

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523  
ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

REPORT OF THE QUARTERLY MEETING  
JUNE 26-28, 1985

ON

FOOD AND DEVELOPMENT

MINNEAPOLIS PLAZA-HOTEL  
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

Prepared by J. Don Looper  
under Contract Number 845-1098



TABLE OF CONTENTS

SESSION	PAGE
Introduction.....	1
Dinner Session.....	3
Morning Plenary Sessions.....	4
Opening Statements.....	4
Discussion.....	7
Panel I: U.S. Food Assistance and Development.....	8
Discussion.....	12
Afternoon Plenary Sessions.....	14
Panel II: Investment, Trade and Development.....	14
Discussion.....	17
Panel III: Public Education about Food and Development.....	18
Discussion.....	21
Women in Development Subcommittee.....	23
Business Session.....	24
List of Advisory Committee Members.....	27
Meeting Agenda.....	29

2

## INTRODUCTION

The focus of this meeting was the use of U.S. food assistance to promote Third World development. In particular, the Advisory Committee examined in what ways and under what conditions food aid programs can be made to produce a development impact, how the business sector can invest in food-related development activities, and how food aid programs can be used to build an American constituency for development.

The Advisory Committee chose these themes for a number of reasons. Experience indicates that food aid can be an instrument for development, and AID has been called upon repeatedly to improve the developmental impact of its food aid programs. However, major questions remain as to how to accomplish this and how significant such efforts are likely to be. Experience also shows that the business sector can make a valuable contribution to Third World development.

Increasingly, the business community itself is discussing its role in food assistance - ranging from individual groups seeking a corporate commitment to end hunger to broad efforts such as the President's Task Force on International Private Enterprise. Yet questions remain as to how businesses can be informed about opportunities and persuaded of the benefits of investing in development.

Additionally, there have been calls for AID and Department of Agriculture constituencies to unite behind U.S. food aid and development, yet the development and agriculture communities have yet to forge a solid working relationship. Finally, if hunger is to be eradicated, there must be a permanent constituency in America for long-term development.

The Advisory Committee chose to hold this meeting in Minneapolis to obtain perspectives often missing from its Washington meetings -- those of Midwestern business, academics, farmers, and media -- and in turn to provide them with the opportunity to exchange views with private voluntary organizations.

DINNER SESSION - JUNE 26, 1985

Former Secretary of Agriculture and Minnesota Governor Orville L. Freeman was speaker at the ACVFA dinner June 26. He called for a new U.S. international policy for agriculture, to join trade and development objectives in a single, well-coordinated effort. Freeman recalled a pre-inaugural meeting with President Kennedy in 1960 in which he called attention to the paradox of a world food surplus and millions of hungry people. The question now, he said, is "Why haven't we done better?" Freeman argued that crisis breeds opportunity and that the U.S. needs to make significant progress in using the enormous U.S. potential for production as a means of creating overseas development and export markets. "The two go together."

He recalled a similar crisis in the 1950's when a coalition of commodity groups succeeded in enacting the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480). This Act was followed in the late 1950's and the 1960's by massive economic and trade development. But by the late 1960's, the world had become a sellers' market, and efforts at market building diminished. Now, the U.S. is back in the same kind of crisis. There is a real opportunity to put together the same forces. "It is time to do it again. I think it is do-able," Freeman said.

Freeman described an "export initiative" that he hopes will become part of the 1985 omnibus farm bill being written in Washington. "What is called for is a united effort. A maze of agricultural groups are involved in the current farm legislation, which brought together experts and professionals from all over the country. Then the credit crunch hit. The emphasis shifted to exports, market development, and economic development. Out of this came our proposal for an agricultural initiative. A focus on small farm development should be a basic key of U.S. foreign policy. This will require the President and someone who can speak for the President to resolve the turf problems and set direction."

He said this plan was developed with the advice of leading farm policy thinkers from both political parties and that it had been discussed with Administration officials and Congressional leaders. A key element, he said, would be "appointment of a new leader-spokesman to articulate agricultural policy for the U.S. and indeed for the world. This person should be a Presidential appointee with Ambassadorial rank but without line responsibility. He or she should have complete confidence and support from and direct access to the President."

Freeman cited benefits to American agriculture in the 1960's and 1970's when the middle income developing countries were experiencing annual economic growth of 5 to 7 percent. A review of 15 developing countries that experienced rapid economic expansion between 1960 and 1983 shows a substantial increase in commercial imports of U.S. farm products, he said. The challenge is to identify the next 15 to 20 countries that have great long term economic potential and determine how best to help them realize that promise.

Freeman said export policy should focus on individual country markets and their special needs as customers. He advocated a strengthening of the Department of Agriculture and the Agency for International Development to augment their respective capabilities for export development and foreign assistance to maximize cooperation and coordination between the two agencies.

The Executive Branch, he said, should be prepared to make long term aid commitments to countries that agree to pursue specific development strategies. He recommended greater flexibility in shifting U.S. assistance among countries, commodities, and the various export assistance programs. Freeman proposed that Congress expand and strengthen P.L. 480, the Food for Peace program, in line with recommendations of the President's Task Force on International Private Enterprise.

On the question of budget, Freeman said that a program to use agricultural commodities constructively would be cost effective. Doubling P.L. 480 would cost less than taking the additional commodities under price support loan, he said. Such a comparison by the President's Task Force on International Private Enterprise concluded that food aid is two-to-one cost effective, based on studies by USDA's Economic Research Service, Congressional Research Service, and private consultants. Three things must happen, Freeman said: (1) Farm income must be improved. (2) Exports must be expanded. (3) Budget objectives have to be met. "This is a big order, not easy, but do-able."

MORNING PLENARY SESSIONS - JUNE 27, 1985

#### Opening Statements

E. Morgan Williams, Chairman of ACVFA and President of the National Cooperative Business Association, called the meeting to order and introduced the members of the ACVFA. He presented the theme of the meeting as focusing on the whole area of food and development. Even though food and development programs have been around for 25 or 30 years or more, in many ways they have just begun and many of the most creative ways to use food in a development sense have yet to be put into appropriate action. So the objective is to get into the whole area of how food has been used in the past, what some of the new ideas are for the future, and how effectiveness can be improved. The United States has a very productive food machine. Food is a renewable resource that can be used effectively in the Third World for human, economic and community development.

This is a very important year because Public Law 480 comes up for reauthorization this year. Also the farm bill comes up for reauthorization, and in this can be built some of the programs that are vital to successfully using food resources as a tool for development. So this meeting will explore some of the pros and cons.

Another purpose is to encourage through this committee the involvement of more private and voluntary organizations, more agribusinesses, more trade associations, more development organizations in food aid and development. In P.L. 480 and some of the other programs, private

participation has been limited to a small group of PVO's and other development oriented folks. This is an area where many more players ought to be involved. If the use of food as a vital resource is to be increased, there is an obvious need to increase the constituency as well as the users of the programs.

Williams encouraged participation by agribusinesses and private and voluntary organizations that have not in the past used food to help with investment, community development, business development, relief programs, educational programs, feeding programs, school lunch, and nutritional support programs. "Very frankly, it's been limited to too narrow a group," he said. "We would hope that four and five years from now, there will be many, many more organizations who are assisting in Third World development by utilizing food programs that are available." So that's another part of this agenda -- to look for ways that PVO's can become involved and more agribusinesses and others become involved in using food as a development tool in the Third World.

Williams introduced the morning speakers, Julia Chang Bloch and Dr. Raymond Hopkins.

