Thank you very much.

As many of you know, I am relatively new to the World Bank. This is my first visit to Japan in my new capacity as vice president for external and United Nations affairs, and I am very pleased to be here at Tokyo United Nations University to talk with you about the future of development. I can think of no better place than to test our own ideas, hear new ones, and think through different approaches than here in Japan. Indeed, while I have only been at the Bank six months, I am certainly not new to development, and have long been aware of, and grateful for, the enormous intellectual contribution Japan has made to all areas of economic and social development during the more than 20 years I have been working in this field.

In fact, so much of the new thinking about, and approaches to, development at the World Bank and elsewhere reflects important lessons learned here in Japan, and across Asia more broadly, including the fundamental emphasis on sharing the benefits of growth, educating girls and investing in human capital, expanding trade and investment contacts, and capitalizing on communication and technology. This is a fascinating time to be involved in development. Bold leadership, particularly from developing countries themselves, is pointing toward a new way of doing business by building on what has worked and abandoning what has not.

I want to take a few minutes today to talk about an emerging global consensus on what works in advancing economic and social development, and to say a few words about the challenge of ensuring that developing countries are not left behind in a world of rapid globalization.

A. Past Directions in Development.

First, however, let me give you a brief update on where we are, and a bit of a report card. The world has made significant progress over the past half century in terms of per capita income, and in access to education, health, and other indicators of social development, critical for poverty reduction. There is much to be proud of. Decades of hard work has lifted generations from poverty.

But progress has been painfully slow. In too many places, the basic needs for a decent and productive life still have not met. The following facts are perhaps well known, but they bear repeating—because behind them are real people we can not forget.
• More than 1.2 billion people—one in five of every man, woman and child on the planet—struggle in extreme poverty. This means a daily life of wrenching sickness, hunger, isolation and insecurity.

• 1.5 billion people, a quarter of the world’s population, still lack access to safe water, the basic building block for human health;

• 125 million of the world’s children are still not in primary school, and therefore cut off from most rudimentary first step towards fulfilling their potential in the adult world.

So, despite many success stories, there are still far too many other cases where development efforts as traditionally conceived have made at best only a limited difference. With a few notable exceptions, the prospect of convergence between the poor nations and the rich is in danger of becoming a forlorn hope. Why is this so? I single out two fundamental reasons of special significance in the context of “rethinking development”.

• First, the way in which the development process has historically been conceived and supported by external agencies, including my own.

• Second, the capacity of developing countries themselves to own, frame, and implement development strategies and to get appropriate support from external partners.

Fortunately, we continue to learn, from our mistakes and our successes. Indeed, the very history of development, at least at the Bank, has shown a steadily broadening set of concerns, reflecting a parallel broadening of our understanding of components of successful development: Initially, we focused on supporting investment in physical infrastructure to promote the growth of industry and agriculture. We later expanded this simplistic vision of development to include support for human capital development; for it is people after all who will determine what kind of economy and community they will create. We then turned to the environment in which people live; we now, for example, work to help our member countries manage the effects of high population growth and environmental degradation.

More recently, thanks in part to the financial crisis which started here in East Asia two and a half years ago, we know that long-term economic stability and development are impossible without the appropriate policy and institutional environment, and the improved voice, justice and equitable inclusion of people in economic life which such institutions strengthen. Taken altogether, this is an ambitious task, and one certainly beyond the power or mandate of the World Bank acting alone to address. But taken together these elements of development form a comprehensive strategy which country policymakers and their development partners can work toward together.
The good news is that there is a growing awareness that such a multifaceted approach to development is what will be required if we are ever to have lasting success in our common fight against poverty. We are finally reconciling old and artificial arguments about growth and poverty reduction—we will never have the latter without the former. And we are at last realizing that a truly global economy, if it is to endure—must meet the needs of all.

B. The enduring challenge of poverty.

This will not be easy. We must understand that overall, the poverty crisis is not improving. Let’s look at two trends in income poverty. While it is true that in percentage terms the proportion of the population of developing and transition economies living on less than $1 a day has fallen from 28% in 1987 to an estimated 24% in 1998. (Excluding China, the reduction is rather less—from 29% to 26%). Thanks to population growth, the actual number of people living in dire poverty has remained roughly constant since 1987, at about 1.2 billion—or nearly one in every five persons on the planet. (Indeed, Excluding China, the number has actually risen, from just under 880 million to over 980 million).

