

PN - AAN - 231

S 21 - I

ISN 29906

**Report of Seminar-Cum-Workshop**  
**ON**  
**People's Participation in Rural Development**  
**in**  
**Nepal**



**APROSC**

**AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**WASHINGTON, D. C. 20053**

REPORT OF SEMINAR/WORKSHOP ON

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL

Organised by Ministry of Home Panchayat, MHP  
& Agricultural Projects Services Centre  
( APROSC )

July 24-26, 1978  
(Shrawan 9-11, 2035 B.C.)  
Hotel Blue Star  
Kathmandu, Nepal.

## C O N T E N T S

	Page.
Introduction - Dr. Ram P. Yadav, Deputy Director, APROSC . . . . .	1
Organisation of Seminar Proceedings . . . . .	3
Acknowledgements . . . . .	6
Welcome Address - Mr. Sher B. Shahi, Secretary, Home Panchayat Ministry . . . . .	7
Inaugural Address - Hon. Khadga B. Singh, Ministry for Home Panchayat . . . . .	9
Remarks by Chairman - Hon. Rabindra N. Sharma, Ministry for Food, Agriculture and Irrigation . . . . .	13
Presentation - A.Z.M. Obaidullah Khan, Secretary of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh . . . . .	17
Presentation - Mr. Sam Butterfield, Director, USAID/Nepal . . . . .	26
I. EXPERIENCE WITH PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL	
Presentation - Mr. Kul Shekhar Sharma, Governor, Nepal Rashttra Bank . .	34
Reports of Discussion Groups:	
A. Agriculture, Irrigation and Soil, Water and Forest Conservation	42
B. Health, Family Planning, Education and Other Social Services .	45
C. Rural Works (Roads, Bridges, Water Supply) and Cottage Industries	47
II. MECHANISMS FOR SUPPORTING PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL	
Presentation - Dr. Mohammad Mohsin, Member-Secretary, Back-to-Village National Campaign . . . . .	51
Reports of Discussion Groups:	
A. District and Village Panchayats and Class Organisations . . . .	60
B. Sajha Cooperatives, Small Farmer Action Groups, and Ward Development Committees . . . . .	62
C. Paraprofessionals from Village and Village-Level Workers . . . .	65

11

**III. INHIBITIONS FOR ACHIEVING GREATER PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL**

**Presentation - Dr. Norman Uphoff, Chairman, Rural Development  
Committee, Cornell University . . . . . 68**

**Reports of Discussion Groups:**

**A. Factors of Sex, Caste and Ethnic Status . . . . . 78**

**B. Factors of Land Tenure Status . . . . . 80**

**C. Relations between Civil Servants and Rural People . . . . . 83**

**IV. CONCLUDING DISCUSSION**

**Remarks - Hon. Dr. B. P. Shrestha, Vice-Chairman, National Planning  
Commission . . . . . 86**

**Remarks - Hon. Omkar P. Gauchan, Member, Rashtriya Panchayat . . . . . 93.**

**Appendix A: Schedule of Seminar . . . . . 95**

**Appendix B: List of Participants . . . . . 98**

**Appendix C: List of Abbreviations . . . . . 104**

C 11  
///

## INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this seminar on "People's Participation in Rural Development in Nepal" was to bring to light the meaning and importance of such participation in this country's development efforts. His Majesty's Government and various international donors have felt the need for greater involvement of the people in all phases of development, in planning and decision making as well as in implementation and in benefits. Practically speaking, the ways and means of getting broader based participation have not to be fully realized. Given the continuing increase in HMG efforts to achieve greater rural development, it seemed appropriate to take stock of Nepal experience and conditions as well as aspirations with respect to people's participation.

There is no doubt general agreement among Nepalis at all levels that greater people's participation is desirable. But there is need to get some clarification and consensus on several things.

- (1) What is the meaning of participation? Different things are often meant by this term. Can we be more specific about what it means and implies?
- (2) What has been the experience in Nepal with people's participation, or lack of it, in different sectors? What can be learned from this experience?
- (3) What are the mechanisms where by popular participation can be fruitfully increased?
- (4) What are the inhibitions that stand in the way of achieving broader people's participation? How can these be tackled?

The seminar sought to develop some answers to these questions for Nepal. A copy of the schedule for the seminar is given in the Appendix (pages 95 ).

## Introduction - 2

We were gratified that Hon. B. P. Shrestha, Vice-Chairman of National Planning Commission, indicated in his concluding remarks that this seminar was particularly timely and relevant because His Majesty's Government is beginning to conceptualize and map out the next Five-Year Plan, with greater emphasis on people's participation. The aim of this seminar was to help achieve a broader base of agreement within HMG on how this participation should be promoted in development plans and programmes.

This report cannot include all that was said and debated in the three days. That would require a whole book. We hope that this summarization of the proceedings will serve to inform a much wider number of persons throughout Nepal of the ideas and conclusions presented for consideration. This seminar should not be seen as concluding the discussion on this important subject. Rather we hope it has raised the discussion to a higher level so more people can join in. We wish this report to stimulate more thought and discussion about Nepal's experience and Nepal's needs, about what is desirable and what is possible, so that we can all more faithfully and effectively contribute to the goals of development-cum-participation which His Majesty has so thoughtfully pointed out.

Dr. Ram Prakash Yadav  
Deputy Director, APROSC  
Seminar Coordinator

ORGANISATION OF SEMINAR PROCEEDINGS

The seminar was inaugurated on July 24, 1978 by Hon. Mr. Khadga B. Singh, Minister for Home Panchayat, followed by his inaugural address. This was preceded by a welcome address by Mr. Sher B. Shahi, Secretary, Ministry of Home Panchayat on behalf of the organisers. The inaugural address was followed by a speech by Hon. Mr. Rabindra Nath Sharma, Minister for Food, Agriculture and Irrigation, who was the chairman of the inauguration ceremony. The opening session was closed with a vote of thanks by Dr. Ram P. Yadav, Deputy Director, APROSC.

Papers were presented in the seminar by Mr. A.Z.M. Obsaidullah Khan, Secretary of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh; Mr. Sam Butterfield, Director of the USAID Mission in Nepal; Mr. Kul Shekhar Sharma, Governor of Nepal Rashtira Bank; Dr. Mohammad Mohsin, member-secretary of Back-to-Village National Campaign Central Committee; and Dr. Norman Uphoff, Chairman of Cornell University's Rural Development Committee. A paper prepared by Dr. Prakash C. Lohani for the seminar which he was unable to attend was circulated at the meeting.

Presentations of the papers were followed by some questions from the floor. Then after answers from the speakers, the whole seminar divided into three discussion groups on Monday afternoon, Tuesday morning and Tuesday afternoon. The topics of the discussion groups were:

- I. Experience with People's Participation in Nepal with respect to:
  - A. Agriculture, Irrigation and Soil, Water and Forest Conservation
  - B. Health, Family Planning Education and Other Social Services
  - C. Public Works (Roads Bridges Water Supply) and Cottage Industries
- II. Mechanisms for Supporting People's Participation in Nepal:
  - A. District and Village Panchayats and Class Organisations

B. Sajha Cooperatives, Small Farmer Action Groups, and Ward Development Committees

C. Paraprofessionals from Villages and Village-Level Workers

III. Inhibitions for Achieving Greater People's Participation in Nepal:

A. Factors of Sex, Caste and Ethnic Status

B. Factors of Land Tenure Status

C. Relations between Civil Servants and Rural people

Each discussion group had a chairman, moderator and rapporteurs. The number of participants in each group was about 35 people. The rapporteurs assisted the moderators in preparing a group report which was then presented to the whole seminar on Wednesday afternoon. Presentations of the reports was followed by comments by participants from the floor. With a concluding statement by Hon. Dr. B.P. Shrestha, Vice Chairman of the National Planning Commission, the seminar came to an end. (See appendix A, pages 95, for complete schedule and names of the chairman and moderators of discussion groups).

The participants in the seminar were drawn from various institutions, organisations and walks of life. Among others, the participants came from among the honourable members of the Rastriya Panchayat and National Planning Commission. The seminar was participated in by Secretaries from several ministries of HMG, Zonal Commissioners, Back-to-Village National Campaign Committee members, Chairman of District Panchayats, and Chief District Officers. Among others there were representatives from the Ministry of Education, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Irrigation, Ministry of Public Works and Transport, Ministry of Industry and Commerce, Departments of Agriculture, Irrigation, Land Reform, Forest, Soil & Water Conservation, Local Development, Cottage Industries and Health Services. From Tribhuvan University were the Vice-Chancellor and members of its various organs, e.g. CNAS, CEDA, Political Science Department and National Development Service.

There were participants from various institutions and corporations, such as Agricultural Development Bank, Nepal Rastra Bank, Industrial Services Centre, Dairy Development Corporation, Panchayat Training Centre, and APROSC members. The seminar participants included members of the Social Services Central Coordination Committee. Among the foreign agencies who had their members among the participants were IBRD/World Bank, ICM, SATA, UNDP and USAID. Members were drawn from rural development projects, e.g. K-Bird (Karnali-Bheri Integrated Rural Development), KHARDEP (Kosi Hill Area Development Project), HADP (Hill Area Development Project), and IHDP (Integrated Hill Development Project). The seminar had also other scholars, researchers and social workers present among its participants. (A list of participants is given in Appendix B, pages 98).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The organisers of the seminar would like to thank the Honourable Ministers and resource persons who made presentations to the seminar to stimulate thought and discussion so well. We would like to thank also the chairmen and moderators of the discussion groups who made an important contribution to the work of the seminar. The moderators were assisted in preparing their reports by rapporteurs whom we would like to thank: Dr. D. D. Joshi, Mr. P. Misra, Mr. S. Pandey and Mr. S. Sharma for groups I/A, II/A and III/B; Mr. Surendra B. Adhikari, Mr. Khalil Miyan and Mr. B. H. Dahal for groups I/B, II/C and III/C; and Mr. Pramode S. Pal, Ms. Ramrajya Joshi and Mr. Madhav Karki for groups I/C, II/B and III/A.

The costs of the seminar were underwritten by the U.S.A.I.D. Mission in Nepal, and the organisers would like to express their appreciation to its director, Mr. Sam Butterfield and his staff. USAID also made available for the seminar as resource persons Mr. Obaidullah Khan, Secretary of Agriculture, Bangladesh, and Dr. Norman Uphoff, Chairman, Rural Development Committee, Cornell University. Dr. Uphoff also assisted in preparation of the final report.

EXCERPTS FROM WELCOMING SPEECH BY MR. SHER B. SHAHI, SECRETARY, MINISTRY  
OF HOME PANCHAYAT

On behalf of the organisers, I welcome you all to this inaugural session of the Seminar/Workshop on "People's Participation in Rural Development in Nepal," being sponsored by the Ministry of Home Panchayat and APROSC.

First of all, I would take this opportunity to say that the organisers are highly pleased to learn about the extensive interest that has been shown by persons in all the concerned fields towards this Seminar. It was originally planned as a small seminar for perhaps 35 persons. However, as a result of the intensive interest forthcoming from concerned institutions, departments and individuals, the present number of participants has reached about 135 (see Appendix for list). We are sorry that we could not accommodate the requests by many others to participate. Nevertheless, the enthusiasm that has been displayed towards this seminar has been a great inspiration to the organisers.

It would be belabouring the obvious to say that our success in development plans and programmes depends mainly on people's participation. Enhancing the broad participation by the people in the implementation of our development programmes and in the distribution of the benefits thereof has remained both an urgent necessity as well as a challenge before us. His Majesty the King himself has given us the direction for our development by saying that our development plans must enlist the wide cooperation of the people. This is indeed the basis of all round development.

To the organisers this Seminar is of special importance because of the organisers, APROSC is presently involved in the preparation of several integrated rural development projects, while the responsibility for coordinating activities in their implementation will rest with the Ministry of Home & Panchayat. It is proposed that six integrated development projects will be

launched next year in the country. To this end, the organisers hope to be highly benefited by the discussions and conclusions of the Seminar.

