowly, overall economic growth is greatly constrained. Conversely, when the agricultural sector achieves a high growth rate, incomes in both agricultural and non-agricultural sectors increase more rapidly.

Increases in incomes of developing countries result in substantially increased demands for food. Combined with increasing specialization in agricultural production as development occurs, these trends result in

25

Table 1
Changes in Agricultural Imports in Developing Countries
with Differing Rates of Domestic Food Production Growth¹

Categories of Agricultural Imports	Group I ² Countries ² (Fast Growth)	Group II ² Countries ² (Slow Growth)	Percent Group I exceeded Group II
(% change in current \$ value from 1970 to 1980)			
Total Agricultural Products ³	587	318	+84
Food and Animals	513	341	+50
Cereals and Preparation	399	378	+ 6
Animal and Vegetable Oil	752	378	+99
Agricultural Requisites ⁴	568	487	+17

¹ FAO Trade Yearbooks for selected years were used to obtain agricultural import values. USDA's World Indices of Agricultural and Food Production (Statistical Bulletin No. 669) was used to obtain domestic food production growth data.

² Group I included 10 developing countries experiencing fast growth rates in domestic food production among all developing countries during the 1970s. These countries and their food production indices in 1980 (base 1969-71 = 100) are: Guatemala, 150; Indonesia, 169; Kenya, 150; Republic of Korea, 155; Malawi, 156; Surinam, 155; Syria, 229; Thailand, 186; Tunisia, 175; and Venezuela, 160.

Group II included 10 developing countries experiencing slow growth rates in domestic food production among all developing countries during the 1970s. These countries and their food production indices in 1980 (base 1969-71 = 100) are: Bangladesh, 122; Ethiopia, 90; Ghana, 94; Jamaica, 98; Jordan, 98; Mali, 105; Morocco, 95; Peru, 117; Trinidad and Tobago, 95; and Uganda, 109.

³ Total agricultural production imports include food and animal imports, animal and vegetable oil imports and other agricultural product imports.

⁴ Agricultural requisites include imports of fertilizer, pesticides, and agricultural machinery.

significant increases in agricultural imports. In these studies we observed that not only were the increases in total agricultural imports more rapid in Group I than in Group II countries, but the same pattern emerged for all sub-categories of agricultural imports studied (Table 1).

Food and animal imports increased by 513 percent in Group I countries contrasted with 341 percent in Group II. Even cereal and cereal product imports increased more rapidly in Group I countries (399 versus 378%) as noted in Table 1. Also, countries in Group I were better cash customers than those in Group II, receiving proportionately less PL 480 and other subsidized shipments.

The largest difference in growth rates occurred in animal and vegetable oil imports. The countries with rapid agricultural growth increased imports in this category by 752 percent contrasted with only 378 percent for Group II countries (Table 1).

Not only are developing countries with rapidly developing agricultural sectors increasing agricultural imports most rapidly, they also import substantially more U.S. agricultural products per capita. In 1980, countries in Group II imported U.S. agricultural products valued at \$4.91 per capita, whereas those in Group I imported U.S. agricultural products at the rate of \$10.83 per capita, or 121 percent more.

Our analyses strongly suggest that effective U.S. assistance in agricultural development is important to the future exports of U.S. agricultural products. Thus, successful agricultural growth in developing countries actually expands U.S. agricultural export markets in such countries.

As has been the case in the U.S. and in other more developed nations, then, higher incomes result in a greater demand for all goods and services leading, in turn, to a still higher standard of living.

21

Participation in agricultural development programs is important to U.S. land-grant universities because international and foreign agencies and organizations are becoming increasingly important to U.S. agriculture. This trend is expected to continue as nations become more and more interdependent.

Students presently in undergraduate and graduate programs will soon be the leaders in the U.S., other countries, and in international agricultural organizations. They will need a broad understanding of agriculture and world affairs if they are to function and counsel effectively on an international scale.

