AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20523

# BIBLIOGRAPHIC INPUT SHEET

FOR AID USE ONLY
Batch # 38

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. SUBJECT CLASSIFICATION | A. PRIMARY: TEMPORARY |
| | B. SECONDARY: |

2. TITLE AND SUBTITLE

Proceedings (of) a conference concerning U.S. policies in human resource development, population policies and programs, and economics planning and employment issues

3. AUTHOR(S)

(101) Economic Development Conf., Va. State College,1973

| 4. DOCUMENT DATE | 5. NUMBER OF PAGES | 6. ARC NUMBER |
|---|---|---|
| 1973 | 64p. | ARC |

7. REFERENCE ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

Va.State

8. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES *(Sponsoring Organization, Publishers, Availability)*

9. ABSTRACT

| | |
|---|---|
| 10. CONTROL NUMBER<br>PN-AAC-213 | 11. PRICE OF DOCUMENT |
| 12. DESCRIPTORS | 13. PROJECT NUMBER |
| | 14. CONTRACT NUMBER<br>CSD-3415 211(d) |
| | 15. TYPE OF DOCUMENT |

AID 590-1 (4-74)

# PROCEEDINGS
# OF
# ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
# CONFERENCE

**A conference concerning U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development, Population Policies and Programs, and Economics Planning and Employment Issues**

VIRGINIA STATE COLLEGE — EDUCATION BUILDING — PETERSBURG, VIRGINIA

**APRIL 19, 1973**

**(Conference made possible through cooperation of Virginia State College & USAID)**

This conference was sponsored by Virginia State College under Institutional Grant No. AID/csd-3415, with support from USAID, authorized under section 211 (d), Title II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. Participants were encouraged to express freely their professional opinions. Therefore, points of view or opinions found herein do not necessarily represent the position or policy of Virginia State College or the United States Agency for International Development. The participants are solely responsible for the factual accuracy of all materials in the Proceedings.

## FOREWARD

Virginia State College was awarded a 211 (d) five year grant by the Agency for International Development (AID) in May, 1972 to improve its competence in economics and agricultural economics so as to enhance its ability to deal with the economic development problems of low income agricultural and rural business units particularly as applicable in the less developed countries.

The grant was made under the authority of Section 211(d), Title II of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1966. One of the objectives is to assist research and educational institutions in the United State in strengthening their capacity to develop and carry out programs concerned with the economic and rural development of less developed countries.

The Departments of Economics and Agricultural Economics, through the Bureau of Economic Research and Development (BERD) will add staff, will create programs of staff development, and will focus on developing graduates concerned with and knowledgeable about helping rural people improve their lot, and in applying these lessons in LDC's. The major thrust of the program includes (1) marketing, (2) manpower, and (3) farm management.

This Economic Development Conference is focusing on U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development, Population Policies and Programs, and Economic Planning and Employment Issues. It has as it objectives: (1) to increase awareness in the State of Virginia of international economic development issues, (2) to understand the missions of 211(d) programs and their potentials, and (3) to establish a basis for developing a closer tie among institutions with 211(d) programs.

The conference was held April 19, 1973 at Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia. Mrs. Julia C. Gilliam, Secretary of the AID Program at Virginia State, Mrs. Ann M. Knight, Administrative Assistant of the Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Dr. Agha N. Khan, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, and Mr. Charles W. Womble, Assistant Professor of Education, and Research Associate of the Bureau worked untiringly in the preparation for the conference. Mrs. Gilliam has also been responsible for the transcription and typing of the proceedings.

The Bureau of Economic Research and Development expresses sincere appreciation to those who apperared on program and participated in the Discussion Groups. The Bureau is also grateful for the cooperation received from directors of 211(d) programs at other institutions. The contributions to the conference by officials of AID, for which Virginia State College is indebted, are apparent as one reads the proceedings. Drs. Arthur Coutu and Lawrence Witt were especially helpful. All segments of the college called upon cooperated in a commendable manner; the State of Virginia played a significant role in the conference for which we are appreciative; and other institutions within the State of Virginia and those present outside of the State contributed significantly in the viability of the conference.

The summaries of group sessions should be read with caution, since the transcription and editing of some of the statements may have been misinterpreted. For the accuracy or validations of the presentations, one should contact the individual who presented the paper. See the List of Contributors for addresses.

Huey J. Battle, Director
Bureau of Economic Research
and Development
Virginia State College
Petersburg, Virginia 23803

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreward iii

**SESSION I**
**Introductory Remarks**

Introductory Remarks ..... Huey J. Battle 3

Greetings ..... Wendell P. Russell 4

About Our Speakers 5

**SESSION II**
**U. S. Policies in Human Resource Development**

U. S. Policies in Human Resource Development ..... Vivian W. Henderson 9

Introduction of Speaker ..... Huey J. Battle 15

Luncheon Address ..... Samuel C. Adams 16

**SESSION III**
**Population Policies and Programs**

Population Policies and Programs ..... James W. Brackett 23

**SESSION IV**
**Economic Planning and Employment Issues**

Economic Planning and Employment Issues ..... Carl K. Eicher 33

**SESSION V**
**Group Sessions**

Group 1-U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development ..... T. T. Williams, Chairman 41

Group II-Population Policies and Programs ..... Charles O. Meiburg, Chairman 42

Group III-Economic Planning and Employment Issues ..... Robert Kirby, Chairman 43

**SESSION VI**
**Implications and Future Planning for 211(d) Programs**

Implications and Future Planning for 211(d) Programs ..... Theodore E. Brown 47

**APPENDIXES**

Appendix A ..... The African Rural Employment Study 51

Appendix B ..... Rural Employment Paper Series 52

Appendix C ..... List of Contributors 53

Appendix D ..... List of Conference Participants 54

Appendix E ..... Conference Program 57

Appendix F ..... Bureau of Economic Research and Development 59

# SESSION I

## Introductory Remarks

## INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

### Dr. Huey J. Battle

We are indeed pleased with the kind of response we have received for this Economic Development Conference. Your presence reflects the interest you have in the economic development of the low-income sectors of this country and the sharing of your skills with less developed countries. There is something complimentary to be said about a country with that kind of a commitment. It is our hope to carry out this mission most efficiently through our 211(d) grants. For some of us this means considerable development and expansion at the institutional level, we are committed to do this within available means. To others it means the working in concert and cooperation with other institutions. I trust that we are committed to this. Overall, the mission of team of institutions is to provide institutional competence needed in the foreign assistance programs, not excluding whatever assistance we may provide on the domestic scene.

This brings us to the objectives of this conference. First, to increase the awareness in the state of Virginia of the international economic development issues. Secondly, to understand the mission of 211(d) programs and their potentials. Thirdly, to establish a basis for developing a closer tie among institutions with 211(d) programs.

We would be the first to concede that these three objectives have broad dimensions and we are perhaps a bit ambitious in attempting to achieve them in a one-day conference. We are pleased to have been able to get some of the most abled persons to appear on this program in our effort to achieve these objectives.

As you can see from your programs, we have a full day of activities. We have no suggested changes in the program at this moment. Let us introduce persons before you who are Directors of 211(d) programs. They are:

Dr. B. F. Stanton, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York
Dr. Lawrence W. Witt, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan
Dr. Lee R. Martin, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota
Dr. T. T. Williams, Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

Unfortunately, Dr. Lehman Fletcher, Director of the AID Program, Iowa State University, just recently notified us that he will be unable to come. He sent his regrets.

Among persons who are committed to this program is the President of Virginia State College. President Russell upon viewing the areas where a contribution might be made by Virginia State College set into motion a plan whereby the college could participate in the development of less fortunate areas of this country and would share these skills with less developed countries. We are pleased to have Dr. Wendell P. Russell, President of Virginia State College to bring greetings. President, we have present or scheduled to arrive, persons from Illinois, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, New York, North Carolina, Maryland, Louisiana, Wisconsin, and of course Virginia. Institutions included in addition to those represented behind the lectern are John Hopkins, Southern Illinois, Norfolk State College, John Tyler College, Richard Bland College, University of Wisconsin, University of Virginia, Virginia Union University, ST. Paul's College, V.P.I. & S.U., Madison College, Lord Fairfax Community College, Central Virginia Community College, and Virginia State College. Agencies represented include USAID, Virginia State Planning and Community Affairs, Cooperative Extension Services, Overseas Liaison Committee--American Council on Education, Division of Industrial Development, Virginia Employment Commission, State Department of Education, AFL-CIO, Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, City Savings Bank, B & W Tobacco Corporation, First & Merchants Bank, Gillfield Baptist Church. President, this represents the composition of the audience you are about to extend greetings.

## GREETINGS

**Wendell P. Russell, President**
**Virginia State College**
**Petersburg, Virginia 23803**

Welcome to Virginia State College and to Virginia for what we consider to be a most important conference. This Economic Development Conference is jointly sponsored by AID and Virginia State College through its Bureau of Economic Research and Development.

I am pleased to welcome you to Virginia, those of you who have come from afar. I welcome my colleague Dr. Vivian Henderson, President of Clark College, who will be speaking later this morning and Dr. Samuel Adams who is so well known to us in the black colleges.

We are particularly happy at Virginia State College to share with Southern University of Baton Rouge, Louisiana the distinction of being one of the two black colleges with 211(d) Programs. Richard Ware, who was most instrumental, along with Theodore Brown in working with both of the institutions to assure an understanding of what 211(d) was all about and showing how this particular program fits into the mission and scope of these two instititions. Quite frankly, we are delighted to have this responsibility and the possibility of making a real contribution in this area of economic development because it involves a couple of things in which we think we have not only tremendous interest but also tremendous expertise.

First, it allows us to make use of our own institutional resources as well as those resources outside of institutions represented here in the development of a viable program of economics at this institution both in terms of research and the development of young people who can make use of the tools of research. Therefore, at home among our own people who have tremendous problems, who are the victims of poverty, and who are the victims of societal organization, victimized by so many things, we can do something to be of help.

Secondly, in the meantime, we can be developing students, and developing other resources which have effects that may be passed on to the less developed countries. I think that when an institution is confined by its own boundaries and does not reach out, it is no longer of any importance. When it does not seize opportunities which are available to it outside of normal boundaries, the institution is not extending itself to its fullest abilities.

We at Virginia State are concerned that we shall not be bound by any tradition-oriented elements, that we shall find new vistas, and that we shall explore them to their fullest. Therefore, the 211(d) grant represents for us a prime possibility and we want to be about the business at hand.

So, your presence here does us honor. We hope, that at the completion of this conference, with some of the very exciting people that we have scheduled to participate, we shall be further along in the planning of our own program at Virginia State; and there shall be something here which will be of help to the colleges which are not involved in this particular program but are also involved in this business of extending learning and development of resources in the community.

Again, welcome to Virginia State College and welcome to Virginia.

## ABOUT OUR SPEAKERS

**DR. VIVIAN W. HENDERSON** has served as the President of Clark College in the Altanta University Center since 1965. Under his leadership Clark College has become one of the leading small and black colleges in the nation, and a pioneer in curricula and administrative reforms. A nationally recognized economist, Dr. Henderson's work has demonstrated to industry and business the buying power of the black American community.

He received his Ph.D. degree from the University of Iowa. Dr. Henderson has long held an interest in economic development, and is an author of numerous publications. He is associated with many professional organizations.

**DR. SAMUEL C. ADAMS,** former U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Niger is presently serving as the Assistant Administrator for Africa, USAID, Washington, D.C., since 1969. He has previously served the foreign aid program for 16 years before his appointmnet as Ambassador to Niger. Dr. Adams has served in Nigeria and Cambodia as chief education officer and in Mali and Morocco as Director of the AID Missions.

He holds bachelor and master of arts degrees from Fisk University and a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago. He has also done post graduate studies at several other schools including the University of London's School of Oriental and African Studies.

Dr. Adams' collection of awards includes the Arthur S. Flemming Award for outstanding federal government service and the Alouite Decoration of King Hassan II. Among his list of publications is "The Private World and Public Impact of Poverty's People."

**MR. JAMES W. BRACKETT** has served as Chief, Demographic and Economic Analysis Division, Population and Humanitarian Assistance Bureau since 1970. He previously worked as Deputy Chief in the Research Division and the Analysis and Evaluation Division in the Technical Assistance Bureau, USAID, Washington, D.C.

He has done graduate work at the University of North Carolina majoring in Sociology and Statistics with a concentration on demography. Mr. Brackett has a rich experience in demography which has equipped him to be very knowledgeable with respect to policies and programs. He has served in a capacity concerned with such matters since 1955. During this time he has authored many publications.

**DR. CARL K. EICHER** is presently serving as Professor of Agricultural Economics at Michigan State University, and has been engaged in teaching and research on agricultural development problems in Africa since 1961. From 1963 to 1966 he assisted in the establishment of the Economic Development Institute, University of Nigeria, Enugu, Eastern Nigeria.

