MSU Rural Development Papers

The Rise and Fall of Community Development in Developing Countries, 1950-65: A Critical Analysis and an Annotated Bibliography

by
Lane E. Holdcroft

MSU Rural Development
Paper No. 2
1978

Department of Agricultural Economics
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824

MSU RURAL DEVELOPMENT PAPERS

Carl K. Eicher and Carl Liedholm, Co-editors

The MSU Rural Development Paper series is designed to further the comparative analysis of rural development in Africa, Latin America, Asia, and the Near East. The papers will report research findings on community development and rural development in historical perspective as well as on contemporary rural development programs. The series will include papers on a wide range of topics such as alternative rural development strategies; off-farm employment and small-scale industry; marketing problems of small farmers; agricultural extension; interrelationships between technology, employment, and income distribution; and evaluation of rural development projects. While the papers will convey the research findings of MSU faculty and visiting scholars, a few papers will be published by researchers and policy-makers working with MSU scholars on cooperative research and action programs in the field.

The papers are aimed at teachers, researchers, policy-makers, donor agencies, and rural development practitioners. Selected papers will be translated into French, Spanish, and Arabic. Libraries, individuals, and institutions may obtain single copies of the MSU papers free of charge and may request their names be placed on a mailing list for periodic notifications of published papers by writing to:

MSU Rural Development Papers
Department of Agricultural Economics
206 International Center
Michigan State University
East Lansing, Michigan 48824
U.S.A.

THE RISE AND FALL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES, 1950-65: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS AND AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY*

by

Lane E. Holdcroft**

1978

*This paper was printed under AID contract AID/ta-CA-3, Office of Rural Development and Development Administration, with Michigan State University.

**Lane Holdcroft is currently Assistant Director for Agricultural Development, USAID/Philippines. This paper was prepared while Mr. Holdcroft was a Visiting Scholar at Michigan State University in 1976/77. The paper does not reflect the views of the Agency for International Development.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	THE RISE AND FALL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	5
	2.1 Origins	5
	2.2 Ideology and Techniques	8
	2.3 Decade of Prominence	15
	2.4 Reasons for the Decline	19
3.	IMPLICATIONS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE 1970s and 1980s	26
	3.1 Summary	26
	3.2 Lessons	28
4.	SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW	33
	4.1 Principles of Community Development	33
	4.2 Training	39
	4.3 Country Studies	40
	4.4 Evaluation	46
5.	BIBLIOGRAPHY	60
	5.1 Community Development Bibliographies	60
	5.2 General Bibliography	62

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1970's there has been a re-emergence of interest in the community development movement of the 1950's and early 1960's, primarily as a result of the attention that is now being directed to the rural poor. However, the rapid growth and demise of community development in poor countries in the 1950's and early 1960's has not been systematically documented. The purpose of this paper is to trace the rise and fall of community development and to draw lessons for developing countries and donors interested in helping the rural poor.

The community development approach of the 1950's was directed at the promotion of better living for the whole community, with the active participation and, if possible, the initiative of the community. However, if this initiative was not forthcoming spontaneously, techniques for arousing and stimulating community initiative were employed by trained community development personnel.

Both the United States and the United Nations described community development as a process. The United States referred to it as a process

> ...in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and problems; make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems; execute these plans with a maximum of reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community [U.S. International Cooperation Administration, 1956].

The United Nations viewed community development as the process

> by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these

> communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress." [United Nations, 1955].

Many leaders of developing nations and external donor agency officials viewed community development as the means to mobilize rural people to achieve economic, social, and political objectives. They saw it as the appropriate democratic response to the threat of international communism during the Cold War era. Numerous American advocates of community development maintained that its central purpose was to develop stable, effective, democratic nations and, as such, community development was carrying out the major objective of American foreign policy.

In 1948, the term "community development" was first used officially at the British Colonial Office's Cambridge Conference on the Development of African Initiative. Community development was proposed to help the British African territories prepare for independence by improving local government and developing the territories economically. Shortly thereafter, the term and concept spread rapidly to various external donor agencies, as well as to many national governments.

A number of modest national community development efforts were launched, primarily in British territories in Africa about 1950. The first major community development program was initiated in India in 1952 with support from the Ford Foundation and the United States foreign economic assistance agency. Soon thereafter, national programs were established in the Philippines, Indonesia, Iran, and Pakistan.

The community development movement experienced phenomenal growth in the 1950's, primarily as a result of promotion and financial support by the United States. By 1960 the United Nations estimated that over sixty countries in Asia, Africa, and Latin America had community development programs in operation. About half of these were national in scope and the remainder were regional programs of lesser importance. But, even by 1960, some community development programs were faltering, and by 1965 most had been terminated or drastically reduced in scope to the extent that they were no longer considered by national leaders to be major national development efforts. By the late 1950's, donors, including United Nations agencies and those of the United States, appeared disillusioned and shifted their resources in support of new initiatives such as the "green revolution."

During community development's decade of prominence in the 1950's, professional journals in the social sciences also focused on this new movement. Regretfully, however, very little was done during that era, or since, to bring together the theory and empirical evidence into a coherent body of knowledge. Furthermore, there is a paucity of published materials that document the successes, as well as the failures, of community development institutions and programs.

The failure to synthesize the literature on community development is partially a function of the diverse nature of community development, which was seen by its advocates as a democratic social movement embracing the idea of the balanced, integrated development of the whole of community life. As such, it became recognized as the legitimate concern of

specialists in agricultural production, cooperative development, rural education, rural health, local government, social welfare, cultural change, development economics, and rural organizations--to name only a few. Each tended to stress the unique contribution of his discipline to community development.

Community development was seen by its supporters as having sufficient substance to merit recognition as a new field of development activity requiring training in community analysis, community organization, community education, social action, and in the creation and administration of local democratic institutions.

As one who assisted in launching the community development program in Korea and who has been involved in rural development programs in Asia and Africa, I have been particularly interested in the implications of community development for rural development programs in the 1970's and 1980's. This paper examines the community development movement from a historical perspective in an effort to enhance our understanding of that earlier movement and to draw some lessons for contemporary rural development strategies, policies, programs, and projects.

Part 2 of this paper analyzes the origins of the community development movement, its ideology and methodology, as well as the reasons for its rapid expansion and the causes for its precipitous decline. Throughout Part 2 particular attention is given to the role of the United States because the movement was dominated by its technicians and financial assistance. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that other bilateral, multilateral, and private philanthropic external donors

did not subscribe to, and support, various community development endeavors in the developing world. On the contrary, many provided significant support for community development programs and projects. Part 3 provides a discussion of some lessons and insights with implications for the current rural development programs.

Part 4 is a selected review of the community development literature and provides some background for Part 2. It is intended to include the most influential and perceptive, as well as representative, publications of that era. Part 4 is somewhat arbitrarily divided into principles, training, country studies, and evaluation. These categories may be misleading in that many of the publications included in the review deal with two or more of the four topical divisions.

Part 5 provides a comprehensive bibliography of major community development publications. Also included is a bibliography of bibliographies for those desiring to pursue research in this area.

2. THE RISE AND FALL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Origins

The term "community development" was introduced in the United States in the 1930's to denote community participation in municipal planning. In the late 1940's, its use became world-wide to describe government programs which stimulated local initiative to undertake development activities. The community development approach in the developing world in the 1950's had its early roots in a) experiments by the British Colonial Service, primarily in Asia, b) United States and European voluntary agency activities

abroad, and c) United States and British domestic programs in adult education, community development services, and social welfare.

Both the United States and United Nations drew heavily upon the synthesis of earlier rural reconstruction efforts in India. India had more well-documented experience with rural reconstruction and community development than any other single country in the world. Gandhi and Tagore were influential personalities in spearheading rural development activities in India and in influencing how the United States and United Nations approached community development. Also F.L. Brayne's experiments and writings in 1929 on rural development in the Punjab provided important lessons, as did the work of agricultural missionaries at various locations in India and elsewhere. These experiments provided ample evidence that rural people would respond and take the initiative when they realized that they would benefit from community efforts. Post-Independence projects in India, including Etawah, Nilokheri, and Faridabad, were influential prototypes for India's community development program, which was launched in 1952, as well as other early national community development programs in the developing world [Dayal, 1960].

The second source of related experiences grew out of American and European voluntary agency efforts in the developing world. These included the work of missionary groups as well as nonsectarian philanthropic institutions such as the Near East Foundation and the Ford Foundation. The Near East Foundation assisted in launching the Varamin Plain Project in Iran in the late 1940's which became a prototype for the more ambitious national community development program initiated in 1952.

The third set of experiences which influenced community development were those from adult education, community services, and social welfare programs in the United States and the United Kingdom, many of which were initiated in the 1930's. In the United States, these included the community services components of state agricultural extension services, "New Deal" rural development efforts, as well as other university-related public service activities which received their leadership primarily from sociologists, rural sociologists, and anthropologists.[1] The post-World War II activities of the Universities of Kentucky and Washington in assisting depressed communities in their states are particularly well known.

The social welfare experience in the United States and Europe also contributed to the ideology underlying the concept and approach of community development. Social welfare was, and is, rooted in relief and other charitable efforts to help the poor, but such programs historically have focused primarily on the urban poor. The United Nations definition of social welfare has an affinity with community development concerns of the 1950's and 1960's. The United Nations defined social welfare as

> an organized activity that aims at helping towards a mutual adjustment of individuals and their social environment. This objective is achieved through the use of techniques and methods which are designed to enable individuals, groups and communities to meet their needs and solve their problems of adjustment to a changing pattern of society and through

---

[1]"New Deal" efforts of particular relevance here include programs of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and its successor agency, the Rural Resettlement Administration, as well as the better known Works Progress Administration.

> cooperative action to improve economic and social conditions.[2]

It can be understood how this movement arising from these diverse origins, with its theme of balanced integrated development of the whole of community life, became the concern of a variety of subject-matter specialists with differing values and perceptions about the nature of development.

2.2 Ideology and Techniques

Commencing in 1945, American leaders tended to portray military and economic assistance to the Congress and the American public as remedies for what ailed the world. Essentially, community development was seen by its free world advocates as the democratic response to totalitarianism. In the Cold War era of the 1950's, American leaders believed that the developing nations in the free world were under a two-pronged threat from international communism: a) the potential of external military aggression; and b) the possibility of internal revolution growing out of subversion via communist agrarian movements. Only in the late 1950's was there a growing realization on the part of the administration, the Congress, and the American public that economic assistance was a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the attainment of American foreign policy objectives. These objectives were categorized as humanitarian, national security, and economic.[3]

---

[2] United Nations, The Development of National Social Welfare Programs (New York, 1959); quoted in Friedlander [1968] p. 4.

