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I am honored by your invitation to give this Memorial address.

In major measure, the honor I feel accrues from the fact that I can recall with startling vividness the inauguration of the Memorial addresses. It was an inauguration that reflected a seriousness of purpose by the students of Macdonald, many of whom were survivors of events we are met today to remember. For those of us at that first address, the happenings, now recalled as a dim struggle of another generation, were remembered with the sad freshness of yesterday.

This series of addresses was begun in the belief that the perceptions of men of integrity could alter the course of human affairs and in so doing, establish without the sacrifice of life a more humane foundation for civilization.

Today I will speak in this tradition. My thoughts will focus on some of the requirements I see as necessary to generate a larger prosperity for rural peoples.

My remarks will concern mainly the welfare of the more than half of the world's population who live in the low-income nations we often call underdeveloped and who conduct their lives within the framework of social and cultural traditions that arose directly from man's discovery of agriculture more than eight millennia ago. This discovery provided the technical foundations of the neolithic civilizations that were the
highest forms of social organization until the advent of modern science-based technologies reshaped the societies of the North Atlantic Basin during the past two centuries.

In terms of human history, the shift of North Atlantic societies from a base of traditional agrarian technologies to a base of technologies derived from the application of scientific knowledge has been sudden indeed. Until roughly two centuries ago, agriculture was mankind's most significant technical achievement. And while estimates vary, it probably took from two to seven thousand years for agriculture to diffuse from its place of invention to the farther reaches of the world.

Not so with science-based technologies. Within only two hundred years all the world's nations are pursuing an even wider application of the processes by which the ancient technical basis of production can be rapidly and successfully recast in the form of science-derived technologies. The route to development is the technical transformation of the processes of production from traditional to modern, from traditional agricultural technology to scientific technology.

Anyone with a sense of North Atlantic Basin history of the past two hundred years cannot argue lightly that the transformation of society in the so-called "Western" nations should serve as a template for the future for non-Western peoples. The tremendous upheavals in Western social structure and cultural values which have attended the change from ancient to modern structure must be a source of disquiet about the worth of emulating Western experience. The current unease and detailed questioning of the values of Western civilization now dominating much of our social discourse, and the rising fear that the un-critical, widespread adoption of science-based production technologies may carry the hidden potential to destroy man or the earth he inhabits, must give pause to those who would foster worldwide development.

The question we must answer is: why is development sought and openly encouraged in both Western and non-Western nations alike? I think the basic element in the answer is to be found in the phrase "well-being". A phrase that implies a material benefit; a lessening of poverty; an enhancement of com-
fort; an increase in opportunity; a gain in personal freedom; an easing of fear and of want and of illness and above all, of despair.

The fact is, Western science-based technologies are the source of unparalleled prosperity, of unequalled well-being.

They have wrought their widespread benefits in the societies that have successfully shifted from an agrarian to a science-based structure of production. They hold the promise and demonstrated potential to enhance the well-being of a vast mass of people. Because of this, they are a prize to be sought, captured, and used. To assure their successful absorption, world nations are consciously altering the fundamental characteristics of their cultures in the hope that these alterations will facilitate the transformation necessary to procure the tendered material benefits.

I am sure many of you would like to explore the moral issues involved in altering society for the material gains of an acceptance and application of modern technologies. The exploration would be a sterile one, however, for once discovered, the inherent productivity of science-based means of production insures their continued viability as part of man's culture.

Those who would argue for the banishment of modern technology because of its power to shape society fail to understand that modern technology has no substitute. Mankind today could not survive either in number or in outlook by a return to neolithic methods of production or to the structure of neolithic society. Indeed, the solutions to the problems now perceived as threats inherent in the present state of the technical arts can only be found by the further extension of these same arts.

Those who argue the more moderate selective application of modern technologies are also in danger of error for they demonstrate a serious misunderstanding of the implications of scientific modernity. The fabric of modernity cannot be cut into designs to permit the choice of one and the discard of another. The web is a holistic one. Modern medical technology cannot be chosen to the neglect of more productive means for agriculture. Modern agriculture cannot be pursued without the
adoption of the industrial technologies of the agro-supply and processing industries; these, in turn, cannot be built without the supporting services of complementary industries, and so on. In the longer term, the transformation must be total — for the parts themselves are indivisible.

