

PA-APAD-271
ISN - 35509

9300085/62
931192/~~25~~

**ASIAN PEASANTS, POLICIES, AND PROJECTS:
SOME THOUGHTS ON SOCIAL RESEARCH AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

**Paul Durrenberger
Department of Anthropology
University of Iowa**

**Michael Calavan
Development Studies Program
Agency for International Development**

*Paper prepared for the Workshop on Agricultural
Decision Making and Development Washington, D.C.
• Sept. 9-10, 1980*

Introduction

Social scientists who examine rural development projects from outside readily perceive the need for greater social sensitivity and more careful social analysis. We join those who call for more intensive, sophisticated research in support of project planning and implementation. However, we also offer a caveat -- careful research carried out in the wrong administrative setting, or directed toward the wrong goals, may be irrelevant, or even harmful, to residents of the project area.

Our inquiry begins with the issue of appropriate research questions. It is argued that prevalent neoclassical assumptions have limited our comprehension of peasant economic behavior and led to formulation of inappropriate project goals. The situation in Northern Thailand is then briefly examined. It is argued that development projects and development-oriented research in the area have been distorted by overly simple assumptions about income, welfare, and the benefits of commercial agriculture. A corrective strategy, suggesting an approach to "appropriate administration", is outlined. The role of social research and analysis within this framework is briefly sketched. The conclusion places these ideas within a broader philosophical framework.

Posing Appropriate Questions

Research is directed by the questions it seeks to answer. Much of our own previous work in Northern Thailand was focused too narrowly on quantification and modeling of production decisions within agricultural households.

In future work, we will pose a broader question: HOW DO RURAL HOUSEHOLDS DECIDE WHAT TO DO AND WHAT FACTORS CONDITION THESE DECISIONS? In the Asian countryside there are many kinds of households -- some are agricultural. It is tempting to focus our attention on these units and ignore others: landless laborers, school teachers, traders, petty shopkeepers, government officials, bus operators, injection doctors, artisans, monks, and others who do no farming but are clearly important to the rural economic system. If we describe agricultural decision making without taking account of such households, we have accounts of what farmers do and some comprehension of why they do particular things under specified circumstances. What is lacking is a firm basis for describing the political economy which shapes choice in farming and other endeavors. This weakness can be overcome only by more attention to the global, historical, and structural context of choice.

Much applied research done in Northern Thailand has been in service of particular projects or concerned in a general way with economic development. Western and western-trained economists-- carriers of ideology as much as practitioners of science-- assume the inevitability and desirability of modernization, commercialization and capitalist production (for a critique of this approach, see van Nieuwenhuijze, 1980). Social scientists working in the development field must comprehend, but needn't fully accept, this ideological position.

An alternate view can be discovered in the work of marxists, and dependency theorists, who offer provocative insights into rural political economy and argue persuasively that economic development in some groups and places creates underdevelopment in others (Baran, 1952; Frank, 1966; Gamer, 1976). These authors should be read carefully for the hypotheses they offer, however, assumptions about class structure and patterns of exploitation cannot be substituted for observation and analysis any more than those about growth and trickle down effects.

Another corrective to the "narrow" view of rural development lies in adoption of a variety of indices of state and process in rural systems. Complex processes are too often measured against simple indices -- household income, cash profits, mean yields, aggregate growth rates. In consequence, shifts toward greater inequity, environmental degradation, higher morbidity, and institutional breakdown go undetected. The Physical Quality of Life Index has been developed as an alternate measure of human welfare (Morris, 1979). Energy accounting offers an analytically powerful, alternative view of system process (Cook, 1977). Numerous additional indices -- nutrient intakes, Gini coefficients, soil erosion rates, levels of indebtedness, morbidity levels -- will be appropriate in particular circumstances. Adequate analysis of rural systems depends on adroit manipulation of many indices in addition to those most commonly used in neoclassical analysis. It also requires comprehensive measurement of the costs as well as the benefits of modernization and commercialization.

The Case of Northern Thailand

Recent work on agricultural change in Asia has emphasized the benefits and costs of the Green Revolution. Two articles published in the Economic and Political Weekly of India in 1969 pointed the way. Wolf Ladejinsky describes trends and events which strongly suggest a causal tie between newly introduced rice and wheat varieties and social turmoil, increasing unemployment, and growing social inequity (1969a; 1969b). These points have been re-examined in hundreds of case studies, articles, and books. However, the Green Revolution is but one aspect of a temporally deeper, geographically broader trend -- agricultural commercialization. We will examine this phenomenon in the area we know best -- Northern Thailand.

