

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
AND
NATIONAL CHANGE

Summary of Conference
Endicott House

December 13-15, 1957

Sponsored by

Center for International Studies
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Assisted by

International Cooperation Administration
and
Associates for International Research, Inc.

This Summary Prepared by

Irwin T. Sanders
Research Director
Associates for International Research, Inc.

March 1, 1958

The increasing emphasis on Community Development in several countries throughout the world which is supported by the United States through the International Cooperation Administration warrants careful and continuing study. This conference, sponsored by the Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, had as its broad purpose discussion of the rationale of Community Development, its goals and its political, economic and social implications. The International Cooperation Administration is pleased to publish this Summary which reflects the results of three days' discussion by a group of senior social scientists from several fields.

The background papers referred to by Dr. Sanders are not included in this Summary as it is anticipated that they will be published by a university press in the near future. We also hope to reproduce as a supplement to this Summary statements made at the Endicott House meeting by Dr. Margaret Read and Dr. Carl Taylor regarding the practice of Community Development.

Louis M. Miniclier
Chief, Community Development Division
Office of Public Services
International Cooperation Administration
Washington, D. C.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part One: INTRODUCTION

I. The Academicians Gather	1
II. Community Development: The Phenomenon	3
III. Community Development and American Foreign Policy	6

Part Two: CENTRAL ISSUES

I. The National Elite and Community Development	9
Basic Social Structure of Underdeveloped Countries	9
Bridging the Gap Between the Elite and the Peasant	13
Social and Economic Forces at Work	15
II. The Central Government and Community Development	15
Community Development and Political Participation	16
The Politician Versus the Administrator	19
Peasant Pressure Groups	21
III. The Effectiveness of Community Development as an Approach to Economic Development	22
Allocation of Scarce Resources	24
Economic Gains from Community Development Type Activities	29
The Problems of Population Growth	30
IV. Community Development and Social Change	33
The Philosophical Implications of Purposeful Change	33
Community Development and Shifts in Value System	36
Local Participation and External Change	39
Motivation and Levels of Aspiration	43

Table of Contents (Continued)

V. The Practice of Community Development	48
Finding and Training Local Leaders	49
Working Through a Governmental Bureaucracy	55
Social Science Research and the Practice of Community Development	58

Part Three: CONCLUSION

Community Development	62
-----------------------	----

APPENDICES

Conference Program	65
Conference Who's Who	67

Community Development and National Change

Part One: INTRODUCTION

I. THE ACADEMICIANS GATHER

The mud-walled villages of South Asia or the isolated settlements of Latin America seemed far removed both spatially and psychologically from the manor-like Endicott House, a spacious conference site near Boston, where forty academicians had gathered to discuss community development and national change. Even though most of these present had spent some time in the so-called underdeveloped areas of the world they frequently had to use an act of the will to sense the connection between the daily problems of the peasant and the discourse of the economists and social scientists who were discussing community development programs.

The group was representative of different subject-matter disciplines and of study in various geographical areas. One of the three anthropologists spoke knowingly of political and economic trends in Southeast Asia, another of the efforts at community development in Afghanistan and a third of a three-year effort at planned social change in a Peruvian village. The six sociologists individually had had recent experience in the Middle East, Southern Europe, Guatemala, Puerto Rico, India and the Philippines, while the three psychologists were more familiar with Western Europe. The eleven economists could speak from first-hand experience about every major region of the world, while the six political scientists had concentrated chiefly on the Middle East and Asia. A professor of public health had recently returned from India, one professor of education from Taiwan and another from Nigeria, while two representatives from the social welfare field had studied community development in numerous countries abroad. Several conferees, though moving in and out of academic appointments, had recently had or were still involved in the experience of trying to operate programs

of public administration or community development in a number of foreign countries. Three participants were administrators from the Washington office of the International Cooperation Administration which assisted the Center for International Studies at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the sponsorship of this Conference. The Associates for International Research, Inc. had also assisted, chiefly in the conference preparations.

Most of those attending had done homework prior to their arrival. Background papers, totaling 220 pages, had been sent out in advance and their contents formed the takeoff points for the four main discussion sessions. One paper dealt with the political implications of community development, two with the connection between economic development and community development, a fourth with the social and cultural conditions necessary for successful community development, and a fifth with the general problem of motivation in programs of this sort. In addition, copies of the statements about the nature of community development, one prepared by the International Cooperation Administration and the other by the United Nations, had been made available to the participants. The September (1957) issue of the Community Development Review provided further background materials in the form of three case studies of community development programs written specifically for this conference. The countries treated were India, Pakistan, and the Philippines.

The background papers were not read or even summarized at the conference but were discussed by one or two participants, who had prepared their critiques in advance, before the group as a whole began to air a wide variety of views. The discussion was recorded but no effort was made to arrive at any consensus about a major issue or to come up with any specific recommendations for more effective conduct of community development programs. The conference experience was simply one in which keen, perceptive minds probed here and there and raised more questions than were answered. New light was cast on old problems, philosophical assumptions were questioned, and little time was spent in defending any existing program. If a person had arrived with pat answers to perennial difficulties he must have left the conference less sure in his dogmatism; if he though his view all-encompassing he must have realized what a small segment his discipline really covered; if he were generalizing broadly on the

basis of extensive experience in one region he must have learned how many exceptions some other region would probably afford to these generalizations. Like any thoughtful experience it was chastening; like any chastening experience it is likely to be productive.

II. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: THE PHENOMENON

Efforts at rural reconstruction, village improvement, and mass education have been in existence for many years under a wide variety of sponsoring agencies. But it has only been since the Second World War that they have become numerous, comprehensive in content, and nation-wide in scope.

The term "community development" was first used officially at a Conference on the Development of African Initiative, held in Cambridge, England in 1948. Dr. Margaret Read, who has been very much in the forefront of the community development activities in the British colonies, described to the Endicott House Conference why the term was chosen and how community development was urged upon the British colonial officials attending the Conference as a means toward helping the territories move toward national independence and at the same time improve their local government and learn more effectively to cope with the new economic developments taking place in their countries. Since 1948 the term community development has been used widely by the Social Welfare Branch of the United Nations, by the United States International Cooperation Administration, and by at least a score of national governments who recognize it as a means of improving conditions in their countries. A term whose use spreads so widely and is applied to such a variety of programs takes unto itself many meanings that are not always consistent. This was borne out in the conference discussions.

Some participants tended to view community development as an end in itself, while others thought of it as a part of a larger problem. For example, Lucian W. Pye was interested in the broad context:

We can begin . . . by noting that the problem of community development is an aspect of a larger problem, that of seeking through purposeful action to establish a particular type of nation out of a distinctive type of society. More precisely the problem seems to be that of creating, by political and administrative action, a modern nation--in which secular and industrialized modes of behavior will be secure and dominant--out of an earthbound society, predominantly composed of a population that is fragmented into tightly ordered village

units, but possessing a restless, growing urban segment from which come its decision-makers (and also its trouble-makers). (P. 2)*

Harold Isaacs, following much the same approach, recognized as the central problem of community development that of creating a consistent constructive self-generating desire for change and improvement which runs counter to all the traditional peasant cultures.

The economists, too, tended to view community development with reference to its broader bearing upon national economic growth. Wilfred Malenbaum examined "the potential of the community development device as a tool of high national policy in a program of growth," (p.5) thinking of it as one among several techniques "for combining units of capital, labor, and entrepreneurship or leadership" (p. 6) in a country's development plan even when a country seeks rapid industrialization.

But community development by very definition cannot be seen only in national terms: the local community must figure in the picture in some way. John Badeau stated that his organization (The Near East Foundation) had come up with this definition after trying "to define the undefinable": "Community development is a program by which the people of a village are enabled to reach out and avail themselves of national services which are already in existence." That is, according to John S. Badeau, community development is a way of bringing the agricultural services and the health services and the educational services, which are directed by the central government, into operation at the village level with the co-operation of the villager himself. The participation of the villager in the planning and carrying out of the local program was considered by some to be a necessary ingredient of the definition, as later sections will bring out.

This definition by Dr. Badeau and his staff had much in common with the objectives of community development as David C. McClelland had gleaned them from the literature: (1) raising rapidly the productive output and real income of the villager; (2) multiplying community services so as to contribute to the health, education and welfare of the villagers; (3) enlisting the participation of the people themselves in efforts

* These page numbers refer to the background paper of the author just cited.

to improve their level of living; (4) setting up administrative arrangements which assure a coordinated rather than a segmented approach to the interrelated problems of the community. (Pp. 20-21)^{*}

This relatively simple definition was also consistent with the model of a community development program derived by Carl C. Taylor from the study of three outstanding national programs: (1) change in village practices; (2) government agents of change located in local communities who will stimulate or catalyze villagers and assist them in mobilizing their own material and human resources, and to act as channels through which technical and material assistance from government agencies and personnel can be brought to the villagers to help them succeed in local improvement undertakings; (3) adequate technical knowledge and well-organized and well-staffed government agencies which can render technical assistance to village level workers; (4) the establishment and maintenance of channels of effective communication between these agencies and villagers, and between agents of change who are working among and with villagers and higher sources of technical knowledge and assistance; (5) the integration, or at least coordination, of all these elements in such a way that all and each of them shall help to accomplish changes in the practices and outlook of villagers.

Since the focus of such characterizations is upon the village and what happens to the people there it is easy to see how those who wish to stress national political change and economic development (as community development) may seem to be and actually at times are talking at cross purposes with those closely identified with some particular community development program. The Endicott House Conference did not try to determine which of these interpretations was right and which was wrong; nor was there even open admission that there were inherent disagreements as to emphases. To some, community development was to be defined and judged by its effect on the Gross National Product; to others, the GNP was of secondary importance compared to what happened to the sense of participation on the part of local people involved in community development programs. But all agreed that the phenomenon was there to study; nation-wide efforts to improve the villages on a thorough and vast scale.

^{*} In this connection see the 15 elements set forth by Melvin Tumin, in his background paper (pp. 38-40).

But what is the community? Some would say the nation, others the village, and perhaps a third group would hedge and claim both as essential.

What is development and what is to be developed? Some would say the economy, others political administration, and still others people. True, none of these are mutually contradictory but the way one places the emphasis serves to define the concept and guide the allocation of budgetary items. It also has a bearing upon the support for American foreign policy when United States overseas programs are interpreted at home and abroad.

III. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Community development is more than a fairly widespread program of change in many countries, more than an interesting phenomenon simply to be studied, speculated about, and watched with interest by social scientists. It is definitely a part of the foreign policy of the United States since community development programs are tied in with the economic assistance being given to many so-called underdeveloped countries. Thus the inquiry into community development and national change has a timeliness, even an urgency. This was especially brought out in the comments by Max F. Millikan, Director of the Center for International Studies at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, which was host to the Conference. He had this to say:

It is my conviction that we have made enormous progress as a nation in the last two or three years in reorienting our thinking about what we were trying to do with economic development programs.

I think that we have achieved very much wider recognition, in the first place, in the negative sense. We have learned, for instance, that economic development assistance is not a particularly helpful instrument in attempting to promote some foreign policy objectives.

We have learned that economic development assistance, as conceived in the purpose of the loan fund and of the technical assistance program, is not an instrument which is primarily well-designed to affect the short-term foreign policy of the countries to whom it is directed. This was not generally recognized I think, two or three years ago.

We have also learned that there is a quite distinct set of purposes in military assistance and that the central purpose and objective of that portion of the Aid Program described as economic assistance is not predominantly to increase the military capabilities of the recipients.

I think that there is increasing recognition of the fact that the primary purpose of aid programs is not to make people in foreign countries like us better,

is not to increase the Gallup Poll popularity of the United States as against other countries.

I think, turning to the positive side, that there is an increasing recognition and agreement that the central purpose of economic development and technical assistance programs, from the standpoint of the United States foreign policy, is to have a favorable effect of some kind on the internal political evolution of the foreign society to which we are extending aid.

Professor Millikan then spoke in specific detail about the sort of internal political evolution which he had in mind. One direct political and military interest of the United States is to avoid the probability that any of the countries receiving aid will adopt Communist political systems. But he felt that this was too narrow a description of our basic political objectives since the larger goal of the United States is that of promoting a kind of political maturity, particularly in the newly-emerged states but also in some of the underdeveloped countries that have had political independence for a long time, with two sorts of objectives in mind.

Our hope would be to promote a kind of political evolution which will reduce the probability that extremist groups, dedicated to the use of violence or willing to resort to the use of violence readily, will be less likely to achieve control of these countries. I think this is a United States interest simply because of the general conclusion that violence, as it breaks out anywhere in the world, is increasingly with modern communication, modern interconnection of interests, and with modern weapon systems likely to spread to a point where it actually directly menaces United States security.

I think a second general objective we have in influencing the political evolution of other countries is to hope for a development of value systems in those countries which makes essential cooperation with the rest of the world more possible and more likely.

In most general terms, the United States political objective, according to Professor Millikan, is the political evolution of states which are stable, effective, and democratic.

By states which are stable I mean states which are capable of change by evolutionary processes. This does not imply states which are static but rather stable in the sense of continuity of the institutions in some form which deals with the local problems of these areas.

We want states which are effective in the sense that they are capable, to some degree, of meeting the aspirations of their peoples.

By states which are democratic I do not mean the development of a particular set of parliamentary institutions but that important decisions are increasingly fairly widely shared in these societies through whatever mechanism.

Granted these foreign policy objectives, how do economic development programs affect the internal political development of foreign countries? Professor Millikan pointed out that mere economic advance is not enough, for the USSR has achieved this. But he did indicate the relevance of community development programs as such in these words:

The national political influence of the rural population has been very small, but this is certainly changing. Since community development is one of the main ways we have devised so far of reaching the rural population in some fashion, it seems fair to appraise its consequences for the local political system, the local society.

If community development programs play an important part in leading to stable, effective and democratic states then they are carrying out some of the major objectives of American foreign policy. Many of those responsible for such programs claim this as a central purpose.

A main objective of the Endicott House Conference proved to be the examination of the problems faced and results achieved in the implementation of this purpose. The best way to summarize the conclusions on the matter is to trace the central issues which were discussed throughout the meetings, not always presenting the discussion chronologically but topically, while taking care that the general tenor of the comments is retained. These issues range across all of the disciplines represented, but in the final analysis they go back for illustration and confirmation to the personal experience of the participants themselves.

Part Two: CENTRAL ISSUES

Some of the central issues led directly from the background papers and were consciously posed by the chairman of a session, but others bubbled up now and then like an underground stream. To isolate out these issues in a summary of this sort has the advantage of pulling together the ideas germane to a central theme; it also means that these ideas lose some of the richness of their context. For example, the problem of the gap between the elite of an underdeveloped country and the peasants can be viewed chiefly as an aspect of the social structure of the country. This is how it is first treated here. But this gap can also be described as a political question since the members of the elite are in charge of the government which they use in their efforts to "improve" or at times control the peasants. This is taken up as a second issue, distinct from the first, since it involves the matter of expanding the peasant's political horizons, his sense of the community, his relationship with the national government. At the Endicott House Conference, however, these two issues were discussed interchangeably, and quite properly so, but the implications for community development are clearer if they are looked at separately in a summary of this sort.

I. THE NATIONAL ELITE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Posing the Issue: How can community development programs be made to work when their success inevitably must rely upon an elite, usually Westernized and frequently out of touch with the peasant communities, who are in control of the government and all other major institutions of the society?

A serious consideration of this question involves first of all some statement of the social structure of the countries where this elite figures so prominently, then some attempt to note how the gap between the elite and the peasant can be bridged, and finally an assessment of some of the social forces at work leading either to a resolution of the problem or a further impasse.