Lastly, I would like to express our gratitude to Hon. Minister for Food, Agriculture and Irrigation for chairing this inauguration session. We also thank Hon. Home Panchayat Minister for accepting our request to inaugurate this Seminar and give the inaugural address. We would also like to thank the participants who have come to the Seminar for the contributions we know they can make.

EXCERPTS FROM INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY HON. MINISTER FOR HOME PANCHAYAT, MR.  
KHADGA BAHADUR SINGH

First of all, I would like to express my heartfelt congratulations to the Agricultural Projects Service Centre (APROS) for having organised this important seminar/workshop on a very topical theme, "People's Participation in Rural Development in Nepal."

Our rural life extends from the Himalayan region to the hills and valleys and inner terai and terai, and this life remains ever difficult for our people. Increased population density, especially in the hills, has often led to indiscriminate encroachment on the forest lands, even for meagre cultivation. This in turn has led to increased soil erosion. Coupled with this situation in the hills is also a situation of indiscriminate deforestation in the terai, on account of massive migration that has taken place from the difficult hills. Together they have created a situation where the levels of the rivers in the terai has been rising and consequently to the destruction of much of our fertile lands on account of frequent floods. The rural life has thus become more and more difficult. Our rural population, especially the youth, have been thus compelled to become city-oriented, on the one hand, and to look toward foreign lands for livelihood, on the other. I may submit therefore that development of the rural areas poses many problems as well as a serious challenge for us.

In our scheme of things in Nepal, after the 2007 B.S. (1951) revolution, we initiated the Tribhuvan Gram Bikash program for village development, which covered only a few pockets instead of the entire country. Even with this concentration we achieved only partial success in bringing about some consciousness in the minds of our village folks. In this way, our system remained unable to bring about rural participation in its endeavors for village development.

The post-revolution period was one in which many of our traditional values were discarded without being able to adopt a suitable alternative. Our people in the society became divided into various groups and parties, not just in the political field but also in the social and other development fields. Narrow sectional interests became overriding. There was even opposition only for its own sake, with one group always trying to nullify the programmes of other groups no matter how well-intentioned were those programmes for national development.

The political change that took place in 2017 B.S. (1960) brought about a momentous transformation in our conduct of national affairs. This change in our attitudes and conception was evident also in our concern for rural development. We can realize that as long as the people for whom development is meant do not themselves become conscious and active, any programme for their development would meet only frustration. Without participation by the local people in the village it becomes impossible to enlist their efforts in development.

A new environment more conducive for rural development emerged. We have now various institutional levels of ward, village, district panchayats, etc. that can be used in bringing about effective participation by local people in our development programmes in the rural areas. Through these institutional mechanisms we have been successful in undertaking various programmes, although many of them are small-scale, in building canals, opening up schools, construction of bridges, etc. All this has surely led to a new era where the problems are to be considered, identified and discussed at the local level, in the village itself. We may note here the invaluable contribution made by His Late Majesty King Mahendra that led us to usher in this new era.

I must confess here that we have a long way to go in this direction of integrating resources, especially manpower, at the local level with the limited physical and human resources, including technical manpower, available from the Government. There are several cases where projects initiated at the local level have been frustrated because the Government has been unable to provide assistance by making available some experts to the project as its due share. Realizing this problem, His Majesty's Government has initiated recently a number of integrated rural development projects. It is intended to integrate whatever resources are available at the local level with that are possible on the part of the Government. Often when locally initiated programmes and projects fail, it is because HMG fails to make available some necessary inputs. Also some programmes the Government initiates fail because of its inability to enlist the active participation by the people. The people look upon those programmes as only that of the Government and not as concerning themselves.

Part of the problem may lie with the complexity and remoteness of Government programmes, with certain inconsistency often evident in several programmes and projects. For instance, even within the Ministry of Home Panchayat we have different kinds of plans. For instance, those which are launched by and at the local levels with some financial contributions by His Majesty's Government. Some programs are directly planned and implemented from the centre. There is the Small Area Development Programmes (SADP) in which a small viable panchayat area is identified, where resources are to be intensively used for its all round development. Finally we have gotten into integrated rural development projects which have already been mentioned. Coordination is important because in a resource-scarce country like ours, due attention should be directed to minimization of duplication in use of resources in related projects.

We have also adopted the programme of Panchayat Development and Land Tax in order to mobilise resources at the local level. The new District Administration Plan has been implemented with the purpose of enlisting the creative participation of the local people. For unless the participation of people is enlisted in every stage of a programme -- participation in identification, implementation and evaluation -- people's participation in the true sense of the term will not be forthcoming. This is true also in mobilising resources at the local level for which PDLT was introduced as I have already mentioned.

One of the principal considerations that has to be taken by us, especially for inducing the local people, for instance the farmers, to accept newer techniques and technologies, is to see that they are not only fairly comprehensible to them but are also at the same time profitable to undertake. Not all that appears good to us may be profitable or practical to rural people. I think these are considerations that need to be thoroughly taken to heart by us when we seek to introduce innovations in the life and production of rural areas in the process of rural development.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the organisers of this seminar for having given me an opportunity to express some of my impressions about rural development in the context of Nepal.

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN, HON. MINISTER FOR FOOD, AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION, MR. RABINDRA NATH SHARMA

First of all, I would like to thank the organisers for giving me the opportunity to chair this inauguration session of the seminar/workshop on "People's Participation in Rural Development in Nepal."

When we begin to talk about rural development, we face some very important questions: What is Rural Development? Rural Development for whom? and How to carry out rural development programmes? Whom do we want to involve and provide benefits for from rural development programmes and activities ?

The efforts and process of village development are not new things for Nepal. Our country is largely constituted of villages, and the majority of people live in the villages. Unless we develop the villages we cannot develop Nepal. Only when we are clear with respect to our policy and strategy of rural development can we proceed with a relevant programme of development.

Development means upliftment. But upliftment for whom? The answer to this question is: the upliftment of people who are residing in the villages. In villages there are people who are prosperous and rich, and side by side with them are people who are depressed and poor. There are people who are below the line of poverty, who face day-to-day problems of maintaining their daily life at even a meagre subsistence level.

First of all we need to be clear about who is the "target group," who is to benefit from development. The next question is, how to bring about people's participation? Who is to decide matters? Should we at the top be deciding about the programmes which are to benefit the target group? Or should we first be making efforts to identify their needs and find out the kinds of programmes that they are interested in, and the kind of projects that will meet their needs? What kind of projects will best utilise their local skills and resources?

They must be brought into decision-making for identifying these projects and only then can we at the centre be providing useful technical and financial support to implement rural development projects.

Our past experience indicates that we have prepared plans for them which were suppose to benefit them and thereby get their participation. However, we found out there was a wide gap between the ambitious plans and the implementation. The benefits that were envisioned in the plans could not be achieved. In spite of our substantial investment in the rural sector, the impact of this investment is not discernable in the living conditions of the people. This is the truth and we all must not shy away from the reality.

If we analyze the agricultural sector, the portfolio which I am looking after, what we find is that the people who receive credit, agricultural inputs and extension services have by and large benefited from the programmes. But the majority of the people, who are small farmers and landless, have been bypassed in this process. Why has this happened? This happened because we started agricultural development with the conviction that as investment is made in the rural sector, everybody will benefit through its trickle-down and radiation effects. But this conviction turned out to be wrong. This I would again emphasize, we must identify the target groups who are to benefit from our development efforts and orient our programmes to that section of the population.

One of our major resources is labour. In order to create a more prosperous and exploitationless society through the panchayat system it is essential to bring development which will draw on and benefit this labour. The mechanism for such mobilization is through the panchayats and village-level institutions such as Sajha societies. But there must be representation of small farmers in the Sajha society executive boards. The experience of the Small Farmer Development Programme indicates that small farmers are weak when alone and reluctant

to take risks. But in a group they are strong. We must give the implementation authority for such projects to the people, through the political process rather than leave it entirely under the domain of bureaucracy.

Often we tend to spend a lot of money on a seminar/workshop for small farmers. It is my feeling that the amount spent on some of these seminars is more than the amount that can be used to carry out small projects for direct benefits.

As far as people's participation in rural development is concerned, they should be involved to participate in planning, decision-making and implementation. Only then can we proceed in the right direction. Otherwise, if in the name of people's participation we start opening several offices and increase the bureaucracy, we will end up where we were before and the effort will be self-defeating. Therefore we must be cautious about adopting administrative approaches.

Let me give you some examples of people's participation in some of the projects. Political involvement is essential, and in implementation of these projects not only the technicians and bureaucrats but the politicians were made equally responsible. There was political accountability that brought a greater involvement of politicians, even for the sake of their own political careers.

There was an irrigation project which needed people's participation in its construction. But only a limited number of people owned land. Only they would benefit. How could we involve people who didn't possess land? There were 20 families who had no land, so to involve them, land was given to them to bring participation. At Bajhtar in an irrigation project of 2200 ropanis, about 35 households owned most of the land. Why should the others participate in that irrigation project? It was agreed that if all the big landowners gave 50% of the production off 50% of their land to the district panchayat, to be used to carry out other district-level projects, all would participate. Thus it is

essential that all people who are to participate must feel that they benefit from such participation. If they decide things among themselves, as at Bajhtar, it is better than having the same decision come from the centre. If the decision would have been made at the centre, it would be difficult to implement.

If we want to bring people's participation into rural development, we must be clear about who is to participate, who is going to benefit, who are involved in the decision-making. If they are brought into the decision-making process and if they feel it is their project, not something given from the centre, then only can there be effective people's participation.

In conclusion, I hope that this distinguished group will exchange their views on this topic and come up with some significant recommendations which reach to the real problems and real conditions rather than remain simply abstract. With this I wish you success in your workshop. Thank you.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY MR. A. Z. M. OBAIDULLAH KHAN ON "EXPERIENCE WITH PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN OTHER COUNTRIES"

(Mr. Khan is presently serving as Secretary of Agriculture in the Government of Bangladesh, having served previously as its Secretary of Rural Development. He was associated with the now well-known Comilla Project in Bangladesh, headed by Akhter Hameed Khan, from its beginning, and served for 2½ years as Bangladesh's agricultural attache in China, writing a book on rural development experience there, The Chinese People Speak. He has served as a consultant for the World Bank on rural development and headed a United Nations review of all its activities in rural development in 1974-75.)

The rhetoric of popular participation and rural development in the recent development literature has suffered a very acute verbal inflation, whether in national programmes or in the preambles of international agencies' documents. We have so many references to rural development and to the genuine participation of the majority of the people. On the other hand, rural underdevelopment has deteriorated continuously in most of the developing countries. In fact, the misery of the people, the poor majority, has increased in exactly the inverse proportion of the rhetoric on the subject.

There is also confusion about what is rural development? For some people, it is just a question of going to an area which is arbitrarily called "rural" (the U.N. definition is that any cluster which is less than 20,000 is rural), and trying to develop that area. Another approach is to take agricultural production programmes and add a little cosmetic of social services like health and education. The latest fashion is to talk about the target group, the rural poor who are to benefit from development. «The recent change in development focus is like this, instead of trying to "catch up" with the West through capital transfer or technology transfer, development efforts should focus on the rural people, on their participation in decision making and implementation, rather than on an enclave urban sector. This new focus includes a corresponding concern with people's organisations and the institutional setup.

The whole concept of "target groups" smacks of the old patron-client relationships which we are trying to get away from. Most governments and international development agencies are talking about induced participation of the rural poor. Yet in many developing countries, the question of development is essentially one of transforming the agrarian society in a fundamental process of social, economic and political change in which the main actors and decision-makers are the members of the agrarian society themselves. Governments have a critical role in assisting this process of change through resource allocation decisions, through rural-urban terms of trade, through policies and programs in favor of the rural people. External agencies can assist governments in this task. But neither should believe that they are "doing" rural development.