He did his doctoral work in Economics at Harvard University. Dr. Eicher is currently Chairman of the Overseas Liaison Committee, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., and directing a three year Michigan State University research study of unemployment and rural development in Tropical Africa. He is a joint author of several publications relevant to growth, development, and employment in African agriculture.

**MR. THEODORE E. BROWN** is presently serving as Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator - AID, Department of State in the Bureau ot Technical Assistance. He has served as Assistant to the Director, Department of Information - AID and Program Director for Black American - Nigerian People-to-People Program. He has served as President and Executive Director of American Negro Leadership Conference on Africa, Inc.

Mr. Brown's experiences include consultantships in several capacities of a national dimension. He organized the first white house conference with black leaders concerned solely with foreign policy affairs in 1962.

His education came from matriculation at Northwestern University, Harvard University, and Columbia University. He has traveled extensively in the United States, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and Europe.

# SESSION II

## U. S. Policies in Human Resource Development

## U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development

by

Vivian W. Henderson, President
Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia

My speech will mainly focus on the component of manpower policy in this country and implications it can have for countries abroad.

Manpower policy is only one component of the larger question of human resources. Human resources is the larger question because in its larger context it involves virtually every aspect of human behavior in the aggregate as well as from the standpoint of an individual. Moreover, any inquiry into human resources has to conclude that human resources in the aggregate as well as for the individual is extremely heterogeneous. As a matter of fact, perhaps unfortunately in some ways, we have spent most of our time since World War II categorizing human beings in attempts to get handles on their needs, to answer questions involving human capital, training, education, professional and vocational development, the learning process, to get a handle on such questions as migration, schooling and a host of other matters. Because it is involved with human beings, the human resource question has to be heterogeneous. Therefore, you can't talk about it in a aggregate sense and draw generalizations and conclusions because our level of sophistication in dealing with this heterogeneous mass is not what it should be and what we hope for it to be in the future. Much of the research, for example, has gone into many questions involving costs and benefits from investments in various aspects of human resources and human capital. But as I shall try to point out in the latter part of my remarks, those questions have yet to be translated into policy issues, policy matters, or policy decisions, particularly those involving manpower. So when I choose manpower as one component of the human resource question, I choose it primarily because we have, perhaps, done a better job of getting a handle on manpower as a component in human resource policy in this country.

I should like to review very quickly a little about the manpower question and manpower policies in this country. I think there are some implications for foreign operations and for some of the things we're trying to do through this conference.

When I talk about manpower policy, I have to talk about it in the context of employment policy, as well as fiscal and budgetary policy because it is out of these that the program has developed and, of course, the human resource question. It is also a fact that from the vantage point of overseas involvement the extent to which countries in their planning and development of plans for implementation, whether it be in agriculture or in the field of technology, the building of dams or whatever the case may be, manpower, employment policy and human resource development must waltz together. They must dance together as you move toward an overall development plan for the economy. Too often we have separated these things from the traditional development plans. The human resource development part of it simply comes in through the back door or through conventional wisdom, conventional programs, traditional approaches involving education in the traditional way, and vocational education in the traditional way. Manpower involves a development and training concept. It has to do with shaping the supply of labor in such fashion as to make it conducive for use by the whole range of users of labor in various occupations in industries.

Manpower, as I said, is part of the concept of human resources but it is not as fundamental as human resources in the strictest economic sense. Again, manpower connotes the process of developing and shaping human resources, activating those human resources, and generating the supply. Tied in with it is employment policy. This connotes a conscious effort by public institutions, since we are dealing with public policy, to generate and indeed use available manpower and human resources. You know the critical question. For example, in a developing country, do you substitute machinery for labor? You don't pay the machinery but you pay the labor. You

generate wages. Therefore, employment policy and manpower policy go together. Employment policy here embraces everything from public arrangements for pushing and pulling manpower into the job market, to recruiting, training and matching up manpower with jobs and the development of ways and means to assure the fullest utilization of manpower that there is available regardless of its form. Thus, employment policy by definition embraces everything associated with such questions as migration, development and training.

This country was very late in establishing even a limited employment policy and was even later in establishing a manpower policy. Even today this is the critical point, there is no real policy governing ... man resource development in this country. I say this despite various kinds of budget and administrative pronouncements by Mr. Nixon and his staff about the great investment in human resources. But the administration is cutting back on the social programs, OEO, HUD, and all such things. However, the defense budget goes on. They come back with the retort that there has never been a greater investment in human resource development than what supports this statement by Mr. Nixon and his staff. What I am saying here is that *we have no bona fide, legitimate human resource policy in this country.*

Now, someone is saying, "you're wrong Henderson." "We've got schools, we've got medical schools, and we've got medical schools, and we've got vocational schools. These are all human resources development agencies." Well they're fine. I understand that. But these functions are all left to the states and the cities and there is no national set of goals, priorities and policies. I am also aware of the fact that many state governments now have what they call human resource departments and they deal with drug abuse, and a whole host of very good things. However, I still argue on my basic point that we were very late in establishing employment policy, even later establishing a limited manpower policy. Even today we have not established what I would consider to be a reasonably sophisticated human resource policy for this country.

I would like to cite what I meant when I said recently, the Employment Act of 1947 which was enacted after World War II is now only twenty-six years old. That was our first real stab at establishing an employment policy for this country promoting employment to about a three per cent level of unemployment. The point is that the 1947 act, as good, as forward, and as progressive as it was, and as much as we have used it, did not have express programs for dealing with such problems as racial discrimination, sex discrimination, migration in the labor market, demographic problems such as those found in the rural areas right here in our own country, and structural problems associated with the job market. It was based on the general theory of employment. To get at the structural problems is a very serious matter in some of the underdeveloped countries. It is not the frictional unemployment that is a serious matter so much. It is the structural unemployment, the structured underemployment. So to get at these it wasn't until 1962 that we began to develop a manpower policy to deal with some of the structural problems. But look at what I am saying about what is happening here in this country. While we had an educational system for many years, we had vocational schools, we had a whole lot of other things growing out of conventional wisdom, out of traditional methodology, we didn't have any real vehicle to get at the critical, structural unemployment, underemployment, and other kinds of human resources problems in this country. Yet, when we look overseas, when we look at the Scandinavian countries where we visited, we find there is much more sophistication in the development of labor policy, manpower policy, and employment policy for a developing country. Therefore, you can have, for example, X per cent of the labor force undergoing training for a variety of occupations and the changing demand in the labor market.

In 1947 employment policy was void of many things and yet, it was good in many areas. The first real struggle and strike at a manpower policy was made in 1962. I want to point this out because I think this has importance for overseas work. Also, it has importance for the schools who are trying to develop manpower for the economics profession.

As I sat on the Manpower Commission, I wondered what we did in those eight years.

But every now and then something does come through. We did some good things. There are three basic objectives associated with manpower policy:

1. To minimize the impact on the individual of cyclical fluctuations in the economy. In the overseas countries and developing countries, I don't know how much of a concern they have for cyclical fluctuations. They are simply depressed. Maybe that wouldn't be an objective of manpower policy in a country overseas.

2. To provide a vehicle whereby workers and job seekers could more effectively adjust to the structural rigidities in the job market and technological change. Here it isn't a question of technological change so much for the depressed areas. it is the question of introducing technology, manning that technology and relating it to the manpower and human resources available in the economy.

3. To reduce the differentials in levels of employment between certain categories of workers, particularly black and white workers. What would this be if you were to translate this to an underdeveloped area? I'm not too sure what the answer is here but it seems to me manpower policy has to be developed as part of the total plan for the economy. It obviously takes a lot of research. You've got to know the labor market, know what people need, and know what the demand is so that you can provide the supply. Is it supplied out of the traditional, and conventionalwisdom or is it supplied out of some new concept associated with manpower policy?It should definitely relate itself to technological developments and implementation.

One of the reasons MDTA in this country came into being was because in 1956, 1957, 1958, or 1959 when we had high employment, we found that a great deal of this was the result of the push out of the labor market and the inability of individuals to adjust to changes in the labor market. This was a role for manpower policy then. These would be the traditional schools, etc. And of course, the whole question of correcting the problems of unemployment is involved.

What I am really trying to establish in this set of remarks is that we have the unemployment policy and it hasn't been too good. It hasn't done everything I want. We have human resources that are lying idle right now in Petersburg, unused human resources, unemployed people, underemployed and that very critical category of people who are being pushed out of the labor market who no longer participate and are being pushed on into the welfare roles, idle people, the idle minds. Do we have human resource policies in this country ? No. We don't have them. It's a pretty sad state and even manpower policies have not been able to achieve what they are supposed to achieve. In spite of what we have been able to do with manpower, that is under serious attack by the current administration. In other words, these manpower and employment questions clearly relate to the question of human resources which I've argued we do not have clearly delineated as part of the social and economic policies of this nation. There isn't a clearly delineated manpower policy approach to go with the social and economic planning that is part of the country. We don't even have clearly delineated goals.

I could give you a speech and talk about how many people we need for various health professions in this country, etc. But I'm not interested in this. I think the critical question before this country is the one being able to get a handle on this third component, the human resources itself, and the goals associated with it, the clearly developed and systematically developed public policy for the role of human capital itself. Human beings should be looked upon as capital. The only time in this country that we really looked upon human beings as capital was during slavery. It was only until about the last ten, fifteen or twenty years that we began to see individuals as capital. It's just like a piece of machinery, a plant or anything else. You invest in that capital in order for it to pay certain kinds of dividends. We don't have any clearly delineated policies here. Again, it's a very heterogeneous field and we're just beginning to touch at it. In other words, I think this whole question of having human resources from the vantage point of what it means to a developing nation is very important.

I have been very much concerned as I sat on various committees about one aspect of our manpower policy that was always deficient. And I think it has to do with some

of the issues of the conference. I used to argue with some committee members and would ask, "Why is it that we don't put more money in the rural areas?" "Why is it that when we get ready to disperse the trends, we always think of the ghetto and the urban centers?" Of course, I knew the answers. The point I am trying to make here is that I am still appalled by the obvious area in our human resources, manpower, and employment policy matters here in this country.

I was down in Hancock County, Georgia over the last several months. The Ford Foundation has put a lot of money down there to develop a catfish farm. Among other things, they are a developing economy. Hancock County is about the fifth poorest county in the country. About seventy-five per cent of it is Black. Therefore, you can imagine what the per capita income is. There is a young man down there is trying to develop this county. He is trying to demonstrate that Black and white folks can work together to develop an underdeveloped area in this country. He has a lot of things going for him. He has some politics going, he has a great organization, he has some investments in the catfish farm and he is thinking about bringing in low wage textile firms. But we kept going down there and we found there was something missing. We concluded after a couple of trips that they didn't have adequate access to higher education. They didn't have any real training programs. There is no manpower policy to go with their economic development program. Well, among other things, Clark College became ambitious. We decided that we would earnestly inquire into the question and find out what value it would be to establish college level manpower development programs in Hancock County as part of the development program of that county which is being engineered by the people in that county. We don't know what the answer is, yet. We're satisfied with concentional wisdom regarding manpower and employment, and we're satisfied particularly with conventional wisdom regarding the larger question of human resources. We think in this country that if we can identify the needs in the health profession with a chart someone from the labor department draws, that's all we need to do. We think that if we can tell how many people we need for certain kinds of other professions, that's all we need to do. However, that's not quite the whole story. When all of this comes out of the hopper, it is not only the economy that's at stake but it's that first word that bothers me, human. And in this country we have not been humanely oriented to the extent I think we should in terms of the policies regarding fiscal and monetary matters, economic development.

I think we ought to see the victimized members of the population. There is a word that has crept into our language called disadvantaged. I have argued for so long that I am not interested in the disadvantages people have. I am interested in the fact that they have been victimized and done in by racial discrimination, the failure to invest in rural manpower development, the failure to really give them the kind of opportunity they should have to develop their capacities as individuals to the extent of their abilities. You can call the people in the overseas areas disadvantaged all you want to but they are really victims of the growing technology in the world and the failure to bring that technology to the people and the growing distance, as Barbara Ward says, "between the rich lands and the poor lands."

The victims in our country, all the people in the rural areas, I think, are the unemployed. It's the person who's been pushed out of the labor force, the person who really doesn't have the opportunity to correct the situation in which he is trapped. For example, in this country with the advancing technology, there has been a shift from the traditional hardgoods industries as sources of employment, as surces of occupations, to the service producting industries - government, education, health, person-to-person services, human-to-human services, communications, food service, and recreation. The hardgoods industries would be the mining, construction, agriculture and manufacturing. We know that syndrome, the shift from the hardgoods industries to those service-producing industries. It seems to be going up. There doesn't seem to be any turn around on that. We know it's happening and yet, I will still argue manpower policy fails to address itself to this kind of question.