It is a transformation that has a time dimension, however, and it is important to choose correctly the sequential steps in fostering its accomplishment. In stressing this, I join those critics of Western history who claim North Atlantic societies have lost substantial social betterments that might have been captured through a greater control of the course of change.

The alteration of societies from ancient to modern involves not only an ultimate totality of adoption but also a totality of change. The purpose is an improvement in well-being, an improvement measured best by reference to changes in the aggregate value of a society’s goods and services per person. The familiar concept of gross national product per capita.

In all but a very few human societies, the basic economic ethic holds that each person can claim for himself from the flow of goods and services produced by the society, that amount of product which is roughly equal to the contributions he has made to the flow. The change from agrarian to modern is sought because of the demonstrated capacity of modern technology to enlarge by several orders of magnitude the total flow of social product. In quantifiable terms the result of the development process must be a rise in economic output, and its rate of growth must be substantially in excess of the rate of growth of population. In other words, an improvement in well-being of the citizens of a nation that is the ultimate purpose of development can be attained only if there is a sustained growth in the contribution the average citizen makes to the gross product.

I would fully agree with the contention that the well-being of a nation’s citizenry is embracive of far more than the outturn of the country’s production processes. It involves also an assessment of the mix and quality and distribution of the product of society’s labor. But a discussion of the relative capacities of a social product of alternative compositions to promote well-
being has relevance only for those nations enjoying the luxury of at least some affluence and, therefore, holding some power to make the practical political choices ultimately necessary for determining the components and distribution of total output. What does mix and distribution mean to the people and political leaders of a nation who generate a yearly output stream of less than $200 per person? What is there to distribute? And what significant options are open for altering the quality and changing the components of product when half the output is derived from traditional farming and a substantial portion of the population remain underfed? The first need of the desperately poor is more, more of everything except of want, illness and despair. The fulfilment of this need is measured by a rising GNP per capita; this must be the first goal of the practitioner of the development arts.

This is not to imply that I am oblivious to the issues that are often called ‘social justice’. The distribution of economic power, economic wealth, economic income and economic opportunity are closely correlated among themselves and with the holding and exercise of political power. There is an undeniable need in most low-income countries for a more equitable sharing of the components of economic well-being, but while reforms that slice a small pie into more equal pieces may assure an improved short-term social justice, they will do little in themselves to ease the gnawing realities that confront people who are poor.

The attributes of social justice may be the components of political stability, at least in societies of marked injustice. As such, they must and do command attention. But the attainment of justice is properly the sovereign concern of each nation. Its pursuit and establishment are not easily transferred across national or cultural boundaries. Although these truths should not limit debate about, or enquiry into the quest for better justice, a proper balance between a search for what is just among those who share the small pie of a common poverty, and a search for the efficient means to bake a larger pie, must result in a very much heavier emphasis being given to the processes of enlarging the pie.
Over 1.7 billion of the world’s population live in countries that produce less than $400 per capita per year, and almost forty per cent of the world’s total population of close to three billion live in countries with annual incomes of not more than $100 per person. Less than five hundred million persons live in countries with per capita incomes of over $1,500 per year.

Most of the world’s poor are people living in rural areas. Of the 1.7 billion persons inhabiting countries with less than an average income of $400 per year, an estimated eighty-two per cent or 1.4 billion people, close to half of the world’s population, live on the land or in small rural cities and towns. These people are dependent either directly as farmers, fishermen and herdsmen, or indirectly as artisans, laborers and traders on the output of the processes of traditional agricultural technology. For such societies, development entails a transformation of the life experience of people.

Conscientiously directed efforts to embrace the world’s rural populations as contributing and benefiting partners in the process of development has been of major concern to the world for only the past twenty years. In fact, many of the low-income countries have emerged as national entities only within this brief two-decade span.