Basic Social Structure of Underdeveloped Countries

Although the discussion of the elite-peasant relationship loomed largest in the

discussion there was a recognition that other social traits were important in underdeveloped countries. For example, the family system was strong; the village community in many respects constituted the social world of the peasant, although it was most definitely pointed out that these villages were not always the pleasant places, free of backbiting and other human ills, that the romantics might lead one to believe. Local government existed chiefly as an arm of the national government and in the past had largely become identified with collecting taxes or military service and only recently with the idea of a "welfare state." Most religions found in underdeveloped countries tended to reinforce traditional values at the expense of any innovations which might be suggested in a community development program.

The economy which accompanied such a village-oriented, peasant society in Asia was described by Wilfred Malenbaum in his background paper as follows:

In these countries, agriculture is the main source of the nation's income. It is primarily a small community and peasant agriculture, where land is scarce and where most workers and their families are some form of tenants on small individual agricultural enterprises. Non-agricultural rural pursuits are still not usually independent economic units; their services may be extended as part of the traditional institutional arrangement rather than as market transactions.

These economies are labor-rich, and labor is not fully utilized. . . . Yield per acre, per animal unit, per unit of other capital is low. . . . Although to the outsider there appears to be extreme poverty, there seems to be limited motivation to a greater and more pointed effort which the individual or local group could presumably exert. (Pp. 2-3)

In such a society containing such an economy it is hardly likely that people, even if they wanted to, could raise themselves by their own bootstraps (if they wore boots). If a community development program is to get a start and maintain a momentum in a given country some members of the national elite must be actively involved. Outsiders may help in various ways but the final test of success must reside in the assumption of responsibility by people in the countries themselves.

This matter was brought into focus early in the Conference since it was a major theme in the background paper by Dr. Pye, which formed the pièce de resistance of the opening session. The paper had reviewed the relationship between the national elite and the rural masses in the ancient or earlier civilizations of the East, stressing the following points among others:

One of the most distinctive features of underdeveloped countries is the sharp and conspicuous division between the few who are involved in the national political process and the vast majority of the population who are oriented to a peasant's way of life. The dominant group is generally the product of quite different experiences for they are usually the more urbanized and the most Westernized segment of the population. In a very literal sense they tend to have attitudes and values and follow a way of life that sets them off from the rural population. (p.3)

In examining the pattern of relations between the ruling elite and the village populations in all these civilizations of the past, one of the first things that attracts our attention is the great importance of the common bond of religion or in some cases a remarkably secular ideology. Ruler and ruled to some degree shared a similar view of the world and they could believe that they received the highest statement of values from the same source. (p. 6) Today the bond of religion between the ruling group and the villages has been harshly broken and is only gradually being replaced by the ties of secular ideologies. (p. 10)

...Also, politics was the vehicle for achieving all manner of goals, including that of personal security, while those who were excluded could expect little recognition and only the security of conformity. (p. 13) ... Today, politics remain, or has just become, practically the only important way of achieving social recognition in most underdeveloped societies. (p. 14)

But the Pye presentation of the "gap" between the elite and the rural masses touched off a number of comments:

DR. MARSHALL E. DIMOCK: They have a statement in Turkey, "Scratch the veneer off any cabinet minister and you will find a peasant." I, myself, believe this is true. In Turkey, every peasant has the dignity and has the feeling of self-confidence that the cabinet minister has, and as far as I can ascertain, the social bond between the peasants and cabinet officers is very close... On the basis of what I observed in Turkey I cannot believe that the gulf between the elite and the peasant that Mr. Pye talks about is as great as he seems to indicate.

DR. HUGH R. LEAVELL: During my not-too-long experience in India I did have a chance to talk with some Indian villagers about their ideas of disease, how it was spread, and what they did about it. I think the results of my conversation led me to be a little more in accord with Professor Pye's view than with the experience of Professor Dimock.

DR. SUSANNE RUDOLPH: It is true that in India there continues to be some kind of division between the national elite and the rural people. However, there is an intermediate group which have sprung up and which is more village-based than westernized. The last ten years has seen a pretty radical replacement of the previous westernized elites at the state level, so that most of the state cabinets these days tend to be drawn from village castes, from people who look to the village primarily.

DR. BADEAU: May I point out that in the particular field of community development this question of the rapport between the elite classes and the village

classes poses, it seems to me, a very particular and concrete problem. As far as the Middle East is concerned, and that is the only experience I can speak on, the elite classes feel that they have a much closer rapport with the agricultural peasant than the peasant feels he has with the elite classes. In other words, the people coming out of this class are perfectly sure that they know how to treat the peasant...

When you come down to a community development program, the heart of which is the achievement by the local community and its divisions of its own goals, this feeling of one-sided rapport from the elite class is apt to lead not to a community development program, but to imposing on the village an elite-designed program. I think this is the place at which the ability of the elite to understand the villager or the villager to have rapport with the elite becomes critical. Therefore, a great many of the programs--an outstanding example of which is Egypt--are really the imposition by the elite class of their concepts of what peasant development ought to be on peasants who are either too uninstructed or too supine to resist them.

A little later in the discussion Benjamin H. Higgins reacted to what others had said about the elites, drawing upon his experience in Libya, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

DR. HIGGINS: In Libya there was a certain close contact between the traditional elite and the people because the traditional elite were illiterate sheikhs living in the same villages with the people and there was no other kind of elite. The national government, when formed, naturally drew in the 16 university graduates that were in the country at that time, but this was rather too small a group to constitute an elite in itself.

Even in Libya, as the provincial governments were formed, it was necessary to draw in, at that level, people who came from the villages, thus setting up at that level of government leaders who were in touch with the people in terms of attitudes as well as other things.

Now in the Philippines the elite is still drawn, in considerable measure from the educated land-owner class. They certainly do not feel themselves to be very closely in touch with these people and, as a new elite is formed, drawn from outside this group, my impression is that they like to associate themselves with the old leadership, at least socially.

I remember a cartoon in one of the Manila papers at the time the schools were closing and some of the students were on their way back to their villages from the colleges. The picture showed a young man arriving in his village, greeted by his young brother driving the inevitable water buffalo with a small boy on his back. The lad fresh from school of Manila was made to say, "What did we used to call those things?" He wanted to disassociate himself from the village.

In Indonesia the elite is an educated elite drawn in large measure from the old aristocracy. In commerce or finance, there is very little contact of any kind between the leadership group and the people. One evidence of the prevailing

attitude is the great difficulty in sociological or anthropological research in persuading Indonesians actually to go to the village and spend any time there. They don't like it; they don't feel comfortable there. However, again, the traditional leadership is too small to staff both a cabinet and a civil service at the national level and the provincial and local level, so that as the provincial governments are formed and as the city governments are formed, the administrators and politicians are of necessity drawn from the villagers to a much higher degree.

These comments state the case. Some of them corroborate Pye's basic position; others do not. If such an elite does exist and if in many countries there is a gap between the elite and the peasant, community development workers are confronted with a matter of primary sociological importance. How can this gap be bridged?

Bridging the Gap Between the Elite and the Peasant

One way to bridge the gap would be to educate the elite to an understanding of the peasant and an appreciation for the particular set of problems he faces. In some countries a satisfactory start along this line seems to have been made, largely because the charismatic leaders--usually heads of state--make a concern for the peasant a part of their political platform as well as official policy. But Pye has indicated that this approach can be carried only so far. By the very nature of his training, of the responsibilities he has assumed, of his impatience at trying to help his country catch up with more "advanced" countries, the member of the elite must remain out-of-step with the peasant. But at all costs he should not turn his back upon the peasant if there is to be the kind of political stability described earlier by Dr. Millikan. As Earnest E. Neal, who is actively involved as a consultant in the Philippine Community Development program, wisely pointed out, the community developer must work as hard at educating the elite in the national capital, at the provincial and district centers as at teaching the villager how he can be involved.

Another approach at bridging the gap would be to begin with the villager and figure out how his horizons could be expanded socially, economically, politically to the point that he recognized the utility of the role of the elite and increasingly identified himself with the national government of which the elite are the spokesmen. This will be taken up in some detail in the next issue on the relationship between

the national government and the local community. But it is necessary to record what might be two different, though not necessarily opposed views about how the peasant is to be given this broader perspective. There seemed to be implicit in the Conference discussion the assumption that by extending the political apparatus, by getting the villager to vote, by interesting him in selecting competent representatives, and by improving the services performed by the national government in the villages one would automatically involve him in this broader participation which seems to be one objective of many community development efforts. But one or two dissenting voices asked if the cart were not being put before the horse. Would not this involvement in the national political process be a result of the operation of many non-political factors at the village level. Would not some period of "citizen preparation" be necessary in the local community before the villager were ready to play his role constructively in the national community? Would purposive political action really achieve the goal that was sought? No attempt to answer this question seriously engaged the Conference for the chief attention was being devoted to the political process itself as it affected community development.

Recognizing that problems exist if one tries to make a case for reorienting the members of the elite or the peasants, some middle-of-the-road solution might be possible. The greatest hope in this respect, as some of the comments have shown, is that the elite and the peasant might meet in a useful way in the person of the provincial official, who more and more is being recruited from the ranks of the intellectual who is born in the village but trained outside and who could become an effective intermediary between the traditional elite and the peasants. This gain would be offset, however, if the elite had ways of absorbing such officials into their ranks, even though at a lower social position, but with the effect of making such a person feel identified with the elite and not identified with the peasant.

A more likely solution toward bridging the gap was not discussed at the Conference, not because it would have been an unacceptable idea but because the focus was upon the political complexion of the elite. This solution, experienced by all industrialized societies, lies in the creation of a middle class, whether commercial, industrial, or professional, which serves as a means of social mobility for the lowest groups and

also checks the power of the elite. How soon such a situation will come into existence in most underdeveloped countries depends upon economic and social forces.

Social and Economic Forces at Work

This would indicate that along with the rationalized goals of community development there are implicit or even impersonal forces which have a bearing upon the social structure, and particularly the elite-peasant relationship, in underdeveloped countries. One of these is the redistribution of political power as between countries and within a country; another is the changing system of allocation of human and material resources; a third would be the rising feeling of nationalism and, in some cases, a sense of national destiny. Dr. Dimock took note of this last in the following words:

There is a new factor in the modern world: that is the feeling of comradeship and solidarity and of morale and of unitedness which comes from a recognition of a mission, a national mission. I don't think the word nationalism is really appropriate any more. It is a deep-seated desire to get on with economic development. It is a sense of equality... Because of this solidarity I am inclined to think that the gulf between headquarters and the field instead of becoming wider will become more closed. The village people are becoming more westernized and are taking a more active role.

Dr. Dimock was referring primarily to his experiences in Turkey and Puerto Rico but others showed a realization of world-wide forces which were operating to change the traditional elite-peasant relationship. The discussion of later issues will bring many of these to the forefront.

II. THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Posing the issue: How can one reconcile the dilemma of requiring a great deal of authority, power and political administration in the center in national community development programs and at the same time release a substantial amount of it in decentralized fashion away from the center to small communities?

In the discussion of this issue the comments dealt with three interrelated phases: the first had to do with the fact of and need for participation by local people in the political process; the second to the diverse roles of the administrator, on the one hand,

and the politician, on the other, in their dealings with village people; and the third with the likelihood that peasant pressure groups would arise to settle to their own advantage the redistribution of power from the center.

Community Development and Political Participation

The background paper by Professor Pye stressed the need for the participation by local people in the political process with an argument which ran something like this:

It is possible to have highly efficient programs of community development, largely in the hands of well-trained administrators, which accomplish numerous objectives considered desirable by the central government.

Such a program could very possibly result in the enlargement of the gap between the elite and the peasants since the former could try to impose its ideas and values on the latter.

Nor can one expect the administrators, charged with the responsibility for the programs, to serve as representatives of rural interests. At best the administrators may become responsive to their perceptions of their 'customers' needs, but this can only be a marginal influence since the power relationship is so overwhelmingly in their favor. (p. 40)

The only recourse open to the peasant, therefore, is to have access to the lawmaker--the politician--who theoretically at least in the parliamentary process is in a position to control or at least limit the activities of the administrators of the national programs. True enough, the development of political parties has not been much help in this direction, but somehow or other the rural people must find some effective means of influencing the legislator so that rural interests--and not those of the elite--are truly taken into account.

Admitting that it is hard to give a definite prescription as to how this should be done, Professor Pye does offer some concrete suggestions:

Foreign aid may be a lever which can be used to see that there is a greater investment of resources in the countryside thereby altering somewhat the proportional distribution of resources between the urban and rural.

Greater prestige by various means may be attached to those who work in community development programs and who genuinely seem interested in improving village welfare.

The formation of peasant associations or associations for village leaders might afford a mechanism whereby village people can combine on an intervillage basis to exert stronger influence and run counter to the traditional policy of the elite which can be characterized as mobilizing resources while keeping the countryside fragmented.

Develop the kinds of skills at the village level which are effective in national politics. Very few roles exist comparable to the lawyer in backwoods America or to the country squire or local school teacher. (Pp. 43-46)

In any event, Dr. Pye stresses the necessity of trying to provide the means for people to express their political interests while improving their level of life in the village.

Some of the reactions prompted by this formulation of the problem have already been given in the discussion of Issue One on the Elite and the Peasant. But the matter of political participation came in for extended treatment.

DR. THEODORE SCHULTZ: Whatever the reasons are, some countries have found it possible or appropriate to decentralize power from the center, and this has given political vitality to communities or areas in states. Brazil has done this very substantially and Mexico. In other countries towns of 25,000 or 50,000 just can't move because every decision has to be made in the capital. Callao in the west and Santa Maria on the east side of the mountains of Peru are just lately let loose from Lima.

DR. HIGGINS: If you want to build up a two-way relationship between the masses of the people and politicians and administrator you may want to try to strengthen government at the intermediate level, at the provincial level, at the small city level, which is not the thing which community development programs as ordinarily constructed are designed to do because usually their work is at the village level itself.

DR. NEAL: I don't agree with that conclusion. The programs of community development I know anything about put emphasis on improving government at the district and provincial levels...The services of government cannot flow down to the village level unless you strengthen the lines of government. As soon as you start villagers moving upward, they make more demands on governmental services than the local village-trained leader can deliver. Inevitably the district and provincial technicians become involved. The villagers may request the services of a veterinarian. He may not be there, so the government must provide the services of a veterinarian to the villagers. The same may be true for health officers, agricultural technicians, etc. It is a definite part of the community development program to assist the government in making the services of technical specialists available to village people.

DR. WILBERT MOORE: I wonder if it is fair to say that communities will be integrated to part of the national political and economic life only if certain conditions are met. First, the administrative structure must not have major gaps in a territorial sense, or in any other, so that political liaison is maintained. Second, there must be genuine local political participation, which presumably means something more than simply getting people out to meetings. I suggest that in the absence of these we get one of two results: either the Pye gulf between the village and the national elites or a virulent and paranoid form of nationalism.

But there was a feeling on the part of some that the Conference was not getting sufficiently down to specifics. How, one member asked, do you give the villagers a

wider horizon? The whole problem of developing effective nations is one of evolving a wider and wider sense of community. Along with gaining an experience in dealing with their own health and agriculture, it was pointed out, people must develop an awareness of the kind of issues about which they must cooperate with other parts of the community. There is power in this awareness and cooperation.

But somehow or other a balance needs to be struck between what the local community does and what the national government does.

DR. DIMOCK: To the extent that you increase the portion of central government and centralization, to that extent reciprocally you need to concentrate upon developing strength of the local unit's economy. This is because, in terms of quick advance, the central government is the indicated instrument, but in terms of the long pull the autonomy of and the participation of the local centers is the important thing.

One of the problems therefore is to get local people aware of their influence on their own problems before they participate in terms of a wider national horizon.

Of course, intermediate to the central and local government is the state or provincial government whose spokesmen tend to come out for agricultural needs, irrigation, and land reform while the national planners continue to talk about industrial improvement and industrial change. Lloyd Rodwin observed that some regional expression of the national plan would help local people see the place of the village in the total plan.

Dr. Neal pointed out a few things that were being done to bring the national interest and local interest together in the Philippines. These included a seminar consisting of top officials, such as departmental secretaries, middle officials, and representatives of the peasants. Then, too, the national government sets up specific programs in which it would like for the local people to participate, using a grant-in-aid program when verbal persuasion is not sufficient.