Julia Chang Bloch, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID, emphasized the need for better integration of food and non-food resources for development and a better understanding of common goals among commercial and humanitarian interests. It is timely and appropriate, she said, that this meeting is focusing on the non-cash development resource that is food. More countries receive U.S. food assistance under Public Law 480 than any other form of foreign assistance. This meeting is another indication that food aid is gaining world-wide interest and respectability as a resource for development.

Food for Peace continues to be the United States' primary vehicle to combat famine. But it also has served other equally important objectives: (1) To expand exports (2) To encourage development, and (3) To promote U.S. foreign policy and national interests. Over the years, the emphasis has shifted, yet all four objectives remain central.

One of the primary lessons to emerge from P.L. 480 experience is that feeding alone is not the answer. Unthinking generosity can in fact create problems such as disincentives, dependencies, and opportunities for waste and fraud -- problems that have of course been exaggerated. In the last four years, the U.S. has concentrated on maximum developmental impact from food aid. AID has made strides in integrating food and non-food resources, in promoting better understanding of these relationships, and building a broader coalition of development, commercial, and humanitarian interests. But there is still a ways to go.

That is one of the reasons AID is pleased that the ACVFA is highlighting food and development in this forum. Events make this another watershed year for Food for Peace: (1) A new farm bill is before Congress. (2) The state of the farm economy focuses attention on food

exports. (3) The tightening of the U.S. budget, at a time of surpluses in this country and famine in Africa, makes more difficult any increase in development assistance but less difficult an increase in food aid. The challenge: How to use this precious resource to effectively eradicate hunger.

Feeding alone will not do the job. Increased agricultural production is not enough because at the bottom of the hunger problem is poverty. Food for Peace knows how to keep people alive. It doesn't know very well how to help people make a living, although some innovative inroads are being made. Food for Peace is an old hand at helping individuals, which is no mean achievement. But it is only a fledgling at reaching beyond to the fundamental problems that cause individuals to need food aid.

Voluntary agencies and church groups applaud the humanitarian objectives of Food for Peace. Agricultural groups applaud the export expansion objectives. But there is not an integration of those interests or communities. AID thinks a balance of the four objectives provides greater strength to promote P.L. 480 in support of both national and international objectives. "We hope this meeting can come up with ideas on how to move Food for Peace into a resource that effectively promotes productive enterprises in support of economic growth," Bloch said. She raised four questions confronting AID:

(1) How best to move from emergency relief to preparedness, prevention and development; how long can we provide emergency relief without causing dependencies and encouraging countries to put off needed policy changes. (2) How best to use food and development aid to leverage necessary policy changes. (3) At a time when American farmers are looking for export markets, how to rationalize our plenty against the needs in Africa. (4) How to persuade the American farmer that economic development and specifically agricultural development in poor countries are essential to his having markets for his products and how to transform the current outpouring of compassion for Africa into support for solving long term development problems.

Dr. Raymond Hopkins, Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College, discussed three broad philosophical points: (1) The importance of commitment in looking at food and development because of the uncertainties involved in evaluating whether or not a project or program of food aid has had net positive development effects. (2) The responsibility that goes hand in hand with policy based lending. (3) The importance of flexibility in carrying out a project or program in order to avoid criticisms and mistakes.

There are two extreme views of food aid and its impact on development. One is the ideal or "blissful" view that food aid is the solution to hunger. At the other end is the agnostic or actually negative view that food aid creates disincentives for farmers and governments in recipient countries, that it distorts taste preferences, creates dependencies, and serves political interests. The negative conclusion is that it is

therefore hopeless to expect a developmental impact from food aid and that, except for emergency situations, it would probably be better to abolish food aid.

The truth is in a "gray area" somewhere in between. There is inevitable subjectivity in evaluating foreign assistance. Evaluation is based on assumptions as to what would have happened under a different scenario. We have to make assumptions as to how things would be if the world were different. In designing efforts to analyze impact, we need to keep in mind this ongoing tension. We don't have scientific certainty. You need a certain humility and a sense of commitment -- that you will try to achieve development impact although there will not exist an irrefutable scientific conclusion as to how well you succeed.

The second point has to do with the concept of responsibility. In recent years the international lenders and donors have moved toward a philosophy of policy-based lending. There has been much more attention to designing projects to make sure that they fulfill a development objective. There is a responsibility, however, that goes along with telling a country that it should undertake policy changes that are recommended but which may put a burden on that country. This assumes a responsibility -- to stay the course. Once you begin these efforts to get countries to change their policies, you must recognize a real responsibility for long-term sustained effort. One of the worst things, Hopkins said, is to rush in and offer a variety of new ideas, and then after a year or two or three, begin to pull back the kinds of resources that are going to be needed.

Finally, there must also be flexibility in implementation. Built into food aid transfer should be the notion of learning, of seeking corrective feedback, of changing, over time, the institutional mechanisms as a project moves on. Programs should not send technical assistance people in for only two or three years, but rather look to long term flexibility.

#### Discussion

In follow-up discussion, Julia Taft, ACVFA member, raised the question whether the U.S. dust bowl experience of the 1930's offers lessons for drought-affected countries in Africa. Hopkins responded that general lessons might be useful -- for example the need for incentives to get farmers to do things differently. But he expressed doubt that the U.S. can transfer more specific knowledge to weak governments in developing countries. The U.S. is basically an abundant country while the African countries have few resources and are far behind in development.

Dr. LaVern A. Freeh, ACVFA member, offered the view that organizations and individuals have to leave the "gray area" if they are to become active in development. Too many are saying the subject is too complex and therefore "I'm not going to get involved." Sooner or later you have to move out of the gray area and get into the game. Hopkins responded that recognizing the fallibility of a position should not necessarily undercut the commitment or will to take action.

David Guyer, ACVFA member, asked Julia Bloch where she personally would like to see P.L. 480 go at this time. Bloch replied that we should build on the success of the program and develop innovative ideas on how to channel food resources and create productive enterprises. In response to a comment from the audience, Bloch said there is much greater support for food aid than for foreign aid. Food aid serves special interests and is expanded when there are U.S. surpluses. It would be better if commercial and humanitarian interests understood the mutuality of their interests.

Williams mentioned the need for greater understanding of the need for agricultural development, beyond narrow commodity interests in the U.S. He referred to criticism from agricultural groups.

ACVFA member Mary McDonald said a goal of this committee is to concentrate on education. It behooves all of its members to answer such criticism. Newspapers will print opposing views. "We have to do this ourselves," she said.

#### Panel I: U.S. Food Assistance and Development

The first panel focused on two questions: (1) What are the essential components of U.S. food aid programs necessary for achieving development impact? (2) What are the management, administrative, and bureaucratic constraints to implementing effective programs and how can they be overcome? The panel was moderated by Dr. Raymond Hopkins.

Dr. LaVern A. Freeh, ACVFA member and Vice President for International Development, Land O'Lakes, Inc., spoke on "Cooperatives and Food for Development," stressing the need for private organizations to get involved. He talked about development activities of his organization, based on a commitment made by Land O'Lakes in 1981 to get actively and deeply involved in international development. A purpose was to give the 350,000 farmer-owners the opportunity to become more fully and directly involved in helping people throughout the world to solve their food and agricultural problems. This, if successful, would have a positive influence for world stability and peace, and this would be in keeping with the interests of Land O'Lakes.

In order to assure the success of Land O'Lakes, the organization needed to better understand and appreciate the factors contributing to world poverty and then be in a position to more directly affect those international policies and actions which impact on the organization's 350,000 farmer-owners.

