



FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION
www.fpa.org

**The European Union, Human Rights and the
UN Millennium Development Goals
Panel 2 Discussion: Conversation on Millennium Development Goals
March 12th, 2009**

Featuring:

Üner Kirdar, Senior Adviser to the United Nations

Bettina Luescher, Spokesperson, United Nations World Food Programme

Irmy Richardson, German Public Radio

MR. NOEL V. LATEEF: We are fortunate, indeed, to have with us Irmy Richardson, who for over two decades has covered transatlantic relations in Brussels and in New York, for German Public Radio. Some of her fans are here. I was going to say that her trenchant insights have made her a standout for the European public, but also for the public on this side of the pond. She has graciously agreed to chair our second panel. Irmy?

MS. IRMY RICHARDSON: Well, thank you very much, Noel. Mic is on? Yeah. Thank you very much, though, for the kind words. Let me say a quick word to introduce our distinguished panelists here. To my left is Üner Kirdar, who's a senior adviser, and I think known to nearly everybody in the United Nations family, and in the United Nations world here in New York. He's held a couple of—and a number of very, very important posts within the United Nations, and he's a very prolific author, as we can all read up here. You've written 17 books, and I don't know where you found the time to do that.

Further on the left is Bettina Luescher. Bettina Luescher, now the chief spokesperson in North America for the United Nations World Food Programme, and a former journalist with CNN in very important times. I believe you were involved

in the reporting on 9/11 and you got an award for that. It was probably a very, very tough time to be a reporter. Before that she was, in a sense, a colleague of mine, because you worked for German Public Television, ARD, which is my employer at the moment. So welcome, here in New York.

Let's open the second panel this afternoon. Before I hand over the discussion to my panelists, I would like briefly to touch on a subject which might impact on the Millennium Development Goals quite considerably. I want to talk about transatlantic relations, and specifically what are the implications of the current crisis for the developing countries.

The prevailing consensus from many experts is that massive flows of trade and investing are the glue that holds the transatlantic partners together and creates a commonality of interest. Similarly, it has been the globalization of the world economy, and the associated growth in trade and financial flows which have been the principle motors of global development for decades. And all this is now at risk.

The World Bank projects a fall in world trade this year of 6%, and that's the first fall since World War II. The engine has gone into reverse. It is hardly surprising that these issues have recently taken a back seat on national agendas on both sides of the Atlantic. All our governments have been consumed by the need to find effective national responses to the financial crisis, and arrest the freefall of the economy.

Our governments have learned much from the Great Depression, and across the globe massive stimulus programs have been implemented, interest rates have been radically cut. European and American initiatives have been integrated within the much broader context of the G-20. There is to be no backsliding into the beggar my neighbor policies as in the thirties.

Now I quote from the communiqué of the G-20 Summit in London on the 2nd of April, and there you read, quote, "We start from the belief that prosperity is indivisible, that growth, to be sustained, has to be shared, and that our global plan for recovery must have at its heart the needs and jobs of hardworking families, not just in the developed countries, but in emerging markets and the poorest countries of the world too."

The declaration went on to pledge new money to the IMF and other multilateral development banks, and to establish a new financial support mechanism for finance to keep trade flowing.

It seems that the world community has learned its lesson and we'll face this crisis together. What is true within the European microcosm is also true for the world community. Bob Zelig talks of an additional 53 million people who will be trapped in poverty this year, because of the crisis, and that is a very, very daunting prospect, especially for the developing countries. There is a tiny sliver of a silver lining on the horizon. One of the few areas which escaped budget cuts in the budget announcements in the United Kingdom on the 22nd of April was foreign aid.

That is truly the right response. It remains for other rich countries to follow this example, as indeed they have pledged to do in London. So how serious is this challenge? I would like to quote to you, as two final points in my introduction, first from a official UN report on—a progress report on the Millennium Development Goals and this report was published in 2008, and there it states that this global collective effort is yielding results. A number of targets will be reached by 2015, the target date, especially as far as primary education is concerned, gender parity, and also the combat to fight AIDS.

Now a more recent quote from Bob Zelig from April 2009. “Our latest research shows that most of these eight globally-agreed goals are unlikely—” I repeat—that’s my repetition—“are unlikely to be met. These include hunger, child and maternal mortality, education, and progress in combating AIDS. An additional 55 to 90 million people will be trapped in extreme poverty in 2009, and the number of chronically hungry people is expected to climb to over 1 billion this year in 2009.”

So there you have it. A damning prognosis for this year, and I think with this I would like to open the discussion, and Üner, possibly you can give an overview of the MDGs, and then Bettina will address the specific problems of hunger in this world.