Commercialization has proceeded farther in some portions of the region than in others. The data are incomplete; however, available evidence suggests that commercialization is positively correlated with landlessness, inequity, underemployment, and growing class consciousness. (Calavan, 1977b; Moerman, 1968; Durrenberger n.d.; Bowie, 1979; Van Roy, 1971). Nevertheless development projects in the area have pursued commercialization as an unalloyed benefit, and much development-oriented research has assumed that it is inevitable and desirable. This approach is exemplified in an AID-sponsored project carried out jointly by Iowa State University and the Division of Agricultural Economics-Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (DAE-CARD) of the Thai Ministry of Agriculture (see Rogers and Itharattana, 1976; DAE-CARD, 1977a; Stephenson and Itharattana, 1977; Framingham, et. al, 1977; Blakeslee and Peteharatana, 1977; DAE-CARD, 1977b; Rogers and Itharattana, 1977; Dagestar et. al, 1978).

Quite appropriately, project documents emphasize the need for longitudinal regional analyses and the integration of analyses from both agricultural and non-agricultural sectors. Unfortunately, they assume that agricultural production is uniformly commercialized and urge policies that would increase the degree of commercialization. Furthermore, as an artifact of the linear programming method used throughout, they assume rural household uniformity, for instance by averaging income among rural households (Rogers and Itharattana, 1976:2 5-26). This is done in spite of numerous detailed studies which show the variation in income and economic strategy among rural households in the region. (e.g. Marlowe, 1969; Calavan, 1977a, 1977b; Bowie, 1979; Keen, 1970; Kaufman, 1960; Kingshill, 1976; Hanks, 1972; Chadwick, 1978; Van Roy, 1971). In their third annual report (DAE-CARD, 1977:35) they state that their analyse and recommendations are based on "...the commonly held premise that economic growth in a region is predicated on the expansion of sales of regionally produced goods outside the region." They use their analysis to show average consequences of "a basic package of programs designed to increase agricultural income" (DAE-CARD, 1977:27). Rogers and Itharattana (1977:58) argue that Thai farmers respond to economic incentives and that "The sharp increases in area planted, production, and value of production suggest that increasing prices could have a very significant impact on the welfare of rural people."

Feeney (1977) documents the history of commercialization and its consequences in Central Thailand. Feeney concludes that the system of secure property rights and tenure through various forms of land registration were consequences of the appreciation of land prices and that the shift from rights in persons to rights in land was possible because the elite gained thereby. Moerman (1968) contrasts the situation of a relatively isolated village in Northern Thailand with those of the Central plains where commercial production "creates an infinite demand for land which results in the concentration of ownership in a few hands," and "loosens the bonds of mutual service and respect among kinsmen and fellow villagers and replaces them with more purely commercial ties." (See also Hanks, 1972). In the northern village, land is plentiful "and its uses still too traditional for its owners to exert social and economic domination." Durrenberger has argued that in some Shan villages of Northwestern Thailand, there is a delicate balance. Some households are quasi-commercial producers; most are not. Full commercialization has not developed because there are adequate agricultural alternatives for non-commercial households so that they need not provide agricultural labor to quasi-commercial households. In this situation, programs which support commercialization will favor the commercial households at the expense of non-commercial households, transforming the latter into a wage labor pool without independent access to subsistence resources (Durrenberger, n.d., 1977, forthcoming).

Programs which encourage the development of commercial agriculture have a long history in Thailand and predictable outcomes of alienating a sizable portion of the rural population from subsistence resources and transforming

them into an impoverished rural wage labor force. In spite of this history, experts continue to urge programs of commercialized agricultural production.

The Multiple Cropping Project in Chiangmai Province in Northern Thailand was informed by assumptions about the benefits of commercialization similar to those of the DAE-CARD analysis (Thodey and Sektheera, 1974; Thongsiri, et. al, 1975). In an early policy statement, we learn that

In contrast to most existing systems, these new systems will require the adoption of a combination or 'package' of improved practices, including improved crop varieties, fertilizer, pesticides, and good crop and water management. While these new systems can provide substantially higher returns, they will also require higher levels of purchased inputs and better management. (Thodey and Sektheera, 1974:1).

By 1977, this project had generated a substantial body of research, much of it technical. Suthasupa found that

...multiple cropping has more appeal to commercial oriented farmers.... If peasant families desired to take up multiple cropping through the employment of additional casual labor, they would be able to increase production and income on the condition that casual labour required is available in the village. There does not appear to be a shortage of casual labour supply since it can be obtained easily in the villages and in the Chiang Mai valley (1977:461-462).

From the beginning the project was oriented toward those with access to land, even the early survey work (Thongsiri, et. al, 1975:5). It is no surprise to find that casual labor is readily available in part as a consequence of agricultural commercialization. It is not clear what benefits (or losses) this group incurs from the project, but clearly this is an important topic. In an insightful survey of the project, Kellogg (1977), an agricultural economist, outlines the importance of a greater role for social science analysis of economy and agricultural choice in the project area. Reports of the Multiple Cropping and DAE-CARD projects suggest that existing analyses (by anthropologists, geographers, political scientists, and other non-economists) on rural economic conditions and farming strategies were largely ignored.