I have tried to establish that we have no real human resource policy. During my years

on the commission, we did a lot of good things but we really haven't met the critical needs. The underdeveloped areas are probably not at that point. I don't know. They have a combination here of still trying to exploit their natural resources, develop their agriculture, do the mining, get some construction, establish some manufacturing. This is where we are with emphasis on the human-to-human services. Yet, obviously in a world where we are advancing as fast as we are today, they have to have both. Manpower policy and the failure to have human resource policy has put us in a box here and we have not been able to engineer the adjustments that are so important to this kind of a picture. One of the best things it did was to deemphasize institutional training and to emphasize on the job training and the like. Yet, we have not come to the question of human resource policy and I think we should.

Very important to us in this country now is the failure of manpower policy concerning the structural question but particularly to meet the problems of the trade-off between inflation and unemployment. I think in an underdeveloped country the trade-off between labor intensive and capital or machinery intensive kinds of operation. That's an age old development question but those trade-offs have to be calculated, measured and I'm afraid that the kind of economists we deal with, will all due respect to those in agriculture, for example, do not have the answers to the trade-offs between inflation, enemployment, labor intensive, overseas capital intensive, etc. In this country, the trade-offs has been made and Mr. Nixon says we will have a budget policy, a fiscal policy, an employment policy, not to generate jobs and opportunities but to curtail them. And we will have a set of policies here that will be directed toward trying to correct inflation at the expense of the victimized members of the population, at the expense of the idle workers, at the expense of the ambitious people. How much this will exasperate the discouraged personalities, I haven't been able to determine at this point. But certainly it is the poor, the Black and the minority who get hurt in this kind of trade-off.

We don't have a sufficient manpower policy at this point and we are trying to kill what little bit we do have. The question of a moratorium in housing, the failure to support public service employment, all of these are placed in great jeopardy along with what little progress we have made with a limited manpower policy.

Again, I would argue that the Scandinavian countries do keep a systematic process in operation for trading and meeting certain needs in certain parts of the labor force. I served as Chairman of the President's Commission to inquire into occupational training in industry and on the job. We are concerned with this because of the heterogeneous nature of the human resource question, the failure of manpower policy to deal with the very critical area of human resource use in training and manpower policy and the question of what happens to people on the job. What kind of policy should this country have regarding occupational training in industry? I'm not talking about safety programs or orientation to the job. I'm talking about occupational training for mobility. Of course, you know the great problem concerning this. Whenever you give a person occupational training risks. But really we don't have the answers to the question concerning occupational training in industry. We should know and be more conversant about it and how we can use it more effectively. The Scandinavian countries have been more successful here. They have a clearly delineated policy in this area. They know what's happening with X per cent of the labor force on the job that undergoes training. Here, again, is a case where we are grossly deficient and what's more tragic is that we know so little about it or what to do.

All of these things come down to the question of distributing income and how we are going to get the returns from production best utilized by the population and how we are going to improve upon the distribution of income among people.

In closing, the last of my remarks has to do with the research question on human resources and human capital. Here is where the people who are developing the economists, Southern University, Virginia State, Cornell, Iowa, Michigan and other places really have some tough problems in this area I am going to describe. My

reasoning behind this is because somehow or another in this country we are a snobbish group of people, particularly educators and economists. We do a little bit of research concerning human capital research. However, I have found very little that's applicable to the kinds of problems you are concerned about here today, not only in the countries abroad but at home. We have found very little, for example, that we could use in this kind of research that's applicable to manpower policy itself. In recent years, there has been a development of research on human capital. This is welcomed, and it is great. The National Bureau of Research held a symposium at Clark College last spring on human resources. The serious void is between the findings on human capital and their application to manpower policy and programs. The application to the real problem is human resources. Within the last two decades they have sharpened their tools. We need more to be done in this area. Obviously, theoretical research has to continue but this had little impact on manpower policy which had so much promise in the early 1960's and which could use much more influence from those who have worked on human capital. I think we would say in 1960 when Mr. Kennedy had the MDTA passed that the conditions were very ripe at that time and they were ripe all through the sixties for manpower policy to benefit from analysis and research on human capital but it did not occur. Whatever occurred was almost by accident. In other words, there were things that just didn't seem to happen. And I wonder about the question of cost benefit analysis. What we have here is a bunch of political statements about the benefit of Job Corps, for example concerning the cost. Some statements that came out were: "You spent more on sending a guy through Job Corps than sending a guy through Harvard." All of these accusations were made but yet, the researchers on human capital (human resources) never really got to the point. What are the real benefits from investment in X manpower program? The underdeveloped countries provide an excellent opportunity, perhaps, more so than we can concerning the measurement of cost benefits from investments.

The Travelers Aid Society has probably been the greatest, most important vehicle for migration policy in this country. If I recall correctly, it's not part of the national manpower policy or national human resource policies. Why is it that we cannot get people to go into the rural areas, for example, the physicians, and teachers? Why is it that I am not going to get people from Clark College to want to go into Hancock County and live in order to establish these first year courses? Migration is a critical problem in this country.

What manpower policy we did have in this country apparently is going to be shattered by revenue sharing. I'm not optimistic that we will get any more sophisticated movement in the area of human resource policy than what we've had in the past because I don't think revenue sharing can do the trick. Theories regarding human resources and human capital are important. We need to do more work to get them applied to manpower programs, manpower policy and I suppose the heterogeneous nature of this area. It is important if we can simply recognize this point, the fact that this is a very difficult area to get a handle on and it certainly is one in which we need to get a handle on. In other words, there are a lot of unanswered questions that consortiums such as this one represented here today can obviously deal with. I hope you don't misunderstand some of the things I have said in terms of my lack of respect for current administration directions. Obviously, I don't like revenue sharing. I am concerned about migration. All of this comes down to the question of how policies and programs meet the needs of victimized people and help them to share better in the returns from production. It's my view that the human resources question that we address ourselves to has the best answer to those kinds of questions if we can get a handle on them.

## INTRODUCTION OF SPEAKER
### Dr. Huey J. Battle

When planning a program of this nature one of the most difficult tasks is to find a speaker who is knowledgeable and available to share this knowledge with us at the time. Our speaker for this occasion is one who has advanced himself from a small town in Texas through many enviable positions up to this date. He did his undergraduate and master's degrees at Fisk University. His education included his matriculation at the University of Chicago where he received the Ph.D. degree with a major in sociology. He devoted time and energy to an Assessment of the Changing Organization of a Rural Negro Community and its Implications for Race Accommodation. His post doctorial work in 1958-58 at the University of London in the London School of Economics and Political Science broaden his understanding of the problems of less developed countries. In addition, his work at Syracuse University in 1958 and in the Senior Seminar in Foreign Policy, Department of State, tended to surface some of the long held beliefs of the speaker.

Our speaker has had a rather broad range of work experiences. He was selected as a Social Science Research fellow after his employment with the Department of Navy. From 1952-54, Dr. Adams was the Mass Education Adviser and Chief Education Officer for the U.S. Special Technical Economic Mission to Indo-China. This was the beginning of responsible positions held by our speaker with the United States Department of State. He has served as Director of USAID Missions from 1962-1968, when he as appointed U.S. Ambassador to the Republic of Niger. On November 7, 1969, he was sworn in as Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development in charge of the African Bureau.

This office over which Dr. Adams is responsible spends well over $150 million annually in the forms of development loans, technical assistance grants and supporting assistance grants.

Dr. Adams has been recognized on numerous occasions for his achievements. They include the (1) John Hay Whitney Foundation "Opportunity Fellow," (2) William A. Jump Memorial Award for performance in the field of Public Administration and Public Service, (3) Arthur S. Flemming Award - As an outstanding young man in the Federal Government, (4) A Presidential appointment in 1967 - U.S Representation to the Fifth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly, (5) Equal Employment Opportunity Award, AID, (6) Ralph Bunche Award, Opportunities Industrialization Center, and (7) In 1972 - Rockefeller Public Service Award in the field of Human Resource Development and Protection.

It is unquestionable that Dr. Adams has provided a tremendous contribution in the areas about which this conference is concerned. It is indeed my pleasure to introduce to you Dr. Samuel C. Adams, Jr. our Luncheon Speaker.

## LUNCHEON ADDRESS

by

**Samuel C. Adams, Jr.**
**Assistant Administrator for Africa**
**USAID**

I appreciate the opportunity to address this meeting. It is of special significance that six colleges and universities, each of whom is building its competence to deal with the problems of the developing countries, have come together to share their plans and concerns. The opportunity exists for something very creative and very new to emerge. The need for new fresh approaches to development is indeed pressing. Times have changed from those days in the 1950's and 1960's when the U.S. felt both encouraged and determined to solve the problem of poverty both at home and abroad. There are doubts expressed about the realism of such an undertaking at all. And even among those who would support such an endeavor there are questions about the capacity of those of us who are so-called specialists to achieve something significant with the resources put at our disposal.

Nearly 200 years ago from this site, Petersburg, Virginia, there began the final campaign of the Revolutionary War which climaxed in the surrender of the British forces and the emergence of a new nation. Perhaps here today we can set in motion a movement that will result not only in concepts of development but a new kind of competence that I would like to devote my remarks today.

Military strategists are often accused of preoccupying themselves with the last war rather than the requirements of the next one. We in AID, and those in the universities who are building up their competence in development, have to be sure that we are building competence that is relevant for the conditions of the future rather than based on the traditions of the past. The conditions surrounding the past assistance relationship between the U.S. and the developing countries, even those of the very recent past, are not going to pertain in the future. The future relationships cannot be fully perceived by even those of us most directly involved. But we can begin to understand them if we rid ourselves of false conceptions based on the past. Let me indicate what will be some of the major differences from the past.

First, the U.S. will not be the leader in foreign aid. In fact, for some years, U.S. foreign aid as a percentage of GNP has been falling behind that of other donors. Today, the U.S. ranks 12th out of 16 among the developed countries in foreign assistance. In Africa, the U.S. has never been the major donor. AID's contribution in recent years has averaged around eight per cent of the total bilateral and multilateral assistance. Programs of France far surpass our own; that of the World Bank group is rapidly assuming a role far larger than ours in major countries like Nigeria, Ghana, and Kenya. The technical assistance program of the U.N. exceeds that of the U.S. in Africa. While this has been true for some time, many Americans still approach the tasks of development with the attitude that the U.S. must somehow be the most important contributor in a technical, if not a financial sense, and that the U.S. must play the leading role in every sector in which we participate. This approach is not applicable in Africa and probably is becoming less so in other parts of the world.

Second, the American foreign aid program is changing rapidly and will be significantly different a few years from now. The role of the administrators of U.S. assistance both overseas and in Washington, will likely bear no relationship to their role today. Just as the U.S. will no longer be at the forefront of the aid relationship between the developed and developing countries, so too, in the U.S., AID or its successors will no longer be the central source of either planning or financing the many relationships that might pertain between the U.S. and the countries of the developing world. The formal AID program will like be more of a facilitator of exchanges between America and the developing countries than a financier

of such relationships. And the web of any relationships that might grow and thrive will have to be rooted in the mutual interests of the countries, and derive domestic support within the U.S. from a concern beyond "foreign aid" as such.

Third, a correlary to these changes and of particular interest to the institutions represented here today, the AID program will not be able to underwrite in the future the types of long term institutional relationships between American and African universities that were supported in the past. The time has passed, and the funds are gone for such multi-year institutional relationships as were once financed by AID between Kansas State University and Ahmadu Bello University in Nigeria, between Oklahoma State University and Haille Sellassie University in Ethiopia. These programs were part of a different era, when African universities were in a fledgling state and when the trend of U.S grant assistance was generally upward. African higher education must increasingly establish a place for itself within the context of limited African resources for education overall. Recent conferences of the Association of African Universities and innovative self-critical analysis such as that done in Ethiopia under the leadership of Haille Sellassie University are pointing the way for African universities to bring their resources more directly to bear on the problems of the majority of the African population which lives in the rural areas and which has no access to college, high school, or in many cases, even elementary education. American universities can be no less radical in evaluating their future relationships to Africa.

