

File Sub: CF/EXD/SP/1993-0017/P
See also: CF/EXSTMNT/1993-0008

Article by Mr. James P. Grant
Executive Director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

"Jumpstart Development"

for
Foreign Policy Journal
Number 91, Summer 1993

Published Version



UNICEF Alternate Inventory Label



Rcf00071VG

tem # **CF/RAD/USAA/DB01/2002-01151**

ixR/Code: **CF/EXD/SP/1993-0017/P**

Jumpstarting Development FOREIGN POLICY Journal, Number 91
Date Label Printed 21-Aug-2002

cover + 7pp + Øb

FOREIGN POLICY

NUMBER 91 SUMMER 1993

JUMPSTARTING DEVELOPMENT

by James P. Grant

Anyone who thought, amidst the euphoria of dizzying change starting in 1989, that the end of the Cold War would usher in an age of global harmony and easy solutions has long since been disabused of the notion. Every day we open our newspapers to dark headlines confirming that the world is still a very dangerous place—in some ways more dangerous than before. We are confronted with a host of problems, both old and new, that are reaching crisis proportions. Is there a way of “jumpstarting” solutions to many of those problems? In fact, there is.

To many, it may not seem so. Ethnic conflict, religious hatred, failed states, economic devastation in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, AIDS, and environmental degradation all seem intractable problems. Meanwhile, the number of poor in the world continues to increase at about the same rate as the world's population. The World Bank put their number at 1.1 billion in 1990. A fifth of the world's population is living on less than one dollar a day, and during the 1980s the poor actually lost ground. The 1990s show little evidence that the world economy will return anytime soon to a high growth trajectory.

The negative trends have even begun to afflict the rich. In the last decade, poverty increased in a number of industrialized countries, most notably in the United States and the United Kingdom and, of course, in the former communist countries of Europe. In most of those countries, children bore the brunt of the reversal. In America today, one in five children is poor, the highest level of child poverty in a quarter century in the world's richest country. In both the United Kingdom and the United States, child poverty has nearly doubled in a

JAMES P. GRANT is the executive director of the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF).

decade.

Small wonder that the lead article in this journal's spring issue contended that "all the trends" are in the wrong direction and that the world "appears to be at the beginning, not of a new order, but of a new nightmare." Such pessimism, however, can be misplaced. The world is in fact on the threshold of being able to make vastly greater progress on many problems that have long seemed intractable. Rather than merely reacting to situations after they have become critical, as in Somalia, the world has an opportunity in the 1990s to make an effective—and efficient—social investment to convert despair into hope and go a long way toward preventing future crises and building healthy societies.

The situation today may be analogous to that of Asia in the mid 1960s, when population growth seemed set to outrun the food supply. Many predicted widespread famine, chaos, and instability for the last third of this century. But then, quite suddenly, within four or five years, the Green Revolution took hold in Asia, extending from the Philippines through South Asia to Turkey. In country after country, wheat and rice production increased at annual rates unprecedented in the West. The immediate cause was not so much a scientific breakthrough—strains of the miracle wheats had been around for as many as 15 years—as a political and organizational one. Only by the mid 1960s had fertilizer, pesticides, and controlled irrigation become widely used, thanks in large part to earlier aid programs. At the same time, the combination of Asian drought and increasing awareness of the population explosion created the political will to drastically restructure price levels for grains and agro-inputs, and to mobilize the multiple sectors of society—rural credit, marketing, transport, foreign exchange allocations, media—required for success. U.S. president Lyndon Johnson deserves credit for his leadership contribution to that effort, though his deep personal involvement remains a largely untold story.

We may be in a similar position today, but on a much broader front—poised for advances in primary health care, basic education, water supply and sanitation, family planning, and

gender equity, as well as food production—and covering a much wider geographical area, including Africa and Latin America as well as Asia. With an earnest effort from the major powers, the 1990s could witness a second green revolution—extending, this time, beyond agriculture to human development.

For the first time since the dawn of history, humankind is making long-term plans for improving the lives of the young.