For most of these twenty years the focus of rural development was diffused. Because of a prevailing view of traditional society as a perpetuator of the status quo and as a guardian of ancient values, there was a widespread acceptance of the belief that peasant culture could only be altered by a simultaneous change in all its aspects. Thus, development efforts were, in the main, directed across a broad front that sought change in everything from house design and child rearing practices to the institutions of local government and methods of farming. This approach was given the catchy label of “community development”.

A basic tenet of the community development thrust was the belief that agricultural productivity could be improved if there was a wider community dynamic generated by an infusion of external values derived from more modern cultures. The community development worker who was to carry these values
and generate the dynamic was proudly called "the change agent". He was trained in educational institutions modelled upon those of Western society. The curriculum for his training was formulated by Western consultants, and often his teachers were Western experts. The role of the change agent in the community was to liberate, mobilize, and channel the energies of a village population to endeavours that were supposed to improve village life and, in turn, release new enthusiasms for further change.

In Asia, the community development experiment was begun late in the decade of the 1940's. For the development economist, the measure of its success was to be a sustained rise in the output of agricultural product. In terms of the economist's models of development, this sustained growth in the product from the farm sector would provide the basis upon which the central core of national development — the creation of modern industry and the building of a modern urban-oriented economy — would rest. The farmer would have purchasing power to be an effective demander of industrial goods; the urban dweller and factory worker would have cheap food; the government would have an investable surplus to channel into the appurtenances of a modern nation.

By the mid-1960's, the failure of community development to deliver its promised payoff in the form of more agricultural product was a matter of world concern. Books were written about the impending world food crisis; speeches were made that sketched with sombre scholarship or colorful oratory the inexorable fate that awaited mankind when the blades of the scissors of stagnating food supply and burgeoning population finally closed. As I recall, the earliest of the projected dates for this doom-laden event was 1975.

It will not happen. But it would not be wise to dismiss those who foresaw a dark future as merely persons who mistakenly viewed reality through a glass darkly. They read correctly the likely outcome for food production of the early efforts of rural development.

The underlying assumptions of the community development movement upon which the hope for rural change was built did
not have the capability of producing change. These assumptions saw the peasant as traditional in outlook and habit, slow to change, stubborn in his tenacious clinging to old ideas and old ways. His decisions as a farmer were seen as being reflexive manifestations of transmitted learning that faithfully copied the behaviour of father and grandfather. A view vividly expressed in the question: "How can you change overnight what people have been doing for thousands of years?" The fact that no one had found a thousand-year-old farmer was dismissed as not being relevant to the real problem of introducing modern innovation.

It took almost twenty years for those concerned with the progress of rural peoples to accept a contrary view. This was a view that saw the rural peasant not as a mechanical animal wired by tradition to respond in pre-set ways, but as a sapient being whose decisions were rational to the circumstances of his present surroundings and whose judgment of his own best interest were as shrewdly drawn as the judgments of his contemporaries anywhere in the world.

Had this belief been the basis upon which the community development movement was launched, the problems of change in rural areas would have been seen not as problems associated with the 'how' of altering the behaviour of people, but as the 'why' of non-response when people were urged to accept innovations that, on the surface at least, appeared to offer benefits to those who would pursue their adoption. We know now that the process of rural development springs not from an answer to the question of how do we induce people to adopt new technologies, but from the question how do we find new technologies people will adopt.

It is a shift that reverses the direction of perceived development causality and opens the route to the development goal. It was this reversal that provided the intellectual underpinnings for what we know today as the "green revolution".

The establishment of the International Rice Research Institute in 1962 by the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations was a demonstration of faith in the rationality of the Asian peasant, and in the belief that nowhere in the world did there exist a more productive technology for tropical rice growing than the
traditional technology with which he was already familiar. (Even if he was not using it, for farmers, like artisans and scholars, are not equally skilled in the practice of their arts.) The Rice Institute was to find crop technologies that would be so highly productive and, therefore profitable, that farmers could not ignore them. The Institute staff were given ten years to transform the technical basis of tropical Asian rice production, and they were told that their success would be in direct proportion to the increase in regional rice output.

The story of the success of the Rice Institute in attaining these goals is now history. To this history must be added also the phenomenal response of the farmers of Africa, the Middle East and South Asia to the opportunities opened by the introduction of the Mexican dwarf varieties of wheat bred by Norman Borlaug.

