International Labour Review, Vol. 121, No. 6, November-December 1982

Prospects for eliminating hunger in the face of world-wide economic recession

Maurice J. WILLIAMS*

"Food and jobs for all is a central objective of the International Development Strategy. It is a challenge of unprecedented dimensions and urgency." With this message to the 1981 World Food Council ministerial meeting in Novi Sad, Yugoslavia, the Director-General of the International Labour Office synthesised the essential inter-relationship between food, employment and incomes in the elimination of mass hunger and poverty. The Development Strategy's objective of eliminating hunger by the turn of the century has received widespread support from political leaders. In October 1981 the Cancún Summit meeting of 22 Heads of State or Government of developed and developing countries emphasised that the eradication of hunger within as brief a period as possible was "a first priority both at the national level and in the field of international co-operation".[1]

Among the important initiatives following the Cancún Summit has been the Plan of Action against Hunger and Malnutrition launched by the European Economic Community with emphasis on an immediate increase in food aid for the hungry and stepped-up support for food strategies in developing countries. The Italian Government, too, has launched an initiative to intensify international co-operation to fight hunger in the world by doubling its own development assistance and by seeking greater co-ordination of efforts among development assistance agencies. This will be the subject of a ministerial meeting of donor countries and international agencies in late 1982, following the high-level preparatory meeting of development assistance agencies which was held in Rome in April 1982.[2]

The urgency and difficulty of eradicating hunger have been growing in the face of the current world economic crisis, highlighting the need for a development approach more sharply focused on food and hunger objectives and related employment, income and equity problems, which will give an impetus to economic recovery.

*Executive Director, World Food Council.

The scale of the crisis

In most developing countries, where the vast majority of the poor and hungry live, the world economic recession and the inflation which accompanies it are causing great distress. Economic growth has fallen to its lowest level in a decade. Sharp reductions in commodity prices and in demand for exports, as well as growing trade barriers, have meant serious loss of earnings, enormous current account deficits, mounting debts and difficult structural adjustment problems. There are alarming trends of growing food import requirements and marked deterioration in the ability to finance them. These difficulties press most severely on the low-income groups, for whom the economic crisis means severe food shortages and who have no voice to tell of their rising distress. Children are particularly at risk: of the 125 million who will be born in 1982, at least 17 million—as in 1981—will die of malnutrition and disease before they reach the age of 5.

Aggregate indices of food production, though not indicative of the distribution of available food, give especial cause for concern. In the developing countries as a group, food production growth rates averaged 3.2 per cent during the 1970s (see table). However, food requirements increased by about 4 per cent, equivalent to the United Nations food production target for the Second International Development Decade. This was due to rapid population growth in the developing world and rising incomes in a number of countries, notably the oil-exporting countries. The gap between production and higher food needs was made up, although only in part, by rapidly rising food imports, financed commercially, and by food aid. The cereal imports of the developing countries, for instance, are estimated to have risen to some 98 million tons in 1981/82.[3] This is almost two-and-a-half times the 1970 level and about six-and-a-half times that of the early 1960s; in the 1930s, developing countries were exporters of food grains.

The aggregate data conceal wide disparities in the food situation and prospects among different countries. There have been outstanding achievements in food production in Asia, notably in India, Indonesia, Pakistan and the Philippines; these have had dramatic effects on their economic prospects, but have not as yet significantly affected the nutrition standards of their lower-income populations.

There has, however, been a serious drop in food production and availability in the least developed countries as a whole, where population growth rates are leading food production by a substantial margin (see table). Food production in this group increased by 2.2 per cent a year between 1971 and 1980, but declined by about 0.4 per cent in terms of per capita food availability from domestic production.

The situation is even more grim in Africa, which contains the majority of the least developed countries. Here average annual production growth stagnated at 1.7 per cent during the 1970s; for many countries growth was

Changes in total and per capita food production (crops and livestock), developing countries, 1971-80
(%)

