Fostering Political Will for Food Security

By Jean-Charles Le Vallée
Development Gateway Food Security Guide, Co-Founder/Member of Food Secure Canada, Canadian Association for Food Studies, Ottawa Just Food, PhD Candidate at Carleton University and past Coordinator of the Food Security Bureau of Canada
Comments to: levallee@msu.edu

Note from author: We are now celebrating ten years since the WFS yet the number of food insecure remains stubbornly high in absolute terms. I have taken part in the WFS process from afar, volunteering time to manage both the official web site and internet forum for the FAO 50th anniversary symposium in Quebec City in 1995, and the joint north-American forum at Michigan State University in 1996 in preparation for the WFS. I also volunteered time to belatedly run a discussion group for the WFS: fyl in 2002. I recall more recently, we put out a piece for World Food Day in 2003 that the 2015 goals would only be achieved in 2115. Now there is a Special WFS Forum October 30-31 held in conjunction with the 32nd session of the FAO Commission on World Food Security in Rome, and in response, I have drafted this paper to further the debate around political will. It is not exhaustive as I am defending my PhD thesis on food system resilience this semester but reckon it still makes a compelling case. I chose political will as the topic because it should be given the highest priority yet it gets modest attention if any. I see the term frequently used but without substance, no definition, or lacking on ways to foster political will for food security. This paper is an attempt to address these gaps. I hope the paper will galvanise thinking and further replenish the fight against food insecurity. I look forward to your comments.

Abstract: The paper reviews developments in global and national political relations, thinking, and related institutional changes; the effect of such developments on the incidence of hunger; the ability and willingness of governments to eradicate hunger; and the efforts to foster greater political will for food security. The paper makes a strong case for good governance while mechanisms for policy development are essential to achieving food security. Building blocks such as the right to food, well-organized advocacy, self-help, partnerships and investments in public goods, are fundamental elements in advancing the food security agenda. Increasing awareness of the above blocks may be a useful reference point for policy debate and the setting of appropriate mechanisms. The aim should be to provide information to national leaders and policy-makers so that appropriate decisions can be taken, evaluation of progress made, to further foster and sustain political will in efforts to end food insecurity.

Keywords: Food security, political will, good governance, public goods, policy

"We have the means, we have the capacity to eliminate hunger from the face of the earth in our lifetime. We need only the will."
President John F. Kennedy, The First World Food Congress, Washington, D.C., 1963

Introduction

Food insecurity persists largely because of governance and policy failure at the national level (Paarlberg 2002). Paarlberg adds where national governments have performed well in the developing world, hunger has been significantly reduced, while in those regions where hunger is not yet under control, improving governance at the national level must now be the highest priority. Good governance, including the rule of law, transparency, lack of corruption, conflict prevention and resolution, sound public administration, and respect and protection for human rights, is of critical importance to assure sustainable food security. Where national governments fail to take appropriate action, food security fails. While such actions should involve a process of consultation and action by a full range of actors, the primary initiative lies with national governments and public investments (Paarlberg 2002). National governments remain the most appropriate, and frequently the only major supplier of essential public goods (Pinstrup-Andersen 2003). Given the importance of these goods, how can the political will of national governments be fostered in efforts to reduce food and nutrition insecurity?

The world has the capacity to feed its population adequately today and in the future, and many international and national institutional arrangements for achieving this are in place (FAO 2002). Over the past several years, many reports and conferences on world hunger, such as the 2002 World Food Summit: five years later, have concluded with a call for more political will (Beckmann 2002). In addition, attainment of the Millennium Development Goal on hunger is principally constrained by political will (Scherr et al. 2003). If famine is to be eradicated, political will - national and international - is more essential at this point than technical capacity, e.g. food production and distribution (Devereux 1999). The concern is how to generate and sustain the political will, notably at the national level, to translate commitments into actions.

These prescribed actions are not often taken or are only partially implemented. Whether national leaders can initiate the complex processes needed to bring about rapid reductions in food insecurity depends on their standing and leadership in their own countries, on the capacity of the institutions over which they preside, on whether potentially feasible solutions exist, on the availability of resources, and on whether those responsible for taking action are persuaded of the validity of the prescribed actions (FAO 2003).

