



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

SEP 13 1976

Agricultural Economics Library

THE FAMINE PREVENTION AND FREEDOM FROM HUNGER AMENDMENT:

AND COMPROMISES IN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY MAKING

Harold D. Guither<sup>1/</sup>

The International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975, passed by Congress and signed by the President on December 20 as public Law 94-161, is described a "legislation of consolidation and progress." (9,p.8) Although its major titles include International Disaster Relief, Food Aid to Poor Countries, and Development Assistance, this paper will focus upon Title XII--Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger, an amendment developed and introduced in the House by Representative Paul Findley of Illinois and sponsored in the Senate by Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota.

Title XII is described as "new authority designed to enlist fuller and more effective use of one of America's great resources--its land grant and similar agricultural colleges and universities--in meeting the challenge of increasing food supplies for the growing populations of developing countries." (9, p. 25) The purpose of this paper is to describe briefly the issues and compromises that were involved in developing this legislation.

The international efforts of land grant universities to develop institutions for agricultural teaching, research, and extension actually dates back many years. From 1951 to 1975, thirty-seven U.S. universities worked in 43 countries under 88 rural development contracts with the U.S. Agency for International Development (hereafter referred to as AID or USAID) or its predecessor agencies. These contracts usually involved relationships with

<sup>1/</sup> Harold D. Guither is Professor of Agricultural Policy, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. While on sabbatical leave during 1975, the author served on the staff of Congressman Paul Findley of Illinois. The suggestions and comments from W.D. Buddemeier, Director of International Agricultural Programs, University of Illinois, Russell McGregor, National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and Erven J. Long, U.S. Agency for International Development, are gratefully appreciated and acknowledged. The author, however, takes full responsibility for statements of fact and observation.

degree granting institutions in less developed countries, including some research and extension, and also with Ministries of Agriculture. Others involved projects with Ministries of Agriculture or technical training schools. Average annual expenditures for these projects averaged \$36 million from 1960 to 1970 but by 1975, the federal outlay was reduced to around \$6.5 million as large country contracts were completed. USAID efforts in recent years have placed more emphasis on specific problem-solving research efforts. (10)

One report of U.S. university overseas development assistance concluded that the AID-university institution building contract has usually been strongly oriented toward service to an overseas educational institution without providing the means by which the contracting university could develop competency to implement and support the project for the 5 to 20 years required to do the job. (4, p. 1322) Recommendations were made in 1968 for a stronger commitment on the parts of all participating agencies to an expanded and long-term program of building institutions to serve agriculture. (1, p.4)

From the time Findley introduced his Famine Prevention Bill on October 10, 1974 until July 30, 1975 when the House Committee reported out H.R. 9005, the International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975 that included the Title XII Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Amendment, many man-months of discussions, negotiations, hearings, redrafting and legislative support efforts took place.

Support for continuing international development assistance to agriculture was stimulated by the World Food Conference in November 1974. The House delegation to that conference recognized the necessity for raising farm production in developing lands and the wide range of opportunities to accomplish this with self-help as a primary ingredient. (8, p.5)

Hearings were held in November, 1974 before the Subcommittee on Department operations of the House Committee on Agriculture. However, redrafting efforts continued through December and January. Findley introduced a new Famine Prevention bill on January 30, 1975 with 71 co-sponsors. The large number of co-sponsors demonstrated broad bipartisan support--rural and urban, male and female, black and white. By the time hearings were held in July, more than 90 House members had joined as co-sponsors. Senator Humphrey introduced a revised bill in the Senate on February 11 with 6 co-sponsors.

The revised bill introduced in January was referred to the International Relations Committee in the House and the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate. After the introduction, interested groups and institutions began to suggest revisions and changes. From January to July 1975, many people had been involved in suggesting and negotiating the changes. The major issues and compromises are discussed below:

Priority for Development Assistance. Differences in priorities for development assistance surfaced during the drafting and negotiations between AID officials, university representatives, and Congressional sponsors.

In recent years, AID had shifted its major technical assistance program emphasis from institutional building contracts with universities to problem-oriented research and cooperative support for International Research Centers that were originally foundation funded. Universities that had gained experience under contract projects felt a need for continued efforts on some of the projects on which they had worked, but funds had been terminated. Findley felt that more work needed to be done to help developing countries develop their extension programs to help farmers increase production, and train more agricultural scientists through effective teaching programs especially in their colleges and universities.

The compromise which made it possible to pass the bill was agreement to give land grant and other eligible universities the opportunities to strengthen their capacities in "program related agricultural institutional development and research" by having them work in current AID programs where funds could be effectively used.

Without strong insistence by Findley and Humphrey, the role of universities written into the bill would have been much less significant.