	Change		Annual rate of change		
	1979-80	1980-81	1971-75	1976-80	1971-80
Total food production					
Market economies	3.1	3.9	3.2	2.5	3.2
Africa	4.1	2.0	1.7	1.8	1.7
Far East	3.6	6.0	3.4	2.4	3.4
Latin America	2.9	3.3	3.7	3.3	3.9
Near East	1.1	0.7	3.6	1.8	3.3
Asian centrally planned economies	−0.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.2
All developing countries	2.0	3.8	3.3	2.8	3.2
Least developed countries	5.1	0.8	2.8	2.3	2.2
Per capita food production					
Market economies	0.5	1.3	0.7	−0.2	0.6
Africa	1.0	−1.0	−1.1	−1.1	−1.2
Far East	1.1	3.5	1.0	−0.1	0.9
Latin America	0.2	0.6	1.0	0.6	1.2
Near East	−1.7	−2.1	0.9	−1.0	0.6
Asian centrally planned economies	−1.8	2.1	1.7	2.0	1.6
All developing countries	−0.3	1.5	1.0	0.5	1.0
Least developed countries	2.2	−2.0	0.4	−0.5	−0.4

Source: United Nations, World Food Council: *Current world food situation*, Note by the Executive Director, Eighth ministerial session, Mexico City, 1982 (Rome, 1982; doc. WFC/1982/7).

negative, reflecting the declining trend from the 2.5 per cent rate of production growth in the 1960s. The reduction in average food production per capita since 1970 has been over 1 per cent annually because of adverse climatic conditions, civil strife in some areas and generally poor agricultural policies.

The employment picture is also gloomy. ILO statistics for some 45 developing countries suggest that, in about 15 of them, the number of unemployed has more than doubled during the past ten years.[4] In countries with large populations, such as India and Indonesia, the rise was approximately threefold. In some smaller ones, such as Burma and Thailand, the number of unemployed appears to have increased more than fivefold. Although there has apparently been a drop in unemployment in a dozen countries, in the remaining 18 unemployment has increased in proportions ranging from 15 to 62 per cent.

Young people are particularly affected by rising unemployment. In many developing countries, adults of 15-24 years of age accounted for 50-75 per cent of total unemployed in 1980.[5] One person out of five in the

developing world belongs to this age group. By the year 2000, their numbers will have increased from the present 665 million to close to 900 million. Unemployment of youth is probably the most critical socio-economic problem of today, especially in developing countries, and is likely to remain so for the rest of the century.

What is clear from the picture outlined above is that successful food production programmes are but one of the major strategies in the fight against hunger. More jobs and a more equitable distribution of income are other important elements.

The dimensions of hunger

In estimating the number of hungry people in the world, the problems with food production and related statistics in developing countries are compounded by uncertainties regarding the distribution of available food and differing standards of human food requirements. Basing itself on data of the mid-1970s, the World Bank estimates the number of *inadequately fed* people, i.e. those whose food intakes fall short of average requirements, at over 1,000 million.[6] Using similar food production and distribution data but much more severe criteria for defining "hunger"–intake levels inadequate even for a minimum of physical activity, let alone for leading an active and productive life–FAO puts the number of *seriously undernourished* people at 435 million. World Bank estimates of the *absolute poor* (those unable to satisfy their most basic needs) at some 750 million fall between the upper and lower estimates of those suffering from food deficiency.

However the numbers are estimated, the outlook for the elimination of hunger in the world by the year 2000 is not encouraging. Both World Bank and FAO estimates have predicted more hunger by the turn of the century if past trends of economic development and food production continue, with FAO's study, *Agriculture: Toward 2000 (AT 2000)*, suggesting an increase of some 35 per cent from its 1974-76 estimate of 435 million seriously undernourished to close to 600 million.[7] Even under *AT 2000*'s most optimistic development scenario, with assumptions of annual economic growth (7 per cent) and food production (3.7 per cent) in the developing countries approximating the objectives of the International Development Strategy, it is projected that some 260 million people would remain hungry at the end of the century. This scenario is unlikely to materialise, given the effects of the current economic crisis on development prospects. A more modest assumption by *AT 2000* sees the number of seriously undernourished people in the year 2000 at about the same level as today; and a recent United Nations study casts doubts on the prospects for achieving any reduction in their numbers, concluding that, unless energetic steps are taken, the numbers of the absolute poor will increase by one-third, to 1,000 million, before the end of the present decade.[8]

A concerted attack on hunger

Given all these difficulties, what, then, should be done to arrest growing hunger in the years ahead and eliminate it by the year 2000, in support of the objectives of the International Development Strategy? Essentially, the World Food Council believes that what is required is a two-pronged approach to the problem:

first, the developing countries with largely agrarian economies need to place a much higher priority on investment in basic food and agricultural development and to formulate comprehensive national food strategies. The technical programmes of FAO and other development agencies can best realise their potential when their individual efforts are part of more comprehensive national policy incentives and food strategies;

second, a more concerted attack should be made on hunger as part of efforts to accelerate economic growth and distribute its benefits more widely.