Thank you.

MR. ÜNER KIRDAR: Thank you, Madame Chair. It’s a great honor and a great pleasure, and I thank - - to include me for distinguished panel. You just started evaluating where we are, referring to the - - reports which was published last year, while we are all implementing MDGs, and you said that some parts are bright but most are not.

What I want to say, at least, to make this crowd happy, the goal three of MDGs, which is promote gender equality and empower women, have been implemented here. Look.

[Laughter]

Here, how it is implemented.

[Crosstalk]

FEMALE VOICE: - - not 100% because then you wouldn’t be here.

MR. KIRDAR: No, exactly.

[Laughter]

MR. KIRDAR: We have to adopt - -. Yes, you have been kind enough to ask me to give you an overview.

What I did, I mean, I drafted ten layman questions about this question, and I’ll try to go very quickly in ten minutes. First of all, I mean, at UN we do refer to these

goals, MDG goals, which is an acronym, MDG. Like any other institution, at UN too we did the rollout period of the past 64 years. Our own language, several, the acronyms only we understand. Even in the institution, sometimes we don't understand. We talk to UNIDO, ANTAT, DIDI1, DIDI2 [phonetic], that, the MDGs acronym become much more known, which is a very good thing at least.

Why it has been known compared to the other one? Because, as I'll come afterwards, only implementation. Several actors have been involved, at least compared to the past. At least for the first time the UN tried to involve several actors on the local levels too.

The second question, what's the original Millennium Development Goals? - -. On 8 September 2000, the general assembly at the beginning of the new millennium have had a very important meeting of the head of states level. At then, they wanted to produce a documents for the new millennium to try to give to the UN - - and also conviction that whatever was said 64 year—at that time, 60 years ago, in the charter, is still valid, and all the heads of the international communities believes in it, and to take some type of, again, undertakings for the millennium.

That has been adopted as resolution 552, which has been called United Nations Millennium Declaration. And what we call Millennium Development Goals are part of this big parcel. - - eight separately adopted goals. It's piece by piece, and thereafter, during the implementation, the UN organization came to - - these eight goals to put together to make more sense.

The third question. What are the Millennium Development Goals? From what has been taken, there are eight goals which have been identified. One, to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger. That's the first one. The second one, to achieve universal primary education. By that I mean when we are setting goals for the whole international community.

Three, to which I just referred, promote gender equality and empower women. Goal four, reduce child mortality. Five, improve maternal health. Six, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases. Seven, ensure environmental sustainability. Eight, develop a global partnership for development.

Now, the same thing—this is eight goals which have been adopted. That resolution has much more wide goals, like what has been taken earlier, under the chairmanship of the distinguished professor. Human rights, for instance, or the environment. Human rights, democracy, governments, - - that has not been looked as development goals, which is a mistake to say, at least from my part, and this is where I come. The good thing about this approach is at the UN when we started, I mean, either everything was sectorized [phonetic]. But during the practice, especially during the nineties, we learned that the world is much more complicated.

Everything is interlinked. You can't get peace if you don't deal with hunger. Human rights also is part of—I mean, implementation of human rights depends also

on if you are hungry or not. So the good thing about this is an interlink type of document.

The fourth question, are these MDG goals new goals? Did we invent something new? On that, I will say no, not necessarily. Reducing poverty and hunger, achieving universal primary education, promoting gender equality, ensuring environmental sustainability have always been at the forefront of the UN development agenda.

Even in the charter, you open to read Article 55, in 1945. It says that all the countries have pledged. What did they pledge? Higher standards of living, full employment, which have been forgotten completely now, which is one of the main reasons the shortness of the membership of the international community that has eroded. Nobody speaks about, anymore, full employment. That has been looked—is dirty words now. I mean, I'll come to that as productive - -.

Third, it says the solution to international economic social - -, related problems, cultural. Universal respect and observance for human rights. What I wanted to say, nothing is new. And since then, at least we have adopted four development dictates, since 1960. As a matter of fact, let me make a big, I mean convey my greatest respect to my American friends, because it was the Americans who had, first of all, the vision of including this charter. The economic and social part came from the Americans for the Europeans at that time. They didn't—well, or the Russians. It was the Americans who insisted to include collaboration and cooperation on economic—so I mean, historically I want to put this straight on the table, that we should know.

Secondly, the development - -, do you know who launched it? It's not the developing country, it was President Kennedy, 1960. He took the floor, asking that the world has to develop, and he launched it. The first human development - -. And in other respect of him, because one forgets these things, he was one of the—probably the last president when he was taking his oath, and I can read it from here, because that's very historical, and he said that to those people in the huts and village on half of the globe, struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge—he pledges, and himself—our best efforts, to have them—to have themselves, that's very important, for whatever period is required, and the last sentence is even more important. It says if a free society cannot help the many who are - -, it cannot save the few who are rich. This was said in 1960 during when he was coming to the - -.