[3] For an excellent discussion of the Cold War and its impact on American foreign assistance, see Mason, 1955.

Military assistance was seen as necessary to counter the potential of external military aggression, while economic assistance would build democracy and thereby prevent internal revolution. Both American and United Nations decision-makers saw in the community development concept and approach the democratic means to mobilize rural people as a resource for, and the objective of, economic, social, and political development. Advocates of community development maintained that its central purpose was to develop stable, effective, democratic nations and, as such, community development was, in fact, carrying out the long-term objective of American foreign policy. It was expected that this multi-disciplinary approach to comprehensive development at the grass-roots level would improve the welfare and increase the productivity of village people, thereby conquering both poverty and disaffection. Thus the stage was set for America to take the lead in promoting community development in the developing world.

What Gunnar Myrdal wrote about South Asia was also true, although to a lesser extent, in Latin America and Africa:

> The period 1950 to 1955 witnessed the start of foreign governmental financial assistance programs unprecedented in the history of international capital movement. The scene was completely dominated by the economic assistance rendered by the United States government whose interest in South Asia suddenly blossomed under the influence of the Cold War. Furthermore, the United States abandoned any idea of multilateral action and adopted a national foreign policy whose major instrumentality was bilateral economic and military aid. The growing threat of Communist penetration in South Asia amid continuing guerrilla warfare in several of the countries, Communist success in China and the Korean War impelled the United States to consider South Asia a region of prime significance. As a result, South Asia was no longer to be bypassed. Total United

> States' grants and loan commitments to the South Asian countries for the period 1951 to 1955 exceeded two billion, a sum not much below total United States net capital outflows to all countries during any comparable time span in the 1920's. Indeed, from the end of the Second World War through fiscal year 1958 the United States alone supplied over 80 percent of the greatly enlarged total of grants and net credit to South Asia [Myrdal, 1968, p. 62].

Community development was defined as a process, method, program, institution, and/or movement which: a) involves people on a community basis in the solution of their common problems, b) teaches and insists upon the use of democratic processes in the joint solution of community problems, and c) activates and/or facilitates the transfer of technology to the people of a community for more effective solution of their common problems. Joint efforts to solve common problems democratically and scientifically on a community basis were seen as the essential elements of community development.

Community development was described as rooted in the concept of the worth of the individual as a responsible, participating member of society and, as such, was concerned with human organization and the political process. Its keystones were seen as community organization, community education, and social action. It was designed to encourage self-help efforts to raise standards of living and to create stable, self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility commensurate with basic free world objectives. Community development was seen as dealing with a complex unit, the total community, and using

a flexible, dynamic approach adapted to local circumstances. Precise definitions were believed to be neither realistically possible nor desirable. Rigid definition was seen as producing rigid, ritualized, and standardized programs which would be self-defeating.

The United States and United Nations approach to community development focused on the initiation of comprehensive development schemes in individual villages on the basis of what village people perceived to be their "felt needs." Community development activities were customarily initiated by sending a specially trained civil servant known as a "multipurpose village-level worker" into the village. These village-level workers were generally secondary school graduates who had received several months of preservice training in a community development institute. By living in a village and working with village people, the village-level worker was supposed to gain the villagers' confidence. He was to serve as a catalyst, one who would guide and assist villagers in identifying their felt needs, then translating these felt needs into village development plans, and finally implementing these plans--always working through the active village leaders.

The village-level worker was supposed to have some skills in a variety of subjects such as village organization and mobilization, as well as in such areas as literacy, agriculture, and health. And in areas in which he lacked special skills, technicians from specialized government agencies were supposed to support him. Usually the village-level worker administered "matching" grants to villagers in which the villagers' labor and some locally available materials would be combined with grants-in-kind from the

national community development organization in order to carry out village projects. However, the products of successful community development were seen as not only the building of such community facilities as wells, roads and schools, and the creation of new crops, but also the development of stable, self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.

Community development proponents likened it to an enterprise by which the government and the rural people would be brought together, thus improving the lot of the more downtrodden and less fortunate peoples. Consistent with this view of community development, however, was a broader one which saw community development as an important technique for modernizing an entire society. Where national community development efforts were being implemented, usually a large new bureaucracy was established at the national, regional, and local levels to administer the program and attempt to coordinate the rural programs of technical ministries and regional offices, e.g., agriculture, education, and health. Most often, these new community development organizations were well financed, primarily by external donors, and staffed with expatriate advisors. With their large foreign and domestic training programs, they were usually able to recruit highly motivated, relatively well-educated young men and women for both headquarters and field staff positions.

Some twenty-eight delegates to the 1960 SEATO-sponsored international Conference on Community Development suggested the following "pre-conditions and apparatus necessary for a successful program." These provide an

excellent summary of the thinking of community development practitioners at the time:

A. There are certain objectives common to most free nations towards which a Community Development programme is of particular value, but each country has its own needs resulting from its own individual characteristics. The chief aim of a successful Community Development programme is not wells, roads, schools and new crops. It is stable self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.

B. A programme should encourage the people to organize themselves and to exercise initiative in improving their communities and ways of living through co-operative efforts on a self-help basis.

C. The administrative organization should have a structure which assures the highest status for the programme and in its support secures the maximum effective co-ordination of the activities of technical agencies.

D. The Community Development programme should foster the growth of local government and develop local leadership.

E. Continuing research and evaluation are essential to the success of Community Development, not only in relation to the initiative of programmes, but also in relation to follow-through action.

F. The Community Development programme should enjoy strong and continuing support from the head of government and receive the highest priority in the development of the national economy.

G. Planning and policy making for Community Development should be carried out at a ministerial or a higher level by an agency specifically created for the purpose, rather than in a functional department such as agriculture, education or health.

H. Co-ordination of technical services is of vital importance at all levels of administration and these services should be rendered on the basis of actual village needs.

I. The village council, which is composed entirely of representatives of the village, should be the basic unit for Community Development and arrangements should be made to enable it to raise funds for the projects it decides to

undertake. In order that village people can develop initiative and self-confidence, the village councils, in their determination of priorities and in the allocation of their resources, should have as wide powers as possible.

J. Community Development requires substantial and continuing financial support from governments. As most villages do not have enough money for the full financing of important projects, grants-in-aid will be necessary. Such assistance ought to stimulate even small communities into undertaking their own projects. It will be concrete evidence of a government's concern for the people living in the small communities and it will build up faith and confidence in the nation as a whole. There should be ready availability of such additional funds as may be necessary for particular projects if local initiative is not to be discouraged or frustrated. This means that, hand in hand with the decentralization of responsibility for planning, should go the provision of adequate procedures whereby communities are afforded reasonable local authority in the raising and expenditure of development funds [SEATO, 1960].

Thus, it can be seen that community development was appealing to the leaders of some free world and developing nations who were looking for an ideology and technique to improve the living conditions of rural people. Community development not only held forth the promise of building "grass roots" democratic institutions, but also improvements in the material well-being of rural people--without revolutionary changes in the existing political and economic order. In summary, the community development approach was assumed to have nearly universal application to rural societies. The United States and other donors agreed to finance most of the costs associated with launching national and pilot community development schemes.

2.3 Decade of Prominence

The community development movement blossomed in the developing world during the decade of the 1950's. By 1960 over sixty nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America had launched national or regional community development programs. In some instances small pilot projects which had been launched by the British or French governments in African and Asian nations in the early post-World War II period were expanded rapidly with United States and/or United Nations assistance.

The greatly publicized launching of India's ambitious community development program in 1952 gave the movement an added impetus. Until about 1956 the Indian program served as a prototype for national programs in other Asian countries. Leaders in the Indian program served as consultants and provided training materials for these new programs, and numerous government officials from around the world visited India to observe and/or attend training courses.

A few United States foreign aid missions established community development offices in the early 1950's, and in 1954 a Community Development Division was established in the foreign aid agency's Washington headquarters under the leadership of Louis Miniclier. This Community Development Division, through its personnel and consultants, was instrumental in promoting community development around the world. A relatively small number of individuals spearheaded the United States foreign aid support. The proponents included sociologists and anthropologists with a smaller number of educators, economists, agriculturalists, political scientists,

and social welfare specialists. Some of the more prominent advocates of community development included Carl Taylor, Douglas Ensminger, Melvin Tumin, George Foster, and Richard Poston. Others who provided intellectual and, in some instances, operational program leadership included Margaret Read and Thomas Batten of London University, Paul Taylor, Lyle Hayden, Lucian Pye, John Badeau, Ernest Witte, and Louis Miniclier. Members in this group provided leadership in the American bilateral effort, as well as the various United Nations agencies and private foundations.[4]

Many of the individuals mentioned above served on three major American foreign aid teams in 1955 that visited and reported in glowing terms on the recently launched community development programs in Bolivia, Egypt, Iran, Jamaica, Peru, Puerto Rico, Gold Cost, India, Pakistan, and the Philippines. Success or effectiveness was reported in terms of numbers of village workers trained and numbers of village projects (e.g., wells, latrines or roads) constructed as well as acceptance of community development by the government and the villagers. These favorable reports encouraged the initiation of community development programs elsewhere.

The modus operandi of the American foreign aid agency in spreading the community development approach consisted basically of a) sending teams of community development experts to assist interested governments in planning national and pilot community development programs, b) providing long-term technical and capital assistance, c) publishing a community development periodical as well as numerous other community development documents, and d) holding a series of six international conferences around the world in which interested governments were invited to participate.

---

[4]See Part 4 and the Bibliography of this paper for a discussion and listing of publications by most of these individuals.

In the early 1950's the American foreign aid agency reproduced and published materials from newly initiated community development programs. A widely disseminated periodical, The Community Development Review, was initiated in 1956 and continued publication until 1963. This periodical and numerous other original and reprinted community development documents and reports contributed to the spread of the ideology and techniques being advocated by the United States and the United Nations.

The six American-sponsored international conferences in Iran (1955 and 1956), the United States (1957), Libya (1958), Ceylon (1959), and Korea (1961) provided a forum for an exchange of experiences among participants already implementing community development programs and an opportunity to proselytize representatives of governments considering the initiation of community development programs.