Clearing away the outdated traditions of the past helps us to see the challenges of the future. But before speaking directly to these challenges, let me say that I feel they are perhaps greater in Africa than on most continents. Most of the changes in the aid relationship I have described reflect worldwide changes of attitude, including changes in the outlook of the U.S. based on our domestic concerns. But African countries achieved independence in most cases later than other developing countries. Africa, thus, starts the 1970's with greater distances to travel. Literacy in Africa is still extremely limited. Approximately 75% of the population is still engaged in subsistence agriculture with a per capita income of less than $100 in half the countries. Transportation systems are entirely inadequate. There are only 40 miles of improved roads per 1,000 square miles in Africa compared to 920 per 1,000 square miles in the U.S. Moreover, most of the improved roads in Africa were constructed to serve the export-import trade during the colonial period rather than the vast majority of persons in subsistence agriculture. In Ethiopia more than 80% of the population lives more than 10 kilometers from any kind of road. Managerial skills are scarce at all levels in both the public and private sector. Perhaps the most telling statistic is that of the 26 countries of the world identified by the U.N. as the least developed, 16 are in Africa.

Some might say, wistfully, that Africa could have used another decade of the aid programs of the 1960's. But that is irrelevant. Africa will need to deal with its critical problems in the 1970's under the conditions of the 1970's. And that by far is not all bad. There are opportunities open to us in the next decade that did not exist before. Forced to give up our old habits we may be better prepared to take advantage of these.

I would group the challenges of the 1970's under three headings. First, there is a need to identify better what is the basic problem of development as it actually affects the people of these countries. We are used to the compartmentalization of problems in terms of our own of these countries. We are used to the compartmentalization of problems in terms of our specializations and intellectual categories. But we need to look again at what is the problem of the people in these countries and what such words as agriculture, education or health may mean in terms of the problems that they face every day.

Second, we need to approach these problems in a truly interdisciplinary nature. By compartmentalizing problems along the lines of our own disciplines, we tend to prescribe remedies that are equally compartmentalized. Universities in the U.S. see the need for universities in Africa with

all the titles, courses and advanced degrees that go with an American institution of higher learning. Health specialists see the need for a structure of hospitals, medical schools, clinics and equipment which would provide persons with a minimum amount of modern, curative medicine. Agriculturalists foresee systems of extension and distribution that in the U.S. proceed from an enormous reservoir of trained manpower and a well developed transportation network. All of these things are prescribed for countries which, in may cases, cannot afford to finance one, let alone several nationwide structures of outreach services.

Third, we must learn to leap across the boundaries of past evolutionary technologies and make use of the most advanced breakthroughs in science and technology for the benefit of the least developed. This is a key to overcoming some of the financial and manpower constraints on our work. Yet this last challenge is perhaps the least understood and the least mastered to date.

Let me illustrate these challenges by describing a problem of great seriousness and great magnitude on the African continent today. Stretched across 13 countries is a belt of land just below the Sahara which supports 60 million people and which contains the source of protein, in livestock herds, for nearly all of West and Central africa. This area, instead of growing in production and potential, is dying. Over land that was once considered the potential grainery for all of West Africa, the desert is gradually spreading. Part of this process is a slow natural evolution of desertification. But far more alarming is the rapid dissintegration of once arable land resulting from inappropriate development of the resources of this area. There was a time when farmers in this area, with the knowledge of generations of living in this environment, would move from place to place and allow each patch of land to lie fallow for 15 years between cultivations. The steady growth of population and the concomitant increase in demand for food has rendered that practice obsolete. But other ways to regenerate the land have not replaced it. Once there existed a symbiotic relationship between the herdsmen of the North and the sedentary farmer of the South. In the rainy season herdsmen would keep their cattle in the north to graze along the Sahelian grasslands. When the dry seasons came they would drive the animals to the higher rainfall areas of the south where they could graze upon the stubble of agricultural lands in return for fertilizing the soil. But as population has grown and as farms have increasingly adopted practices of double cropping, and as land has become more scarce, the symbiotic relationship has begun to disintegrate. More and more animals have thus congregated around water holes and scare grazing lands of the north and in time have left them desolate. Today, at this very moment, a major drought in this area has deprived both herdsmen and farmers of their livelihood. Countries, whose main economic activity is in livestock, face the loss of one third to 60% of their national herds. People from countries that once exported grain are digging grass seeds out of the parched earth to eat. And perhaps most distressing the projections are that this area, 6 years from today, will have a lower per capita production of grain than it has today.

How do we conceptualize this problem? If we see it as agriculture or as livestock, or as water, we may miss the fundamental issue. The problem here is one of environment in its truest and most basic sense. This is an environment supporting 60 million people which is being destroyed in our very lifetime. And with the destruction of the environment comes the destruction of people: their livelihood, culture, and family structure. Only when we begin to conceive of this problem can we begin to develop solutions.

Furthermore, this is precisely the kind of problem which will be exacerbated rather than alleviated by narrow, disciplinary approaches. Improvements in veterinary services have undoubtedly benefited the herds in this part of Africa but have, equally, contributed to the overgrazing of fertile land. Development of wells, carried on by several donors over the past decades, has seemed a natural and desirable activity. But it has, in fact, contributed to the congregation of population in areas that could not support them. Agricultural programs which developed cash crops for export failed to take account of the growing need for food production. Each program in its way served a purpose that seemed intelligent, but all of them failed to reverse and in some ways helped accelerate the destruction of the entire area.

Yet, in this poorest of lands we find the opportunity for bringing to bear some of the most advanced technology developed by man. The multibillion U.S. space program has produced satellites which, with remote sensing devices have been able to identify the configurations and the potential of natural resources as never before. The Earths Resources Technology Satellite, better known as ERTS, has been photographing areas such as the one I have described. And scientists, African and American, are using these photographs to gain insights into all the problems that I have discussed.

This satellite provides the capacity to monitor water and land resources, locate crop disease, measure the area of land being cultivated and that being destroyed. The breadth of these pictures provides insight in a way that smaller areas covered bv normal aerial photography cannot provide in terms of identifying sources of ground water and potential mineral wealth. What is perhaps even more phenomenal is that this most advanced technology can be brought to bear on the problems of the developing countries with a small additional investment. One major scientist, training much more unsophisticated colleagues, has brought these resources to the benefit of the government in Mali. It is estimated that for only $2,000 a laboratory can be constructed to process and interpret satellite photographs. In sum, here is a technology whose impetus came not from the AID program and whose major source of financing has never been part of our foreign assistance effort, but whose potential for our efforts in development is enormous if we in the development business could only grasp it. In space technology and in all highly advanced scientific endeavors, the potential exists to deal with the problems of the developing countries in new ways. And with it, there comes the possibility, indeed the necessity of a new kind of relationship between the U.S and the developing countries. This relationship cannot be simply an AID relationship. It must, if it is to develop, be part of an international scientific collaboration, supported by those in the U.S. concerned with the advancement of science as by those of us concerned with the elimination of poverty. And yet, only a few persons, some physical scientists and some social scientists, have begun to see the ways in which ERTS and similar advancements can become relevant to the problems of development.

There is yet another challenge in this scientific potential. Having once grasped the knowledge that can be gathered from science, how do we translate it in meaningful ways for the millions of people who will never be in school and who will never be part of even $2,000 laboratories. Last year in the Cameroons, I met a young Peace Corp volunteer who had devised a system for herdsmen to identify just ten plants by which they could map and better utilize the entire grazing area available to them. By knowing no more than how to count from one to ten, these herdsmen could become more scientific ranchers. The kind of competence that we need from American universities in the next decade is the kind that can help translate the potential of earth telemetry to the benefit of illiterate herdsmen, and use it on a scale massive enough to make a difference in this generation. We have not yet begun to tackle that problem.

We will need a competence, moreover, which understands that education, health, agriculture, and all those other disciplines can only be meaningful if they are relevant to the life tasks of the people of these countries. When I think of education in the Sahelian Zone, I think of a system where people faced with a drought as severe as that of this year can seek help and advice on how to cope and to survive. I cannot help wondering, when I see an occasional transitor radio among people wandering from their land to take up life in shanty towns in Mauritania, because of the lack of water, whether there might not have been some system to tap that small example of modern technology in their hands to save these people from the destruction of their culture. If that is education, it is meaningful. But that has nothing to do with schoolhouses, teacher training colleges or all the paraphernalia that normally is associated with education programs.

My purpose today then, is to try to challenge you to a new era of development assistance. In an era in which AID funds are smaller, in which American institutional support overseas will be limited, in which fewer Americans generally will be working

side-by-side with their counterparts in the developing countries, and in which no relationship between the U.S and the developing countries will thrive unless rooted in something more basic in this country than the concept of foreign aid -- in this era -- I challenge you to find a way to make even more dramatic breakthroughs in solving the problem of poverty. And I offer you that challenge with optimism because I see in the potential of this country's intellectual and scientific resources a greater capacity for assisting, in the best sense of the word, than was possible throughout all our past aid programs. We need only to have the imagination and the will to understand how exciting our role can be under these circumstances.

# SESSION III

## Population Policies and Programs

# Population Policies and Programs

by

James W. Brackett

Chief, Demographic Analysis
and Evaluation Division
Office of Population, USAID

The facts and figures of the population explosion have been often cited but may be worth repeating here.

For most of the human history, the spectrum of disease, famine and death hung over mankind. High birth rates were matched by high death rates, resulting in a very slight increase - and not infrequently sharp declines - in population. Along with the industrial revolution and other changes in the 18th and 19th centuries, countries, what are today referred to as the developed countries, began to conquer disease and famine and to take effective measures to handle santitation. The changes came gradually in Europe, North America, and Japan. Death rates declined slowly, followed by declines in birth rates as more effective means of birth prevention were discovered and used.

The 20th century witnessed a rapid acceleration in progress. Advances in preventive medicine meant that many diseases simply vanished or occurred only rarely. Advances in curative medicine meant that people recovered quickly and with greatly diminished risk and discomfort when sickness occurred. Improved sanitation removed the source of much disease. Advances in agriculture provided a more ample and steady food supply while improved transportation diminished the threat of famine resulting from local crop failures. Moreover, these advances were no longer limited in their impact to the developed countries. The less developed countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America were able to avail themselves within the span of a very few years of two centuries of scientific development. Thus, death rates in most developed countries have declined very rapidly. For example, the death rate in Ceylon declined from 22 in 1946 to 15 in 1947. Declines are not as readily quantifiable in Africa and in the major Asian and Latin American countries because vital registration systems do not exist. But censuses, surveys and a variety of other methods clearly document the reality of markedly lower mortality in virtually all countries.

The historical pattern of world population growth mirrors these events. It was not until about 1650 that the world population reached 500 million, that is the level of today's India. By 1830 it had grown to one billion. It had doubled in a bit under 200 years. By about 1930 - only 100 years later, the second billion people had been added. The third billion was added in only 30 years or by 1960. The fourth billion will be added in only 15 years, or by about 1975. We are in fact already four-fifths of the way there. The world population at the present time is about 3.8 billion. At present rates of population growth, the fifth billion will be added in only one decade - that is, between 1975 and 1985.

Growth rates in most developed countries are presently low, generally one per cent or less per annum. For example, the United States population is growing by about 0.8 per cent, Japan's growth rate is 1.2 per cent, Great Britain's is 0.4 per cent, West Germany's is 0.1 per cent and the Soviet Union's is 1.0 per cent. In fact, if we look at family size in these countries, we find that women are on the average having about two children. That is, couples are just replacing themselves. If fertility remains at present levels, the populations of these countries will stop growing after a few years.

The developing countries present an entirely different story. Population growth in the less developed countries average about 2.7 per cent. Family size is still large. Women have an average of six or seven children and families of ten, twelve and fifteen are not uncommon.

Growth rates in these countries are a historic high - higher than those experienced by developed countries at any stage of their development.

These high rates of population growth create major social and economic problems for the developing countries. These problems are aggravated by the fact that the less developed countries are struggling to extend services to the present population. Despite major efforts in education, health, employment, etc., it is difficult to keep up. In fact, some countries find that although school budgets are expanding sharply, the number of children not in school is growing rather than shrinking. I recall an article that appeared last fall in a Nigerian newspaper. The writer reported that the legislature of one state in Nigeria passed a compulsory school law in the early 1950's. Large budgets were provided to finance school buildings, teacher training, book procurement, etc. A few years later when the law was to become effective - and the planned resources were in place - the school house doors open to double the number of children planned for. The Nigerian writer reported that the state legislature "wisely" repealed the compulsory feature of the law and that this feature has not been restored.

Providing jobs for the ever increasing labor pool is another major problem. Large capital outlays are required to create each industrial job. Agriculture is already oversaturated with labor, resulting in large movements of people to the cities in search of work, and the situation is likely to become worse. Just to feed the burgeoning populations will require major changes in agriculture that may push even more people off the land. The Green Revolution - the name applied to the development of new and higher yielding varieties of rice, wheat, and other staples, requires considerable capitalization. Chemicals to fertilize the crops and to control weeds and insects are required, as in some degree of mechanization. Many traditionally inclined subsistence farmers are likely to be displaced by more innovated and better educated farmers capable of adapting to the new methods.