Furthermore, the approach of the government representatives to the village people is a crucial factor in the extent to which they expand their political horizons.

DR. CARL TAYLOR: The first move of community development as we saw it came down in the instructions to the village level worker in India was to caution him and to train him so that when he said, "I come from the government to help you," he would expect to be met by the Indian equivalent of "Oh, yeah, we have had others from the government who said the same thing, but we never found that to be the result." The village level worker was taught that for a matter of

perhaps six months nothing was to be expected that was visible, but that to gain the confidence of the people in the villages was the first mission and to convince them that their own government was on this occasion actually there to help them. This would bind the villagers to the central government.

Finally, Dr. Pye indicated that in arguing for political participation he was really hoping for an increase of plurality of groupings which would reflect various interests or values within the society, so that a man--whatever his interest--would at least find others that would represent the same interest. He would be in a position to make choices. Nor would the choice inevitably lead to the peasantry siding against the central government since much of the peasantry would be with the central government. Dr. Pye continued:

I think that this problem would be reduced somewhat if you had both the land-owning class and the peasantry represented, to some degree, and then let the conflict take place in a political structure where the various units have some idea of the real power of the others. Then you can begin to get a rational process, in the sense that the various actors can begin to make calculations as to what would be the consequences of various actions on their part; in short, a coherent political process.

The Politician Versus the Administrator

The local community is nowadays in touch with the centralized government through two channels: that of the official bureaucracy represented by the agencies performing services, collecting taxes, and otherwise administering programs and that of the elected official from the vicinity who represents the local community in national parliament. In order to be re-elected the politician, if his party is in power, must justify what the government administrators have been doing; if his party is not in power, he must make promises that will win popular support to his cause.

Which of these two types of leaders should have the controlling voice in community development programs: the politician or the administrator? As one participant summarized the argument:

The administrators, by the very nature of their craft, are concerned with goals which are as definite as possible and there is likely to be a great disappointment in case the accomplishment is not as great as the announced goals. This may lead to violence, xenophobia, etc.

The role of the politician must be fuzzy since the politician is the person who carries water on both shoulders and tries to appeal to all kinds of interest; he is a

necessary foil or corrective to the overemphasis of the administrator on the sharp definition of goals.

In some countries, it was thought, administrators are highly attuned politically and there was a tendency for educated people to move back and forth between political and administrative posts. As far as the Philippines are concerned, Dr. Neal pointed out that the community development programs are directly the objective of the political leaders. There the administrators are brought in to administer the program, but it originates, is formulated, and it is put out by the political leadership and not through the Civil Service.

But the question was raised: Do the political leaders give the budgetary support that their verbal emphasis would seem to indicate? Those in charge of community development programs are often short of needed resources under the control of the politicians even though the politicians benefit from those programs which the villagers can see are to their immediate benefit. National programs without local reference prove poor vote-getters.

Obviously, the growing sense of responsibility of political leaders to the electorate and a modification of policies to the benefit of greater numbers is one way of distributing power from the center, the chief issue under discussion at this point. But the administrator, too, has a role in this distribution. Dr. Millikan stated the situation as follows:

Earlier somebody said that the politician goes out and is very much interested in community development but never has any detailed plans for working it out. This is true the world over. Even in this country members of Congress don't think up budgets; they don't even think up laws. The administration is the paid staff which works up these plans and submits them to the legislature, which then debates them. The legislature may change them or put its stamp of approval on them. Actually, the spade work is done by the administration.

The implications of this for community development programs are clear: if the administrators have an awareness of the problems and a sympathy for the programs they can help greatly. Therefore, much attention should be given to educating the administrators as to the reasons for and the nature of such programs. At the same time, according to Dr. Rudolph, the administrator--though aware of important political factors in formulating his programs--must not become a politician. She had this to say:

Presumably, in order to have effective economic development, you have to maintain some kind of impartial administrator. There is the danger in some

countries that as the legislator becomes more important he begins to have an effect on the administrator.

In the Indian situation what sometimes happens is that the legislator, usually a Congress Party man, goes to the administrator and says, "These are good Congress Party villagers. I hope you'll take special care of them." Presumably the legislator has a responsibility to those villagers which have elected members of his party. The tendency has been for administrators to yield to this pressure increasingly because the legislator can go to the State Cabinet and say, "Look, this district collector isn't doing the job I am telling him to do; depose him; send him to a less favorable post."

As the discussion continued it was obvious that effective community development programs were dependent upon effective government, both in the legislative and executive branches. Dr. Dimock saw the need for balance:

I think the solution is to be found in the control function of the legislature. If the legislature concentrated upon reviewing proposals from the administration, putting their stamp of approval on it and exercising control to see there was no abuse of power, you would have a distribution of authority within the government, which is probably the best that you can possibly secure.

Peasant Pressure Groups

But with politicians and administrators what they are will the peasants even benefit from national development to a fair extent if they do not form their own pressure groups? Are these necessary if there is to be any redistribution of power from the center to the local communities?

DR. CORA DUBOIS: I should like to hear someone discuss peasant unions that are organized under the auspices of political parties or labor unions of one sort or another.

DR. ALLAN R. HOLMBERG: I know of one instance of this kind in Peru which covered quite an area some years ago. They organized a rural league of peasants in Ankasha Province for the political department and it received the support of a number of villages. This resulted in an attempt, largely on the part of the peasants, to get hold of land of their own. When the party which had organized this league was thrown out of power the new government used force to keep this league from reaching any fruition.

MR. ISAACS: The Chinese and Russian experience would indicate that the peasants, by the very nature of their social organization and their cultural level, do not organize a peasant political movement which has a continuous character in support of consistent and fairly generalized goals.

DR. RUDOLPH: I think the kind of organization that has sprung up has been

mostly that of the well-to-do-peasants. What you tend to get are land-owner associations that press for land-owner interests.

One participant observed that in some countries such as Turkey the rural population has gotten a considerable degree of control over the central government, has affected the party structure, and has limited the freedom of Turkish planners to a degree not yet encountered in India. Another participant suggested that perhaps political development in the world today had gone beyond the stage of peasant parties. Instead, since most issues were decided at the national level, the national parties were more effective means by which the people could express their opinions than any kind of party based on local considerations or the interests of one economic segment alone. According to Dr. Neal, the governments sponsoring national programs of community development were not interested in seeing these programs become the bases for the creation of partisan political groups. Instead, he pointed out, the government is more concerned with the use of community development as an instrument for bringing the dissatisfactions of the people to the government and in turn taking the steps that will solve these problems. In such cases a democratic form of government is an accepted thing so the people are not fighting off a repressive government but rather finding in community development a way of speeding up the democratic processes within a reform government.

But Dr. Malenbaum said that he interpreted most community development programs not as consciously-formulated political programs but rather programs devoted toward improving the welfare of the citizenry. The question then becomes one of the political consequences of expanding the opportunity to learn, of learning of one's potential as a citizen. Out of this would eventually emerge a greater participation than has been seen in the past. People would become more politically conscious and would sooner or later take into their own hands some of the power which had formerly rested exclusively with the elite.

III. THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AS AN APPROACH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Francis Bator, the Chairman of the session on economic development, opened with a statement of the kinds of problems involved in analyzing the relations between economic development and community development:

DR. BATOR: Our focus this evening is to be on the role of community development in generating economic growth, i.e., growth of output per head. In particular, given the goal of expanding output per capita, what volume of scarce resources is it sensible to devote to community development?

The question can be split in two: First, what volume of scarce capital and administrative resources is to be allocated to small unit agricultural activities, local public works, local roads, wells, irrigation, ditching, and to rural small unit cottage industry? Two, how efficient is community development as an administrative and organizational device for organizing such scarce resources?

In relation to the first question, the allocation of investible resources, the chairman suggested that the conference discuss the "issues of fact and prediction in terms of which the community development 'optimists' or 'pessimists' would have to defend their position." He suggested the following partial list:

First, what are the opportunities for getting lots of extra output in community development type activities with only small input of scarce capital and administrative resources? The optimist claim that the employment of lots of plentiful unskilled labor in combination with only a little capital and administrative talent would yield a large return in output per scarce resource input. The pessimist, on the other hand, argues that this fritters scarce capital resources on activities which will yield very little output per unit of capital. The optimist--and this concerns a second issue--would assert that community development activity involves and leads to a higher volume of capital formation than would otherwise prevail; in effect, when a man's time is used to help build a road in the village, or to help dig a well, this is in itself an act of saving and an act of investment which would not occur but for the community development activity. The pessimist disagrees. He thinks that if you concentrate a high proportion of investment resources on community development-type projects, you will get a much more widely dispersed distribution of income, and inevitably this will result in a lower volume of saving hence investment, because the fiscal machinery will be incapable of generating the volume of public saving which it could do if more income were concentrated in the cities.

DR. BATOR: A third issue, it seems to me, concerns not the direct capital and administrative organizational cost per unit of output in community development-type activity as against urban industrial investment, but the non-directly attributable social capital costs of such activity. If industrial investment means drawing a lot of people into the cities, you have to provide housing,

transport, etc., which may be more expensive there than similar needs in the country. On the other hand, it can be argued, that the net effect on output more than offsets these disadvantages in terms of social capital.

The fourth obviously critical issue is one of population growth. Will a high allocation of scarce resources to community-type investment tend to trigger substantially higher fertility rates than concentrated investment in urban areas?

A fifth issue concerns what I shall call in the economist's jargon "external effects." What are the benefits other than the value of extra output which may be associated with a high allocation of investible resources into community development-type activities, as against such benefits due to allocation to urban industrial-type activities? What are the effects on skill training, on attitudes toward work, on changes in the value patterns of the people, all of which will influence productivity and output later? Are there considerations of this sort, which may outweigh considerations of current output?

As to the second question, the efficacy of community development as an organizational device, there exists a whole set of additional issues. In particular, given whatever volume of resources are to be applied to small unit agriculture, local public works, etc., what are the advantages and disadvantages in terms of administrative efficiency, decentralization, etc., of the community development method, as against other possible organizational modes?

Despite this clear-cut call to action, the Conference participants dealt with only some of these questions in any detail and treated none of them in conclusive fashion. In particular, most of the discussion concerned Bator's first question: the allocation of scarce resources to community development-type activity. This was followed by discussion of specific gains from village-centered community development programs; and the problems of population growth.

Allocation of Scarce Resources

Dr. Malenbaum in his background paper approaches the problem of allocation as follows:

The argument for the allocation of scarce resources to the rural areas is based both on the opportunities for increased output there and the need to counter the present levels of migration to the large cities. Major urban centers are already overpopulated relative to work opportunities and social overhead facilities. It is unlikely that even high levels of industrial and urban investment will be able to absorb present labor surpluses for some years, but the rural-urban flow persists. Increased opportunities in rural and smaller-urban activities can be a decisive influence here; it can also serve to expand the market for the output of modern industry. (Pp. 12-14)

Through the community development technique, rural output can be expanded at relatively low cost in resources which have alternative uses. This is due to

the possibility of utilizing labor without additional wage compensation, plus local surpluses of goods which might otherwise be consumed or used for investment which might have lower priority from a national viewpoint. (p. 6, p. 12)

But Dr. Malenbaum recognizes the formidable task ahead in the effort to interest the government and people of an underdeveloped country, with their present attitudes and motivations toward economic progress, in such programs of mutual improvement. He characterizes the problem as less one of advisability than of feasibility.

Dr. Higgins, who also prepared a background paper dealing with the economic aspects of community development, takes a quite different view. He thinks that only community development programs which move people off of the land rather than attract them to remain in the villages can be justified.

Only a rapid change to extensive, mechanized agriculture, with enough industrialization to absorb the population displaced from the rural sector, will assure a take-off into steady growth. Indeed, economic development is tantamount to getting people out of agriculture. (p. 59)

Insofar as community development programs remain part of the technical assistance provided by Western countries they absorb budget funds, reducing the amounts available for other foreign aid projects. They utilize technical expertise from the Western countries which is scarce even in these countries. The same is true of administrative personnel in aid-giving countries. Community development also uses at least some budget funds and capital goods of underdeveloped countries, no matter how simple the community development projects may be. More serious, they absorb the extremely scarce administrative and technical capacities of personnel in the underdeveloped country. (p. 63)

This does not constitute an argument against community development as such, but only against community development projects of a kind to make life more attractive in the villages, as opposed to projects designed to facilitate a flow of people from the rural to the industrial sector. Economic development, as here defined, requires both agricultural improvement of a kind involving a shift to more extensive and mechanized agriculture, and more rapid industrialization. (p. 64)

In the discussion based on these papers a few supported the Higgins thesis but the majority seemed to side with the Malenbaum position. Professor Schultz presented an idea that remained the center of attention throughout most of the session. He suggested that what was necessary was the allocation of resources to those areas of the economy where there would be high rates of return.

DR. SCHULTZ: If you find communities where they are earning 40, 50, 60, 100 percent returns on their resources, these are likely to be situations where people are also going to cut down their consumption to have a little more to put into that very productive stream.

He then reviewed recent economic development in Brazil, Mexico, Jamaica, and Guatemala and said:

This is largely bringing new knowledge into play and producing new skills in the people. This is where the payoff is, in large part, and surely one can do this in each of these two ways: in some circumstances it may come off better with a community development approach and in others through line organizations of the sort associated with the agricultural extension service.

Dr. Rodwin suggested that if he were an administrator charged with economic development he might be tempted to apply resources to industry rather than agriculture because in the former there is less uncertainty about returns--the techniques are more readily available and can be adopted from other countries. Agricultural potentials can be determined after a much more lengthy process of research. David Bell pointed out that in Pakistan many visiting agricultural experts were quite confident that they could prescribe high return activities and changes in methods which would pay off in relatively short order and without a lot of experimentation.

DR. BELL: I myself saw at least two cases where this was done. One is the well-known illustration of the so-called Japanese method of rice cultivation. There were Japanese farmers in both wings of Pakistan who were showing the local farmers, on the first crop, so to speak, that it was possible to expand production very much. The other illustration involves an American extension agent working up in the northwest frontier who is putting in hybrid corn.

DR. HOLMBERG: We had a technician come into Peru for a few days who said, "If you do this one step, two steps, three steps, and four steps, I will guarantee you will get this." We did and got 400 percent production in one year.

DR. JOHN BLACK: The question still remains, although the Japanese farmer came in and got a few farmers to do it, how fast would it spread? Even in the United States, your corn in Iowa took 10 years.

DR. GEORGE ROSEN: I was just thinking of the case of Japan which I am surprised no one has mentioned. There you did have a very substantial increase in agricultural output, a whole development of the silk industry, based almost entirely upon the farms, as well as a substantial increase in rice production per capita. I don't know whether this occurred through a formal community development program or not but it did occur with government assistance, and the Japanese government was successful in siphoning off the increases in productivity to finance the industrial development that occurred in Japan. If this could occur in Japan and if this is what Professor Schultz would call a high-yielding area it would be worthwhile to find other such areas of activity in other countries.

DR. BELL: We have been talking as though an allocation of resources to

community development is an allocation of resources to agricultural improvement. To some extent, of course, that is true, and in most community development programs, agricultural improvement is a high priority component. But I think, also, it contains a lot of other things and many of those other things are not easily measurable in return on investment calculation.

DR. BLACK: I think what we are really interested in here is how well these people really live, raising the level of living or well-being of these people in the villages. In underdeveloped countries this is the highest order of political and other importance. It is much more than agriculture if you get a supply of pure drinking water that haven't had it before, if you get a medical center or clinic set up where the members of the village can get help in the problems of child care, if you can build a schoolhouse and get education started, if you make a connection between the village and a highway so that the people in the village can find a way out and make contact with the world. These can be done quite largely with otherwise unutilized labor and I would say, to all intents and purposes, that you may have almost doubled the well-being and the way of living of these people without touching agriculture at all.

