

conference model of the UN's Committee of the Whole. The latter has been inappropriately nicknamed COW, inappropriate because a cow is usually productive.

The world is poised to move towards another model, that of negotiation-by-summitry: The Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting scheduled to be held in Melbourne, Australia; the mini-summit of 25 or so countries, proposed by the Brandt Commission, to be held in Mexico City in the autumn of 1981; and the 'big seven' powers economic conference to be held in Ottawa in July, will all concentrate on development issues. There is a certain attraction, but also a certain danger, in the process of summitry. A summit that succeeds is usually a spectacular success. A summit that fails is usually a spectacular failure. Potentially, a summit is the appropriate place for North-South decisions to be made, for the process of power-sharing requires consent at the highest levels of authority. On the other hand, should a summit meeting fail to produce a true 'marriage of minds', the countries represented could well find themselves locked into inflexible positions from which there can be no escape in the foreseeable future.

When ambassadors disagree, ministers or heads of government can step in, to resolve the differences. Unfortunately, the buck cannot be passed in the opposite direction. Given these imponderables, it is clear that the whole field of global negotiation, encompassing training for negotiation, urgently deserves study, analysis, and thoughtful proposals. While urging that such studies be undertaken in an effort to sharpen and strengthen the process of global negotiation, more narrowly-focussed initiatives are needed which could, in a relatively short time, make a direct impact on the lives of the people. These initiatives should not be considered substitutes for global negotiation. On the contrary, if they are properly selected and effectively pursued, they could both inspire and buttress the global negotiating process. Food, energy and technology transfer are areas in which accelerated, collective action is both desirable and possible.

Rhetoric to action

These are not the only areas in which collective international action can and should be mounted without delay. They hold promise of movement from rhetoric to action. In stating a case for joint sectoral action, this could also be sustained by global action. One sustains the other. In a situation where the human condition dictates a sense of urgency, it is practical and realistic to fractionalize major issues into their component parts and work collectively to solving them, never forgetting that the ultimate intention is to put them all together in an interlocking global composite.

One of those interlocking components is the domestic intentions and capacity of developing countries themselves. The quest for international partnership if it is not accompanied by a parallel domestic dynamic,

will make little or no difference to the lives of people most affected by disadvantages and disparities. A South-North compact will be ineffectual if it involves only power-sharing between and among elites. It is the responsibility of developing countries, therefore, to construct domestic structures designed to make maximum advantage of international arrangements, and to share the product of domestic and external gains equitably.

In Sri Lanka, our development strategy involves the creation of a system of government and administration that combines the imperatives of parliamentary democracy with those of development; the replacement of import-substitution in industry by import-substitution in agriculture; the redirection of food subsidies, except in the case of the very poor, from the consumer to the producer; a nationwide housing program with housing starts concentrated in village areas; the establishment of new, rural-oriented credit and investment institutions; the allocation of industry to the private sector, both local and foreign, under state monitoring and a giant river basin development program.

The Accelerated Mahaveli Ganga Development Program aims at a 40 percent increase of the country's land under irrigation, the voluntary resettlement of 140,000 landless rural families in the newly-fertile farmlands, massive generation of employment, increased productivity that will turn us into a "surplus country" and the increased development of hydro-electricity. To do this, work is in progress on the trans-basin diversion of 1,000 cubic feet per second of water from our major river, the Mahaveli Ganga. Our program combines the requisites of 'growth' and 'basic needs' in an exemplary manner.

Economic self-interest

Economic self-interest simply demands that the North cooperate with the South, in building new economic and financial arrangements to replace those post-World War II arrangements which worked well for the North up to a point, but are now dysfunctional. The so-called crisis that afflicts some developed countries is not really a crisis at all. The refusal of stagflation to respond to established remedies does not constitute a crisis, but offers proof of the need for innovation and inventiveness. Oil price shocks, if nothing else, have demonstrated that vested interests cannot be preserved indefinitely. Transnational operations have made autarchy irrelevant. What is left but faith and hope in a symmetrical North-South compact?

Similarly, political self-interest requires that the North respond to the South's demand for economic liberation no less than it did to the struggle for political freedom. Some years ago, Canadian Senator Dandurand told the League of Nations that Canadians "live in a fireproof house, far from inflammable materials". There are no fire proof houses in today's world. Anarchy, as a response to continued economic depriva-