For the World Food Council the national food sector plays a unique role, not only in food production and distribution but in economic progress in general. With this in mind, direct measures to raise food consumption as part of a drive to increase production and generate incomes for those in need will have to go well beyond what has been done so far.

National food strategies

Many countries are making determined efforts to restructure their national food sectors and mobilise increased investments by adopting more effective food policies. National food strategies are now widely accepted as a means of achieving this and of integrating food policies with wider economic and social policies and reforms by transcending the sometimes sharp sectoral demarcations in national decision-making.[9] An outstanding example is the Mexican Food System, which pursues the dual objective of increasing national food self-sufficiency and ensuring adequate food consumption for all Mexicans. Specifically, it seeks to improve the nutritional status of the poorest 19 million people through a combination of small-farm production programmes and consumer subsidy policies. The System is co-ordinated by the President's Office, thereby ensuring its integration with the Government's over-all development policy.

Food strategies not only facilitate the co-ordination of national efforts, but also provide a focus for the mobilisation and co-ordination of international assistance. In order to be more effective, development assistance agencies need to redirect and liberalise their lending procedures and criteria and terms of assistance, placing the emphasis on loans for sectors and subsectors rather than on credit for individual projects. The resources of

multilateral agencies should be expanded, to enable them to sustain and increase their investment assistance to food and agriculture and to strengthen institutions for food strategy implementation in the developing countries.

Some 50 countries are now engaged in food strategy reviews. The initiative launched by the World Food Council during 1980, following its fifth ministerial session in Ottawa, thus appears to be meeting the need of developing countries to intensify their efforts in a framework which provides for increased international support.

Turning the tide: Direct measures

In pursuing the dual objective of raising food production and improving poor families' access to food, food strategies are necessarily concerned with measures which involve underemployed and undernourished people more directly and effectively in the achievement of development objectives. This means concentrating on reforms and measures to ensure adequate food-purchasing power for landless families, including land tenure improvement and resettlement programmes to achieve greater equity in economic opportunity and income distribution. Given the structural and other obstacles in most countries, implementation of some of these measures will take many years, especially under conditions of economic stagnation or slow growth. To turn the tide of growing hunger and to provide food for all by the end of the century will therefore require a much more forceful policy orientation towards more immediately effective measures.

Some countries have already achieved improvements in food consumption through food-entitlement measures such as subsidies and rationing programmes and other direct measures such as small-holder programmes, credit schemes for poor families and special public works. But measures of this kind have to develop within a policy framework—such as a national food strategy—truly aimed at hunger and poverty reduction. Most countries will therefore need to expand and redirect their programmes, at the same time paying more attention to their design. Maximising the benefits from direct measures will require each country to combine programmes immediately capable of preventing hunger from worsening with longer-term action to eliminate it by the turn of the century. Greater emphasis must be given to linking food consumption policies with production programmes; promoting self-help and private initiatives; and focusing services and assistance more sharply on those in need.

There are both trade-offs and synergistic effects among different measures for reducing hunger. Generally, those with the potential for rapid effect—such as food subsidies—tend to be more expensive, while greater recourse to projects designed to achieve self-reliance through a progressive raising of productivity reduces costs over time and is thus financially feasible, but is often constrained by difficulties of administration or social problems.[10]

Overcoming hunger will therefore require political determination and managerial ingenuity to tackle the administrative difficulties inherent in such measures.

Direct measures for small farmers

Paradoxically, about half of the world's hungry people—and the majority of those in Africa—have a potential for growing their own food. This underlines the importance of specific measures for small land-holders and tenant farmers, even though in many cases the land is marginal and its occupants are partially dependent on off-farm employment.