While new policy action is also needed in industrialized countries where food and nutrition insecurity, and unsustainable use of natural resources are significant problems, this paper addresses these problems only as they apply to developing countries. In this paper, political will is taken to mean: the extent to which those with political responsibility for the well-being and food security of a country's inhabitants, devote efforts and resources, through actions and policies, to fight food and nutrition insecurity. Within a given country, political will ranges from the highest political position centrally to the various local levels in government. Governmental programmes will benefit from said leadership when national leaders come forward to adopt them: it would firm up the bureaucracy, sensitize the media, encourage social and volunteer organizations, and heighten personal commitments. Consequently, political will can translate into national will.

The paper reviews: a) recent developments in global and national political relations, thinking, and related institutional changes, b) the effect of such developments on the incidence of hunger, c) the ability and willingness of governments to eradicate hunger, and d) the efforts to foster greater political will for food security.

These four points are central to the argument presented here and appear across the subsequent sub-sections. They are intertwined and only offer a complete picture in combination. The paper starts with a short statement to set the context for a national perspective on political will. It then reviews and appraises examples where political will has either frustrated attempts to address food insecurity and examples where political will has been formulated into a cohesive set of policies and programs to address food insecurity. These case studies then set the foundation for articulating the key constructs to focus political will in a way conducive to reducing food and nutrition insecurity.

Actors and Context

From the international community to the consumer, many actors are involved in ensuring food security. Despite globalization, most food insecurity today is still highly localized and locally generated (Paarlberg 2002). Although the focus of this paper is on fostering political will at the national level, energetic and well-organized political advocacy is essential in mobilizing action, both domestically and internationally, as actors such as international donors to community organizations and other stakeholders, fight food and nutrition insecurity.

Efforts by national political institutions to fight food and nutrition insecurity are hampered by the complexities of food policy. The process of improving policy is also problematic. Lang (2003) identifies public pressure as one of the main drivers of policy change in the food arena, reflecting concerns about health and the state of the environment. Public pressure for change, however, is beginning to mount. Haddad (2003) identifies seven triggers for public action including social disapproval, mass movements, and interest-group action. In food security planning, policy requires reformulation, while institutions need restructuring (Clay 2003).

Additionally, the will of such political institutions to address the potential impacts of marginal policy issues may be fostered by the actors and stakeholders concerned with, or affected by, food insecurity (Maxwell and Slater 2003). Globally for example, trans-national civil society movements are emerging as powerful advocates for a more equitable world, demonstrating that there is broad popular support in both developed and developing countries for addressing hunger[1]. For example, the governments of China (Zhai et al. 2002) and Brazil (Coitinho et al. 2002) have begun taking steps towards improving their food supply and physical environment, as their populations confront transiting diets and nutrition, and are looking at how to influence public policy from community intervention to national programming[2].

When political institutions fail to address the inter-connectedness of food security, trust is lost (Lang 2003). Trust is the central issue in food policy. According to Lang, this is most clearly seen in times of war or crisis, when food's multi-sectoral impact emerges from the analytical and

_____

[1] See for example, www.foodsovereignty.org
[2] See also Puska et al. 2002

3

practical shadows to take centre stage in political life. He concludes that the need for a multi-sectoral approach in food policy is well appreciated in the study and management of hunger.

At the national level, renewed determination and commitment on the part of governments, strongly backed by such international bodies and also by civil society, is paramount. Fortunately, in the U.S., Brazil and Africa, there are some positive signs of political mobilization around this issue (Scherr et al. 2003). For example, InterAction, an umbrella group of development and relief non-governmental organizations based in North America, is effectively lobbying for policy support in the U.S., as is the U.S. Alliance Against Hunger. And Bread for the World, an American anti-hunger advocacy group, has found that religious communities are a core constituency on hunger issues. In Brazil, political processes initiated by civil society led to the development of the Zero Hunger Program. In addition, grassroots groups in Africa have used the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper process to reduce corruption, strengthen democracy and improve health and education service for impoverished and hungry people[3].

Hence, many non-governmental and civil society organisations are already deeply engaged in coping with food emergencies and in providing support services to small farming communities and households, often with an emphasis on sustainable land use practices or HIV/AIDS and nutrition education. Others have played a prominent role in the post World Food Summit consultative process on the right to food[4], led by the High Commissioner for Human Rights. These organizations are likely to form coalitions, taking advantage of improved networking possibilities, and to become increasingly effective forces in ensuring greater international and national commitment to addressing food issues.