With these projects in mind, we might expect that when a group of peasants independently develop commercial production of a profitable crop, they would be applauded. This has not been the official response to the Miao (Hmong) opium producers of the highland North. In the past fifteen years the economics and sociology of highland agriculture have been analyzed and described in detail (Walker, 1970; Keen, 1968; 1970; 1976; Dessaint, 1971, 1972a, 1972b; Durrenberger, 1974, 1976, 1978, 1979; Geddes, 1976; Grandstaff, 1976; Cooper 1976; Miles, 1978; Hinton, 1977, 1978; Hanks and Hanks, 1978). Geddes (1978) testifies that even if anthropologists are instrumental in designing development programs, as he was in the initial stages of the United Nations Program for Drug Abuse Control crop replacement program, their advice is often ignored. He points out that

The aim, after all, of the project was to produce a social change and a social change by definition means a change within the society, that is to say a change which all people will have to make themselves. This is a very hard point to get across to administrators at any level from directors to international organizations to local officers in the field because it conflicts with their bureaucratic interests. (19).

Geddes failed, and the project became a technical exercise.

Chindarsi (1976) has documented the results of the program. Opium harvests have increased by nearly six percent; average rice production has declined from 697 to 440 kg; the amount of land planted to rice has increased. McKinnon (1968:8) comments

If it were not for the apparent increase in opium production and the addition of Red Kidney bean to the cash crop assembly, the people of Maeto would be facing a serious food supply problem. It appears that farmers are becoming increasingly dependent on cash crops because they can no longer secure good harvests of rice (1978a:8).

Ruddle and Grandstaff (1978) outline the general nature of marginal areas and suggest a strategy for development similar to Geddes' program for the Hmong.

Highlanders rely on swidden agriculture. Since it takes from five to twenty years for a field to revert to strong secondary forest which can be profitably replanted, a household needs access to five or ten times the amount of land it requires for any one year. Population increases in the uplands due to political dislocations in Burma, the Shan States, Laos, and increasing land shortages in the lowlands of Thailand, have led to a shortage of swidden sites. Highlanders searching for new sites forested lands find only other highlanders with the same needs. There is an immediate subsistence problem.

As population increases, the fallow period decreases with a corresponding decrease in yields. As rice production decreases, alternative means of subsistence must be found. An obvious solution is the production of opium to provide cash to purchase rice from the lowlands. Opium is an important means of subsistence.

Thailand can serve as a microcosm for substantial areas of Asia. Rights in persons have been changed to rights in land; most of the population is rural; rice is a major crop; in addition to lowland rice cultivators, there are highland and valley cultivators. None of the structural constraints to agricultural decision making is unique to Thailand, even, we would suggest to Asia. We have discussed the literature on agriculture in the context of development programs to indicate the lack of interplay between the analyses of social scientists and development workers, even in the unusual case in which an anthropologist was invited to design a program.

From this review of development projects and social analysis, in Northern Thailand, we can draw several conclusions:

1) As commercialization of agriculture develops, land holdings become concentrated in fewer hands and more people are thrown into a wage labor pool working for those who own land. Fewer people have direct access to subsistence resources.

2) Where land is available for people to develop, they will engage in subsistence production rather than enter the wage labor pool.

3) In any area some households are more prosperous than others, either because they have access to more land or because they enjoy non-agricultural incomes. Given access to appropriate means (credit, improved crop varieties, extension services, new cropping systems, new technology) they will attempt to commercialize their operations.

4) As these households are successful, the average farm income increases, but the well-being of those in the wage labor pool decreases. As the latter group is deprived of access to subsistence resources, their existence becomes marginal.

5) Governments are likely to promote the process of commercialization because elites benefit from it. Feeney (1977b) documents a case from the turn of the century in which the Thai government chose carefully from among possible irrigation projects.

The government was willing to invest in increasing agricultural productivity where the elite could capture some of the benefits, but was unwilling to invest in agriculture when such investments would have been detrimental to the interests of the elite. (18)

6) The analyses and assumptions of development agencies are important for understanding the process of pauperization of the rural areas since they make the means for commercialization available to governments and prosperous farmers (see Ingram, 1955).

7) Several additional factors are important in the highlands.

a) In general, rice production is not productive enough to support the highland swiddeners because population density is too high to allow adequate fallow periods (Leach, 1954, Keen, 1970; Hinton, 1969).

b) Opium is the only reasonable agricultural product with which to make up the deficit (Chindarsi, 1976; McKinnon, 1978).

c) These statements characterize Thailand, but may not characterize the Shan States or Burma where insurrection is financed by opium production and trade (McCoy, 1973; Delaney, 1974).

Defining an Appropriate Context for Applied Studies of Rural Economy

Now we must consider another question central to the concerns of this gathering: WHAT IS THE POLICY MILIEU WITHIN WHICH WE PROPOSE TO DO "USEFUL" RESEARCH ON RURAL ECONOMIC SYSTEMS? This question raises a host of others. "Policy milieu" conjures images of giant Washington- or Rome-centered bureaucracies dispensing astronomical sums for large projects in the service of objectives defined in contexts irrelevant to farmers. This is an important

reality. We focus on another--implications for rural people. It is also a reality that many rural development programs have undesirable consequences: concentration of resources in fewer hands, a shift from production for household needs to production for markets, and consequent development of a large group of landless rural people with no reliable means of support. Perhaps there is an administrative context in which our research can raise issues of equity, sustainability, and human welfare from the rhetorical to the analytical and policy level.