The recent upthrust in the output per acre of some tropical crops has crucial import for our understanding of the peasant and the processes of change. The traditional peasant has proven that when opportunities open he can be as vigorously innovative as any of his supposedly more modern contemporaries. He has demonstrated that the true basis of change lies in opening to him new and enlarged opportunities for action that are perceived by him as promising a direct enhancement of his well-being. In demonstrating this, he has forced the development specialist to focus on the set of opportunities that are available or might be made available which would enable him to express his innovative drive and fulfil his desire to reach for the attributes of a fuller life.

When those who foster development are asked to build sets of meaningful opportunities into which the creative energies of the rural mass can flow, the nature of the development course takes on new substance and form. A substance and form that breed an optimistic assurance that mankind has garnered the insights necessary to launch the development efforts of poor nations on a course toward the goal of an enhanced well-being for their rural peoples.

I hold this optimism even in the face of the fact that the arithmetic of the next 25 years of population growth holds that
the number of rural poor will have doubled. There are harbingers that suggest this datum may be as much in error as the prediction of those who cried famine seven years ago. They are only harbingers, but I find them comforting because they suggest that mankind's propensity to reproduce is the outcome of rational behaviour. In other words, people do not breed like computerized mechanical fruit flies. There is a small but growing body of evidence that human birth rates are responsive to an underlying set of variables that may be controllable by an appropriate set of national population policies.

I believe that within the next ten years we will know vastly more about population and the factors influencing its inherent dynamic, and that with this knowledge we can slow the seemingly inexorable exponential growth of human numbers.

I want to turn and dwell briefly on the long-term perspective for rural prosperity. Not that the short-term is unimportant, and certainly what is done now greatly influences what can be done in the future; but I will dodge the short run because the complexity of addressing the present would demand a tedium of detail.

The basis of long sustained human progress is to be found from only two sources: 1) making more productive the technical relations among the factors of production; 2) enhancing the skills of people engaged in productive pursuits. To translate this into a larger prosperity for the rural populations of the present and yet to be born, there are four elements that must command attention.

The first is the need to expand rapidly the conduct of applied research from which will come the technologies for a larger production of primary agricultural products, including those of the forests and fisheries. A firm beginning has been made in this endeavour through the joint efforts of the world's major aid donors and philanthropic foundations, but there remain significant gaps in what is being done to find profitable new technologies for the circumstances of all rural peoples. Greater attention must be given to research in fisheries, land use including range management, and for the better exploitation and utilization for agriculture of the world's geophysical
resources, to mention only three areas of limited investigation. But of all the neglected areas, it is likely that the largest payoff to research will be found in discovering the most effective means of trapping the tropical climatic potential of sunlight, rainfall and temperature to produce plant material from diversified farm crops on a sustained year-round basis. Present research into technologies that exploit the opportunities for sequential cropping in the tropics suggest that the yield potential on land with assured water is between eight and ten metric tons of grain equivalent per acre per year. The widespread use of these methods holds a promise of abundance that is staggering. If they were applied to the land of the Indo-Gangetic Basin of India, Pakistan, and East Bengal, the resulting output would be close to equalling the world’s present total production of grain. A great deal more research is required, however, before these technologies are ready for demonstration to, and adoption by, tropical farmers. But the promise is there.

The second element of the four that must be pursued is an investment in building in rural areas the structures of improved land and service institutions and facilities needed to support a high productivity agriculture. These investments will not be cheap, but it has been demonstrated clearly from the aftermath of the green revolution that the rural peoples who will benefit from them are willing to put a large proportion of the gains of their rising prosperity into the capital improvements necessary to sustain the growth in the outturn of their endeavours. The need now is to translate into national policies the recognition that investments in agriculture can have a high rate of return if they follow upon successful research and are directly instrumental to facilitating the adoption of new technologies.

The third element of the four that must be pursued is education. This is probably the most cloudy of the four and I have no clear prescription. I do not think anyone has defined what we mean by education in terms that lead logically to the actions necessary for efficiently bringing new or improved skills to rural people. Perhaps the best that can be done is to follow the traditional route of the three R's. As I observe or read about the outcome of educational experiments that seek a more royal road to learning, I find myself very attracted by the traditional
techniques of the Scots schoolmaster and the rigor of his methods of transmitting skills.