Significant advances have been made in thinking on human rights issues as well, particularly on how concepts underlying the right to food can contribute to the design of effective programmes for hunger eradication[5]. This thinking emphasizes the primary role of the individual, the household, and the community in meeting their own food needs, while attributing a fulfilment role to governments, activated when the assurance of access to adequate and safe food is clearly beyond local capacities. In addition, the ability of governments and governance structures to guarantee universal access to vital resources is a key element of their effectiveness and legitimacy (Liberatore 2001).

Governments also have an important role to play in creating the conditions for local efforts to succeed, for instance by assuring internal peace - a public good - and conditions for effective participation in political processes. They are also required to ensure that food is not used as an instrument for political or economic pressure, as in Zimbabwe for example. Well-targeted food and nutrition communication and education campaigns can have a profound effect on public opinion about issues concerning poverty, hunger and malnutrition. They can be a powerful tool for generating the popular will (e.g. consumer or public pressure), and consequently the political and national will, necessary to alleviate poverty and hunger (FAO 2003, Lang 2003).

---

[3] Additional findings show that democratization helps reduce child hunger rates, as do reductions in international arms trade (Jenkins 2002).
[4] See www.righttofood.org
[5] See www.fao.org/righttofood/en/index.html

Internationally, the elimination of poverty is a central theme of many policy statements by most of the development institutions. Many such strategies supported by these institutions have shown a conspicuous lack of focus on food security issues and have much to learn from past experience in the food and nutrition sectors (Maxwell 1998). Furthermore, their concern about hunger has been confined largely to emergency situations. However, such emergencies have also contributed new insights, especially about the value of participation and the importance of political processes (Booth 2003).

The simultaneous persistence of widespread extreme food deprivation and plentiful food supplies in a world with modern means of communications and transportation suggests that there are fundamental flaws in the ways in which nations function and the relationships between them are governed. Indeed, the World Health Organisation (WHO) has appealed to governments to act to prevent the double burden of food related ill-health problems associated with under- and over-consumption coinciding in the same country. The WHO and the Food and Agriculture Organisation (2003) are now in agreement that the productionist era in food policy has come to an end. Mere quantity is an inadequate policy goal. Quality, distribution and externalized social, health and environmental costs also have to be central to the policy framework.

Assessments of national political commitment to address food insecurity are bound to be subjective until firm evidence emerges of faster progress towards the eradication of hunger (FAO 2003). Political commitment, policy-making and regulation present the familiar problem of how to deal with a crosscutting issue, particularly in relation to new developments such as biotechnology that cut across national borders. There are indications that several developing countries are now recognizing the critical role that the rural sector plays in a process of broad-based economic development. These countries are committed to promoting agricultural growth, focusing particularly on new domestic and international market opportunities[6]. But these countries are exceptions; many developing countries continue to pursue urban-biased food price policies, with little evidence of a genuine determination to stamp out chronic hunger and malnutrition or to promote rural development (Bates 1998).

What's more, official development assistance for agriculture has fallen steadily in recent decades, and the proportion of the new international loan commitments to agricultural and rural development reached an all-time low in 2000. Public spending on agriculture has stagnated: in the 1970s it was 15.1%, in the 1980s, it came down to 5.1%, while it further declined to 1.3% in the 1990s (Babu 2004). Until recently, there was little evidence of a rise in international or domestic resource allocation for agricultural development, which should be part of any programme aimed at reducing food insecurity (CIDA 2003).

Finally, there is also growing recognition of the negative impact of North American and European farm subsidies, and a political willingness of key actors, such as the World Bank, to take a high-profile position in arguing to modify them (Scherr et al. 2003). Consequently, developed countries, backed by international institutions, especially those concerned with trade must also contribute to hunger eradication by opening their markets, to the agricultural exports of developing countries by reducing dumping and subsidies on farm products; by sharing technology; and by substantially expanding funding for relevant public goods.

---

[6] See for example www.aec.msu.edu/agecon/fs2/ the work in Mali

Examples of Where Insufficient Political Will Hinders Food Security

Below are three examples of how food insecurity is exacerbated by conflict, corruption, incoherent policies and inaction.

