

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.

Try food loss and waste: 0.68%. Tax abuse: 1.37%. Each source alone holds multiples of what's needed.

Not anti-military? Switch to fossil fuel support. Not anti-capitalism? Use luxury spending. Same result.

The data exists. Scattered across reports. We connected the dots at [redistributed.net](https://redistributed.net)

The numbers don't lie. We do.

"Can't afford it."

Yes, we can. 0.25%. Next excuse.

"It's more complex than that."

Transferred resources ÷ Cost of feeding the target population = Impact on starvation. Sixth-grade arithmetic.

"But what about logistics?"

The WFP will use existing systems already working around the world, and scale them up where needed.

"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.

Move a slider. See the impact in real-time. Share your results.

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

Daily cost per person: US\$0.50 (one meal per day), UN World Food Programme