Nations without money cannot buy products and services. Nations that have money can do it and will do it. Hence the need to help them solve their poverty problems. And that has to start with agriculture. This country's traditional international markets are mature. Opportunities are really in the developing countries that don't now have money. So if Land O'Lakes is to develop new markets, it must help those countries solve some of their problems.

Finally, Land O'Lakes made this commitment because it believes that international development and technical assistance require decisions and actions far too important to be left to governments alone, the U. S. government or other governments. The free enterprise system, America's businesses and cooperatives, are a force in the economic development of the nation. They can be and need to be a driving force for development internationally. Within that commitment, Freeh described the firm's project in Jamaica.

In 1983, with the assistance of AID, a private company in Jamaica, and the Rockefeller Foundation, Land O'Lakes founded and initially staffed a non-profit venture capital foundation in Jamaica called the Jamaica Agricultural Development Foundation. The idea was to receive and monetize surplus U.S. dairy products for the purpose of generating venture capital to be invested in food and agricultural development projects in Jamaica. Under Title II of Public Law 480, bulk butter and cheese were provided to the Foundation, which then contracted through a bidding process to Jamaican processors to convert the bulk commodity into forms acceptable to Jamaicans.

The products are then sold and the money realized goes to the Foundation. The Foundation then is in a position to make loans, loan guarantees, or grants to stimulate development. The idea was to generate U.S. \$35 million for the Jamaican economy over a five year period. Finally all pieces came together, and nine months ago the project went into operation. In those nine months the project has generated over 10 million Jamaican dollars and has provided the funding for 18 development projects in Jamaica. The project is now approved for the second year.

What are the essential components of a food aid program necessary to achieving development impact? Freeh listed (1) A strong commitment on the part of an organization and the U.S. government, and a positive and effective working relationship between the two, (2) An adequate supply of surplus products that can be monetized, (3) Clear policies and appropriate policies and procedures and the willingness to be innovative. (4) A good partner in the host country and approval and ongoing support from the host country government, (5) Knowledgeable and dedicated staff and board members and adequate infrastructure, (6) An environment that permits monetization without disrupting the existing market.

Among the management, administrative, and bureaucratic constraints, Freeh listed inadequate understanding and support for the means and importance of using food assistance for development; not enough surplus commodities available for development under the present laws, procedures and policies; and yearly rather than multi-year funding.

He also referred to a lack of commitment by PVO's, a high official emphasis on assuring that a project won't disadvantage U.S. allies, and a general reluctance in our government to enter working relationships with the private sector. Also, Freeh said, in host countries it is sometimes difficult to obtain and maintain government support.

Dr. Philip Johnston, ACVFA member and Executive Director of CARE, stressed the development impact in most CARE programs and the importance of health and nutrition to human productivity. Speaking on "PVO's and Food for Development," he posed the question: Does the management of CARE believe that its food use programs are developmental in purpose or humanitarian? His answer was that very few of CARE's programs are not developmental. Johnston's working definition: Development is creating those conditions that enable individuals to meet their basic human needs and realize their potential to contribute to the society of which they are a part.

CARE considers basic human needs to be adequate dietary intake, adequate health care, easy access to primary education, adequate housing and an environment conducive to sustained living. Johnston outlined three categories of CARE programs -- aid to mothers and children, food-for-work, and refugee and disaster assistance.

CARE uses food aid as a supplement to the dietary intake of pregnant and nursing mothers, infants, pre-school children, and school children to create: (a) An improved health status of expecting mothers. (b) Fuller development of genetic potential for mental capacity of infants and pre-school children. (c) Increased attendance at primary schools through the attractiveness of a school meals program.

CARE uses food for compensation or what is referred to as food-for-work to: (a) Improve facilities that underpin agricultural development -- such as farm to market roads, irrigation canals, and desilting of open wells. (b) Provide opportunities for refugees and landless laborers in projects on state lands including deforestation, dune stabilization, marginal land protection.

CARE uses food in connection with refugee assistance and disasters -- to prevent death and stabilize human lives. The goal is to shift people from an emergency context to a development context. CARE does not make an artificial distinction between refugee relief and development, considering the two to be at different points of a development spectrum.

Johnston emphasized that the success of these programs depends on "hundreds" of elements essential to development results. He listed a few examples.

Supplementary feeding programs for mothers and infants require that the host governments be involved financially and that they place importance on primary health care. The food aid should fit into a package of services made available locally in a permanent and integrated manner. It is important that beneficiaries contribute to the effort in some form and that a goal of national absorption of the program be stated and pursued.

For supplementary feeding at primary schools to produce development results, the host government should financially underwrite all of the internal delivery costs. It should place importance on enrolling and

retaining as many students as possible through the fifth grade as well as placing priority on educating females. The program should use homegrown foods to the maximum possible.

Food-for-work programs should not be "make work" but should result in improvements for society, not just for the individual. Machine intensive programs should give way to more labor intensive programs. The people who will work on a project or benefit from it should be involved in design, implementation, and evaluation.

Johnston made two major points in summarizing the attitude of CARE toward food aid in the future:

1. It is unconscionable to predict that we will not use food aid in the future to meet the three needs outlined above -- pregnant and lactating mothers, infants, and school children -- as well as food-for work.

2. I suggest that AID investigate the use of food in programs that help families with family planning. For surely population control will be one of the major determinors in the next two decades of the quality of life in many developing countries.

Dr. Walter P. Falcon, ACVFA member and Director, Stanford Food Institute, focused sharply on food policy in recipient countries as a determinant of success in development. Falcon's topic was "The Problem of Disincentives and the Connection between Food Aid and Food Policy." He argued that Title I offers the greatest opportunity to influence policy, that most PVO's are too small to have an impact on host country policy, and that Title I and Title II constituencies should therefore join in a common effort. Meanwhile, he warned against a "theological" approach in evaluating food aid and development.

Food aid is not a point of theology, he said. Anyone who says food aid always works or never works -- it creates disincentives or it does not -- is taking a theological stand that is wrong and misinformed. If we are going to make progress, we have to read the empirical record because these are empirical questions. The greatest harm we can do is to say that food aid always works or it never works.

The one generalization that can be made is that food aid, considered in terms of development, works or doesn't work depending on the policies of the host government. Bad policy will drive out good projects. Or alternatively, bad policy will make astronomically high the cost of replicating projects into programs, which is the name of the game if we're really going to alleviate hunger. We kid ourselves, if we think we can take a project approach and do much good. If we're really serious about alleviating hunger we've got to do something about policy. And you don't do much with policy unless you're very big. Maybe CARE or Catholic Relief Services is big enough to sit at the table to change policy. Most PVO's aren't. We ought to face up to that fact. And if that's the case, the fight between the Title I forces and the Title II forces is a fight that has to be redressed.

More people go hungry because of bad exchange rates and lousy trade policy than they do from any decision in the ministry of agriculture or the ministry of food or probably even in the ministry of health. Title I is the biggie. That's where the policy fights will be. For the long run, Title II doesn't have much of a chance in a development context without some help from Title I. That's a terribly important coalition.

Governments don't like to have other governments meddling in food and food policy, and here's a terrible dilemma. If food policy is to be changed, there has to be a very constructive dialogue. It's no secret why Title III hasn't taken off very much. Recipient countries, given a choice between Title III and Title I, prefer Title I because there is much less involvement in terms of their own policy. But if food aid is to be effective it will have to be in the policy dialogues generally about food policy generally in countries. If that's the case, then AID and USDA and others have to sit importantly at the table. And AID frankly is simply not geared up in the field with qualified experts in many places of the world to be a central part of the food policy dialogue. That will have to be redressed.