MS. RICHARDSON: You know, if that's all right with you, maybe we could now go to the specific program.

MR. KIRDAR: Sure.

MS. RICHARDSON: I would like to thank Üner very much for this overview, and to put it all into a historical perspective, too, and to, I think, we all have become aware again

by what he's said, how important this topic is, and how very much on the forefront of the United Nations policies it was, but now I think we'll come with Bettina.

MR. KIRDAR: Sure.

MS. RICHARDSON: Has it yielded result? And has the fight against hunger yielded result? I mean, as I said, the prognosis of Zelig is frightening.

MS. BETTINA LUESCHER: It is frightening, and a year ago we were talking about the perfect storm, when the food prices were suddenly rising rapidly. One day you could buy a ton of food in Bangkok for \$400. Six weeks later it was suddenly \$1,200. The world went a little bit crazy last year, and that was well before September. Suddenly, in the middle of September we were all wondering, oh my god, you know, we thought we were in the perfect storm, what is going to happen now?

The World Food Programme is the biggest player when it comes to humanitarian aid, to being there when people are in need. We're really on the front lines in all the big crises and the worst spots on the world. We take care of some 100 million people every year. If you translate that to the United States, it's every third American. So if we take this room here, and I divide it in three, then this whole group of people over here would be the ones that would get food from us or cash vouchers or take-home rations or something like this.

We've been doing this for over 40 years. It came out of the times of John F. Kennedy, and we have been in many respects incredibly successful, because between 1969 and 2004 we cut the proportion of hunger by half, so that's really, really good. The problem is that just in the last few months, in the last two years, the rising food and fuel crisis added 150 million to the ranks of the hungry. I think everybody is revising their numbers. We are studying like crazy.

I was just coming out of a meeting here where we were discussing what we're going to do, and what we will need. And sometimes it's quite simple. We need the help of the world. If maybe around a billion people are going hungry, then we need to help them. And it's not that we need to invent something new. The tools are there. We might have to look for new tools, but it's—we know how to do this. We know how to help people.

You see this collection of tools here, this is my water thing, so that's definitely mine, but the other things are not mine, except they're important. I just want to give you a real sense of what we do in the field. This is—I was just in Gaza. These are the date bars we give out to schoolchildren in Gaza, and in many places around the world, because we have found that school feeding is one of the simplest, most effective tools that you can have to totally change the life of a child. And it touches many of these Millennium Development Goals. It's poverty, it's health, it's maternal health, it's education. The most basic thing, you fight hunger. In these little date bars, they've been produced in Egypt. They've got all the nutrients you need. And I've seen them when the little kids in Gaza were eating them. We're

giving them out in places all over the world. Or, for example, our high-energy biscuits. One of those little parcels here has 450 calories. Every nutrient you possibly could have is in this neat little—it's in this little parcel. And we give those, for example, in earthquakes and in floods, and in, you know, war zones where people have lost their cooking utensils, where people have fled.

They get this, and they can survive. And that's the crucial thing. We have to help people to survive. I'm sometimes asked, in these current times, during the financial crisis—well, but it's really tough here in America too, and shouldn't we think of our people first here, and isn't the need so great here? Well, here people can get help. You've got food stamps programs. You've got food banks who are struggling. But here, people are not starving on the streets.

Well, we are seeing people who are dying on the areas that don't have streets and roads or anything. Somewhere in the most faraway places on Earth, and those are the ones that—whom we have to help. Some of the numbers are really amazing, when you think about—especially when it comes to children. This is—we use this here because hunger is such an abstract problem, because you and I have never been hungry. We might've had an appetite, but we were never really hungry. I don't think we know that feeling.

We looked for ways that we can tell the story, so people get it. How basic it is, and how simple it is, that all you need to do is you give a child some food, and that child will have a totally different life. It costs 25 cents to fill this cup. This red cup is being used in schools and emergency operations all over the world. 25 cents a day to feed a child. I brought another little one. Since we're in a bank, I figured—usually I show a quarter, to make it simple, but since we're in a bank, this time I took a \$50 note. [Laughter] This is how much it takes to feed a child for a year.

So now think about the last time you had dinner eating out here, you know, in New York City, somewhere on the Upper East Side, or wherever, or down in the Village, and how much it cost. You could feed a child for a year. I've seen it in action. It's absolutely amazing and effective. I was in a village in Afghanistan, like 3,000 meters high, and the sense—I always tell that story, because it shows you how basic and how elementary the problem is.