Moreover, the Green Revolution provides only a respite. With populations doubling in only one generation, by the end of the present century, the populations of many countries will have outspaced the ability of the new varieties to meet the demand. Thus the age of spectrum of famine is only around the corner.

A number of African countries are faced with another problem which is aggravated by rapid population growth. The Sahara Desert is encroaching upon arable land, thus reducing the amount of land available to grow crops. A drought has reduced the ability of the remaining land to produce the food and fiber needed to feed and clothe the population of Upper Volta, Mali, and other countries. Farm output is reportedly off by some 40 per cent, requiring large imports of food. Since these countries have little in the way of developed natural resources and industry, their principal sources of foreign exchange are agricultural products. Thus, they have no means to pay for food imports

The immediate hunger problems of these countries cannot be solved by family planning programs. When people are faced with starvation, one obviously sends food rather than contraceptives. However, it is very easy to postpone attention to the population problem under the rationalization that other problems are more pressing. A few years ago the medical staff of a large public hospital in the United States pleaded that they did not have time to provide family planning services because they were too busy delivering babies!

The time available to mankind to solve the population problem is very short, for even if the norm of the two child family were adopted quickly, the momentum of population growth will result in a doubling of the population before growth stops. This is because there are large numbers of young people in the population now and even if they limit their childbearing to two children, they will collectively have many more children than would be required to equal deaths.

A few examples should serve to illustrate the point.

The population of Brazil in 1970 was about 94 million. If the norm of the two child family is adopted by the early 1980's, that is, about then years from now, the population will continue to grow until about the year 2040, at which time there would be 195 million Brazilians.

Nigeria's 1970 population was 63 million. If the two child norm is adoped by the early 1980's, the Nigerian population would continue to grow until about 2040 at which time there would be about 125 million Nigerians. The same pattern is repeated for country after country.

Should the adoption of the child norm be delayed until the end of the centrury, the populations of these countries will continue to grow until about 2060 at which time there would be about three times as many people as at present.

These models presume a very substantial reduction in fertility, such as would be accomplished by a highly effective family planning program. To illustrate this point, look at what would happen if fertility and moratality remain constant.

Brazil's population would reach 3.5 billion within the next 100 years, Nigeria's would reach about 1.8 billion, Indonesia's about 4.5 billion, and India's more than 25 billion. Remember, the total world population now is 3.8 billion.

These astronomical populations will not be attained because the resources to support them will simply not be available even at marginal levels of subsistence. The choice is between allowing Malthusian forces to take care of the problem - with all the human misery that entails - and the application of our intellect to solve the problem humanely through family planning programs.

The choice is ours and much has in fact already been accomplished during the last 10 to 15 years although much remains to be done.

Let's look first at what has happened in population policy.

Some of you may recall President Eisenhower's statement in December, 1959 that:

"I cannot imagine anything more emphatically a subject that is not a proper political or governmental activity or function or responsibility."

President Eisenhower further stated that:

"This government will not, as long as I am here, have a positive political doctrine in its program that has to do with the problem of birth control. That is not our business."

Only three years later, General Eisenhower stated that:

"When I was President, I opposed the use of federal funds to provide birth control information to countries we were aiding because I felt this would violate the deepest religious convictions of large groups of taxpayers. As I now look back, it may be that I carried that conviction too far. I still believe that as a national policy, we should tell receiving nations how population growth threatens them and what can be done about it."

You may recall President Eisenhower's appearances on television in his capacity as honorary Chairman of Planned Parenthood, his expressions of strong concern about the population explosion and his endorsement of federal support for family planning. Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon have each advanced the support for family planning programs and congressional support has also increased to the point that there is virtually universal support for the rationale for family planning programs.

Beginning in fiscal year 1968, the Congress earmarked foreign aid funds for population programs. The earmarking has increased from $35 million in FY 1968 to $125 million for each of the last two years. These funds were for overseas programs. There was an equally rapid increase for domestic programs in the United States.

The experience in the United States is typical of what has and is happening worldwide. Family planning is potentially controversial. Political leaders often recognize privately that population is a serious problem before they feel safe politically in publicly acknowldeging the problem.

Two generaly types of policies may be defined: population policy and family planning policy. To qualify as a population policy, the policy must be directed toward modification of at least one demographic variable: fertility, mortality, or migration. Family planning policies are explictly directed toward the modification of a non demographic variable such as improvement of maternal and child health (common in Africa), elimination of illegal abortion, as in Chile, or improvement of family stability, (common in Latin America). Obviously, family planning policies may have demographic implications even if this was not the primary purpose.

All countries have policies relating to international migration. Foreigners are not permitted to enter except under specific circumstances and conditions and they are often excluded entirely. Some have a policy of expelling specific ethnic groups - as happened recently with Asians in Uganda. A few countries also attempt to control internal migration. Most are in favor of reducing mortality.

Governments may adopt either pro or anti-natalist population policies. A number of European countries provide family allowances for each child. Some of these were explicitly for the purpose of increasing the birth rate while others were simply welfare programs designed to assist the mother and child.

Most developed countries do not have explicit policies to limit fertility. Most people in these countries obtain contraceptive supplies from their private physicians, from the National Health Services, or through commercial channels.

Publicly and privately supported family planning services are offered for persons who cannot afford to pay for services. Also abortion has become widely available in many developed countries. Recent action by the U.S. Supreme Court has greatly broadened access to abortion in this country.

While many people feel developed countries should have policies to limit population growth, birth rates are already low and have been declining over the past decade or so and there are a number of reasons to expect further declines.

One of my colleagues had divided the less developed countries into four groups reflecting their policy positions.

1. Twenty one countries had anti-natalist population policies.

2. Fourteen had family planning policies.

3. Nineteen were opposed publicly to family planning but permitted family planning programs.

4. Thirty-five had no program and no anti-natalist's policy.

Some actually had pro-natalist policies, all had high fertility. Private programs were operating in some.

Not surprisingly, most of the anti-natalist countries were in Asia. In fact, with the exception of Burma and Bhutan, all of the East and South Asian countries had either population or family planning policies. Six African countries had anti-natalist policies and three others had family planning policies.

Three Latin American countries have anti-natalist policies and five have family planning policies.

A number of Latin American and African countries oppose population control but permit active family planning programs. Only two Asian countries - Jordan and Lebanon - fall into this group.

Some 21 African countries have no program and either no policy or a pro-natalist policy. These include some of the poorest countries in the world, countries with a few natural resources and a largely illiterate population. The only other large block of countries in this category are the oil rich Arab countries.

We are often asked to name the country with the fastest growing population. The questioner, expecting to be told that India or perhaps Pakistan has the dubious honor, is dumbfounded to hear that Kuwait, one of the wealthiest countries in the world, has a growth rate of ten per cent or so per annum.

This growth is most migration - immigrants from Jordan and other countries - coming into Kuwait to work in the oil fields.

Brazil is currently listed in the no policy, no program group, but there are a number of reasons to believe that she will follow Mexico's lead in promulgating a family planning policy. Actually, several Brazilian states are already providing family planning services through their health clinics.

From this analysis, it is clear that much work lies ahead particularly in Africa, to assist countries in understanding the interrelationship between population and development. AID is pursuing a number of actions to assist this process. We are supporting the United Nations program to assist countries in collecting demographic data by conducting censuses. The African census program is widely accepted by the African countries and some 14 countries have asked to be included.

AID has also developed several computer models designed to show quantitatively the impact of population growth on specific sectors like health, education, employment, and agriculture. These models have been used extensively in Asia and Latin America and are beginning to be applied in African countries. The models are normally used by citizens of the country to which it is applied. Our role is to provide the computer programs and assistance in how to use it.

Other programs include small grants to African scholars to support research on population matters, assistance to African Universitites in setting up population centers, travel grants to permit Africans to participate in international conferences and workshops, grants to support training abroad, etc.

I would like to turn now to program accomplishments. Although India's family planning program officially dates back to 1951, neither India nor any other country had significant family planning activity until the mid 1960's. • •

Some of the earliest and most successful family planning efforts have occurred in areas of Chinese settlement -- eg., Hong Kong, Twain, and Singapore. Hong Kong's birth rate declined from 29 in 1965 to 20 in 1972, Singapore's from 21 in 1965 to 23 in 1972 and Taiwan's from 34 to 28 in the same time span.

Major programs have since been launched in such countries as Indonesia, Philippines, Thailand, Jamaica, Costa Rica, Columbia, Tunisia, Morocco, and Ghana, to name a few.

We have collected data on IUD and pill acceptors from 35 less developed countries. These data, which are imperfect and incomplete, show that during 1972 some 3.5 billion women and men accepted family planning. This figure compares with 1.3 billion in 1965.

For a number of years the IUD was the most important contraceptive technique in large scale programs. However, IUD acceptance plateaued several years ago at a bit over two million new acceptors per annum and in the last few years has declined probably to a level of about 1.5 million in 1972. Pill acceptance has increased sharply over the last several years, surpassing the IUD. The number of new pill acceptors in 1972 in the 35 less developed countries for which we have data probably reached two million.

Other principal means of fertility regulation currently employed in mass programs are condoms, sterilizations, and abortion. Some programs also use vaginal foam.

There have been some important differences in programs, particularly in regard to the methods of fertility regulation employed. Taiwan's program was almost exclusively an IUD program until recently. In fact, oral contraceptives were not introduced until 1967 and then only for women who had been unsuccessful with the IUD. Not until 1969 were pills generally and freely available.

Hong Kong followed a different course. Pills were introduced early and proved to be popular. Because pills are more acceptable to younger women seeking a means of child spacing while IUD's are more likely to be accepted by older women seeking means of limiting the number of their offspring to those already born, the impact of the two methods on fertility is quite different.

The IUD was first introduced into Taiwan between 1960 and 1965. It's early impact on fertility can be seen as a slight indentation in the fertility of women 30 years or older. IUD acceptance increased between 1965 and

1970, resulting in a further drop in fertility of women 30 and over but only a slight change in the fertility of women under 30.

Hong Kong's fertility changed very little between 1960 and 1965. However, very substantial changes at all ages are visible by 1970.

Data for country after country show the same pattern. South Korea, for example, relied heavily upon the IUD. Thus, fertility declines were more pronounced at the older ages. The pill was the principal method in Costa Rica. Thus, the charts show a general melting away of fertility at all ages.

I would like to point out the impact of abortion. Japan legalized abortion during the American occupation just after World War II. Fertility declined sharply and remained very low.

Romania liberalized its abortion law in the mid 1950's. Birth rates plummetted as the numbers of abortions increased. The charts for 1962 and 1965 show fertility rates at levels close to the lowest attained by any population in history.

In the fall of 1966, the Romania government became concerned about the low birth rate and high number of abortions. It, there, imposed restrictions on abortion and on the sale of contraceptives. Divorces were made difficult to obtain. The results are strikingly displayed in the chart. Fertility at all ages increased. The birth rate increased from 14 during the quarter preceding the imposition of the new rules to 28 one year later.

The Indian program relies almost exclusively on vasectomies and condoms. Until recently, vasectomies were performed in large camps. Heavily publicized campaigns attempted to assemble prospective candidates for vasectomies at a fairground or similar place. Operations were performed on an assembly line basis. Men who underwent the operations were paid a bonus. The camp I visited about 18 months ago paid cash and goods valued at about $15, a substantial sum in a country with a per capita income of $100 per annum. Ethical questions have been raised about these payments and the program became the center of controversy in the India Parliament after several deaths occurred from tetanus allegedly contracted in the camps. The camps have now been suspended.

A program based on sterilization will have its impact on older persons who have already had several children. Thus, a program based exclusively on sterilization will not have a sufficient impact to ultimately bring about zero population growth.

India has passed a liberal abortion law which could be an important factor in sharply reducing fertility but conservative policies on implementation have greatly reduced the impact.

The lead times to bring about the needed changes in fertility patterns is quite long and despite increased attention, progress has been agonizingly slow. Excuses for in-action are many.

Some have maintained that the population problem is a white's man's concern about growing numbers of black, brown, and yellow men. Others admit that there may be a problemurgency or maintain that people need children as a form of social security, they will not limit their families until social security systems are established.

Let's look closely at some of these arguments.

The struggle is not a racial, ethnic, or nationality one. Population pressures affect all of us. Increased demands for scarce resources by burgeoning population in other parts of the world increases the worldwide demand for food and other commodities and drives up the price you and I pay in North America. Of course, prices are also higher in Africa, Asia, and Latin America where ability to pay is much less than here. Much of the recent rise in food prices in the U.S. is due to large sales of food to the grain short Soviet Union.

Those of you who have been in India know what conditions are like there -- for the Indians. Hundreds of thousands of people are simply not housed. They live on the streets, existing on whatever income can be derived from casual labor. Africa has not yet reached the population pressures common in India but many of the cities are not much better and as Dr. Adams has described, conditions in the drought ridden sub-Shara countries are dire.