I recognize that education is far more than that which transpires in a formal school setting, but I remain mystified by what I see of those who claim an expertise in the fields of adult enlightenment. I do know that the Western nations wrought a teaching miracle in their colleges and universities, a miracle repeated, using essentially the same techniques, by Japan and, perhaps, China. I know also that this nation wrought a training miracle during the Second World War when it made Rosie a riveter. It seems plausible that we have not exploited adequately the lessons of this experience when we strive to enhance the knowledge and skills of populations unfamiliar with modern technology.

I wish I could say that all we needed in education was research on educational technologies. If I thought this were so, I would group this element with my first one. But I think it is not the case. I feel a great deal more effort must be put into seeking an understanding of what we mean by the term ‘education’. The process of changing human perceptions and human capabilities is an integral part of development and, despite its messiness and uncertainties, those who would practise the development arts must come to grips with the hard reality of the ‘why’ and ‘how’ of education.

The fourth element is derived from a recognition that the development of North Atlantic societies will probably have little relevance to what must be the ultimate course of change in today’s low-income nations. I do not foresee the time when the population of India, say, will be ten per cent rural. To build metropolises, to house a billion or so people, and to provide them with urban jobs is a task that to me is inconceivable of accomplishment. The future prosperity of most low-income nations must rest upon the provision of employment opportunities within the physical space of a rural setting defined to include the small town or local city.

If research is channelled to the discovery of intensive farming techniques that will require a large labor input and provide an appropriate return to that labor, and if public policies for
agricultural development are drawn to foster the economic and operational feasibilities of high-output small-farm agriculture, I think it will be possible to prevent the mass displacement of farm people from the land that characterized Western development. However, even if rural populations presently dependent on agriculture were presented with an array of attractive innovative opportunities that held them on the farm, the foreseeable pressure of population growth will, in many countries, add people whose services are not needed and are not useful in agriculture. It is for this group that opportunities for productive employment must be created. And if the overburdened slums that presently blight most of the major large cities in low-income countries are not to become an even more shameful shadow on the conscience of mankind, these new opportunities for employment must be the core elements giving rise to a growing number of rural towns and small industrial centres.

It is not easy to see how the industrial processes of Western culture can be adapted to the requirements of a rural-based population. There are truly formidable problems in screening the experience of the world’s wealthy nations to extract understandings of how this experience might be adapted to meet the long-term needs of low-income countries. It is clear that the capital investment required to create a job in the small-scale factories that are beginning to emerge in many poor nations is probably a tenth to one hundredth the capital needed to create a new job in factories designed to meet Western specifications; an order of magnitude that holds a glittering potential for meeting the employment demands of future populations. It is only a potential, however, for it cannot be realized without an abundance of diversified small-scale, labor intensive, economically efficient factory technologies. There is no such abundance. Worse, there is virtually no research focused on generating such an abundance.

There are a few Asian countries, notably Singapore, Hong Kong, Taiwan and South Korea, that have grappled with this problem. From their experience, and from the experience with modernizing the farm sectors in both low- and high-income nations, it seems likely that a breakthrough in high productivity and high employment in small and medium industry could
emerge from an aggressive application of the same methods used so successfully to transform the technological basis of farming. These methods would suggest the establishment of research centres and research programs devoted to finding, through the use of applied science, the technologies that are necessary for profitable small industry. They would involve programs of training for workers and industrial managers, and they would entail the establishment and operation of an extension network to carry to factory managers the results of research and the solutions to immediate problems. In short, small industry requires for its support and development the same combination of teaching, research and extension that has been the prime mover of agricultural productivity both here and overseas.