When government considers that it is "doing" rural development, what happens can be well illustrated by what a friend of mine wrote for the ILO: "Planning from the top has in practice usually meant planning for the top." The present crisis in rural development, the deepening poverty, is not merely an unfortunate episode but an inevitable consequence of past intentions to exclude the rural majority from development planning and processes, to avoid institutional and structural reforms including agrarian reforms, and to concentrate narrowly on increasing production. The present tendency to focus discussion on so-called "target groups," the rural poor, is to be welcomed in that it emphasizes that rural development should be primarily for the poor. It is incomplete in that it fails to emphasize that development increasingly be by the poor. When Abraham Lincoln talked about government of, by and for the people would never be stamped out from the earth, what we are experiencing, at least in most developing countries, is government administered to the people. It is the policy makers, the bureaucrats, the technocrats who along with donors decide what is good for the rural people. Then they try to impose that package on

the rural population. What is attempted generally goes beyond the understanding of the people and they become confused and more dependent. This has happened with many of the cleverly and rationally designed "packages" of rural development.

Further, in a stratified society, where the local power structure has definitely an elitist bias, it is difficult to involve people in participatory development. An example of this was the Chilalo Agricultural Development Unit (CADU) project in Ethiopia, done with the Swedish government assistance, and with a supposedly participatory approach. We found that a major reason for the failure of the project was the restrictive, self-serving local government system and the collaboration between elitist local government officials and the provincial elites. In such a system, it is clearly necessary to build up viable, countervailing people's organizations. This is very difficult. Small farmer cooperatives have been set up in various countries. I have had the pleasure of being associated with the ones beginning in Comilla. These were supposed to be cooperatives of small farmers, to raise their savings and to channel inputs to them. Because of the highly stratified society, even with a relatively egalitarian situation like Bangladesh, what happened was that many of these cooperatives were taken over by the more prosperous farmers, for gentile rural corruption and for elitist self-service.

I would suggest three important considerations drawing on examination of experience in a good many countries. First, although it would be a dangerous assumption to make in many instances, factions of the national leadership in some countries drawn from and largely responsive to the elites may in fact intervene against local power to distribute benefits to the weak and the majority. Second, a delicate balance between supervision from the top and participation from below can be obtained through the use of intermediaries between government and the people drawn from the community group itself and remaining accountable to the community organization. Third, such organizations must be built on a

clear recognition that there are conflicts of interest within village society, and that these need to be openly aired and addressed. A big problem with the Comilla cooperatives was that they were each for the whole village. In this circumstance, normally the marginal farmers are excluded, the landless laborers want nothing to do with it. Maybe the small farmers get some benefit, but ultimately the cooperatives become the domain of those who are more powerful. So in a stratified society, I would like to suggest that if you really want to have popular participation, what is more important is interest-based people's organizations at the local level, which means plural organizations so that more and more voices can be heard through more and more institutions. There can be the local government system, the cooperatives of small farmers, the unions of landless laborers. There can be various types of organizations. We must be careful, however, that these organizations do not become taken over or crushed by local powers.

I would like to discuss some of the assumptions that lie behind such a strategy. The assumption in participatory development is this, that a reservoir of creativity exists among the rural poor, and that their participation, in day-to-day decision making, in all phases of local economic and social activities will provide them with awareness and willingness to channel their energy most effectively. In other words, the emphasis is on increasing the largely untapped productive capability of the majority of the population in rural areas whose productivity has not yet been harnessed.

There is another assumption, that people participate most freely and fully in what is theirs. If I ask a landless laborer to participate in a public works project that increases the value of the land of the landlord, or that helps the farmer bring his goods to market, why should he participate, if he does not himself benefit from the process? One condition for broad participation is that the

majority has access to productive resources, be it land, water, credit or whatever. This access to resources is a political decision and such political decisions are quite difficult within existing political and social constraints of many developing countries.

In this respect, rural development likely involves redistribution, and that means people giving up something. Yet there might be a willing giving up if we consider the concept, not of trickle-down, but of trickle-up. If those who have could conceive that the increased output will be shared by them also, this could improve the middle and upper classes' reaction to the proposed redistribution effort.

One source of difficulties in getting participatory development may be the bureaucratic structure itself -- and remember that I am a bureaucrat myself, so please don't take it otherwise. If decentralization and popular participation are supposed to be the sine qua non of a development process which releases the creative energy of the majority, nevertheless I fear both are anathema to many bureaucrats. A civil service takes on the role of servant to the people with very bad grace. If we really want decentralization, let us not talk about union parishads or panchayats unless they are given real authority, and unless the experts, the technocrats and the bureaucrats are made responsible and answerable to those bodies. Otherwise the dichotomy will continue and the local government bodies will remain an academic framework without expert services. It will remain the officials who control the development process and the line ministries will continue to trickle down their favors and patronages to various groups.

If we take an approach to rural development which wants to incorporate more and more people for a better life, than we have to build upon the existing local resources, the existing local culture, and the existing manpower. One

has to build upon the local majority. The government has to decide with whom it will lay, the majority or the minority. Under present social and political constraints, the majority are the silent ones, and the minority are those on whom the majority are dependent, so the minority cannot be simply dismissed. This is a fact of life. But within these constraints, many governments have succeeded and have done rural development projects and programs which benefit the rural poor. I would like to identify some of the major elements where they have been successful. The countries have been as varied as Taiwan and the People's Republic of China, Sri Lanka and Tanzania, South Korea and North Korea, where participation has been part of a transformation of the agrarian society.

The first step has been some redistribution of current assets, and in most cases this is land. It could be done by imposition or by involving peasants in local committees to implement this themselves. Without some such distribution, whatever we may try will only postpone the increase of poverty. We can only buy some time, but the processes of history will at some time take us over.

A second thing found in these countries are very strong local organizations, which can deal with the national government on an equal footing. The concept behind this is self-reliance, not autarky, where there is interaction between the different levels of government on a cooperative, not a compelled basis. There are good and bad examples of this from China, but as far as production plans are concerned, and this is accepted even by critics of China, there is a thorough and participatory system, from the production team at the bottom all the way up to the center, with each level more or less autonomous within the broad framework set by the plan. There is an intricate process of consultation, back and forth, back and forth between levels, taking 3-4 months before a certain production plan is agreed upon. When communities do not agree

with central ideas, upper echelon planners and bureaucrats go into the rural areas, working along with the people, proving to them if they can that the idea is good, to get positive acceptance before something is done.

Third, there is the relationship between rural and urban areas. The agrarian sector has not been transformed often because of a policy which Mao described as "drying the pond to catch the fish," i.e., constantly taking away the rural surplus for industrialization. The theory in China is that local income, certainly increments to it, should not be taxed away by the central government but should remain in rural areas for investment. This way the people know that their money is to be used in the area. This makes possible the diversification and increase of production.

What can be done to promote participatory rural development, even in the often difficult situations which most developing countries find themselves in? There is considerable scope for improving rural infrastructure by using the labor power in the countryside. But some cautions should be expressed. Everyone talks about voluntary labor of rural people, but not of urban people. Roads in urban areas are paved with money from the exchequer, but rural roads are to be improved by voluntary work. In my country, 40% of people have to earn their livelihood by selling their labor, and it is criminal just to mobilize these people for voluntary labor, especially when they have no say in what public works will be constructed, when they will be constructed, where and how. With this caution, it is still true that there is often no alternative in a poor country for capital formation and local infrastructure development. At Comilla we were seeking a model for local participation and cost sharing. In China I have seen how a major project to tame a huge river involved discussing the whole plan with each and every locality (3,000), so that each put forward its own labor plan, setting out how much resources would be local and how much central.

Without such matching, our countries will remain poor for a long time, and hopes for participation and development will remain only hopes.

On the question of technology, which to adopt, we can start with the presumption that we will develop ourselves on the basis of our own resources, using available technology or only somewhat improved technology, or we can attempt broadscale transfer of technology. Any blind transfer leads to non-participation by the users, who should have a full understanding of the technology and should be its masters. There is a problem in Bangladesh, where we have some excellent professionals, who do not want any compromise on "standards." They are already worried because they are living in the third best world and don't want to use third best technology. But we have to make some compromises in standards and techniques, by thinking, with what little we have how much can we do, that will be integral to the people themselves?

A most important aspect is the whole educational setup. We have now a lot of talk about non-formal education (NFE). For those like us, we go from school to college to university to civil service. For the rural poor there is a non-formal education stream, for the poor cousins. NFE is completely unacceptable in this sense. But experimentation in education is going on, in Bangladesh and elsewhere, to make education more relevant and to adapt it to the needs and conditions of rural people, which often means taking it out of the classroom and into their lives.

Some specific actions would be first, to put all primary schools in rural areas under the control of local communities. Second, all extension agents (and I have 6,000 that I am responsible for in Bangladesh), who are not farmers and don't go to the villages, should be selected not on the basis of college degrees but as nominees of the villagers. They can be trained, as simply as possible, over some period of time, in-service, to become responsible for local

development. Third, we could make compulsory that all students do work in the rural areas. We might make entrance to the university based on two criteria, academic results and how villagers evaluate their work in the village. Unless there is more educated personnel in villages at the service of local organizations, all talk about top-down, bottom-up planning will be really a whitewash to continue what we have been doing.

Finally, I would suggest more attention to the role of women, who are important not only for reproduction but for production. Most programs for women now emphasis things like nutrition, cooking and home economics, and handicrafts. Yet the fact remains that at least in my country, women do the seed preparation, winnowing and threshing, post-harvest management, etc., with no remuneration I might add. Efforts should be directed to making women's production functions more skillful, involving them also in planning processes for these and even giving certain remuneration. Otherwise, as the Chinese say, "women are holding up half the sky," and half the sky will continue to fall upon us, and poverty will be perpetuated.

These have been deliberately somewhat provocative remarks. I hope they will stimulate discussion and consideration and will be glad to elaborate on country experiences in the discussions to follow.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY MR. SAM BUTTERFIELD ON "THE MEANING, VALUE AND IMPLICATIONS OF A PARTICIPATORY APPROACH TO DEVELOPMENT"

(Mr. Butterfield is currently Director of the USAID Mission in Nepal. He has served previously in USAID as Director for East and Southern Africa in the Washington headquarters, as Deputy Director for the mission in Sudan, then as Deputy Director and Director for the mission in Tanzania. After this, as Associate Assistant Administrator of USAID in Washington, he headed AID's Working Group on the Rural Poor, which charted new directions for the Agency. This paper was co-authored with J. Gabriel Campbell, USAID/Nepal.)

The concept of participation as it applies to development is not altogether new. It brings together many old ideas under a new rubric. And because it entails many familiar ideas at the same time it introduces a new form, there is a lack of clear understanding of the concept of participation, its meaning, value and implications for development. Having almost taken the form of a slogan, it suffers the uncritical acceptance or rejection that seems the fate of most slogans. Participation means many things to many people: for some it refers only to voluntary contribution of labour; for some it defines certain kinds of political structures; for some it is a moral imperative; and for others it is a broad catch-all for any activity that involves a sufficient number of people one way or another.

World-wide experience shows that effective rural development requires the integration of a number of things. Among them are appropriate infrastructure for communications and marketing, price policies that encourage food production, family planning, health and education systems that reach the villages, agricultural research aimed at small farmers, decentralized administration, local decision-making institutions for local problems, and the willing, disciplined participation of rural families. Experience seems to show that of all the elements that make up effective rural development programs, the active participation of the majority of the people is the most crucial. Thus, because it is a technical requirement of the development process, we need to get a clearer understanding of what is involved in effective participation.

### Dimensions of the Concept of Participation

The elucidation of the concept of "participation" provided in the monograph by John Cohen and Norman Uphoff,<sup>1/</sup> provides an excellent framework within which we can examine the meaning of participation in development. They suggest the concept of participation can be understood in terms of three basic categories (or dimension):

- (1) the kinds of participation (the "what" of participation)
- (2) the type of people who participate (the "who" of participation)
- (3) the mechanisms and characteristics of participatory activities (the "how" of participation)

Of particular importance in any discussion of participation are the specific kinds, which Cohen and Uphoff have broken down into participation in:

- (a) decision-making, (b) implementation, (c) benefits, and (d) evaluation.

