

THE HONORABLE DAVID E. BELL, ADMINISTRATOR

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

at

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

Stanford, California

AID-65-102

As delivered

June 13, (1965)

It is a rare privilege for me to be invited to speak at this Commencement. As the son of a Stanford faculty member, I grew up in this community, and have always felt toward this University that special blend of affection and realistic appraisal reserved for the places and people one knows most intimately.

I gained here, as a youngster, some appreciation of the significance and the excitement of the scholar's search for truth, by observing some of Stanford's greatest - men like Dean Cubberley, Dr. Terman, Professor Bailey Willis. I also saw something of the less scholarly aspects of university life - exemplified most clearly, perhaps, by my recollection at about the age of ten, of helping a friend of mine who was a collector of whiskey bottles, search out new varieties from the rich assortments which we found under the seats of the Stadium after major football games.

So I think I have more than the usual background of acquaintance with this University, and I mean it as far more than a perfunctory politeness when I say that I have admired greatly the strong progress Stanford has been making. Particularly in recent years, under the leadership of President Sterling and his colleagues, Stanford has plainly moved far toward becoming one of the topflight universities in the United States.

Those of you who are graduating today have been fortunate in your opportunity to seek education in this place. You have been especially fortunate to work in a University that reflects so well the growing international element in American life. To one in my line of work it is most impressive that Stanford now has undergraduate campuses in France, Italy, and Germany, and graduate centers in Tokyo, Taipei, and Lima - that there are now about 800 foreign students enrolled here - that about half of the Stanford student body is expected to study abroad sometime in their college years - and, to me most impressive of all, that Stanford has ranked highest among major universities in ratio of Peace Corps volunteers to enrollment.

These facts are evidence of the extent to which Stanford's situation has changed in parallel with the Nation's situation. World War II catapulted the United States into a leading role in affairs all around the world - and we can never turn back. We are today a world power in the full sense of that phrase.

Nowhere is this more plain than in the so-called less-developed nations of the world, in Latin America, Africa, and Asia, where over two-thirds of the world's people live, in conditions which by comparison with ours in the United States can only be described as appalling poverty.

What is happening in the less-developed countries is now of very great importance to us in the United States, and will be of increasing importance to us during the lifetimes of everyone here today. I should like to make a few comments this afternoon on the meaning to the United States of the changes that have been occurring in the countries of Asia and Africa and Latin America, and what we have been and should be doing about it.

I

The developing countries have been in a state of tremendous upheaval since the end of World War II, as a result of two main forces. One is the drive for national independence - a drive so irresistible that the European colonial empires, gradually acquired over a period of three or four hundred years, have been all but dismantled in twenty years. It is hard to realize how rapid this process has been. Of the 34 independent countries in Africa today, 17 have gained their independence since the beginning of 1960; only four were independent in 1950. Half of the Ambassadors in Washington today were born the colonial subjects of foreign powers.

The second main force working in the developing countries is the drive for economic and social progress. The people in these new countries - and throughout the less-developed parts of the world - are determined to overcome the conditions of poverty, illness, and hunger in which they

find themselves. The powerful thrust of their desire for change can be seen in their passion for education - in their effort to sweep away feudal landlords - in dozens of challenges to established patterns of government and economic life.

Make no mistake about it, the contemporaries of these Stanford graduates, in Bogota and in Bangkok, in Delhi and in Dar-Es-Salaam, are a generation of revolutionaries. They are not satisfied with the world as it is, and they intend to change it.

These twin forces - the drive for national independence and the drive for economic and social progress - together make up an irresistible tide of change sweeping through three continents. I suppose it is not too much to suggest that the aspirations of the developing nations, along with the powerful thrust of communist imperialism and the harnessing of the atom, are the three most significant forces of history at work in our time.

This tremendous tide of change in the developing countries has posed extremely important issues for us in the United States. What should be our response?

The first element in our response must be that we are natural allies of the drive for independence and for progress. As President Kennedy put it in one of his splendid phrases, the United States was "born in revolution, and raised in freedom."

And we in the United States have always believed that freedom is more than a state of political independence. Freedom in the United States has not meant passive acceptance of a status quo, but active, passionate struggle for change and improvement.

The result has been rapid and widespread progress. It is a caricature - and always has been a caricature - to describe progress in the United States primarily in terms of material welfare. We are indeed a rich and wealthy society in the material sense, but we are a strong and progressive society not for that reason, but because we have achieved over the years great gains in opportunities for education and for personal achievement for an ever larger proportion of our citizens.