In universities in which international agricultural instruction and activities are an important part of the academic program, students have better access to international opportunities and expertise than in those where the international aspects are taken lightly. Consequently, they are more likely to develop the understanding necessary to become effective future agricultural leaders throughout the world.

Furthermore, U.S. land-grant universities must be involved in agricultural research in developing countries if they are to continue to expand their leadership in the agricultural sciences. Crop and livestock production programs will continue to depend on widening the germplasm base, much of which exists in developing countries. Access to this germplasm is critically important to biotechnology in the U. S., because it is the source of the genes to be recombined in unique new plant and animal lines. New varieties of wheat, rice, potatoes, and breeds of livestock originating in developing countries are already contributing substantially to U. S. agriculture.

With increased trade in commodities and germplasm, the United States continually faces the possibility of having exotic diseases and pests introduced. We need to anticipate these cases, to have knowledge of effective control mechanisms, and to have working relationships with foreign scientists

28

that will enable us to quickly detect and manage such problems if they emerge. Soybean rust, various blood diseases of food animals, and brown plant hopper of rice are three examples of major problems that could be harmful to U.S. agriculture if they were to become established here.

Perhaps the best rationale for U.S. university involvement in international agricultural development efforts emerges when we consider what might occur if universities did not remain involved in the concerns of developing countries. Progress already made in alleviating world hunger problems might deteriorate, with an attendant slowing in the improvement of the level of living for millions. With a depressed standard of living, it is not unreasonable to predict that increased political instability would follow. Moreover, U.S. research programs might become less integrated into international research and development systems. Our students and faculty would lack experience and understanding of the international dimensions and interrelationships of agriculture.

International Agricultural Development Programs at the
University of Illinois

The University of Illinois College of Agriculture is a "World Class College of Agriculture", with a faculty and staff that includes "World Class" agriculturalists, which began its development as such in 1952 with an international contract program in association with the International Cooperation Administration (later named AID), by assisting the Allahabad Agricultural Institute in India. Following that program, three other major AID-sponsored projects were initiated to assist with the development of institutions of higher education in India and Sierra Leone.

The University of Illinois supported the formation of the Uttar Pradesh Agricultural University (UPAU) at Pant Nagar, India, which was the first land-grant type university in India. Following that effort, the Indian state of Madhya Pradesh received University of Illinois assistance in developing Jawaharlal Nehru Agricultural University (JNAU) in Jabalpur. In 1964, the University helped establish a new agricultural college with a teacher training component, Njala University College (NUC), in Sierra Leone, West Africa.

University of Illinois faculty members were stationed at these universities as consultants and advisers and provided U.S. training for individuals from those universities. Numerous faculty members from these universities received graduate degrees at Illinois and other U.S. universities. Today, the aforementioned institutions are functioning on their own and are contributing significantly to the development of their country.

A University of Illinois project in 1966 with the Committee on Institutional Cooperation (CIC) conducted a study of AID-supported institutional building projects in agriculture. It revealed factors determining contract effectiveness and the effects on American universities of participation in AID overseas contracts. Other past University of Illinois involvement has included an agricultural communications project in Jordan, a maize research and production technical exchange in Yugoslavia, and an oilseed production feasibility study in Egypt.

In 1973, the International Soybean Program (INTSOY) was established as a worldwide program of research, education, and technical exchange. The major purpose of INTSOY has been to exploit the tremendous potential of soybeans as a source of high-quality protein for human consumption. It also focuses on the use of soybeans as a source of vegetable oil and livestock feed.

Projects to establish and/or expand soybean production and utilization have been completed in Peru and Sri Lanka, as well as in other cooperating countries. The International Soybean Variety Trial Program is a collaborative effort with scientists in 85 countries throughout the world.

Two INTSOY short courses--one on soybean processing for food uses and one on soybean production--are offered on a recurring basis. To date, 178 foreign scientists have been trained in these courses.

The University of Illinois participates in a strengthening program in food, nutrition, agriculture, and rural development, as part of a cooperative federal-state program authorized by Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act. This program provides increased opportunity for faculty and students to study, conduct research, and cooperate in development activities with national and international organizations.