Is participation a means or an end of development? From the point of development planning and administration, it is evident that our primary concern is with participation in benefits. While various political strategies and ideologies may place broad-based participation in decision-making, implementation and evaluation as major goals in themselves, the developer is primarily concerned with the distribution of benefits to the people. In this sense, widespread participation in benefits helps to define our major "end" in development.

Using this understanding of the goal of development, the question for developers becomes first of all, how to increase such participation in the benefits of programs designed to meet the world's basic human needs. It is in terms of the extent to which participation in decision-making, implementation and evaluation are necessary and useful to increasing participation in benefits that these kinds of participation are of importance to us.

<sup>1/</sup> John M. Cohen and Norman T. Uphoff, Rural Development Participation: Concepts and Measures for Project Design, Implementation and Evaluation, Cornell University, Rural Development Committee, January 1977.

Our concern as developers is with weighing the importance of these other kinds of participation as a means to reaching our goal. It is the job of politicians and statesmen to determine to what extent different kinds of participation are also important as ends in themselves. To advocate uncritically all kinds of participation for its own sake would be to confuse many types of means with our ends -- and possibly leave us more confused than we would have been without the concept of participation.

#### The Value of Participation to the Development of Rural Areas

The Indonesian developer Soedjamoko has written in a recent article that "We still don't know...despite a few obvious success stories, how to bring about rural development."<sup>2/</sup> Nevertheless, there is increasing evidence that some kinds of participation show a high correlation with the more successful rural development programs. Development Alternatives, Inc., conducted an exhaustive study of 36 rural development projects sponsored by various institutions operating in 11 African and Latin American countries. They concluded that when a large number of possible success determinants were weighed, "small farmer involvement in project decision-making and his resource commitment to the project accounted for nearly 50 percent of the differences in success scores of the projects."<sup>3/</sup>

We cannot assume from these results that participation in decision-making and contribution are the single most important determinants to successful rural development. In fact, it is likely that the formula for success differs by nation and area and depends on a wide variety of factors working together within each instance. However, the results of the DAI study, which are also borne out in our own experience, do indicate the high potential of the participatory approach.

<sup>2/</sup> "National Policy Implications of the Basic Needs Model," Part I, p. 2

<sup>3/</sup> Strategies for Small Farmer Development: An Empirical Study of Rural Development Projects, Executive Summary, Final Report, p. 2.

The Value of Participation in Decision-Making

In the 1950s and 1960s, many countries thought of development in terms of centralized investments and the question of people's participation was, therefore, not considered very important. However, in this decade and probably for many years ahead, national development programs are supplementing investments in physical infrastructure with major attention to the problems of rural development, such as increasing agricultural production on small farms, improving health of villagers or mobilizing village resources. Government cannot by its own decision cause these changes to happen. Government can contribute but government cannot make change take place. The degree to which government programs are successful directly depends on whether they are able to create the conditions under which individual farmer families themselves to decide to adopt new behavioral patterns or make their own microinvestments.

Given this ultimate dependence on widespread participation in decisions to pursue rural development, both at the individual and the community level, it follows that organized participation in local development decision-making would increase the speed and degree of development. Involvement of the local people in the design, adaptation of design, and organization of a project can go a long way to insure that the inputs delivered by the project are genuinely wanted and needed by the people and are made available in a form that is economically and culturally acceptable.

This truism is often recognized in principle, but it is rare that real operational decision-making power is taken from us bureaucrats and actually given to the people. Naturally, not all decision-making regarding the design, budgeting and organization of a development project can or should be taken out of the hands of government experts. However, it is clear that there is much more room for local decision-making regarding field aspects of a project within the overall framework set out by central government.

### The Value of Participation in Implementation

The value of involving the local population in various aspects of project implementation is also evident from an analysis of the development process. Clearly, the scarcity of development resources, including money, labor, materials, information, and management, is one of the largest constraints on effective development. However, it is here that widespread local participation in implementation provides us with a means to help break the deadlock. As experience in Nepal and elsewhere has demonstrated, there is a large reservoir of resources in the form of voluntary labor and contributions of local materials, that can be mobilized to maximize development resources. (This does not mean, however, that local labor should always be uncompensated.) In addition, although rarely tapped to any significant degree, it is evident that there are considerable resources of information and management skills at the local level which could be used to overcome some of the center-level shortages. Data from the rural areas of Nepal and other countries shows that most local communities demonstrate considerable managerial ability for organizing and implementing local projects if encouraged and not impeded by higher levels of government.

The Development Alternatives study suggests that local commitment of resources (human and financial) to project implementation may be the most effective means of increasing local commitment to project success, to bringing about those individual decisions which are essential to development. A word of caution is, however, necessary. Commitment to project success will not necessarily be the outcome of participation in project implementation if local resources are mobilized without the concurrence and understanding of the local people. It is essential that there be sufficient local participation in decision-making so that local people perceive the project to be in the best interests of the community. At times, the amount of labor required will be such, or the benefits so delayed that projects will want to reimburse local labor as

a means of increasing local employment and injecting financial inputs into the area.

#### Other Benefits from Participation

For the development process to be successful, we need to have a constant inflow of information on the relative success of project strategies. This monitoring and evaluation information allows development planners and administrators to expand, adjust or drop various programs and strategies on the basis of their actual effectiveness in the field. The history of monitoring and evaluation activities in development presents a classic example of the "top-down" approach. There is no doubt that some of the skills required for applying sophisticated criteria in project evaluation will continue to call for the services of highly trained personnel. However there are many spheres of project monitoring and evaluation in which the local people can have a better understanding of the problems and better solutions than we can provide from the centre. There certainly appears to be scope for a greatly expanded utilization of local personnel and committees to participate in the process of project monitoring and evaluation.

#### Implications of the Participatory Approach to Development

Soedjatmoko has noted that all programs designed to meet basic human needs, require a much greater degree of community participation and organization, encompassing village cooperatives and the evolution of traditional village organizations, and the opportunity for them to exercise autonomous authority. The development of such organizational and managerial capability is at best a slow and uneven process. It is obvious that both the program implementation on the administrative side, as well as the development of an increasing role of such grassroot organizations will inevitably have to be experimental in nature at an early stage, and will have to be continuously monitored and evaluated.<sup>4/</sup>

Providing genuine decision-making and implementation power to local communities,

<sup>4/</sup> Soedjatmoko, op. cit., Part IV, p. 6.

then, implies that development projects are flexible enough to allow these groups to exercise their autonomy to do things their own way within broad guidelines. However, this requires that development officials are: (a) actually willing to distribute some of their decision-making power to local communities, and (b) that they are willing to make things administratively harder for themselves by allowing considerable variety in the precise shape of different local institutions. Both of these requirements run counter to most prevailing bureaucratic behavioral patterns.

In this regard, Ruttan has observed that in expanding successful pilot rural development projects into regional or national programmes, the administrative freedom to tailor programs precisely to local conditions is

frequently sacrificed to administrative convenience when the projects are generalized. Highly centralized administration of national programs makes it difficult to carry out the experiments with program content and delivery methods that are essential if rural development programs are to meet the diverse needs of rural areas.<sup>5/</sup>

This sort of flexibility can only be meaningfully obtained by increasing the accountability of development officials to the local people. The benefit/cost ratios that govern bureaucratic behavior must be changed so that it is in the government employee's interest to be responsive to the local people.

Perhaps most important, the participatory approach implies a significant change in the attitudes of developers such as ourselves towards the local people. Recognizing that they lack many of the sophisticated educational and technological skills that we possess, and recognizing that they are also people like ourselves with the normal distribution of vices such as selfishness, narrow mindedness, and greed, we also need to recognize that they, like ourselves, operate as rationally within their total environment as we do in ours. We must participate ourselves in learning from the farmer as

<sup>5/</sup> Vernon W. Ruttan, "Integrated Rural Development Programs: A Skeptical Perspective," International Development Review, XVII:4 (1975).

much as we invite him to learn from us. Participation means dialogue, humility, patience, and willingness to learn. And just as we allow ourselves a number of mistakes along the road to development, we must allow the rural resident to make mistakes and learn from them.

Finally, the participatory approach also carries important implications for donor agencies. We too are extremely vulnerable to the bureaucratic tendencies of "top-down" behavior. Our institutions frequently work to standardise policies and procedures from the centre such that there is insufficient flexibility to adapt programs to the specific situations of different countries, let alone to local areas within a country. Rural development and a participatory approach can all too easily be rendered ineffective through a lack of donor flexibility. Donors' rules must allow local people to genuinely participate in making the decisions regarding their own development. What is called for is the same attitude of humility, patience and willingness to learn on the part of donor agencies that is required of the host country's development officials in the field.

#### Conclusion

Above all, participation should not be assumed to be one big new answer to all development problems. Indeed, for effective rural development to take place, experience has shown many things are necessary. These include good price policies, efficient health and agricultural delivery systems, transportation and power facilities, basic education and a number of other elements. But an essential ingredient for success in most countries, sectors and projects is participation. What participation connotes is the conclusion from world-wide experience that the willing, disciplined and organized involvement of the rural poor in most aspects of the development process that directly affects them is absolutely necessary if the development process is to be successful.

**Best Available Document**

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY MR. KUL SHEKAR SHARMA ON 'EXPERIENCE OF  
PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL

(Mr. Sharma is presently Governor of the Nepal Rashtra Bank. He has held important positions in His Majesty's Government since 1951, including Secretary for Parliamentary Affairs, 1951-52; Officer on Special Duty in H.M. Secretariat, 1952-55; Secretary to Advisory Assembly of Nepal, 1955-59; Secretary to National Parliament, 1959-60; Secretary, Ministry of Education (1961-62), National Guidance (1961-62), Panchayats (1962-66), Land Reform (1965-66), Public Administration (1966); Chief Secretary to the Government of Nepal, 1966-69; Ambassador of Nepal to the United States, 1969-73, also accredited to Canada, Argentina and Chile. He has served as chairman of the Cooperative Bank, 1963-67, and of the Agricultural Development Bank, 1968-69 in addition to holding various other important positions and representing Nepal in various capacities. He has been Governor of the International Monetary Fund for Nepal since 1973.)

Nepal is committed to a policy of maximising people's participation in the administration and development of the country. The Constitution of Nepal cites "participation of the people in the process of economic development of the country" as one of the economic objectives of the present political system (Article 19).

It has now become widely acknowledged that development is neither meaningful nor sustainable without participation of the people. Nor is it possible to accelerate the pace of economic growth without it. What, then, is people's participation, which is so vital and indispensable for rural development?

The phrase has actually been used to mean different things by different people. It has been most often used to mean participation of the people in the making of decisions which affect their lives and their economic well-being. Participation by the Gaun Panchayat and Gaun Sabha in the identification, preparation and approval of village level plans are examples of such participation.

It has also been used to signify involvement of the people in the actual execution of development projects. "Shramadan" is an example of this kind of participation. There is a third kind of participation also,

which however is referred to less frequently. It is participation of the people by their utilization of the services offered by government and other institutions for their well-being. Making use of the services provided by development institutions like the Agricultural Development Bank is one of the examples of such participation.

In the present conditions of widespread illiteracy and deep poverty in rural areas and in view of the present economic and social structure in the rural community, it appears that the main concern of planners and policy makers should be the involvement of the maximum number of rural people in the development process by getting to them the services they need for increasing their income in order to enable them to meet their basic needs and by helping them to make use of these services. It has been seen that the objective of meaningful participation in decision-making and implementation cannot be fully realized unless the basic needs of the weaker sections of the rural population are met, thereby reducing their heavy economic dependence upon local elites, big landlords and money-lenders. Any framework of participation without this fundamental requirement would be only ritualistic, not real.

