

Passage 5

Pre-reading

Here are some programmes we usually have on television. Which one do you think may have an influence on violence?

- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Mystery | 6. Crime serials |
| 2. Horror | 7. Documentary films |
| 3. Science Fiction | 8. Comedy |
| 4. Adventure | 9. Cartoons |
| 5. News | 10. Ghost stories |

VIOLENCE ON TELEVISION*

What is the likelihood of a connection between the violence shown on television and the violence, including the violent crime, in real life? If violence on television has any influence, it's not likely to be restricted to children, but children may be exposed to it most, because they view so much television and have the least direct experience of the world outside their homes. They go to it to

*Ken Methold and Barbara Fonseca, *Reading for Meaning: A Practice Book in Cursive Reading* (Hong Kong: Longman Group (Far East) Ltd., 1974), pp. 83-87.

relieve boredom and to get excitement, on the one hand, and to learn about the world and how to cope with it, on the other. So there are ways in which it's quite reasonable to suppose that violence on television may influence them.

How is television violence said to promote violence in real life? Three main
10 methods of influence have been suggested. One is that people imitate the violence they see on the screen; another is that they are aroused and stimulated to violence by it; and a third is that they become increasingly tolerant of it. There are, of course many influences in television itself that are opposed to violence. All viewers perceive selectively, and there's probably a great deal of violence
15 that isn't noticed—*perhaps* therefore having no effect. Again, the influence of violence on television is likely to be weak when someone lives in a stable 'primary group', especially where there is a high value placed on gentleness and non-violence within that group. Television in general has been shown to have the most influence where people are isolated and detached from families and stable
20 groups; when they are members of groups with so-called deviant values; when they are cross-pressured; or generally in times of stress, uncertainty and chaotic social change. These conditions are also ones in which the restraints on violence are often at their weakest.

An increase in violent crime has been going on (though at a slower rate than
25 today) for a very long time, and a great deal of it is undoubtedly due to causes completely independent of television—such as the break-up of closely-knit communities and increasing affluence. Possibly one such factor is indirectly a result of families watching television for a very long time—a decrease in contact between adults and children. But there's little evidence that crime or aggression

30 are correlated with sheer hours of viewing television, and when a recent
experiment was made in America, crime rates weren't found to be correlated,
even after a time-lag, with the number of hours of violent programmes actually
screened. The possibility that remains plausible is that there's a connection
between actually viewing violence on television, especially in childhood, and
35 subsequent aggressive behaviour.

By any definition of violence, there are at least a couple of violent incidents
on average in any hour of television, and by most definitions there's as much at
the moment in the News as in fiction. However, it's not easy to find firm
evidence that people are becoming insensitive to the violence on the News.

40 There seem to be roughly five kinds of programmes, apart from the News,
where concern about the probable influence of violence has been expressed.
Crime serials generally come first. Then there are war films. Westerns are
sometimes said to be less influential because remote from children here and
contained within formal conventions, but they are sometimes very violent. And
45 at the least realistic end of the scale are horror, mystery and Science Fiction, and
finally even some comedy and cartoons.

It's impossible to tell whether the mixture of humour and violence in
cartoons spills over into real life. A nine-year-old girl, in the middle of a
conversation about television and animals, suddenly said: 'This boy told me that
50 he got this black cat by its tail and kept swinging it round and singing.' All the
children listening to her immediately burst out laughing. Both the action and the
laughter might well have happened before anyone viewed animal cartoons: but
parents are not necessarily absurd to think an influence here is worth asking
about. But, in fact, the children who laughed then were all fond of real animals;

55 and the main appeal of these cartoons and comedies doesn't seem to be the violence. Children like the animals.

Then there is a kind of fantasy world of ghosts, monsters and unlikely happenings which often includes a great deal of what's prohibited by adults, including violence. One theory is that it's a world where children repair the
60 damage to their self-confidence caused by the repressions and prohibitions of being socialised. And there always have been sub-cultures in the past—for children and others—in which the values of the official world have been inverted in fantasy, and in which not only monsters but also violence could occur freely in imagination. Concerned persons who wish to eliminate all such elements from
65 myth, literature and fantasy—according to this theory, at least—would be as misguided as fanatical devotees of hygiene who were determined to have a world with clean rubbish.

More serious programmes of this kind merge into Science Fiction, mystery and horror, and these may contain a good deal of violence. But they also offer to
70 fulfill other real demands that children have. They like to be mildly frightened, for instance, and they like suspense. The figures out of these programmes can play a part in children's own games and fantasies, and it's *possible* that these help them in dealing with their own aggression.