Behind these numbers are substantial regional differences: Here in East Asia and the Pacific, there has been a dramatic decline in both percentage and absolute terms. Including China, the population living on under $1 a day in the region fell from nearly 28 percent to 15 percent between 1987 and 1998, and numbers fell from 418 million to 278 million. Excluding China, percentage fell from 24 percent to 11 percent, and the numbers from 114 million in 1987 to 65 million in 1998 (despite a jump of 10 million between 1996 and 1998, reflecting East Asia crisis);

But virtually every other region has seen absolute increases. In Sub-Saharan Africa, the number of people living below the $1 a day level has grown over the 1987-98 period from under 220 million to over 290 million—more than 70 million additional souls struggling to survive through every day. In South Asia, the number of people in extreme poverty is up by 48 million over the same period. In the transition economies of Eastern Europe and Central Asia, that number is up by 23 million. The Latin America and the Caribbean region has seen the number increase by 14 million.

Looking at those living on under $2 a day, again East Asia has experienced some absolute reduction, but the numbers have risen very sharply in South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa, and substantially in Eastern Europe and Central Asia and in Latin America. The total number of people living on under $2 a day is now estimated at nearly 3 billion, approaching half the world’s population.

What does the future hold? Unfortunately, in absolute terms the picture is not bright. Current projections indicate that given existing growth expectations, by 2008 the same number
of people, about 1.2 billion, may still be living on under $1 a day. Even under a brighter alternative scenario of smoother and more rapid growth, neither Latin America and the Caribbean nor Sub-Saharan Africa would see much improvement in numbers—in fact the number of people living in extreme poverty would rise in Sub-Saharan Africa by nearly 40 million. Using the higher $2 a day yardstick, even under the brighter scenario, the number of poor in Sub-Saharan Africa would grow by over 90 million by 2008.

These figures call into question the ways in which the world has been doing development, making all the more urgent the “rethinking” I have talked about. Poverty remains intractable despite economic growth in many countries partly because of income inequality within countries. Income inequality substantially reflects inequality of opportunity, a function of the still substantially unmet need for equitable and inclusive investment in human capital—investment in people through better education and health care—and for wider access to the infrastructure and finance needed to broaden the basis of opportunity.

And finally, there is a two-way relationship between poverty and growth. As I already said, rapid growth is a necessary—but not a sufficient—condition for poverty reduction. What is too seldom mentioned, however, is that persistent poverty and inequality reduce growth rates and undermine economic stability and security. Vigorous and comprehensive investments in reducing poverty, in other words, is a necessary component of long-term growth.

C. A new and broader approach to poverty reduction

*Poverty is more than lack of income. Poverty is voicelessness. It's powerlessness.* These are the over-arching themes of the *World Development Report 2000/1 on Attacking Poverty.* The *World Development Report* aims precisely at broadening our collective approach to poverty reduction. The WDR proposes a new framework of actions to attack poverty. A new framework built on three pillars: *empowerment, security* and *opportunity.* Ravi Kanbur, sitting here, and his team have come to your country to engage in a series of consultations with the Bank’s partners - governments, civil society, academics, the private sector. Your comments will be most important to chart that new collective approach to poverty reduction.

To prepare the WDR, teams from the World Bank and from non governmental organizations have listened to the voices of these men, women and children trapped in poverty. In 60 countries around the world, we have gathered the voices of more than 60 000 men and women. Proud and courageous men and women trapped -- sometimes, even sliding deeper into poverty. We have asked poor people: *What does poverty means for them?* These *Voices of the Poor* are sobering and humbling:

In Latvia: "Poverty is humiliation, the sense of being dependent on them, and of being forced to accept rudeness, insults and indifference when we seek help."
In Kenya, a poor man: Don't ask me what poverty is because you have met it outside my house. Look at the house and count the number of holes. Look at the utensils and the clothes I am wearing. Look at everything and write what you see. What you see is poverty.”

In Moldova, a poor woman: "Poverty is pain; it feels like a disease. It attacks a person not only materially but also morally. It eats way one's dignity and drives one into total despair.” In Jamaica, a young woman: "like living in jail, living under bondage, waiting to be free."

In Bulgaria: "To be poor is to mean to live from day to day, you have no money, no hope.”

