

With our command of technology, we of the Western industrial nations can confidently expect to grow by at least 3 per cent a year. In the developing continents, even that rate of growth is precarious and, when achieved, is swallowed up by population growth. So the prosperity of the rich nations is leaping ahead of the poor nations almost with the speed of rockets to the moon.

Just as, in the nineteenth and early twentieth century, the misery of the masses was the root, for long years, of an underlying threat of violence, so, today, the misery of the dispossessed people, coupled with their "rising expectations", is the chief raw material of world-wide revolutionary violence and subversion -- a movement which, especially in the case of China, is taking on an additional and ominous strain of racism.

Well, we know all this. I am repeating to you things that are in danger of becoming clichés. Yet they are true. We are living on a powder-keg of anger and revolt. We are living in a world so small that the violence affects us all. We are confronted with the risk of international class war. The curious fact today is not that we do not know these things but that a great many people are bored with them and feel less and less obligation to do anything about them. There is a sort of "weariness with well-doing" after two decades of economic assistance, a feeling that not much good has, in fact, been done; that aid has been squandered, and that, even if it got to the people it ought to help, probably they would by then have too many children to get much benefit from it. The mood is thus not so much to deny the crisis but simply to avert national attention from it and then rationalize the indifference by pleading the impossibility of effective action.

One reason for this malaise stems from the nature of our reporting of developments. In foreign affairs, as in most other things, bad news is usually good news. The crises, the eruptions, the violence, the catastrophes - these are the staples of headlines and stories. All of you know about President Nasser telling the United States to put its aid in the Red Sea and President Sukarno telling the Americans to "go jump" in the Indonesian equivalent of "the lake". All of you know that burning American libraries or stoning American embassies has become a popular "under-developed" sport. All this news produces a certain disillusionment about foreign aid -- certainly in the U.S.A., the country where most of it comes from.

Above all, there is current disenchantment because the value of aid as related to it, the necessity of peace, seem to be subordinated to political factors that make for conflict which could not only wipe out the benefit of aid already received but prejudice its continuance.

Notwithstanding all this, we should not forget the great successes already achieved in the field of mutual assistance.

In Pakistan over the last five years, industry has been growing by 12 to 15 per cent a year, farming by nearly 4 per cent, national income by 6 to 7 per cent, exports by 7 per cent. This is an economic success story as startling as any in the contemporary world. It has been made possible by sustained, sensible Western aid administered through a World Bank consortium. Yet who knows about it?