The University of Illinois also manages a training program for the Ministry of Agriculture of the Ivory Coast which prepares their students and places them in master's degree programs at the University of Illinois and other institutions. We are especially pleased with our involvement in the Ivory Coast project, because their government invested of its own hard currency and foreign exchange. With their support, we trained some 60 students to the M.S. degree level over an 8-year period. Similar degree training arrangements have been made for students from Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Zaire, and Zambia. Approximately 117 foreign students have had their studies in agriculture administered through such programs supervised by the University of Illinois College of Agriculture.

The University of Illinois has also sponsored a number of U. S. and some LDC graduate students to conduct portions of their M.S. and Ph.D. thesis work abroad. A professor in the LDC and one on the University of Illinois campus serve as co-advisers. Such research relates to a problem of mutual interest and economic importance. This program also benefits both countries by providing graduate students and advisers with first-hand international

The College of Agriculture is currently involved in a long-term agricultural research and extension project that assists the Government of Zambia in its efforts to improve the welfare of small farmers and to increase national food production through the development and adaptation of relevant technology. A recent institution-building activity being implemented by the University of Illinois involves assistance to the Government of Pakistan to upgrade and develop their University of Agriculture in the Northwest Frontier Province into an institution integrating agricultural education, research and extension.

In 1982, the University of Illinois established the International Program for Agricultural Knowledge Systems (INTERPAKS), a multidisciplinary project focusing on the way in which agricultural research, extension, and education efforts can be linked to effectively serve farmers and support more rapid agricultural development throughout the world.

Also in 1982, the University of Illinois established the Program for Agricultural Communications Education (PACE), which cooperates with national institutions outside the United States to establish educational programs in agricultural communications.

The University of Illinois has become more and more involved in soybean activities with the People's Republic of China. Our College of Agriculture hosted the first China/USA Soybean Science Symposium in July 1982, with the objective of understanding the development and current status of the respective soybean sectors, as well as development of cooperative scientific programs to benefit consumers and producers of soybeans in both countries.

A second symposium was held in 1983 at the Jilin Academy of Agricultural Sciences in Changchun, China. In addition, the University of Illinois is involved in a United Nations Development Program/ Food and Agriculture Organization (UNDP/FAO) project to strengthen soybean research for increased production in Heilongjiang Province, China.

nd

University of Illinois faculty are participating in projects for the Midwest Universities Consortium for International Activities (MUCIA), including: (1) a higher-education training project in Indonesia, (2) an institution building program at the Institute for Agriculture and Animal Science in Nepal, (3) an agricultural research planning and evaluation project in Somalia, (4) an agricultural extension project in the eastern Caribbean, and (5) a Technical Service Mission (TSM) contract with the AID regional office in Barbados.

Activities of the College of Agriculture and other units of the University of Illinois are often developed with the use of memoranda of understanding (MOUs). At present, institutions in eight countries are cooperating in particularly active agricultural programs: Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center (AVRDC), Taiwan; Fundacao Instituto Agronomico do Parana (IAPAR), Brazil; Fundacao Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Brazil; Universidade Federal de Santa Maria, Brazil; Office of Rural Development (ORD), Republic of Korea; International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA), Nigeria; Philippine Council for Agriculture and Resources Research (PCARR), Philippines; Instituto Nacional de Investigaciones Agropecuarias (INIAP), Ecuador; Instituto Colombiano Agropecuario (ICA), Colombia; the International Agricultural Development Service (IADS), New York and Centro Internacional de Agricultural Tropical (CIAT), Cali, Colombia. An additional MOU currently being signed is the InterAmerican Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA), and discussions are underway to sign an MOU with the University of Zambia.

We believe these efforts have made significant contributions to agricultural growth in developing countries. We also believe they have provided important opportunities to our faculty and students, as well as having contributed to better understanding among people in the U.S. and other countries.