The constraints are that, when we talk about food aid for development, the key thing is country policy there. You can have successful projects, you cannot have successful programs, with bad policy. Food aid will be as good or as bad as the domestic policy environments into which it is put, almost surely. And that means that there is a whole set of skill levels and so on. One of the scarcest commodities of all in many countries is administrative talent. The kinds of projects that work well and are wonderful to describe are terribly administrative intensive on the recipient side; you simply can't have 50 PV0's all trying to get at the ministry at the project level.

That is the great danger of the project approach. And it is discouraging because one sees the enthusiasm, the involvement and the identification of the American people with projects they can understand. But you can't replicate those projects on a wide enough scale without a good enough policy to have it work. That is the dilemma.

More resources help. Fewer administrative hassles help. More competence helps. But the name of the game is getting food policy straight in recipient countries. The best hope for that is with Title I, not with Title II. This calls for a coalition of those two and not a fight between them.

### Discussion

In subsequent discussion, Williams said he sees two policy dialogue problems. One is that the United States is not effectively organized to sit down with other governments and press policy issues. USDA, AID, USTR, the Department of State and perhaps other agencies show up for a meeting, but there is no concentrated central effort. This, he said, reduces U.S. effectiveness. Second, Williams raised the question of how to pull into the dialogue additional pressure groups in the recipient countries. To improve the dialogue, the U.S. should be creating more

pressure groups within those countries who can bring pressure for policy change.

Bloch, responding to Falcon's presentation, sought to clarify the focus of AID negotiations. She agreed with the emphasis on policy reform and said policy reform has been made credible in the past four years. She said there is some confusion about the Development Coordinating Committee food aid subcommittee. Decisions there are reached by consensus. No one agency can speak of all the various factors, so the DCC works in a collegial way. But once the DCC agrees on aid to another country, the Agency for International Development is the negotiating point with responsibility for implementation. Bloch said AID is trying to strengthen the capacity of field staff.

Falcon responded that the best hope on policy dialogue is in the field. In some countries AID does not have sufficient chips to be taken seriously. Falcon made a second point having to do with the effects of food aid. He said that in 30 to 40 percent of the cases, the recipient countries were not happy with the results of food aid because of policy reasons. Falcon emphasized he didn't mean to denigrate AID field staff. There are many good people doing good work, which is usually most successful where the ambassador exerts strong leadership. But in many posts AID does not have that kind of team or does not have enough resources to make a difference.

Dr. Robert J. Marshall, ACVFA member, expressed approval of the makeup of the panel. He emphasized that the Advisory Committee is representative of the American people, and having Falcon as representative of the academic community is very important, also the inclusion of LaVern Freeh and Philip Johnston. Marshall agreed with Falcon on the inadvisability of a theological or dogmatic approach to food aid. Food aid is in a gray area between absolutes. Most PVO's recognize that the macro economic and political factors are important. But he said he would not want to settle for involving the PVO sector only in emergency relief if they can be at all involved in development. He raised the question how PVO's can be involved to the best possible effect.

Johnston added that it is an accepted reality that many Third World governments are hanging by their fingernails and the priorities among leaders may not include the welfare of people in the bush. Bush farmers have survived on a subsistence basis and will continue to do so. But with land pressures increasing along with drought and other problems, it is recognized that policy changes are needed. But when lives are threatened, the U.S. must help to feed people even when policy change is not forthcoming.

Falcon agreed, but argued that this is famine relief rather than developmental aid. He said successful projects are good from a moral viewpoint. But we must be modest about the opportunity to build that kind of success into a national pattern.

In a question from the floor, Thomas A. McKay, Bureau for Food for Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID, asked Falcon whether he considers

projects to be "valueless" and what value he places on specific projects while policy dialogue and the reform process are going on. In his response, Falcon emphasized the importance of timing and education. Learning about countries, getting started at the negotiating table, and educating Americans may be the highest payoff of projects. He cited the importance of the Peace Corps as an educational process. It created a generation of Americans who understood the process. Timing is extremely important.

In a comment from the floor, Peter Davies, President of InterAction, said Food for Peace has a long history of successful development results. He cited experiences in Brazil, including the school lunch program, the use of food aid to strengthen cooperatives, and food-for-work programs in drought areas of northeast Brazil. There is a wealth of evidence, he said, that food has been used successfully in development.

Julia Bloch commented that food aid has been used for many years in policy reform, and especially in the past two years this has been a priority. She referred to successes using Title I and other resources aimed at improving agricultural policy in recipient countries. She posed two questions to PVO's: (1) Under what conditions can PVO's have an effect on positive policy reforms at different levels; (2) Under what conditions, and in what countries, should PVO's be focusing on small social service projects. Although they might be very excellent projects, where do they lead?

Johnston remarked that the word "reform" is pejorative and he would substitute "change." The trouble for PVO's comes in the dichotomy between (a) the PVO role as "partners" with host countries guided by the country's own assessment of its problems and (b) the implications of "reform" connoting a role in which the PVO tells the country what it is doing wrong and must do differently. This is a very difficult connotation for PVO's.

Freeh made the point that anyone who gets into development -- a PVO, a corporation, or whatever -- has to move ahead on many fronts and must be prepared to participate both in policy and in projects.

#### AFTERNOON PLENARY SESSIONS

#### Panel II: Investment, Trade and Development

The early afternoon panel centered on roles and opportunities for private businesses in food aid and agricultural developments. It raised the questions (1) How can those engaged in food-related investment and trade generate development? (2) How can more businesses be informed of the opportunities and persuaded about the benefits of engaging in development activities?

The moderator was Steven Carlson, Assistant General Counsel for Private Enterprise, AID, who described the shifting emphasis toward private involvement in international development. He said the private sector

was for years a neglected element in the development equation -- and that this is changing. He emphasized that this emphasis is much on the minds of leaders and business people in developing countries as well. He made the following observations:

1. Washington is now hearing the private sector's concerns about food aid. These are live issues.

2. There is a growing change in the Third World climate with respect to private sector and private sector agribusiness types of problems. There is an openness that was not there in the recent past as people search for new solutions.

3. Local currency programing for P.L. 480 is a hot topic, and it would seem that Congress may be coming up with a solution that may deliver more food assistance and more development.

4. AID, along with the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank and others, is working to develop private sector in developing countries and is focusing more of its efforts on that type of issues. AID hopes to work more closely with the private sector, including cooperatives and PVO's.

Dr. Earl Kellogg, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois, posed a question often raised by critics of agricultural assistance: By assisting developing countries to increase their own agricultural production, won't this mean that these countries will decrease their agricultural imports and further aggravate the bad situation which many American farmers already face? Speaking on "The Connection between Third World Agricultural Production and Importation of U.S. Agricultural Products," Kellogg summarized a research project at the University of Illinois indicating a positive correlation between increased production and increased imports.

This is an apparent paradox, he said. To become more important customers for U.S. agricultural products, developing countries must increase their own agricultural production because agriculture is such an important part of these economies that agriculture must contribute if they are to prosper. What then is the relation between these countries increasing their agricultural production and their import of agricultural products?

The Illinois study began to look at this question in several ways. Ninety-two developing countries were divided into four equal groups ranked by the rapidity of increases in their food production. Group A countries, the most rapid in terms of per capita production increases, were found to increase their imports of agricultural products more rapidly than Group D countries by about 35 percent.

Illinois also did multiple regression analyses of 77 developing countries incorporating time series and cross-section data to determine the relationship between per capita imports of agricultural commodities

and domestic per capita agricultural production changes. Two basic results: (1) In no estimated equation was there a negative coefficient significantly different from zero for the influence of per capita agricultural production on imports of agricultural products. (2) There was no evidence to suggest that increases in developing countries' per capita agricultural production negatively influence their agricultural imports. In six equations the coefficients were positive; that is, increases in domestic agricultural production had a positive correlation with increasing imports of agricultural products.