Administration and Role of Board. The first Famine Prevention bill provided for the Secretary of Agriculture to administer it. Next, an Institute for International Food and Agricultural Development was to be established as an independent agency in the Executive Branch with a board to implement and administer Famine Prevention activities.

In the final bill, a permanent Board for International Food and Agricultural Development was created. The final authority for administration, as with all foreign assistance legislation, is given to the President who "shall exercise his authority through the administrator of the Agency for International Development." (6)

Agreement on the Board and its role was reached through a compromise. The university community, as represented by the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, favored administration by the USDA or a board under an independent agency such as the proposed Institute. Universities have worked with USDA on cooperative research and extension programs for many years. The Institute concept was introduced after USDA rejected the international assistance role in the early draft of the bill. Although universities and USAID have worked together, the university community was seeking more autonomy and independence in having the program administered outside AID.

On the other hand, the State Department, through AID and predecessor agencies has by law been designated to carry out foreign assistance. University and AID working relationships have sometimes been strained. (5)

However, USDA officials supported the view that AID should continue to have final authority in administering foreign assistance programs. They supported creation of an advisory board with university representatives and a real mandate for universities to be involved.

USAID officials faced continued pressure by the Land Grant University community and Congressional sponsors for some kind of board that would participate in policy making, planning and implementing programs. They proposed "A council of Universities for International Development to assist and advise the administrator of AID and other agencies and departments of government when appropriate." The advisory role of this proposed council was much broader than food and nutrition, the role favored by Findley and the Land Grant University community.

The final compromise was the creation of the permanent Board for International Food and Agricultural Development with broad responsibilities and duties in assisting the Administration in AID. Two subordinate units of the Board are also provided for: A Joint Research Committee, and a Joint Committee on Country programs which AID had earlier proposed under the Council of Universities for International Development.

How much real authority the Board would have remains an open question until actual operations and working relationships are established. However, Humphrey and Findley intended that the Board would make real contributions and participate as partners in decision making. (7)

Findley stated "The board will have substantial authority in the formulation of basic policy, procedures and criteria for project proposal review, selection, and monitoring. It will also participate in the planning,

development, implementation and monitoring of specific programs in foreign countries. Through control of the Board, the universities will be partners with AID, not subordinates. The Board will share with AID decision making on all aspects of development and execution of contracts and grants." (7, p.H12065)

Humphrey stated, "I want the legislative history of this amendment to be clear, that both you (Findley) as a sponsor in the House, myself as a sponsor in the Senate--look upon this Board as having powers and authority and responsibility. We are making it clear that the Board is more than window dressing. It is a basic fundamental part of the program... From the Board's activities, things flow. I just wanted to make it clear so our colleagues and friends at AID will clearly understand that this is not some little after thought that Congressman Findley and Senator Humphrey had. We are deadly serious about it and intend to get this into a bill." (7, p. H12066)

The law states that the Board's general areas of responsibility shall include, but not be limited to (1) participating in planning, development, and implementation of, (2) initiating recommendations for, and (3) monitoring of, the activities described in the general authority for Title XII. (6)

Make-up of Board. In the final passage, the bill provided that the Board would consist of seven members, four of which would be selected from the universities. The House Committee had also designated that one would be from a non-land grant university but this was not in the final bill.

One earlier draft had called for six members with three from universities and three from the general public. It was felt that public members might represent foundations and business firms interested in or engaged in international development. Before this, a nine member board was proposed, three members from the Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research, and three from the general public. The first board proposal suggested 8

members, four from the federal government, with one designated by the Secretary of Agriculture and four from the land grant universities.

The decision to take out federal government representatives from the Board was made because final authority was with the AID administrator. A member of the board from AID or other federal agency to advise the administrator did not seem appropriate to USDA, AID officials, or the House International Relations Committee legal counsel.

The final make up of the board provided some flexibility of getting input from land grant universities, other universities eligible to participate, and other persons who have a vital interest and contribution to make in implementing development assistance.

Eligible Universities. The first bill designated that land grant universities should be strengthened to assist and cooperate in developing land grant type universities in the agriculturally developing nations. The final bill designated assistance to U.S. land grant and other eligible universities to assist with all U.S. efforts to apply agricultural sciences and make them more effective in increasing world food production.

The change recognized that:

(1) Certain non-land grant universities, including Sea Grant colleges, are carrying on extensive programs in agricultural teaching, research, and extension-type activities and they could participate to further the objectives of the bill.

(2) The efforts to improve food production capacity in developing nations might be carried out in research and extension programs in Ministries of Agriculture or institutions other than a university.

The agricultural colleges and schools outside the land grant community worked effectively through their Congressional representatives to achieve change (1) above. AID wanted to carry out assistance programs with other institutions besides universities in the developing countries.