In countries where governments indicated an interest in initiating community development programs, the usual pattern was that of small teams of community development "experts" who would assist the host government in formulating a preliminary program proposal. Usually, this would be followed by the establishment of a host government community development agency and a Community Development Division in the United States country aid mission (USOM). Then, observation trips were arranged for senior host government personnel to attend the international conferences and observe programs already launched. The next step would be to train prospective community development officers in the host country or another developing country with an active community development program. Generally, the United States would provide technical advisors, supplies, and

equipment; training for host country personnel; and most of the budgetary support needed for program implementation. In some instances, rather than providing direct United States government assistance, the United States foreign aid agency would finance assistance programs operated by American universities or voluntary agencies.

After the national program in India was initiated in 1952 with massive support from the Ford Foundation and the United States foreign assistance agency, the United States assisted in launching major programs in Iran and Pakistan in 1953, the Philippines in 1955, Jordan in 1956, Indonesia in 1957, and Korea in 1958. Smaller programs were also launched with United States assistance in Iraq in 1952, Afghanistan and Egypt in 1953, Lebanon in 1954, and Ceylon and Nepal in 1956. The American foreign assistance program at its zenith in 1959 assisted twenty-five nations in the implementation of community development programs and the United States foreign aid agency employed 105 direct hire and contract community development advisors. During the ten-year period ending in 1962, the United States provided directly some $50 million dollars in support of community development programs in over thirty countries via its bilateral foreign economic assistance agency, and a somewhat lesser amount via the several United Nations agencies that funded community development efforts in another thirty countries.

Under the leadership of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, the United Nations agencies generally fostered the community development movement in much the same manner as did the United States foreign aid agency, albeit on a reduced scale. Technical and

capital assistance were provided in launching pilot programs and international conferences were sponsored, in addition to the preparation of numerous widely disseminated community development publications.

2.4 Reasons for the Decline

By 1960 some community development programs, including the major Indian effort, were faltering and by 1965 most national community development programs had been terminated or drastically reduced. The precipitous decline was due primarily to a) disillusionment on the part of many political leaders in developing countries with the performance of their programs vis-a-vis stated goals, and b) the sharp reduction in support from the United States and other donors. These interdependent causes were mutually reinforcing and, thus, explain the precipitous decline of most major community development programs. Political leaders in developing countries were disillusioned because their community development programs had not demonstrated, as promised, that the community development approach would build stable "grass roots" democratic institutions and would improve the economic and social well-being of rural people while contributing to the attainment of national economic goals.

During the era of the 1950's and 1960's when the "trickle down" theory of economic development was in vogue, community development programs were not intended to, nor did they, affect the basic structural barriers to equity and growth in rural communities. Rather, they accepted the existing local power structure as a given. Usually community development village-level workers aligned themselves with the traditional village

elites, thus strengthening the economic and social position of the elites. There was little attention given to assuring that benefits from community development programs accrued to the rural poor. Realizing this, the poor majority of the villagers did not respond to the community development approach. Only in those few nations, e.g., South Korea, with rural communities composed of relatively homogeneous farm owner-operators were community development programs relatively successful in reaching their stated objectives. In some instances, efforts were made in the early 1960's to recognize that most rural communities were divided by the different interests of the landless and nearly landless laborers, subsistence tenants and owner-operators, and commercial farmers, thus calling for changes in the local power structure if community development were to succeed. However, most political leaders of developing countries turned to programs to increase food production.

Although the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962[5] indicated continuing strong American congressional support for "greater emphasis on community development in the less developed nations," this congressional mandate was not implemented by the Kennedy Administration. The following is an excerpt from the 1962 Report of the United States House Committee on Foreign Affairs:

---

[5] Amending Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as reported in U.S. Congress [U.S. Congress, 1962].

> Section 109 amends section 461 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which relates to assistance to countries having agrarian economies. The amendment directs that, in such countries, emphasis shall be placed, among other programs, on community development to promote stable and responsible governmental institutions at the local level.
>
> During the past 10 years, through its foreign assistance programs, the United States has spent approximately $50 million in support of community development programs in 30 countries. Almost one-half of this amount was allocated to help launch major programs in India, Pakistan, and the Philippines. Prior to 1955, the United States assistance for community development emphasized equipment and supplies, such as vehicles for village workers. Since 1955, the emphasis has shifted to providing technicians and participant training in addition to small amounts of supplies and equipment.
>
> Basically, community development approaches the local community as a whole and is directed toward helping the people on the village level to participate effectively and with knowledge in shaping the future of their own community and of their nation.
>
> The product of successful community development is not only wells, roads, schools, other community facilities, and new crops; it is, more properly, the development of stable, self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.
>
> The committee believes that community development can be a dynamic force leading to economic improvement, social advancement, and orderly political growth. The amendment proposed in this section has been approved by the committee in order to encourage greater emphasis on community development in the less-developed nations [U.S. Congress, 1962].

In spite of successful efforts on the part of its American advocates to maintain congressional support, after 1959 United States aid rapidly declined for community development. The number of developing nations receiving major United States support for community development dropped from twenty-five to nineteen between 1959 and 1960 and the number of American community development advisors was reduced from 105 to 68. By 1963 the United States foreign aid agency's Community Development Division

in Washington, D.C. had been abolished along with most community development offices in field missions. Only a few countries continued to receive United States support for their community development programs by the mid-1960's. When major United States assistance was reduced or terminated, community development programs were terminated, drastically redirected, or greatly reduced by host country governments.

Under the Kennedy Administration, the leadership of the United States foreign aid agency in the early 1960's was concerned not only with the lack of host country support of community development programs, but was also disillusioned with the widespread internal conflict and animosity between United States community development and technical services personnel, particularly agriculturalists. This conflict permeated the foreign aid agency both in Washington and field missions, and it spread to host country ministries and agencies. It was an ideological battle which pitted the generalist against the specialist, the social scientist (excluding economists) against the technologist, the pluralist against the monist. Usually these conflicts were resolved in favor of technical services personnel who were bureaucratically more established and less abstract in their perception of the development process.

By 1963, where community development offices had not been eliminated, community development and agricultural offices in United States field missions were combined into rural development offices in line with the recommendations of Stanley Andrews [Andrews, 1961].[6] And where not eliminated, most host country community development ministries or agencies

---

[6] See Part 4, page 46, for a review of Andrews' report. In most cases a rural development office was formed after the demise of the host country's community development program and the new office focused primarily on agricultural development.

became units of the agriculture or internal affairs ministry depending on whether the current development focus was on local government or agricultural technology.

The United Nations and a few private philanthropic organizations continued to fund some community development activities throughout the 1960's, but without American and host country government support these efforts were relatively minor and increasingly shifted from a development to social welfare orientation. Even British government support for the University of London's community development training and publication activities was terminated in 1964.[7]

Perhaps the most universal criticism of the community development movement was that its programs were inefficient in reaching economic goals. It was assumed that man would respond rationally to economic incentives and, since underdevelopment was defined in economic terms, programs that more directly focused on economic growth were considered more deserving of support. As central planning agency personnel in particular became established and influential in decision-making in developing countries during the 1950's, they criticized community development programs as being "uneconomic" and a "low priority investment" of scarce domestic and external development resources. Related to this issue was the concern in many nations that community development programs were not contributing to the alleviation of food shortages and poverty.

---

[7]The widely read periodical, Community Development Bulletin, was published quarterly from December 1949 to December 1964 in English and French.

The community development program in India was the best-documented case.[8] The stated objective of the Indian program was to transform the economic and social life of the villages and to alleviate poverty and the scarcity of food through popular participation of village people. A massive self-help program embracing agriculture, health, education, public works, and social welfare was implemented for over a decade. Yet, program performance, measured in terms of reaching its stated objectives, was poor. Poverty and food scarcity were not reduced, but rather became more widespread during that decade, as did disparities of wealth between the large farmers and peasants in the rural areas. Critics pointed to the wide disparity, in the distribution of benefits of the program, between accessible and remote villages, between cultivators and other groups within villages, and between the wealthier and the poorer farmers among cultivators. Evaluators reported that the program was not accepted by people, did not reach the poor, and was a "top-down" bureaucratic empire which ignored agricultural production.

The leaders of the Indian community development program recognized early that the program was ineffective in stimulating village-level initiative and action. There was a propensity on the part of village-level workers to work with the traditional village elite, to ignore the poor, and to lead or direct villagers rather than develop local leadership. This basic problem of being unable to arouse popular participation plagued most community development programs.

---

[8] Parts 4.3 and 4.4 of this paper, Country Studies and Evaluation, includes a review of the major publications which describe the Indian program content and discuss its decline.

Defenders of community development in India and elsewhere maintained that success depended on more and better training for village-level workers and improved coordination of local government services. The view most often expressed was that political leaders did not understand either the complexity of the problem or the time required to transform traditional village societies.

India also provides an example of how national community development programs evolved during the 1950's. During the initial years social welfare, public works, and changes in villagers' attitudes, rather than material results, were emphasized. Then, food production became the prime focus of the program in the late fifties. In the early 1960's the focus shifted to local self-government and cooperative development as the community development effort receded and technical agriculture came to the fore again. The evolution of the Indian program from social welfare and public works to cooperatives, local government, and technical agriculture was the general pattern in community development programs around the world.

While the forces suggested above were also in motion, in several countries, including the Phillipines and Korea, national community development programs were closely identified with a political leader or political party. With the emergence of new political leadership, the community development programs were made subordinate to technical agricultural and cooperative development agencies. In such instances, the detractors of community development, particularly senior officials in the traditional technical ministries, were able to unite with economists in the central planning agencies to achieve their ends.

3. IMPLICATIONS OF THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS OF THE 1970's and 1980's

3.1 Summary

The world-wide community development (CD) movement faded away over ten years ago amid the euphoria of the "green revolution." There are numerous insights and lessons which can be drawn from the community development experience. Community development had great appeal to leaders of developing nations and external donor officials because it provided a nonrevolutionary approach to the development of agrarian societies. It is now apparent that these decision-makers were rather naive.

The failure of CD and the shortcomings of the "green revolution" have once again shifted the focus to a more comprehensive or integrated rural development (IRD). Some CD veterans believe that the new IRD is in fact a revival of old CD. Although the sponsors of IRD themselves would rather emphasize the differences, there are sufficient similarities to uphold the revivalist view. A question then may well be asked: Are there any major implications of the rise and fall of the CD movement for the new IRD?

