

A Bill To End Starvation

A BILL To ensure that the United States of America at all times maintains a basic level of aid to people in danger of starvation and to promote the security, prosperity, and general welfare of the United States by feeding starving peoples of the world.

PART I

Chapter 1 - Policy; Assistance Mandate and Authorization

Sec. 101. General Policy. - (a) More than half a century ago, in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, Congress asserted “that the individual liberties, economic prosperity, and security of the people of the United States are best sustained and enhanced in a community of nations which respect individual civil and economic rights and freedoms and which work together to use wisely the world’s limited resources”. In the same act, Congress went on to “reaffirm the traditional humanitarian ideals of the American people”, but it is clear that legislation, from beginning to end, is focused on pursuing those humanitarian ideals insofar as that pursuit will return definite dividends to the United States.

Given the dramatic drop in child mortality, maternal mortality, abject poverty, and disease and the increase in life expectancy, education, and opportunity across the entire world and in particular in the most vulnerable countries and the role played by foreign aid from the United States in accomplishing this progress, the Congress finds the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 has been a success. This bill seeks to enhance that success by focusing efforts and resources on the elimination of starvation as a common cause of death for humans everywhere, establishing a base level of investment from the United States into that effort and by reordering the prioritization of the end goals of humanitarian aid given by the United States in pursuit of that goal.

Therefore, the Congress declares that the United States shall allocate no less than 0.25% of its GDP to assistance to starving people wherever possible. This level of investment shall be maintained until assistance to all people in danger of starvation can be provided for a sum less than 0.25% of GDP.

While this aid will certainly have positive impacts on the United States by improving security throughout the world, building better developed and more productive trading partners, and increasing positive perceptions and influence of the United States,

these benefits should not be the primary concern of nor even material consideration in where assistance is given .

The execution of this legislation should follow one principle goal:

- (1) the elimination of starvation as a common cause of death in humans.

The Congress declares that pursuit of this goal be fully reflected in the foreign policy of the United States and that resources be effectively and efficiently utilized.

(b) Under the policy guidance of the Secretary of State, the agency primarily responsible for administering this part should have the responsibility for coordinating all United States food assistance-related activities sanctioned under this bill.

Sec. 102. Immediate and Long Term Assistance Policy. —

(a) The Congress finds that the root causes for starvation can be highly varied across places and times. Immediate assistance may be more appropriate in some cases than others but ultimately reaching the goal of this legislation will require developing sustainable food production for vulnerable peoples.

The Congress recognizes that there may not be sufficient funding to both develop sustainable food production and prevent the immediate starvation of all people. It would be short sighted to commit in stone the exact moral calculation involved in trying to do the most good with available funding. Therefore it shall be the responsibility of the administering agency, with guidance from the Secretary of State, to determine to what degree funds are allocated to immediate starvation relief versus development of long term sustainable food production.

Broadly this decision should follow these basic principles:

- (1) the lives of all people, regardless of race, gender, color, religious belief, age, sexual orientation, national origin, disability, etc., have value and shall be considered to have value.

- (2) cost efficiency of providing assistance to a given populace shall be considered in terms of total cost or expected total cost of providing assistance divided by the number of lives saved or expected to be saved by that assistance.

- A. general preference should be given to more cost efficient assistance or assistance that is reasonably expected to be more cost efficient.

B. any assistance effort funded under this bill whose cost per life saved exceeds 200% of the median cost per life saved of all assistance efforts under this bill shall be reviewed annually.

(3) investment into programs that don't provide immediate relief, including those that will increase long term food production of a vulnerable area, at the cost of providing immediate relief shall only be allowed if it can be reasonably expected that the longer term program will save more lives or be more cost efficient.

(4) assistance may not be allocated nor revoked with the intent of pursuing any other policy goal nor any other objective other than the elimination of starvation as a common cause of death in humans.