I sometimes wonder if children are confused by the fact that what has been
75 in the past a sub-culture, defined by—and made safe by—its opposing parental world, comes at them now, not so much from each other in rhymes and games and stories, as from the most authoritative source of information and entertainment, which they see their parents regularly attending to also. I wonder if their imaginations are richer or poorer if they no longer invent their own

80 fantasy world, alone or with each other, and instead are provided ~~with these~~
mass-produced horrors and monsters.

Beyond these programmes lie war films, the Western and the specifically
violent dramatic ones about crime. Besides providing excitement and suspense,
these also may be offering ways in which children can express their aggression in
85 a safe way, or see it being expressed. The evidence suggests, however, that if
they offer to satisfy this need the more realistic ones at least don't necessarily
succeed in doing so. Perhaps they function as pornography often does—
attracting with the outward signs of what might satisfy a need, but not actually
doing so; or perhaps they are like certain processed foods which have been found
90 no more nourishing on examination than their cardboard packaging.

Although there's some evidence here and there in favour of the 'catharsis'
theory, as it's called—the idea that aggression is reduced by the violence people
choose to watch in violent programmes on television—it is less secure than the
experimental evidence for the opposite theory; that television violence can lead to
95 at least some degree of real-life aggression.

Much of the violence in these programmes is what's called 'clean'. But it
can be argued that 'clean' violence has more effect, in that it accustoms
children-and adults-to the spectacle of violence, without showing either the
suffering, in terms of immediate pain, or the consequences, in terms of bereaved
100 families, or lifelong mutilation, or the spirals of revenge and protracted counter-
violence that **can** follow in reality. Violence may be presented merely as a form
of exciting action, engaged in by heroes and villains alike, and **frequently**—
within the programme-rewarded. This last point is perhaps particularly serious,
since a large number of experiments suggest that it is rewarded or legitimised

105 violence—often the violence shown on the part of a hero—which is most likely to be taken into a viewer's repertoire, or most likely in itself to stimulate him to aggression.

Children go to television, among other things, because they're bored, because they want to forget, or because they want to be aroused and be excited. 110 They may also use television in an attempt to work out some of their own aggression, and to make a world of fantasy, opposed to the adult world, in which what is prohibited in fact can be indulged freely in imagination. However, children also go to television to learn—about the world and about their roles in it. And violence, by being continually available and by occupying a great deal of the 115 time given to suspense programming, may have effects on children that were not foreseen. If it helps to discharge the aggression of some, this is not clearly proved: and effects in the opposite direction—stimulating, leading to imitation, and inducing toleration of violence—are, on the available data, more probable. We don't know what proportion of children may be affected. Most people tend 120 to assume that they or their children are not likely to be affected, so it's possible that if there is danger, it will be underestimated.

When all this is said, television violence is only one factor among many making for aggression; and some forms of violence on television—in the News—may possibly deter some violence in real life. There's also a great deal of 125 television unconnected with violence, or opposed to violence. But people pick out from television what they want to see. If they pick out the more brutal forms of programme to watch heavily, the evidence available at the moment suggests that—particularity between children and adolescence—these may well have an effect in promoting more aggressive behaviour in real life.

Answer the following questions.

1. Why do children watch television?

2. What are the three main ways in which television violence is said to encourage violence in real life?

3. How has television helped to lessen contact between adults and children?

4. Which type of programme has most concern been expressed about?

5. Why are cartoons included in the types of programmes which may have an influence on violence?

6. What useful function may fantasy programmes with ghosts and monsters and such like have ?

7. In what way may children be confused when their fantasy world comes from television and not from each other?

8. What is meant in the passage by 'clean' violence?

9. What kind of violence seems most likely to stimulate violent behaviour in the viewer?

Passage 6

Pre-reading

Before begin reading, respond to each of the following key words. Write down any word or phrase that comes into your mind related to this word.