Who are the rural people whose participation in development we are seeking to achieve, and whose economic condition are we striving to improve? The overwhelming majority of the rural people are either small and marginal farmers or landless people. 90% of the families in the hills own less than 0.6 hectares and 78% of the families in Tarai have less than 1.7 hectares of land. A vast majority of the small farmers have been unable to make use of the services which have been offered by agencies responsible for rural development. More than half of the man days of the rural population are unemployed, and more than 40% of the people live in conditions of unacceptable poverty. More than 80% of the rural people are illiterate. Moreover, in the course of the last 15 years, agricultural production per capita has declined.

Under these conditions, the main problem before us is to find ways of engaging all available human resources in development, more than half of which remain

unutilized according to the preliminary findings of a recent survey made by the National Planning Commission. Unless all efforts are directed toward this end, it is neither possible to accelerate the pace of economic growth nor is it possible to secure social justice, the twin goals to which the Government remains deeply committed. The main focus of all these efforts should be the small farmers, whom it is very difficult to reach because of their illiteracy, poverty and their unorganised condition.

It has now been realized that efforts made until recently by two of the principal organisations responsible for rural development, i.e., the local panchayats and the cooperatives or sajha, have not been adequate in achieving the desired objective of people's participation in development.

A study made of the contribution made by village panchayats under the Local Development Programme during the four years 1971-75 reveals that the total of 4554 projects implemented by them involved contributions through the village panchayats in the form of human labour amounting to about 1.3 million days. Since in this period there were a total of 1033 million idle man days, the panchayat mobilisation amounted to approximately 1/8 of 1% of the unemployed human resources available. This has led the Government now to adopt an integrated approach to rural development. A number of plans for integrated rural development in different parts of the country are now under different stages of formulation and implementation.

Similarly, in the field of agricultural development, different studies have revealed that the services provided by the Agricultural Development Bank and the Sajha have mostly been utilised by big farmers who are better educated, have greater access to information about these institutions, and have greater social prestige and influence. This has led the ADB now to initiate a number of Small Farmers Development Programmes in various districts, after the experimental projects started in Dhanusha and Nuwakot districts yielded satisfactory

and encouraging results. The main objective of the Small Farmers' Programme is to help small farmers, tenants and landless people in improving their economic condition by organising themselves into groups and thus enabling themselves to obtain access to institutional facilities already available and also by encouraging them to make additional efforts to raise their incomes further.

It is now evident that any strategy for increasing popular participation in rural development will have to be built around the utilisation of more than 1000 million working days being wasted every year in the country. This will also help in improving the condition of more than 5 million people who are living under conditions of absolute poverty.<sup>1/</sup> The following may be some of the important components of a strategy to reduce unemployment of the rural work force and thereby to raise their income and their level of participation in the process of development.

1. Adoption of more intensive agricultural practices

Various studies have indicated that there is sufficient scope for greater application of labour in agriculture if more inputs could be supplied to farmers, and if greater knowledge of improved agricultural techniques could be imparted to them. This would lead to increased productive employment among small farmers. One of these studies also reveals that per hectare production and income from land owned by small farmers is greater than that of big farmers. This can be ascribed to larger per unit application of labour in the case of land owned and tilled by small farmers. Breaking up larger landholdings may thus result in fuller employment of smaller farmers and in increased production. Taxation and credit policies may be designed to push the big landowners into reducing their landholdings while making it possible for very small farmers to increase their holdings to a more economic size.

<sup>1/</sup>Based on "Preliminary Report on Unemployment, Income Distribution and Consumption Pattern," National Planning Commission, 1977.

## 2. Supplementary sources of income based on agriculture

In view of the increasing pressure of population on land, especially in the hills, and in view of the seasonal nature of employment in general agriculture, a concerted effort to include small farmers to start supplementary vocations, like poultry, cattle farming, fisheries, bee keeping, etc. by providing them with resources, inputs and knowledge, will be helpful in raising both employment and income.

## 3. Employment of unutilised labor in minor works

One of the characteristics of rural underemployment is that both work and employment exist side by side. To take an example, a farmer may be needing a certain number of man days during a particular period of time for the improvement of his farm or house, but he may not be able to pay wages while there may be surplus labor lying idle in the village. This could be true of many farmers who would themselves be able to contribute labour at some other time. A system could be devised, a sort of labour pool or bank, by which the available manpower could be utilised in accomplishing throughout a year most of the work needing to be done. The settlement of accounts would be done through clearing arrangements under the supervision of local co-operatives or the local unit of some farmers organization hopefully without any one having to pay any substantial amount to any other person.\*

\* If at the end of the settlement period, a person had put into the labour bank as many days as he had utilised of other persons' labour, the account would be even. Persons who had drawn out more labour than they had contributed would pay a fixed amount per day that had been agreed upon in advance, or they may put in extra days of labour in tasks assigned by the managing authority of the pool or the bank (e.g. co-operatives or local unit of farmers organization). The whole idea is to utilise available labour for productive purposes with the minimum transfer of money. This removes the "money constraints" being experienced by the rural people because of their present low money incomes. Details of this system could be worked out on the basis of experimental projects to be undertaken in villages with different social and economic conditions.

In communities where this may not be possible, co-operatives may be asked to provide loans for farm and home improvement, to private individuals, and for the construction of public facilities to the local organization of farmers. This would also lead to greater employment for the underemployed small farmers and landless people.

#### 4. Development of cottage industries

Another important component of a plan to reduce unemployment may be a carefully designed programme to encourage the establishment and development of cottage industries producing those goods and services the demand for which is likely to go up as a result of increased income of the people. Some of these cottage industries could be handlooms producing cloth needed by local people, small plants for mixing feeds for poultry and livestock, building of carts for transportation, small processing plants for agricultural products as well as the services of carpenters, brick-layers masons and other construction workers etc.

#### 5. Training of rural workers, youth and women in rural areas

Training of small farmers, youth and women in different kinds of agricultural practices and activities, in handicrafts, in sanitation, family planning, child welfare, etc. would have to be another integral component of the strategy for promoting participation.

#### 6. Organisational means for involving rural people

The main difficulty in implementing any strategy for improving the economic conditions of the small farmers would be the difficulty of reaching them effectively because of the fact that the small farmers are mostly unorganised. The jurisdiction of the Sijha local co-operatives today is too large to enable

them to concentrate on the large number of small farmers within their area. As already stated, experience has clearly shown that the services provided by the co-operatives and other development institutions filters down to the small farmers only after the demands of the comparatively bigger farmers have been satiated.

Under these circumstances, the necessity of an organisation at the sub-cooperative level, catering solely to the clearly indicated. Since there is already a Peasants Organisation in the country, it could fill this role. The smallest unit of the Peasants' Organisation would, however, have to be reduced to the ward instead of the whole village panchayat as provided under the present law. It may also be desirable to restrict the membership of the Organisation to small farmers. The local units of the Peasants Organization could then be used as the main media for funneling all the services to be provided by government institutions to the small farmers.

#### 7. Government policy and coordination efforts

In view of the need for a large number of trained manpower, for co-ordination between many government departments, and for intensive supervision and vigilance in the implementation of this strategy, the progress towards people's participation in rural development is bound to be gradual and without miracles. A carefully worked out perspective plan may be helpful in keeping the progress of the policy on course. It will also be necessary for ensuring co-ordinated and concerted efforts of all the government agencies towards the same goal of participation.

A suitable machinery also has to be devised to supervise intensively the distribution of these services to the actual farmers and to bring about co-ordination in the activities of different Government Departments engaged in rural development at the district, village and ward levels. This may be necessary to ensure the smooth and timely execution of the plans for participation.

### Conclusion

The above strategy may, by increasing production and income in rural areas, make it possible for greater financial resources to be mobilised locally, thus laying a secure foundation for self-sustaining rural development and strengthening people's participation still further.

Contant review and evaluation of progress made towards the goal of people's participation should also be made and appropriate action taken whenever needed. Such meetings should sometimes be held in rural settings which will impart realism to the deliberations. Also, some of the participants in these meetings could be the people who are the objects of our attention and efforts, but whose views are not regarded as worthy of consideration in the belief that we know better about them than they do about themselves. We may be in for some surprises.

REPORTS OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

I.A. AGRICULTURE, IRRIGATION AND SOIL, WATER AND FOREST CONSERVATION

Chairman: Mr. C.B.Gurung, Member Secretary, Social Services Coordination Central Committee  
Moderator: Mr. B.P.Sinha, Regional Director, Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Irrigation.

The economy of Nepal and its broad-based progress depend upon the productive exploitation and conservation of its natural resource for the benefit of our people. Agriculture is the sector where we are most dependent upon the initiative and effort of individuals and groups scattered across the length and breadth of our country, where people's participation is most crucial to the strength of our nation.

Coordination between the village people and technocrats and bureaucrats is essential for people's participation, right from planning to the final implementation phase. Imposition from the top, without due consultancy from the village level, has failed to activate people's participation in agriculture. From the discussion it was observed that planning should be from the grass roots level. With two decades of planning behind us we have still failed to uplift the lot of the rural poor. Thus we realize that there must be something wrong with planning imposed from the centre.

The pressure on land is extremely high and landholding is so small that even with agricultural inputs raising land productivity is very difficult. Thus there is need for diversification of agriculture to areas like bee-keeping, poultry piggeries, fisheries, etc. Such reorientation of rural economic activity will need the widespread understanding and cooperation of our rural people which necessitates overcoming the communication gap often noted between people at the village level and the government's planners and implementers.

There was not much discussion specifically of experience in conservation measures, but this is an area of activity where people's participation is

obviously essential. Unless rural people understand, agree and cooperate with measures to protect and productively utilise our soil, water and forest resources these will become dangerously depleted. Circumvention of imposed measures is all too easy. Enforcement by purely technocratic or bureaucratic means is impossible. So we need to consider with some urgency how people's participation for conservation can be promoted.

With respect to agriculture in particular the following suggestions were made:

- (1) There is need to establish micro level organization at the village level which should be linked to district and national level organization. In this respect, an example of Fewatal for conservation was cited, with village level soil conservation committee relating to district level and national level soil conservation committees.
- (2) For people's participation, it is essential to have a village level technician, such as JT or JTA who should look into and communicate the vital needs of the village. There should also be some kind of developmental unit which would be an agricultural sub-centre among to serve the rural poor.
- (3) Planning from above cannot go down to the village level, but rather the district level should be where plans from below are evaluated and supported, being meshed into a district plan with assistance from technicians who have professional training. The idea of mobile planning teams in rural areas to assist villages in this exercise could be put forward.
- (4) A provision should be made for a catalytic agent who might be able to motivate and assist people's participation. (Such roles also came under discussion of group II.C. on paraprofessionals and village-level workers.)

- (5) Based on experience with Small Farmers Development Programme, it was suggested also that there must be a group voice reflecting the felt needs of the small farmers.
- (6) There was no controversy regarding the need for people's participation, but there was a question of how can people be activated for maximum participation. Some felt that economic participation by itself is not sufficient. Thus political participation as well as economic participation might bring about the desired result.
- (7) One of the major ideas that struck the group was that the youth were neglected in all phases from planning to implementation at all levels. Thus the group suggested that the vigour of youth combined with the experience of the old might be beneficial as far as people's participation is concerned.
- (8) There was some talk about efforts to help the majority of farmers realize better what their needs are, but it was also said in conclusion that only those who wear a shoe can know where it pinches. So in this we need to look to the opinions and ideas of the rural people themselves, to get a proper basis for promoting more rapid and effective development in the agricultural sector.

I. B. HEALTH, FAMILY PLANNING, EDUCATION AND OTHER SOCIAL SERVICES

Chairman: Mrs. Kamal Rana, Chairman, Women's Services Co-ordination Committee

Moderator: Dr. Benu B. Karki, Integration Division, Department of Health.

In the discussion, it was felt that rural people are often not aware of the advantages and disadvantages of different rural projects, because there has not been sufficient communication with them and they have not been involved with the projects from the outset. Often, projects planned in rural areas have not fully considered the people's point of view and their felt needs, thus the very concept of people's participation has been jeopardized. It is frequently noted that the initial projects launched in rural areas did not run successfully, thus leading to a loss of interest among the rural people.

