

do without if all will become good stewards of what we have. And to ensure that, we must concentrate not so much on what we possess but on what we are and what we are capable of becoming." This challenge was a central issue at the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Jamaica, last month; this challenge is being faced by the group of experts set up by that conference; and it was also this challenge that led me to visit five West African countries in April to discuss among other things with their leaders how we might shape the evolving relationship between developing countries and the industrialized world. These discussions confirmed to me how rapidly the context in which development issues are viewed is changing.

Until recently, international development could be discussed almost exclusively within the framework of bilateral and multilateral aid programmes. True, there were a few experts, a few Cassandras, who claimed that international assistance was not working, since there could never be enough of it to finance the social and economic transformation of the three-quarters of the world that live in poverty. True, the developing countries were not only clamouring for more aid, but also asking, in UNCTAD and other arenas, for a revamping of international trading arrangements which would enable them to "earn their own way," so to speak, that is to finance their development out of export earnings. All of us were familiar, long before the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations, with the slogan "trade not aid".

Yet international development was still mainly discussed with reference to the aid relationship. Statistics were endlessly recomputed, as if more dollars could be wrung from figures. A call to do more invariably meant more money for international development agencies. Studies and reports tended to focus on various aspects of the aid relationship; bilateral versus multilateral aid, agriculture versus industry, the sending of experts versus technical training, ways and means to relieve them of their debt burden, or to coordinate more effectively assistance made available to them from various sources. By and large, the contribution of donor countries to international development was still considered as a response to a moral imperative. The affluent sought to buy their peace of mind with a slice - quite often a substantial slice - of national budgets. The problem thus defined, only a predetermined set of questions needed to be answered. The technicians having taken their cue from the moralists, vital issues of development were thrown out with the bath water of aid.