Frequent illness, malnutrition, poor growth, illiteracy, high birth rates, and gender bias are among poverty's worst symptoms. They are also some of poverty's most fundamental causes. We could anticipate, therefore, that overcoming some of the worst symptoms and causes of poverty would have far-reaching repercussions on the national and global level. The recent experiences of such diverse societies as China, Costa Rica, the Indian state of Kerala, Sri Lanka, and the Asian newly industrializing countries (NICs) suggest that high population growth rates, which wrap the cycle of poverty ever tighter, can be reduced dramatically. Reducing poverty would give a major boost to the fragile new efforts at democratization that will survive only if they tangibly improve the lives of the bottom half of society. As we know from the experience of Singapore, South Korea, Taiwan, and the other Asian NICs, such progress would in turn accelerate economic growth. By breaking the "inner cycle" of poverty, we would increase the capacity of the development process to assault poverty's many external causes, rooted in such diverse factors as geography, climate, land tenure, debt, business cycles, governance, and unjust economic relations.

We are uniquely positioned to succeed in the 1990s. Recent scientific and technological advances—and the revolutionary new capacity to communicate with and mobilize large numbers of people—have provided us with a host of new tools. The world's leaders can now use them together to produce dramatic, even unprecedented, results.

For example, the universal child immuniza-

tion effort—the largest peacetime international collaboration in world history—has since the mid 1980s established systems that now reach virtually every hamlet in the developing world and are saving the lives of more than 8,000 children a day—some 3 million a year. Here, too, the technology was not new; vaccines had been available for some 20–30 years. Success has been the result of applying new communication and mobilization techniques to the immunization effort, often led personally by heads of state, making use of television and radio advertisements, and supported by a wide range of local leaders. School teachers, priests, imams, local government officials, nongovernmental organization (NGO) workers, and health personnel all joined the effort. By 1990, more than 80 per cent of the developing world's children were being brought in four or five times for vaccinations even before their first birthdays. As a result, Calcutta, Lagos, and Mexico City today have far higher levels of immunization of children at ages one and two than do New York City, Washington, D.C., or even the United States as a whole.

A similar effort is now being made to spread the use of oral rehydration therapy (ORT) to combat the single greatest historical killer of children, diarrhea, which takes the lives of some 8,000 children every day, down from 11,000 daily a decade ago. ORT was invented in the late 1960s, but only recently have leaders mobilized to use this lifesaver on a national scale. Every year it now saves the lives of more than 1 million children, a figure that could easily more than double by 1995 with increased national and international leadership.

The arsenal is now well stocked with other new technologies and rediscovered practices that can bring tremendous benefits with inspired leadership and only modest funding. Thus, the simple iodization of salt—at a cost of five cents annually per consumer—would prevent the world's single largest cause of mental retardation and of goiter, which affect more than 200 million people today as a result of iodine deficiency. Universal access to vitamin A through low-cost capsules or vegetables would remove the greatest single cause—about 700 cases per day—of blindness while reducing

child deaths by up to a third in many parts of the developing world. The scientific rediscovery of the miracles of mother's milk means that more than a million children would not have died last year if only they had been effectively breast-fed for the first months of their lives, instead of being fed on more-costly infant formula. In such diverse countries as Bangladesh, Colombia, Senegal, and Zimbabwe, it has proven possible to get poor children, including girls, through primary education at very little cost. Recent advances have shown how to halve the costs of bringing sanitation and safe water to poor communities, to less than \$30 per capita. New varieties of high-yield crops—from cassava to corn—are now ready to be promoted on a national scale in sub-Saharan Africa.

Meanwhile, with such tools in hand, the new capacity to communicate—to inform and motivate—empowers families, communities, and governments to give all children a better chance to lead productive lives. In short, we are now learning to “outsmart” poverty at the outset of each new life by providing a “bubble of protection” around a child's first vulnerable months and years. Strong international leadership and cooperation—facilitated enormously by the end of the Cold War and the expansion of democracy—could leverage that new capacity into wide-ranging social progress.

