

# Homework Assignment

The following arguments for and against **a program to cut global hunger in half by the year 2030** were taken from the report of a survey issue by *Bread for the World Institute*. Read the arguments, and in your journal write a paragraph about whether you would be for or against a program that aims to cut world hunger in half, giving reasons for your position. You may also advance other reasons for or against the proposal than those stated below.

## FOR

Given the high level of wealth in the industrialized countries, we have a moral responsibility to share some of this wealth to reduce hunger in the world.

Because the world is so interconnected today, reducing hunger in the world ultimately serves U.S. interests. It creates more political stability, and by promoting economic growth helps create more markets for U.S. exports.

The industrialized countries have huge economies and tremendous resources. If they would all chip in, hunger could be cut in half at an affordable cost.

## AGAINST

It is not the responsibility of countries like the U.S. to take care of the hungry in other parts of the world; that is the responsibility of *their* governments.

It is unrealistic to try to cut world hunger in half. It would cost more money than people in the industrialized countries would be willing to pay.

The causes of hunger in other countries are complex and poorly understood. It is naive to think that outsiders can really make a serious difference by throwing money at the problem.

## CONCLUSION

Having heard all these points of view, do you think, if the other industrialized countries are willing to do their share, the U.S. should or should not be willing to commit to a joint plan for cutting world hunger in half by the year 2030?