Researchers require a setting in which it is unnecessary to ask: "How can we be successful consultants, giving development agencies what they think they want? How can we incorporate fashionable techniques econometrics or cost/benefit analysis--so as to make our proposals and reports more attractive to those who dispense funds?" We need a context in which the insights we provide will support more appropriate, more complex goals. We must reject a liberal view which preaches tolerance for customs and traditions, but assumes their inevitable destruction in the face of commercialization, capitalism, and increasing global interdependence. Development workers must be artisans rather than assembly line workers. Design "templates" must be far simpler than the projects they shape, while project goals must evolve in response to research insights and local preference.

What would be an appropriate administrative setting for social research? First, it must not casually foster the development or spread of commercial agriculture. This rules out attempts at providing large-scale credit, development of export-oriented market structures, and all other approaches which focus single-mindedly on raising incomes. We think policy should be

directed to those in the countryside who are ailing most under present circumstances, the landless poor and the smallest owner/operators. No grand policy can accomplish this goal; no regional survey can suggest a policy, no national statistics or national economic models will help. We suggest approaches which would enable the landless to utilize the paltry resources available to them, or which could be available to them with limited assistance. This implies small-scale, low intensity programs, participatory decision making, and expert understanding channeled into the role of "cultural broker." It means that "development experts" are not those who work in offices in Washington, Rome, or Bangkok. They must work in the fields and villages discovering opportunities for the landless to produce food and providing means to accomplish that goal. They must be committed to a local area and not subject to frequent transfer. They should seek immediate but modest impacts on the workings of the rural economic system. Analogous with the notion of appropriate technology, we might call this "appropriate administration".

Concrete proposals for cautious, participatory approaches to local development can be found in the work of political scientists (Korten, 1980; Bryant and White, 1980); agriculturists (Harwood, 1979); radical practitioners (Dolci, 1967; Freire, 1970); social theorists (Ehrlich, 1977); and anthropologists (Geddes, 1978; Grandstaff and Ruddle, 1978). In our view, development projects likely to succeed are: small-scale, aimed at marginal improvement of existing production activities, participatory, and essentially unreplicable. They are carried out in non-hierarchical, non-bureaucratic fashion.

Two projects with which Calavan has had brief contact in Thailand provide examples of problems that an appropriately administered local development program must meet and overcome:

Land Settlements - USAID/Bangkok is involved in a project which supports the work of the Land Settlements Division of the Public Welfare department in ten settlement areas (nikhom) of Northeastern Thailand (USAID/Bangkok, 1979). While the AID project makes commendable efforts to support locally initiated activities, it faces major obstacles. Nikhom staff unfortunately lack the personnel, knowledge of local conditions, and political clout necessary to help the more disadvantaged households in these areas. As a result, certain "shadow holders" are able to claim large areas of "free" land and exploit settlers as a cheap labor pool. Some of the crops produced -- e.g. manioc -- are known to lead to rapid depletion of local soils. (Calavan, 1979a). On the other hand, the Netherlands government is mounting a project at some of the nikhom which is smaller, less structured and bureaucratic, and seems more likely to have positive impact on poor households (McKinnon, 1978b).

Village Fishponds - USAID/Bangkok is cooperating with the Department of Inland Fisheries of the Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives in upgrading a large number of fishponds in Northeastern Thailand (USAID/Bangkok, 1980a). Unfortunately, administrative arrangements for upgrading ponds largely ignore village-level knowledge of ponds and their management (Calavan, 1980). In some fortunate cases, the project will provide improved ponds, larger catches of fish, and more reliable water supplies. In other

less fortunate cases, the result is likely to be dry ponds and local communities with diminished confidence in themselves and their government.

Our approach can be exemplified in a brief discussion of Northern Thailand's Chiangmai Plain. Roughly half of the rural households in the area are landless, and meet subsistence needs through farm labor, crafts, and related pursuits. Serious efforts in rural development must address the needs of this group. Although no approach is unequivocally promising in addressing the problems of the landless poor, one is to improve production of labor-intensive garden crops (garlic, watermelon, tobacco, peanuts, soybeans) on rented land. Irrigated land for rice production in the rainy season is usually unavailable, even on a 50/50 sharecropping basis. Tenancies are rare, usually inherited. However, during the dry months from December through April, substantial land is available for cash rental or sharecropping.