While broad generalizations are often unwarranted, it may be useful, with the advantage of hindsight, to understand fully the shortcomings of CD. As a starting point we should remember that CD was a product of the Cold War era, and its political and economic objectives were connected with it. Its principles were derived, con-

sciously or unconsciously, from theories directly opposed to revolutionary doctrines. In that period, the threat of subversion was taken very seriously. CD was designed to remove this threat. By bringing people together, inviting them into harmonious communities, and mobilizing them for common endeavors, CD promised to generate permanent political peace and quick economic growth. After a decade of experience, it became evident that neither promise could be fulfilled, expect in rare and isolated cases.

Politically, CD was ineffective because, in most developing countries, basic conflicts were too deep to be resolved simply by the persuasive efforts of CD workers. Factors such as distribution of land ownership, exploitation by elites, or urban domination could neither be ignored nor bypassed. CD's attempt to proceed smoothly without friction towards general consensus was unrealistic. The expected reconciliation and common participation for the sake of development occurred as an exception rather than as a rule.

Economically, CD displayed a double weakness. First, it enlarged social services more rapidly than the production of rural incomes. Secondly, it could not significantly improve the condition of the distressed poor, the sharecroppers and laborers. Both aspects of rural poverty, low production and unjust distribution, were not significantly changed by CD.

Recoiling from the elitist bias of CD (and the "green revolution"), the new IRD programs are concentrating on the rural poor. In other words, IRD programs acknowledge the presence of conflict of interest,

namely, class struggle, a point of view that was studiously avoided by CD. Beyond the IRD acknowledgement however, there remains the challenge of finding ways and means to uplift the underprivileged. Perhaps for identical reasons, the new IRD, like the old CD, does not relish the prospect of highlighting politically sensitive obstacles, and so diplomatically shrouds the suggestions for removing them. Similarly, even though CD's fondness for social services and neglect of production are now well known, the new development programs of the late 1970's such as "basic needs" may fall into the same trap. To strike a balance between demands for social services and conditions for increased production is, in any case, a very difficult task.

3.2 Lessons

A. Pitfalls of New Ministries of Rural Development. In the field of administration, CD was hampered by the confrontation between the generalist and the specialist. In country after country, attempts were made to bring different departments working in the rural area under unified control. The department of agriculture, usually the most rapidly expanding entity, tenaciously resisted any kind of merger. CD in India enjoyed a brief period of supremacy as the czar of rural development, and then succumbed to the department of agriculture. The new IRD programs which demand unified control must be prepared for this battle of departments. Perhaps the necessary coordination can be secured more peacefully, not by imposing a superdepartment from above, but by creating autonomous institutions at lower levels nearer to the village.

The experience of numerous community development programs suggests that the problem of coordination among various government agencies cannot be resolved by establishing a single new ministry or agency, even with the strong support of the Chief of State. Difficulties arise from rivalries between the technical ministries, i.e., agriculture, health, and education (especially extension departments in these ministries) and the rural development agency or ministry. To be effective, integrated rural development, like community development, inevitably must affect and make demands on the technical ministries. National "community" development organizations in developing countries were unable to provide the mechanism for coordinating rural development efforts and there is no evidence that a national "rural" development organization could do any better today. Local-level coordination was successful when all local technical extension personnel and CD workers were supervised by the district administrator rather than by representatives of their technical ministries or the national community development agency.

B. Planning. Rural development projects should include from their inception an income-producing component, usually one which entails increasing agricultural output through the introduction of a profitable "package" of technology. With an income-producing "center piece," other components, such as health, sanitation, and education, can follow. Many observers were properly critical of the Indian CD program for initially investing in community buildings, schools, clinics, and in social welfare which increased consumption and population growth,

rather than stressing agricultural production from the onset of the CD program. In countries where community development programs included an agricultural or other income-producing component, these programs often became internationally known. When there was a failure in agricultural production, the causes were usually the technology employed and/or the share-cropping arrangements.

C. Participation. Participation, a major goal in the CD strategy, proved to be a most difficult and elusive goal to attain. Participation by nearly all segments of rural society, including the landless and nearly landless, was rarely accomplished in any of the community development programs. In most instances village community development workers tended to identify with the traditional village elite to whom most of the program benefits accrued. Unfortunately, there has been very little analysis of the impact of the political and social milieu on villagers' incentives to participate in CD projects. The CD experience indicates that, if the rural poor are to be helped, the structural barriers to greater equity must be addressed.

While most CD programs espoused participatory democracy, self-reliance, and local initiative, in practice the village community development worker was paternalistic and directed local-level programs. The reason usually given for the villagers' lack of participation was the inherent fatalism of rural people and their general apathy toward improving their own standards of living. Yet, the experience of those relatively successful pilot community development programs suggests that villagers will participate when they perceive that the benefits of the program will accrue to them.

D. Implementation. Regardless of the apparent differences in the rhetoric, most of the new IRD programs are based on the political and economic theories which sustained CD. The affinity is even more pronounced in the implementation of IRD programs.

1. CD relied mainly on the village-level worker. He was the "catalyst" who precipitated the formation of communities. He was the agent of change, the chief modernizing influence. Although he was asked to help establish local leaders, committees, and councils, his role, in fact, reinforced the paternalistic and centralist tradition. Ultimately, CD could not foster the growth of self-reliant local institutions. IRD relies mainly on government change agents who fulfill similar functions.

2. The CD concept of "self-help" projects, boosted by matching grants brought by the village-level worker, seemed very attractive. But, it proved a poor substitute for long-term institutional growth and mobilization. The "aided self-help" projects implemented by the village-level worker unintentionally inhibited real planning and participation. IRD also uses "aided self-help" projects implemented by the government change agent.

3. The CD worker, generally a secondary school graduate himself, was biased in favor of the rural elite and their values. Furthermore, he was directed to work with the established leaders. He felt more at home with the large farmers or youth club members than with the landless laborers. He

gladly strengthened the existing power structure. He did not see himself as the champion of the weak against the strong. The IRD change agent cannot ignore the elitist leadership.

E. Expansion of Pilot Programs. Political leaders and administrators of rural development programs must exercise restraint in expanding successful pilot programs. In many nations, including India, the CD program was expanded very rapidly as a result of efforts by politicians to spread the program to their constituencies as soon as possible. This rapid expansion necessitated the recruitment of large numbers of poorly trained personnel. Village-level workers were assigned too many responsibilities in too many villages and the damage which resulted was often worse than if no work had been attempted. Pilot programs are usually successful when adequate resources are provided for material and human inputs. Often, plans for the expansion of these programs do not take into account the additional resources and time required to replicate the carefully nurtured pilot schemes.

F. Drawing on History. Since many of the new IRD programs employ the same organizational methods as CD (i.e., government change agents, aided self-help projects, and collaboration with elitist leaders), the results achieved by IRD will probably mirror the CD experience in many countries. The initial popularity of CD and its quick decline provides an object lesson, but it is a lesson which is rarely studied by the IRD experts of the 1970's. Architects of new IRD programs should draw on the earlier CD experiences. Since CD programs were carried out in over

50 countries in the 1950's and 1960's, these experiences should be assessed on a country by country basis and the lessons learned should be incorporated into the planning and implementation of IRD programs today.

4. SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Principles of Community Development

Batten, Thomas R. 1957. Communities and Their Development. London: Oxford University Press.

This book was influential in the community development movement as a basic text for national leaders, village workers, and external donor agency advisors of community development programs in numerous nations. The book compares different objectives, approaches, and organizations in community development using a variety of examples and drawing conclusions that provides guidance to those involved in launching new community development programs.

It discusses the variety of definitions and patterns of community development and considers their appropriateness according to the different needs of different communities. Community development is seen as a new emphasis based on principles derived from past experience. The rationale for community development is to foster development in local communities. The main problem is to find effective ways of stimulating, helping, and teaching people to adopt new methods and to learn new skills, and helping people to adapt their way of life to the changes they have accepted or have had imposed upon them. And, as change occurs it is important to ensure that the feeling or spirit of community is not destroyed.

The author concludes that community development is the response of the larger national society to the failure of past development to make ordinary people feel more satisfied with life in their own small community, or even as satisfied as they were before. Community development agencies are seen as trying to reduce some of the tensions or equipping rural people to resolve new tensions that change may bring. The community development agency tries to achieve these objectives by

a) Stimulating people to decide what it is they want and then helping them get it through collective effort,

b) Introducing people to new kinds of satisfactions and ways of realizing them and equipping people to make wise choices between alternative satisfactions,

c) Maintaining existing groups or developing new ones to ensure that each individual has opportunities to develop his personality and to achieve status and significance in his relationships with other people.

DiFranco, Joseph. 1958. Differences Between Extension Education and Community Development. Comparative Extension Pub. No. 5. Ithaca: New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University (October).

By 1958, two distinct and widespread approaches to rural development had emerged, namely community development and extension education. Proponents of each approach were critical of one another and the purpose of this publication was to analyze and compare extension education and community development. It discusses the similarities and dissimilarities between both approaches with regard to objectives, process, organization, and principles, and then draws some conclusions. Supporters of each

approach welcomed this paper as an objective attempt to overcome the growing conflict between extension education and community development.

The publication concludes that there were more similarities than dissimilarities and that differences arose from different philosophies, objectives, and organization that were, often, only a matter of emphasis, e.g., extension education placed more emphasis on individual action and community development on group action; extension education concentrated more on agricultural production and community development on all aspects of human welfare.

Finally, it suggests that community development might be most appropriate in the first stage of a rural society's development and extension education best suited for the second stage. It states that both approaches have merit and should be promoted as "tools" to be adapted to different situations, avoiding clashes of personalities and programs.

Mosher, A.T. 1958. Varieties of Extension Education and Community Development. Ithaca: Rural Development Department, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University.

This publication examines varieties of extension education and community development processes comprehensively and from the perspective of a scholar identified with agricultural extension education. At the time of its publication, there were growing animosities between proponents of agricultural extension and proponents of community development as approaches to rural development, and this publication was widely disseminated in both camps.

Mosher observes that all varieties of extension education and community development are directed at furthering rural development and that

rural development requirements are many and diverse. Thus, no one process is a panacea; each can make a substantial and important contribution. However, there are many difficulties in deciding which of the processes can be successfully combined with each other or with other governmental activities essential to rural development.

The most important task of any rural development effort is identified as helping rural people develop confidence. And to do this, extension agents and community development workers must have a great concern for rural people.