DR. DIMOCK: I remember that one time I had lunch with the Governor of Puerto Rico, who said: "The thing that most concerns me about the economic development in Puerto Rico is that the characteristics of our common people, their aesthetic characteristics are being lost as the result of going to large cities and working in factories. I want to do something to counteract that tendency and therefore we are going to concentrate more of our programs in the villages." This suggests that what we ought to work for, contrary to some of the implications of the background papers that I have read, is a program of balanced development. The idea that the index of advance is the number of people that annually leave farms for the cities leaves me utterly unconvinced.

Dr. Bator, serving as chairman asked: Is the economic criterion--output per head--really going to rule the roost, and should it? He expressed surprise that there was not more of a challenge by the non-economists at the implicit presumption agreed upon by the economists that the sensible rule to follow in terms of investment allocation was to look for high yields without any reference, except incidentally, to non-economic factors.

DR. MELVIN TUMIN: What is it the economists are agreed upon? I don't quite see.

DR. BATOR: It seems to me they have agreed that in making a decision as to what resources ought to be allocated to these agricultural and nonagricultural type community development activities, the thing to watch for are those activities which yield an awful lot of output per input of the big scarcities: capital and skilled people, especially administrators.

DR. LERNER: I think you need some sort of context. Just finding a high yield area is itself not enough. Any such area, to be developed, requires some social overhead capital. This is just what is hardest to do because investment in social overhead requires risk--behavior over a long time--perspective, by both entrepreneurs and bureaucrats, which is conspicuously lacking in the underdeveloped countries. To do anything about this situation one would have to take the traditional institutions apart--maybe smash the extended family, maybe introduce compulsory schooling and labor service. In any case, one would have to change the traditional structure of motivation and behavior. To do that one would also need money, and I would suppose that economists must figure out, in any community or economic development project, the proportion of direct costs that ought to be written in as social overhead costs.

But the agreement among economists was not as profound as it first appeared. Dr. Malenbaum estimated that whereas Dr. Higgins might put only 5 to 10 percent of the total investment program into the rural sector he would be inclined to place from 25 to 30 percent there. But Dr. Higgins replied that under certain circumstances--large scale, mechanized agriculture--he might put the bulk of the investment into the rural sector, but certainly not if the holdings were from 2 to 5 acres. Further amplification of the economists' position was given by Dr. Higgins.

DR. HIGGINS: I think much of the difference between Mr. Malenbaum's presentation and mine arises from the difference in context in which community development programs seem to be discussed in India and in Indonesia. My fear so far as Indonesia, and to a lesser degree the Philippines, are concerned is that community development will come to be regarded as a panacea. The government says, "We don't like foreign investment, we don't like foreign aid because it might commit us in one way or another; we certainly don't like to contemplate any governmental system to increase savings and we certainly can't impose any increase in taxes, and you people tell us if we don't have one or the other of these things, we can't develop." Then along comes an Indian enthusiast and he whirls through the country in three months and says, "What you need is a community development program," and the Indonesians seize on that. They say, "Here we are: no savings, no local investment, no taxes, no foreign aid, no foreign investment and we are going to have a big increase in income through community development." They are going to be disappointed for by this plan they are not going to get significant increases in per capita income. What I fear is that after 10, 20 years of this kind of gradualized program, the frustrated people will say, "Let's try the Communist route; this doesn't seem to work."

DR. MALENBAUM: I had a feeling that when Mr. Higgins was describing the characteristics of government leadership in Indonesia more than possible alternative paths for economic growth. I am hesitant to infer that a very well-formulated hard-headed program of industrial expansion would fare much better in Indonesia. There is no formula for growth which is independent of the people

who administer it. Indeed, in the final analysis, leadership is decisive.

By this time it was clear that non-economic factors did play a part in economic development and some of the economists present were pointing out the need of making detailed village studies where community development is underway to collect more empirical data about the economic effects of such programs. Until this is done the problem of allocation of national resources would continue to rest on philosophical or political grounds instead of upon hard economic facts. But the Conference members were interested in looking into some of the possible economic gains from community development programs even though much of the discussion had to be speculative in character.

Economic Gains from Community Development Type Activities

Toward the close of the session on community development and economic change the Chairman, Dr. Bator, raised again a question he had posed earlier:

DR. BATOR: What are the possibilities for very low cost kinds of local, village-type public works such as local roads, wells, irrigation ditches, and the like, which yield in terms of any sensible valuation a lot of output fast in terms of the resources it uses? What I have in mind is very, very cheap because it primarily relies on unskilled labor, which is around anywhere, hence people don't have to move any distance. They can stay at home and be fed at home. Agricultural output doesn't fall because the people working on such projects can be drawn off during the off-season. What are the opportunities for these kinds of things? One hears anecdotes out of China, but the truth is difficult to ascertain. What are the elementary facts?

In the case of India, one person pointed out, the savings from such programs (roads, schools, etc.) were about \$150 million dollars, a sum which would have had to be spent if techniques other than the community development program had been used. But many of the economic gains were considered indirect: basic changes in the attitudes of the village people with significant increase in output per man, increased levels of living broaden the market for the increased capacity for other parts of the economy. A point stressed by Dr. Malenbaum in his paper was the increase in rural savings which, in a country such as India, result when excess food over farm consumption may not be marketed but utilized for payment to labor working on farm improvement, or on maintenance and improvement of the farmer's house.

But, again, few detailed studies existed which helped one answer adequately the

question which the chairman had put. Estimates did exist for one or two countries but these were insufficient to serve as the bases for making policy decisions as to the nation-wide allocation of scarce resources.

The Problems of Population Growth

It was inevitable that the connection between community development and over-population would be explored. The background papers on economic growth had called attention to this point as did Professor Moore who gave the critique of these papers:

DR. MOORE: I would not say that increased production of a rural community will raise fertility but, at least, it is not likely to reduce it much if there has not been a coordinate change in the value structure applicable to the family and a considerable reordering of family values towards individual mobility and towards saving the lives of a limited number of children. It is a waste to populate graveyards with children who do not live to a productive period and pay back what they have drained from the economy.

DR. LEAVELL: It has been pointed out that if you do want to kill people off, it is much cheaper in the end to do this by war or famine. This means that the agricultural economists are perhaps more at fault than the public health people in upsetting the population balance. It is much cheaper that people die quickly than to die over a long period of time from disease. There aren't unfortunately, enough data on this thing to give us the conviction that we ought to have.

DR. MALENBAUM: I would include population control as a part of any kind of public health program in an underdeveloped area.

Professor Schultz pointed out that the treatment of population growth as an economic variable was important but something with which the economist was not alone prepared to deal. He thought that it should be on the agenda but that each economist would have to speculate about the matter in his own way. Professor Higgins indicated that there was one answer that economists could give:

DR. HIGGINS: If you don't know what the impact of a development program on population growth will be, make sure that your rate of increase in income exceeds any biologically possible rate of increase.

DR. GEORGE FOSTER: I would like to ask whether the rate of reduction in population increase in the industrial world would be sufficient to relieve the problem in those parts of the world in which the pressure on the land, almost to the extent of standing room only, appears to be a critical level. I can't see the possibility in India of reducing the rate of population increase through industrialization to the rate of the United States.

DR. BATOR: Actually, output in the Indian economy has been growing at a percentage rate somewhat higher than the best estimates of population growth.

DR. MALENBAUM: Taking the last five years as a whole. May I ask Dr. Leavell with reference to rural-urban fertility in India, is there any significant difference in rural areas as against those in urban areas?

DR. LEAVELL: I think there is little difference. You might be interested to know that some people from the School of Public Health at Harvard are working on an experiment in rural India and it is quite possible from present indications to reduce birth rates in villages by 50 percent.

DR. MOORE: There is some evidence from a variety of areas in the world, including India, that it is not the female element of the population who are the observers of tradition in this respect. It is the males.

DR. BADEAU: The population increase in Egypt coincided, by and large, with the British occupation which produced two factors other than irrigation (to which a previous allusion had been made): one was the beginning of health services, which cut down the death rate although it did not increase the birth rate. The other was the provision of certain internal security for the peasant which also cut down inter-village fighting and all of the other things which make it difficult for families to flourish.

Actually the birth control problem in Egypt is tied in with the fact that you have a social structure in which the number of children which a woman bears is very closely related to her economic security. As long as divorce remains easy and relatively uncontrolled by the state, there is a tendency for women to have large families because the divorce curve almost exactly parallels the number of male children a woman has. If a woman has four male sons she is practically never divorced. This is a religious and sociological factor and not an economic one at all.

These statements and others like them indicated that the economic benefits of community development would depend to a great degree upon the extent of natural increase that accompanied them. From the economic standpoint, admittedly only one way of viewing the problem, the development program should lead to the accumulation of resources which makes possible the "take-off" which underdeveloped countries must experience if they are to move steadily toward the kind of economic growth known in the western world.

* * * * *

The answer given to the central issue of the contribution of community development programs national economic growth was at best inconclusive. The economists demonstrated in their discussion that the economic implications of these programs were highly

significant. Whether they assisted or hindered economic growth depended upon the model of economic growth which one happened to be using.* It was also apparent from the discussion that community development involved more than economic factors and that economic growth itself, even viewed narrowly, was tied in with its social context.

DR. MOORE: In studying economic growth one has to identify a number of non-economic variables. For example, one does assume that there is some market mechanism for the exchange of goods and services and for the allocation of capital and the factors of production. This is a social arrangement of considerable importance and it cannot always be assumed that what we think of as a market system actually exists in undeveloped areas. Or take the question of the financial organization--not the general medium of exchange but the method of mobilizing credit related to the physical policies of growth. This is an institutional arrangement of importance as are such matters as transfer of property rights, transfer of liquid capital with some kind of a bookkeeping system to keep track of who is debtor and who is creditor.

Many institutional arrangements involve an extension to areas hitherto fairly immune to the rational spirit. This is the notion that nature is somehow or other subject to manipulation and control, that this nature includes not only man's non-human environment but--even more revolutionary--that it includes his social environment. It also holds that intervention is possible, that ends can be stated, and that purposive action can be taken in achieving those ends. This revolutionary notion has many barriers to its extension because it tends to intrude into long-held and deeply-felt beliefs of all sorts, of which the irrational approach to reproduction control is one of the most crucial.

But an awareness of the non-economical factors does not minimize the need for asking and seeking to answer the questions that the economists rightly raise. Granting that economic development is only one aspect of national change, it still follows that the economic aspects of community development are definitely tied in with national economic development. These economic aspects, local in scope, need to be carefully studied and measured. Only when this is done can their importance be weighed against alternative approaches to national economic development. The formulation of national policies can then be based on these economic considerations as well as the political and social objectives to which they are related.

* For a description of such models see the background paper by Professor Higgins.

IV. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SOCIAL CHANGE

Posing the issue: 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?

The very fact that Professor Tumin's background paper on Some Social Requirements for Effective Community Development seemed to pose the problem in these terms was enough to assure that the issue would be joined. He had stated in the conclusion of his very provocative paper:

Because our knowledge of probable outcome is so provisional and so necessarily hedged by all types of contingencies, I personally advocate the greatest caution in interfering in the lives of others, no matter for what reason, unless they specifically ask for help. Even when help is asked for, it is still highly doubtful, from a moral and ethical point of view, whether one ought to provide such help if he knows beforehand that in some significant ways the lives of the people concerned are going to be affected above and beyond the solution of the immediate problem. (p. 46)

The discussion of his point of view led into an examination of some of the philosophical implications of purposeful change, the problem of the shifts in value systems and culture patterns, the connection between local participation and external change, and the connection between motivation and the levels of aspiration. Each of these will be taken up in turn.

The Philosophical Implications of Purposeful Change

The two discussants of Dr. Tumin's paper thought it necessary to challenge his personal evaluation (stated above) even though they readily granted that it was a point of view well worth examination.

DR. DUBOIS: I do not believe that the movement in the direction of Westernization or modernism, is any longer a matter of choice in the West. It is neither our privilege to bestow or withhold it...

Furthermore, no discussion of economic, social, or political change can properly be considered without attention to alternatives. And a consideration of alternatives, I think, may often force us into the lesser of two evils in a world which is, after all, something less than the best of all possible worlds.

It seems to me that the leadership and even the peoples of most of the world aspire to the material well-being of the West and even aspire to some of the social-political structures that are associated with that material well-being, whether they be necessary or accidental adhesions.

I would suggest that, as far as possible, we stop arguing whether Western value systems are good or bad but rather treat these as we would any social science data. And the topic that we really have to treat is the highly selective set of values that non-Western nations aspire to. It seems that our task as social scientists is seriously to analyze the relationships between the values selected and the potentialities for achieving them.

Dr. Badeau, a second discussant of the paper, dealt with the philosophical implications of change:

DR. BADEAU: Mr. Tumin raised the question, to use his own phrase, of the right to lay hands on other people's lives. Now, this is a very necessary and a very sobering consideration. For one thing, it is a clear recognition that the foreign technician does and cannot avoid making value judgments in a community development program. The theory that the villager always decides what he wants to do uninhibitedly simply doesn't work.

On the other hand, I am not nearly as much disturbed about this factor as Mr. Tumin. We are not the only people that are trying to lay our hands on other peoples' lives, and I don't mean the Russians at all. I mean that the whole of the peasant society in Arabia and now, I think, in Africa has had violent hands laid upon it by the modern world.

Take the oil industry in Saudi Arabia that is breaking that society apart. It isn't the case, it seems to me, of deciding whether or not through community development or any other device we are going to lay our hands on the lives of other people. The question is, rather, who is going to lay hands and for what purposes... Some of the discussion we have had overestimates the ability of a foreign community development service to come in and take control of lives. My experience has been that both the villager and the village community is extraordinarily resistant to not doing what they don't want to do.

But Dr. Tumin had a chance to reply. He pointed out that those who differed were merely posing one value against another. After all, one could refrain from being the agent of change if one chose.

DR. TUMIN: If I have added what is called a romantic philosophical point of view it is because in the total venture with which I was charged to study--community development--there is a thoroughgoing mixture of some materials from social science and some materials from a particular type of benign imperialism called Western democratic community value, using the words in the better sense and not the worst.

...I am only suggesting that if we do not have the kind of knowledge which some of the community development reports suggest that we do have--and I think there is a tremendous amount of overclaiming in the literature--then the decision to be willing to lay hands upon others, with whatever benign motives we might have, is fraught with danger.

Two of the eight major findings which Dr. Tumin drew from community-development

experience dealt with social change. In the first place, he pointed out that a community development program tends to substitute new problems for old ones, a fact difficult to impress upon a population not accustomed to thinking in terms of social change and problem-solving. Community development, in other words, will not help people get rid of all of their problems. In the second place, the outcomes of social change--as already indicated--cannot be fully predicted. According to Dr. Tumin:

Community development theory is thus forced to face the fact that both the short-range and the long-range consequences of development, and both the anticipated and unanticipated consequences, will be mixed. Some will be viewed as benign, some as destructive and undesirable by the locals as well as by the externals. Not even the most controlled social change, nor the best intentioned, nor the best equipped, nor the most thoughtful and reflective has ever been able to avoid producing mixed results. (p. 32)

This statement, too, prompted the discussants to comment:

DR. DUBOIS: I find that Mr. Tumin is oppressed with the number of problems in the world and he sees programs of development as either substituting new problems for old, even perhaps intensifying old problems rather than reducing them. This is a judgment, that warrants investigation rather than assertion, although I realize that proof would be difficult to marshal.

And even if it were true that economic development multiplies the choices that people face, I would like to suggest that some people are exhilarated by problems and choices rather than oppressed by them. This was the point that Mr. Pye was making earlier when he was stressing the importance of a variety of choices. Mr. Pye is apparently one of the persons who views these possibilities of multiple choices with elation and Mr. Tumin does not.

Professor DuBois suggested that the chief task was not one of prediction, which is something too difficult to tackle. The task is that of defining categories of social context within which one should select the best diagnostic factors. One must compare comparables and not place a disease eradication campaign, planned at the national level, on a par with a private multi-purpose improvement scheme, planned at the village level. We must establish meaningful categories and isolate the significant diagnostic elements before we can predict with any certainty.