Jenkins (2002) depicts how political will failures can increase food insecurity. He draws particular attention to several factors illustrating how internal violence in countries, e.g. civil wars, have the greatest effect on child hunger. However, inadequate political will goes beyond civil wars and can involve the use of food as a means of control by political leaders or warring factions. Hence, obstacles to improved distribution are primarily political. Overall, Jenkins concludes that conflict regulation, violence prevention, the reduction of international arms trade, and the protection of civil and political rights should be central to policies that address hunger.

Another example is where the Green Revolution did not succeed, as the roots of its failure, or at least the lack of penetration of the technology, can be traced to incompetent or corrupt governments not providing the environments conducive for adoption. The Green Revolution had an uneven impact throughout the developing world, however, despite some criticism, the technology benefited many poor people (Mellor 1976, Lipton with Longhurst 1989). Nonetheless, the Green Revolution took place primarily in the well-watered or irrigated plains of Asia, the Middle East and Latin America (FAO 2002). Farmers and consumers who benefited most were those located in better lands with relatively good transport infrastructure, with irrigation or adequate rainfall, access to improved seed, fertilizer, credit and markets, and located in countries where the political will existed to support such a transformation to industrialised agriculture. As research throughout the developing world suggests, governmental policy has tended to be antithetical to the interests of most farmers (Bates 1998).

Bates (1998) further argues that where there are representative assemblies whose members are accountable to constituencies, political pressures will arise for the provision of favourable policies for farmers, given that farm districts tend to outnumber urban constituencies, improving food security. According to the pluralist view of policy formulation - an alternative to the assumption of welfare maximization, where policy then becomes a bargaining outcome - governments do not pursue transcendent social interests but rather respond to private demands. Political will then becomes detrimental to all the food insecure. As a result, public policy is regarded as an outcome of political competition among organized groups, e.g. the influential force of urban consumers on lowering food prices because of geographic concentration and strategic location. Where governments are subject to competitive elections, for example, the evidence suggests they are more sensitive to rural interests, as farmers constitute a political majority in many developing countries.

A final example of where insufficient political will hinders food security, are the policy problems apparent during the Southern African food security crisis, particularly in Zimbabwe, which are due to a combination of domestic political structures and processes that inhibits the pursuit of coherent policies for national development and the reduction of poverty. These problems are further exacerbated by patterns of action and inaction by the major external actors that are

incapable of compensating for the lack of domestic commitment to reform, in some ways reinforcing it, and in other ways contributing additional difficulties (Bird et al. 2003).

Example of Effective Political Will

Misguided or insufficient political will as seen above can be detrimental to food security. Mounting pressure from concerned actors and stakeholders can also enhance political will, thereby becoming a key construct in support of alleviating food insecurity. Thailand imparts one example of how political will has been focused, providing a foundation to address food insecurity (adapted from FAO 2002):

Over three decades ago, the government of Thailand recognized malnutrition as a national problem concentrated in rural areas. It decided to address the problem through a community-driven rural development programme. Improving the nation's nutritional status was considered to be a productive investment - a public good - and not a welfare expense. This was reflected in a national policy calling for accelerated action focused on the improvement of nutrition as a critical element in poverty alleviation. A national rural development policy and plan was developed with the involvement of planning officials, staff from many sectors, academics and community representatives. Improved nutrition, closely aligned with poverty alleviation, became a central element of a broader economic and social contract between the government and people. Poverty was to be addressed in all its dimensions and not from an income perspective alone. It entailed integrated multi-sectoral actions linked to income generation opportunities in order to improve the nutrition of communities. Programme components included rural job creation, village development projects, complete coverage of basic minimum services for the community, and an expansion of food production (with an emphasis on improving diet quality). At first, these activities covered only the poorest third of the country, but they soon encompassed the entire nation.

The case study above shows that decentralization created opportunities. Coupled with good governance and partnerships, decentralization was critical to the success of community-based approaches to reduce food insecurity and malnutrition. Hence, a community-government partnership was developed and fostered through broad-based social mobilization strategies. Among other reasons for Thailand's success in eradicating malnutrition in a single decade was its decision, and political will, to invest in human capital. The country recognized that the measures introduced must have a social foundation, and that the concept of self-help is central to collective action against food insecurity and malnutrition.