A Children's Revolution

Notwithstanding the media image of the Third World as a lost cause, there is real momentum there for change. In fact, for all the difficulties and setbacks, more progress has been made in developing countries in the last 40 years than was made in the previous 2,000, progress achieved while much of the world freed itself from colonialism and while respect for human and political rights expanded dramatically. Life expectancy has lengthened from 53 in 1960 to 65 today, and continues to increase at a rate of 9.5 hours per day. Thirty years ago, approximately three out of four children born in the developing countries survived to their fifth birthdays; today, some nine out of ten survive.

At the same time, the birth rates in countries as disparate as Brazil, China, Colombia, Cuba,

Korea, Mexico, Sri Lanka, Thailand, and Tunisia have been more than halved, dramatically slowing population growth and the inherent strains it places on limited natural resources and social programs. Among the factors that have helped contain population growth, improving children's health is undoubtedly the least well-known and appreciated. As the United Nations Population Division puts it, "Improvements in child survival, which increase the predictability of the family building process, trigger the transition from natural to controlled fertility behavior. This in turn generates the need for family planning." While they are important priorities themselves, reductions in child mortality, basic education of women, and the availability of family planning make a strong synergistic contribution to solving what Yale historian Paul Kennedy calls, in *Preparing for the Twenty-First Century* (1992), the "impending demographic disaster." As population specialist Sharon Camp noted in the Spring 1993 issue of FOREIGN POLICY:

Measures like quality reproductive health care, greater educational and economic opportunities for women, and reductions in infant and child death rates can and will bring about rapid birthrate declines. If all developing countries were to emulate the most effective policies and programs and if donor governments such as the United States were to provide adequate levels of assistance, the population problem could be resolved in the lifetime of today's children.

In fact, a children's revolution is already under way in the developing world, often led by those in power. Developing country leaders took the lead in seeking history's first truly global summit—the 1990 World Summit for Children—with an unprecedented 71 heads of state and government participating. They also pressed for early action on the Convention on the Rights of the Child, which was adopted by the General Assembly in November 1989 and which has since been signed or ratified in record time by more than 150 countries—with the United States now being the only major exception.

The experience of the past decade showed it possible—even during the darkest days of the Cold War and amid the Third World econom-

ic crisis of the 1980s—to mobilize societies and the international community around a package of low-cost interventions and services, building a sustainable momentum of human progress. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and NGOs called it the Child Survival and Development Revolution, and as a result more than 20 million children are alive today who would not otherwise be; tens of millions are healthier, stronger, and less of a burden upon their mothers and families; and birth rates are falling.

Leaders are learning that productive things can be done for families and children at relatively low cost, and that it can be good politics for them to do so and bad politics to resist. More than 130 countries have issued or are actively working on National Programmes of Action to implement the goals set by the World Summit for Children, all of which were incorporated into Agenda 21 at the June 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. Those ambitious goals—to be met by the year 2000—include controlling the major childhood diseases; cutting child malnutrition in half; reducing death rates for children under five by one-third; cutting in half maternal mortality rates; providing safe water and sanitation for all communities; and making family planning services and basic education universally available. In 1992, most regions of the developing world took the process a step further by selecting a core of targets for 1995, when the first World Social Summit will review children's progress within the broader development process. For the first time since the dawn of history, humankind is making long-term plans for improving the lives of the young.

In part, that new concern has its roots in the communications revolution that brings daily pictures of large-scale famine or violence into our homes. At the same time, the new communications capacity has permitted deprived populations everywhere to see how much better people can live, firing grassroots movements for reform and democracy. But most of the Third World's suffering remains invisible. Of the 35,000 children under age five who die every day in the developing countries, more than 32,000 succumb to largely preventable hunger

and illness. No earthquake, no flood, no war has taken the lives of a quarter million children in a single week; but that is the weekly death toll of the invisible emergencies resulting from poverty and underdevelopment. In 1992, 500,000 children under the age of five died in the kind of dramatic emergencies that attract media attention, but that is a small portion of the nearly 13 million children under five who are killed every year by grinding poverty and gross underdevelopment. The tragic deaths of 1,000 children per day in Somalia last year captured far more public attention than those of the 8,000 children around the world who die every day from the dehydration caused by ordinary diarrhea, which is so easily treated and prevented.