Kellogg cited two case studies, Brazil and Korea, in which increased domestic production coincided with increases in imports of U.S. agricultural products.

Davis Helberg, Executive Director, Seaway Port Authority of Duluth, made the point that there is still a lack of understanding about the positive impact of P.L. 480 on the private sector. Speaking on "The Business Sector and Food Aid," Helberg said the Port of Duluth is aware of the business impact of P.L. 480, as are the millers who participate in these shipments. But the public is not aware of the importance of Food for Peace to the region's economy. Since the Department of Commerce, trade offices, and many chambers of commerce hold seminars on exports, perhaps there is an opportunity to crank into these programs the message that P.L. 480 is important to business.

"Horror stories" about the problems in overseas projects may deter some companies from getting involved. Anything that can be done to ease the burden for the private sector, particularly a company that is going out in a privately conceived and continued development effort, should be encouraged to the maximum.

It would seem that the "hydra-headed" government system could be streamlined in some degree. Also, the private sector that is so involved with commercial transactions should receive some kind of encouragement to send its very capable marketing people into the less developed countries to see what is happening in terms of their own product, a spinoff product, or perhaps a transfer of technology. He also advised more effort to ease the transition for U.S. commercial interests when a country moves from Title I to private trade.

Helberg offered two examples of Minnesota companies that are creating new international markets through innovative product development. One has developed an organic mat made from Minnesota peat that can be impregnated with seed or fertilizer to stabilize lands in areas affected by desertification. This might be an example for other companies, with some stimulus from the Federal government.

The second example is a small Minnesota firm that uses residues of forestry products, or wood chips, and converts these to a log for use in fuel-short countries. By the year 2000, 2.8 billion people will be affected by a fuel wood shortage. This Minnesota industry may be able to help.

John Freivalds, Publisher, Foreign Trade Magazine, said American private companies are often better able than governments to create an environment for change but emphasized that they must be willing to take a long-term view of profit potentials. Speaking on "Opportunities for Corporate Involvement in Development," Freivalds said a private firm can help in developing agricultural operations overseas if it takes a longer term view as to when profits will come. Profits are necessary but will not come overnight. In addition, being more results-oriented than many government bureaucracies, the private firm tends to get things done more quickly and create an environment for change. The private entity has a special advantage in promoting a new crop or production idea. Freivalds cited examples from his own experience, both successful and unsuccessful.

An international grain company from Minneapolis went into Jamaica in 1974 to build a soybean processing plant. Disease had destroyed the coconut palm and there was a shortage of vegetable oil. The plant was built, but the Jamaicans failed in an effort to create a soybean industry. The Americans were brought back in to establish a commercial-size pilot project. Despite intensive efforts, the project failed because of inability to get government approvals.

A venture to use soybeans as a rotation crop with sugar cane in Jamaica also met with government resistance. In the end, however, there was success in a venture to use soybeans in Jamaica as a rotation crop with vegetables and tobacco. But without the leadership of a private company, nothing would have happened.

In Brazil, a venture was undertaken to produce and export cassava. The American firm joined in ownership of a processing plant, which became uneconomic when rising energy prices made too costly the gas drying of cassava. Out of the Brazilian experience, however, came a successful project in Mexico. Again, this is evidence that a private firm can take leadership in moving a venture along and helping it to become profitable.

### Discussion

In subsequent discussion, Walter Falcon raised the question whether Kellogg in his study had looked at export performance as well as import requirements as they are associated with growth in food production. Kellogg responded that the Illinois study had been focused only on import requirements because of severe criticism being received from agricultural groups displeased with the international work being done at the university. It was very much an "applied study," he said.

In a question from the floor, Kellogg was asked what his work implies for the long-term effects on U.S. agriculture if we are heading into a worldwide surplus. Kellogg replied that surpluses have to be defined in terms of the effective demand that can be generated by economic growth. Many studies indicate there will be increasing gaps between supply and demand, instead of the reverse.

Dr. Martin Kriesberg of USDA's Office of International Cooperation and Development pointed to the flattening of growth in developing countries since 1982 and raised the question whether Kellogg's work would consider what happens under such conditions. Kellogg agreed that this needs more study and surmised that part of the poor U.S. export performance in recent years was caused by slow growth in developing countries.

### Panel III: Public Education About Food Aid and Development

The final panel dealt with the need for greater public understanding of hunger and development problems and the need for media, farm organizations, and the PVO's to participate in the educational process. Moderator for the panel was Mary Barden Keegan, ACVFA member and president of the Houston Chapter and member of the National Board, the End Hunger Network.

Keegan spoke of the need to attack "cultural assumptions" that make education difficult. She said there is an overwhelming challenge to educate the public and develop a constituency that understands the problem and has the will to effect a solution. Development education, like all education, operates in stages. The first stage is to speak to the basic cultural assumptions.

One does not get much action when the cultural assumptions happen to be: That food aid is money down a rat hole. That food aid is never-ending; it creates an expectation to be fed tomorrow. That there are no solutions. That we don't know how to do it. That the hungry will be always with us. That Third World people are primitive and uneducable. That the individual American can't make any difference. Or lastly, that governments, including our own, and the PVO's are inefficient or corrupt.

Given these assumptions, it is difficult to educate people about the importance of food aid programs and development. These assumptions, which have nothing to do with reality, are the target of the End Hunger Network. The role of the End Hunger Network is to create an atmosphere where messages can be heard, aimed at changing destructive cultural assumptions. International, national and local efforts are aimed at this goal. As the assumptions crumble, development education will increase.

Daniel E. Shaughnessy, President, TCR Services, Inc., spoke on "Opportunities to Build a Constituency for Development Around Food Aid." The principal thrust was that Americans need a greater realization of the benefit to this country of food assistance to poor countries. Continued U.S. involvement in international activities, he said, is important to our own economic, security, political and social interests. We must realize that providing foreign assistance and sustaining trade relationships is essential to our own interests as a nation. Yet, many people fail to realize the importance to our economy of combating world hunger, or of the value of promoting foreign trade or assisting in foreign economic development.

One such area is in the export of food to those who need it -- both through assistance programs and trade. Few other forms of assistance offer such real and immediate opportunities to demonstrate that self-interest which is so essential to a wider understanding of why it is important and of value to the United States to engage in "foreign aid."

For example, every time we export \$1 million of wheat under P.L. 480, it generates \$5.42 million gross output, employment for 143 workers, increases personal income by \$1.54 million, and generates \$326,000 in additional tax revenue. And, if this same \$1 million of wheat is processed into flour, the return to the economy will be even greater:

- (1) There would be additional gross output of \$8.84 million, for a total of \$14.26 million.
- (2) There would be additional employment of 192 people for a total of 335.
- (3) There would be additional income of \$1.91 million for a total of \$3.45 million.
- (4) There would be additional tax revenue of \$451,000 for a total of \$777,000.

We are helping ourselves by helping others! Many of the countries we assist or have assisted with foreign aid programs are already important customers for our food -- they buy 40 percent of our farm exports. If they could afford to, they would buy more.

Stewart Truelsen, Director of Broadcast Services, American Farm Bureau Federation, said it is time once again to mobilize farmers in support of food aid and development. Speaking on the subject, "How can the American farm community be persuaded that Third World agricultural development is essential for the well-being of U.S. agriculture?", Truelsen discussed farmer attitudes toward foreign aid and a new effort to inform the Farm Bureau membership about food aid and development.