DR. BADEAU: I think in a certain sense that all Mr. Tumin is saying is that all life is unpredictable and that we live in a particularly unpredictable age. I think, however, we meet this somewhat if we recognize that community development is not so much the attainment of a series of goals as it is the inauguration of a process... And while it is indeed impossible to say what this process will bring to any particular society in any particular country, the direction in which

it is going to travel and, therefore, the values that are inherent in it can be somewhat more sharply defined.

I have no fear of laying hands on the village unless we are willing to resign the village life of Arabia and the Middle East to undirected chaos which, I think, is the direction in which it is moving. I think that giving it some direction is a good deal better than allowing it to mill around in the ruin of its own historic directions and cultures.

Dr. Tumin countered with the observation that viewing community development as a process rather than as a set of goals increases rather than lessens its unpredictability. He also reminded the Conference that he wanted the analysis in his paper to serve as an antidote or a warning sign to those who, in the name of community development, were naively inducing change without any conception of the effects of their behavior.

DR. TUMIN: I am only arguing actually in the paper against that kind of hypereuphoric notion regarding community development which says--which waves flags about: Hurrah, we are solving problems.

I am too well aware of the fact from watching the little bit of history of man that I know of the extent to which every successful resolution of a large problem that has ever confronted man has proceeded, in the very process of resolution, to create for him other problems.

Now, this doesn't say, "Let's do nothing." It simply says that we should know how to move from one type of problem context into another...

This discussion apparently stated the case pro and con to everyone's satisfaction because no other participants delved anew into the philosophical implications. They continued very much interested in the problem of change but turned to other facets of it.

Community Development and Shifts in Value Systems

Throughout the Conference there was an awareness of the variations in value systems from country to country and an emphasis upon their importance, although no attempt was made to define them. Dr. Millikan had stated that one objective of United States foreign policy was the development of value systems in other countries which would make essential cooperation with the rest of the world more possible and more likely.

Dr. Leavell, in his visit to India, was struck by the differences between the British and the Brahman value systems.

DR. LEAVELL: I asked an anthropologist how the Brahmans had reacted to the English when they first came in. He said, "Obviously, we sized these people up as outcastes and unclean. I mean they obviously were: they ate beef, they used pocket handkerchiefs, they didn't take a bath every day, they did a lot of

things that made them fit into our untouchable class. But we had to modify our view when we saw that they could build telegraphs and railways and roads and factories, and that these things were pretty nice. So finally, we did invite them to our houses, even for meals. But when they left, we washed down the whole place with cow dung to purify it, since cow dung is a purifying agent."

Furthermore, Dr. Moore in his discussion of the economic papers, had stressed the importance of understanding the value system even in comprehending how the economy worked. Thus, the connection between change and a shifting value system was recognized at many points. Dr. Tumin put this in somewhat capsule form when he pointed out what was in store for people who changed from traditional peasant ways to those of the Western world:

For, in store for such people, if past experiences are any guide, are:

(1) changes from sacred to secular sanctions for the way of life;

(2) loss of the securities and stabilities of kin-based social relations in exchange for the gains, such as they may be, of relatively individualized and self-determining existences;

(3) the need for ever-increasing attention to the making of choices among alternatives, as against the faithful following of prefabricated formulae;

(4) increasing involvement in a world of ever-expanding desires for more material goods and services, no matter what level has already been reached;

(5) sharp generational discontinuities instead of the smooth flow of assumption of social obligations and positions in conformity with traditional criteria of age and generation;

(6) increase in the diversity and competition among the numerous roles which any individual most play in the round of social life, as against the relative internal consistency of roles in the limited round of traditional life;

(7) the continuous quest for purpose and meaning in a world which offers numerous possible sets of purposes, but guarantees none as adequately as did the traditional society. (p. 45)

In his paper he also postulated that "every relatively successful project of community development has in some way or other adversely affected the basic traditions and cultural themes of the local community. It has proven impossible to solve substantial problems of material conditions of life without in some way disrupting traditional understandings, social organization, and cultural balance." (p. 13) At the same time he pointed out that if a community development program is to exist it must have as a necessary condition "the presence of a value system such that an active preference emerges for the prices and profits of attempting to solve the problem rather than for those which accrue from continued tolerance of the problem." (p. 39)

Although many agreed that there was much resistance to change on the part of peasants, the reverse also proved true. According to Dr. Foster, it is astonishing to find with what facility the villagers will drop the mantle of culture when they can perceive the advantage of so doing.

DR. FOSTER: Several years ago one of my then associates in the Smithsonian Institution was making an analysis of certain health problems and particularly the resistances of people--expectant mothers in this case--in Ecuador to hospital care.

And in the city of Quito a splendid maternity hospital was built and, if I recall correctly, within a couple of years approximately two-thirds of the live births in the community were occurring in this fine new hospital.

My associate, Charles Erasmus, interviewed a large number of mothers while they were in the hospital and listened to their complaints and gripes. The mothers complained that the nurses opened the windows at night and that fresh air came in--"and you know that is terribly dangerous;" and they bathe us--"and that is the worst possible thing they could do;" and they make us clean our fingernails--"and nobody ever has cleaned our fingernails for forty days following birth;" and they make us drink orange juice in the morning with our breakfast--"and that is terribly dangerous for the child and it is dangerous for me."

But they all added that they noticed when they went back home that "our babies are healthier than they have ever been before."

One way of viewing community development, therefore, is in terms of its effort to induce change in the value system since such a change usually goes along with changes in behavior. But should change be ordered from outside or should it be so paced that it follows local acceptance and participation? There were few advocates of the "gradualistic" school of social change. If there had been they would have had to face the onslaught of Professor Moore.

DR. MOORE: Over the short run, you might argue that community development programs ease the transition to a modern integrated economy. You base this argument essentially on the doctrine that you start from where you are and you disturb as little as possible the traditional social structure. I find that this is proposed by people who are peasant lovers, who have a somewhat distorted notion of peasant communities and certainly a distorted notion of the general level of health, material well-being, and general satisfaction on the part of local people. This approach may confirm all the archaic elements in the traditional social structure, bolster them, and effect what is precisely not needed with reference to long-term, continuing economic growth.

Although he did not qualify as a "peasant lover" Lawrence K. Frank did show some concern over the necessity for trying to maintain a "dynamic stability" in societies where

the members are moving away from their traditional belief systems and are developing aspirations hard to fulfill. He sees a social order as a design for living which people have developed and maintained over the generations and which consists of several channels of communication--economic, political, social, religions, aesthetic. Through the centuries tradition has been the unseen guiding hand. Dynamic stability comes about when the channels of communication, similar in nature to what are often called institutions, are able to withstand changes such as droughts, etc. and to roll with the punches and yet come back to maintain a continuous integrity of their social order--integrity in the sense that it goes on.

Then he moved to the theme of the weakening of tradition.

DR. FRANK: In some cases, tradition has been lost or repudiated; in other cases it has been badly eroded or weakened. People have lost faith in what they live by and for. You might compare the social order to the magnetic field with its iron particles. As long as the magnet is there, the current on, the particles maintain an orderly special relationship to each other. If the magnet is turned off, then you see erratic movement. That is what is happening throughout the world with the emergence of new aspirations.

Dr. Frank pointed out that as long as man continues to be man he will face the problems of physical survival, of maintaining a social order, of rearing children. But these age-old problems must be reformulated in our day in terms of the new ideas, new techniques, new sensibilities, and new aspirations abroad in the world. This is done through a reshaping of what he calls the communication channels, which makes the discussion of political development or of economic development so tremendously important. A democratic or a democratic-aspiring society is one that will conduct a continuous essay or evaluation of all its laws, institutions, practices, and beliefs in the interest of seeing that no individual, no matter how unimportant or insignificant, is unnecessarily deprived, neglected, frustrated, or humiliated in the carrying on of his culture.

Granting the correctness of Dr. Frank's analysis, there still remained the problem of describing the mechanism by which change is made a part of the social order. Perhaps part of the explanation is afforded in an examination of the significance of local participation.

Local Participation and External Change

The involvement of rural people in the national political process calls for participation

of these people in governmental affairs at the community level—a fact already stressed in the discussion of the relation of the central government to community development. Likewise, the economists had recognized that economic development affecting the villagers requires entrepreneurial decisions on their part, which is still another form of participation. But a community development program per se, as usually defined nowadays, tends to accept participation as a social good in itself or as the most effective mechanism for incorporating change into the local culture patterns. The argument runs to the effect that people who actively participate in deciding what they are to do, who have a leading role in the conduct of the plans they have developed, who can justifiably take credit for the changes occurring in their midst will be more apt to perpetuate the innovations than if they had merely been ordered to carry them out.

As a matter of fact, Ernest Witte indicated that he considered participation to be "the core of the method in community development." Several other Conference members raised interesting points about the importance of participation in a program of purposeful change:

DR. MILLIKAN: In the underdeveloped countries more and more of the basic decisions about the way these countries are run have to be taken on some kind of national basis. It is not going to be possible to have as large a proportion of the decisions affecting the lives of a particularly small community made by a small community itself, as has been the case in the past. Therefore, it seems to me that the gap in community development efforts, up to now, has been a gap in attention as to how you generate some greater participation of the local communities in the kind of decisions which affect them, to be sure, but affect them via national politics.

DR. BADEAU: Local participation can have interesting consequences. We (the Near East Foundation) started a cooperative in Jelalabad in Iran which, after two years, the mayor of the village finally joined. He was an appointee of the central government who had been nominated by the local landlords. At the first meeting, since he was the mayor of his village and since these were his villagers, he had a program to present, but every idea he put forward was enthusiastically voted down by the cooperative. The members had discovered that this was one place where the mayor had only one vote, and the mayor went away a very sad and sober man. When you vote the mayor down in the cooperative, you begin to vote him down in the village, and the moment that you do that, you raise political implications for a landlord government, which robs your community development program of central government support and which actually begins to threaten the basis of political stability in Iran.

Dr. Tumin in his background paper had had a look at the "requirement of participation" and observed:

There is a worrisome tendency among some community developers to become cultist about participation, to the point of investing it with an inherent virtue, and to insist upon it, as a requirement of social process, in all contexts and at all levels of projects. Almost magical properties are assigned to group process so that any decision reached by a group is by that fact rendered superior to any other decision. Time and time again the insistence on continuous participation has acted to discourage any such participation at all by those...who are dismayed by the insistence that they be involved actively even when they are not interested, or feel they do not have the relative skills, and would be far more pleased to entrust the decision to others...

An important side problem which is raised here concerns the extent to which Western-style democratic participation in decisions is a relevant and reasonable expectation in non-Western forms of social organization...

In summary, we return to the theme of the importance of participation by the local community, but now hedge it with the qualification that such participation may be had in a variety of ways not ordinarily familiar to or consonant with the experiences of Western developers. (pp. 19-20)

Dr. Tumin had raised a further question that proved of considerable interest--that of the compromise of efficiency and participation. This is related to what is going on in the country as a whole.

The success of any local community development project is probably proportional to the following two things: (1) the extent to which simultaneously there is being developed certain fundamental material improvements in the way of life of the total society in which the community is located; or, at the least, provisions are being made for such improvement to occur by economic assistance programs aimed at the mainsprings of the national economy; and (2) the extent to which these national improvements or developments set in motion a series of radiating impulses--new labor force demands, new schooling facilities, new posts of government, new export requirements, and the like--some of which are felt by the local communities as pressures and opportunities from within their own society. These help to reduce the strangeness and the interventionist character of local projects, as they are led by external agents, and commend, more forcefully than would otherwise be possible, the kinds of new values and new cultural arithmetics which are a precondition of effective social change. (pp. 25-26)

Arnold Rivkin, as chairman of the session discussing Dr. Tumin's paper, at one point directed the attention of the Conference specifically to the problem of participation, "theoretically or practically in terms of experience, its importance, and how to get participation of the community--the whole population." In reply, one of the participants drew the distinction between short-range and long-range participation which led to Dr. Dimock's observation, previously quoted, that for short-range purposes the outside agency can bring pressure to bear quite effectively but that for long-range purposes the local people must be definitely involved. Others, too, had ideas on the subject:

DR. FRANK: Could we say at this point that participation offers not only the possibility of learning the new but also of unlearning, of freeing people from the coercion or the loyalty to those patterns and practices and beliefs which they have to give up in order to accept the new. I don't know of any other method of unlearning except by practical experience. You can't do it just by arguing. So, I would like to stress the unlearning aspect of community development.

DR. CARL TAYLOR: I think when you get in a practical program and are using all you know about the technique of participation and its use that your group discussion and your group participation really becomes pretty foolish in a lot of cases unless it is also goal-focused.

MR. RIVKIN: I think the word "participation" has now been used in several contexts: one has been participation in setting the goal and another has been participation in executing the program. How important is it that the individuals who are concerned perceive their problems and then set their goals?

DR. RUDOLPH: It seems to me that this distinction between goal setting and participation in goal execution is a very useful one. I wonder whether the problem of participation in goal setting doesn't require further breaking down. It seems to me that if you talk about participation in goal setting you have two types: one an active one, one a passive one. In one process, presumably, villagers all sit down together and set their goals; in the other one, they all set down together with the technician and are educated in what the goals might be.

From a point of view of psychological involvement, presumably the first one is the more desirable but it raises the problem that then you take as given the aspirations of the villagers. And so I suspect that we have to be pessimistic about having villagers participate actively in goal setting. The limitations of their knowledge and their aspirations would mean that goal setting might be too narrow. The best that you could hope for at that level is that you would have a mixture in which, on the one hand, the technician suggests his goals and attempts to persuade; and, on the other hand, the villagers suggest some of their own goals.

She pointed out also that participation in goal execution could be both active and passive, voluntaristic and non-voluntaristic. She gave an example of the passive, non-voluntaristic type which occurred in India where there was much participation in village development projects. An expert was sent down from the central government to make inquiries about the reasons for so much participation only to find that the villagers were very used to being told by the local jagirdar once a year to build a road. So when the block development officer, representing the community development program, came to suggest that a road be built the villagers said, "All right," and went ahead to build the road. Their perception, according to Dr. Rudolph, of what the block development officer was doing was no different than their perception of what the jagirdar had said the year before.

DR. HOWARD V. PERLMUTTER: We need to understand more about the conditions under which individuals really participate in groups. There is a gap between the theory of how individuals are encouraged to participate and the actual practice of getting people to participate, whether we are talking about community development or any other human endeavor.

DR. READ: I have been surprised that nobody has made anything of the apathy, this inertia one finds in local communities as an obstacle to participation. People may be suspicious of schemes which, on the face of it and in the view of the people putting forward the schemes, are quite obviously for the betterment of the community or the people, but which the people do not regard in such a way because they think they may raise questions of additional taxation or some kind of a result which is not at all in the mind of the promoter.

At a later session the discussion turned back to the meaning and purpose of participation.

DR. EDWARD S. MASON: I've always assumed that the primary purpose for getting the participation of a community is that if you didn't get the participation there would be no systematic follow-through. I have never myself thought that participation was in and of itself an end to be achieved. Now, I quite agree that reading a lot of the literature on community development might give one a different impression there. I regard participation only as a means to achieve this end of efficiency and would take the position that if adequate community participation is to be brought about it will be brought about by a limited number of leaders who can demand the allegiance of the other people in the community.

Verna Carley, in describing her recent experiences as an educational consultant in the villages of Taiwan, pointed out that participation was definitely linked with the selection of problems about which the villagers already had a felt need. She suggested that if such a problem was solved then the people would be willing to cooperate in other kinds of programs for which they had not felt an earlier need. But their experience with the first problem had given them confidence in the worker from outside and in his ability to help them.

The substance of the discussion seemed to indicate that participation was a useful and at times necessary mechanism in promoting many kinds of change. Some questioned whether it should be viewed as an end in itself, although many maintained that unless participation on the part of local people occurred one did not have community development.