1. *life* _____
2. *survival* _____
3. *natural selection* _____
4. *extinction* _____

NATURAL SELECTION*

If under changing conditions of life organic beings present individual differences in almost every part of their structure, and this cannot be disputed; if there be, owing to their geometrical rate of increase, a severe struggle for life at some age, season, or year, and this certainly cannot be disputed; then, 5 considering the infinite complexity of the relations of all organic beings to each other and to their conditions of life, causing an infinite diversity in structure, constitution, and habits, to be advantageous to them, it would be a most extraordinary fact if no variations had ever occurred useful to each being's own welfare, in the same manner as so many variations have occurred useful to man. 10 But if variations useful to any organic being ever do occur, assuredly individuals thus characterised will have the best chance of being preserved in the struggle for life; and from the strong principle of inheritance, these will tend to produce offspring similarly characterised. This principle of preservation, or the survival of the fittest, I have called Natural Selection. It leads to the 15 improvement of each creature in relation to its organic and inorganic conditions of life; and consequently, in most cases, to what must be regarded as

*Charles Darwin, *The Origin of Species* (New York: Collier Macmillan, 1909), reprinted in Harriet Johnson, *Ideas in Context: Strategies for College Reading* (Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, 1986), pp. 230-235.

an advance in organism. Nevertheless, low and simple forms will long endure if well fitted for their simple conditions of life.

Natural selection, on the principle of qualities being inherited at
20 corresponding ages, can modify the egg, seed, or young, as easily as the adult. Amongst many animals, sexual selection will have given its aid to ordinary selection, by assuring to the most vigorous and best adapted males the greatest number of offspring. Sexual selection will also give characters useful to the males alone, in their struggles or rivalry with other males; and these characters
25 will be transmitted to one sex or to both sexes, according to the form of inheritance which prevails.

Whether natural selection has really thus acted in adapting the various forms of life to their several conditions and stations, must be judged by the general tenor and balance of evidence given in the following chapters. But
30 we have already seen how it entails extinction; and how largely extinction has acted in the world's history, geology plainly declares. Natural selection, also, leads to divergence of character; for the more organic beings diverge in structure, habits, and constitution, by so much the more can a large number be supported on the area,--of which we see proof by looking to the inhabitants of
35 any small spot, and to the productions naturalized in foreign lands. Therefore, during the modification of the descendants of any one species, and during the incessant struggle of all species to increase in numbers, the more diversified the descendants become, the better will be their chance of success in the battle for life. Thus the small differences distinguishing varieties of the same species,
40 steadily tend to increase, till they equal the greater differences between species of the same genus, or even of distinct genera.

We have seen that it is the common, the widely-diffused and widely-ranging species, belonging to the larger genera within each class, which vary most; and these tend to transmit to their modified offspring that superiority
45 which now makes them dominant in their own countries. Natural selection, as has just been remarked, leads to divergence of character and to much extinction of the less improved and intermediate forms of life. On these principles, the nature of the affinities, and the generally well-defined distinctions between the innumerable organic beings in each class throughout the world, may be
50 explained. It is a truly wonderful fact—the wonder of which we are apt to overlook from familiarity—that all animals and all plants throughout all time and space should be related to each other in groups, subordinate to groups, in the manner which we everywhere behold—namely, varieties of the same species most closely related, species of the same genus less closely and unequally
55 related, forming sections and sub-genera, species of distinct genera much less closely related, and genera related in different degrees, forming sub-families, families, orders, sub-classes and classes. The several subordinate groups in any class cannot be ranked in a single file, but seem clustered round points, and these round other points, and so on in almost endless cycles. If species had been
60 independently created, no explanation would have been possible of this kind of classification; but it is explained through inheritance and the complex action of natural selection, entailing extinction and divergence of character. . . .

The affinities of all the beings of the same class have sometimes been represented by a great tree. I believe this simile largely speaks the truth. The
65 green and budding twigs may represent existing species; and those produced during former years may represent the long succession of extinct species. At

each period of growth all the growing twigs have tried to branch out on all sides, and to overtop and kill the surrounding twigs and branches, in the same manner as species and groups of species have at all times overmastered other species in
70 the great battle for life. The limbs divided into great branches, and these into lesser and lesser branches, were themselves once, when the tree was young, budding twigs; and this connection of the former and present buds by ramifying branches may well represent the classification of all extinct and living species in groups subordinate to groups. Of the many twigs which flourished when the
75 tree was a mere bush, only two or three, now grown into great branches, yet survive and bear the other branches; so with the species which lived during long-past geological periods, very few have left living and modified descendants. From the first growth of the tree, many a limb and branch has decayed and dropped off; and these fallen branches of various sizes may represent those
80 whole orders, families, and genera which have now no living representatives, and which are known to us only in a fossil state. As we here and there see a thin straggling branch springing from a fork low down in a tree, and which by some chance has been favored and is still alive on its summit, so we occasionally see an animal like the *Ornithorhynchus* or *Lepidosiren*, which in some small degree
85 connects by its affinities two large branches of life, and which has apparently been saved from fatal competition by having inhabited a protected station. As buds give rise by growth to fresh buds, and these, if vigorous, branch out and overtop on all sides many a feebler branch, so by generation I believe it has been with the great Tree of Life, which fills with its dead and broken branches
90 the crust of the earth, and covers the surface with its ever-branching and beautiful ramifications.