Assistance to small land-holders not only promotes equity but encourages national growth. Low-cost, simple technology packages emphasising improved cultivation practices, could increase their food production and consequently their consumption in a comparatively short time. However, if small-holder programmes are to realise this potential they will require a higher degree of political priority and administrative support than programmes for larger farms which are more highly organised at the outset. Given appropriate support, small producers can achieve high standards of husbandry and market orientation. Malawi's *Achikumbe* small-holder programme, for instance, initiated in the mid-1960s, has helped to make the country largely self-sufficient in staples and to significantly reduce food insecurity among most of the population, both rural and urban. Its approach embraces a combination of land reform, measures to increase and diversify agricultural production, establishment of agro-related industries in rural areas, and infrastructural improvements. Part of its success is attributable to the Government's general policy to improve the standard of living of the rural population, including such measures as provision of safe drinking-water, primary health care and educational facilities. This policy has also helped to keep rural-urban migration at a rate lower than that in other countries of the region.

Despite the progress made in Malawi and in other countries, such as Indonesia and Mexico, the implementation of small-farm programmes lags well behind the potential. Greater efforts are required from both governments and development assistance agencies to expand their operations in this sector.

Productive credit for low-income families

Small-holder agriculture often produces high returns on capital, yet its access to credit has been far from commensurate with these. Better credit facilities, probably emphasising improvement of loan administration, will therefore be a key element in any package of assistance for small-holders.

Landless families have long been penalised by the denial of credit on reasonable terms. The provision of small loans to this group for productive

purposes is a promising new approach to asset and income generation. Early experience with India's *Antyodaya* programme[11] and Bangladesh's Grameen Bank[12] suggests high returns on capital, few defaults and considerable economic multiplier effects at low cost—a largely self-financing operation. Although relatively high administrative demands tend to limit the pace of expansion of such schemes in the short run, they could make an important contribution to reducing hunger and poverty in the medium term.

Special labour-intensive investment programmes

To extend food and economic support to large numbers of landless people and marginal farmers with insufficient production potential, special public works programmes were recommended by the 1976 World Employment Conference and the 1979 World Conference on Agrarian Reform and Rural Development. Many countries have operated such programmes in some form, with emphasis on relief-oriented food distribution and employment.

Special works programmes can not only generate jobs quickly and effectively augment the incomes of the really poor, but can also yield important productivity increases and stimulate additional economic activity and employment. This latter point has received less attention than it deserves. With more productive labour-intensive infrastructure investment in rural and urban areas, the additional economic activity generated by special works can contribute to a sustained reduction of hunger and poverty.

Special works can also stimulate private initiative and self-reliance, for example through community self-help and the creation of labour co-operatives. This has been demonstrated by the ILO Inter-regional Special Public Works Programme, which has so far been joined by 18 countries, ten of them in sub-Saharan Africa.

The problems associated with special works, which have occasionally cast doubt on their effectiveness, have been extensively analysed by the World Bank and the ILO, and the conditions for the success of special works programmes are now better understood. According to the ILO analysis, first priority should go to those which both permit maximum labour utilisation and bestow ownership of the assets created on participating workers. Examples which may be cited are land development and reclamation for distribution to landless workers; infrastructural works connected with land settlement and colonisation schemes or in areas predominantly inhabited by small and marginal farmers; and economic infrastructural projects (crop extraction, roads, reforestation and market centres) on common or public land in the vicinity of target group settlements.[13].

The ILO analysis identifies social infrastructural works to meet urgent basic needs such as safe drinking-water, low-cost housing and school and health centre construction as second priority. Infrastructural works to enhance the production potential of land belonging to better-off landowners,

provided that the latter bear their economic costs, are identified as third priority.

Similarly, there is an improved understanding of ways of increasing workers' participation in special works programmes. Given the need to guarantee productive employment, there is a new political determination to overcome administrative constraints in order to realise the potential of redirected and expanded special works.

Consumer food subsidies

Consumer food subsidies in various forms–general retail-price subsidisation for basic foods, coupons, rationing, free food distribution–have been used in many countries.[14] Subsidies have the potential for reducing hunger fairly quickly, but they lack the direct income-generating effects of employment-oriented investment measures. This naturally makes them less desirable in the longer term.

Careful targeting can, of course, reduce costs. A promising approach is the combination of food-subsidy programmes aimed at households with young children and health, educational and related services provided through primary health care networks. Such programmes also maximise returns on human capital investment at the most critical age of life. Within the next few years, many developing countries should, according to WHO and UNICEF estimates, have sufficiently developed primary health care networks which could be used effectively to establish household entitlement to food supplements, with actual food distribution handled, to the extent possible, through regular commercial channels. Colombia's food-coupon programme is a pioneering example of a project operating along these lines. Food coupons are distributed to eligible families by local health workers and can be used for the purchase of a limited range of food products at local retail stores. After operating in eight out of a total of some 20 provinces for several years, the programme is scheduled for national coverage shortly.

