

We have the money to end starvation. We choose not to.

\$2.718 trillion - annual global military expenditure
\$6.75 billion - annual cost to end starvation

That's 0.25%. Not 25%. Not 2.5%. Zero point two five percent.

Not anti-military?

Switch to food loss and waste: 0.68%. Take tax abuse: 1.37%. Pick fossil fuel support: 1.31%. Go with luxury spending: 0.42%.

The data exists. Scattered across reports. We connected the dots at redistributed.net

Move a slider. If the slider moves you, take a stand.

Yes, but...

"We can't afford it."
0.25%. Next excuse.

"It's more complex than that."
Transferred resources ÷ Cost of feeding the target population = Impact on starvation. Sixth-grade arithmetic.

"What about logistics?"
The UN World Food Programme has the people, tools and partners to get the job done.

"We need to address root causes."
Ask someone starving what the root cause is. The answer is lack of food. You don't debate complex theories on an empty stomach.

The tool doesn't argue. It calculates.

This isn't a problem without a solution. It's a solution without political will. Every day we delay, we choose the outcome.

redistributed

Military expenditure: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2025*
Food loss and waste: United Nations Environment Programme, *Food Waste Index Report 2024*

Tax abuse: Tax Justice Network, *State of Tax Justice 2024*

Fossil fuel support: The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, *OECD Inventory of Support Measures for Fossil Fuels 2024*

Luxury spending: Bain & Company, *Luxury in Transition 2025*

Target population: 37 million people experiencing IPC Phase 4 (Emergency) and Phase 5 (Catastrophe)
food insecurity, Food Security Information Network, *Global Report on Food Crises 2025*

Daily cost per person: \$0.50 (average cost of a WFP meal), UN World Food Programme