Taylor, Paul S. 1958. "Community Development." Technical Lecture No. 10, UNC/OEC, Seoul, Korea.

The author of this paper served as a short-term consultant to several national community development programs including Korea, where this paper was presented, just prior to the launching of the Korea national program. The paper was widely quoted in Korea and it provided community development advocates with the rationale for launching national programs in the Cold War era.

Tumin, Melvin M. 1958. "Some Social Requirements for Effective Community Development." Community Development Review No. 11 (December):1-39.

This paper was widely cited and reprinted in several community development publications and was discussed by scholars and practitioners in the late 1950's. The author identifies themes and pervasive problem areas, and develops fifteen elements that he considers to be the sum total of the community development process. Believing that the "science" of community development was too immature to allow systematic formulation of

propositions, Tumin argues that the fifteen elements could be used to predict trends and likelihoods in community development efforts.

A significant focus of attention in the paper is on the competing demands and claims of two major and usually not compatible objectives of community development. The first of these emphasized the need for improvement of the material conditions of life. Success was measured in terms of certain technological gains or by some indices of economic growth, with only secondary interest in community participation. The second emphasized the need for development of concern for problem-solving and of a spirit of self-reliance in communities which typically depended on others for the solution of their problems, or which had simply learned to live with their problems. The interest in this paper was in part due to the fact that while community development scholars and practitioners usually agreed in principle that both goals should receive equal priority, in fact sharp strains and incompatibilities in programs arose continuously out of the conflict between different priorities given to these two purposes.

United Nations. Economic and Social Council. 1955. Principles of Community Development--Social Progress Through Local Action.

This publication was very influential in the era of new national community development programs in the 1950's. It deals with the policy of promoting healthy and balanced growth through local action in the rural areas of developing countries. Community development is tentatively defined as "a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community's initiative."

Used in a generic sense, community development is said to include: a) physical improvements such as roads, housing, irrigation, drainage, and better farming practices, b) functional activities such as health, education, and recreation, and c) community action involving group discussion, community analyses of local needs, setting up committees, seeking needed technical assistance, and the selecting and training of perssonnel. Community development, it is said,

> implies the integration of two sets of forces making for human welfare, a) the opportunity and capacity for cooperation, self-help, ability to assimilate and adapt new ways of living that is at least latent in every group, and b) the fund of techniques and tools in every social and economic field, drawn from world-wide experience and now in use or available to national governments and offices.

The report stresses the existence of community resources, e.g., labor, building materials, land, savings, and local leadership, which combined with government resources, encouragement, guidance, and technical direction, will result in local progress. In spite of a variety of approaches and programs among countries, the report points out a growing convergence upon goals of higher productivity of primary products and goods by improved methods, and effective social organization to bring the surplus labor of men and women to bear on their own social improvement. It emphasizes that village problems cannot be successfully attacked in isolation because a village is a highly integrated unit, and that a sound approach involves all of the community's various aspects, i.e., the physical, social, and economic aspects of development must be taken into consideration simultaneously.

The basic elements of community development programs are identified as including:

a) Activities that correspond to basic needs of the community and initial projects that respond to the expressed needs of the people,
b) Multipurpose village programs,
c) Increasing village participation in community affairs and strengthening existing forms of local governments,
d) Training local leadership,
e) Greater reliance on women and youth in development,
f) The belief that changed attitudes are more important than material achievement.

This report also discusses the various types of local institutions and local projects for community development, examples of various national community development programs, essential elements in building national programs, and community development techniques, e.g., village surveys and communications techniques, and training community development workers and local leaders.

4.2 Training

Batten, Thomas R. 1962. Training for Community Development: A Critical Study of Method. London: Oxford University Press.

This book was published in 1962 when the community development movement had begun to decline, yet it was influential in modifying the type of training provided for community development in several countries. The author discusses the training programs then current, recommends changes,

and describes techniques and methods that evolved over the years from the community development training course at the University of London's Institute of Education.

United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1957. Study Kit on Training for Community Development. New York.

This publication was used by national program staffs in preparing training programs for new village-level workers for community development programs.

4.3 Country Studies

Abveva, José V. 1959. Focus on the Barrio: The Story Behind the Birth of the Philippine Community Development Program Under President Ramon Magsaysay. Manila: Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

This excellent book provides an understanding of the background and growth of the community development movement in the Philippines.

Conditions identified which gave rise to the community development movement include:

a) Diffusion of democratic values in a changing society

b) Agrarian and political unrest

c) Socio-economic studies

d) Experiments in changing rural villages

e) External ideas of rural reconstruction and community development

f) The campaign and victory of Magsaysay.

President Magsaysay saw improving the welfare of barrio people as in the public interest and he dominated the Congress in making policy for the community development program until his untimely death.

Dayal, Rajeshwar. 1960, 1966. Community Development Program in India. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.

This book provides in the first edition a very comprehensive treatment of the community development movement in India from 1952 until 1960 and in the second edition until 1966. It provides in considerable detail the concept, major features, administration, progress, and targets of the community development program in part one. Part two deals with all welfare and development components of the program, including agriculture, cooperative development, village industries, communications, education, health and sanitation, training, housing, and social welfare. Part three discusses the programs in the tribal and Gramdan areas and urban community development, while part four deals with evaluations and appraisals of the community development program. Part four makes reference to the findings of major evaluations, e.g., the wide disparity in the distribution of benefits between accessible and remote villages, between cultivators and other groups within villages and, among the cultivators, between wealthier and poorer farmers. Also reported are the lack of progress in changing villagers' attitudes as reflected in villagers' participation in community activities and organization, the unwillingness of the community development worker to divest himself of power, and the top-down administration of the program. The Seventh Report of the Program Evaluation Organization indicated that the entire general level of achievement of the community development program was still low and far from adequate.

Dayal concludes that the community development program failed to reach its most important central objective of engendering in rural people a spirit of self-reliance and collective action to bring about comprehensive development and changes in village life and work. The failure is attributed primarily to the lack of competent personnel to implement the program.

Dey, S.K. 1962. Community Development--A Chronicle 1954-1961. Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

This revealing book is composed of extracts of monthly community development letters by the leader of the community development program in India; it is very helpful in understanding the progress and problems of India's community development program. It provides the reader with a glimpse of the thinking underlying the changes in policies and program emphasis as community development evolved in India. The changes in priorities were generally from social welfare and public works in the initial years of the national program to food production in the late 1950's. Increasingly, the focus turned to the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) and cooperative development as the program declined.

By 1957, Minister Dey recognized that the development of village-level initiative and action were lacking in the program and that there was a failure in the Ministry of Community Development to recognize excellence in the technical areas of agriculture, education, and health. In 1960, he admits that priority should have been given to food production and the Panchayati Raj when the program was initiated in 1952.

Minister Dey was directly or indirectly involved in community development programs in Burma, Thailand, the Philippines, Indonesia, Iran, Egypt, and Nepal.

Du Sautoy, Peter. 1958. Community Development in Ghana. London: Oxford University Press.

This book details the progress and problems of the community development program in Ghana which focused initially on mass literacy and mass education. It emphasizes community self-help with the initiative coming from the people themselves, i.e., not being imposed from above. However, community development workers did employ a process of stimulation to break down apathy and show people that what they want could be achieved, if they were prepared to listen to new ideas and to help themselves. The role of the community development agency is seen as one of implementing rational policies through the provisions of program guidelines.

The community development program of work in Ghana was composed of four parts, namely adult literacy, home economics, community self-help projects, and extension campaigns. The latter were an attempt to teach communities all types of improvement in their living, including health and agricultural practices.

Mukerji, B. 1961. Community Development in India. Calcutta: Orient Longmans.

This book provides an uncritical textbook treatment of community development in India, its purpose being for use in the colleges and universities in India. The author was associated with the community development program from its initiation until 1960 when the book was published.

Singh, D.P. 1976. "The Pilot Development Project, Etawah." Paper produced for Expert Consultation on Integrated Rural Development. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

This paper describes the Etawah project, which was one of the successful early post-Independence Indian village-level development efforts and served as a prototype for the massive national community development program. Begun under the sponsorship of the Uttar Pradesh provincial government in 1948 with sixty-four villages, it expanded in three years to include over three hundred villages.

The distinguishing features of the project are described as

a) The piecing together of a comprehensive and coherent picture of rural development based on the combined efforts of the people, government, voluntary workers, and others concerned,

b) The adoption of a trial-and-experiment approach to find out "what would work and what wouldn't and why,"

c) The testing of ideas, programs, organizational and administrative patterns, and techniques of development in a small area with a view to selecting ideas and approaches for replication.

The project built upon the strengths of earlier rural and community development efforts, particularly in India. Many saw this project at the time as the alternative to the communist threat in rural India.

The major objectives of the project were considered to be:

a) "To see what degree of production and social improvement, as well as of initiative, self-confidence, and cooperation can be achieved in the villages of a district not the beneficiary of any set of special circumstances and resources such as hydroelectric development or large-scale industry."

b) "To ascertain how quickly those results may be obtainable, consistent with their becoming permanently part of the people's mental, spiritual and technical equipment and outlook after the special pressure is lifted."

c) "To see whether these results, if attainable, could be at a cost in material and personnel which would be within the reach of the State (Province) by the existing departments and agencies."

Some of the basic principles that guided the project included an emphasis on self-help and on villagers' participation, the simultaneous improvement of both land and people, the good possibility of replicability, an integrated approach, the use of an economic spearhead, the changing of attitudes of the officials, a unified administration, and an institutional development.

The program of work consisted of increasing agricultural production, cooperative development, rural industries, rural works, adult and formal education, health and sanitation, manternal and child welfare.

4.4 Evaluation

Andrews, Stanley. 1961. A Comment and Review of Community Development Projects--in Selected Countries of Africa, the Middle East and Asia. Washington, D.C.: U.S. International Cooperation Administration, The Technical Assistance Study Group.

This controversial report by a former senior United States foreign aid official had a major impact on the thinking of the United States foreign aid officials about the role of community development in national development. The author reviews community development programs in nine countries to see what happened over a ten-year period.

Andrews' findings are as follows:

a) Community development programs should not be launched on the premise that "since community development is good every country must have it." Programs should be launched only after all government agencies support the concept and understand their role.

b) No community development program should be undertaken until there has been a pilot effort.

c) The application of the "process" of community development rather than the "doctrine" of community development should be of prime concern and the actual partnership of other agencies should be institutionally incorporated into the total program, rather than using agricultural extension, public health, fundamental education, etc., services in community development programs.

d) There is a need to submerge the identification of community development, agricultural extension, public health, etc., under the concept of a task force with another appropriate name such as "rural development." The leadership of programs would then depend upon the priority of the problem being addressed, but the process of community development should be employed by all agencies and their field agents.

e) There should be more training in the concepts and processes of community development.