A. Choose the best answer.

1. Which would be the best title for this passage?
 - a. Engineering of the Species
 - b. Survival
 - c. Weakness Fails
 - d. Changing Times

2. In the struggle for life, the individuals who survive have the _____.
 - a. strongest characteristics
 - b. most unusual characteristics
 - c. best external display
 - d. best luck

3. The author calls his principles of preservation _____.
 - a. diversification
 - b. principles of inheritance
 - c. the strongest survives
 - d. Natural Selection

4. According to Darwin, low and simple forms of life _____.
 - a. will never survive because they are simply not strong enough
 - b. can survive if well fitted for the simple conditions of life
 - c. will sometimes make it if they try
 - d. can survive if they improve their structure

5. Natural selection can modify the egg, seed, or young _____.
- but not all in the same species
 - with great difficulty
 - in addition to the adult
 - depending upon the principle of diversity
6. In this reading, the author contends that sexual selection favors _____.
- males with the greatest number of partners.
 - males if they have unusual characteristics
 - the males with the least number of offspring
 - the most vigorous best-adapted males
7. Strong male traits _____.
- are inherited
 - are not necessary for survival
 - can be won through battle
 - are passed on only to females
8. "Extinction" means _____.
- all survive
 - some survive
 - all are gone
 - some of the best survive
9. Natural selection leads to _____.
- the female dominating the male
 - overpopulation
 - the male dominating the female
 - a divergence of character

10. Another important outcome of natural selection, according to Darwin, is _____.
- a. superiority
 - b. extinction
 - c. balance
 - d. subordination
11. In the process of survival, _____.
- a. the more limited the species, the greater are the chances for survival because of its strength
 - b. the more diversified the species, the better are the chances for survival
 - c. diversification weakens the species
 - d. natural selection works for the weakest in a favorable environment
12. Based on this theory of natural selection, we can generalize that _____.
- a. all species of plants and animals developed from earlier forms through heredity
 - b. varieties of the same species may be related, but not all animals and plants are related to one another
 - c. the development of plants and animals is through the will of God
 - d. all species have been independently created
13. The word "affinities" as used in this selection most likely means _____.
- a. classifications
 - b. attractions
 - c. forces
 - d. similarities

14. Darwin states that within the classification system of each family _____.

- a. ranking occurs by groups
- b. all groups are ranked equally
- c. subordinate groups are ranked in clustered cycles
- d. subordinate groups are ranked by single points

15. The Tree of Life represents _____.

- a. existing generations only
- b. the past and the present
- c. the past, the present, and the possibility of the future
- d. only the fittest that have survived

B. Write T on the space provided in front of the following statements if they are true and write F if they are false.

_____ 1. Small variations in the species do not occur.

_____ 2. Natural selection leads to the extinction of some species.

_____ 3. Darwin contends that all plants and all animals are related to one another in groups.

_____ 4. The reading states that several subordinate groups in any class cannot be ranked in a single file.

_____ 5. A great tree represents the affinities of all the beings of a variety of classes.

_____ 6. The green and budding twig may represent many species.

_____ 7. All changes lead to survival.

- _____ 8. In the theory of natural selection, what survives is better than what came before.
- _____ 9. A species can adapt and survive at any point in its life cycle.
- _____ 10. The more variety in a group's future generations, the more likely it is that the group will survive.

Passage 7

Pre-reading

Which do you think are non-recipient countries of foreign aid?

Pakistan

Indonesia

Hong Kong

Malaysia

Nigeria

Burma

India

The Gold Coast

Can you give reasons why these countries do not want foreign aid?