From a Separate Bill to Title XII Amendment. The Famine Prevention idea began as a separate bill and more than 90 House members co-sponsored the bill. Yet it was later incorporated into the International Development and Food Assistance Act. of 1975, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961.

Some may ask why Famine Prevention did not move through the legislative process as a separate bill. Congressman Findley decided to shift from a separate bill to an amendment to achieve legislative action in 1975. If he had held out for a separate bill, it would probably have died in committee or if passed, might never have received any appropriations. By getting hearings during the consideration of the total foreign assistance bill, and introducing the bill as an amendment, it was accepted in committee and moved through both houses as part of the 1975 foreign aid bill. The amendment added a new dimension to foreign assistance. Findley, Humphrey, and the university community supported this strategy because they believed it had the greatest chances for legislative success.

Also, in the spring of 1975 AID officials had proposed Title XII to get more legislative commitment to research and saw the Findley-Humphrey effort as an opportunity to merge ideas and get Congressional approval. AID's Title XII was part of the draft of proposed foreign assistance legislation sent to the International Relations committee but was never introduced as a bill. AID officials, the Land Grant University community representatives, Findley and Humphrey negotiated for several weeks before a new Title XII amendment, with the Famine Prevention concept included, was agreed upon. During early stages of these discussions, one AID official remarked as he saw the Findley-Humphrey proposal, "it needs to be thoroughly lawyered out." When agreement was reached, AID officials supported the new Title XII, the Findley-Humphrey Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger amendment.

Funding Authorization. The January draft included funding authorization up to \$150 million in a fiscal year. When Findley used this figure he allowed for inflation in costs and did not expect that this much would be needed under the act for five to ten years. However, AID officials were apprehensive about a separate authorization and appropriation, since it could easily be cut out.

The final act authorized use of funds from Section 103, Food and Nutrition, of the Foreign Assistance Act.

Such funds taken from this section would not be subject to ceilings of \$10 million of Section 211(d) or the 40 country limitation of Section 211(a).

Although final decisions on allocation of funds out of Section 103 rest with the administrator of AID, it would be difficult to cut out all funds for the Famine Prevention Amendment. In Section 300, Annual Report a "projection of programs and activities to be conducted during the subsequent five fiscal years is to be included." The Board would also be involved in planning with AID officials and could include separate views if they had differences with the AID administrator in allocation of funds.

The key to programs and activities is the actual amount appropriated to AID, and allocations to Section 103. The appropriation for AID will determine the extent of funding for famine prevention and all other international development assistance. It was generally recognized by both AID and university officials that the amounts expended in the first years would be less than later as universities developed programs and staff for carrying out the intent of the bill.

The Coalition for Legislative Success. Passage of the Famine Prevention amendment would not have been possible without a three-way coalition of forces that were willing to work together and compromise. These forces were: (1) the Executive branch, particularly USAID and USDA with approval from the Office of Management and Budget; (2) in Congress agreements and cooperative arrangements a) between Congressman Findley and Senator Humphrey, b) between the chairmen of the House Agriculture and International Relations Committees, and c) Congressman Foley, Poague and other members of the Agriculture committee not to call for the bill to be reviewed in the House Committee or consider similar bills; and (3) the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges with strong support from the Directors of International Agricultural Programs, the Inter-Religious Task Force on U.S. Food Policy, and the League of Women Voters in gaining public support.

Within the Executive branch, AID wanted to continue as the administrator of foreign assistance programs and USDA supported this view. As a result, USDA did not favor provisions for USDA involvement in the Famine Prevention bill. However, Don Paarlberg, representing Secretary Butz, played a key role in mediating different views of AID and the university community. His counsel was also respected by Findley and Humphrey.

Although Findley introduced the Famine Prevention bill, he knew it would need support from others in the House and Senate. Like Findley in the House, Senator Humphrey served both on the Agriculture and Foreign Relations committees in the Senate. These dual assignments along with one belonging to each Party, made Findley and Humphrey ideal sponsors. Senator Humphrey carried great respect and his support was very helpful. He also stated clearly that he wanted the AID Title XII ideas combined with the Findley bill.

He agreed to support the bill in the Senate if AID, the university community, and Findley could work out their differences and bring in one bill.

Within the House, there was some question about which committee would have jurisdiction over the bill. The first hearings on Findley's 1974 bill were before a subcommittee of the Agriculture Committee. On May 1, 1975, Congressman de la Garza of Texas introduced H.R. 6630, an amendment to the Smith-Lever Act, which was also a program to enable agricultural colleges to assist with development overseas. This bill was referred to both the Agriculture and International Relations Committees.