As a final point, decentralization over the last two decades has resulted in a diminished role for national governments in many developing countries. In addition, decentralization is expected to increase in the future, making possible new forms of farmer and consumer organizations to address food security, including governance of food systems. But institutional decentralisation has yet to be adequately resourced for local institutions to fulfil an expanded mandate (FAO 2002). And for the poor to benefit from decentralization, it must occur in the context of a genuine devolution of political power that permits the democratic participation of local people in decision-making. It is of questionable benefit, however, if the legal system cannot prevent the abuse of power by local elites (von Braun 2002).

Advancing the Food Security Agenda: A Political Will Perspective

There is a pressing need to assess the practical steps that could be taken to build the necessary political will (Beckmann 2002). The examples above of political will, or its absence, illustrate several key constructs that can become the building blocks for developing a political will environment that will end food insecurity. The following points (adapted in part from FAO 2002 and Paarlberg 2002) are presented as individual tools, however, they reinforce each other and provide support to public policy as a whole.

Rights-Based Policies: Freedom from hunger is the most fundamental human right, proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and reaffirmed in various international treaties (Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; Rome Declaration on World Food Security 1996). All people have a right to adequate and safe food, and actions by governments must respect, protect, and fulfil this right as shown above. Any denial of food on political or economic grounds is contrary to the human right to adequate food. Governments have a duty to promote the rights of people, especially the impoverished and food insecure. Tackling hunger is not about charity or food aid, but about fulfilling obligations to protect and promote rights to adequate and safe food (DFID 2002). At the national level, over twenty countries, including South Africa and Malawi, have now included the right to food specifically in their constitutions.

Self-Reliance: As highlighted by the example of Thailand, decentralization opens up opportunities for more effective collaboration at the local level among public institutions concerned with the multiple dimensions of food security[7]. It also greatly facilitates participative diagnostic and decision-making processes, which are increasingly recognized as important in contributing to local self-reliance in addressing critical issues, including hunger, and the basis for more sustainable livelihoods. Nonetheless, the primary responsibility for ensuring access to adequate food rests with individuals[8], their families, their wider social circles and the communities in which they live. Efforts to alleviate food insecurity therefore need to focus on empowering women, families, groups and communities to achieve inclusive food security, encouraging a maximum of self-reliance or self-help, but supporting this where absolutely necessary with external inputs to address priorities articulated at the local level.

Protection from Market Failures: Food insecurity is also the consequence of lack of access to adequate and safe food. It is essentially an extreme instance of market failure, in the sense that those people most in need of food are least able to express this need in terms of effective demand. Governments that are committed both to neo-liberal macro-economic policies and to eradicating hunger, need to compensate for market failure by facilitating improved access to food and to the means of enhancing production through a balanced combination of policy adjustments and practical targeted measures that respond to local needs and opportunities.

---

[7] Other empirical studies have demonstrated that governance systems, composed of multiple units at multiple scales of organisations, are less vulnerable to many types of external shocks than centralized systems (Ostrom 2001).
[8] With women as gatekeepers as they are the primary care givers and producers of food for the household.

Improved National Governance: For the purpose of reducing poverty and food insecurity, a starting point for judging good governance at the national level is a government's performance in providing basic public goods to all of its citizens. Some essential goods include internal peace, rule of law, and public investment in infrastructure and research. Where hunger, malnutrition and obesity are on the rise, e.g. in Côte d'Ivoire and much of rural Sub-Saharan Africa, some of the most basic public goods needed for income growth and food security are not being provided in sufficient measure by national governments.

Partnerships: Non-governmental and civil society organisations work best when they are partnering with governments. If governments are willing to invest in public goods, these organisations can collaborate by providing essential help, mobilizing local participation in both the planning and construction phases. Local participation is key to ensuring affordable maintenance and successful management of public goods, through a greater sense of local ownership.

Leadership: The most important forces producing persistent food insecurity today tend to be local, and they are governed best at the local level. Where national governments have responded well to this challenge, food insecurity has come under better control. Willingness, high in the polity, brings increased solidarity, cooperation, and national will to address these concerns[9].

Fiscal and Donor Pressure: Fiscal pressure provides a strong motivation for states to re-think their public policies. Donor pressure through economic incentives enhances such motivation. However, although donor organisations shoulder public investments for example, they often remain silent on governance failures and on policies detrimental to the food insecure.