Calcutta, Lagos, and Mexico City today have far higher levels of immunization of children at ages one and two than do New York City, Washington, D.C., or even the United States as a whole.

As the international community assumes greater responsibility for proliferating civil strife and other emergencies, it must come to terms with the realities of limited resources. How many operations to rescue failed states like Somalia can the international community afford? It is estimated that the U.S. component of the Somalia operation alone will cost more than \$750 million for just four months' involvement, nearly comparable to UNICEF's average annual global budget of recent years, much of which is used to prevent future crises. There are now 48 civil and ethnic conflicts in progress around the globe. The United Nations is involved in 14 peacekeeping operations on five continents. Last year, those operations cost more than \$3 billion, about four times higher than the previous record. Those operations are the most expensive way to relieve suffering, and it is clearly time to invest far more in *preventing emergencies and conflicts*, and in buttressing the new democracies, even as we put out the world's fires. As U.N. secretary-general Boutros

Boutros-Ghali argues in his *Agenda for Peace*, prevention can prove far less costly—and produce far greater results—than relying on expensive and sometimes ineffective rescue operations.

As the international community shifts toward prevention—as it must—it makes the most sense to focus on eradicating poverty's worst manifestations early in the lives of children, breaking the cycle of poverty from generation to generation. At the World Summit for Children, the international community identified the basic package of high-impact, low-cost interventions that can make a difference in the short and medium term, while helping to build long-term development. Now it has only to make them work, albeit on a massive scale.

The overall price tag for reaching all the year 2000 goals for children and women, which would overcome most of the worst aspects of poverty, would be an extra \$25 billion per year. The developing countries themselves are trying to come up with two-thirds of that amount by reordering their domestic priorities and budgets, while the remaining third—slightly more than \$8 billion per year—should come from the industrialized world in the form of *increased or reallocated official development assistance (ODA) and debt relief*. That is a small price for meeting the basic needs of virtually every man, woman, and child in the developing world in nutrition, basic health, basic education, water and sanitation, and family planning within this decade.

In Russia and the other former Soviet republics, such aid could produce rapid grassroots results at an affordable cost, easing pain and helping to buy time until democratic and macroeconomic reforms show concrete progress. Plans for restoring democracy to Cambodia, Haiti, and Mozambique will need to *alleviate suffering among the poor quickly; and targeting the essential needs of children and women can produce the biggest impact at the lowest cost*. International relief programs for Somalia must rapidly give way to assistance that constitutes an investment in human development, and no such investment has been found to be more cost-effective than primary health care, nutrition,

and basic education for children and women. The road to power for many of the world's extremist movements—whether based in religion or political ideology—is paved with the unmet needs of the poor.

With an earnest effort from the major powers, the 1990s could witness a second green revolution.

Sadly, the U.S. has stagnated or regressed over the past decade with respect to children, even while much of the developing world has been making impressive progress. The United States has provided little leadership for that progress, except for that provided by the bipartisanship of Congress, which actively encouraged U.S. support to child survival and development programs abroad. But by increasing investment in American children and strengthening American families, and by re-ordering foreign assistance to reflect that new priority, the United States, the world's sole superpower, could once more set the global standard and give a major boost to human development and economic growth.

First, few actions would have more immediate impact than the signature and ratification this year of the historic Convention on the Rights of the Child. President Bill Clinton's signature of the convention and its submission to the U.S. Senate for early ratification (as has been urged by bipartisan leadership) would send an important message to the world, bringing the rights of children close to becoming humanity's first universal law.

