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Scanlan and Jenkins approach the topic of child hunger as well as hunger in general from all possible many directions. They ask the major question: with so much help out there going to needy countries, and with so much food available, how could hunger still be increasing? Their hypotheses lead them to point out military control, lack of access, and gender discrimination as the most prominently destructive forces. The force of hunger does not remain immobilized in one country, either. Nutritional problems quickly become international issues due to the panic and instability they cause. Therefore it is no surprise that the United Nations has made eradicating starvation its top priority. Aided by such organizations as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention on the Right of the Child, and others, millions of dollars have been raised to go to LDCs (define acronyms) in order to fight the dangers of hunger (Scanlan 2007: 825). Nonetheless, as Scanlan and Jenkins go on to say, such aid cannot truly help with the deeply rooted complexities in some of the hunger issues out there.

As Scanlan and Jenkins point out, the presence of food has no effect on whether the population will be starved or not. That there is food availability is not of any assistance without its partner, food access, or "The ability to acquire available food via the marketplace, a public distribution system" (Scanlan 2007: 827). If people are not given the means to have any sort of purchasing power, which will happen in the countries of questionable governments, then not only with the economy be detrimentally affected, but individuals will hardly be able to get their hands on any goods. This downward spiral is only reinforced in societies that don't allow women to obtain jobs or any sort of an economic in (?? not sure what this means). In these cases the females are held back from taking care of their families, and in times when their men are taken away to war (thereby usually ending up being killed or kept away for extended periods of time) the women are left without any means to provide neither their young nor themselves with food.

But overlooking all of these issues is the most complicated one, the issue of highly militarized and corrupt governments. It is the government that determines that women have no political nor economic power, and the government that can lock away the population's access to the food supply. These issues come back to bite (avoid idioms) international intervention as well, however, in the matter of globally paid for emergency aid. For though money and food may be sent in assistance, "Predatory militaries and insurgents have been known to seize emergency aid, using it to sustain 'food wars'" (Scanlan 2007: 830). If one wants to get any sort of assistance across to the people in need, the government must be dealt with first, which could certainly lead to sticky situations.(avoid idioms)

The research these experts have done and their proofs for each hypotheses has made my outlook on the hunger issue both more solidified, as well as more formidable. I had known about the corruption of some of the governments in third-world countries--Hollywood has definitely brought such issues out to the open if nothing else. But the matter doesn't simply lie with politics but culture as well. For example, some of these societies consider women to be entirely unimportant out of a cultural perspective (even cultures that deny women's rights in some areas give them importance in others e.g., child rearing. Also, what is a "cultural perspective"? vague. I'd reword this statement). As Scanlan and Jenkins point out, this means they are not provided with access to either food or money. The problem extends from these issues to include birth control, which allows for yet more famished children to be born into this world. If anybody were to solve the hunger matter, then, one would have to struggle with every aspect of society. They would have to intervene with the role of the government, as well as change some basic belief systems. Not only is the possibility of this questioned, but also the morality, because who says that outsiders have the right to barge in and say that their ways are better, that they can "fix" these less-fortunate others? Good point.