Major events in American history underline this fact. Recall the drive for free public schools for all children in the first half of the nineteenth century. Recall the invention of the Land Grant College, first in the state of Vermont, and then, under the advocacy of a Vermont Senator, on a national scale. Recall the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, enacted in 1890, and to this day the strongest and most effective legislation in any country in the world for achieving the benefits of private business enterprise without the ill effects of private business monopoly. Recall the establishment of the Federal Reserve System and the progressive income tax in the early 1900's, the adoption of the Wagner Labor Relations Act in the 1930's.

We often forget the significance of steps like these - each of which was highly controversial - each of which was fought bitterly for years, some for decades, before being adopted as public policy. It was steps like these which helped to bring about in this country a dynamic economic system which opens opportunities not for a few, but for the vast majority; and which has encouraged very rapid social mobility and very rapid technological innovation, to the great benefit of all of us.

With a history like this, it is no wonder that we understand and share the passionate desire of the people of Latin America and Asia and Africa to throw off ancient shackles and to build a better life for themselves and their children.

II

But our attitude toward the developing countries is based on far more than a feeling of kinship. Fundamental interests of the United States are involved. It matters deeply to us whether these countries are able to make progress as free societies.

We in the United States could not live safely in a world where the area of freedom was shrinking. Our own economic future will be greatly benefitted by economic growth in the developing world. Finally,

it would surely not be fitting for the wealthiest nation on earth, proud of its ethical and moral background, to ignore the needs of fellow men who are poor and hungry and ill.

So we are powerfully motivated, for reasons of national security, of economics, of humanitarianism, to help the developing countries as they strive for economic and social progress. And we have been helping them, on a sizeable scale. Our first major aid programs after World War II were directed to Europe and Japan, but for more than fifteen years we have been providing technical advice and training and material help to the developing countries.

What have we achieved? In some cases, the results have been remarkable. The experience of free China, for example, on the island of Taiwan, is little short of miraculous. Fifteen years ago Taiwan was generally written off as a permanent pensioner of the United States. Today, as a result of strong and sensible efforts by the Chinese, plus major assistance from the United States, the Taiwanese economy is thriving - production, income, and exports are gaining so rapidly that the need for our economic assistance has come to an end.

What has been done on Taiwan is not the result of luck. The Taiwanese did not strike oil. The results there stem from sound policies and from very hard work. A highly successful land reform was carried out. Better seeds, more fertilizer, and other elements of modern agriculture have brought rapidly rising farm output. A lively industry has been developed, the main thrust coming in the private sector. Schools and health centers have been built.

The Taiwanese have not become rich in this process. The income per person in Taiwan is about \$150 per year - compared with over \$2500 per person per year in the United States. But the Taiwanese have learned how to apply modern science and technology to their problems. They have learned how to achieve a steadily higher standard of living for themselves, year by year into the future. Our aid has done its job, and the Taiwanese can take it from here.

Taiwan is exceptional, but other aid-receiving countries have also made very substantial progress. Pakistan, for example, where Professor Despres of this University and I had the privilege of working ten years ago, has made rapid gains in agriculture and industry and education - more rapid gains than either of us would have thought possible in 1955.

The results in Taiwan and in Pakistan - and in other countries such as India, Turkey, Korea - can be read as highly encouraging.

I think, however, it would be a serious mistake were we in the United States to draw an unduly optimistic conclusion about the rate of progress that we can expect in Asia, in Africa, and Latin America.

The inherent difficulties of modernizing these societies are extremely large. Consider the fact that whereas about 25 percent of the young people of college age are in college in the United States, something under one-tenth of one percent of the young people of college age in Africa have any opportunity for higher education. It will obviously take a generation to create anything

like the numbers of trained leaders Africa needs, no matter how rapidly the Africans with our help seek to expand their educational opportunities, no matter how generous we are in bringing young Africans to the United States for training here.

Increasing education in the developing countries is a slow process. So is modernizing agriculture. Many of you here I am sure have watched, as I have, oxen treading out the grain on the threshing floor - not in a Biblical movie - but in the fields and villages of India today. The process of raising agricultural output is one of the most complex endeavors in human experience. It requires change in rural technology, education, transportation, markets, credit, and many other aspects of life. It is a slow and difficult process - but a crucially important one.