Motivation and Levels of Aspiration

Even if one grants that participation is a necessary aspect of community development

the problem still remains of motivating people to participate. Professor McClelland in his background paper on Community Development and the Nature of Human Motivation challenged many of the usual assumptions of community developers and set forth ideas which were dealt with at length in the general Conference discussion. The central problem to which he addressed himself was the type of person needed in a society if community development is to succeed. Above all, he must have n achievement, a term discussed in the next section in connection with finding and training of adequate leadership.* But his paper does contain some observations about motivation which relate to the general topic of community development and social change. Professor McClelland writes:

If one starts with the assumption that motives can be easily manipulated by rational considerations and arrangement of incentives to work, he will concentrate his attention on changes in the social system. If the system is changed, people will "come forward" to fulfill its new requirements. If, on the other hand, one recognizes that to a considerable extent motives are autonomous forces within individuals, he will concentrate on changing people. If the people are changed, they will force changes in the system... Both the social system and personality structure are interdependent, but it is worth overstressing the importance of beginning with personality change since the other approach has been generally adopted. Its chief disadvantage is that it starts from outside people and involves the simultaneous arrangement of a large number of social institutions to provide maximum incentives to work... Nearly all planners recognize the probable futility of trying to lead an essentially passive people through the paces needed for economic development, but few of them have faced squarely the fact that to create the spirit of self-help and initiative that they want, a basic change in n achievement and allied motives is necessary. Only such change will produce the irrational driving force necessary to overcome what are factually and rationally considered nearly insuperable obstacles to economic development. (pp. 17-18)

Although Dr. Higgins was not replying to this specific quotation, in the session devoted to the discussion of Dr. McClelland's paper he did have this to say:

DR. HIGGINS: Quite a lot can be done by creating an institutional framework in which the economic incentive works.

A few months after I first went to Indonesia, I was writing that one of the major obstacles to economic development in that country was a kind of old-fashioned European attitude toward soiling one's hand in trade. No one wanted to go into business. The bright young men all wanted to go into government

* For the explanation of this term see the background paper cited. "The n Achievement score for an individual is simply a sum of the number of instances of achievement 'ideas' or images and their subtypes, and the score for a group of individuals is some measure of central tendency (the average, the mode) of the scores of individuals who make up the group." (p. 14)

service or perhaps into the Army. Possibly the third choice was the professions. Businessmen, both foreign and Indonesian, said: "We just can't get the bright young man to work for us. They all want to go to the government. And I made the suggestion that one way of beginning to overcome this antipathy to commercial and industrial activity might be to add to the University of Indonesia a School of Business, thus conferring professional status on the businessman. Five years later, the Faculty of Economics at the University of Indonesia had 2,000 students, the great bulk of whom were heading for business careers. And the government officials who had vacancies in their personnel lists were saying: "We just can't get the bright young man, the university graduate, to come into the government service. They all want to go into business."

DR. MC CLELLAND: We are talking past each other. I must distinguish between the wish for achievement and the need for achievement. These are not the same. The need for achievement is an unconscious, irrational, affective association formed early in life and is difficult to change. The desire for achievement can be changed easily in the conscious sense by education, exposure to the West, and so forth. In fact, I would say that a lot of the difficulty in the underdeveloped areas is precisely the gap between their desire for achievement and the need for it.

In his background paper Dr. McClelland also had something to say about the group approach in community development.

If the central problem of community development is an increase in productivity and entrepreneurial behavior, these are functions which cannot be taken over by a group. In the end it is always the individual who acts. One can argue even further that the objectives identified by a group are often not the right ones. . . . But quite aside from such objectives, group action simply does not hit at the heart of the problem--namely getting more people to work harder and in an entrepreneurial fashion. It remains an external rather than internal method of setting objectives. Its chief value is to reduce friction, to prepare people for changes, but not to motivate them to greater action. (p. 24)

Professor McClelland is also struck by the fact that community development programs tend to concentrate on four major areas: agriculture, health services, public overhead (roads, irrigation, etc.), and education. In his opinion, these are the wrong areas to be stressed:

Difficult as it is to deny the importance of such obvious humanitarian considerations, they have tended to warp aid programs in the direction of helping people as they are, rather than changing them so that they can help themselves eventually. In fact, one can make a case for the fact that by concentrating aid on agriculture, health, and public overhead capital, the plans are least likely to affect those values and institutions which must be changed if development is ever to be self-sustaining. The family is the key institution which carries cultural values and sees to it that the next generation is brought up to share the values of

its elders. To produce real cultural change, one must get at the family, one must for example change the attitudes of parents toward achievement and self-reliance in their children. (pp. 27-28)

Then, in a summary paragraph he writes:

Our critique of the "standard" (or typical) plan for achieving the objectives of community development has been fairly severe. By focusing on felt needs and welfare considerations, it has given higher priority to short run than long run objectives and may succeed in increasing population faster than productivity. By identifying democracy with group planning and action, it misreads the economic history of the democratic nations of the West, and confuses the valid objective of obtaining the understanding and consent of the governed with the ineffective one of motivating the governed. By concentrating on agriculture and health, it strengthens the most conservative part of the culture, making essential changes in values and institutions even harder to introduce. But above all the standard plan is likely to be ineffective because it is not consciously organized around what must be the primary objective of any successful plan for community development--namely changing people, in particular their values and motives. (pp. 32-33)

But how does one change values and motives? What help can the psychologist give on that score?

Roughly speaking, there are three possibilities: by persuasion or education, by introducing changes in the social system that promote new motives and values, and by early character training (that is, by introducing the new values before the traditional ones have been acquired.) To some extent all of these methods should be followed: some change can be produced by any of them. The first two need to be examined especially critically because they have been relied on so exclusively by social scientists not particularly sensitive to recent findings in the psychology of motivation.

The method of persuasion has some major "successes" to its credit in the form of mass religious conversions in the past, although it can be questioned whether there was very much change in basic personality structure after the conversion. Most psychologists believe...that persuasion can change fairly superficial attitudes but that stable personality characteristics as the entrepreneurial motive complex cannot be altered by normal educational means in adulthood...Rightly or wrongly there are few psychologists who would have much faith in an adult educational program designed to change the moral character of the Indian weavers so that they could learn to live by new standards and thus make new institutional arrangements successful.

Changes in the social system may provide more subtly effective ways of altering motives and values. For example, repeal of laws favoring discrimination or the joint family may release a certain amount of individualism normally held in check. Setting up new channels of upward mobility through the growth of political parties may have the same effect...The possibilities are almost limitless: what is needed is a clear understanding that new values are essential and not

simply accidental and perhaps unwanted characteristics of developed societies.

...

To the psychologist, the third method of inducing new values and motives--by character education of the very young--is by all odds the one most likely to succeed...According to this view, aid for community development should concentrate heavily on support for nursery schools, kindergartens and the early primary grades plus the preparation of a special group of teachers for handling those grades...While it may be questioned whether the influence of the teachers can outweigh that of the parents and other adults in the village, such an approach must still be regarded as the one most directly aimed at introducing the motivational changes which we have argued are crucial to sustained growth. (pp. 37-42)

Views such as these were in no case wholly denied nor did they meet with universal agreement as some of the comments show:

DR. MASON: The limiting factor in the educational expenditures in Pakistan is not the amount of money that is available; it's the organization, the administration, the time required for training adequate teachers, and so on. There the emphasis was very much on upgrading the kind of teaching that was attempted, rather than increasing the number of teachers at the primary level. In keeping with what Mr. McClelland has in mind, it was thought much more desirable to have the right kind of teachers than to expand the number who continued to use existing techniques.

DR. BADEAU: You must realize that most of these schools are operating in a completely-illiterate society. Therefore, the task of the primary school is not only the education of children, but the utilization of the education of children for the education of the employer. And I think it's entirely possible to build a community development program around the schoolhouse and the primary school teacher which--when you do both--interests the parents in the education of their children and at the same time furnishes short-term and/or long-term results.

Dr. Neal seriously questioned the practicality of Professor McClelland's suggestion that community development be turned largely toward character education. He claimed that in the countries where he had worked they didn't have the teachers, the schools, and the facilities which were necessary. Furthermore, he considered the "character education" so nebulous a "product" that he didn't know where they could get it anyway.

Dr. Moore had chided Dr. McClelland somewhat for overlooking the fact that there is much adult socialization and that such character formation did not occur only in childhood. When asked to comment on this, Dr. McClelland said:

DR. MCCLELLAND: Psychologists are kind of prejudiced about this and have a number of theoretical reasons for thinking that, as far as motivation is concerned--in the limited, restricted sense of unconscious, irrelevant, affective associations--you really have to get a person fairly early.

Now this does not apply to values. They can be changed radically, and I

think that the value change often has to precede the motive change. What you do in community development is to change the values of the adults, and they change the motives of their children. That's my own guess.

DR. PERLMUTTER: I suspect that a good deal of activity which becomes part of the self-sustaining community process involves presenting before the children certain models of achievement and of striving; and to the extent that these are built into the institution, then you are--in effect--accomplishing a good deal of socialization in connection with achievement.

Toward the end of his paper Professor McClelland raised a question that needed to be faced:

We have argued that in the long run character education for the next generation is likely to be much more effective than anything we can do here and now for the present generation of adults. Yet it is this generation of adults who are running the government or to whom the government in a democracy must be responsive. Are they likely to permit such wholesale sacrifice of their interests for the benefit of their children? Under some conditions they will. (pp. 50-51)

On this subject there was also comment:

DR. BATOR: I think that a hundred years from now you're likely to be better off if you take little outputs tomorrow and the next day and the next day--they will accumulate--than if you take no output at all for a generation or a hundred years and then hope for a very big output.

DR. MILLIKAN: I would like to add to Francis Bator's point. I wonder whether Mr. McClelland's strategy might not be self-defeating. I doubt that unless you can show some pay-off in a fairly short time, in terms of concrete things that people think they want, whether they're going to keep up steam to go ahead with the program and to continue pushing these motivational things--these need-achievement correctives--long enough.

* * * * *

The issue posed at the beginning of this section has been dealt with at length but not resolved. In any event, the treatment of the topic of social change has almost moved full circle for there is really little distance separating the philosophical problem of the desirability of "laying hands upon other people's lives" from the psychological problem of how people are motivated, since in the latter case it is apt to be the outsider that is guiding the motivation along lines which he and others, perhaps including the local adults, think desirable.

V. THE PRACTICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Many ideas dealing with the practice of community development had already been set forth before the last Conference session which was specifically devoted to this theme. Few of

these ideas were on the level of precise techniques but rather dealt with the general question of what approach one had to take or what conditions had to be present if community development programs were to work out satisfactorily in the long run. Even the two papers prepared for the final session traced the approach used and experience gained in two widely different programs. Dr. Margaret Read told of the type of programs worked out in the British Colonial Service and Dr. Carl Taylor reviewed the accomplishments of the Community Development Program of India. In other words, a central issue which appeared over and over again was the practicality of community development as a method, say in carrying out economic development, as well as the specific methods by which one practices community development as a program.

Posing the issue: In what ways can the practice of community development be made more effective?

Although the issue was never presented quite this clearly, at least three important lines of discussion related to it: finding and training adequate local leadership; working through a government bureaucracy; and application of social science research to community development problems.

Finding and Training Local Leaders

The connection between national and provincial leaders, as representatives of the centralized government, has already been discussed under previous issues. Their importance is reaffirmed in the following comment:

DR. BADEAU: From the practical standpoint of program conduct, I think we must recognize that no foreign agency and no foreign technician can enter a country for a community development program without cushioning his impact by the imposition of good local leadership. It is only in good local leadership that you find the sensitivity and understanding of the local situation that prevents the Westerner running wild in his desire to impose or inject his own systems.

Of course, Dr. Badeau was using local here in the sense of national but his observation would hold true as well for national leaders coming from outside to work out a program within a given village.

Dr. Tumin in his background paper had pointed out:

Typically one must expect that some of the locals most ready to understand and cooperate with the developers will be those who in some degree are marginal to their own cultures. In that sense, they are likely to be the worst possible representatives of the traditional society, some of whose mainstays are threatened

by the implications of the proposed project. In that sense, then, too, such marginal leaders are likely to force least compromise upon Western style plans as they come to be translated into community projects...The tendency to select such marginal local leadership is to be expected when the field workers have not been trained to be wary of such marginal men...

The effectiveness with which traditional leadership can sabotage projects is matched by the ease with which marginal leadership can overcommit the community and the developers to unrealistic goals, thereby insuring a defeat equally as decisive as the sabotage of the traditionalists...What will surely help is the willingness on the part of field workers to listen attentively to local cues and hints, and to respond sensitively to the kind of almost inaudible, minimal resentments and resistances which local leaders are likely to voice if they feel that the developing agents represent a power structure against which they cannot prevail. (Pp. 30-32)

DR. DUBOIS: The question of leadership raised by Dr. Tumin deserves further discussion. I suspect that Dr. Tumin's judgment that leadership in community development is in the hands of marginal men is open to scrutiny, both in terms of how marginal men are to be defined and also what the implications of this are...Maybe the flexibilities of a society rest in the rewards that are inherent in variant and dominant roles. Is such flexibility necessarily bad? Bad for whom? The traditional or the new leaders of the community? Is it bad for the followers in the community, for the local field worker or, perhaps, for the political leaders at the national level?

DR. BADEAU: I don't know exactly what Mr. Tumin meant by marginal leaders but, thinking of it in very practical terms, it can be said that in the Middle East the urban-educated high school and university product of the national school systems almost always are ineffective at the direct level of community development leadership...This leadership is marginal not only in cultural terms, but in time terms. The village is living in the 16th Century and this leadership is living in the 20th Century. It is almost impossible to get the 20th Century to march backward to the 16th Century and to establish rapport.

And therefore, a very common experience is that community development involves a leadership training program carried on in villages for villagers; and that only with such a leadership training program can the community development be supplied with the savior-faire that will lead it forward.

Dr. Badeau then pointed out that in the villages with which he was familiar there were always three kinds of leaders: those appointed by the government, who have a technical, political official authority of leadership; the leaders of the traditional social structure of the village--the landowner, the mullah, the poor but blueblooded family--and they exercise a different kind of leadership from the government officials. Finally, there is the natural leadership--the farmer to whom the other farmers always turn to get an answer to a problem. He may be a tenant farmer but he has the Eastern reputation of

the wise man. According to Dr. Badeau, "all of these leadership resources have to be tapped and a determination has to be made as to what kind of leadership is appropriately drawn from each one of these types."

But it remained for Professor McClelland to take the lead in trying to apply the findings of his research to the specific problem of local leadership. In his background paper he had identified a measurable entity which he called n Achievement and had related it to the practice of community development.*

Dr. Mason, who gave the critique of Dr. McClelland's paper, summarized the main points as follows:

DR. MASON: I take it that the first proposition is: entrepreneurship is necessary to economic development. Secondly, that a necessary ingredient in entrepreneurship is a certain level of n Achievement. Third, the stock per capita of n Achievement in a country varies between countries, and there's reason to believe that it is particularly low in the underdeveloped areas. Fourth, community development is as dependent on entrepreneurship, and consequently on n Achievement, as any other kind of development. Five, there's been a general failure to recognize this; and consequently, most community development schemes are doomed to failure or worse.

Then, existing community development schemes show conspicuously two kinds of mistakes: the first, which might be called a typical economist's error, is to believe that if techniques are improved, fertilizer and seed are provided, and opportunities for profit shown, that a self-reinforcing process of economic growth will be started. According to Mr. McClelland this is an error because this is impossible unless the community has a requisite stock of n Achievement.

Secondly, there's a typical error, which may be characterized as the error of the professional community developers, that effective action can be the product of group thinking and group action. It has to come primarily from properly motivated individuals.

Comments about each of these propositions indicate the way in which they were received. The first: Is entrepreneurship necessary to economic development?