You have this sense as if you're going back centuries. The women are my age, and they look as if they're 75. They have eight or nine children. The children themselves are much shorter, because one of the big problems is if you don't get enough to eat, you're shorter. It's stunting. It's chronic malnutrition. We had built a school, and we got some partners together from the European community, and we bought, together with the local families, we built water pipelines. It's a food for work program where the workers are being paid in food. You help the infrastructure, you bring water to the village, you build a school, you get food to them, to the children.

You get basic teaching lessons to women so they can learn how to write and get basic medical knowledge. You use the food to build roads. So finally if the woman

is pregnant, there is a road to take her to a village somewhere half an hour away by car, that normally would have been inaccessible. So maybe her child has a chance to survive. Very basic.

I met this little girl, and it was one of those great things when you show up as a woman, and first the village elders check you out, like, she's there with a whole gang of guys. Of course, first they only check out the guys, and then they realize, well, somehow this woman might be a little bit important, so let's see what she does. They're incredibly hospitable. They would share their last food with you, anything.

I, as a woman, was able to go into the houses, which, of course, my male colleagues weren't allowed to, and I could talk to the women, with translators and everything. And I met this little girl who's 12 years old, and I wanted to see what she wanted to do when she grows up. She said, I want to be a doctor. That's just massive. And it's a little revolution. I don't know whether this little girl will ever become a doctor, but with school feeding she has a chance to do this.

The Taliban forbid the girls to go school, so we're using our school feeding things, a simple little trick. They're not only get—they get rice, and flour and cooking oil. If a family sends their girl into school, they get an extra ration of cooking oil. Yeah. Suddenly, the whole family's really interested that this little girl goes to school. So attendance rates have gone really high up. So with this little extra ration of cooking oil, suddenly attendance rates by girls goes up. Simple, practical things, because I think that's what it takes.

We need to be practical. We don't need to reinvent the wheel. It's all there. The science is out there, what it does if a child is malnourished, if it gets enough food, what amazing progress it can make. There is real hope, but we have to have money for this. We think that this year we're going to need almost \$6 billion.

MS. RICHARDSON: But Bettina, if I may ask that, do you think you're going to get it? Because that's basically the—I could imagine that must be your worry. How does the current crisis impact on programs like yours?

MS. LUESCHER: Yes. Until now we've raised like 1.2 billion dollars. We always—I always joke we're the best-dressed beggars in the world, because we hit up everybody, as you can tell, wherever we have the chance. I mean, until now the governments have been pledging, but there have been some—they have said that, of course, budgets are tight. But I think everybody realizes also how big and how important the need is. Those are not just simple statistics. Those are real lives, real consumers, real people, and I think many governments have also watched what happened last year. We saw food riots in 30 countries. The prime minister of Haiti had to resign because the people were on the streets. I think governments see that too. The other thing is also, I mean, the money is there.

I will tell you an anecdote. Last year I went with my boss, Josette Sheeran, who's a wonderful storyteller, and we—with the help of our ambassador Drew Barrymore,

we made it onto the Oprah show. And right before we went on, we were still debating up to the last seconds, what should we ask for. I mean, how much? Are we going to ask for 25 cents, are we going to ask for \$50, are we going to do the big picture?

Then Oprah asked what the big picture was, so we had to say it, so we said the big number, for if you want to feed every hungry schoolchild in the world for a year, it costs \$3 billion. That feeds every hungry schoolchild in the world. \$3 billion. Last year, it was like, oh no, that number is too big. People are just going to freak out. [Laughter] Nowadays when you see how much all these bailout packages are, and these bonuses, you know, Army's going to laugh about this because the word "peanuts" is a really bad term in Germany.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yeah.

MS. LUESCHER: So I'm not going to call it—I'm not going to say this is peanuts, but it's doable. The money is out there. We just have to convince our leaders that this is a good investment. I don't want to throw too many numbers around, but I have it somewhere here, one of those things.

Child malnutrition costs an estimated \$20 to \$30 billion a year. We've done studies, for example, if child malnutrition exists, how much the gross national product of countries is being affected, and it has a real impact on this. So you could also make a very good economic argument that this is a very, very good investment. My little 25 cents, \$50 for the schoolchildren, and the 3 billion per year, because those people could all be possibly little consumers.

I can talk more about other things that we're doing.