Better food aid utilisation

Except in the case of small-holders, a major expansion of the direct measures discussed would immediately increase food demand, while corresponding production increases would take several years. This temporary supply gap would have to be met by increased imports, including expansion or redirection of food aid. At present, some two-thirds of total food aid is provided as commodity aid to maintain aggregate urban consumption levels and serve as balance-of-payments and public-budget support. The use of such assistance for resource transfers to developing countries is not questioned, but it remains a concern that the benefits of food aid should more directly reach the hungry and malnourished.

Estimating the costs

Cost estimates for the reduction of hunger are necessarily of a speculative nature, depending on the scale and effectiveness of projected programme activities. Cost comparisons between different hunger-reducing measures are further complicated by the varying degrees to which these measures generate future economic activity through multiplier effects and by assumptions concerning the distribution of the benefits derived from it. Clearly, the costs of a consumer subsidy programme which primarily provides an immediate food and income transfer cannot be assessed in the same terms as those of a production-oriented rural works programme which includes immediate economic and food relief to people in need as a component of additional investments in longer-term development.

For example, on certain assumptions concerning the benefits from additional investments applied annually for 15 years to the reduction of hunger, it can be estimated that $1,000 million of additional annual outlays would provide subsidies to raise food intake to adequate levels for 50 million people who would otherwise be hungry and malnourished. For children and mothers of poor families, there is no better method of providing adequate food. Since it is estimated that at least 100 million of the hungry are children, pregnant women and nursing mothers, the cost of reaching them immediately would be of the order of $2,000 million annually.

In contrast, $1,000 million invested annually over 15 years in special works programmes to create agricultural infrastructure could provide income to ensure adequate food in the first year for close to 30 million who would otherwise be hungry, and income accruing over time to labour from the increased productivity of cumulative investment could benefit some 95 million people by the fifteenth year.

As data on the *Antyodaya* programme show,[11] the returns in income generation could be up to three times greater for small credit programmes to increase the productivity of the poor, although the scope of such programmes is more limited than that of special works. Even allowing for large slippages in economic returns as a result of expansion and replicability problems, slowly expanding small credit programmes hold great promise for direct hunger and poverty reduction in the medium term.

These somewhat speculative figures suggest that annual investments of the order of $4,000 million, in a combination of properly directed measures, could go a long way towards reducing hunger by the end of the century. For example, global programmes allocating, say, $1,500 million to productive public works benefiting marginal farmers and landless families, and $1,000 million to mother and child food entitlements or other subsidies could gradually reduce hunger among 400-500 million people over the next 15 years. In this example, three-fourths of total investments would directly support economic development in the areas of food production, agricultural infrastructure and rural economic activities. The other fourth would be

human capital investment to safeguard the healthy development of future generations as a basis for subsequent economic development.

However, the actual costs of a global programme could well be significantly higher–perhaps $6,000-8,000 million–for a number of reasons not fully accounted for in the above estimates. Among these could be such considerations as socio-political and administrative difficulties in the design and implementation of direct measures, the impact of changing national and international economic factors, and a possible emphasis on more immediately effective, less productive programmes, within the total mix of direct measures dictated by the needs of certain countries. Global estimates in this regard are less useful than country-by-country programmes, which can and must take account of such factors.

Even with these qualifications, the eradication of hunger by the turn of the century can be said to be economically feasible and well within the reach of world resources. Additional expenditure of $6,000-8,000 million annually for 15 years may seem high, but amounts to only about 1-1.5 per cent of current annual world armaments spending.

Poor countries would, of course, require external assistance: initial food aid to meet rising demand from poor families, financial assistance for investment in income- and asset-generating schemes, and technical advice. However, the major limitation will be administrative rather than financial. Progress in eliminating hunger is most likely to be constrained by the need to strengthen administrative capacities in a number of developing countries and to design programmes which take account of them.

Trade policies

Increased export opportunities are vital to enable the poorer countries to develop their economies and meet their immediate import needs, especially for essential food supplies.