In Vietnam: "There are more opportunities than before, but poor people take advantage of them less.”

Again, in Vietnam, a group of children: "The poor children are looked down upon by others, and have few friends."

D. Responding to the voices of the poor: A new sense of responsibility

The poor know what could make the greatest difference to their lives. In their own voices, they say:

-- organizations of their own so they may negotiate with governments, with traders and with NGOs;

-- direct assistance through community-driven programs, so the poor may shape their own destinies. Let me say that at the Bank, we are working to scale-up our portfolios of community-based programs and carry forward such programs that more directly benefit the poor;

-- The poor also say that they would feel more empowered if they had local ownership of funds, so they may put a stop to corruption;

-- Last, but not least, listening to the poor tells us that non-governmental organizations and governments should be accountable to the poor. We can no longer ignore central governance issues.

In Vietnam, a country I just visited with Jim Wolfensohn, a poor man said:"I am glad I was invited to the meeting today, but do we get to talk? Usually we do not get to talk, we just come and listen to them talk…"

The implications of these voices are quite profound.
E. Rethinking the Approach

A Comprehensive Vision and Framework

These numbers—and the danger of persistent poverty to the future security of our planet—demand that we “rethink development.” We at the Bank have taken this responsibility very seriously. Our objective is simple: getting real results on the ground.

The outcome of this thinking has been the “Comprehensive Development Framework” (CDF), with which you may by now be familiar. The CDF offers a holistic approach to development strategies and programs that highlights the interdependence of all aspects of development strategy—social, structural, human, institutional, environmental, economic and financial.

While Jim Wolfensohn gets the credit for drafting a clear and much needed synthesis, he is the first to say that the CDF is not a new concept in principle, but a reflection of the common sense consensus around which we have all been heading for years.

Any good development project manager knows that building new schools can be a substantially wasted effort without roads to get the children to school, or basic health care that permits children actually to attend school on a full-time basis, or a socio-economic environment that encourages parents to believe that it is worthwhile to send children to school rather than using them as unpaid household labor.

It may sound simple, but as Jim would say, all the CDF is intended to do is to make explicit these kinds of linkages within a coherent overall strategic framework. Perhaps as important as the reminder of how inter-connected economic and social development are, the CDF is an eminently practical document in its stress on basic principles of incentives and coordination.

No development strategy can work unless it is first and foremost the product of those whom it is meant to serve. The CDF seeks to build sustained national support for comprehensive development efforts and improve coordination among external partners based on what each can do best to support the country’s goals. In short, the CDF is intended to enable countries to build development strategies which are:

- country-owned— that is, where development goals, and timing/sequencing of programs to realize them, are determined by the country, in line with unique needs and capabilities;
- partnership-based—where the goals, programs and implementation plans are built up on the basis of consultations among government, civil society, the private sector and other stakeholders, along with external development partners.
• Based on long-term vision of the development process, over a ten to twenty year time horizon;
• focussed on results—which set out the links between overall aims and practical action to make progress towards them; and
• balanced and treat social and structural issues equally with macroeconomic and financial issues, so that the former are not overshadowed by the latter.

Partnerships with external supporters require cooperation and coordination. The Bank is working with the IMF, the UN system, multilateral development banks, bilateral donors and NGOs to support the CDF process and to lay the foundation for a division of labor in supporting different elements of country strategies and programs.

There are currently 13 CDF pilot countries. The process has not always been easy, and it will continue to take time to build capacity and strengthen country leadership. But the pilot process is well on track for completion later this year. This is a solid basis for the extension of the CDF approach in an increasing number of developing countries, including the poorest (3 already in 13-country pilot program).

A Sharper Poverty Focus

This “rethinking development” has also led the Bank, in partnership with the IMF, to begin intensive work on a new, more sharply focused approach to supporting member countries’ poverty reduction strategies. Indeed, we have already started to work with selected countries on “Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers” (PRSPs).

The PRSP concept was initially designed to support Heavily Indebted Poor Countries under the HIPC Initiative. But in October, the international community endorsed its application to all low income countries eligible for concessional assistance from IDA and the IMF’s PRGF (Poverty Reduction and Growth Facility).