Rapid population growth is an extremely

serious problem for mankind. At present rates of growth many less developed countries double their population every 25 years. These rates cannot be continued for very much longer. Projections of world population running into the tens of billions will not be realized. The world cannot support such numbers.

There are two avenues open to solving the problems, reducing the birth rate or increasing the death rate. These are the only two options open to us.

The desirability of efforts to further reduce mortality and to increase the level of health and nutrition is obvious. However, these programs should be pursued on their merit and not as a substitute for family planning.

Growth rates in the less developed countries are high for one reason -- death rates have declined while birth rates have remained constant or declined only slightly. Infant and child mortality has already declined. Thus, to argue that reduced mortality is a prerequisite to fertility decline ignores the facts.

Solution to the population problem is no panacea. Curtailing population growth will not in and by itself bring instant success to the LDC's. Major efforts will be required to solve problems of health, education, employment, agriculture and the many other problems of the LDC's. However here is no prospect of solving these many problems unless the population problem can be solved.

# SESSION IV

## Economic Planning and Employment Issues

# ECONOMIC PLANNING AND EMPLOYMENT ISSUES

by

Carl K. Eicher
Professor of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University
and
Chairman, Overseas Liaison Committee
American Council on Education
Washington, D.C.

Will there be any role for American researchers in Africa in the 1980's ? This is an important question which can be analyzed within thc context of the performance of American scholars and U.S. government and private agencies supplying expertise on Africa over the 1950-73 period. For example, a quick review of a recent book, *Nigeria: Modernization and the Politics of Communalism*[1] disclosed that all of the 20 contributors were American and U.K. scholars. Why were no African political scientists in the list of contributors ? One answer is that may American institutions supplying expertise on Africa over the past quarter of a century did not provide an opportunity for African scholars to compete for research funds from U.S. agencies. Generally U.S. institutions were not noted for their capacity to create a community of scholars (both African and American) to undertake research in Africa. U.S. institutions facilitated the interests of U.S. scholars and as a result, a significant imbalance in scholarship on Africa emerged in many disciplines such as political science and history. As a result of this imbalance and a number of other complex factors, the doors of many African countries are being closed to American for foreign researchers.

If American scholars want to remain relevant to the problems of African countries, African universities and to donor agencies assisting Africa in the 1980's, there needs to be redirection in the style, attitude

[1]Edited by Robert Melson and Howard Wolpe, East Lansing: Michigan State University Press, 1971.

and the approaches of American researchers in Africa. Unless this redirection is implemented I am convinced that there will be a token demand from Africa for American scholarship in the 1980's. The first step in this redirection calls for an examination of the social and economic development process in African countries with emphasis on the types of problems which are likely to be important in Africa in the 1970's and 1980's.

If we address ourselves to the problems of Africa in the early seventies and look ahead to the 1980's what do we find ? The OECD has recently prepared a ranking of the 25 "least developed" of the developing countries as shown in Table 1. The "least developed" of the developing countries are ranked by the U.N. according to the following criteria:

1. Gross domestic product of less than $100 per capita in 1968.

2. Manufacturing accounting for 10 or 12 percent or less of the total value of GDP.

3. Less than 20 percent of the population is literate.

Although there are many different variables you can use to rank countries depending on your particular meaning of development, the above three criteria which have been used by the U.N. to rank the least developed of the developing countries are a rough but useful composite index of developments. When you look at these 25 least developed countries you will notice that 16 of the 25 are in Africa. You will also notice a high percentage of these 16 countries are land locked. As we examine the 16 African countries which are among the 25 least developed of all developing countries and the remaining countries in Africa we find that there is one overriding feature -- they are mainly agrarian countries with 70-90 percent of their people in agriculture. In addition, to the "agrarian grip" on these countries, we note that the road to development in most African countries in the 1970's and 1980's will depend to a considerable degree on how their agricultural sectors can be better organized and modernized. I am of the opinion that greatly increased economic research on agricultural problems can improve the decision making process in African countries. Although there is a long list of economic research topics I shall focus on one important problem area -- unemployment and underemployment.

The purpose of the balance of this paper is to illustrate how policy oriented research on rural employment problems in Africa is being carried out in the form of an African Rural Employment Study. (A description of the African Rural Employment Study is found in Appendix A.)

Our present three year research study of rural employment problems in Africa grew out of a summer research project which three of my graduate students and I carried out for AID in an attempt to answer the question of whether more productive employment could be generated in agriculture in African countries. Although our report used the catchy title, "Employment Generation in African Agriculture"[1] we found in our review of the literature on unemployment problems in Africa that data were not available in these countries to determine whether in fact more productive employment could be found in the agricultural sector. As a result we recommend research should be pursued on this topic. The next question was how should research be organized on these particular questions?

We took a decision in 1970 that the only way to approach research on these problems was to sit down and ask African scholars if they were interested in jointly preparing research proposals. We then obtained a small research contract from AID/Washington which allowed us to interact with a group of scholars in Africa in 1971 in developing a network of researchers and a formal research proposal which was submitted to AID/Washington in January of 1972. In June 1972 we signed a three year research contract with AID/Washington which launched our African Rural Employmnet Study. The main objective of the African

[1]Carl K. Eicher, *et. al. Employment Generation in African Agriculture.* Michigan State University, Institute of International Agriculture, Research Report No. 9, July 1970.

Table 1. ECONOMIC AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF LEAST--DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

| | | | Three criteria used to rank least developed Countries | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Countries | Land locked | Population (million) 1969 | Gross domestic product per capita, $(1968) | Manufacturing share in total production %, 1968 | Literature adults as % of adults 1968 |
| African: | | | | | |
| Botswana | • | 0 6 | 106 | 8 | 20 |
| Burundi | • | 3.5 | 53 | 4 | 10 |
| Chad | • | 3.6 | 73 | 4 | 7 |
| Dahomey | | 2.6 | 91 | 5 | 10 |
| Ethiopia | | 24.8 | 64 | 9 | 5 |
| Guinea | | 3.8 | 89 | 9 | 5 |
| Lesotho | • | 0 9 | 87 | 1 | 40 |
| Malawi | • | 4.4 | 69 | 8 | 15 |
| Mali | • | 4 9 | 92 | 8 | 2 |
| Niger | • | 3 9 | 89 | 6 | 1 |
| Rwanda | • | 3 5 | 43 | n.a | 10 |
| Somalia | | 2 7 | 60 | n.a. | 5 |
| Sudan | | 15 3 | 115 | 7 | 12 |
| Tanzania | | 12 9 | 71 | 6 | 17 |
| Uganda | • | 9 5 | 95 | 8 | 25 |
| Upper Volta | • | 5.3 | 51 | 6 | 7 |
| Others: | | | | | |
| Afganistan | • | 16 5 | 91 | 11 | 8 |
| Bhutan | • | 0.8 | n.a. | n.a | n.a. |
| Haiti | | 4 8 | 83 | 12 | 11 |
| Laos | • | 2.9 | 72 | n.a | 15 |
| Maldives | | 0.1 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a |
| Nepal | • | 10.8 | 82 | 11 | 9 |
| Sikkim | • | 0.2 | n.a. | n.a | n.a. |
| Western Samoa | | 0.1 | n.a. | n.a. | n.a |
| Yemen (Arab Repub.) | | 5.6 | 110 | n.a. | 10 |

Source: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, *Development Cooperation: 1972 Review.* Paris. OECD, December 1972, p 104

Rural Employment Study is to further comparative research on rural employment problems in tropical Africa. We are proceeding to carry out micro level research with a heavy emphasis on primary data collection at the village level on a whole range of issues which influence the demand for labor in agriculture and in rural non-farm occupations.

Our African Rural Employment Study has placed considerable emphasis on developing a conceptual framework for the study of rural employment problems before going to the field to collect micro data. The results of our work on a conceptual framework for the study of rural employment problems are being reported in our publication series entitled "African Rural Employment Papers."[1] The first paper entitled "Rural Employment, Migration and Economic Development," attempts to integrate research on rural employment, migration and economic development. The second paper on "Migration in Africa: Past, Present and Future" reviews about 130 studies on migration in Africa. Although there has been conducted by geographers, sociologists, and it generally has not been very policy relevant. In addition, past research on migration has relied heavily on data collected in urban areas and on census data. There is a need to carry out intensive studies in rural areas on the decision making process which guides labor allocation in agricultural production, rural non-farm employment or rural-rural or rural-urban migration. Our research on migration will be policy oriented and will be carried out concurrently with studies of agricultural production and rural non-farm employment.

The third paper is by a Sierra Leonian agricultural economists, Dr. Dunstan Spencer, who recently visited Virginia State as part of the Overseas Liaison Committee's 1972/73 International Seminar Series. Dr. Spencer recently completed a three year micro study of rice production in Sierre Leone and he has recorded his experience in organizing and carrying out village studies in Sierre Leone in African Rural Employment Paper No. 3. Also, Dr. David Norman has been carrying out village studies for the past seven years in Northern Nigeria. Norman's experience in organizing and carrying out village studies are reported in Papers No. 4 and 8.

Our African Rural Employment Study will be carried out for a period of three years in Sierre Leone and Nigeria and possibly in Ethiopia over a five year period. We also have other scholars who are working with other sources of funding in Ghana, Zaire, Tanzania, and in Kenya. Although there are about 24 or 25 researchers who are working or will be carrying out a wide range of research problems on employment and income distributions.

We have a number of problems, however, with the network approach. One problem is how to develop a research partnership among unequals in terms of the availability of funding. Our network assumes that Americans and Africans are equally qualified as scholars, share an equal interest in the stated problems and have the same capacity to deliver research results on schedule. However, since Michigan State University has signed a contract with AID/Washington to deliver the results of the African Rural Employment Study, we will use the concept of sub-contracting research to African scholars as one means of operationalizing the partnership among equals. For example, we have just signed a sub-contract with the Department of Agricultural Economics at the University of Ibadan. Next, we are sub-contracting with a Sierra Leonian - Dr. Dunstan Spencer - for field work in Sierre Leone. We hope the sub-contracting can overcome some of the problems inherent in our central research contract. However, I believe we should push in the direction of matching funds - bringing in outside research funds only when they are matched with local funds. Also, there is a need for donors to make block research grants directly to African research institutes. AID's Bureau for Africa program of channelling grants (similar to 211d grants to U.S. universities) to

[1]See Appendix B for a list of the African Rural Employment Papers. These papers are being distributed to every department of economics, department of agricultural economics, and to every social science research institute in African universities.

African social science research institutes is a welcome step in this direction.

Another problem facing our African Rural Employment Study is that of policy relevance. Since our network is composed of academic researchers we can easily be tied to the research problems of current interest to our academic disciplines rather than to the problems of current interest to our academic disciplines rather than to the problems facing policy makers in African countries. Although there are obvious advantages of undertaking joint research with government agencies we have taken a position of working with scholars in African universities for two reasons: first, universities are involved in training and research and the African Rural Employment Study seems to offer a potential to strengthen local training by offering jobs to university students as members of research teams, and providing data for development of local courses, etc. Second since employment and income distribution problems are politically sensitive it is obvious that foreign researchers will have little opportunity to become directly engaged in policy analysis on these issues. Our network is an "academic network." Steps are being taken by African researchers in Sierra Leone and Nigeria to relate their research more directly to the needs of government and to obtain the feedback of government officers.

Another problem is that of developing a common analytical framework for the study when it involves more than one country and it takes into consideration the research interest of African scholars rather than imposing a monolithic framework and set of research priorities. I have already mentioned that we have spent the past year in developing an analytical framework which has been reported in the first eight analytical papers. In addition we bring our researchers together once a year for one week to discuss research methodology. Our first meeting was held in Nigeria in December, 1971, our second in Bellagio, Italy in October, 1972 and our third will be held in Sierra Leone in the fall of 1973.

The above discussion has been in the nature of a progress report on how we are trying to develop an "academic network" of U.S. and African researchers to undertake policy relevant research in Africa. Although there is still room for the "lone scholar" to undertake research in Africa, we are convinced that there is a great deal of duplication of effort when U.S. professors and graduate students go to Africa and function as independent researchers. We think there is a need for "clusters of scholars" to work on key problems for periods of 5-10 years. We think that our network approach to research in one way which American researchers can contribute both to African governments, to African universities and hopefully to donors as they try to improve their policies in coming to grips with problems of employment and income distribution.