DR. MASON: I don't think you'd have any difficulty convincing a group of economists that entrepreneurship is necessary to the process of economic development, but it seems to me that Mr. McClelland develops a pretty monistic theory here I suspect that, in part, he laid this tremendous emphasis because he wanted to bring out the nature of his contribution here, and I suspect that he

* For the explanation of this term see the background paper cited. "The n Achievement score for an individual is simply a sum of the number of instances of achievement ideas or images and their subtypes, and the score for a group of individuals is some measure of central tendency (the average, the mode) of the scores of individuals who make up the group. (p. 14)

would admit without tremendous pressure that this is only one of several conditions that have to be involved. I would say myself that Kuwait could develop entrepreneurs until they're coming out of the ears, and still not have economic development in Kuwait because the other conditions are not present; and I suspect that there are other underdeveloped areas in which this may be true.

DR. JULIAN H. STEWARD: The diagnosis of such psychological characteristics as the n Achievement may throw much light on potentials of communities or of individuals within communities. I have in mind various societies which seem to be below the threshold of desire for economic improvement--for example, the Paraguayan peasants who work for wages only to finance a wedding or festival; the river bottom dwellers of Shawnee Town in Illinois, who ignore the opportunities for gainful employment in nearby towns and barely subsist; and the Wakaguru in East Africa who produce cash crops only to buy beer. With these societies we might class the many corporate peasant communities of Mes-America and the Andes, communities of Indian descent who save their money in order to discharge ceremonial obligations. Such obligations, along with other social mechanisms, serve to level status differences and prevent entrepreneurship. But in all these societies, the enticements of cash and manufactured goods gradually brings a break-through, a striving for personal gain.

I am sure that psychological tests could help identify the individuals ready for the break-through and likely to assume leadership in establishing new patterns. But caution suggests that since there are many types of communities, we be sensitive to the possibility that the varied interplay of factors will call for different personality characteristics in each case....*

Is n Achievement necessary to entrepreneurship?

DR. MASON: I have certainly formed the opinion from reading this paper that about the most that could be said is that n Achievement is a necessary but insufficient ingredient to business entrepreneurship. I would say that the whole value structure of the community, the prestige that adheres to business careers and the making of money, to economic activity in general are an essential part of entrepreneurship. I can conceive of societies which have a high level of n Achievement, but in which there are very few business entrepreneurs.

Reading Everett Hagen's work on Burma leads me to the conclusion that the Burmese may not lack for people with a high level of n Achievement, but the values of the system lead to people organizing religious ceremonies, building pagodas, doing other things that have a high value in Burma, perhaps a higher value than the achievement of business success.

Dr. Foster also pointed out that often times lack of entrepreneurship in many parts of the world does not primarily mean lack of spirit or lack of knowledge but simply the

* Professor Julian Steward prepared a critique of Dr. McClelland's paper but was unable to attend the Conference at the last minute and his comments did not arrive in time for Conference use. Some of them are included here, however.

existence of a type of tradition which must be broken before the entrepreneur can enjoy the benefits of his labor and therefore be willing to consider the labor worthwhile.

DR. FOSTER: A fishery expert in Peru told me of an experience which I found very revealing. He was interested in stimulating Peruvian fish production, so he proposed low-interest loans to finance modern equipment to a fisherman, and the fisherman said, "Let me think it over and I will tell you tomorrow." The fishery expert went back the next day, and the fisherman said: "I've decided not to accept your offer." The fishery expert asked: "Why?" and the reply came back, "If I make ten times as much money as I'm making now it simply means that all of my relatives will move in on me, and I will be no better off than I am now and I will have many more worries."

Does the stock of n Achievement vary from country to country?

DR. MCCLELLAND: All cultures contain some individuals with high n Achievement and its associated values and motives. Our position is that the percentage of these individuals varies from culture to culture and our first approach argues that the proportion must get above a certain significant value to set off a chain reaction throughout the economy... We have suggested the plan for selecting as teachers for the next generation those individuals who had the right motives and values so that they could transmit them to the children. In the same vein, one might select village aid workers in terms of their motive characteristics with the thought that they can often serve as energetic middlemen in stimulating cottage industries or advising farmers on more efficient techniques or younger sons on how they can more effectively earn a living in the city than by staying on the farm. (p. 45)

DR. MASON: Coming to the particular problem of community development, I would say that nobody is in a position to know now, so far as I can see, whether in the communities that have been dealt with in the Middle East, India, Pakistan, or elsewhere, the stock of n Achievement is insufficient to the promotion of a sustained rate of growth if other things are undertaken to promote the rate of growth. So far as I know, nobody is in a position to say that these communities that we've been dealing with, as they stand now, are inadequately supplied with n Achievement. It may be that they are, but the evidence is not clear.

DR. MOORE: There are two positions a person can take on this matter. One can start from the assumption that achievement orientation is universal and that it has been restrained only by ignorance, error, or the creak of custom awaiting some perception of felt needs or the enlightenment of an external agency that points out that something better is available. Or one can assume that there are substantial differences in achievement motivation and I think that the crude empirical facts fit this position. We can see it in our own society. We are aware that there are the strainers and time servers in administrative organizations, that we identify people as high participators or low participators, and so on.

DR. SCHULTZ: It isn't quite true that we make this wide a difference in any population. Do you think that there really is a significant difference between different populations in the distribution of this thing?

DR. MOORE: I'm inclined to think so.

DR. KARL DEUTSCH: Quite generally, wouldn't it be useful to discuss separately the development of high n Achievement people, assuming it can be developed in urban environments in middle or upper-class levels, as distinct from the problem of getting indiscriminately-scattered high n Achievement people in some villages, mostly among the peasant population? (A coffee break prevented his getting an answer.)

The fourth proposition in Dr. McClelland's paper alluded to by Dr. Mason in question form: Is community development as dependent on entrepreneurship, and consequently on n Achievement, as any other kind of development?

In response to this Dr. Read pointed out that the reverse might be true for those high in n Achievement might not be interested in community development. She cited the case of the Yoruba women in West Nigeria, who do the trading for their people. The younger girls help them. They are so successful in some cases that they amass bank accounts.

DR. READ: Many of these women are illiterates or near-illiterates. By reason of their activity and because they are successful traders, within the culture pattern, they are not interested in most all kinds of community development. They are out of their homes for a large part of the day, and the children are looked after by somebody else. This seems to violate the usual procedure which the community developers assume; and yet, we've got these three things: motive, entrepreneurship, and on a large scale this allergy to community development.

DR. MCCLELLAND: In a way high n Achievement people are allergic to community development for they think they can run their own affairs and they don't want the community development people to come in. Now we are a high n Achievement people going in with our standards; and I think one of the advantages of community developers is that mostly they have high n Achievement or they wouldn't be out there.

The discussion of these and other points showed that many participants were not willing to accept the fifth proposition in toto: that the failure to recognize the need to cultivate n Achievement dooms community programs from the start. But those who worked most closely with village people seemed ready for the assistance of any psychologist who could help them select and involve those local people able to contribute most significantly to community development programs. In keeping with Dr. McClelland's suggestion they were willing to await the outcome of further research on motivation now underway.

Working through a Governmental Bureaucracy

A thorny problem in the conduct of any community development program is the relationship between local people and central government representatives as well as between various staff members of different ministries supposedly cooperating in the joint effort.

Dr. Neal had some cogent remarks to make:

DR. NEAL: When you think about introducing a program of community development as a national program into a national government, there is usually from six months to a year of real study into the political organization, the structure of the government, the social organization of the people, and also the amount of funds available for it. You come up with a pretty well-rounded plan.

Then you organize some kind of administrative structure in a central government and each unit of the government. Then you know that you need trained persons, familiar with processes that social scientists have evolved, to work with local people in the solution of their own problems. You train such workers, put them out into the villages, and under proper direction certain things happen that can be measured in terms of economics and institutionally. Pretty soon you see the whole structure, the institutional structure of the government beginning to be improved as the result of an administrative decision to flow the services of government down to the people and, in turn, to bring the needs of the people up to the government. You streamline and you make efficient this administrative structure that you work with. You also soon discover there are gaps in your institutional structure and in the training program and you begin to repair these.

We have enough experience in these programs to know how they should be organized, how they should be administered and how to train the people to operate. One can even measure the output. In India, the people who evaluated the program found that where community development programs were in operation, the increase in grain production was 25 percent over the areas where you didn't have community development in operation.

He suggested that people should view community development as an administrative tool for getting things done and as an instrument for speeding up the process from the traditional economy to a more productive economy. In his opinion, a special bureaucratic structure had to be set up to give the program form and life. At the same time, this special structure, notably the national services which provide the specialized knowledge and skills ordinarily required for village improvement.

DR. BADEAU: As a matter of fact, where I have seen community development operate best, it has been precisely where there have been national services that can be involved in the program. And if this fact be true, it is also a warning that community development is not necessarily appropriate to every country.

Take a direct example that Louis Miniclier and George Foster and I were talking about en route to the Conference. We have a community development program in Afghanistan. One of the problems of such a program there is that you do not have a Ministry of Agriculture or a Ministry of Health or even a Ministry of Education that is yet capable of supplying the services to support the activities that community development engenders in the village. And I think it could be fairly argued that the way to attack the rural problem in Afghanistan is not through a community development program at all at this present time but through the development of these other substantive national services which, in the end, must be co-ordinated and focused upon the village problem to make community development possible.

Dr. Schultz, for one, agreed that in some countries an agricultural extension service might be preferable to a community development program but elsewhere the total approach represented by the latter would be superior to an emphasis on agriculture alone.

Dr. Read, while tracing the story of community development in the British colonies,* pointed out that they made use of a team approach at all levels of operation and not multi-purpose workers of the type utilized in the Pakistan, Indian, and many other programs. She cited the case of Malaya where a district officer had a team consisting "of a cooperator, agricultural extension officer, school teacher, public works foreman, and people of that kind who worked together."

DR. READ: In the training schools there was no suggestion of a multi-purpose worker, and this, I think, is an important difference. The emphasis was always upon the existing staff, and upon using them in order to give them a new slant on their own work in terms of community development as well as to produce some effective team work among them both at the district and village levels.

In the discussion which followed Dr. Read's presentation Dr. DuBois asked for further information about the pros and cons of team groups in contrast to single, multi-purpose workers.

DR. READ: One of the objectives to a multi-purpose worker was the setting up of somebody in a special category called a community development worker.

DR. DUBOIS: But the objections there lie essentially in the administrative problems created at home?

* Dr. Read's discussion of the professional training of community development workers, presented at the final session, will be released as one of the Conference papers so will not be fully reviewed here.

DR. READ: Yes. Remember that in most of Africa, though not quite so true in Malaya, one is dealing with a shortage of personnel all the time, as distinct from India, where you have a tremendous pool. The argument ran this way: If you created a community development worker of a multi-purpose type, you first of all have got to face having a new set of employees of the local government. You have then got to fix his position in the salary scale, according to qualifications, etc., and he then, unless he did something frightful, would be employed for keeps, and the community development movement was something that was always pressing forward.

DR. DUBOIS: So the decision was essentially not one of the relative efficiency of team vs. a multi-purpose worker, but it is essentially an administrative or bureaucratic decision?

DR. READ: That is right. I think it is true to say that.

Dr. Read also pointed out that community development in the African and other territories took the form of improving local government since the district officers, concerned with such governmental affairs, had charge of the program. This meant that it was not viewed primarily as economic development; it proceeded first toward training local councillors and sought village improvement (schools, roads, etc.) rather than immediate agricultural or other economic gains.

Dr. Carl Taylor, whose paper dealt chiefly with lessons to be learned from the India community development program, had this to say about some of the bureaucratic considerations.

DR. CARL TAYLOR: The large bureaucracy required in the operation of such programs tends to make it difficult to maintain the idea of building from the bottom up. There is the tendency for targets, specified for the attainment of long-time national development goals, to conflict with the targets, which villagers themselves would specify. When differential scales or subsidies are given, for the attainment of various targets, the idea, and practice of permitting local groups to decide for what undertaking they will mobilize their manpower, talents, and zests is compromised.

Most of those who constitute cadres of program personnel above the village level of workers find it difficult to be servants, or at most supervisors, of village level workers. Because of their past experience, they still tend to be inspectors or directors of those who work below them in the program organization.

Persons well trained in fields of technical knowledge fail to make their maximum contributions because they do not recognize that this knowledge becomes useful in a development program only if and when it becomes the usable practice of tens of thousands of local people. They have little knowledge of the difficulty which inheres in changing the age-old folkways and thought ways of isolated villagers. Government agencies, therefore, do not always cooperate wholeheartedly in the coordinated or integrated program of technical assistance of village self-help programs. (pp. 28-29)

These comments and many more like them show conclusively many of the bureaucratic problems inherent in the practice of a national community development program and stress the importance of understanding this structure.

Social Science Research and the Practice of Community Development

To what extent can those operating community development programs turn to social scientists for help in resolving the problems that they face? In other words, is there a body of theory which can be applied to practical situations in much the same way that medical theories are used by the doctors in his dealing with a patient? There were differences of opinion on this matter.

As indicated previously, Dr. Tumin had pointed out the difficulties one encounters in trying to predict the consequences of social change. If science be equated with prediction and control then those dealing with social phenomena can lay little claim to successful application of the scientific method. But if science involves a systematic approach to the study of selected data, the effort to develop hypotheses about the interrelationships within these data, and the ability to trace some of the consequences not otherwise foreseen then the social scientists can make a strong case for their endeavors. Dr. DuBois took the position as already indicated that at this stage of knowledge the social scientist's task with reference to community development was not that of prediction but rather rigorous analysis of categories of the context within which community development occurs and the description of useful diagnostic factors. Dr. Badeau ranked himself with the appliers, the developers, the practitioners because he did not feel there was a set of community development generalities of universal application. He thought communities differed so sharply that concrete decisions could only be made on the basis of specific experience.

As Dr. Schultz listened to the discussion of the social and psychological factors in community development he was led to comment that he had learned nothing that would convince him that community development would give the high rewards, the pay-offs for which economists were seeking. He, too, felt that the situation would differ in every area. But Dr. Tumin was quick to assume the objective analytical role of the social scientist and state the following:

DR. TUMIN: Mr. Schultz suggests that he would like to know how community development as a device can contribute by pointing, if you will, to the high pay-offs to the economic growth of society. This is now making community development an instrument to an economic need.

The community developers in the literature strain in just the opposite direction, asking how can one use economic development or social organization or whatever it happens to be as an instrument or a series of instruments to an end called community development.

I suggest that when you pose the questions in opposite ways you begin clearly to see that you are going to use very different sets of resources in very different ways for very different ends depending upon which approach you take. You will also say that you are successful or you fail under very different circumstances.

Thus the real basis for interaction among community developers and social science specialists must be in terms of resolving the way in which you will consider alternative techniques and means for given ends rather than stumbling between the two rather diametrically opposed sets of ends which keep people from talking about the same thing because they are moving in different directions.

DR. MILLIKAN: Although I think that sociological and psychological factors require correlation, I would like to argue on the other side for a breakdown on the economic generalizations. It's obviously a very different thing in Saudi Arabia than in the Indian countryside; and it seems to me, therefore, that one of the things I would like to see done by McClelland or by someone else is a correlation of some of these psychological variables as they are found in small communities with economic variables as they are also found in these small communities. Then I think you get closer to an answer to some of the questions community developers are worried about.

There is really no end to the delineation of the types of problems in which specialists clear across the social science spectrum might manifest a lively interest. Each of the background papers had demonstrated a scholarly, objective approach and some had dealt with the need for a scientific perspective on the part of field workers as well as others engaged in community development. But this did not answer the very real question of where one would use social scientists in a community development program if one had several on hand. They study culture, the political process, social change, and a host of other topics. Would you therefore ask them to go out and direct a program in a village? Dr. Badeau thought not.