We suggest that a development team appropriate to this situation have three components: a couple of agriculturist/development agents, a couple of social analyst/development agents, and a couple of extension worker/development agents. This team would work closely with a few hundred landless households, helping them to analyze their problems and define areas for action. Resources provided--production loans, agricultural research, assistance in establishing cooperatives--may seem conventional. However, these approaches must be carried out under unconventional administrative structures. Loans should be small and locally administered. In some cases, subsistence rice loans may be appropriate. Cooperatives should be allowed to evolve slowly into locally appropriate forms. Agricultural research should follow the approach outlined by Harwood (1979:32-41).

Development workers must be sensitive to ever present possibilities of growing inequity and hijacking of project benefits by local elites. In such cases, reform will sometimes be appropriate. Often, the only feasible strategy for the development workers will be retreat!

We have not addressed the nature of the bureaucratic institutions which lie behind this field operation. Perhaps useful hints lie in the varied structure and processes of other bilateral programs. (See Arnold, 1980 for insights in various European approaches.) Have we re-invented agricultural extension on the model of American land-grant universities, a model which development agencies have already attempted to export to Asia? There is one important difference. Land-grant institutions and their extension agents have worked in the service of commercializing agriculture in the U.S. We would change the objective of the agent from increasing income and market dependency to developing food production systems in service of the rural populace.

With our emphasis on detailed analysis of all aspects of the rural economy instead of focusing on land owning decision makers, perhaps we have reinvented Lenin's approach in THE DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITALISM IN RUSSIA. Perhaps it is necessary to reinvent Lenin. We also wish to reinvent the Organization and Production School approach (Chayanov, 1966) and see analysis and development programs work hand in hand.

We envision a role for anthropologists within this administrative scheme. If we decide to give development agencies what they need rather than what they require and not ask what sort of research will best serve them, but what sort of research is appropriate to anthropologists and poor third world farmers, how do we proceed? What kind of research

would foster the policy we have outlined? What sort of research program should inform policy after it is established? First, we need a well developed theory of peasant household choice. We think such a theory exists in the intersection of Marx and Chayanov (Durrenberger, n. d.). We think the development agent should work in research as well as implementation so that ongoing research informs action and action informs research. This was the model Chayanov and his colleagues developed. This removes questions of decision making and rural economics from the exclusive realm of the academy. It is distinct from the land-grant ideology and practice because it is not committed to commercialized agriculture, it places research at the service of its subjects. We suggest this as the proper social/political context for research.

In line with the policy and analytic goals we have outlined, we can suggest some methodological principles:

- 1) TAKE ACCOUNT OF NON-FARMING HOUSEHOLDS INSTEAD OF LOOKING ONLY AT THOSE ENGAGED IN AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION. Our research must take account of the variety of economic forms in the countryside and not assume homogeneity.

- 2) DESIGN LONGITUDINAL STUDIES TO DEVELOP INSIGHT INTO HOW MICRO SYSTEMS ADAPT AND EVOLVE. Most anthropological studies are too short to develop any appreciation for variation of circumstances over time. National statistics and other data which might provide time depth lack useful detail and are usually inaccurate. We do not advocate abandonment of the traditional anthropological methodology, but its broadening in time and space. This requires efforts by teams rather than individuals. The kind of analysis we envision involves large-scale cooperative effort. (For insights into the

promises and problems of this approach see Foster, et. al., 1979).

3) DESIGN RESEARCH WHICH COVERS DIVERSE ECOLOGICAL AND ECONOMIC ZONES.

If it is impossible to specify in detail the global and historical context for each production decision, at least it is plausible to contemplate analysis of interactions among the parts of regional systems.

4) DO NOT ISOLATE POLITICAL ISSUES FROM ECONOMIC ISSUES. Participatory decision making implies organization and group awareness of problems and alternatives. When people begin to understand their social/economic/political situation and decide to organize, they cease to be politically neutral. They come to appreciate their disadvantaged positions and attempt to alter them. Differential access to resources in the countryside is an economic and political fact. The two cannot be separated. Economic change is not politically neutral. To suggest otherwise is to engage in dangerous deception. Our research should be used to inform policy only if policy addresses the needs of the rural poor in a participatory, flexible fashion. Large-scale projects which are "efficient" and replicable are likely to be inhumane, irrelevant, and inappropriate places for us. To speak of "aiding the people" through income generation and export-oriented agriculture under large government to government programs is to engage in obfuscatory propaganda.

Conclusions

For research to inform policy, practice must inform research. We would retain the traditional close contacts between anthropologists and the people they would understand; but integrate development workers into the research program (and research into the development program). Have we re-invented applied anthropology? We don't think so. Applied anthropology has too often accepted the assumptions and limitations of the bureaucratic,

hierarchical approach. If we put our research at the service of the people, we must persuade government and other development agencies to adopt policies which work without destroying people. Such policies are not widely supported.