Braibanti, R. and J. Spengler, eds. 1963. Administration and Economic Development in India. London: Cambridge University Press.

This excellent book contains several chapters which provide valuable insights into community development. Hugh Tinker reports that the community development program was not really accepted by the people and did not teach the poor, but rather was a bureaucratic empire. Still the author did not consider it a lost cause and he held hope for the Panchayati Raj (local self-government), calling it a major step forward. Richard L. Park traces the origins of the community development program, discusses the conflict between the traditional and the development administrations, and between centralized and decentralized administrations. Park considers the major dilemma of community development to have been whether or not agricultural production should receive the highest priority, and faults the program for its failure to involve village people and for losing touch with the people the program was designed to benefit.

Dumont, René. 1965. Lands Alive (Terres Vivantes). Translated by Gilbert and Suzanne Sale. London: The Merlin Press.

In three thought-provoking and revealing chapters devoted to a discussion of India, the author, an early critic of the community development program there, maintains that the community development leaderships' priority that "changing villagers' attitudes towards progress [was] more important than material results" was wrong. Rather, from the onset the program should have stressed agricultural production, not investments in community buildings, schools, clinics, and social welfare which only increased consumption and population, further decreasing per capita production.

Ensminger, Douglas. 1972. Rural India in Transition. New Delhi: All India Panchayat Parishad.

In this book Dr. Ensminger attempts to appraise and put in perspective the Indian Community Development and Panchayati Raj programs of the previous two decades and, from this experience, suggests lessons that have application and implications for India over the next two decades. Those interested in the recent history of Indian rural development will find this book valuable in providing a concise and current appraisal of what happened in India by one of those who led and supported that major community development program.

Dr. Ensminger analyzes the genesis of the program and Nehru's guidance; problems associated with the self-help concept and the village workers' role; the relationships among agriculture, Panchayati Raj, cooperatives, the village school, and the poorer villagers; and the special problems in modernizing Indian village society.

He points out the inherent conflicts between the philosophies of a people's self-help program on the one hand and administratively established targets and an annual appropriation of funds by Parliament on the other which negated the underlying philosophy of community development as a self-help movement.

In his discussion of the role of the village worker and the conflict between being a servant of the people and a functionary responding to the demands of the technical ministries, including loan collection, the author notes the natural tendency of the village worker to emphasize the latter as a basic problem of the earlier program.

Ensminger, Douglas. 1974. "Rural Development: What Is It? (Its Contribution to Nation Building)." Paper presented at the East-West Center's Conference on Integrated Communication in Rural Development. Honolulu.

The author, who was prominent in the international community development movement and head of the Ford Foundation program in India for nineteen years, shares his perception of the rise and decline of the community development program in India.

In reviewing India's community development experience he points out that while Prime Minister Nehru and other political leaders saw in community development a way to improve the living conditions of village people, India's planners saw it as the method of getting village cultivators to increase their agricultural production. Neither understood the complexity and the time required to transform India's village economy and culture. There was disillusionment when food self-sufficiency was not reached in the 1950's, even though India lacked new agricultural technology and government policies did

not provide incentives for farmers to increase production. The community development program became the "scapegoat" supposedly responsible for the failure to achieve food self-sufficiency.

Ford Foundation. Agricultural Production Team. 1959. Report on India's Food Crisis and Steps to Meet It. New Delhi: Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Ministry of Community Development, Government of India.

This report, which called for an all-out emergency food production program, greatly influenced the Indian government's community development program. The report urges that the community development and technical ministries give top priority to food production by increasing the number of technical agricultural personnel assigned to blocks and villages and recommended that community development village-level workers concentrate on technical agricultural tasks. The community development program is described as trying to be all things to all people and not giving adequate attention to food production. It is critical of the Block Development Officers for not understanding agriculture and using village-level workers as errand boys. After this report was published, the focus of the government's rural programs clearly shifted to food production and community development declined.

Inter-regional Conference on Community Development and Its Role in Nation Building. 1961. Community Development and Its Role in Nation Building; A report of a technical conference on community development sponsored jointly by the Republic of Korea and U.S. International Cooperation Agency. Seoul.

This is a report on the last of a series of six international community development conferences sponsored by the United States that contributed to the spread of community development programs around the world.

Senator John Sparkman of the United States addressed the conference as an ardent advocate of community development and stated:

> "The genius of community development is clear: it is the most effective way of harnessing the motivation and aspirations of the millions of ordinary people to the gigantic effort of national development. The potentially explosive rising tide of expectations becomes transformed into what President Kennedy has called the people's revolution of hope."

By 1961 national leaders in India and several other countries were disillusioned with community development as an approach to development. Douglas Ensminger, head of the Ford Foundation in India, reports in his conference paper that in 1959 both westerners and India's top administrators and political leaders began to express great dissatisfaction with India's achievements in community development and some concluded that the community development program had failed. Ensminger contends that these observers lacked understanding of the process and time required for change. The report also includes insightful papers on community development programs in the Philippines, Nigeria, Thailand, and Korea.

Nair, Kusum. 1966. Blossoms in the Dust: The Human Factor in Indian Development. New York: Praeger.

This is a perceptive report on the diversity of attitudes and aspirations of India's village people towards life and work in the late 1950's. The author reports that the community development program primarily benefited the wealthier villages, that community improvement projects were often identified by the community development agency's officers rather than the villagers and were not being maintained by the villagers, that most community

development projects did not increase the villagers' income, and that the success of the village council (panchayats) was a function of the attitudes and leadership abilities of the council members.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1967. Community Development and Panchayati Raj. Delhi: Ministry of Broadcasting, Government of India.

This is a compilation of speeches by Prime Minister Nehru covering the period from the initiation of the community development program in 1952 until 1963 when the program emphasis had shifted to the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) and cooperative development.

From 1952 to 1955 Nehru asserts that the community development program was the nation's most important undertaking, basic to India's development and successful in all respects. Then, from 1956 to 1958 he refers increasingly to the need to emphasize agricultural production and in 1958 states that the success of the community development program will be measured by food production. By 1958, it is clear that Nehru has other reservations about the community development program. He urges community development personnel to shed their "official" character and to gain the confidence of the rural people and states that community development has, regretfully, only partially succeeded in mobilizing villages. By 1960 the focus is on strengthening government and local economic development through local cooperatives. He chides the community development program for being too centralized and village-level workers for considering themselves "big bosses," but expects that community development's loss of appeal will be overcome by the Panchayati Raj which would change society.

From 1961 to 1963, his interest is in the Panchayati Raj which is of "revolutionary importance" because it gives power and authority to the villagers. At this time he sees community development as the first step, and Panchayati Raj and cooperatives as the second step, which would bring political and economic development to India.

Poston, Richard W. 1962. Democracy Speaks Many Tongues, Community Development Around the World. New York: Harper and Row.

This book by a prominent community development advocate was widely read by the American public and represents the view of those who felt that community development was a democratic alternative to communism. It was seen as the means of creating the conditions around the world that would be essential to the growth of freedom in the developing world.

The author is critical of the United States foreign aid agency for not emphasizing community development more as an approach to development. He attributes this to the threat that community development poses to the professional and bureaucratic interests of the United States foreign aid officials, particularly those identified with agricultural extension programs. This error was attributed to the importance of technology and specialization in American life, which are inappropriate to the development of villages in the developing world. The author believes that no amount of technical assistance or economic aid rendered in accordance with the lines of specialization found in America would be sufficient to deal with the basic difficulties of the developing world.

Sanders, Irwin T. 1958. Community Development and National Change. Summary of Conference sponsored by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for International Studies, December, 1957. Washington, D.C.: U.S. International Cooperation Administration.

This publication summarizes the major points from a conference attended mainly by Americans prominent in international economic development and the community development movement of the 1950's. It identifies many of the basic issues being discussed by community development practitioners and economic development planners, particularly in nations receiving assistance from the United States foreign aid agency.

The publication briefly reviews the origins and definitions of community development and its role in reaching the United States foreign policy objective of stable, effective, and democratic nation states, then focuses on central issues faced and results achieved in community development programs. The central issues discussed include:

a) How can community development programs be made to work when success depends upon an elite who controls the government and all other major institutions of the society?

b) How can the dilemma of requiring a great deal of authority, power, and political administration at the center of national community development programs while at the same time releasing a substantial amount of it to small communities be resolved?

c) How effective is community development as an approach to economic development?

d) By what authority do outsiders initiate rural change, to what degree can they predict the results of their efforts, and what are some of the social mechanisms of change?

e) In what ways can the practice of community development be made more effective?

There was a divergence of opinion among conference participants with regard to the effectiveness of community development programs as indicated by the following statements of the skeptics and the endorsers:

The skeptics:

a) If one's goals are economic as measured in terms of gross national product or some other index of economic achievement, community development represents an inefficient method of trying to reach them.

b) If one does not work out some way of preventing population increase, the relatively slow economic gains which accrue will be absorbed by the increase and not result in a higher standard of living.

c) Since social changes are so unpredictable, any effort to promote change is fraught with danger for all concerned.

d) Since community development programs call for leaders who are achievement oriented, they cannot succeed unless such leaders are present and can evoke a following. Most underdeveloped countries lack achievement-oriented people so there is little hope that community development programs can work well in such places.

e) In many, if not most situations, it is better to work through already established agencies (agriculture, health, education, welfare) than to try to channel village improvement through a community development program.

f) In some countries a community development program raises the popular level of aspirations and sense of participation, which is politically disturbing to "the powers that be" and therefore endangers supposedly "friendly" regimes.

The endorsers:

a) If one is interested in what happens to people--materially, psychologically, and socially--then community development is a fruitful way of betterment.

b) It is sound on economic grounds, even viewed from the standpoint of the whole economy, since it makes use of an underutilized labor supply with a minimum use of capital investment.

c) It leads to political stability in that it is a means of preparing peasants for effective and enlightened participation in the national state.

d) It is an economical use of scarce government specialists in health, welfare, agriculture, and education since the community development worker can extend his usefulness in many ways.

e) The villages of the world are bound to experience cataclysmic change in any event and community development represents one of the best ways by which local people and national leaders can help guide this change.

f) Through the proper use of what the social scientists already know much can be predicted as to community development outcomes. Programs could be more successful than they now are.