MS. RICHARDSON: Bettina and Üner, I want to thank you both very much for the overview, for the specific description of the problem of hunger in the world, and how we could go about it, and now I think it's time to open the floor for questions, because I'm sure there are many out there who would like to ask a question. So the first one, please. Yes, over there, please.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, my name's Heather Brady, and I work with realizing rights through - - ethical globalization, which is an organization founded by - - Mary Robinson. The last panel talked about the power of human rights and how to apply it to certain issues, and you talked about the Millennium Development Goals and certain positions at the UN, and I'm just wondering about do you see a marriage of this? Some of us are wondering if the MDG framework might start incorporating human rights more, for example, around the right to food, or the right to work, and so on.

MR. KIRDAR: - -.

MS. RICHARDSON: If there could be a form of combination between the Millennium Development Goals and the human rights issue, that you create something which combines the two. That's how I understood it, that you create something to combine the two, right? Yeah.

MR. KIRDAR: Well, as I said that this—I'm an economist but at the same time a lawyer, international lawyer, right now I look to that declaration. I say in total there is no division in between human rights—well, on that - - I mean, there may be some arguments, but there are four types of human rights, whenever it was launched. One of them—I mean, when we are talking now on the human rights, mostly we are approaching the - - rights from the political angle.

But there is one of the major human rights. It's the rights of getting out of the poverty. Hunger. The four human rights which were launched by President Roosevelt, even before the UN was created, that during the time—I mean, this is a very funny thing which has happened. In the history of the UN, we succeeded at the end to establish two big—and here in front of Michael—it's not for me to say. I mean, he's a great expert. Two big conventions. One is on the political side, then the other one is on the economic and social development rights side.

That what has happened in the practice, people have forgotten. Not only forgotten, I mean, Michael will say it definitely much better than I do, one of the major principles on international human rights, you cannot—it's not divisible. It's part of a parcel. That once you start to implement, oh, that side is more important for me. That's where, I think, my major responsibility on the political, whether your democratic system works or no.

Fair enough. Then you forget about whether where you are asking that the democracy should be implemented fully, where people are hungry, where people are not educated. How can you accomplish that type of freedom and democracy? And this has been the case, this degradation [phonetic], and on the implementation side, so that's what I'm trying to argue in the UN. What we tried to say, and here it is, I mean, look, peace, the role of human rights, human freedom, are part and parcel of the whole. Once you start to divide, you take one piece, it wouldn't work. That's my answer.

MS. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Thank you Üner. There's a question in the back there, yes please.

MALE VOICE: I am - -.

MS. RICHARDSON: Could you possibly state your name, and affiliation, thank you?

MALE VOICE: - - and I would like to ask you, - - say no, during the - - from United States - - just a small portion of help - - and many Asian countries is - - billion plus 20, maybe 20 times more than Marshall Plan.

MR. KIRDAR: Marshall Plan, this is, no?

MS. RICHARDSON: Mm-hmm.

MALE VOICE: Yes, Marshall Plan. And Marshall Plan set - - in several ways we have results. What kind of results - - from all of this here?

MS. RICHARDSON: Yeah. Bettina?

MALE VOICE: Would it produce more corruption, more - - dependency, more feelings that government's not responsible for the destiny of her own people. How it's - - government - - authorities who would really do something for - - people? That's my question.

MS. RICHARDSON: Maybe Bettina, would you like to answer?

MS. LUESCHER: Well, I think the hard part is I work for an organization that does mainly humanitarian work, and the more long-term programs are, as I explained, these school feeding programs or food for work programs. It's very hard to have—almost impossible to have corruption in those areas. We do, for example, very close monitoring of where our food assistance goes. You can't buy a Rolls Royce with a few bags of rice or so, if you steal those.

I think what we're trying to do is—I think there's a real debate going on, obviously, about what is the best way of how you aid, and how you help. We at WFP always look for ways—first of all, we operate in countries where the government has to invite us, and they can't help themselves. We look for new ways to not just, like in the old days, hand out food aid, but really be inventive so that we strengthen the local economies. And one of the big projects that we have ongoing, and really it's not just a project, it's our daily existence, that we buy locally so that we empower these economies in these countries, and the farmers in those countries.

Over a billion dollars in food that we help—that we provide is bought in developing countries, and most of it in Africa. That's a crucial tool of how we do our little part to make sure that it's not just simply pouring in, but that you help from the bottom up. We're doing, for example—we have a pilot program with the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, and with the Howard Buffett Foundation on using small-scale farmers, so that for the first time they also can participate. That these little farmers get forwarding contracts. They have guarantees for the next three years, because they know there's going to be a client who buys something from them. And then we give it out in those countries.

I think the whole issue of how you aid is strongly developed. I think we've proven that our form of assistance really works. I think also what you have—what our concern is when we look into the future, about where we go from here, it's also really what are the problems that you touched on, but also other problems. For example, climate change, increasing natural disasters. People are so hard-hit in many of these African countries, HIV/AIDS, you know, the life expectancy, 37, 45 years old. We had that in the middle ages in European.