As a rule, the rural people have rarely been involved in the planning, implementation and evaluation of the rural projects. Various steps taken to serve the rural people with involvement of their own share or functioning of organisations like Sajha at the village level have bypassed the responsibilities to the local people or the panchayat, with the result that services could not be satisfactory or the return was disappointing.

Where execution of programs in rural areas has been forced without prior local consultation and agreement, there may have been some short run results to show, but in the long run they seem to have a negative impact on public participation. Often, it is noted that the rural community has lost interest in development activities due to vested interests of one or two local influential people, sometimes even in leading to misutilisation of benefits from the project by them.

The importance of adequate health education to achieve greater participation of the people in health services is noted to be still lacking. One could add that nutrition education and family planning education are similarly important. The role of women in people's participation has not been duly encouraged, in

part because the provision of job opportunities has not been adequately attended to and in part because of the limited educational background of females. Parents have not been able to recognize the value of education for their daughters, and elder children are kept home to look after their younger ones or kept busy in household activities at the cost of their education.

There was less discussion of experience with education provided by the schools as regards popular participation. Possibilities for involving parents in and through the schools could be much more explored, to strengthen motivation for children to enter and complete school and to improve the educational status of parents. Family planning was also not discussed a great deal, but the essentialness of participation by the people in this activity could not be overlooked.

With respect to various social services, the following suggestions were made:

(1) Any project planned in rural areas should be based on the felt needs of the people, and they should be involved right from the planning and implementation to the evaluation stage. In this way they can be expected to participate fully and effectively.

(2) In rural areas, especially the initial projects should be planned according to the felt needs of the people so these projects can be successfully completed. With confidence among the people thus developed, this will encourage them for more effective participation in further programmes. Some of these may be more related to basic needs.

(3) Various schemes in rural areas, where the rural community is directly involved or where these schemes are meant for their direct benefit, should preferably have a local person to run them being supervised by the concerned agencies. If not, at least such schemes should be duly responsible to the local and district panchayats.

(4) To encourage an effective increase in women's participation, orientation or extension programmes should be arranged such as maternal and child health care, better utilisation of nutritious foods, maintenance of better hygienic habits and adult literacy campaigns. Adult education should be promoted and extended generally to wider areas.

47

I.C. RURAL WORKS (ROADS, BRIDGES, WATER SUPPLY) AND COTTAGE INDUSTRIES

Chairman: Hon. Mr. Omkar P. Gauchan, Member, Rashtriya Panchayat

Moderator: Mr. Santa B. Rai, Director, Local Development Department

The discussion began with a narration on the Baglung bridge experience by the group chairman. Indigenous construction of nearly 62 bridges in Baglung district has helped to dispel any doubts with regard to the pertinence and practicability of popular participation for rural development. In this context, Hon. Gauchan described the step-by-step approach adopted that culminated in the successful completion of so many bridges through use of local resources and manpower.

It had become evident over the years that the people of the district had four major demands, viz. provision of schools, drinking water, irrigation canals and bridges. In keeping with our aspirations for inducing popular participation in rural development, it is only fitting that a decision was taken to tackle the task by indigenously initiating the process of rural development. Physical, financial and technical considerations prompted attention to be focused on the task of bridge building first.

The Baglung experience is discussed more fully in the concluding section of this report, as Hon. Gauchan was asked to speak on this to the whole seminar in its final session (see pages 93 ). The essential elements of the Baglung strategy are as follow: (a) the local needs for bridges were queried throughout the district through the village panchayats, with a list of 118 needed bridges drawn up; (b) at the district level, panchayat discussions determined which were the most needed bridges, and 62 were selected for phase one; (c) this work was under the leadership and supervision of a district committee of five people, which gave out the materials costing a total of 7 lakhs of rupees;\*(d) for each bridge, a local project committee was established, usually of panchayat members, but if they were reticent, otherwise influential elders or social workers sympathetic to the project were chosen. In this way a far-reaching coordinated organisation was created. Moreover, often restrictive governmental rules and regulations were conveniently side-stepped.

\* US. \$ 60 thousands approximately.

The choice of using indigenous resources was dictated by the resort to popular participation which encourages use of local resources and manpower to the maximum possible extent. The financial resources available were limited, but adequate intelligence and common sense were fundamental in overcoming many a perplexing problem. The village committees were given the responsibility for coming up with accurate estimate of the materials required. Upon receipt of such estimates through the district committee, the Local Development Department supplied the materials to the nearest motorhead, Syangja. Cement, which normally constitutes one of the key construction materials was not used since it implied the use of foreign technology and help. (This factor, incidentally, delayed the final O.K. from the central level.) Even the assistance of engineers and overseers was foregone in favour of local carpenters and blacksmiths who were hired locally. Nearly all bridges have been constructed with schedule. Nowhere has work ground to a halt. Although direct benefits from the project are obvious, there are also considerable indirect advantages in terms of psychological inspiration and optimism to be derived for similar projects in future. People of Baglung can now move on to other infrastructure needs.

For supporting increased people's participation, the following suggestions were made:

- (1) Energetic leadership undoubtedly played a vital role in mobilising people's participation in such development. Such leadership should be encouraged and appreciated.
- (2) At the same time, leadership needs to be institutionalised since personal leadership invariably passes from the scene, perhaps to other tasks. Communities which have urgent development requirements should form an organisation among themselves. Leadership in such cases would be generated from within the organisation.
- (3) The village panchayat should be given greater importance in such works.

Decentralisation of this lower section of the panchayat system would undoubtedly enhance the overall operational flexibility and efficiency of the panchayat system.

- (4) Any institution which fails to reflect the crying needs of the genuinely-needy sections of the rural community will probably fail. Leadership through the panchayat

system could not be successful or even meaningful if the interests of the weakest sections of rural society which are practically a majority are blatantly ignored. Any misplaced zeal of a leader who compels his more unfortunate brethren to labour in the name of development can only backfire with devastating consequences.

(5) Experience of people's participation in big projects indicates that, although there is tremendous potential for such participation around the country, lack of adequate forethought and planning has had disastrous results on various projects. This has sadly resulted in the general loss of people's faith in future development activities.

(6) If the tasks involved in big projects can be divided up into smaller tasks, they are more readily delegated to local groups for implementation and even sometimes for detailed design. Large scale in itself is generally a deterrent to people's participation.

(7) The role of technical support needs particular attention. There is ample evidence that the will for whole-hearted participation exists around the country in direct proportion to the availability of technical facilities and support. People have learned that in many instances, their efforts have not been very beneficial because they lacked sufficient technical guidance.

(8) At the same time, it was noted that actual cases proved, time and again, that indigenous, even rudimentary technology was (and is) better suited to rural conditions than exotic, borrowed ones, which did not elicit participation because they could not be easily understood. So government technical support should not foist unnecessarily complicated technologies on the people as this discourages participation.

(9) There was strong expression of support for the idea that beneficiaries of development efforts need to organize themselves and foster technical skills among themselves. It was suggested that the provision of informal training might activate local organization to solve its own manpower requirements.

(10) Finally, people's participation should be considered with an eye on geographical variations, rather than the code of government regulations. The view was expressed that government should lay down regulations in such a way as to encourage all those living in the remote hills and mountains as well as those residing in the accessible plains, to participate fully and voluntarily in the development process.

(11) It was felt that very often government regulations were so complicated as to actually hinder enthusiastic participation in development, e.g. use of forest products, wildlife conservation, use of local indigenous techniques or skills, etc. It is hoped that governmental regulations will be reconsidered in the light of people's participation in rural development, so as to facilitate the mobilisation of the most valuable resources at hand, viz. overwhelming people's participation.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY DR. MOHAMMAD MOHSIN ON 'MECHANISM FOR ENCOURAGING  
PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL'

(Dr. Mohsin is presently member-secretary of the Back-to-Village National Campaign Central Committee, member of the National Development Council, and Member, National Education Committee. He has previously played a major role in formulating the New Education Plan and as member-secretary of the Constitutional Reform Committee.)

Introductory Remarks

A country is a people. A nation is a community. The geo-physical boundary that encompasses a people and the politico-cultural norms that guide their interaction together provide a geo-political entity, call it a people or a nation, with an identity and a character. The typology of a national identity or a people's character is basically determined by the historical backdrop, the cultural heritage, the socio-political structure and material base that a people or a nation has inherited from the past or evolves into the future with. How a nation or a people belonging to the Third World especially those labelled as LDCs, shall fare in the East changing modern era, with the breath-taking technological spectacles all around, the rapidly expanding mass communication media, the soaring expectation of its Western-educated urban elite and the overwhelming mass of its dormant citizenry languishing in the rural backyard, deprived of even basic amenities, will greatly depend upon the breadth of vision, the depth of insight, the sense of proportion, the strength of commitment, and the skill of organisation, its ruling class is endowed with.

I have, on purpose, used terms "the people" and "the nation" as two distinct entities. However, the distinction between the two lies not in the absence or presence of social interaction, because to be Man is to be social. Hence, both are comprised of social collectivities. It is, in fact, the scale, the quality and the nature of social interaction that will define their distinctive

character. A people is not an amorphous phenomenon but is comprised of ethnic, religious, territorial, economic or status groups. The system of relationship that characterises a people shows closer resemblance to that of a tribal system within which the units are stronger than the system and are more integrated internally than they are with each other. The opposite of this is a nation, the social units of which are more organically integrated one with another. The small tradition of the micro-community commingles and merges with the great tradition of the macro-community of the nation. In such a community system, the totality exercises more power and is stronger than the units or sub-systems which make it up.

The strength or the weakness of a national identity, as it unfolds in the drama of development, rests largely on the direction and dimension of efforts employed in transforming a people into a nation. An identity that is sponsored from above by the national elite will only be skin deep. A national identity to be overwhelming and inalienable needs to be mass-based. It has to evolve from below. Bursts of sporadic nationalistic impulses at times may provide a people with a semblance of national identity. But to be self-propelled and enduring, it needs to be sustained by the institutionalised responsiveness of its component social units and sub-systems. The task of nation-building in this sense implies the active, conscious and organised participation of the entire population.

These are the premises on which an analysis of the mechanisms for promoting people's participation in rural development can usefully be based. The challenge is to transform the national identity through a process of evolution whereby the nation emerges from a people. For this process, which encompasses political and social development as well as economic development, the various mechanisms of individual and group participation are crucial.

#### Mechanisms for Popular Participation

In the discussion groups there will be specific discussion of the institutions such as village and district panchayats or sajha cooperatives which can facilitate people's participation. In my remarks, I should like to examine various ways and

means whereby the process of increasing people's participation in the nation-building process can be strengthened and given focus.

1. Conceptual Clarity: To encourage popular participation, first of all, a system or a nation has to be clear about what it is aiming at. The panchayat policy from its very inception has clearly delineated its system goal, which favours and supports popular participation in nation-building. It has specifically mentioned the aim of evolving a society which will be "democratic, just, dynamic and free from exploitation." And popular participation, as a matter of fact is inspired and supported by the system's commitment to democratic ideals. The panchayat system wants to give to the people the central stage in the drama of development. It wants to think not for the people, but with the people. The basic crux of popular participation is that we are not just supposed to work for the people. The elite were doing this from the very beginning. Under the exalted claim that they think for the people they have established their domination over the society. The basic thrust of the democratic system is to think with the people, sharing their joys and sorrows; experiencing their feelings and sentiments. Only then will our thinking with them be meaningful for them.

We understand that there are certain regions and certain strata which are exploited. We are also in the know that the exploited are these who are inarticulate, unorganised and ill-informed. So the basic objective of the system is to organise the handicapped strata, to make them conscious of the objectives of reforms, of the thrust of various programmes, so that when these programmes reach to them, they are able and competent to insure their effective implementation. So with the delineation of the system-goal, we have achieved a modicum of conceptual clarity to inform our efforts toward people's participation. Besides, we are constantly trying to spell out these goals with the view to render them more relevant, more effective and more accurate in relation to the changing times. Because, I have already submitted that being dynamic means being flexible.