Farmers and specifically Farm Bureau were instrumental in developing P.L. 480 some 30 years ago. But more recently Farm Bureau members have not been made fully aware of the benefits to American agriculture from food aid and development. Opinion polls have indicated that support for food aid is waning in the public and the U.S. Congress.

Truelsen described the development education project to be officially presented to the Council of Farm Bureau Presidents in Washington in July. CARE was the initiator of the project and was joined by Farm Bureau, The Cooperative League of the USA, and the National Farmers Union. The project is entitled "Food and the American Farm Community." It will involve workshops for a wide cross section of the membership with the purpose to stir interest in food aid and development. A greater goal is to make the farm community so knowledgeable that its members can enlist the support of the public at large for foreign assistance.

The Farm Bureau leadership believes that projects that help developing countries improve their agricultures and their own purchasing power will help U.S. farmers. This will be related through workshops in which the videotape "Sharing Global Harvests," produced by the American Farm Bureau, will be presented. After viewing the film and printed materials, participants will discuss their own role in the process. At least, they will come away better informed. Perhaps some will come away as advocates. Of course, not everyone will agree.

Some Farm Bureau members are concerned that projects that stimulate agricultural development abroad will ultimately increase the level of competition for export markets. Farmers also bristle when they see the U.S. portrayed as a rich nation that owes something to the rest of the world. Farm Bureau members feel that Third World farmers have not had the proper incentives to produce. Farm Bureau feels the educational efforts will be more successful if it can demonstrate the basic kinship among farmers everywhere. The timing for the project is considered excellent right now because of the famine in Africa. The Farm Bureau wants to take the story beyond a crisis situation and show how assistance can benefit both sides.

Robert Ainsworth, Director, World Vision Relief Organization, discussed his organization's experience in trying to build a development-oriented constituency and a lack of success in using mass media. Ainsworth spoke on the subject, "How can PVO food aid programs be used to educate Americans about the need for a long-term solution to the problem of world hunger?" He said the real challenge is to develop systems to provide the same levels of food aid once the drought subsides in Africa. A need is to share lessons learned among organizations in the field, in government, and the academic community.

Ainsworth said it is very difficult to sell development to the public. World Vision doesn't even like to use the term. It would rather use terms like self reliance and building self support. "We have been totally unsuccessful in using the mass media in appealing to our donor public to make a commitment to programs of development," he said. "We have tried every approach possible. TV time dries up when we put anything on having anything to do with development."

Eight-five percent of World Vision donations come from individuals. The average gift size is \$35. The average pledge over a year is \$140. The attitude is: "I'm aware of the needs, the suffering of my fellowman. For either religious or humanitarian purposes I want to be of some help. Here is my contribution. I like to know that a major part of it will be used to alleviate some of the suffering. Now I'm going on and do other things. Don't bother me."

World Vision targets on child care. It targets on wealthy business people who understand what it means to apply resources to a problem. And it brings together groups of churches. But as far as going to the general donor public, Ainsworth said, "It's a total bust, and we aren't wasting our time on it."

Lee Egerstrom, Agribusiness writer, St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch, responded to the question, "what should the role of the media be in forming and changing opinion about development?" He discussed the problem that the media have in maintaining interest and news coverage of long-standing problems such as world hunger. The public is subject to "compassion fatigue" and will lose interest in a story after a short time. The media have the same attention span problem as the general public. Moreover, Americans probably would not find it acceptable for reporters and editors to set the agenda for public discussion and debate.

The recent "cyclone" disaster in India won a media attention span of about three days -- until replaced by the soccer atrocities in Brussels. And within a few days, the TWA hijacking had stolen the attention of the American media.

Egerstrom said he could not tell the voluntary organizations how to make news. But if organizations keep working at development, sooner or later the media will start paying attention.

During the food shortage cycle of 1972-74, selling the idea of market development or economic development was a difficult chore. Today there are shrinking world markets, and the only way to expand markets is to raise the standard of living of developing nations.

If there is to be a just and growing and expanding world this requires the help of agricultural groups. This will require not just more media assistance but more work by the Farm Bureau and other farm organizations, churches, and everybody else concerned. There are far greater moral issues than who serves on the Supreme Court. A quarter or third of the world is going to bed hungry.

### Discussion

In the following discussion, John Sewell, ACVFA member, made two summary points: (1) It is an essential fact that you can't separate commercial or economic interests from the state of development in the Third World. (2) The public response to Africa provides an enormous opportunity. The real challenge is how to convert that short term response to support for long term development, especially in Africa.

David Guyer, ACVFA member, observed how quickly European publics can jump on an issue because governments spend more to educate the public. Biden-Pell is still minuscule. How can we help to augment these efforts?

Shaughnessy added that, at the time of the World Food Conference in 1974, there were no real vehicles for winning public support, no existing mechanism. In Europe there was an already existing pattern, led by governments in Holland, Germany, and England. It is entirely appropriate that Congress has funded the Biden-Pell effort. The European experience is an appropriate guide. Continuation and expansion of this program

should be encouraged. The U.S. public is woefully uninformed about these issues.

Egerstrom agreed it is a long process, but it has to continue. Truelsen said many Farm Bureau members are unaware of what other countries are doing. If made aware, they might take more interest.

Peter Davies commented on "our responsibility, our failure, to articulate these problems and needs." The need, he said, is to find ways to translate this outpouring of humanitarian assistance. When you talk to people, you can get the message across. It is wrong to blame public fickleness. "We need to look inward at the way we do not utilize the media skills that exist."

Willie Campbell, ACVFA member, suggested that perhaps what the development community is finding is that the media are not the way to get long term commitment. Information has to be targeted to specific interest group audiences. People get committed by study, by research, by talking -- it takes a long time.

A comment from the floor stressed that foreign students should be more involved in American discussion. There is a need to use representatives of countries themselves.

Raymond Hopkins raised the question whether it might be possible to interest producers of entertainment for television and elsewhere to get involved and communicate the development story.

Julia Bloch said she would like to see a greater effort from development education people to emphasize what is going on in Third World countries that we can learn from. Not just economic gains but also benefits from cultural traditions, art, architecture, and other contributions.

Bruce Moffett of the Minneapolis YMCA spoke from the floor on YMCA efforts to utilize partnerships between Y's here and overseas. It's a two-way street. Americans can learn a tremendous amount from poorer countries. The YMCA tries to inform its memberships and communicate that fact.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE - June 28, 1985

Subcommittee co-chairwomen Willie Campbell and Mary Barden Keegan convened this session to review the agenda for the upcoming conference in Nairobi bringing to a close the U.N. Decade for Women, as well as the NGO Forum which will precede it. Arvonne Fraser, Senior Fellow at the Hubert H. Humphrey Institute for Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, and former director of the Women in Development Office at AID, discussed conference issues. When asked, "If your hopes were fulfilled for this meeting, what would happen?", Ms. Fraser replied that "women, by area of interest and expertise, [would] get organized and go home with a clear idea of what they are going to do and then keep communicating." This, it was pointed out, is an achievable goal even if the conference becomes bogged down in politics, and it underscores the importance of the NGO forum as a complement to the work of the official government delegations.

ACVFA member Julia Taft spoke briefly from her experience working with the U.S. delegation to the conference on refugee relief and resettlement issues. Although most of the world's refugees are in Africa and most nations have experienced the challenges of hosting refugees, there is no guarantee that refugee issues will receive their due attention since some delegations prefer that the problems of refugee women not divert attention from their indigenous women's issues.