Climate change is going to be a huge issue, because it means less agricultural production, more droughts, more floods in areas like this, so it's a very complex and a very, very good question that you raise there, and I think it's being discussed in many circles. I think for our group, we look for really inventive tools because we know we have to deliver. We are—you might not realize this, but the World Food Programme is a totally 100% voluntarily funded organization. Nobody gives us, like, a budget or something. We have to come up with a work plan. We think this

is what we're going to need, how many people we'll need to feed, and then we go and start begging.

We have to prove to our donors, all the time, and we're totally accountable for what's happening with the money that they're giving us, and prove that it shows effects on the ground.

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you. Yes, there's a question—

MR. KIRDAR: Can I?

MS. RICHARDSON: Yes.

MR. KIRDAR: Also—

MS. RICHARDSON: - - yeah.

MR. KIRDAR: Just a few things. First of all, on MDG, that's a novelty, I must say, compared to all the previous ones. They did include as you—not conditionality, but additionally. For economic growth itself, what's needed, it's been said. That for economic growth, so development. It's not the previous things which you have to do, but they added institutional type of requirements. It has been stressed that if you want to reach these goals, you need to have good governance. Secondly, you have to have accountability in the governance. Third, they have added the transparency. Fourth, they said that there should be participation, which is very important, because it's not the government which will ensure that, it's the people.

Unless you ensure the people take part in that process, you cannot achieve. From there, I'm coming to my summing up. You have posed a very interesting question. At the beginning you did refer to Marshall Plan. Yes, Marshall Plan had been very successful. Why? The reason is very simple, but it took 30 or 40 years at the UN to understand that.

The Marshall Plan had been successful, both in Germany and also in Japan, because there, there was a human capacity and capability. The human beings were already there. It was maybe after the war, what was missing was only the financing, the needs for that. Once you put the money, the people—up it came. For 30 years at the UN, as economists, we thought that to solve the problem of development, the main question is financing. Billions went to Africa. Well, where are we? It's only toward the end, and I must say that there I take a little responsibility to play a little role, when we posed the question, what's development? How to ensure? Then we have reached that the main factor of development is human development.

Unless you develop your own people, unless you give to the people the capacity, the capability to take their own human energy out for - - their own development in their own society, you can't reach the true development. The best example, you give same money on East Asia, Europe to Southeast Asia. They are much more prosperous now, eh? Even, I mean, when the financial crisis has happened in Asia, it took only three years to recover for Asia. I don't want to say that, but in Latin

America it takes longer, and especially in Africa. Why? Because the emphasis has not been given, neither internationally or nationally, to developing their own people.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. Yeah. Yes please, the next question.

MALE VOICE: My name is Ron - -. I'd like you to talk a little more about the money. - - said the money is fundamental and - - talking about how important money - - could you say a little bit about what your fundraising strategy is? How do you go about locating where you might get the money? You ask everybody, and you're a wonderful beggar?

[Laughter]

MALE VOICE: But when you talk among yourselves and - - counsels, how do you go about deciding on - - strategy - -.

MS. LUESCHER: I mean, it's mainly the—it's governments. Those are the big ones, the big donors, because obviously when you talk about trying to raise \$6 billion, that's the only way how it would work. The United States is the largest donor, has always been the largest donor. Last year, we made a really extraordinary appeal to the world, because we said, listen, this is no longer business as usual. We need your help.

Saudi Arabia stepped up, and for the first time ever, they gave \$500 million in cash, no strings attached, just take it and use it. We have the European Community, which is one of our best players. You've got government. You've got big institutions like the European Commission. They have given, I think, \$4 billion over the last 40 years or so, since 1969. Then often all the various European countries give something too.

I think a lot of it is government-oriented, and the big organizations, but it's also public-private partnerships. TNT, the shipping company, has been doing this Walk the World for years now, and to quote their CEO, until they started working with us they were just "a bunch of hairy-assed truck drivers." I love saying that in places like this. [Laughter] It's a quote. Now these people feel incredibly proud and do something.

We've got, for example, the corporate partner Yum [phonetic] and they, every year in October, do a big fundraising campaign worldwide in all of their restaurants. There are like 30,000 restaurants, only some fast food chain. Except I think they're called quick service now, in the quick service industry, they can mobilize 30,000 restaurants worldwide, and then people who go shopping in those restaurants, they help too. So you have that.