Findley kept Chairman Foley (Agriculture) informed on developments in the International Relations Committee. After the July hearings and passage of the bill in the House on July 30, Foley wrote to Chairman Morgan of International Relations stating that two provisions of H.R. 9005 related to matters within the jurisdiction of the House Agriculture Committee. However, since he desired not to interfere with expeditious consideration of H.R. 9005 by the whole House, Foley stated that he would not insist on referral to Agriculture on this occasion but would reserve the right to claim jurisdiction on such matters in the future. (9, p. 20)

Public support was essential. Through its national office in Washington, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges rallied support in almost every state from its member universities. The large number of co-sponsors when the bill was introduced, and support in the final vote resulted partly from encouragement and support from member universities through the Congressmen in each state. Suggestions for revisions of the early drafts of the bill and reactions to various changes flowed from the university community through THE NASULGC office to Findley's office, and Humphrey's office, where they were later reconciled with AID. Findley strongly supported university participation in developing the bill and working out compromises with

AID, yet he always could use his own legislative prerogative if compromise failed. Foreign assistance bills in the past had frequently lacked a broad base of public support. With a new initiative through the Famine Prevention amendment, and enlarged public interest in world food problems, the public support for the 1975 bill came from the university community, the Inter-religious Taskforce on U.S. Food Policy, and the League of Women Voters. The relative effects of each group in achieving legislative support is difficult to assess. However, the 1975 bill passed the House by a greater margin than any foreign aid bill in recent years. (3)

After all the untiring efforts, resolution of issues and compromises to obtain passage, the true test of success lies ahead. Will the coalitions that secured the passage of the authorization, work together for adequate appropriations to fund the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Amendment? Will universities make long-term commitments and receive adequate funds from AID to effectively develop relationships with teaching, research and extension institutions in developing countries? The hopes and visions of the main sponsor are summed up as follows:

"What I hope will be undertaken by means of this amendment is to enable each country to establish its own problem-solving system. The United States can't hope to prevent famine itself, but here on this continent we have developed a system of problem solving in agricultural education which has sufficed beautifully for us and has enabled us to be quite generous in helping other countries... But the weak link in most countries, is getting information to the man in the field...it is in that respect that the United States has developed such a useful system." (2)

Although universities have been involved in previous international development projects, the major difference was stated by Findley, "For the first time, the universities will be established on a long term basis as a prime resource...

First they will have a majority membership on the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development... Second, the universities will be established as a long term resource in their individual capacity." (7,p. H12065)

The Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Amendment could become landmark agricultural legislation that may someday rank with the Morrill Act, Hatch Act, and Smith-Lever Act. It could advance agricultural science and education in the United States and the developing countries of the world. Much will depend upon the support of the American people through their representatives in government, the attitudes and policies of AID, and the dedication and commitment of universities and their agricultural scientists to work in the developing countries as well as at home.

## REFERENCES:

1. CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Building Institutions to Service Agriculture, A Summary Report of the CIC-AID Rural Development Research Project, Committee on Institutional Cooperation, Purdue University, September 1968.
2. Findley, Paul, statement at hearings before the House International Relations Committee, July 21, 1975.
3. Findley, Paul, letter to author, September 17, 1975.
4. Guither, Harold D. and W.N. Thompson, "Agricultural Economists in Overseas Development Assistance and the Impact Upon U.S. Universities," American Journal of Agricultural Economics, 50:5, pp. 1313-1325, December 1968.
5. Richardson, John M. Jr., Partners in Development An Analysis of AID-University Relations, 1950-66, Michigan State University Press, 1969
6. U.S. Congress, Public Law 94-161, H.R. 9005, December 20, 1975.
7. U.S. Congress, Congressional Record, December 9, 1975, pp. H12065-12066.
8. U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Foreign Affairs, World Food Conference, Report of the Special Mission to Europe, November 6-17, 1974, Committee Print.
9. \_\_\_\_\_, Committee on International Relations, 94th Congress, 1st Session, International Development and Food Assistance Act of 1975, Report 94-442, August 1, 1975.
10. U.S. State Department, Agency for International Development, unpublished report, 1975.

Footnote on Board Appointment

On August 2, President Ford appointed the following to the Board for International Food and Agricultural Development:

Clifton Wharton, President, Michigan State University, Chairman, 3 years

Orville G. Bentley, Dean, College of Agriculture, University of Illinois, 3 years

Gerald W. Thomas, President, New Mexico State University, 3 years

Anson Bertrand, Dean, College of Agriculture, Texas Tech University, 2 years

Charles A. Krause, President, Krause Milling Co., Milwaukee, 2 years

James J. O'Connor, Private Consultant in Food Marketing, Houston, Texas, 1 year

A seventh member was yet to be appointed.