It is trade–rather than aid–policies which are most crucial in the fight against world hunger. For when the terms of trade turn against low-income countries and export earnings decline, as they have in the last two years, employment and incomes fall and hunger and malnutrition worsen. Admittedly, there is a need for a better policy balance between incentives for exports and crops for domestic consumption. But there is also a need for an improved framework of commodity agreements and compensatory financing to stabilise export earnings, as well as sustained expansion of the developing countries' access to markets.

Moreover, it is imperative for developed countries to adjust their economies so as to abandon protectionist policies, so that trade patterns may benefit all countries. In the meantime, the level of development assistance for food must be substantially increased in the next few years in response to the efforts of the developing countries themselves.

Conclusion

In the present adverse economic climate the outlook is one of growing hunger and sharply increasing numbers of unemployed (particularly among youth) and absolute poor within this decade. Overcoming hunger must therefore remain a central concern of development efforts throughout the world. Higher priority for food production in the developing countries, combined with specific measures to reach the undernourished, must be supported by a concerted international effort to increase investment flows to achieve these objectives. National food strategies are recognised as a means towards this end.

Today, more than ever before, it is in the interest of all countries–in North, South, East and West–to act to resolve pressing food and hunger problems. There is a growing understanding of the need to turn the swelling tide of poverty and hunger and contribute to economic recovery by focusing development efforts more sharply on the national food sector and on direct measures to reduce hunger and unemployment.

The costs of an accelerated programme of direct measures to reduce hunger as part of a campaign to raise productivity and generate incomes and assets lie within the capacity of world economic resources. However, the political, social and administrative constraints are real and should not be underestimated. Overcoming them will require a much greater and more ingenious effort in which the international community will have a major role to play. If such an effort is launched, there are prospects that the objective of food and jobs for all can still be achieved by the turn of the century.

Policies and measures to resolve food problems would in themselves contribute significantly to a restructured and expanding world economy. And this, in turn, would provide the basis for a renewal of international confidence and a shift from regressive nationalism towards a new international order that would meet the needs of all the world's people.

Notes

[1] United Nations: *Launching of global negotiations on international economic co-operation for development: Development and international economic co-operation*, Letter dated 26 October 1981 from the Permanent Representatives of Canada and Mexico to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, General Assembly, 36th Session (New York, 1981; doc. A/36/631), Annex, "Summary by the Co-Chairmen of the International Meeting on Co-operation and Development", p. 3.

[2] Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department for Development Co-operation: "The fight against world hunger", in *Cooperazione*, Special issue (Rome, ICT, 1982).

[3] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: *Food Outlook* (Rome), 23 Mar. 1982, p. 2.

[4] ILO: *Year Book of Labour Statistics, 1981* (Geneva, 1982), pp. 315-327.

[5] Idem: *Report of the Director-General*, International Labour Conference, 68th Session, 1982, p. 16.

[6] United Nations, Administrative Committee on Co-ordination, Subcommittee on Nutrition: *Statement on measuring the magnitude of the nutrition problem at a global level* (note SCN 5/16 of 13 May 1982).

[7] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations: *Agriculture: Toward 2000* (Rome, 1981), p. 21.

[8] J. Ripert: "International development: 1981 critical policy issues", in *UN Chronicle* (New York), July 1981, p. ii.

[9] For details of the food strategy approach, see United Nations, World Food Council: *National food strategies to eradicate hunger* (Rome, 1982).

[10] Idem: *Food security for people–direct measures to reduce hunger*, Report by the Executive Director (Rome, 1982; doc. WFC/1982/6).

[11] P. Chopra: "The roots, flowers and thorns of Antyodaya", in *Monthly Public Opinion Surveys*, Vol. XXV, No. 6.

[12] International Fund for Agricultural Development, Economic and Planning Department: "IFAD's credit projects–An opportunity to reach the poor" (Rome, IFAD, 1982), pp. 15, 31-34 and 37-42.

[13] S. Guha: "Income redistribution through labour-intensive public works: some policy issues", in *International Labour Review*, Jan.-Feb. 1981, pp. 67-82.

[14] United Nations, World Food Council: *Toward the eradication of hunger: Food-subsidy and direct-distribution programmes*, Sixth ministerial session, Arusha, Tanzania, June 1980 (Rome, 1980; doc. WFC/1980/3).