Second, the United States needs to demonstrate a new culture of caring for its own children. The much-needed reordering of priorities for American children, women, and families is already under way, with initiatives on Head Start, universal immunization, parental leave, family planning, and health services for all. A "Culture of Caring," the American plan in response to the World Summit for Children that was issued at the end of the Bush administration—in January 1993—provides a useful base for bipartisan action.

Third, the United States needs "20/20

vision." It should support the May 1991 proposal of the United Nations Development Programme, which had two components: It called on developing countries to devote at least 20 per cent of their budgets to directly meeting the basic human needs of their people, roughly double current average levels. It also argued that 20 per cent of all international development aid should go to meet those same basic needs: primary health care, nutrition, basic education, family planning, and safe water and sanitation. Today, on average, less than 10 per cent of already inadequate levels of ODA are devoted to that purpose. Different ways of defining and reporting social sector allocations within national and ODA budgets make precise quantification of those proportions somewhat difficult, and efforts are therefore underway to achieve a common form of reporting. But even if subsequent research changes the target percentages, the "20/20 vision" concept underscores the importance of restructuring both sets of budgets in line with the priorities established at the World Summit for Children, which may require—on average—a doubling of existing allocations.

On the ODA side, the United States today devotes less than \$1 billion to basic human needs. Of the projected \$25 billion extra annually that will be required globally by mid-decade to meet the World Summit year 2000 goals, the U.S. share would be \$2 billion. The roughly \$3 billion total would then still be less than 20 per cent of all U.S. foreign and military assistance. It is a small price to pay for jumpstarting solutions to so many of the overwhelming problems of population, democracy, and the worst aspects of poverty, to say nothing about saving tens of millions of young lives this decade. The additional funds can be obtained from reductions in the military and security component of the U.S. international affairs budget.

Fourth, the new spirit of democratic change and economic reform in Africa will not survive if its creditors do not give it some debt relief. Together, the sub-Saharan African countries pay \$1 billion in debt service to foreign creditors every month, and its debt is now proportionally three or four times heavier than

Grant

that of Latin America. At the November 1992 Organization of African Unity-sponsored International Conference on Assistance to African Children, donor countries and lending agencies alike pledged to promote more debt relief while expanding or restructuring ODA in order to help Africa protect and nurture its children. Here again the United States could help lead the way, preventing Africa from deteriorating into a continent of Somalias. The G-7 Summit in Tokyo in July 1993 should make a definitive commitment to debt relief, with much of the local currency proceeds going to accelerate programs for children, women, and the environment through a variety of debt-swapping mechanisms. With the right mixture of domestic and international support, and with apartheid ending in South Africa, we could see dramatic progress in most of Africa by the year 2000. That could include a food revolution every bit as green as Asia's—but African countries will need help. The alternative could be a return to authoritarian rule, corruption, and conflict throughout large parts of the continent.

Fifth, the United States must actively support multilateral cooperation. With human development and poverty alleviation increasingly accepted as the focus for development cooperation in the 1990s, the United States has an opportunity to transform rhetoric into reality. Active U.S. support and leadership along those lines in the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, the regional banks, and throughout the U.N. system will go a long way toward overcoming, in our time, the worst aspects of poverty in the South, where it is most acute. Landmark U.N. conferences have been scheduled on human rights (1993), population (1994), and women (1995); U.S. leadership at those conferences and at the U.N. summit on social development in 1995 will strengthen their impact. The U.S. role will also be critical in reducing poverty in the North and in the transitional societies of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

Finally, the United States must strengthen its commitment to the United Nations. The new administration's initiative to seek restoration of U.S. funding for the United Nations Population Fund is a welcome step—a step that

FOREIGN POLICY

Congress should rapidly implement. That and a decision to rejoin the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) would not only give an important boost to family planning and global education, but—together with full payment of its U.N. arrears—it would signal long-term U.S. commitment to the United Nations as the global village's central vehicle for development cooperation and safeguarding the peace.

Focusing on children as a means of attacking the worst aspects of poverty will not solve all the world's problems, but it would make a historic contribution—at this all-too-brief juncture of opportunity—to the better world we all seek. It could change the course of history.