While none of the basic issues related to community development were resolved, this conference did provide an intellectual framework within which the issues were identified and discussed, and the summary report influenced the thinking of many leaders and community development practitioners.

Taylor, Carl C., et al. 1966. India's Roots of Democracy: A Sociological Analysis of Rural India's Experience in Planned Development Since Independence. New York: Praeger.

This book by four prominent foreign authorities on India's development efforts since Independence is a fascinating study of that nation's progress and problems. Chapter 9, "The Community Development Extension Program" by Douglas Ensminger, is particularly useful to those interested in India's community development program. This chapter discusses the early origins of community development in India, the prominent people involved, the rationale of community development (e.g., why British or American extension approaches would be inadequate), and the progress and problems of the community development program as it developed. Some of the weaknesses in the program are identified as the lack of trained and experienced personnel during the period of rapid program expansion, the lack of community development and extension technical know-how, the formulation of false theories and an inadequate understanding of how to motivate individuals and local groups, the use of too much "top-down" direction,

and the failure to use community development methods in agricultural extension where it is necessary to reach large numbers of cultivators to disseminate improved agricultural practices.

United Nations. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1963. Community Development and National Development. New York.

The United Nations report was used by community development proponents to try to gain additional support from national leaders and planners in countries where national programs were declining. The report calls for the United Nations to "significantly expand the means at its disposal to encourage the improvement and extension of community development programs." The report calls for departments of government in developing countries and cooperating international agencies to understand the philosophy and practice of community development and the broad purposes to which their skills and interests relate. The report reflects the growing animosities between national community development agencies and the technical ministries (primarily agriculture, health, and education) in a number of countries.

Wiser, William and Charlotte. 1963. Behind Mud Walls 1930-1960. Berkeley: University of California Press.

While not focused on the community development movement per se, this well-known study of village life in North India provides an understanding of the technological, economic, and social change from 1930, when the original study was completed, to thirty years later when the villagers were provided some government services, including community development. The authors were generally impressed by the village-level community

development worker and technical specialists. The transfer of land ownership after independence was considered as the essential first step toward rural development and the establishment of the "block" structure for providing services to all of rural India was considered even more far-reaching. Development of new local leadership and the greater powers given the village council (panchayat) are seen as very significant contributions of the government to the life of the village. The most important factor in the willingness of the villagers to progress (in 1961) was seen as the characteristics and attitudes of the village council president.

5.1 Community Development Bibliographies

"Community Development Review Index 1956-1963." 1963. Community Development Review 8 (1): 49-65.

Cordero, Felicidad V. An Annotated Bibliography on Community Development in the Philippines from 1946-59. Vol. 1. (Content and Methodology.) University of the Philippines Community Development Council.

Dunham, Arthur and Rameshwar Nath Paul. 1959. "Community Development--A Working Bibliography." Community Development Review 4 (1): 60-90.

Jantzen, Carl R. and Iwao Ishino. 1962. A Working Bibliography on Community Development. Bibliography No. 2. East Lansing: Institute for Community Development and Services, Continuing Education Service, Michigan State University (December).

Lackey, Alvin S. 1963. "A Working Bibliography on Community Development." Community Development Review 8 (2): 101-104.

_____, ed. 1972. Community Development Abstracts. Vol. 2. New York: Essay Press.

London University. Community Development Clearing House. 1961-1962. Bulletin of Acquisitions: A Selective List of Articles, Reports and Other Publications. Vol. 2. (November-May).

Manny, Elsie Sherman. 1956. Rural Community Organization; Selected Annotated References. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Mezirow, Jack D. 1963. The Literature of Community Development--A Bibliographic Guide. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development (May).

National Institute of Community Development. 1962. Bibliography on Community Development. Mussoorie: National Institute of Community Development, Government of India.

Sociological Abstracts, Inc. 1964. Community Development Abstracts, Vol. 1. prepared for U.S. Agency for International Development.

South Pacific Commission. 1953. A Bibliography of Co-operation in the South Pacific. Revised edition. Technical Paper No. 51. Noumea, New Caledonia.

United Nations. Secretariat. Department of Social Affairs. 1953. Selected List of Books, Pamphlets and Periodicals in English on Community Organization and Development. Document ST/SOA/SER. O 15, TAA/SER. D/5. New York.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 1954. Education for Community Development; a Selected Bibliography. Educational Studies and Documents, no. 7, Paris.

United States Agency for International Development. 1966. Index of Technical Publications. Community Development Publications. TCR/ISDS (March).

_____. Bureau for Technical Assistance, Office of Development Administration, Development Reference Service. 1970. Index of Community Development Publications. Community Development Publications. -11. Washington, D.C. (April).

United States Foreign Operations Administration. Community Development Division. 1955. A Selected Bibliography on Community Development. Washington, D.C.

United States International Cooperation Administration. Community Development Division. 1960. Bibliography on Community Development. (Mimeo). Washington, D.C.

5.2 General Bibliography

Abueva, José V. 1959. Focus on the Barrio; the Story Behind the Birth of the Philippine Community Development Program Under President Ramon Magsaysay. Manila: Institute of Public Administration, University of the Philippines.

African Community Development Conference, Tripoli. 1958. African Community Development Conference in Libya: Summary, prepared by Jean Ogden.

Alderfer, H. Freed. 1964. Local Government in Developing Countries. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Almond, Gabriel and James Coleman. 1960. The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Anderson, D. David. 1960. The National Community Development Program of Jordan--Its Aims and Accomplishments. United States Operations Mission to Jordan.

Andrews, Stanley. 1961. A Comment and Review of Community Development Projects--in Selected Countries of Africa, the Middle East and Asia. Washington, D.C.: The Technical Assistance Study Group, U.S. International Cooperation Administration.

Anstey, Vera. 1952. The Economic Development of India. London: Longmans, Green and Company.

Appleby, Paul H. 1956. Re-Examination of India's Administrative System. New Delhi: Cabinet Secretariat, Organisation of Methods Division, Government of India.

Badeau, John S. 1960. "Community Development in Korea: An Address." New York: Near East Foundation (April).

Batten, Thomas R. 1957. Communities and Their Development. London: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1960. "The Trouble Spots." Kurukshetra 9 (1).

_____. 1962. Training for Community Development: A Critical Study of Method. London: Oxford University Press.

Bhattacharyya, S. N. 1970. Community Development: Analysis of the Programme in India. Calcutta: Academic Publishers.

_____. 1972. Community Development in Developing Countries. Calcutta: Academic Publishers.

Binamira, Ramon P. 1957. The Philippine Community Development Program. Manila: Office of the Presidential Assistant on Community Development.

Braibanti, R. and J. Spengler, eds. 1963. Administration and Economic Development in India. London: Cambridge University Press.

Brayne, F. L. 1946. Socrates in an Indian Village. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Brown, Lucy W. 1961. "Community Development and the Progress of Near East and South Asian Countries." Washington, D.C.: U.S. International Cooperation Administration.

Chai, Alice Yun. 1968. Community Development in Korea. Honolulu: East-West Center.

Cohen, Ronald. 1961. "The Success that Failed; An Experiment in Culture Change in Africa." Anthropologica 3 (1): 21-36.

Cool, John C. 1962. The Panchayat System and Self-Help Development. Kathmandu, Nepal: Community Development Advisor, U.S. AID Mission (March).

Community Development Foundation. 1968. Messages on Community Development from Heads of State to International Society for Community Development. Supplement. New York.

Council for Social Development. 1970. Action for Rural Change: Readings in Indian Community Development. New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Danda, Ajit Kumar. 1966. Planned Development and Leadership in an Indian Village. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University.

Dayal, Rajeshwar. 1960, 1966. Community Development Program in India. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.

Dey, S(urendra) K(umar). 1962. Community Development--A Chronicle 1954-1961. Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

_____. 1964. Community Development. Bombay: Asia Publishing House.

Dey, Sushil K. 1960. Spare-Time Production for Gain: Proposal for a New Programme for Rural Communities. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

DiFranco, Joseph. 1958. Differences Between Extension Education and Community Development. Comparative Extension Pub. No. 5. Ithaca: New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University (October).

Dube, S. C. 1958. India's Changing Villages--Human Factors in Community Development. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Dumont, René. 1965. Lands Alive (Terres Vivantes). Translated by Gilbert and Suzanne Sale. London: The Merlin Press.

Du Sautoy, Peter. 1958. Community Development in Ghana. London: Oxford University Press.

_____. 1963. "A Guide for the Administrator to the Principles of Community Development." Journal of Local Administration Overseas 2(4): 204-211.

Dutta, R. C. 1950. Economic History of India. London: London University.

Ensminger, Douglas. 1972. Rural India in Transition. New Delhi: All India Panchayat Parishad.

_____. 1974. "Rural Development: What Is It? (Its Contribution to Nation Building)." Paper presented at the East-West Center's Conference on Integrated Communication for Rural Development. Honolulu.

Espiritu, Socorro C. and Chester L. Hunt. 1964. Social Foundations of Community Development: Readings on the Philippines. Manila: R. M. Garcia Publishing House.

Fairholm, G. W. 1964. "Local Government and Community Development in the Northern Emirates of Northern Nigeria." Journal of Local Administration Overseas 3 (3): 156-163.

Fellows, P. A. 1963. "Community Development in Ethiopia." International Review of Community Development n. 11.

Ford Foundation. Agricultural Production Team. 1959. Report on India's Food Crisis and Steps to Meet It. New Delhi: Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Ministry of Community Development, Government of India.

Friedlander, Walter A. 1968. Introduction to Social Welfare. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. 1958. Community Development, A Handbook. London: H. M. Stationery Office.

Green, James W. 1961. "Success and Failure in Technical Assistance: A Case Study." Human Organization 20 (1): 2-10.

Haney, Emil B., Jr. 1964. "The Israeli Kibbutzim--Blueprints for Community Development." A paper presented to Prof. W. Glade, School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin (January).

Hayden, Lyle J. 1949. "Living Standards in Rural Iran--A Case Study." Middle East Journal 3 (2): 140-150.

Hodgdon, Linwood L. 1961. Community Development in Korea; An Evaluation Survey of the NACOM Grant-in-Aid Program. San Francisco: Community Development Division, U.S. Operations Mission to Korea.