You also have individual donors, but that's on a much smaller level. It's really the big governments and it's ongoing discussions with, so to speak, our supervisory board, our 36 member countries. They always check and approve whatever you're doing, and where you're doing, and whether they can contribute, and it's very

tightly controlled, and you have to convince them, and they meet three or four times a year. We are absolutely accountable to them, but the big strategy is, you have to get it from the governments.

MALE VOICE: Can you just say a word about - - and what it - -?

[Laughter]

MS. LUESCHER: Well, um...

MALE VOICE: Where - - talking very graphically.

MS. LUESCHER: Very graphically, oh no.

MS. RICHARDSON: [interposing] We are off the record here.

[Crosstalk]

MS. LUESCHER: I think there was a real outreach, or so. There was a real outreach, and I think a real realization on their part also, a strategy to also appeal more to the gulf countries, which in the past have often done more bilateral work. For example, when I was in the tsunami region, and had this wonderful trip one day when I was taking care of Al Jazeera and we were chasing all over Sri Lanka, and with Al Jazeera, and it was really very entertaining, especially if you once had worked for CNN before.

We traveled with Saudi donors, but they often did more bilateral stuff. So to go, to do something - - that will have a big international donation, that is very unusual. What I do, as a spokesperson, very practically, whenever they call, Al Jazeera and Al Arabiyah and everybody, then I go on and do their panel discussions and everything. Usually you would say write your congressman. I was in one panel discussion on Al Jazeera, and I said, write your kings, you know. [Laughter] I don't think I gave the 500 million, you know, maybe 10,000 - - on my watch. But that's what you have to do.

I think it is remarkable. I mean, \$500 million, just - -.

MS. RICHARDSON: Okay. There are still a level of questions. Back there, then, and then over there, yes?

FEMALE VOICE: - - the strategy is to work with governments, and that you're gaining some traction with corporate partnerships.

MS. LUESCHER: Mm-hmm.

FEMALE VOICE: Why not explore corporate partnerships more? Because - - corporations and businesses are - -.

MS. LUESCHER: Oh, we do.

FEMALE VOICE: You do.

MS. LUESCHER: We do, we do. It's just in the magnitude, it's, of course, you can't go to - bank center there, and say so, how about that billion you've got somewhere down there, you know.

[Laughter]

MS. LUESCHER: Yeah. I mean—

FEMALE VOICE: - - that strategy more work? Does it require more effort to work with corporations?

MS. LUESCHER: No, because having spent lots of time with bureaucrats or so, it's—no. I don't know whether I would say that. I think it's more, for them, for companies, I think that's the wonderful thing about the tradition here in America where companies are giving so much more, but I think everybody realizes now on what hard times they have fallen. Try to explain that to your shareholders, that you suddenly do something somewhere halfway around the world that doesn't even benefit American citizens or so. No. I think we're doing that, but one still has to keep it in perspective, with the numbers that are required.

It's also, we are the agency that takes care of hungry people. It should be the part of the government of the world community. They should deliver, and should give.

This is the stern German demand, you know.

[Laughter]

MS. RICHARDSON: Sometimes it works, not always, Bettina.

MS. LUESCHER: Yeah, I know.

[Laughter]

MS. RICHARDSON: There was a question over there, yes, please.

FEMALE VOICE: Judith Bunker [phonetic], professor at Cleveland College. Now that goal number three has been achieved, what next? Because the problems of women have not been solved - -. Where do we go from here?

MR. KIRDAR: Well, when I said "achieved," was on this table, not on the field level. First of all. The second thing. When I look to the work which we did during the past 60 - - at the UN, I think that one of the greatest areas has been that area.

It's not an easy area. But with the two conferences which we had recently on women, the last one was in China. I must say that I was very proud not from the governmental side. I was very proud of seeing the number of NGOs from Africa. The number of NGO representatives who participated to that conference with so limited money that they had, was, for me, saying well, I can sleep tonight. At least we did something. Not on the governmental level. Because once the people will speak, then the government will listen.

Look, to sum up what we are saying, what are the weaknesses, why we can't reach? It's not only the - -, that's the point which I'm trying to make. We had it, starting from the charter, did we reach it? We are improving, but several things which have been adopted by consensus, several things which government took the pledge. It says, we take the pledge. What happens?

First thing, intellectually and visually, politics depends like a pendulum. Sometimes you have, all around the world, leaders which see what's happening in the world. They take actions. Creation of UN was like that. Creation of the specialized agency, economic community and so on, and so forth. Look how the committee was created. People who had really large ideas about establishing in Europe. Then philosophies change, it becomes much more from left to right, pendulum. Then the approaches go to a completely different direction.