A Thai government agency that has attempted to implement a program similar to the one we advocate is the Hill Tribes Division of the Public Welfare Department, especially in the work of the Tribal Research Centre under the leadership of Khun Wanat Bruksasri (Hinton, 1969). Here Geddes' ideas of participatory social change and associated research received more than lip service. (see Geddes, forthcoming). The Centre has sponsored much of the research we have cited on highland residents of Thailand; and they have implemented several small-scale development programs (see Oughton, 1970). Some programs have met interference from other agencies; some have been less effective than they might have been due to lack of funding and administrative support. While we contend that massive funding of development programs may be deleterious, we do not suggest that chronic underfunding is conducive to successful programs. This has been a real problem for the Centre. In contrast to numerous other programs with massive funding, here we have a thoughtful, evolving program, personnel with long experience in the highlands, and insufficient funding. The flexible, intensive program of the Tribal Research Centre is perhaps unpalatable, even incomprehensible, to Thai bureaucrats.

A project developed by USAID/Bangkok and recently approved in Washington raises similar issues of comprehension and acceptability. (USAID/Bangkok, 1980b). The Mae Chaem Project is concerned with area rural development and incorporates "interface teams" to work intensively in the villages. The teams are to be mixed by ethnic group and sex, are to be trained intensively, and

and provided with regular field support. (Calavan 1980b). Their agenda, however, will be relatively undefined. To many Washington-based officials, the project appears poorly-defined and loosely-managed. This feeling is strong in spite of the fact that the project has received intense attention from several social scientists with research experience in the area, and in spite of the fact that project designers feel that "loose" management is essential to project success. We maintain that this discussion goes beyond design competence. Perceptions are strongly influenced by our perceptions of how social change and development can and should happen. In spite of "participatory" rhetoric, most workers still approach design and implementation as a bureaucratic task.

Two publications made public in recent weeks usefully define the broader philosophical framework of which our discussion is a part. The Global 2000 Report to the President was prepared by the Council on Environmental Quality and the Department of State. It is infused with a strong sense of urgency about the "state of the world." Resource scarcities, famine, economic and political turmoil seem inevitable. Jeremy Rifkin's Entropy: A New World View supports a similar sense of urgency. However, the two pieces differ radically in addressing questions of "what to do." In spite of its urgent tone, the Global 2000 Report provides a strong sense of "business as usual." Better policies, stronger agencies, more precise studies, longer range planning are needed. All are part of a strategy which accepts "progress" as inevitable and desirable and favors centralized, hierarchical, bureaucratic solutions. Rifkin suggests that this approach is integral to our present

predicament, as much a part of the problem as uncontrolled disposal of dangerous chemicals or gas-guzzling autos. He argues that we need a new "world view" so that we can begin to create appropriate new structures and processes. In the past, decentralized, low energy, adaptive structures may have been desirable, in the near future they will be necessary. We offer our ideas on appropriate administration as a cautious step in the direction Rifkin suggests.

Bibliography

- Baran, Paul A.
1973 "On the Political Economy of Backwardness", in The Manchester School, pp. 66-84, 1952. Reprinted in The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment, (ed. Charles K. Wilber), Random House, New York.
- Blakeslee, L. and Thongchai Petcharatana
1977 Kenaf Demand in Thailand. DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 5.
- Bowie, Catherine
1979 "Class Formation in the Chiangmai Valley," Paper presented to the Council on Thai Studies.
- Bryant, Coralie and Louise G. White
1980 Managing Rural Development: Peasant Participation in Rural Development, Kumarian Press Development Monograph, West Hartford, Connecticut.
- Calavan, Michael M.
1977a Decisions Against Nature: An Anthropological Study of Agriculture in Northern Thailand, Monograph No. 15, Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Northern Illinois University, Cellar Bookshop, Detroit.
- Calavan, Michael M.
1977b "Socio-Economic Variation, Expenditure Patterns, and Economic Strategies in a Northern Thai Village", Journal of the Siam Society, 65 (1), pp. 161-180.
- 1979a "Social Analysis: Land Settlements in Northeastern Thailand", submitted to USAID/Bangkok, January.
- 1979b "Social Analysis for the Village Fishponds Project", submitted to USAID/Bangkok, July.
- 1980 "Ethnic Issues in the Training and Work Program of Mae Chaem Interface Teams", submitted to USAID/Bangkok, February.
- Chayanov, A. V.
1966 The Theory of Peasant Economy, (eds. D. Thorner, B. Kerblay, and R. E. F. Smith). The American Economics Association, Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Illinois.