The PRSP is, in essence, a specific, operational expression of the CDF, with an emphasis on two fundamental changes in the way we have done business in the past. First, poverty reduction strategies will no longer be drafted in Washington by the IMF and World Bank and presented to national authorities as a fait accompli. Rather, our concessional support will be based on the strategy developed by national authorities, with the broad participation of local civil society, especially the voices of the poor. Second, the PRSP is intended, for once, to streamline and coordinate the development community. The strategy will benefit from the intellectual contributions of all providers of external support—and will provide a single, transparent direction for the future.

The PRSP includes a costed set of poverty reduction actions consistent with an appropriate macroeconomic framework, an implementation timeframe of at least three years, and a set of concrete outcome indicators for monitoring progress. This approach recognizes that
income poverty is a critical, but far from exclusive, handicap afflicting the poor, and that addressing poverty effectively requires a long-term and multidimensional approach, in which GDP growth is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for sustained poverty reduction.

F. The Global Trading System and the Development Agenda

Now that I have laid out the principles underlying how we are trying to reinvent the development business, based on what we are learning from our clients and our partners, I want to say a few words about the challenge on all of our minds: and that is what globalization will look like for the developing world. In particular, I want to focus on what can be done to help developing countries—especially the poorest—make the most of the opportunities offered by the world trading system as it has evolved in recent years.

Before getting into specifics, I recognize the concerns expressed by many about the overall globalization process. These concerns are real, and can affect the daily lives of millions. They must be addressed, and I shall say a little more about this in a moment or two. But we can’t turn back the clock on globalization. Technological advances that have fueled it cannot be uninvented. So our task is to see how the positive aspects of globalization can be harnessed in the cause of development and poverty reduction, and how its less positive aspects can be offset for those adversely affected.

I. Inclusive Trade Expansion

Trade expansion has been one of the most dynamic features of the global economy in recent years. Global trade grew at an average rate of 6.5 percent a year between 1990 and 1997—more than three times as fast as global GDP growth (2 percent a year).

Developing countries have played a major role in trade expansion. They now account for about one-third of global goods exports, and nearly one-quarter of services exports. And developing countries’ exports now increasingly consist of manufactured goods—accounting for over 70 percent of their total exports. So-called South-South trade among developing countries has also been growing—from about one-third of their total merchandise exports in 1990 to over 40 percent by the end of the decade.

Appropriately structured and sequenced, trade liberalization can be an engine of development and poverty reduction. Countries that integrate into global markets do appear to grow faster than those that maintain closed trade regimes. The incentives created by export opportunities and import competition, and the doors it opens for productive domestic-foreign partnerships, can help to:

• reduce prices to consumers;
• raise producers’ productivity; and
• increase the stock of knowledge on which successful economic expansion and poverty reduction increasingly depend.

But so far, relatively few developing countries—23 out of a sample of 93 reviewed by the World Bank—have joined the club of what can be called “rapid integrators” into global markets—mainly those that are already better-off. Only one low income country among the group of 48 Least Developed Countries (LDCs) as defined by the United Nations was a rapid integrator, and only seven were so-called “moderate integrators”. All the remaining 20 LDCs in the sample were slow or weak integrators.

The lesson? If trade is to contribute all it can to development and poverty reduction, the poorest countries must be able to participate more fully in its benefits. For these countries, agricultural trade liberalization is critical. They depend far more heavily than the better-off developing countries on agriculture for their GDP and exports. Some numbers:

• agriculture accounts for 35% of LDCs’ GDP, compared to 17% for lower middle income countries and 8% for upper middle income developing countries.

• The share of food exports in total exports is nearly twice the level for lower middle income countries, while LDCs’ share of non-food agricultural exports in total exports is nearly four times the level for lower middle income developing countries.

As Jim Wolfensohn said at last fall’s WTO meeting in Seattle, it makes no sense to exhort poor countries to compete and pay their way in the world while we deny them the means to do so by restricting their market access in areas such as agriculture where they have a comparative advantage. But this is precisely the effect of the current structure of industrialized country agricultural protection, including export and producer subsidies as well as import tariffs.

Currently, developed countries impose protection on agricultural imports from developing countries at average rates nearly five times higher than protection on manufactured imports (15.1 percent compared to 3.4 percent). Developing countries’ protection against other developing countries is even higher—averaging over 18 percent. The structure of agricultural protection helps to explain why the growth of agricultural trade has lagged far behind that of manufacturing trade—about 2 percent a year between the mid-1980s and the mid-1990s, compared to about 6 percent a year.