Let me conclude by returning to my opening question, will there be a demand for American Scholarship on African problems in the 1980's? I am of the opinion that steps should be taken now - in the 1970's - to redirect how American researchers relate to African scholars and governments. I think that we should encourage a "community of scholars" (both American and African) working on African problems rather than programs which earmark funds for American professors and students. Second, I think that we should encourage joint faculty appointments whereby Africans could simultaneously hold appointments with an African and American university. For example, there is no reason why Virginia State College could not use its 211d funding to offer a three year appointment to an African faculty member who could spend nine months every year as a member of his university in Africa and three months at Virginia State. Third, attention should be given to funding African social science research institutions and fourth, the network approach to social science research should be continued with emphasis on linking African scholars within Africa and in other regions.

# SESSION V

## Group Sessions

## GROUP SESSION I
## U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development
## Dr. T.T. Williams, Chairman

According to the speech this morning on the topic, U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development, we can assume that this is a very vague and inadequately defined area. We certainly have a problem between employment, inflation, and the level of economic activity. Another problem lies with the area concerning manpower and human resource development issues.

Some issues were raised concerning the question involving human resource development. There is a concern about this issue being looked at from the standpoint of productivity. If we look at it exclusively from this way, do we miss some aspects of it and engage some concern to education as being both a production and a consumption good? And sometimes, it is a consumption good of a rather interesting nature. When parents, for example, support children in school in this country, in Africa, or in other developing countries, one of the things that they hope or rather that they expect is that the sacrificies which they're making in providing education for their children will lead to upward mobility.

A comment was made that this leads to people being, perhaps, well educated to fit into the rural scene but with enough education to have aspirations and desires to move into the urban scenes. Therefore, they tend to migrate and not make the inputs to the rural scene that was hoped for. At least the government was hoping for this. The question is whether or not they are being educated to be very productive in the urban scene. This was an issue that was not completely agreed upon. A comment was made that education does not have the payoff that we expected it to make. According to one audience member, it appears, perhaps, that education alone does not provide a simple solution to the problems of the poor, disadvantaged, and minorities who are seeking to move into higher levels of activity in other lines of work, etc. Studies have shown that we have put too much faith in education and it simply does not do the job that we had thought it would.

In what ways can you build mobility into people? Education and migration to the urban scene is mobility but can you build that mobility in such a way that it's of the nature that you want? Can we build mobility, perhaps, to work in the rural scene and make a contribution to rural development either on the farm or in communities near the farm whereas others can fit into a regional or a national migration pattern? What can we learn by building these types of mobilities and these types of opportunities? These are questions which have to be studied before one can give an answer.

The last suggestion which was made indicated that we should not look at human resources in the raw or the individual going from a very limited level to a well sophisticated citizen but look at human resource development institutions and managerial changes in those development institutions. And we should not make them mirror images or slight adaptations of what a developed country may have but make modest changes.

## GROUP SESSION II
## Population Policies and Programs
## Dr. Charles O. Meiburg, Chairman

Basically today, there has not been too much information encouraging about population. The problem concerning population is not a simple one, it's not something that can be solved in five years. You have to get the budgets in place, get resources, and get research efforts under way. We had the IUD, and the pill but we felt the necessity of putting initially a fair amount of the funds we had into research.

What are some of the avenues that could be pursued to increase the understanding of the problem or possible solutions with regard to population? There are a number of avenues that could be promising. A year or so ago, there was hope for a new substance called prostaglandin that could be affected once a month or after the fact kind of method. The promise of that is less evident now than a year ago. The name comes from the prostate gland because it was first discovered in semen in the early 30's. It was thought to be only associated with men, but later it was found to be a natural substance. Women discovered how to regulate their menstrual cycle through the use of one of these chemicals. There are a number of these chemicals. The first discovery that there might be some connection between this chemical and reproduction was made less than five years ago when some of the chemical was dropped on a smooth muscle and a reaction occurred.Since theuterus is a smooth muscle, it was apparent that maybe if the substance was applied to the uterus, something might occur. Private experiments were conducted in Uganda by an Indian physican who tried the substance as a method of inducing abortion after 3 - 4 months of pregnancy. Later it was tried as a means of inducing menustration. There was an effort made to develop a reversible means of sterilization. There are some promising breakthroughs, we believe, that work through the endocrine system. But there are a whole series of these things that just take many, many years to check out. Some countries did have health services of some type but the poor countries did not have that. There were not even elementary clinics out in the bush in Africa where people could go to get aspirin. We had to help the country develop the network of resources to deliver services.

Nigeria is a country that has been a little slow. But there are indications there, too, that Nigeria does realize the problem. One of the things that we noted in Africa and Latin America, particularly, has been the concern about population particularly on the part of Europe, North America, Sweden and the United States. Sweden and the United States have been leaders in this field. What this really means is that white people are concerned about increasing numbers of blacks, browns, and yellows and that's not really something they should be concerned about.

From a social and economic side, we have some studies of rural migrants in Columbia that Wisconsin is doing. We have a project which we are trying to get through this fiscal year with the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the Anthropology Section. This will involve a number of key anthropologists to look at this problem in terms of the impact of population growth on the cultures of the countries with which we are concerned. We think that there is a lot of understanding that needs to be done on the part of the people in various countries if they know what is happening to their culture.

Population control is a means of controlling human resources. In addition, population control absorbs resources that could be devoted to exploiting existing natural resources. However, it was pointed out that funds devoted to population control programs or efforts to educate populations about controlling their sizes were probably more helpful than the same dollars, at least within certain limits, spent on other investment opportunities.

## GROUP SESSION III
## Economic Planning and Employment Issues
## Mr. Robert Kirby, Chairman

The session concerning the topic of Economic Planning and Employment Issues relates to a lot of things which the Division of Planning in Virginia has been doing over a number of years.

The Governor of Virginia just came back from Europe. His first trip over there was on an industrial trade mission and he brought back a series of publications from France about planning and development problems. It was amazing in terms of the problems which were identified with the French Government and how they related to the problems which we have in Virginia. Among those were migration problems. Some of the problems we have talked about today such as employment opportunities in the rural areas and being able to keep people in the rural areas. It was most interesting that the book could almost be taken from France and applied here in Virginia. To a degree that these problems exist in France and Virginia, they exist in the developing countries.

The Planning District Commission is well established in Virginia. There are 22 regions with planning districts within this commission. It is responsible for the overall economic, social and physical development of an area. They are in an advisory capacity only. They do not have any implementation authority. The Hahn II report was legislation which would have given the Planning District Commission implementation powers but would not have taken away authority or power of the local government. However, this legislation was not passed. The Planning District in Virginia represents major state policies. They are trying to develop human resources on a regional basis.

How many different kinds of authority do you have to have when you centralize? Is authority now the problem of centralizing control in the capital which does not fit the pattern of the regional approach? Do you have similar types of problems? These were question asked by an audience member. Mr. Kirby replied, to a degree. Over a year, the Governor issued an executive order which directed all state agencies to report to the Division of Planning on the feasibility of their approach, planning the program boundary to the planning district boundary. In some instances, state agencies were able to adjust their boundaries with a great deal of ease. In other cases, the adjustment was not as easy. For example, the State Police, which has an elaborate radio network, could not make the adjustment. They needed to have several million more dollars to adjust all of their planning districts. However, they were not able to do it because of their communications network. Therefore, this raises the question as to whether or not we have too many planning districts in Virginia. We are presently studying this matter. One avenue is to continue with the 22 planning regions because they are small enough to have a relationship with the local government and to have contact with local officials so that they can still feel it is their planning district.

The problem of allocation of resources is not one of the planning division in relationship to these districts. It is a problem of the General Assmembly. An audience member made a statement and raised a question to this effect. The district in North Hampton County needed the most money but that was the area that got the least amount ot money. Why was this so?

Most of the rural planning districts receive a smaller amount of money than the urban areas. These are the areas which need the most. The Hahn II report would have provided more money for all planning districts including the urban planning areas but the minimum state contribution would have gone to $30,000 instead of $10,000 which at the same time would have provided more money to the urban planning districts. The problem is the same except that more dollars are being made available. Therefore, the funding formula should be different.

# SESSION VI

## Implications and Future Planning for 211(d) Programs

# IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE PLANNING FOR 2II(d) PROGRAMS

by

**Theodore E. Brown**
**Special Assistant**
**to the Assistant Administrator**
**Technical Assistance Bureau, USAID**

It is difficult to say what the future of the 2II(d) programs may be. For as we listened to Dr. Adams, he mentioned the uncertainity of the direction that the nation's foreign assistance program may take. If AID has the difficulty of existing beyond the stage of the Continuing Resolution procedure, then obviously the future of the Agency's many separate programs is uncertain.

But it is safe to say that the future of the 2II(d) program will be affected, perhaps, by new directions and emphasis as well as the usual tendency to look in retrospect in order to ascertain how best to plan for the future.

There are many in and out of the official AID family who feel that the 2II(d) program has been eminently successful. There are areas where we see a clear need to continue building an institutional capability in the future.

To illustrate this point, it has already been extremely well developed today by both Dr. Adams and Dr. Henderson, the quality of life -- the social sciences. In the international arena, then, we may need help in building competently.

Currently in selecting and evaluating 211(d) institutions emphasis is being given to:

1. The commitment of a university to a multidisciplinary problem impeding development in LDC's.

2. The linkages the 2II(d) institutions can establish with other U.S. institutions, LDC institutions, and international institutions dealing with the same problem i.e., network approach.

3. The potential and actual utilization of institutional capacity both directly and indirectly to the network approach.

Yet, it is in the area of the 211(d) program for involving minority institutions that I am primarily concerned and officially active. It may be well that a better understanding and usage of the experiences as well as the capability of these institutions vis a vis the domestic scene may lie many important considerations for the future of the 211(d) programs.

We see a greater need to observe and study the possibility and transferability of techniques learned in the LDC's in tackling domestic problems; but, equally important, the experiences of minority American institutions -- its student body, faculty as well as the socio-economic problems that daily surround the life of these institutions and their people may well hold out hope for those who seek more effective ways of involving the 211(d) program concept.

It may be that the future will more involve the consortium approach, involving minority and the traditional larger universities with long 211(d) involvement or consortium of minority institutions with multidisciplinary capability.

Finally, and in summary, the future of 211(d) programs may well be found in the newer interdisciplinary approaches and our ability to develop a more effective and productive inclusion of the experiences and capability of minority institutions. For many of these institutions have demonstrated successes in tackling similar domestic counter problems in America's LDC's -- less developed communities.

# APPENDIXES

## APPENDIX A

## THE AFRICAN RURAL EMPLOYMENT STUDY

The African Rural Employment Study was initiated in 1971 by a network of scholars in order to further comparative analysis of the development process in selected African countries with emphasis on rural employment problems. The research program is jointly designed by scholars in African countries, Michigan State University, other universities in North America and Europe who desire to pursue research on employment problems in selected African nations. Research emphasis is being directed to Sierra Leone, Nigeria and Ethiopia. In addition, individual scholars in other countries, such as Ghana, Zaire, Tanzania and Kenya are carrying out research on rural employment problems and are members of the network.

The research program emphasizes joint and individual studies of rural employment such as the demand for labor in alternative production systems and in the rural nonfarm sector, the migration process as a link between rural and urban labor markets and the impact of macro policies on labor absorption in agriculture. Attention will be directed to developing policy models to trace the consequences of alternative strategies of agricultural development on farm output, employment, income distribution and migration and to incorporating the employment objective into project, sub-sector and sectoral analysis in developing countries.

The study maintains close links with similar networks of scholars in Latin America (ECIEL) and Asia (CAMS) and with organizations such as the FAO, ILO and the World Bank, who are engaged in research on employment problems.

African Rural Employment Papers are distributed without charge to libraries, government officers and scholars.

## APPENDIX B
## AFRICAN RURAL EMPLOYMENT STUDY
### Rural Employment Paper Series

| | |
|---|---|
| AREP No. 1 | Byerlee, Derek and Eicher, Carl K., Rural Employment, Migration and Economic Development: Theoretical Issues and Empirical Evidence from Africa, September 1972. |
| AREP No. 2 | Byerlee, Derek, Research on Migration in Africa: Past, Present and Future, September 1972. |
| AREP No. 3 | Spencer, Dunstan S. C., Micro-Level Farm Management and Production Economics Research Among Traditional African Farmers: Lessons From Sierra Leone, September, 1972. |
| AREP No. 4 | Norman, D.W., Economic Analysis of Agricultural Production and Labour Utilization Among the Hausa in the North of Nigeria, January 1973. |
| AREP No. 5 | Liedholm, Carl, Research on Employment in the Rural Nonfarm Sector in Africa, April 1973. |
| AREP No. 6 | Gemmill, Gordon and Eicher, Carl K., A Framework for Research on the Economics of Farm Mechanization in Developing Countries, April 1973. |
| AREP No. 7 | Idachaba, Francis Sulemanu, The Effects of Taxes and Subsidies on Land and Labour Utilization in Nigerian Agriculture, April 1973. |
| AREP No. 8 | Norman, D. W , Methodology and Problems of Farm Management Investigations: Experiences from Northern Nigeria, April 1973. |
| AREP No. 9 | Tollens, Eric, An Analysis of Research on Agricultural Economics, Rural Development and Unemployment in the Republic of Zaire, June 1973 [Forthcoming in French and English]. |

## LIST OF CONTRIBUTORS

*Adams, Samuel C.*, Bureau for Africa, USAID, Washington, D.C.