The second thing, perceptions are important. Leadership is important. Commitment's important. That what is missing internationally, the institutional side of enforcement, international law has not reached yet to that stage that you can keep account of it. If you are not implementing. What you do? First of all, up to now, and this is where I will be summing up, the collaboration had been always on the governmental level. UN, when I joined it as a delegate, afterwards, this was a governmental organization. All the negotiations were taking among the governments.

With the pendulum going a little on the right side, we tried to include the NGOs. Now it's getting much—I mean, especially on MDG side.

MS. LUESCHER: We - - work with, like, 3,000 NGOs, local NGOs, often international NGOs, who then distribute our food, and we work—if you do a food assistance operation somewhere, you always work with local leaders, with community leaders, who pick who needs food and make sure that the distribution is going. You really reach out, also. It's not this—all these Westerners or so coming in. It's a very international and also very community-oriented and very participatory partnership operation.

MR. KIRDAR: They just don't - -. Only - - at the national level unless the people are asking their own government, whether it's in developed countries, developing, I mean, I don't even believe all these, who's developed, who's not developing, all these things, because money doesn't make a country develop or not. They have to force their own account—the only accountability which you can have today is at the national level. I think the national level, we don't have that mechanism.

FEMALE VOICE: - - grandchildren, so many different - - I just wanted to know - - the origins - -.

MS. LUESCHER: Yeah, god bless the grandmothers. We have really, and I mean that seriously. What we're seeing in Africa is, for example, when I talked about the life expectation in some places of 37 years. We had these model schools where we taught children farming techniques, because they didn't know anybody anymore who could teach them farming, because their parents and uncles and aunts had

died. So when a father or mother becomes ill with HIV/AIDS, immediately the whole family is impacted, because they take their children out of school and everybody starts working. We have all these grandmothers and grandparents that were taking care of suddenly huge family households. If there were grandmothers there.

Older people, of course, are among our main beneficiaries, because we take care of the weakest. The women, the children, the old people. And I think that there's— they can carry also real responsibility. What we have found is especially the women, those are real tools to make change. We work very closely together, especially with women, to—because if you reach out to them, the whole family is being fed.

In some ways, the doubling of the older population is—I'm not an expert on that, but isn't that more in the more developed countries? I'm not quite sure whether the same statistics apply in developing countries. I'm just simply not certain about the age factors there, but definitely I would say crucially important.

MS. RICHARDSON: In the European Union, it's an aging society.

MS. LUESCHER: Yeah. Definitely there. I'm not quite so sure about the developing countries, what the statistics are there.

MR. KIRDAR: It's completely opposite. I mean, first of all I'm very happy that you have done that - - for the old people, because I'm a retired guy. My little grandson instead of saying retired, he says that my grandfather became retarded.

[Laughter]

MR. KIRDAR: So the reality, I mean, from the population when you look, the honorable chair said it. In Europe, when you look, the composition of the population, and the dangers that—I mean, the percentages of elderly gets much higher. But when you look in total, the world, it's the young children, and it will become even more difficult to deal with the problem, because the age between one to working age is the biggest amount, but in ten years time, these people will come to the working age side. When I was saying that one of the missing points in this - - about labor is this. The only reference on the MDG, which is to develop and implement strategies that give young people a real chance, and that's interesting, to find decent and productive work.

What are the figures, just to give you an image, today, according to our low estimate, more than half of the world labor force, which is around 3 billion. World population's 7 billion, so it's only 3 billion who's working, is either unemployed or living on less than \$2 a day. But more important, what struck my mind mostly, youth unemployment is around 80 million. Almost 40% of the total unemployment. When you look to most of the countries, Europe included, it's mostly the young portion of the population today which is suffering from unemployment. And this conception of change due to this market orientation, I'm not really against the market, but you fire people for productivity purposes. You fire people to become

more - -. What they do, the job, I mean, this is what I want to say, and I will say, again, it's not—job is not only the means which will ensure your own living, but it's a job which link a person to the society. It's a question of dignity.

MS. RICHARDSON: Can I—

MR. KIRDAR: [interposing] The jobless person—

MS. RICHARDSON: I'm afraid, Noel, I'm looking here at the master of ceremonies. If I remember, he called you that. [Laughter] I think, unfortunately, we have to come to an end, because we are still all waiting for this speech given by Sir. Emyr Jones Parry, and I would like to thank very, very much, the panel here, the panelists. Bettina and Üner. Thank you so much.

[Applause]

MS. RICHARDSON: Thank you. Thank you so much. I do believe the problem which we discussed last about that the young ones have no perspective and no job prospects, I think that might be a very good topic for another one of these events, to give the young ones hope and jobs. I think that's a very important goal. Thank you very much. Thank you, and thank you for having me.

[Applause]