2. Restructuring the Traditional Polity: The status quo always represents certain structure, certain decision-making patterns. The best way to arouse popular participation is to penetrate into the countryside structurally. Specifically with this view, the panchayat system has shifted from the urban-centered polity of yesteryears to a rural-based polity at present. We have realised that the destiny of the people in the countryside cannot be decided from the urban centres. To win the confidence of people in the countryside we have to take the instruments of decision-making to them. With the view to make these instruments meaningful and fruitful to our rural folk we have adopted a three-tiered political system. Because the concepts such as the nation, the government or the centre are abstract and vague. These are not properly comprehended by people in the countryside. To make these concepts meaningful to them it is advisable to give them a smaller unit to identify with. So the three-tiered panchayat system is actually helping our ruralites to develop a sort of transcendental loyalty to the nation-state. And I think, this kind of loyalty is imperative to arouse popular participation. Because, if the people think that they are the objects of development, that they are just the mere spectators of it they will not be aroused. We have to give them the feeling that they are the main actors of the drama of development; it is upon their activities, motivations and commitment that development is possible. The self-confidence injected into the people thus will be actually a tonic to generate popular participation in a developing country.

3. Systematisation of articulation processes: For this process of assimilation with participation to take root, it is very essential that there be clear and direct articulation of the various interests in our society. The local and national popular institutions, like district, village and national panchayat, will be meaningful to the people only when they facilitate the proper articulation of specific interests. And for this, as I have already suggested, the greatest need

at present is to help the inarticulate articulate their interests freely. They have been the silent spectator of the drama of development. So now the challenge lies in giving this power of articulation to the handicapped, and making them effective partner in the decision-making processes. It is with this in view that we have organised class organisations. Of course we feel that they are not working properly at present. A bill is going to be submitted in the present session of the National Legislature, to improve further their structural linkage with the panchayat.

The basic idea is that whatever we are doing should be more relevant and meaningful to the people. (This we think is the only effective mechanism to arouse their participation and involvement. We who are committed to democracy realize that to make democracy function, it is essential to facilitate interaction between dissent and consent. As a matter of fact, to give some vent to dissent and to help arrive at a consensus, we are organising from time to time, workers meetings and political conventions at different levels. One of the particular features of these conventions is that we have made the participation of development officials and extension agents in these conventions obligatory. Because once these policy implementers are brought into these political meets, the discussions and debates become very meaningful and exciting. The people's representative can air their grievances regarding the performance of these administrative agencies, and administrative officers and extension agents must explain why they have been so lethargic, or what were the difficulties causing them to be very slow in implementation. Once people's grievances are respected and heeded, it will encourage people to have more identification with the administrative units. So the basic function of these forums is to give to the people's representatives the feeling that they can participate in implementation, that they have a definite say in policy making. Because this sense of belongingness is essential in igniting popular participation in developing countries.

4. De-mystification of the decision-making process: Very few people in the countryside know what this decision-making process is. They hold the decision-making in great awe, as if they were super human beings. To break this sort of inertia or superstition, it is necessary that people must be made aware of how decisions are made, what constraints these decisions are made under. With this in view, we are trying to promote dissemination of information about this process. The first mechanism for this is the implementation of the National Education Plan, which is trying to render education more relevant to people's problems, to their environment, so that the knowledge and skills disseminated to them may be useful to help resolve their problems. There is serious effort on foot to increase adult literacy, so that the people can have more access to knowledge regarding government affairs. Also, with the introduction of administrative decentralization, we have taken the decision-making in administration closer to the people, so that they can be better acquainted with them. Because, to encourage popular participation we have opted for the decentralisation of political power which has been, so far, the monopoly of the centre. The basic reason for people's being apathetic, could be attributed to their having no or very little authority to mobilise resources, to undertake the formulation of programmes for their respective community. Under the decentralisation programme, we are making panchayats more effective in the mobilisation of resources, in the taking of decisions for themselves. Because the sure way to de-mystify a process or an institution is to help the people understand its mechanism, to help them handle and operate it.

5. Restructuring of production relationships: The social structure to a certain extent is the product of its material base. So, until and unless we restructure the organisation of production, our effort to transform the society; to effect real change, is not possible. Keeping this in view, we have undertaken land reform. Of course, there are some misgivings regarding its effective implementation. But there is no denying of the fact that the psychological change it has brought in

the countryside is tremendous. With this reform, the domination or the image of the landlords in the local community as the omnipotent has eroded. The state has emerged in the eyes of the common people as much more powerful than the landlords. In the traditional system, where the landlords come in between the state and people, the state is naturally identified with the landlords. So the first thing we have done with the introduction of the land reform is to erode the grandeur and the glamour of the landed gentry. The land reform programme has tried to put a ceiling on the size of land-holding. It has ensured the tenancy rights to the tenants. More recent efforts by the government have provided for some collectivisation of the service provision to the rural sector through the Sajha cooperatives. These have not always been as effective as might be wished, but there will be continuing efforts to ensure that the needed services and inputs will be available to all the small cultivators. This underscores the importance of continuous monitoring of the economic sector to be sure that it is in tune with the egalitarian goals of the political system.

I shall go more quickly over the remaining points.

6. Leadership commitment: There can be no question that when it comes to promoting and supporting popular participation, the role of leaders, both from the more privileged sectors and from the rural communities themselves, will be crucial. However, to effect social transformation in a traditional society, the socio-economic chemistry of the political leadership has to be gradually altered. It has to be much more responsive to aspiration of the laity and, hence, much more representative of the latter's economic interests.

We see a continuing commitment on the part of our nation's leadership to getting a more egalitarian society and in this effort, to enlist the initiative and involvement of leaders at all levels. This is a task given particularly to the Go-to-Village National Campaign, which is charged with the responsibilities of re-orienting the roles of political leaders, of evaluating their performance, and of deter-

-mining their eligibility for panchayat office. Unless we have leaders at all levels who welcome and encourage the participation of the majority in all phases of development activity, it will not occur. Thus, a responsive and committed leadership is definitely the most crucial mechanism, to ignite popular participation.

7. Commitment of development bureaucracy: We need also a bureaucracy which is committed to this path of participatory development. Its role should be more one of facilitator and deliverer, as against priority-fixer and policy-maker, since it is the people's representatives who are to be the latter. How can we get such responsiveness on the part of the bureaucracy? It is important that there be the right motivation and right morale of public servants and extension agents. Popular bodies should decide what and to whom the services should be given, and the bureaucracy should decide how to deliver these to the people. If they are not satisfied with this role then they will intrude in popular participation. So we need their commitment to participatory development.

8. Streamlining of communication system: In support of these objectives, we need to have two-way channels of communication well established, so there will be not just talking down to the people but feedback from the bottom up. Communication should be in simple language, with specific directives and prompt from the centre.

9. Ensuring coordination between research, resource-allocation and training: There are many different roles which persons in positions of authority and greater knowledge can perform in support of people's participation. There is need for problem identification, which often involves research. As these are identified, there needs to be appropriate use of this information to effect resource allocation in keeping with the problems and their solutions. And third, for the best efforts of the people to be mobilised behind these solutions, there needs to be adequate training. Too often we see research unconnected with allocations of resources, and neither related to the programmes of training already established. To use our

human and financial resources well, in practical modes of participation, some better coordination of these functions is necessary.

10. Role of mass media and publicity agencies: Finally I would mention how the communication media can themselves assist people's participation, by glamourising village life and citing the accomplishment and successes of our people who work in the rural areas. We need to bring into focus the village level workers, the social workers who strive for community improvement, and the extension agents. Our media have been much too preoccupied with the affairs of the centre, which orients people to roles at the top rather than in the rural areas. An effective re-orientation of the media to the accomplishment throughout our country, to the valiant efforts being made, giving status and prestige to our really heroic citizens at the grass root level, would be a service to our nation and a spur to popular participation.

11. Conclusion: In short, modernisation of a traditional society where cultural values sanction inequality, where social stratification inhibits both vertical and horizontal mobility and, where subsistence economy perpetuates exploitation poses tremendous challenge to the political leadership. It can not be met short of a launching an all-out, well-integrated and multi-dimensional efforts on all fronts-social, economic and political. A bolder and more radical thrust has to be directed to shift the bias from uni-dimensional traditional production pattern to a highly diversified and self-sustained modern economy. Accomplishment of stupendous task within a short span of time, as stipulated by the panchayat plan will not be possible in the absence of total mobilisation of the entire population. The judicious and effective employment of the aforementioned mechanisms will greatly contribute to facilitate and encourage popular participation in developmental efforts.

Reports of Discussion Groups:

II.A. PANCHAYAT AND CLASS ORGANIZATION

Chairman: Hon. Mr. Radha P. Ghimire, Member, Rastriya Panchayat

Moderator: Mr. Kalika B. Mathema, Back to Village National Campaign

The group recognized that the Panchayat and Class Organizations should play a vital role in generating people's participation. It was also recognised that in Nepal people's participation has a historical process which requires institutionalization. The suggestions emerging from the discussion on the present process of mass participation can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Generally, people's participation has been thought to be limited to voluntary donation of labour. But the concept has much broader meaning and includes participation in decision-making, implementation, benefit sharing, and evaluation.
- (2) The group concept is the only basis for organizing villagers to enlist their participation. Since the rural society is stratified in nature, a plurality of organisations, each composed of groups with compatible interests broadens participatory possibilities.
- (3) While assessing the contribution of voluntary donation of labour to development in quantitative terms, the opportunity cost of the labour involved should also be accounted for. It is not "free" from the standpoint of the participants.
- (4) Since rural people have a better understanding of their problems than anyone else can have, considerations of what constitutes "people's participation" should also include them. (It was suggested that a seminar including mostly rural people would be more conclusive).
- (5) As Nepal is a country with wide diversities, it is natural that the motivating factors for people's participation will also be diverse. At some places, religious gatherings provide opportunities for mutual

- contact; at others social gatherings such as festivals, dances or music may serve the purpose. Teachers in coordination with panchayat workers also can be used to mobilize local people. Therefore, to identify the right type of motivating factors for different programs, operational research projects in at least a few villages should be immediately launched.
- (6) Since national communication media cannot adequately concentrate on rural development activities throughout the country, district development magazines should be published to encourage local workers and leaders.
  - (7) Though there is an increase in the membership of class organizations, in the absence of programs to materialize their functions at the grass root level, they have not been effective as a pipeline to channel people's participation.
  - (8) Competitive activities at the village level should be promoted within the boundaries set by the constitution. Competition is the only way to enthuse local Panchas to increasingly respond to the needs and requirements of local people.
  - (9) In many cases, it has been noticed that bureaucrats bypass local panchayats and assert their own will. To avoid such a situation, government agencies should be made responsive to local panchayats.
  - (10) Training programmes should be arranged at the village level to enable the local leaders to activate local people and generate local participation on a more substantial scale.
  - (11) People's participation is a two-way process. We have realized that in the absence of effective coordination among the bureaucrats, technocrats and people at all levels, it might degenerate into a ritualistic affair only.
  - (12) The discussion group felt that the present arrangement of organizing the Back to Village National Campaign agencies only to the district level is

not adequate enough to enlist effective participation of the people. Therefore it is necessary to set up Back to Village National Campaign units at the village level as well.

**II. B. SAJHA COOPERATIVES, SMALL FARMERS DEVELOPMENT ACTION GROUPS, AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEES AT WARD OR PANCHAYAT LEVEL**

**Chairman:** Hon. Dr. Dambar N. Yadav, Member, Rastriya Panchayat

**Moderator:** Mr. Srikrishna Upadhaya, Deputy General Manager, ADB.

The discussion group covered the following questions in addressing the general topic of what mechanisms can be fostered at the village panchayat level or ward level to achieve greater economic participation of the people

- how effective has the sajha society been as an instrument for supplying credit, inputs and marketing services to farmer members, particularly small farmers ?
- What are the linkages between sajha society and political units of the panchayat system, particularly the village panchayat and ward committees ?
- Is there any need for organizing small farmers into groups so that they can protect their interests and become equal recipients of the fruits of rural development ?
- What kind of organizational changes are required in the co-operative system, from the grass root level to the national level, to make it more responsive to the needs of small and marginal farmers ?