Ms. Taft advised the group that special efforts are being made to encourage and help the U.N. High Commission on Refugees formulate an action plan for women refugees, whose unique and compelling problems the Commission has yet to address.

What can be done in the U.S. as a follow-up to the conference? Several specific efforts were discussed. There will be a debriefing in Minneapolis with conference participants to build an action agenda for the state. In addition, AID's Biden-Pell program is funding several efforts which will internationalize on-going programs: A representative of the Nebraska and the World project discussed their collaboration with the American Association of University Women which aims to insure that women in development issues are understood and treated as an area of on-going rather than isolated interest. Additionally, the Consortium for International Cooperation in Higher Education is working with the Cooperative Extension Service, specifically home extension agents, to internationalize their educational delivery system. The American Association of Home Economists has embarked on an effort to prepare educational materials for high school teachers relating international issues to those traditionally discussed in the classroom.

SUMMARY OF BUSINESS SESSION - JUNE 28, 1985

General Decisions

Meeting with the Administrator - It was decided that post-ACVFA meeting appointments with the Administrator should continue on a regular basis even if the Advisory Committee is ready only to discuss issues rather than make specific recommendations.

ACVFA Meeting Location - It was agreed that the Minneapolis location was an important factor in the June meeting's success and that the Committee should take a close look at the possibility of meeting in U.S. cities outside of Washington, D.C. for every other meeting. It was acknowledged that the budgetary implications would have to be carefully considered.

Subcommittees: It was agreed that Advisory Committee meetings have tended recently to be most productive with a general session format. If Subcommittee chairpersons wish to hold separate meetings, they should do so during breakfast and lunch. However, it was agreed that subcommittee issues benefit from general session discussion, and since there was an earlier decision to coordinate subcommittee and main session topics, subcommittee chairpersons should work with Advisory Committee staff to integrate their specific issues into the general session.

Public Relations - It was suggested that especially in meetings outside of Washington, D.C. a special press conference or press opportunity session should be set up at the beginning of each meeting in an effort to use Advisory Committee meetings to raise public awareness of foreign aid issues.

Social Functions - It was decided that Advisory Committee dinners should be issue-oriented, either for Committee business or for additional meeting-related discussion.

Advisory Committee Business Sessions. It was agreed that the time devoted to discussion among members should be doubled. The second day of the meeting should be devoted entirely to such discussion, and if possible the first day should conclude with an hour and a half discussion of the day's proceedings.

June Meeting Decisions

Food Aid and Development: The Chairman appointed LaVern Freeh to be the official spokesman on this topic. Vern will draft recommendations/issues for discussion based on the food aid session of the June meeting and circulate to all Advisory Committee members for comment and approval before meeting with the Administrator.

Public Education about Development: Willie Campbell and Mary Keegan were appointed to discuss this issue with the Administrator pursuant to the June meeting panel on this topic. Since he has expressed an interest in knowing how effective development education activities have been and what lessons we have learned from them, it was suggested that they relate the various interesting and innovative approaches to development education which were brought out at the meeting, including the video tools which have been created, as well as the provocative comments regarding the use of media for public education.

Humanitarian Assistance to Contras. The PVO community is greatly concerned about who will implement this \$27 million appropriation, since it is felt that AID involvement will adversely affect AID and PVO credibility abroad. The Chairman asked John Sewell, David Guyer, and Julia Taft to be responsible for discussing this issue with the Administrator and to suggest some concrete alternatives to AID implementation of this assistance. These suggestions will be circulated ahead of time to Committee members for comment.

### September Meeting Decisions

Theme: "Promoting Longterm Development in Africa"

Important Meeting Elements. Advisory Committee members agreed that the following elements are important to the success of this meeting: (1) Focus in-depth on a few key issues relating to promoting longterm development in Africa; (2) Invite Africans to participate in discussions; (3) Invite the Administrator and insure appropriate participation from the Oakland and West Coast areas; (4) Limit the number of speakers; devote maximum time to discussion.

Structure: Three-tiered with the following three key elements addressed in depth:

1. Strategic Planning: How can AID and PVOs coordinate their strategic planning for longterm development in Africa?

Currently, there is little or no coordination in planning, and AID rarely considers PVOs strategically beyond allocating them a percentage of development assistance funds. This lack of coordination hampers the making of good resource allocation decisions and is a major stumbling block to promoting longterm development in Africa. The InterAction Survey on what and where PVOs are doing in Africa can be a take-off point for this discussion, which should lead us to consider mechanisms which will mesh AID-PVO strategic planning and to explore new modalities of AID-PVO cooperation.

2. Development and Disaster Preparedness: A Strategy for the Future. What lessons have AID and PVOs learned about emergency preparedness and management from the current crisis, and what is being done to prepare Africa for the next drought and famine?

Without adequate disaster preparedness, we will lose whatever development momentum we gain during the upcoming years when the next emergency strikes. This discussion should focus on a strategy for the future rather than recap what is being done during the current emergency.

3. Development Education: How can we channel the outpouring of support for humanitarian aid to Africa into support for longterm development?

This question bears directly and powerfully on our capacity to promote longterm development in Africa, particularly considering the new and very visible private initiatives such as USA for Africa which the African crisis has engendered. Important aspects of this issue include the effective use of the resources raised through these initiatives, the educational and damage potential which these initiatives have, and the actual commitment of the people behind these initiatives to become involved for the longterm. It has been suggested that this dialogue include InterAction and a representative of USA for Africa, as well as a nontraditional participant who might shed some light on this issue by virtue of experience with other campaigns.

The Overseas Development Council's currently-in-progress survey of public attitudes about foreign assistance can serve as a take-off point for this discussion. Also, in light of the fact that USA for Africa will be considering resource allocation questions before the next ACVFA meeting, the Chairman asked John Sewell, who sits on the USA for Africa board, to express the concern of the Advisory Committee about the importance of insuring effective use of their resources and to ask a USA for Africa representative to participate in the upcoming ACVFA meeting.

Other elements which should be included are U.S. food assistance to promote longterm development in Africa; ocean freight; lessons learned, key themes and forward-looking strategies which emerge from the U.N. Conference on Women.

Preliminary Information about December Meeting: Thursday - Friday, December 5-6, 1985, Washington, D.C. Theme - Population and Development

Preliminary Information about FY 1986 Meetings: ACVFA members present expressed a preference for an overseas meeting in Zimbabwe, Togo, or Cameroon in February or March, 1986, and a spring meeting on May 14, 1986 to celebrate the 40th anniversary of the ACVFA and AID-PVO cooperation.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON VOLUNTARY FOREIGN AID

Mr. E. Morgan WILLIAMS  
Chairman, ACVFA  
President, National Cooperative  
Business Association  
1401 New York Avenue, N.W. - Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
(202) 638-6222 (o)  
(703) 250-5772 (h)

Dr. Robert J. Marshall  
Vice Chariman, ACVFA  
Lutheran Southern Theological Seminary  
4201 North Main Street  
Columbia, SC 29203  
(803) 786-5150 x 230 (o)  
(803) 786-9378 (h)

Mr. Markham Ball  
Wald, Harkrader & Ross  
1300 Nineteenth Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 828-1515 (o)

Mr. Enso V. Bighinatti  
Advisor to the President  
American Red Cross  
17th & D Streets, NW  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 639-3235 (o)

Mrs. Alice Green Burnette  
Director of Development  
Howard University  
2900 Van Ness Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20008  
(202) 686-6606 (o)

Willie Campbell  
President, Overseas Education  
Fund, International  
2101 L Street, NW - Suite 916  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 466-3430 (o)  
(213) 626-7976 (o)