THE CASE AGAINST FOREIGN AID*

Aid is plainly not necessary for development, as is shown by the progress of many poor countries without aid. Moreover, it is often damaging: although it is admittedly an inflow of resources, it sets up repercussions which can outweigh the benefits—repercussions I shall note later. Advocates of aid often claim that official aid is indispensable for development. Such claims patronise aid

*Ken Methold and Barbara Fonseca, *Reading for Meaning: A Practice Book in Cursive Reading* (Quarry Bay, Hong Kong: Longman Group (Far East) Ltd., 1974), pp. 70-74.

recipients, implying that they desperately want development, but cannot achieve it without hand-outs—that is, doles—from us. In fact, very many poor countries have progressed without them. Malaysia was transformed between the 1890s and the 1930s by the rise of the rubber industry, which received no external subsidies, from a sparsely-populated country of hamlets into a thriving country where a larger population lived longer at higher standards. To move from Asia to Africa, the Gold Coast was also transformed without foreign aid: in 1880 there were no cocoa-trees there, by 1950 huge quantities of cocoa, all from Africa-owned farms, were being exported. In 1840 Hong Kong was a barren rock. Now 4,000,000 people live in that major manufacturing centre. Hong Kong also developed without external gifts.

Official aid is thus not necessary for development. Nor is it sufficient. The Navajo Indian nation has remained wretchedly poor in spite of decades of American official aid. If a society cannot develop without external gifts, it will not develop with them. Development depends on people's capacities, motivations and social and political institutions. Where these basic determinations are favourable, material progress will usually occur. There is an inescapable dilemma in the argument that aid is necessary for development. If the required conditions other than capital are present, capital will be generated locally or supplied commercially from abroad, to government or to business, so that aid is unnecessary. If the other conditions are not present, aid will be ineffective and thus useless. Moreover, it is often said that the culture and the social and political institutions of the recipients should not be disturbed. But what if these are incompatible with substantial material progress? Material

26 progress requires modernisation of the mind, and this is inhibited by many institutions and **official** policies in less-developed countries.

This still leaves open the question of whether aid is more likely to promote or to retard progress. I believe that in practice it is more likely to retard it. First, aid reinforces the disastrous tendency to make everything a matter of politics in
35 less-developed countries. The hand-outs increase the resources and power of governments in relation to the rest of society, and this is reinforced by the preferential treatment of governments which try to establish state-controlled economies. **Politicisation** of life diverts energy and ambition from economic activity. Moreover, it provokes and exacerbates political tension, because the
36 question of who *has* the government becomes supremely important, often a matter of life and death-as is clear from the recent history of Indonesia, Pakistan, East Africa and Nigeria. Second, aid often supports damaging policies. Many recipient governments restrict the activities of minorities: Chinese in Indonesia, Asians in East and Central Africa, Indians in Burma, Europeans
37 everywhere. The removal of thousands of Asians from East Africa has reduced incomes and widened income differences between these countries and the West. These measures are often followed by the expulsion or even destruction of thousands of people. Third, aid encourages the recipients' paradoxical policy of restricting the inflow and deployment of private capital. The Indian
38 Government, an aid recipient for many years, sets up expensive state oil-refineries, although the oil companies there have unused capacity which they are not allowed to employ. Fourth, foreign aid promotes the adoption of unsuitable external models. The establishment of uneconomic heavy industries and national airlines is familiar. More important is the proliferation of Western-type

39 universities, whose graduates cannot find employment, and of ~~Western-style~~
trade unions which are only vehicles for the self-advancement of politicians.
Fifth, aid obscures the fact that progress cannot be had for nothing, that the
people of advanced countries have themselves had to develop the required
conditions. It reinforces the widespread attitude that opportunities for the
40 advance of one's self and one's family must be provided by someone else, which
promotes or reinforces torpor, fatalism or even beggary and blackmail, but not
self-improvement. Preoccupation with aid also diverts the government's
attention from the basic causes of poverty and from the possibilities of acting on
them.

65 These are just some ways in which an inflow of resources can damage
development. And **the** economic productivity of aid resources is generally likely
to be insufficient to outweigh the adverse repercussions. Aid cannot be as
closely adjusted to local conditions as can resources supplied commercially.
Moreover, governments are understandably apt to use resources which have been
70 donated from abroad on wasteful show-projects.

This is not to say that aid cannot promote development. Whether it in fact
does so depends on the specific circumstances of each case. But the
considerations I have instanced make it clear that it is unwarranted to assume
that because aid represents an inflow of resources, it must promote development.
75 Because the adverse repercussions affect the basic determinants of **development**,
aid is at least as likely to retard development as to promote it. If it were only
money that were missing, it could be secured commercially from abroad. Aid
means at most that some capital is cheaper. But the capital is **likely** to be less
productive than if it were supplied commercially from abroad to government or

76 to business, and, as we have seen, it is apt to set up far-reaching adverse repercussions. And of course, even if aid does promote development, this still leaves open the question why people in the donor countries should be taxed for this purpose.