33

Opportunities and Suggestions for Improving The Working Relationships Between Land-Grant Universities and AID

With implementation of Title XII, several mechanisms and initiatives have been established to strengthen cooperation in agricultural and rural development programs between universities and AID. Many are positive developments, and those of us in the university community welcome them. However, there continues to be opportunities for strengthening this cooperation to make efforts of universities and AID more effective.

Research Program Development and Priorities

The strengthening of agricultural research efforts is one of the most important elements in an effective strategy for agricultural development. This is no less true in the developing countries we assist than in the history of our nation's agricultural development. Agricultural research is a major strength of U.S. land-grant universities, and an area in which universities can participate substantially. At present, U.S. universities are not contributing fully to the existing research network of International Agricultural Research Centers (IARCs) and national research institutions in developing countries.

AID/university research program cooperation is impeded by a lack of sufficient funds for research in AID, except for a few Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSPs) and IARCs. AID has made a policy decision to provide approximately 25 percent of the core budgets of IARCs. Presently, funds to support this commitment are allocated from centrally funded research of the Science and Technology Bureau of AID.

Because IARCs' budgets are growing, providing 25 percent requires an increasing amount of annual funding. And because the centrally funded research budget of the Science and Technology Bureau is not growing at the same rate as the budget commitment to the IARCs, relatively fewer dollars are

available to support university research programs. It is my understanding that a BIFAD committee (JCARD) is studying this issue.

In FY 83, \$77 million was allocated to agriculture, food and nutrition programs in the Bureau of Science and Technology where Title XII centrally-funded research is supported. Table 2 gives the allocation of that amount for various purposes.

Table 2.
FY 83 Allocation of Funds for Agricultural, Food and Nutrition Programs in the Bureau for Science and Technology of AID

<u>Purpose</u>	<u>Amount</u> ¹ (million \$)	<u>Percent of Total</u>
International Agricultural Research Centers	49	63.6
Collaborative Research Support Programs	11	14.3
Contract Research	6	7.8
Technical Assistance	<u>11</u> <u>77</u>	<u>14.3</u> <u>100.0</u>

¹ Amounts are rounded to the nearest one million dollars.

Two observations are important in this regard. First, given the high payoff and significant needs for agricultural research to alleviate agricultural and rural development problems, the total amount devoted to research is relatively low. Second, the proportion and absolute amount of money available for universities to do contract research is very low. Indications are that this flexible research support will be even lower than \$6 million in FY 84. These data indicate that AID efforts to mobilize the potential capabilities of U.S. universities in internationally targeted research program efforts have hardly begun.

In raising this point, I do not mean to imply that AID should reduce

its support of IARCs. These centers are an important part of the research network serving the needs of developing countries. However, they cannot be--and were not designed to be--the only international agricultural research resource for developing countries. They do not address, for example, many of the important commodities, problems, and topics that need attention. Instead, they focus largely on developmental and applied research, while much needs to be done on a more basic level.

It seems logical that increased resources should be devoted to the Bureau for Science and Technology for centrally funded research. That would permit increases in AID support of high priority, high quality research programs at land-grant universities. It would also enable AID and universities to continue cooperation in developing new research programs, in contrast with the present situation in which AID faces continuing reductions in flexible, centrally funded research support.

Another opportunity for improvement involves the need to develop better mechanisms for establishing AID research priorities and for managing programs for university implementation. In several cases, centrally funded research projects with universities are based on one-year contracts. Development of productive and substantial research programs requires considerably longer term commitments.

Moreover, university research programs often lack the necessary resources to establish research linkages with developing country institutions, so that collaborative efforts can develop and research results can be extended to the targeted developing countries. To a certain extent, the Collaborative Research Support Programs (CRSP) of AID address these problems. But several university research programs supported by AID are not in the CRSP mode.

AID--with BIFAD assistance--should reassess its agricultural research activities and priorities, seek university research expertise in advising on program management as it relates to universities, and articulate research program policies and operations to Title XII institutions more clearly.