A. resource allocation under this bill may not be used to intentionally inflict hunger or starvation on a populace.

B. intentionally inflicting hunger or starvation on a populace, exempting exceptions outlined in Sec. 103 of this bill, shall be considered torture punishable under 18 U.S. Code § 2340A

Sec. 103. Cooperation with Foreign, Regional, and Local Powers and Governments. — (a) While Sec. 101 of this bill makes clear that the principle goal of this legislation is to eliminate starvation as a common cause of death in humans, the increase in goodwill toward and cooperation with the United States from areas receiving assistance are welcome byproducts of this effort. Under Sec. 101 of this bill, these benefits are not allowed to be material consideration for where funds are allocated, but these benefits should be considered in the practical logistics of distributing funds to a given area. This includes making an effort, whenever it is possible and appropriate, to work with local, regional, and national governments and authorities in a given area in order to both maximize the effect of resource investment in pursuit of the goal of ending starvation and build better, mutually beneficial relationships with more open lines of communication with as many peoples as possible.

(b) The Congress recognizes that while working with local, regional, and national governments and authorities is preferable, there will be cases in which this is not practical, feasible, nor, at times, even possible. In such cases, there should still be an

attempt to provide assistance to starving peoples according to the basic principles outlined in Sec. 102 of this bill. Uncooperative powers will likely increase the cost of providing assistance as well as decrease the number of lives saved by that assistance. The extra costs and lower effectiveness inflicted by uncooperative powers should be counted in the cost efficiency of providing assistance. This can be used as reasonable consideration in where funds are allocated, but the decision to deny or revoke assistance to a given area may not be made with the intent to pursue any other policy goal or objective other than the elimination of starvation as a common cause of death in humans as outlined in Sec. 102 of this bill.

(c) The Congress recognizes that there may be attempts to sabotage, steal, or in other ways disrupt the flow of assistance to certain peoples, especially in politically unstable regions. In this regrettable circumstance, all efforts should be made to avoid starting, escalating, or in any way intensifying armed conflict or in any way endangering personnel or peoples being assisted, but when possible, there should still be an attempt to provide assistance to starving peoples according to the basic principles outlined in Sec. 102 of this bill.

Creative solutions may be considered so long as implementation of a solution adheres to the basic principles outlined in Sec. 102 of this bill. Potential cost of lost assets should be counted in expected cost efficiency of providing assistance. Theft or misallocation of assets should be counted in the same manner as damaged or destroyed assets unless the theft or misallocation of assets provides material aid to a power that intends to do harm. In such cases the size and severity of the risk of losing assets to such a power, the number of lives that could be saved if assistance is successfully provided, and the cost efficiency of saving those lives should all be considered in how and whether assistance is provided.

Providing adequate protection to personnel, those being assisted, and assets will likely increase the cost of providing assistance as well as decrease the number of lives saved by that assistance. The extra costs and lower effectiveness should be counted in the cost efficiency of providing assistance. This can be used as reasonable consideration in deciding where funds are allocated, but the decision to deny or revoke assistance to a given area may not be made with the intent to pursue any other policy goal or objective other than the elimination of starvation as a

common cause of death in humans as outlined in Sec. 102 of this bill.

The agency responsible for providing assistance should work closely with intelligence agencies, diplomats, and other officials as appropriate by region and especially in regions where other US operations are ongoing or will soon commence in order to ensure the safety of personnel and peoples being assisted and the effective and efficient use of resources.

Sec. 104. Definitions. As used in this bill. — (a) “People”, “Peoples”, and “Group of people” refer to any socially cohesive unit comprised of two or more humans.

(b) “GDP” means the Gross Domestic Product of the United States as reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis.

(c) “Assistance” and “assistance effort” mean the use of funds in pursuit of saving the lives of starving peoples.

1. The definition of these terms is intentionally vague to allow flexibility in the types of programs and solutions used to pursue the goal of eliminating starvation as a common cause of death in humans.

2. While “assistance” is generally expected to be providing food to starving people or direct expansion of a region’s capacity to produce food, other examples may include

A. Helping starving people move from places that are food scarce to areas that will increase their access to food

B. Improving infrastructure (roads, market spaces, ect.) in order to improve starving peoples access to food

(d) “Starving people” includes any group of people whose lack of access to food has resulted in the death of one or more persons from malnutrition or starvation or whose access to food is sufficiently jeopardized that one may reasonably expect that one or more of them will die from malnutrition or starvation as a result. “Starving people” will also include any group of people where malnutrition is a contributing factor in the deaths of one or more people.