The justification for a century of support from the public purse for the great agricultural institutions and farm advisory services of Western countries rests upon an economic rationale that sees agriculture as a competitive industry composed of small unit farm firms producing a product that is not easily differentiated in the marketplace. The typical firm in the industry has not the resources to support programs of research, or to incur easily the costs of early experimentation; and even if a few firms have such resources, it is seldom that their product line has the uniqueness necessary to permit them to recover their investments in research and experimentation through the capture of some form of monopoly rent. These characteristics of the agricultural industry fully justify a public investment in research, training, and in the diffusion of results to practice. Society as a whole recovers its return on this investment through lower prices for farm output. The record indicates that it has been an extraordinarily sound investment.

The same rationale applies to the argument for similar public assistance to small industry; and to the gains of society in the form of industrial products must be added the benefits of an employed labor force and long-term social stability.

In grappling with the problem of employment, I can see no light at the end of the tunnel described by those who would strive to replace machines with people. In effect, they argue that the muscle power of a million men with teaspoons is to be preferred to a thousand men with wheelbarrows or two men on
bulldozers. I do not believe that man was meant to be a beast of burden merely because a present-day economic ethic demands from a man a contribution of work if he is to have the right to claim a pittance from society's income, and with a teaspoon or even a wheelbarrow all he would claim would be a pittance. I would prefer the productivity of the bulldozer and a program that distributes income as the right of all, to a make-work policy using the muscles and backs of men merely because the beliefs of outmoded times control the distribution of society's product. I would argue that it is the tenet which must be abandoned, not the capacity of the machine to free man from the indignities of physical hardship.

While this declaration skates perilously close to a denial of a fundamental aspect of my protestant heritage, I cannot overthrow this heritage entirely. At least not yet, for it has not been demonstrated to my satisfaction that man need not feel a sense of usefulness to his fellow-man and the larger human community of which he is a part. I have no doubt that it will be possible to attain an extraordinary level of material well-being for all the world's population through technologies of large-scale output that demand only a very small number of workers. And I am confident a method could be found to assure equitable distribution of this product. But the process would likely condemn hundreds of millions of people to lives of affluent idleness.

It is sobering to realize that the gross national product of India is one half the GNP of Canada but that Canada produces its level of output by employing approximately one thirtieth of the labor force of India. In starkest terms, this would mean that India could double her per capita income and employ only one person in thirty if the Indian economy were to replicate the human and physical capital structure and adopt the production methods used in Canada. Such dreams are idle speculations, but they do point to a fundamental problem besetting low-income nations as they seek to provide productive opportunities for their populations. The trade-offs between work and leisure, leisure and idleness are at the root of the future structure of rural society.

In any discussion of the problem of finding jobs for growing populations, I find it difficult to sort through the concepts of
who is employed, and under-employed, and unemployed. I do know that in most agricultural communities of the world, including our own where we must work very hard for four months of the year to chop enough wood to keep warm in the other eight, full employment is a seasonal affair. Yet despite the alternation of periods of hard work and leisure that characterizes the lives of most of the world's low-income people, the analysis of the issues surrounding the crisis of finding non-traditional employment for them has focused on discovering new occupations requiring some sort of standard forty-hour week for 52 weeks per year. It is true that GNP will not be larger if the work week were twenty hours; but it is also true that on a twenty-hour basis a lot more people would be given an opportunity to play a useful role in society (albeit at half the wage of the longer period) concurrently with the opportunity to enjoy a leisure that would be in keeping with the traditions of their forebears. Each society has its own definitions of the work to be expected from a man. I suggest that as we in the richer nations give attention to the problems of enhancing the well-being of the rural peoples of poor societies, we do so by adopting first their concepts of how much labor it is proper for society to claim from a man if he, in turn, is to have the right to claim from society a share of the social product.

For the past several minutes you have honored me by listening to my ramblings on a subject that I see as the greatest challenge ever faced by mankind. The most serious threat to human survival is to be found in the animosities arising from the widening disparity between the few who are wealthy and the mass who are poor. The mass will not sit long in peaceful envy of the rich. If the technologies of prosperity are difficult to find and hard to implement, the technologies of mass destruction and ruthless conquest are not. The survival of the human race depends upon the ability of men of goodwill to find the means of ensuring that each member of the race holds an undeniable stake in man's survival because he enjoys now a measure of well-being, the confident assurance that he and his offspring will have a meaningful place in human society, and the sure hope of a purposeful and secure future.
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