Environmental pressure: Examples include climate change, droughts, natural hazards, or rising sea levels. A one-degree increase in temperature can represent a ten percent yield reduction in tropical crops such as tea and coffee, central to many developing country agendas (UNEP 2001). Growing public awareness of the issues is being developed to mobilize political will.

Civil society pressure: Generators of public pressure, such as non-governmental organisations, labour unions, grassroots movements, well-organized farmer and consumer associations and similar groups, must push for a more balanced political will. They will triumph through greater engagement in the policy process to improve decision-making underlying public policy to redirect food security towards more equitable outcomes.

Integration of Food Security Within National Policies: Strong mechanisms for policy development are key to food security. Governments must ensure that food security is part of the mainstream of national, sub-regional and local policy design and implementation. Priorities and sequencing are essential as policy reforms and proposed actions need strong legislation, administrative measures, and institutional mechanisms for its implementation and monitoring.

---

[9] Such an example of high-level political willingness and participation in food insecurity can be seen during the synchronized national immunization days in The Gambia for example, during which Vitamin A capsules are also distributed as political institutions and national leaders receive good publicity, give a strong image, as successful political will is fostered by the ease in application of the technology and simplicity yet authoritative act.

To conclude, increasing awareness of the above blocks may be a useful reference point for policy debate and the setting of appropriate mechanisms. The aim should be to provide information to national leaders and policy-makers so that appropriate decisions can be taken, evaluation of progress made, to further foster and sustain political will in efforts to end food insecurity.

Conclusion

Political will at the national level is required to direct the necessary resources, strategies, policies and program implementation to ensure food security. It is critical to invest in essential public goods. Efforts should continue by all actors to ensure that policies create appropriate incentives for investments in public goods such as infrastructure and research. Providing an enabling environment, comprising peace, the rule of law, democracy, and political, social and economic stability, are all equally essential.

It is necessary that all those concerned with food security recognize that the political context, in which policies are formulated and implemented, is an integral part of understanding why those policies fail or succeed. Engaged in strategies for improving food security, governments could take into account the above constructs in moulding these strategies. The types of policies and programmes they adopt will vary. Solutions and options must be tailored, sequenced and prioritized to the context within each country, one state at a time. A common feature may be the support for decentralized community-led initiatives as in Thailand, designed to ensure food security, involving a strategic succession of measures aimed at bringing about immediate reduction in hunger and setting-up longer-term sustainable solutions. Implementing such programmes will require the commitment and partnership across all actors, government, civil society organisations, and the private sector, as they respond to the multiple demands made by communities and common interest groups committed to eradicating, or affected by, food insecurity.

Food security must be viewed as a problem of society not a problem for society, that is, as stemming from society not external to it. One of the strengths of the political will approach is the focus on the underlying structural causes of food insecurity as opposed to the proximate causes. The interconnectedness of food policy traces the multiple and interrelating processes operating on local, sub-regional, national, and global scales, and how they affect the food insecure. Such policy therefore shifts emphasis from solely the stimulus, to include socio-economic conditions. Consequently, poverty reduction, increasing levels of equality, institutional reform, and strengthening security and safety nets, become important objectives for reducing food insecurity.

The paper makes a strong case for good governance while mechanisms for policy development are key to food security. The right to food, well-organized advocacy, self-help, partnerships and investments in public goods are essential elements in advancing the food security agenda. However, policy gaps remain to mobilize action. To further strengthen the capacity of political institutions in a syndromes spectrum towards security, such gaps include insufficient conflict-solving capacity, deficient legal and regulatory frameworks, limited human capital and low implementation capacities, low transparency, high leakages, ineffectually allocated budgets and resources, poor statistics and lack of evidence, of land ownership and gender inequalities.

References

-Babu S.C. (2004) 'Good governance' needed for food policy reforms. News Today, India. 17 January.

-Bates (1998) The Political Framework for Agricultural Policy Decisions. In: International Agricultural Development. 3rd Ed. C.K. Eicher and J.M. Staatz eds. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

-Beckmann D. (2002) Changing the Politics of Hunger. The 2002 Forman Lecture. October 15, 2002. IFPRI/Bread for the World. Washington D.C.

-Bird K., Booth D. and Pratt N. (2003) Food Security Crisis in Southern Africa: The Political Background to Policy Failure. Theme paper commissioned by the Forum for Food Security in Southern Africa. Overseas Development Institute, London.