Hough, Richard L. 1968. AID Administration to the Rural Sector; JCRR Experience in Taiwan and Its Application in Other Countries. AID discussion paper No. 17. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development.

India. Famine Inquiry Commission, J. A. Woodhead, Chairman. 1945. Final Report. Madras: Superintendent, Government Press.

India (Republic), Community Projects Administration. 1956. Manual for Village Level Workers.

_____. Ministry of Community Development. 1957. Report. 1956-57. New Delhi.

_____. Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation. 1965. Annual Conference on Community Development and Panchayati Raj at Springar, July 1965, Main Recommendations, Proceedings, and Agenda Notes. New Delhi.

_____. Planning Commission. Programme Evaluation Organisation. 1960. The Seventh Evaluation Report on Community Development and Some Allied Fields. New Delhi.

_____. Planning Commission. Programme Evaluation Organisation. 1970. Evaluation Study of Post-Stage II Blocks. New Delhi.

_____. Team for the Study of Community Projects and National Extension Service, B. G. Mehta, leader. 1958. Report. New Delhi: Government of India Press.

Inter-regional Conference on Community Development and Its Role in Nation Building. 1961. Community Development and Its Role in Nation Building, A Report of a Technical Conference on Community Development, sponsored jointly by the Republic of Korea and U.S. International Cooperation Agency. Seoul.

Jain, S. C. 1967. Community Development and Panchayati Raj in India. Calcutta: Allied Publishers.

Karnjanaprakorn, Choop. 1965. "The Role of Informal Organization in Community Development: Thai Experience." Thai Journal of Public Administration 4 (2).

Khan, Iltija Husain. 1964. Community Development in India: A Critical Evaluation. Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University.

Kempe, M. E. and L. D. Smith, eds. 1971. Community Development--Kenyan Strategies for Improving Rural Welfare. Proceedings of a Workshop held at the Insitute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi. (May-June).

Korea (Republic). Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Office of Rural Development. 1962. An Outline of Agricultural Guidance Work in Korea. Suwon.

_____. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Office of Rural Development. 1963. Rural Guidance Work in Korea. Suwon.

_____. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Office of Rural Development. 1965. Report of the Workshop on Professional Education for Community Development--April 17-19, 1965. Chang Ang University and ECAFE. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry. Office of Rural Development. 1967. Rural Guidance Work in Korea--A Decade of Rural Progress (1957-1967). Suwon.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1958. Community Development Addresses--ROK National Community Development Conference: Seoul, Korea, August 21, 1958. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1959. Community Development Programs: Annual Report (1958 and 1959). Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1959. Community Organization: Selected Articles. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1960. Community Development Programs: Annual Report--1960. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1961. Community Development in Korea. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1961. Your Work With Villagers: A Guide for NACOM Village Workers. Seoul.

_____. Ministry of Reconstruction. National Council of Community Development. 1961. 1961: Community Development Program in Korea. Seoul.

Madigan, Francis C., S. J. 1962. The Farmer Said No: A Study of Background Factors Associated With Dispositions to Cooperate With or Be Resistant to Community Development Projects. Quezon City, Philippines: Community Development Research Council, University of the Philippines.

Malaviya, H. D. 1956. Village Panchayats in India. New Delhi: Ananda Press.

Mason, Edward S. 1955. Promoting Economic Development--The U. S. and Southern Asia. Claremont: Claremont College.

Mayer, Albert and Associates. 1958. Pilot Project, India. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mezirow, Jack D. 1963. Dynamics of Community Development. New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc.

Millikan, Max F. and D. L. Blackmer, eds. 1961. The Emerging Nations. Boston: Little, Brown and Company.

Miner, William R. 1961. Seven Case Capsules from Korea's Community Development Program. Bureau of Community Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Korea, and Community Development Division, United States Operations Mission to Korea.

Mosher, A. T. 1958. Varieties of Extension Education and Community Development. Ithaca: Rural Education Department, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University.

Mukerji, B. 1961. Community Development in India. Calcutta: Orient Longmans.

Myrdal, Gunnar. 1968. Asian Drama: An Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations. New York: Pantheon.

Nair, Kusum. 1966. Blossoms in the Dust: The Human Factor in Indian Development. New York: Praeger.

Najjar, Halim. 1970. Community Development: The Facts and the Myth. Beirut: The Rihani House.

Namboodiripad, E.M.S. 1958. The Mahatma and the Ism. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.

Narayan, Shriman. 1944. The Gandhian Plan of Economic Development for India. Bombay: Padma Publications.

_____. 1960. Principles of Gandhian Planning. Allahabad: Kitab Mahal.

Neal, Ernest. 1964. "A Report on Community Development in the Philippines, East Pakistan and India." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development (March).

_____. 1972. Hope for the Wretched: A Narrative Report of Technical Assistance Experiences. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development.

Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1958. Toward Freedom, the Autobiography of Jawaharlal Nehru. Boston: Beacon Press.

_____. 1967. Community Development and Panchayati Raj. Delhi: Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India.

Pakistan. Village AID Administration. 1954. The Village Agricultural Industrial Development Programme: Manual for Village Workers. Karachi: Government of Pakistan.

_____. Village AID Administration. 1956. Village Aid; Five Year Plan, 1955-56, 1959-60. Karachi: Government of Pakistan.

Paulson, Belden. 1964. "Difficulties and Prospects for Community Development in Northeast Brazil." Inter-American Economic Affairs 17 (4): 37-58.

Philippines (Republic). Office of the Presidential Assistant on Community Development. 1965. A Brief Statement of the Community Development Program. Manila.

Poston, Richard W. 1962. Democracy Speaks Many Tongues, Community Development Around the World. New York: Harper and Row.

Pye, Lucian W. 1961. "Community Development: Political Implications of Community Development--a Background Paper." New Brunswick: Care-Peace Crops-Community Development Project at Rutgers University.

Raynolds, Dana D. 1967. "Role of Local Government and Voluntary Organization in Community Development." Washington, D.C.: Society for International Development.

Ruopp, Phillips, ed. 1959. Approaches to Community Development: A Symposium Introductory to Problems and Methods of Village Welfare in Underdeveloped Areas. The Hague: V. van Hoeve.

Sanders, Irwin T. 1958. Community Development and National Change. Summary of Conference sponsored by Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Center for International Studies, December, 1957. Washington, D.C.: U.S. International Cooperation Administration.

SEATO Conference on Community Development. 1960. Report. Baguio, Philippines.

Shields, James J., Jr. 1967. Education in Community Development: Its Function in Technical Assistance. New York: Praeger.

Singh, D. P. 1976. "The Pilot Development Project, Etawah." Paper produced for Expert Consultation on Integrated Rural Development. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Taylor, Carl C. 1962. "Community Development as a Tool of the Agency for International Development." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Agency for International Development.

_____ et. al. 1966. India's Roots of Democracy: A Sociological Analysis of Rural India's Experience in Planned Development Since Independence. New York: Praeger.

Taylor, Paul S. 1958. "Community Development." Technical Lecture No. 10, Seoul: Office of the Economic Coordinator for Korea, United Nations Command.

Thorner, Daniel. 1956. The Agrarian Prospect in India. Delhi: University of Delhi Press.

_____ and Alice. 1962. Land and Labor in India. New York: Asia Publishing House.

Tumin, Melvin M. 1958. "Some Social Requirements for Effective Community Development." Community Development Review No. 11 (December): 1-39.

United Nations. 1962. Report of the Asian Seminar on Planning and Administration of National Community Development Programmes: Bangkok, Thailand - 22 August - 1 September, 1961. New York.

_____. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1957. Study Kit on Training for Community Development. New York.

_____. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1963. Community Development and National Development. New York.

_____. Economic and Social Council. 1955. Principles of Community Development--Social Progress Through Local Action.

_____. Economic Commission for Africa. 1959. Report on the Workshop on Planning and Administration of National Programmes of Community Development, Addis Ababa, Ethopia, 14-25 September, 1959. New York.

_____. Economic Commission for Africa. 1963. Community Development Evaluation Mission to Ghana.

United Nations. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. 1960. Community Development and Economic Development. Bangkok.

_____. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. 1963. The Role of Local Leadership for Community Development in Asian Countries. Bangkok.

_____. Office for Public Administration. 1959. Public Administration Aspects of Community Development Programmes. New York.

_____. Technical Assistance Administration. 1958. Report of the Mission to Survey Community Development in Africa. New York.

_____. Technical Assistance Administration. 1959. Report of the Community Development Evaluation Mission in India...23 November 1958 - 3 April 1959. New Delhi: Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. Commission on the Status of Women. 1967. The Participation of Women in Community Development Programmes: The Preliminary Report of the Secretary General. New York.

United States Congress. House. 1962. Report of The Committee on Foreign Affairs on H. R. 11921. H. R. 1788, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

United States Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines. 1950. Report to the President of the United States. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United States International Cooperation Administration. Team I. 1955. Community Development Programs in India, Pakistan and the Philippines. Washington, D.C. (October).

_____. Team III. 1955. Community Development Programs in India, Iran, Egypt and Gold Coast. Washington, D.C. (December).

_____. 1956. "The Community Development Guidelines of the International Cooperation Administration." Community Development Review No. 3 (December): 3-6.

_____. 1959. "Concept and Policy." Community Development Conference--Training. Bandarawela, Ceylon (May).

_____. Community Development Division. 1961. "Community Development in the Near East and South Asia." (January).

Valsan, E.H. 1970. Community Development Programs and Rural Local Government. New York: Praeger.

Violich, Francis, and Juan B. Astica. 1967. Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America. Los Angeles: University of California.

Whyte, William Foote. 1975. Organizing for Agricultural Development. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.

Wickwar, Hardy. 1968. "Community Development Administration in the 1960's." International Review of Administrative Sciences 34(3): 224-232.

Wiser, William and Charlotte. 1963. Behind Mud Walls 1930-1960. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Wraith, R. E. 1964. "Community Development in Nigeria." Journal of Local Administration Overseas 3(2): 92-102.

MSU RURAL DEVELOPMENT PAPERS

RDP No. 1 Akhter Hameed Khan, "Ten Decades of Rural Development: Lessons from India," 1978.

RDP No. 2 Lane E. Holdcroft, "The Rise and Fall of Community Development in Developing Countries, 1950-65: A Critical Analysis and an Annotated Bibliography," 1978.

Single copies of the MSU Rural Development Papers may be obtained free of charge by writing to: MSU Rural Development Papers, Department of Agricultural Economics, 206 International Center, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan 48824, U.S.A.