DR. BADEAU: I at first thought that we ought to start staffing our program with people who had a sound theoretical approach to community development. But they didn't work out very well whereas the good, capable technician, whose interest is centered in a special material program and who doesn't worry too much about all of the social science implications, is actually apt to impose far less of Western cultural values than a social scientist is. And I can illustrate that quite directly.

I was very interested and somewhat taken aback to discover that a poultry man that we brought from Colorado--who had never been out of the State of Colorado in his life and whom we, therefore, had employed with certain reservations--did an excellent job in Iran because the medium of communication between him and the Iran villager was not a set of ideas but a chicken. He loved chickens and understood chickens and the villager understood chickens. And having a chicken between them, a pretty good program was developed. Whereas if he had had a mind filled with the cultural implications of poultry raising and all the rest of it, I think he might have gotten into difficulty.

But Dr. Holmberg, an anthropologist, had a different experience to relate.

DR. HOLMBERG: I disagree with some of Dr. Badeau's remarks as to the extent to which social scientists should not play some kind of active role--

DR. BADEAU: I thought that I would get a reaction to that.

DR. HOLMBERG: --for I myself have been playing a dual role in a Peruvian village in the last five years--as operator and a social scientist. I also wish to suggest that we have the possibility of predicting much more firm outcomes in community development if we apply proper methodology in certain situations.

As a social scientist in a kind of power position where we could manipulate certain situations, I and a number of colleagues did make an attempt to set up a goal structure on the basis of previous studies of the community insofar as we could determine the aspirations of the people. This consisted of about 130 variables in the community with respect to its political situation, its economic organization, its social organization, its ideological situation, and so forth.

We projected ahead into this system, which we had defined, rather specific goals for a five year period in these 130 areas of behavior or culture and we made actual predictions on the basis of our previous knowledge of the community and the extent to which we could predict likely influences from the outside. We even stated what percentages of these goals might be reached in the five-year time period. We also then marked the previous goal structure at a base line period which we had studied pretty well for each one of these variables.

Dr. Holmberg stated that he had been able to predict a good many outcomes and, even more importantly, discover certain types of economies of intervention which could affect a wide variety of goals which the planner or the community had set. In other words, one line of action would accomplish changes in several goals simultaneously, whereas another course might affect only one or two.

DR. BADEAU: This is where we like to see the social scientist used. If every community development team were backstopped by the appropriate social scientific technique which could observe the problems, analyse them and deduce suggestions for guidance--this is invaluable.

Dr. Holmberg then asked those charged with the responsibility for administering or

advising community development programs what ways they were using to accumulate scientific knowledge. Dr. Neal told of the Department of Community Development and Research Evaluation set up at the University of the Philippines and stated that one specific research project underway was to establish base lines before action is initiated so that two years later the material progress can be measured. Later it is hoped that other aspects of the community development process can be more fully explored. Dr. Carl Taylor told of the Planning Research Institute in India whose staff members are making studies "all the time right in the stream of action." It was agreed that often times governmental research bodies do not dare to publish their findings, essential though these are in the practice of community development, for fear of the political repercussions that might follow. A concluding comment was made by Dr. Foster.

DR. FOSTER: The single grief--and perhaps I am biased as a social scientist--in community development programs is the fact that as social scientists we have not been able systematically to study and observe the processes in a series of countries. What are the pre-existing conditions; what is the nature of the programs; what are the personality and the training of the individuals who participate; and what does it mean.

In a number of countries, as has been pointed out, there are evaluation programs which are directed specifically toward the goals of a single community development program. But as scientists we realize that if generalizations are actually to be derived that will have meaning in terms of prediction, we must think in terms of comparative attack or a cross-cultural approach....

I would agree enthusiastically with what Allan Holmberg has said. I think, in fact, that we know a great deal about how to run a community development program and how to predict what will happen, given specific conditions. We know more than either the community developers or the social scientists are generally aware of.

Part Three: CONCLUSION

The practice of community development, whether conceived as an art or a science or both, is at best a complicated undertaking upon whose problems the Conference discussion touched only now and then. But stimulating insights, though not general consensus, were afforded in the treatment of local leadership and its motivation and training, of the relationship of the community development to its enveloping bureaucracy and of the part social scientists might or might not play in giving community development programs a sounder basis and a better chance of achieving the goals which they embody.

The Endicott House Conference arrived at no conclusions. Nor was it expected to do so. But it did generate a number of reactions which can serve as fitting conclusions. These can be seen first of all as reactions to the idea of community development itself and secondly with reference to the Conference as an intellectual experience.

Community Development

There was no show of hands at any point in order to find out who was for or against the community development programs which came up for discussion. Since each participant would have wanted to specify concretely on what basis his support was granted or withheld such a register of allegiance would have been meaningless. Suffice it to say, that about every range of opinion--from the hardheaded skeptic of all that went under the name of community development to the enthusiastic endorser of every noble effort undertaken--was represented in the gathering. Nor was there any basic agreement among those who shared a common point on the continuum of skepticism-enthusiasm. Those who doubted did so for very different reasons; those who endorsed also had a variety of buttressing ideas. A statement of some of the more negative and positive positions taken will illustrate the uncomposed divergencies.

The skeptics:

1. If your goals are economic ones 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 these goals.
2. If you do 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 level of living.
3. Since social changes are so unpredictable any effort to promote change is fraught with danger for all concerned.
4. Since community development programs call for leaders who are achievement-oriented, they cannot succeed unless such leaders are present and can evoke a following. But most underdeveloped countries lack achievement-oriented people and so there is little hope that community development programs can work well in such places.
5. In many, if not most situations, it is better to work through old-line agencies (agriculture, health, education, welfare) than to try to channel village improvement through a community development program.
6. 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 regimes supposedly "friendly."

Some of the skepticism was based on the observation of the failure of a particular program and not necessarily on general theoretical grounds. The practicality or workability was questioned. Within this group there was even disagreement about specific examples. One skeptic took as a "horrible example" of community development the ejido of Mexico and told of its failures; others just as quickly challenged his example on the grounds that it had violated many of the basic principles of good community development practice. It is only fair reporting to state that when any of the six objections listed above and many more like them were raised, some participants invariably sought to answer these objections. This lengthy, detailed summary has sought to reflect that dialogue, pro and con, and the reader must judge the merits of each case for himself. But the endorsers of community development stated their case too:

The endorsers:

1. If one is interested in what happens to people--materially, psychologically, socially--then community development is a fruitful way of betterment.
2. 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.

3. It leads to political stability in that it is a means of preparing peasants for effective and enlightened participation in the national state.
4. It is an economical use of scarce government specialists in health, welfare, agriculture and education since the community development worker can extend their usefulness many-fold.
5. 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.
6. Through the proper use of what the social scientists already know much can be predicted as to community development outcomes. Programs could be more sure-fire than they now are.

The participants, whatever their evaluation of community development might be, were all busy examining their own ideas about how community development programs could and should work; most of them were intrigued by the problems in economics or human relations which were raised and admitted that alternative approaches to community development had their pitfalls too.

APPENDICES

Program

Conference on Community Development and National Change
Endicott House, December 13-15, 1957

Friday, December 13th

10:00 - 12:00 Registration of participants and assignment to rooms.

12:00 Luncheon

2:00 POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

Presiding: Max F. Millikan

"Community Development and American Foreign Policy"
Max F. Millikan

Two Critiques of paper by Lucian W. Pye on "Community Development
as a Part of Political Development"

General Discussion.

6:00 Dinner

7:30 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND NATIONAL ECONOMIC CHANGE

Presiding: Francis M. Bator

Two Critiques of papers by Wilfred Malenbaum and Benjamin H. Higgins
on "Community Development and Economic Growth"

General Discussion.

Saturday, December 14th

7:45 - 8:30 Breakfast

9:30 SOCIAL AND CULTURAL FACTORS IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: Arnold Rivkin

Two Critiques of paper by Melvin Tumin on "Some Social Requirements
for Effective Community Development"

General Discussion.

Saturday, December 14th (continued)

12:00 Luncheon

2:00 PERSONALITY AS A FACTOR IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: Daniel Lerner

Two Critiques of paper by David McClelland on "Community Development and the Nature of Human Motivation"

General Discussion

6:00 Dinner

No formal program planned for the evening

Sunday, December 15th

8:15 - 9:00 Breakfast

10:30 THE PRACTICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Presiding: Irwin T. Sanders

"Professional Training for Community Development"
Margaret Read

General Discussion

"Making Community Development Programs Work"
Carl C. Taylor

General Discussion

1:00 Luncheon: Conference Impressions

Presiding: Max F. Millikan

3:00 Adjournment.

CONFERENCE WHO'S WHO

The information given below does not attempt to cover the numerous honors, achievements, or experience of the participants. It simply seeks to highlight some facts which seem to have bearing on this conference and which should prove of interest to other participants.

Zahir Ahmed, Assistant Director, Bureau of Social Affairs, United Nations Organization. Formerly Development Commissioner State of Hyderabad, India.

Conrad M. Arensberg, Professor, Department of Sociology, Columbia University. Leader, social anthropological field study, County Clare, Ireland (1932-35); Special studies in community organization and economic development in foreign areas.

John S. Badeau, President, Near East Foundation. Formerly, President, American University of Cairo. Academic discipline: philosophy. Near East Foundation operates community development programs in several countries, with most extensive one in Iran.

Francis Bator, Assistant Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Studies in economic development, international economics.

David Bell, Director of Pakistan Project and Research Associate, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University. Last three and one-half years in Pakistan as Advisor in general economics to the Planning Board of the Government of Pakistan and Field Supervisor of the Harvard Project. Special studies in economic development.

John D. Black, Professor of Economics, Harvard University. Consultant to FOA, International Institute of Education, Government of Puerto Rico. Special fields: economics of agriculture; land economics; population.

Donald L. M. Blackmer, Assistant to the Director, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Special field: Soviet studies.

James E. Boyce, President, Associates of International Research, Inc. From 1951-53 Director, Burma-American Institute, Rangoon. Studies in comparative cultures.

- Verna Carley, Community School Education, ICA Mutual Security Mission to China. Professor of Education, Stanford University; Higher Education Advisor GHQ, SCAP, Tokyo; Community Consultant, ICA since 1955.
- Karl Deutsch, Professor of History and Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Special studies in nationalism, political theory, and comparative politics.
- Marshall E. Dimock, Professor and Head, Department of Government, New York University. Helped to organize and run the Institute of Public Administration for Turkey and the Middle East at Ankara.
- Cora DuBois, Professor of Anthropology, Harvard University and Radcliffe College. Political, economic and social studies of Southeast Asia. Served with State Department, World Health Organization, Institute of International Education.
- Dennis A. Fitzgerald, Deputy Director, International Cooperation Administration. Academic Background: Economics (Ph.D., Harvard 1938); Economist, Brookings Institution; various positions with Department of Agriculture; since 1952 with MSA and successor agencies.
- George M. Foster, Professor and Acting Director of Museum of Anthropology, University of California, Berkeley. Consultant, public health and community development, ICA and member of survey team for India, Pakistan, and The Philippines; also studies in Spanish-American culture.
- Lawrence K. Frank, City Planning Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Special studies in human development, family, parent education, modern leadership, and community planning.
- A. M. Halpern, Social Scientist, RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, California. Far eastern politics and international relations.
- Benjamin H. Higgins, Visiting Professor of Economics, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Director of Indonesian Project, Center for International Studies; formerly Chief Economist UN Technical Assistance Mission to Libya; economic advisor to governments of Indonesia and The Philippines.
- Allan R. Holmberg, Professor of Anthropology, Cornell University. Cultural anthropological studies of the Indians of the Amazon Valley and the Andean regions of South America; problems of culture change in Latin America.
- Harold Isaacs, Research Associate, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Formerly associate editor and correspondent of Newsweek; author of several books on Asia; interest include Africa.
- Hugh R. Leavell, Professor of Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health, Harvard University. Consultant, Institute of Interamerican Affairs in Latin America; spent a year recently in India under the Ford Foundation working on Health Aspects of Community Development. Special studies in health education and administration.

- Daniel Lerner, Professor of Sociology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Research Director, International Studies Project, Hoover Library (1947-53); studies in Turkey and the Middle East. Communication and public opinion.
- Wilfred Malenbaum, Visiting Professor of Economics, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Served with Division of Investment and Economic Development, State Department (1948-53); Director, India Project, Center for International Studies.
- Edward S. Mason, Dean, Graduate School of Public Administration, Harvard University. Special studies in world trade and economic development. Economic advisor, National Planning Board, Pakistan (1953 to date).
- David C. McClelland, Professor of Psychology, Department of Social Relations, Harvard University. Special studies in the psychology of human motivation.
- Max F. Millikan, Director, Center for International Studies and Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Studies in economic development and most recently an analysis of the U.S. foreign aid program. Directs Center's Economic Development Program.
- Louis M. Miniclier, Chief, Community Development Division, International Cooperation Administration. Background: social services and administration. Germany six years. Department of State, Washington; United Nations Economic and Social affairs. ICA since 1954.
- Wilbert E. Moore, Professor of Sociology, Princeton University. Studies in comparative demography, industrial sociology, economic development of underdeveloped areas. Eastern Europe, Puerto Rico.
- Ernest E. Neal, Special Assistant for Community Development, ICA Mission, Manila, The Philippines. Served as Chief Community Development Advisor with ICA in India; special studies in economic bases for community development.
- Howard V. Perlmutter, Research Associate, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Senior Research Associate, AIRINC. Director, Experimental Project, International Communications Programs (India, France, Germany, Canada, United States), Center for International Studies; other studies in group dynamics.
- Lucian W. Pye, Associate Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Specialist in political behavior in countries of the Far East. Recently studied guerilla communism in Malaya.
- Margaret Read, Professor of Education, London University, Institute of Education and Head of Department of Education of Tropical Areas. Studies chiefly in Africa and on topics of social and cultural change as they affect education. Also familiar with community development programs in Mexico, Malaya and India, and the West Indies.
- Arnold Rivkin, Research Associate in Political Science, Center for International

Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Formerly Associate General Counsel, ICA and similar position with preceding agencies where he had an interest in dependent overseas territories. Special studies in African affairs.

Lloyd Rodwin, Associate Professor of Land Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Consultant, Housing and Planning Section, United Nations; studies in urban growth and structure, urban and regional problems in developing areas.

Susanne K. Rudolph, Department of Government, Harvard University. Ford Foundation Grant, Madras, India to study state government and political development in two Indian states. Areas of interest include Asian government, nationalism.

Robert Rupard, Director, Office of Public Services, International Cooperation Administration. Academic background; law. Has held administrative positions with Veterans Administration, Department of State; ECA and successor agencies (since 1948).

Irwin T. Sanders, Research Director, Associates for International Research, Inc. Founded and directed Bureau of Community Service, University of Kentucky; Village and community studies in Balkans and Eastern Europe. Community Consultant to FAO and UN.

Theodore W. Schultz, Professor of Economics and Chairman of Department, University of Chicago. Studies of agricultural policy, world food production. Specialized study of Latin America.

Julian H. Steward, Graduate Research Professor of Anthropology, University of Illinois. Special studies in contemporary social change; currently directing research program with field teams in Mexico, Peru, Africa, Burma, Malay and Japan.

Carl C. Taylor, Community Development Advisor, Ford Foundation. From 1935-1953. Head, Division of Farm Population and Rural Welfare, Bureau of Agricultural Economics, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Special study of Argentina as well as community development programs in Asia and Caribbean.

Paul S. Taylor, Chairman, Institute of International Studies, University of California, Berkeley. Studied Mexican Labor in the U.S., was a Guggenheim Latin-American fellow, served on study teams in Community Development for ICA.

Melvin M. Tumin, Associate Professor of Sociology and Anthropology, Princeton University. Studies of social stratification and social mobility in Guatemala and Puerto Rico.

Ernest F. Witte, Executive Director, Council on Social Work Education, New York City. Ph.D. in Economics and Business. Special studies in community organization, public social services. Served as team member in ICA survey of community development programs in India, Iran, Egypt, and the Gold Coast. Supervisor, ICA Project on Social Work Education in India.