- Chindarsi, N. (with Tawee Raksachon)
 1976 The Profitably of Opium for the Grower, Report to the Royal Government of Thailand, United Nations Programme for Drug Abuse Control, Project for Crop Replacement and Community Development and the Tribal Research Centre. Chiangmai, Tribal Research Centre.
- Cooper, R. G.
 1976 Resource Scarcity and the Hmong Response: A Study of Settlement and Economy in Northern Thailand. Ph.D. thesis, University of Hull.
- Chiswick, C. U.
 1978 "Profiles of Poverty: Thailand 1972," Paper prepared as part of World Bank Research Project 671-36, Income Distribution in Thailand, Presented to Council on Thai Studies.
- Cook, Earl
 1977 "Energy: The Ultimate Resource?", Resource Papers for College Geography No. 77-4. Association of American Geographers.
- Council on Environmental Quality
 1980 The Global 2000 Report to the President, Washington, D. C.
- DAE-CARD
 (Division of Ag. Econ., Ministry of Ag., Thailand - Center for Ag. and Rural Development, Iowa State University)
 1977a Annual Report: Agricultural Sector Analysis in Thailand, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 2.
 1977b Third Annual Report: Agricultural Sector Analysis in Thailand, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 6.
- Dagostar, B., Wayne Ellingson, Earl Heady, and Randall Hoffman.
 1978 Consumer Demand for Food Commodities in Thailand, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 10.
- Delaney, W. P.
 1974 "On Capturing an Opium King: The Politics of Law Sik Han's Arrest," Society 11:62-71.
- Dessaint, A.
 1971 "Lisu Migration in the Thai Highlands." Ethnology, 10:329-348.
 1972a "The Poppies Are Beautiful This Year," Natural History, 8:31.
 1972b Economic Organization of the Lisu of the Thai Highlands, Ph.D. thesis, University of Hawaii.

Durrenberger, E. P.

- 1974 "The Regional Context of the Economy of a Lisu Village in Northern Thailand," Southeast Asia, 3:569-575.
- 1976 "The Economy of a Lisu Village." American Ethnologist, 3:633-644.
- 1977 A Socio-Economic Study of a Shan Village in Maehongsonn, Chiangmai, Tribal Research Centre.
- 1978 "The Theory of Peasant Economy in Opium Producing Villages of North Thailand," Paper presented to the conference on opium production, trade and use in the Golden Triangle, Inst. Stud. Hum. Issues.
- 1979 "Rice Production in a Lisu Village," Journal of Southeastern Asian Studies, 10:139-145.
- forthcoming "An Analysis of Shan Household Production Decisions," Journal of Anthropological Research.
- n.d. The Economy of a Shan Village, Unpublished Manuscript.
- n.d. "Chayanov and Marx", submitted to Social Science Information.

Ehrlich, Howard

- 1977 "Anarchism and Formal Organizations," Research Group One Report Number 23, Vacant Lots Press, Baltimore.

Feeney, D.

- 1977a "From Property Rights in Man to Property Rights in Land: Institutional Change in Thai Agriculture, 1850-1940," Hamilton, Ontario: McMaster University Department of Economics Working Paper No. 77-12.
- 1977b "Paddy, Princes, and Productivity: Irrigation and Thai Agricultural Development, 1900-1940," Paper presented to Council on Thai Studies.

Foster, George M., Thayer Scudder, Elizabeth Colson, and Robert V. Kemper
1979 Long-Term Field Research in Social Anthropology, Academic Press, Inc., New York.

Framingham, C. G., A. Stoecker, Kanok Khatikarn, Somnuk Sriplung, and Earl Heady

- 1977 Agricultural Development Planning in Thailand: Some Supporting Analysis, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 4.

- Freire, Paolo
1970 Pedagogy of the Oppressed (tr. Myra B. Ramos), Continuum, Seabury.
- Frank, Andre Gunder
1973 "The Development of Underdevelopment", Monthly Review, 18 (4), pp. 17-31, 1966. Reprinted in The Political Economy of Development and Underdevelopment, (ed. Charles K. Wilber), Random House, New York.
- Gamer, Robert E.
1976 The Developing Nations: A Comparative Perspective, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston.
- Geddes, W.
1976 Migrants of the Mountains: The Cultural Ecology of the Blue Miao (Hmong Njua) of Thailand, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- 1978 "Hmong Opium and Attempts to Replace It," Paper presented to the Conference on Opium Production, Trade and Use in the Golden Triangle, ISHI.
- forthcoming. "History of the Tribal Research Centre," In Highlanders of Thailand: Characteristics, Groups, and Some Problems, J. McKinnon and Wanat Bhruksasri, eds.
- Grandstaff, T.
1976 Swidden Society in North Thailand--a Diachronic Perspective Emphasizing Resource Relationships, Ph.D. thesis, University of Hawaii.
- Grandstaff, T. and K. Ruddle
1978 The International Potential of Traditional Resource Systems in Marginal Areas. Technical Forecasting and Social Change 11:119-131.
- Hanks, L. M.
1972 Rice and Man: Agricultural Ecology in Southeast Asia, Chicago: Aldine.
- Hanks, Lucien and J. R. Hanks
1978 "The Context of Opium Production in Chiangrai Province North of the Mae Kok Valley," Paper presented to the Conference on Opium Production, Trade and Use in the Golden Triangle, ISHI.
- Harwood, Richard R.
1979 Small Farm Development: Understanding and Improving Farming Systems in the Humid Tropics, Westview Press, Boulder, Colorado.