Mrs. Anna Chennault  
President, TAC International  
Investment Building  
1511 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 347-0516 (o)

Mr. John Clark  
Vice President, Communications  
American Gas Association  
1515 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 841-8620 (o)

Mr. Ted Connolly  
Chairman of the Board/Chief Executive  
Officer  
Connolly Development, Inc.  
P. O. Box 1558  
Oakland, CA 94604  
(415) 444-8858 (o)

Dr. Walter Phillip Falcon  
Food Research Institute  
Stanford University  
Stanford, CA 94305  
(415) 497-3652 (o)

Dr. LaVern A. Freeh  
Vice President, International  
Development and Governmental Affairs  
Land O'Lakes, Inc.  
Box 116  
Minneapolis, MN 55440  
(612) 481-2506 (o)

Dr. Marie Davis Gadsden  
4617 Blagden Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20011  
(202) 722-1055 (h)

Mr. David L. Guyer  
President, Save the Children  
54 Wilton Road  
Westport, CT 06880  
(203) 226-7272 (o)

Dr. Philip Johnston  
Executive Director, CARE  
660 First Avenue  
New York, NY 10016  
(212) 686-3110 (o)

Mary Barden Keegan  
President, Houston Chapter, End  
Hunger Network, National Board Member  
1770 St. James Place - Suite 608  
Houston, TX 77056  
(713) 963-0099 (o)  
(713) 681-6691 (h)

Mrs. Mary M. McDonald  
Member, Cook County Board of Commissioners  
118 N Clark Street, Room 567  
Chicago, IL 60602  
(312) 443-4393 (o)

Mr. John W. Sewell  
President, Overseas Development Council  
1717 Massachusetts Avenue, NW - Suite 501  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 234-8701 (o)

Mr. Kenneth M. Smith  
President, Int'l Management & Development  
Group, Ltd.  
1250 Eye Street, NW - Suite 303  
Washington, DC 20005  
(202) 842-4190 (o)

Mr. Martin Sorkin  
Economic Consultant  
2700 Virginia Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20037  
(202) 333-0377 (o)

Mr. Steven F. Stockmeyer  
President, Stockmeyer & Company  
1800 M Street, NW - Suite 950 N  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 463-7696 (o)

Mrs. Julia Vadala Taft  
Senior Associate  
Refugee Policy Group  
1424 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036  
(202) 387-3015 (o)

William B. Walsh, M.D.  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
Project HOPE  
HOPE Center  
Millwood, VA 22646  
(703) 837-2100 (VA office)  
(202) 363-4677 (DC office)

COMMITTEE STAFF

Sherry Grossman, Executive Director

Lillian Halter, Administrative  
Operations Assistant  
Advisory Committee on Voluntary  
Foreign Aid (ACVFA)  
Room 260, SA-8  
1400 Wilson Boulevard  
Arlington, VA 22209  
(703) 235-2708 and 3336

MEETING AGENDA

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 26, 1985

3:00 - 7:00 p.m. Registration: Embassy Room  
5:30 p.m. Reception (cash bar): The Palm Terrace  
7:00 p.m. Dinner: The Cotillion Ballroom  
8:00 p.m. Speaker: HON. ORVILLE FREEMAN

THURSDAY, JUNE 27, 1985

8:00 a.m. Registration and Coffee - The Embassy Room  
9:00 a.m. The Embassy Room

Welcoming Remarks: E. MORGAN WILLIAMS, Chairman, ACVFA;  
President, National Cooperative  
Business Association

9:15 a.m.

Opening Remarks: JULIA CHANG BLOCH, Assistant  
Administrator, Bureau for Food for  
Peace and Voluntary Assistance, AID

Discussion

9:45 a.m.

Opening Remarks: DR. RAYMOND HOPKINS, Professor of  
Political Science, Swarthmore College

Discussion

10:15 a.m. Coffee Break

10:30 a.m. - 12:00 noon

PANEL I: U.S. FOOD ASSISTANCE AND DEVELOPMENT

- Focus:
1. What are the essential components of U.S. food aid programs necessary for achieving development impact?
  2. What are the management, administrative, and bureaucratic constraints to implementing effective programs and how can they be overcome?

Moderator: DR. RAYMOND HOPKINS, Professor of Political Science, Swarthmore College

Panelists: DR. LAVERN FREEH, ACVFA member; Vice President for International Development, Land O'Lakes, Inc.: Cooperatives and Food for Development

DR. PHILIP JOHNSTON, ACVFA member; Executive Director, CARE: PVOs and Food for Development

DR. WALTER FALCON, ACVFA member; Director, Stanford Food Institute: The Problem of Disincentives and the Connection between Food Aid and Food Policy

12:00 - 1:30 p.m. LUNCH

1:30 - 3:00 p.m.

PANEL II: INVESTMENT, TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

- Focus:
1. How can those engaged in food-related investment and trade generate development?
  2. How can more businesses be informed of the opportunities and persuaded about the benefits of engaging in development activities?

Moderator: STEVEN CARLSON, Assistant General Counsel for Private Enterprise, Agency for International Development

Panelists: DR. EARL KELLOGG, Professor of Agricultural Economics, University of Illinois: The Connection between Third World Agricultural Production and Importation of U.S. Agricultural Products

DAVIS HELBERG, Executive Director, Seaway Port Authority of Duluth, Minnesota: The Business Sector and Food Aid

JOHN FREIVALDS, Publisher, Foreign Trade Magazine: Opportunities for Corporate Involvement in Development

3:00 - 3:30 p.m. Coffee Break

3:30 p.m. - 5:00 p.m.

PANEL III: PUBLIC EDUCATION ABOUT FOOD AID AND DEVELOPMENT

Focus: How can we use the example of our food aid programs to build an American constituency for longterm development?

Moderator: MARY BARDEN KEEGAN, ACVFA member; President, Houston Chapter and Member, National Board, End Hunger Network

Panelists: DANIEL E. SHAUGHNESSY, President, TCR Services, Inc.: Opportunities to Build a Constituency for Development Around Food Aid

STEWART TRUELSEN, Director of Broadcast Services, American Farm Bureau Federation: How can the American farm community be persuaded that Third World agricultural development is essential for the well-being of U.S. agriculture?

ROBERT AINSWORTH, Director, World Vision Relief Organization: How can PVO food aid programs be used to educate Americans about the need for a longterm solution the problem of world hunger?

LEE EGERSTROM, Agribusiness Writer, St. Paul Pioneer Press-Dispatch: What should the role of the media be in forming and changing opinion about development?

5:00 - 5:30 p.m. Review of Discussion

5:30 - 6:30 p.m. Presentation of Development Education Videos  
and Cash Bar - Regency Room

FRIDAY, JUNE 28, 1985

8:30 a.m. Registration and Coffee - Embassy/Room

9:00 - 10:30 a.m.

WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING - The Embassy Room

- \* Review of the agenda for the upcoming closing conference of the U.N. Decade for Women, Nairobi, Kenya
- \* Planning for the September 18-20 ACVFA meeting, Oakland, California: Promoting Longterm Development in Africa.

10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

11:00 - 12:30 p.m.

ACVFA BUSINESS SESSION - The Embassy Room

- \* Discussion of Recommendations for the Administrator
- \* Discussion of the agenda for the September 18-20 ACVFA meeting, Oakland, California
- \* Discussion of the agenda for the December 5-6 ACVFA meeting, Washington, D.C.
- \* Discussion of ACVFA Planning Retreat for 1986 agenda
- \* Other Business

12:30 p.m. MEETING ADJOURNMENT