Once the case for aid is taken for granted, either progress or its absence can
85 be advanced as reasons for more aid: progress as evidence of its success, and lack of progress as evidence that more is needed.' Whatever happens is an argument for more aid. When a case is taken for granted, evidence becomes irrelevant.

I must try to remove an obvious reservation. Why is the argument that aid
90 is necessary so widely accepted if it is unfounded? This is not easy to discuss briefly. Nor is it strictly relevant: why people hold certain beliefs has nothing to do with their validity. However, for what it is worth, let me give you my explanation. Many advocates of aid are well-intentioned, but not well-informed. The aid crusade is largely a gigantic confidence trick. A well-meaning public
91 has been conned by a motley coalition playing on feelings of guilt which, however unfounded, are nevertheless widespread. This coalition includes international agencies and government departments anxious to increase their activities and power; professional humanitarians with similar ambitions; disillusioned, bored, power-and money-hungry or unsuccessful academics; the
92 Churches, which face spiritual collapse and seek a role as welfare agencies; temperamental do-gooders, frustrated by events at home; politicians in search of publicity; exporters in search of easy markets; and governments embarrassed by commodity surpluses. There are also many people who welcome any argument or policy which in some way or other weakens the position of Western society,

105 which for various political and emotional reasons they have come to dislike.

I think it would be best to finish **with** this system of hand-outs, which is bad both for the patrons and for the patronised, and which, by the way, was only started some twenty years ago. However, this is unlikely to come about, because of the emotional, political, intellectual, financial and administrative interests
110 behind it. Moreover, the immense sums already spent on aid themselves operate against its termination. Given the fact that aid will continue, I would wish to see the method and criteria of allocation changed drastically. Aid could be allocated in such a manner that it would favour governments which, within their human, administrative and financial resources, try to perform the essential tasks of
115 government, at the same time refraining from close control of the economy.

These tasks include the successful conduct of external affairs; the maintenance of law and order; the effective management of **the** monetary and fiscal system; the promotion of a suitable institutional framework for the activities of individuals; the provision of basic health and education services, and of basic
120 communications; and agricultural extension work. These are functions which must devolve on the government: first, because that part of the institutional structure within which the private sector functions does not emerge from the operation of market forces, and so must be established by law; second, because some of these activities yield services which cannot be bought and sold in the
125 market.

I think this list of tasks largely exhausts the potentialities of state action in the promotion of general living standards. These tasks are extensive and complex: their adequate performance would fully stretch the resources of all governments in poor countries. Yet governments frequently neglect even the

130 most elementary of these functions, while attempting close control of the economies of their countries, or even contemplating coercive transformation of societies. They seem anxious to plan and are unable to govern. Much more thought could also be given to preventing the inflow of aid from biasing the recipient countries in favour of development **modelled** on inappropriate external
135 prototypes. Preference could be given to governments more interested in improving the roads and extending external contacts than in opening **Western-**type universities or creating heavy engineering works. This suggestion does not in the least underestimate the role of government. Indeed, the adoption of such criteria would favour governments which try to govern rather than to plan. By
140 the same token, aid would be withheld from governments pursuing policies which plainly retard the material progress of their countries. Many of these policies—for instance, the maltreatment of economically successful **minorities**—often exacerbate the problems and difficulties both of other aid recipients and of the donors. The adoption of such criteria would promote relatively liberal
145 economic systems in the recipient countries, minimise coercion, and favour material progress especially an improvement in living standards. It would also reduce political tension in recipient countries.

This proposal assumes, of course, that the purpose of aid is to improve material conditions in recipient countries. It will be altogether unacceptable if
150 the actual purpose of aid is the pursuit of unacknowledged political policies, such as the promotion of closely-controlled economies and societies, or an increase in the resources and power of the international organizations.

Answer the following questions.

1. Why does the writer think that it is patronizing to feel that aid is essential to development?

2. According to the writer, what does material progress really depend on?

3. If aid is not necessary why, according to the writer, does everyone think it is?

4. What criteria does the writer suggest should be used to decide whom to give aid to?

5. Name three of the tasks a government should attempt to carry out.

6. Which governments should aid be withheld from?

7. What does the writer assume is the purpose of aid?