*Battle, Huey J.*, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Brackett, James W.*, Office of Population, USAID, Washington, D.C.

*Brown, Theodore E.*, Bureau of Technical Assistance, USAID, Washington, D.C.

*Durant, Thomas J.*, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Eicher, Carl K.*, Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

*Henderson, Vivian W.*, Office of the President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia

*Khan, Agha N.*, Agency for International Development Program, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Kirby, Robert H.*, Division of Planning & Community Affairs, Governor's Office, Richmond, Virginia

*Martin, Lee R.*, University of Minnesota, St. Paul Minnesota

*Meeks, Thomas J.*, Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Meiburg Charles O.*, Tayloe Murphy Institute, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

*Richie, William T.*, Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Russell, Wendell P.*, Office of the President, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Stanton, B.F.*, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

*Williams, T.T.*, Office of the President, Southern University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana

## List of Conference Participants

*Adams, Samuel C.,* Bureau for Africa, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Banks, D. W.,* Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp., Petersburg, Virginia

*Banks, J. F.,* Department of Secondary Education, State Department of Education, Richmond, Virginia

*Battle, Huey J., Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia*

*Boese, Alan E.,* Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Boggs, Nathaniel N.,* School of Science and Technology, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Brackett, James W.,* Office of Population, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Broadnax, Madison,* Office of Agriculture, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Brown, Theodore E.,* Bureau of Technical Assistance, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Cephas, James B.,* Treasurer-Comptroller's Office, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Chang, Peter,* Sociology Department, Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia

*Coffey, Joseph,* Department of Agricultural Economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute & State University, Blacksburg, Virginia

*Coleman, Isaac,* Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Colonna, Carl Morgan,* Department of Economics, Christopher Newport College, Newport News, Virginia

*Coutu, Arthur J.,* Agricultural Economics and Sector Planning Division, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Craig, William T.* Norfolk State College, Norfolk, Virginia

*Current, John,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Dickerson, A.,* Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, Richmond, Virginia

*Dunn, Richard H.,* Office of Sponsored Programs, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Durant, Thomas J..,* Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Eicher, Carl K.,* Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

*Everett, Lee Nora,* Richmond-Times Dispatch, Petersburg, Virginia

*Fields, Marvin A.,* Department of Agriculture, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Floyd, Sadie,* Saint Paul's College, Lawrenceville, Virginia

*Gerald Lynwood,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Gilliam, Julia C.,* Agency for International Development Program, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Graves, Edwin,* John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia

*Greene, Malachi,* Public Relations Office, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Henderson, Arnold R.,* School of Education, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Henderson, Vivian W.,* Office of the President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia

*Hicks, Malcolm G.,* Research in Afro-American Political Socialization, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Hogan, Edward B.,* Bureau for Africa, USAID, Washington, D.C.

*Johnson, Harry A.,* Learning Resources Center, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Khan, Agha N.,* Agency for International Development Program, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*King, David J.,* Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

*Kipps, Paul H.,* Madison College, Harrisonburg, Virginia

*Kirby, Robert H.,* Division of Planning and Community Affairs, Governor's Office, Richmond, Virginia

*Knight, Ann M.,* Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Laybourn, John E.,* Office of International Education, Southern Illinois at Carbondale, Carbondale, Illinois

*Lewis, Cornelius C.,* Department of Chemistry, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Lyman, Princeton,* Bureau for Africa, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Maniyar, Virod P.,* Department of Economics, Christopher Newport College, Newport News, Virginia

*Martin, Lee R.,* Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, Minnesota

*Meeks, Thomas J.,* Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Meiburg, Charles O.,* Tayloe Murphy Institute, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia

*Miller, Janice,* Research in Afro-American Political Sociolization, Political Science Department, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Moore, Frank J.,* Office of Policy Development and Analysis, USAID, Washington, D.C.

*Myren, Delbert T.,* Technical Assistance Bureau, USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Park, Seung Oh,* Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Peoples, Irvin C.,* Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University Extension Service, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Powell, Grady W.,* Gillfield Baptist Church, Petersburg, Virginia

*Raines, Sadie,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Randall, Isaac,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Richie, William T.,* Department of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Russell, Wendell P.,* Office of the President, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Scherer, Philip M.,* Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Seay, James M.,* City Savings Bank & Trust Co., Ettrick, Virginia

*Seifreid, Edmond J.,* Department of Economics, Roanoke College, Salem, Virginia

*Snow, Brewster,* Virginia AFL-CIO, Richmond, Virginia

*Stallworth, Vandervelt,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Stanton, B. F.,* Department of Agricultural Economics, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

*Taylor, Carl E.,* School of Hygiene, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland

*Thota, Vykuntapathi,* Learning Resources Center, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Tolliver, Robert W.,* Lord Fairfax Community College, Middletown, Virginia

*Ware, Richard F.,* USAID, Washington, D. C.

*Whitlow, Edward W.,* School of Business Administration, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Williams, Janice,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Williams, Obadiah D.,* Virginia Union University, Richmond, Virginia

*Williams, T.T.,* Office of the President, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Witt, Lawrence,* Department of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan

*Womble, Charles W.,* Agency for International Development Program, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

*Yerby, Wayne,* Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

# Economic Development Conference
# PROGRAM

| | |
|---|---|
| 8:30 - 9:30 A.M. | Registration - Foyer, Education Building |
| 9:30 - 10:00 A.M. | Session I - Introductory Remarks |
| | Presiding - Dr. Huey J. Battle, Chairman, Department of Economics and Director, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia |
| | Greetings - Dr. Wendell P. Russell, President, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia |
| 10:00 - 10:30 A.M. | Thrust of 211 (d) Programs |
| | Cornell University, Iowa State University, Michigan State University, University of Minnesota, Southern University, Virginia State College |
| 10:30 - 10:45 A.M. | Coffee Break |
| 10:45 - 11:30 A.M. | Session II - U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development |
| | Presiding - Dr. W. T. Richie, Prof. of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Va. |
| | Dr. Vivian W. Henderson, President, Clark College, Atlanta, Georgia, Speaker. |
| 11:30 - 11:45 A.M. | Discussion |
| 12:00 - 1:30 P.M. | LUNCHEON |
| | Introduction of Speaker: Dr. Huey J. Battle, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia |
| | Speaker: Dr. Samuel C. Adams, Asst. Administrator, African Bureau, Washington, D.C. |
| | Discussion |
| 1:30 - 2:00 P.M. | Session III - Population Policies and Programs |
| | Presiding - Dr. Thomas J. Meeks, Associate Professor of Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia |
| | Mr. James W. Brackett, Chief, Demographic & Economic Analysis. Division, Bureau for Population and Humanitarian Assistance, USAID, Washington, D.C., Speaker |
| 2:00 - 2:15 P.M. | Coffee Break |
| 2:15 - 2:45 P.M. | Session IV - Economic Planning and Employment Issues |
| | Presiding - Dr. Agha Khan, Associate Professor of Agricultural Economics, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia |
| | Dr. Carl K. Eicher, Professor of Agricultural Economics, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, and Chairman, Overseas Liaison Committee, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., Speaker |

2:45 - 3:45 P.M. Session V - Group Sessions

Group I - U.S. Policies in Human Resource Development, Room 218, Education Bldg. Dr. T. T. Williams, Assistant to the President, Southern University, Baton Rouge, La., Chairman

Group II - Population, Policiess, and Programs, Room 219-A, Education Bldg., Dr. Charles O. Meiburg, Director, Tayloe Murphy Institute, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia, Chairman

Group III - Economic Planning and Employment Issues, Room 219-B, Education Building, Dr. Robert Kirby, Director, Division of Planning and Community Affairs, Commonwealth of Virginia, The Governor's Office, Richmond, Virginia, Chairman

3:45 - 4:30 P.M. Session VI - Reportings and Discussions

Presiding - Mr. Thomas J. Durant, Associate Professor of Sociology, and Research Associate, Bureau of Economic Research and Development, Virginia State College, Petersburg, Virginia

4:30 - 5:00 P.M. Implications and Future Planning for 211(d) Programs

Mr. Theordore E. Brown, Special Assistant to the Assistant Administrator for Technical Assistance, Bureau of Technical Assistance, USAID, Washington, D.C., Speaker

# BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The Bureau of Economic Research and Development (BERD) at Virginia State College comprises five areas: Manpower, Business Management, Production Analysis, Marketing, and Urban and Ecological Studies.

## ESTABLISHMENT

The Bureau of Economic Research and Development, established at Virginia State College in 1970, was funded by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare through its Developing Institutions Branch Division of College Support of the Bureau of Higher Education. The Bureau of Economic Research and Development (BERD), an integral part of the total college program, utilizes an interdisciplinary approach to the solution of economic problems.

The desire to establish BERD grew out of Economics Seminars, conducted at Virginia State College during the second semester of each year since 1966-1967, for business, institutional, and government leaders of the Tri-City Area (Petersburg, Hopewell, and Colonial Heights). The themes were the "Enhancement of Per Capita Income" and "Employment of Those with Marginal Skills." Since many questions were posed for which no answers were available, the need for research became evident.

## PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The objectives of BERD are as follows:

1. To facilitate research on the part of the faculty of Virginia State College by providing part-time appointments of faculty members with interest in research in the areas of economics and development.
2. To assist in the development of new curricular materials as a result of increased faculty research in the areas of economics, statistics, and business administration. The academic climate will be improved by.
   a. Providing the College community with improved data for use in classroom discussion, faculty preparation, and faculty research.
   b. Providing a climate and resources for stimulating Vriginia State College faculty research.
   c. Providing students with learning experiences, sources of data, and research-oriented employment opportunities.
   d. Demonstrating levels of competence in applied research worthy of emulation.
3. To provide an additional learning experience for students who will be involved in many of the BERD research projects.
4. To provide a center for information concerning the economic development of sections of the State of Virginia and the State as a whole to the public at large, to businesses, and to governmental agencies.

## PROGRAM

The Bureau of Economic Research and Development is a continuous research program designed to seek cause and effect relationships among economic phenomena. Courses are open to students in manpower-related areas and will be designed to develop competency in research techniques, analysis, and reporting.

The program is designed for each of the five units, (Manpower, Production Analysis, Business Management, Marketing and Urban and Ecological Studies). Such broad areas as education, employment, human and capital resources, and technological development are included wherever applicable.

Regular meetings of research staff and participating students will be held for coordinating research efforts and interpreting research and development problems.

## RESEARCH STAFF

The research staff of BERD, interdisciplinary in character, will be composed of persons who have demonstrated an interest in research and have expressed a concern for problems within the scope of BERD. The staff is granted release time with the approval of College administrative officers.

## CONSULTANTS

The bureau will secure the services of consultants, with special interest in economic research, who will assist the staff of BERD in research design, methodology, analysis and interpretation, and publication. As emphases change, new consultants will be brought in.

## ADVISORY BOARD

This board will be composed of nine to eleven influential persons who have demonstrated a keen interest in the solutions to problems which BERD is studying. The board will be an advisory body concerned with priorities, information concerning similar projects, State policy, and implementation of BERD policies.

## RELEASE OF INFORMATION

Symposia and seminars will be held to (1) inform the public concerning findings and (2) to assess attitudes toward economic problems in the State.

Research findings will be published annually and will be made available in limited quantities to local, State and federal agencies, and to interested organizations.

## ADVISORY BOARD

Colgate W. Darden, Jr., Former Governor, State of Virginia, Norfolk

Harold O. DeWitt, Director of Personnel, Williamsburg

John W. Garber, Director, Division of Personnel, Richmond

George W. Harris, Jr., Attorney, Roanoke

William L. Heartwell, Jr., Commissioner, Virginia Employment Commission, Richmond

H. H. Holt, Attorney, Special Council for Newport News Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Newport News

Randolph C. Kendall, Jr., Executive Director, Richmond Urban League, Richmond

Brewster Snow, Secretary-Treasurer, Virginia State AFL-CIO, Richmond

William T. Syphax, President, Syphax Engineering and Construction Co., Arlington

Edward T. Temple, Commissioner, Office of Administration, Governor's Office, Richmond, Chairman

E. W. Whitlow, Director, School of Administration, Virginia State College, Petersburg

Richard T. Wilson, III, Vice President, United Virginia Bank, Petersburg