36

Agricultural and Rural Development Program Emphasis

There is a growing awareness that efforts in building institutions, training people, and increasing agricultural research and extension activities are among the most productive investments that can be made in agricultural development programs. We strongly support the increased emphasis AID is giving these areas, and encourage giving even higher priority to these important areas.

Transferring commodities such as food, fertilizers, and tractors; building roads, buildings, and dams; and providing subsidies for purchasing equipment or operating existing agencies can all be productive efforts in certain situations. However, many of these activities do not build long-term capabilities within developing countries to improve the overall livelihood of the people. In some cases, this can be accomplished more effectively by institutions with larger budgets and different missions than AID. For example, large infrastructure investments are best supported by the World Bank, whereas certain relief activities may be implemented most effectively and efficiently by the UN or private organizations.

Earlier, I referred to the need to increase support for agricultural research efforts. Similarly, increased emphasis should be placed on training people from developing countries. This improvement in developing the human resources of these nations is needed desperately. Agricultural development is increasingly based on science rather than on natural resources. The capacity to take advantage of science-based agricultural developments will require large efforts to train students from developing countries. This will improve the performance of public agencies and institutions, as well as the private sector, which plays an essential role in agricultural development.

Table 3 presents the numbers of students from developing countries supported by AID in degree programs in the U.S. or other countries.

Table 3
Number of Students from Developing Countries
Supported by AID in Degree Programs

<u>Year</u>	<u>Number of Students</u>
1982	1,754
1981	1,831
1980	1,648
1979	1,392
1978	1,049
1977	996

Source: Office of International Training - AID

While the number of student participants increased annually until leveling off in 1982, those levels of training are woefully inadequate considering the needs and high priority that should be placed on human resources by AID. It has been estimated that the U.S.S.R. offers approximately 80,000 scholarships to students from developing countries annually. While the data in Table 3 do not include all U.S. government sponsored foreign students, it is clear we fall far behind the Soviet Union in this respect. I urge AID to expand its commitment to the education and development of human resources in the developing countries. It is, in my judgment, a long-term investment that will yield handsome returns.

The difference noted above has obvious political ramifications, because these students quickly emerge as political leaders, policymakers, and scientists. Furthermore, I believe graduate-level training in agriculture in the U.S. is superior to that provided in Eastern Europe and the U.S.S.R.

The process of managing AID-supported students through the Office of International Cooperation and Development (OICD) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) is often costly, awkward and duplicative of services that could be rendered more effectively at the land-grant universities where most foreign students are enrolled. BIFAD is encouraged to provide leadership in resolving this problem because, in many cases, it is not necessary for the USDA to provide a link between AID and the universities.

Increased emphasis should be placed on building institutions within developing countries to train agricultural students at the B.S. and M.S. degree levels. Also, additional support is needed to increase the numbers of graduate students from developing countries being supported by AID for studies in U.S. universities. Land-grant universities are particularly well prepared to cooperate in research, education, and institution-building efforts because these activities are central to our ongoing mission and programs.

Title XII Institutional Capacity and Program Building Support

The most productive efforts in AID programs dealing with Title XII institutions will continue to come from land-grant universities where there is a sustained program for international agricultural activities that incorporates concentrated agricultural expertise and faculty development. While several universities have a commitment to AID programs--needs change, faculty members retire or leave, and AID priorities change.

All of these situations require that universities have core support for continued building of the capacity to be effective partners in AID programs. Funding for many AID activities is insufficient in amount, and often short-ranged (frequently 5-24 months). With limited overall support for universities today, such institutions often do not have the financial flexibility to accommodate faculty returning from intermediate-term foreign assignments.

Dr. F. E. Hutchinson, Executive Director of BIFAD, was on our campus recently, and he stated that AID plans to increase the number of students from the LDCs to be trained in the U.S. It is most appropriate for AID to provide core funding to assist universities in this task, and it would be most helpful if this funding begins prior to the students' arriving, so that the universities can prepare for increased needs in faculty and facilities to accommodate the increased research supervision and space associated with additional graduate students.