-Booth D. (ed.) (2003) Are PRSPs Making a Difference? The African Experience. Development Policy Review 21(2). Theme Issue.

-CIDA (2003) Promoting Sustainable Rural Development Through Agriculture. Policy Statement. April 2003.

-Clay E.J. (2003) Responding to Change: WFP and the Global Food Aid System. Development Policy Review 21(5-6): 697-709.

-Coitinho D. et al. (2002) What Brazil is Doing to Promote Healthy Diets and Active Life-Styles. Public Health Nutrition 5(1A): 263-267.

-Devereux (1999) Famine in the Twentieth Century. IDS Working Paper #105 Institute of Development Studies, Brighton, U.K.

-DFID (2002) UK position on EU themes for World Food Summit five years later.

-FAO (2002) Mobilizing the political will and resources to banish world hunger. World Food Summit: five years later. Rome

-FAO (2003) Anti-Hunger Program. Rome.

-Haddad (2003) Redirecting the Diet Transition in the Developing World. Development Policy Review 21(5-6): 599-614.

-Jenkins C. (2002) Worldwide hunger more a political problem. Ohio State University Research News. January.

-Lang T. (2003) Food Industrialization and Food Power: Implications for Food Governance. Development Policy Review 21(5-6): 555-568.

-Liberatore A. (2001) Governance and Sustainable Development. Newsletter of the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change Nr. 3/2001.

-Lipton M. with Longhurst R. (1989) New Seeds and Poor People. London: Unwin Hyman.

-Maxwell S. (1998) Saucy with the Gods: Nutrition and Food Security Speak to Poverty. Food Policy 23(3/4): 215-230.

-Maxwell S. and Slater R. (2003) Food Policy Old and New. Development Policy Review 21(5-6): 531-553.

-Mellor J. (1976) The New Economics of Growth. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

-Ostrom M. (2001) Vulnerability and Polycentric Governance Systems. Newsletter of the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change Nr. 3/2001.

-Paarlberg R.L. (2002) Governance and Food Security in an Age of Globalization. Food, Agriculture, and the Environment Discussion Paper 36. IFPRI. Washington D.C.

-Pinstrup-Andersen P. (2003) Sustainable Food Security: Moving beyond business as usual. Development 45(2) 89–95.

-Puska P. et al. (2002) Influencing Public Nutrition for Noncommunicable Disease Prevention: From Community Intervention to National Programme: Experiences from Finland. Public Health Nutrition 5(1A): 245-251.

-Scherr S. et al. (2003) Background Paper of the Millennium Project Task Force on Hunger.

-UNEP (2001) Climate Change: Billions Across the Tropics Face Hunger and Starvation as Big Drop in Crop Yields Forecast Soaring Temperatures Force Coffee and Tea Farmers to Abandon Traditional Plantations. News Release 01/107. November 8.

-WHO/FAO (2003) Diet, Nutrition and the Prevention of Chronic Diseases. Report of a Joint FAO/WHO Expert Consultation. WH Technical Report Series 916. Geneva.

-von Braun (2003) Action To Address World Hunger. Prepared for Presentation to The Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate. February 25, 2003. IFPRI. Washington D.C.

-Zhai F. et al. (2002) What is China Doing in Policy-Making to Push Back the Negative Aspects of the Nutrition Transition? Public Health Nutrition 5(1A): 26

ANNEX

Three suggested case studies for further research to demonstrate some key elements of argument in paper:

INDIA: Example of governance and policy failure
- Food paradox;
- Policy choices;
- Governance gaps;
- Budget reallocation;
- Political will volatile.

SOUTH AFRICA: Example of fostered political will
- Populations vulnerable: natural and social causes;
- Building blocks: Trust; Interconnectedness, Actors involved, Primary initiative, Good governance;
- Public good seen as productive investment and not a welfare expense.

CENTRAL AFRICA: New hope thanks to regional political will
- Pressures high, hunger high, conflicts;
- Root causes of instability;
- Building blocks: Regional approach, Interconnectedness, Participatory process, Country ownership.

INSIGHT ON POLITICAL WILL:
- Finite resource, to be galvanized;
- Concerns and attention fluctuate;
- Apply building blocks.

FUTURE RESEARCH:
- Syndrome spectrum approach (adapted from health science) for FS;
- Private sector/corporate political will for FS.