Projections recently made by experts in the U. S. Department of Agriculture suggest that the increase in food supply in the world for the last several years has barely kept pace with growing food demands, and may even have fallen behind. Looking ahead, these experts foresee for at least a decade a nip and tuck struggle to prevent serious and widespread food shortages in view of the rapid rates of population growth in many places.

So we must recognize, in my opinion, that we can expect only slowly to see more success stories like Taiwan.

Furthermore, the efforts of the people of the developing countries will be made much harder by the disruptive hostility of communist insurgency, working through subversion and through infiltration, through threat and through

terror, to turn to their own ends the desires of the people of the developing countries for independence and progress. We have seen in Vietnam and Laos, in Venezuela and the Congo, different aspects of the communist assault on freedom - and we have seen how extraordinarily difficult it is for new and inexperienced governments to handle this assault, even with massive aid from the United States.

Thus the obstacles to progress are great, but the record of these twenty years shows that they can be overcome. We have learned and applied important lessons. For example, it is plain that the most important ingredient for success is the energy and commitment of the people of the developing countries themselves. No country can be developed from the outside. Our aid efforts today, therefore, are all designed as partnership arrangements, like the Alliance for Progress in Latin America, in which our assistance is matched to the strong self-help efforts of the developing countries.

An equally important lesson is the significance of stimulating and encouraging private and local activities in the developing countries. Under our aid programs today we are helping to develop private businesses, trade unions, co-ops, savings and loan associations, and dozens of other types of action units, so familiar to us in our own pluralistic society, so badly needed to create dynamic change in the developing countries. In achieving this objective, we are drawing upon private resources in the United States to an

ever increasing degree - resources from business, labor, farm organizations, cooperative groups, and perhaps most significant of all, from our nation's colleges and universities.

Indeed, if there is one most important American institution from the viewpoint of our national effort to help the development of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, it is the American universities. Colleges and universities in this country are playing a threefold role in the development process - helping us learn through research more about the development process and how it can be speeded up; helping through education to transmit this knowledge; and helping through advisory projects to establish educational and research and other institutions in the developing countries, as the Stanford Business School is now helping to establish a center for business education and research in Peru. Over the last ten years, the Nation's universities have taken major steps to carry out this threefold role. People all around the world are benefitting as a result - and so are the faculty and students of the universities involved.

III

My conclusion then is that we are entitled to a measure of sober confidence that in a great many situations around the world, assistance from the United States can indeed help establish independent and progressive nations that will be ready to work with us toward freedom and peace. I

believe that if we stick to it, we can help bring about in country after country the kind of progress we have seen in Taiwan, in Greece, in Israel, in Pakistan, and in other countries. And I believe the benefits to the United States of such gains are very great indeed.

I would not wish to be misunderstood. Foreign assistance, even where most successful, is no recipe for instant paradise. Witness France. In the years immediately following World War II we provided over \$9 billion in aid to France, more aid than any other single country has received. That aid was intended to restore a strong economy in France, and to help rebuild her military strength. Both objectives were achieved, and our aid programs there came to an end some years ago.

Our assistance plainly did not eliminate the possibility of policy differences between the French and ourselves. But this does not change the success of our aid program into failure. France is strong and free today because of American aid. And we expect to help build other strong, free countries - because it is our belief not that a world of free and independent nations will have no problems, but that in such a world we will have the best chance to solve problems peacefully.

That is the fundamental significance of our foreign assistance program. We will be advised in the future, as we have been in the past, to give up the effort as too costly, too exhausting, too risky. I trust that we will in the future, as in the past, reject such fainthearted advice. Let us press on with our work

to achieve progress in free societies, in full confidence that we are working with, and not against, the highest aspirations of man.

In closing may I say a word to the members of the graduating class. I gather that many of you are seeking ways to become directly involved in the improvement of human society. Welcome to the club! Those of us in the foreign aid field - in the Agency for International Development, in the Peace Corps, in the many private and international assistance agencies - are fully engaged every day in the struggle to overcome hunger and poverty, to eliminate oppression and injustice, to liberate the human mind and spirit - in several dozen countries on three continents. It is work that calls for the highest skill and energy and dedication. But those who have been privileged to share in it, as I have been, believe there is no human endeavor that is more challenging or more satisfying.

I hope that many of you who are graduating here today will have the opportunity at some time in your lives to participate in this great enterprise.