

to our aid programmes, that more sophisticated and comprehensive administrative arrangements, and more clarity and precision with respect to objectives, will be necessary.

The purpose of aid, as we see it, is clearly and simply to help the less-developed countries of the world achieve a degree of economic development which accords with the needs and aspirations of their peoples. Unfortunately, this basic, central objective has all too often been obscured and distorted by conflicting considerations. If genuine international development is to take place on the scale desired, and with the necessarily limited resources available, it is essential that the goal of economic development be kept at the forefront of our thinking, and that other goals be discarded, or at least placed in a subordinate position.

There is, for example, a tendency in some quarters to regard aid as a means of exerting political influence. Given the conflict of ideologies which is such an important feature of the international scene, this tendency is perhaps understandable. Certainly, we should hope that the attainment of economic development would encourage the less-developed countries to evolve systems of government consonant with our own ideals of liberty, an open society, and respect for the rule of law. It should be noted, too, that a certain degree of confidence and understanding must exist between donor and recipient governments, if only to make possible the administrative arrangements necessary for the successful operation of an aid programme. But it is, I think, a grave error to view aid as a means of gaining immediate political objectives, or of buying friends. Experience has clearly shown that such a view may not only lead to disappointment but can result also in the waste of scarce resources and a failure to achieve any sort of meaningful economic result.

Another goal which is sometimes claimed for aid programmes, and which I think is also of doubtful validity, is the attainment of immediate commercial benefit for the donor country. Economic progress in the developing countries will, in the long run, result in expanding trade opportunities on a global scale, but aid programmes which have as their principal purpose the stimulation of production in the donor country are not likely to be very relevant to the economic needs of the less-developed countries. The drive and know-how of businessmen in our free-enterprise economies must, of course, be utilized in the implementation of aid projects, but to confuse aid programmes with the promotion of exports, in itself a perfectly legitimate and necessary field of government action, is to run the risk of failing to achieve the objectives of either.

There is also, I think, a risk involved in regarding aid as charity, or as some kind of massive international relief effort. Special emergency measures must, of course, be taken from time to time on an international scale for the relief of human suffering, and such measures often tend to find their way into aid programmes. It would be morally and humanly wrong not to provide assistance when the alternatives are sickness, starvation, and death. But such measures, if they are allowed to become the foundation of an aid programme, may well make it more difficult to achieve effective and lasting economic progress in the