Another problem universities face is when private consulting firms implement Title XII activities. Because most of the agricultural expertise resides in land-grant universities, private firms often contract directly for faculty services. A moderate amount of this provides faculty with worthwhile international experience. However, these arrangements do not provide universities with core support needed for continual program development efforts. Instead, these firms commonly pay only the faculty member's salary and fringe benefits. Because the numbers of such arrangements are increasing, core support is especially needed to maintain and expand faculty and program development efforts at land-grant universities.

It is suggested that AID be provided support to expand core funding of university faculty and development programs at selected universities. This is critical for maintaining and increasing involvement of high-quality faculty and development of relevant programs within universities for long-term cooperation in AID efforts.

Host Government, AID Mission and University Relationships

Successful implementation of AID technical assistance programs depends substantially on relations among the university contractor, the AID mission, and the host-country government. In many projects, excellent relationships

exist and the effort is highly successful. However, in certain instances, AID mission and university personnel seem to interpret Title XII legislation differently, in terms of the importance and the process of involving universities, in alleviating agricultural development problems. Also, the shortage of agriculturally trained personnel--those capable of providing agricultural expertise to AID agricultural program development in AID field missions--often constrains the overall effectiveness of developing land-grant universities.

The problem is compounded when substantial Title XII activities are implemented by non-Title XII institutions which do not have in-depth agricultural expertise. For example, a recent project to review agricultural research in Africa and make recommendations on further investments was awarded to a firm that lacked meaningful agricultural expertise. After receiving the contract, the firm sub-contracted with a consortium of Title XII universities to complete the tasks.

That project--which seems to be clearly within the definition of a Title XII project--could have been more effectively implemented if the contract had been awarded directly to a Title XII institution. We are advised that a number of Title XII activities are being implemented by non-Title XII institutions using faculty from Title XII universities.

Host-country contracting is a natural progression of working with recipient countries which have developed sufficient capacity to manage agricultural development projects directly. In principle, this contracting mode should not constrain the effectiveness of universities in implementing agricultural development programs. However, there is too often a lack of understanding and agreement among host-country government personnel, AID staff, and university team leaders and personnel.

Confusion exists about roles, lines of authority, and reporting procedures. Not only does this problem constrain timely administrative achievement, it also delays the achievement of project objectives. In addition, host-country government personnel and AID mission staff often do not understand the self-interests of land-grant universities in participating in Title XII projects. While effective implementation of the Title XII project is the primary objective, universities may want to also develop longer-term relationships with developing country institutions to provide faculty with experience, and to foster research efforts with professional colleagues in the host country. While these activities should not be supported by project funds if they are not centrally related to achieving project objectives, such efforts are sometimes discouraged by AID mission and host-government personnel.

A process is needed whereby university representatives, host-country personnel, and AID mission staff discuss broad university participation in the country before finalizing the contract agreement. Also, a thorough study is needed of the process used to determine which projects are to be Title XII projects, and how they are to be implemented regarding cooperation between Title XII and non-Title XII institutions. BIFAQ and AID should also consider ways to bring AID mission personnel and university representatives together on a regular basis for more effective understandings of the roles and interests of each institution and agency.

Notwithstanding the above concerns, many strides have been made in the cooperative efforts to alleviate problems associated with world hunger. The Congress of the United States is to be commended for its support of programs and activities aimed at making this world a safer and more pleasant place for humankind. While we do not know what the future holds in resolving world food production and hunger problems, we know who holds that future. We all do! That is an awesome responsibility. But if we renew our commitment to

42

Page--22

these efforts, and if we work together on a steady course to this end, we can be remembered as the generation and society that accepted the challenge at hand, and did something about it. I urge your continued support of efforts to alleviate world hunger problems, which is fundamental in our continuing search for peace as noted in the following words of David Rockefeller:

We cannot live in a world divided between, on the one hand, two-thirds who do not eat properly, and, knowing the causes of their hunger, revolt, and, on the other, one-third who eat well--sometimes too well--but who can sleep no longer for fear of revolt on the part of the two-thirds who do not have enough to eat.

Thank you.