- Hinton, P.
 1969 Defense, Development and Administration of the Uplands of North Thailand, Chiangmai: Tribal Research Centre.
- 1969a "Introduction," In Tribesmen and Peasants in North Thailand, Chiangmai: Tribal Research Centre.
- 1977 Karen Subsistence: The Limits of a Swidden Economy, Ph.D. thesis, University of Sydney.
- 1978 "Non-growers in the Matrix of Opium Production: The Case of the Karen," Paper presented to the Conference on Opium Production, Trade, and Use in the Golden Triangle, ISHI.
- Ingram, J. C.
 1955 Economic Change in Thailand Since 1850, Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Kaufman, H. K.
 1960 Bangkhuaed: A Community Study in Thailand, Locust Valley, N.Y. J. J. Augustin, Monographs of the Association for Asian Studies.
- Keen, F. G. B.
 1968 "Socio-Economic Change for the Meo of North Thailand," Pacific Viewpoint 9:75-82.
- 1970 Upland Tenure and Land Use in North Thailand, Bangkok. SEATO Cultural Programme.
- Kellogg, E. D.
 1977 "Role of Social Science Research in Cropping System Programs," IN Proceedings of the First National Seminar on Cropping Systems, Chiangmai, Chiangmai University Faculty of Agriculture: 500-547.
- Kingshill, K.
 1976 Ku Daeng--The Red Tomb: A Village Study in Northern Thailand, Bangkok: Suriyaban Publishers.
- Korten, David
 1980 "Community Organization and Rural Development: A Learning Process Approach", special supplement to Public Administration Review.
- Leach, E. R.
 1954 Political Systems of Highland Burma, Boston: Beacon.
- Lenin, V. I.
 n.d. The Development of Capitalism in Russia.

- McCoy, A. W.
1973 The Politics of Heroin in Southeast Asia, New York: Harper and Row.
- McKinnon, J.
1978a "The Jeremiah Incorporation? A Discursive Interpretation of Problems in Contemporary History in the Highlands of Northern Thailand." Paper presented to the Conference on Opium Production, Trade and Use in the Golden Triangle, ISHI.

1978b Series of Papers on Netherlands Development Project in Northeastern Thailand.
- Marlowe, G. W.
1969 "Economic Variety in a North Thai Village," IN Tribesmen and Peasants in North Thailand, P. Hinton ed. Chiangmai Tribal Research Centre.
- Miles, D.
1978 "Perspectives into Pulangka Agriculture," Paper presented to the Conference on Opium Production, Trade and Use in the Golden Triangle, ISHI.
- Moerman, M.
1968 Agricultural Change and Peasant Choice in a Thai Village, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Morris, Morris D.
1979 Measuring the Condition of the World's Poor: The Physical Quality of Life Index, Pergamon Policy Studies, published for the Overseas Development Council, New York.
- Oughton, G. A.
1970 A Proposal for the Development of Phaphuchom Village (Meo), Chiangmai: Tribal Research Centre.
- Rifkin, Jeremy
1980 Entropy: A New World View, Peoples Business Commission, Washington, D. C.
- Rogers, K. D. and Prasit Itharattana
1976 Agricultural Employment and Migration in Northeast Thailand: Application of a Regional Planning Model, Division of Agricultural Economics (Ministry of Agriculture, Thailand) - Center for Agricultural and Rural Development (Iowa State University) //DAE-CARD// Sector Analysis Series: No. 1.

- Rogers, K. D. and Prasit Itharattana
 1977 Agricultural Supply Response in Northeast Thailand: Production, Resources, Income, and Policy Implications, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 8.
- Stephenson, J. A. and Kajonwan Itharattana
 1977 Macroeconometric Analysis of Economic Activity in Thailand, 1962-1974, DAE-CARD Sector Analysis Series: No. 3.
- Susthasupa, Paiboon
 1977 "Socio Economic Factors Affecting Multiple Cropping in Northern Thailand," IN Proceedings of the First National Seminar on Cropping Systems, Chiangmai: Chiangmai University Faculty of Agriculture pp. 461-476.
- Thodey, A. R. and Rapeepun Sektheera
 1974 Optimal Multiple Cropping Systems for the Chiang Mai Valley, Chiang Mai: Chiangmai University Faculty of Agriculture.
- Tongsiri, Benchavan, P. Lerffamrab, and A. R. Thodey
 1975 Agro-Economic Characteristics of the Chiang Mai Valley, 1972-73, Chiang Mai: Chiangmai University Faculty of Agriculture.
- USAID/Bangkok
 1979 Project Paper: The Land Settlements Project.
 1980a Project Paper: The Village Fishponds Project.
 1980b Project Paper: The Mae Chaem Project.
- Van Nieuwenhuijze, C.A.O.
 1980 "Another Whack at Economism", SID Newsletter.
- Van Roy, E.
 1971 Economic Systems of Northern Thailand: Structure and Change, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Walker, A.
 1970 Lahu Nyi (Red Lahu) Village Society and Economy in North Thailand, Chiangmai: Tribal Research Centre.
 1976 The Swidden Economy of a Lahu Nyi (Red Lahu) Village Community in North Thailand, Folk, 18:145-188.