Tough action is needed here. It won’t be easy to take. But it must be done. But reduction of protection is only part of the trade liberalization story, in agriculture as elsewhere. Again in the context of “rethinking development”, we have learned from experience of successful developing countries that governments need to take, and external partners need to support, a range of complementary action in areas such as infrastructure upgrading, governance and institutional reform, and social investment in areas such as education and health care. And we need to take seriously the fact that globalization in general, and trade liberalization in
particular, can at least initially create losers as well as winners in national economies. Attention to the social agenda, notably including provision of well-functioning social safety nets, along with retraining and other compensatory mechanisms to help those adversely affected, is both a human and a political economy priority for us all.

In short, trade liberalization needs to be seen not as an end in itself, but as a means towards achieving wider development objectives, including the goal of poverty reduction.

II. Helping the Poorest

If we are to be serious about poverty reduction, special efforts will be needed to make trade expansion pay off for the poorest developing countries. The LDCs are far behind the “rapid integrator” developing countries with respect to endowments critical for effective participation in global markets.

When one looks at physical infrastructure, for example, LDCs’ proportion of paved roads is 20 percent compared with 54 percent for rapid integrators; electric power production is only 136 kwh/person, compared with 2,164 for rapid integrators; and telephone main lines per 1,000 population average 11, while for rapid integrators that number is 187.

Looking at basic indicators for education, health and good governance, LDCs’ gross primary school enrollment rates are 87% for males and 69% for girls, compared with 103 percent and 100 percent for rapid integrators; literacy rates are 51 percent compared with 83 percent for rapid integrators; life expectancy is 52 years compared with 70 years), infant mortality rate is 93 per 1,000 live births while just 27 for rapid integrators. Last, but certainly not least, the ICRG “corruption index” is 2 on an 0-6 rating where lower is worse—rapid integrators measure 3.5); And the “bureaucratic quality” index is 0.8 on an 0-4 index where lower is worse—for rapid integrators open to global scrutiny, that number is 2.7.

The point underlying these numbers? Trade liberalization can only yield solid benefits for the poorest developing countries if it is accompanied by very substantial improvements in other elements of the wider development agenda. Here—if ever there was one—is a case where the international community can help the poorest countries to help themselves.

But LDCs can’t concentrate simply on these other aspects to the exclusion of trade liberalization. Why? Because without the incentive liberalization provides, good development indicators will not translate into rapid, export-led growth. The lesson: “everything is connected”, again as the CDF tries to make explicit.

Improving the “Rules of the Game”

Finally on trade, there is one more critical issue I want to discuss briefly, and that is the design and implementation of the rules of the game.
Developing country membership in the WTO has risen rapidly in recent years: 110 of them are now members. But membership does not equate with influence. Many developing countries have limited or non-existent representation in Geneva. A case in point: 19 of the 42 African WTO members have zero representation. Many other developing countries lack the technical capacity to negotiate meaningfully. And rules too often seem to be set by the rich and the better-prepared developing countries.

Where rules have already been set—for example in the case of customs valuation procedures—they are often based on developed country models which are simply inappropriate and prohibitively expensive for poor countries. The result: many developing WTO signatories have been unable to comply with agreements negotiated under the Uruguay round.

Mike Moore and his colleagues are highly sensitive to this issue, and are taking steps to remedy it. But a balanced and inclusive world trading system that attracts the adherence of developing countries requires new action to enhance these countries’ capacity to participate in the rule-making process, to move away from the “one size fits all” approach to the rules themselves; and to ensure that their implementation does not place unreasonable financial and technical burdens on those least able to bear them.

G. The Partnership Imperative

Finally, we at the Bank believe that rethinking development also involves new commitment to the need for a partnership approach to development issues and their resolution. In his speech to the Annual Meetings of the Bank and the IMF last year, Jim Wolfensohn called for “Coalitions for Change”, expanded partnerships across the board to address the challenges of development in a new century.

Partnership With the United Nations on Trade

There are many examples of the partnership approach in action. But in the context of trade, let me say just a few words about some elements of the evolving partnership between the World Bank Group and UNCTAD. These are thoughts which Jim Wolfensohn outlined last week in Bangkok.

In addition to our longstanding cooperation on issues of debt and trade information, our affiliate the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) and UNCTAD are working together on two important initiatives, on environmental matters and investment promotion. We expect to work closely together on the preparatory work for the Third UN Conference on Least Developed Countries, to be held next year.
In addition, UNCTAD and the Bank are partners in two areas of special relevance to
the balanced and productive integration of developing countries into the world trading system,
the Integrated Framework for Trade and Development in the Least Developed Countries and
the International Task Force on Commodity Risk Management in Developing Countries. The
Integrated Framework, or IF, is a partnership of six multilateral agencies (WTO, IMF, UNDP
and ITC as well as UNCTAD and the Bank).

The goal is to support integration of LDCs into the international trading system. As a
first step, LDCs were invited to prepare needs assessments for trade related assistance: 40 of
the 48 LDCs have already done so. But concrete action in response to the needs assessments
has thus far been limited. (The IF program in Uganda is a notable and positive exception.) So,
at the request of IF partners, the Bank is sponsoring a review of first two years of IF
implementation, so as to improve its effectiveness in meeting LDCs’ needs.

The International Commodity Risk Task Force, or ITF, is an even broader partnership,
including international institutions, producer and consumer groups and private sector entities,
established to seek ways to deal with the problem of volatility in commodity prices, an issue of
special importance for LDCs (whose export earnings are strongly commodity-oriented). Dealing
with volatility is critical for poverty reduction strategies, because it can disrupt poor producers’
production plans and governments’ anti-poverty programs. ITF has developed a market-based
approach to the problem, based on providing price insurance for commodity-dependent
producers; plans to test the mechanism on the ground.

Partnerships of this kind represent a hopeful trend, where we bring together our
combined capacities to help those who most need our assistance and expertise. More
generally, these partnerships reflect an increasingly inclusive approach to development issues in
general and to poverty reduction and trade expansion in particular. This approach must be the
foundation stone of all our work in the 21st century.

Globalization properly conceived means much more than market integration; it also
means—really, requires—working together towards global solutions to global problems. And
these solutions need to be developed in a cooperative and transparent way that explicitly
includes the priorities of the poorest countries and their peoples.

**II. Doing development differently**

I have tried to highlight why we must now - together and collectively - change the way
we do business. Why we must transform the way development has been done for years. Why
governments, aid agencies, NGOs, the private sector - all of us involved in development efforts
ought to become more "pro-poor". Whether it’s launching a new CDF pilot project, whether
it’s negotiating trade issues, whether it’s elaborating country poverty reduction strategies; in all
what we do, in our daily work, we must - as Jim Wolfensohn so justly put it: "respond to the
voices of the poor. Both institutionally and as individuals, we have to judge what we are doing
vis-à-vis these voices. The time has come for - and I quote Jim Wolfensohn again, "a passionate re-dedication to each other."

I. Conclusion

In February 2000, it's tempting to speak of “rethinking development” in terms of “new approaches for a new century”. I'd put the point differently. We need new approaches, to rethink development, because we have yet to solve old problems—the most important of which is the widening gulf between the haves and the have-nots of the world, a gulf that has the potential to endanger our children’s prospects for living peaceful, secure and productive lives.

Let me just take one minute to summarize: Doing development differently means understanding the scale and complexity of the challenge we are up against, and committing to work together. We know what to do: Development and poverty reduction efforts must be firmly and genuinely country-owned. No more top-down development devised behind closed doors in Washington (or even in national capitals in member countries). They must be holistic and comprehensive in approach, taking account of the interrelationships between different elements of development strategies.

They must be based on inclusion and participation, bringing together civil society, local communities, NGOs, the private sector and the poor themselves, in order to foster trust and sustainability. They must combine a long term vision with a sharp focus on getting results on the ground. They must recognize that globalization and trade expansion are good for growth, but that we must pay careful attention to the social effects of the transition to participation in international markets. Trade expansion alone is not a panacea, but needs to be seen as a component of a wider development and poverty reduction strategy that includes human capital, infrastructure and institutional upgrading, together with help for those adversely affected by economic forces. And finally, the new approach as a whole must be based on comprehensive partnerships and coalitions for change.

This is an ambitious agenda. But addressing it is essential if we are to go forward together into a new century where the long pent up aspirations of the poor of the earth are to have the chance for fulfillment that they deserve.

Technology has meant that we live increasingly in one world. Our sense of common humanity must make us also increasingly become of one mind, and part of one united endeavor, in the development enterprise that we all serve.

Thank you very much.