Regarding the services presently provided by the sajha societies, the following observations were made:

- (1) Most of the small and marginal farmers have not received production credit from the sajha societies due to strong collateral requirements, or because of complicated loan procedures and formalities to be completed.

Where wider area coverage by sajha societies has been attempted, it has been all the more difficult for smaller farmers to receive credit from the societies.

- (2) Most of the sajha societies have concentrated their efforts on supplying consumer goods rather than agricultural inputs to the villagers. It was suggested that even the consumer goods supplied by sajha are more expensive than the ones supplied by private merchants.
- (3) Sajha societies have not been able to assess the demand for agricultural inputs correctly so as to ensure timely supply of inputs to member farmers.
- (4) In some cases, the accounts relating to the transfer of compulsory savings have not been reconciled and the farmers have not received their share certificates from the sajha society. Not having these, their participation has not been encouraged.

On linkages between sajha societies, village panchayats and ward committees:

- (5) Some persons felt that although the village panchayat members including pradhan panch are on the board of directors of sajha societies, they are not able to exercise authority over the management of the societies, with the result that there is a lack of coordination between the panchayat and the society.
- (6) Other persons felt, on the other hand, that to make the societies function properly, they should be made free from political influence. It was suggested there should be elections to make the sajha society more democratic and serve the interest of small farmers, not keeping the sajha linked to panchayats so that panchayat and ward chairmen were also sajha chairmen.
- (7) The suggestion was further made that for coordination between the sajha society and the panchayat, elected officials of sajha should be represented in the panchayat instead of panchayat officials being represented in the sajha structure.

- (8) Some felt that effective coordination could be assured only when the society is organized on the basis of local organizational experience and values, and by associating both panchayat workers and social workers in the management and operation of sajha societies.

On the need for organization of small farmer groups, the following ideas were proposed:

- (9) Some felt that small and marginal farmers have not been able to participate effectively in the main stream of development because they are not organized into their own groups. Field experience in an area where small farmers have been organized into such action groups shows that the flow of credit and other supporting services have increased and they have been able to start group activities such as tree nurseries, group orchards and community drinking water supply. In addition, repayment of credit on group basis has improved.
- (10) In this respect, it appeared that the organization of small farmers into action groups was necessary in order to strengthen the receiving mechanisms enabling small farmers to become major beneficiaries of rural development programmes.
- (11) Some felt that the small farmer groups would not be viable as an economic unit and would be unable to provide services such as agricultural inputs, marketing and storage facilities unless federated into the Cooperative Society.
- (12) Since the requirement of trained manpower to help organize the small farmer groups will be large it was suggested that the services of students working under the National Development Service could be used for this.

On organizational changes required to make the cooperative system effective:

- (13) Some indicated that in order to make the cooperative societies effective at the grassroot level, there needs to be a strengthening of organization both at the district and national level.

- (14) One of the suggestions was to have a separate organization from the grassroot level to the national level which is specific to the needs of small farmers. The same logic would suggest that there be an organization which is specific to the needs of agricultural labourers.
- (15) Alternatively it was felt by some that there could be one cooperative structure starting from the grassroot level to the national level catering to the needs of both small and large farmers.

#### II. C. TRAINED PARAPROFESSIONALS FROM VILLAGES AND VILLAGE-LEVEL WORKERS

Chairman: Hon. Mr. Narendra B. Chand, Member, Rastriya Panchayat

Moderator: Mr. Ram Narayan Shrestha, Training Chief, Home Panchayat Ministry

The group dealt with various aspects of the effective use of paraprofessionals in maximizing people's participation in rural development. A paraprofessional is a semi-skilled person working in some technical area of service. He or she may be in government employment, may be receiving government assistance, or may be working on a purely voluntary basis. The following varieties of paraprofessionals have been working presently under different agencies.

- Home & Panchayat Ministry: Multi-purpose development worker; women workers and chief women workers; development cadres; community engineers (proposed).
- Food, Agriculture and Irrigation Ministry: JTs and JTAs; Agricultural Assistants; Model Farmers; Progressive Farmers; 4-H Club leaders.
- Health Ministry: Junior Auxiliary Health Workers; Nurses; Health Assistants; Health Educators; Traditional Midwives; Witch doctors; FP Motivators.
- Miscellaneous: Social Volunteers; semi-skilled artisans; volunteer school teachers; ex-servicemen; N.D.S. students (in form of change agents).

It was commonly felt that training paraprofessionals in techniques of mobilization of the people is very helpful in attaining higher levels of

people's participation in development programs. Some specific suggestions from the discussion were as follows:

- (1) There should be no rigid educational requirements fixed as prerequisite for employment or designation as paraprofessionals, as they may deter persons with competent skills but little formal education.
- (2) When selecting paraprofessionals, their attitude toward the job should be considered, and a positive attitude toward working with an serving rural people should be a prerequisite.
- (3) Villagers should have more say in the selection of paraprofessionals and paraprofessionals should be made more responsible to the people. The role of local institutions was felt to be very important in utilizing the services of paraprofessionals. For this purpose it was suggested that paraprofessionals be linked with and made responsible to the local panchayat.
- (4) Greater incentives should be provided / to paraprofessionals for the development of their expertise. At the same time, the goal should not be to turn them into professionals since their work as a bridge between the government and the people is important.
- (5) Attention should be given to career possibilities as an incentive. While not trying to turn them into professionals, their work may be better motivated and may become effective over wider areas if some upgrading for the most effective and dedicated paraprofessionals is provided for.
- (6) Paraprofessionals not in the government service should get (a) due recognition from the government, and (b) remuneration commensurate with their competence.
- (7) Such remuneration should be channelled through panchayats as far as possible, and provision might be made in the future to shift this responsibility from line departments to local panchayats.

- (8) An effective mechanism for policy coordination in support of para-professionals should be established at the central level. All agencies should follow the District Administration Plan (DAP) and delegate uniform power to the district level.
- (9) Effective technical supervision and backstopping should be provided through the respective technical ministries represented in the district. This will help to get maximum service from paraprofessionals at the grass root level.
- (10) District level conferences involving all paraprofessionals should be conducted from time to time.
- (11) Training should be organized frequently to build up paraprofessionals' competence, which helps them develop their career and be of more service.
- (12) The village panchayat secretary should be the key contact person at the village level. As this role is upgraded through training under the DAP to become a multi-purpose village development worker, this person should be better able to support the work of paraprofessionals.
- (13) It appears that there is a growing need for a multi-purpose development worker at the ward level who can help people at the ward level to plan development activities and carry these out in connection with the programs and services of higher level organization.

EXCERPTS FROM PRESENTATION BY DR. NORMAN UPHOFF ON "PROBLEMS INHIBITING  
ACHIEVEMENT OF BROADER PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION"

(Dr. Uphoff is a professor in the Department of Government at Cornell University and chairman of the Rural Development Committee there. He has been a visiting professor at the Centre for Economic Development and Administration in 1971, 1972 and 1973, participating in the seminar on Institution-Building in a colloquium for secretaries of HMG. He has served as chairman of the Development Administration panel of the Southeast Asia Development Advisory Group and participated in programs of the Institute of Development Studies (Sussex), International Agricultural Development Service, and Society for International Development. He is presently director of a four-year project on "rural development participation" based at Cornell and supported by a cooperative agreement with the Office of Rural Development in USAID.)

The problems inhibiting people's greater participation can be viewed from two perspectives: (1) some inhibitions are part and parcel of the social and economic structure, of the circumstances and conditions people find themselves in; and (2) some inhibitions come from the side of government, from the way it is structured and the way it is oriented to the people in rural areas. It would be presumptuous for me to try to address these questions specifically and only with reference to Nepal since you know much more about these problems in Nepal than I do. I will rather discuss this subject with reference to experience in other countries, since we can often gain insight into one country's situation by looking at others' experience. It will be up to you to consider and discuss the subject with specific reference to Nepal.

I. Inhibitions which Derive from Social and Economic Structure

A. Individual Characteristics: In virtually every country in the world there are differences in the extent and effectiveness of participation which are a consequence of differences in social and economic characteristics. I could begin by referring to my own country, the United States. When it comes to participating in decision-making, in voting, in holding office, we find that women participate less than men, that younger adults participate less than older persons do,\* that

\*In discussion after the presentation, it was asked whether the young should be expected to participate as actively in a country like Nepal where deference is given to elders. The answer was that there will certainly be different standards according to the culture of a particular country. But if one accepts a dominant role for elders in decision-making, one should not be surprised if the young are less enthusiastic and active in participating in implementation, for example.

persons with less education do not participate as much as those with more education. These differences show up correspondingly in certain differences in the benefit distribution from government policies and programmes.

One of the differences which is most common and most disturbing in various countries is due to ethnic or racial differences. It is well known that persons of the black race in the U.S. do not participate as fully in public affairs as do whites, and they also get less than their proportionate share of income, status and public services. Such differences in participation according to age, sex, education, race or sometimes caste, class, language, religion or other ethnic criteria are common. But they are not inevitable.

One of the most interesting studies of participation done in the last ten years (by Nie, Powell and Prewitt) analyzed participation in the U.S., Britain, Germany, Italy and Mexico. It found that the effects of differences in income, social status and education were largely offset when persons were members of organisations. Organisational affiliation appears to compensate for these other limitations, so that persons with less education or a lower class background will participate relatively more in community affairs if they are members of organisations like cooperatives, public interest groups, etc.

B. Land Tenure Status: Differences in land tenure status are not very significant in the U.S. because it is no longer an agricultural country. But in a country like India, study after study has shown that persons with small landholdings, or even more, with no land of their own, participate much less in public affairs. They seldom hold offices, and if they do it is invariably at the lowest level. They have little influence on government decisions or performance. They are less likely to be members of co-operatives or credit unions, and if they are, studies show they get less than their share of inputs and credit (studies done in Rajasthan and Maharashtra could be cited). Their participation in benefits is thus meager and unpredictable, and their opinions are almost never

solicited. At most, they participate in implementation of community development projects, contributing labour, often not entirely voluntarily.

This has been a very obvious problem in India and it is widely recognized. Interestingly enough, organisation appears to offer some compensating effects also for the landless and near - landless. In a study recently completed by Dr. K. C. Alexander, director of sociology at the National Institute of Rural Development in Hyderabad, he found that in those districts of Kerala and Tamil Nadu where farmers and labourers were better and longer organised into associations or unions, their incomes were higher and, quite significantly, the caste differences in social status had been narrowed, in terms of social interaction, terms of address, etc. I do not want to say that organisation is a panacea, or to suggest that its establishment and maintenance are easy. They are not. But there is evidence to suggest that this factor helps to compensate for the inhibitions raised by factors of age, sex, race, education, caste, class or land tenure status.

C. Illiteracy: I should say perhaps a few words specifically about illiteracy as a factor inhibiting participation. This is often pointed out as a barrier. I cannot speak authoritatively on this in the conditions of Nepal, but I do know there are studies showing illiterates are much more knowledgeable about matters around them than educated think ----- or than illiterate persons usually admit to other people. Pretending ignorance is the usual and safest response of poor and powerless people when confronted with persons who have more education, status and authority. It is a tactic that leads to least trouble for the poor.

Not many years ago, a political scientist (Hayward) conducted a careful study of four rural villages in Ghana to determine how much political knowledge their residents had. Most were uneducated. To his

surprise, and most everyone else's, their knowledge was in some respects quite high. One particularly striking statistic was that a higher percentage of uneducated rural Ghanaians could name the Member of Parliament from their district than could average Americans'. This did not surprise me because the year before, I had conducted a survey of nearly 1,400 Ghanaians, more than half of whom were illiterate, having to be interviewed in vernacular languages instead of using written questionnaires. The range of sub-samples was from doctors and lawyers to farmers and fishermen, from senior civil servants to unemployed youth. In asking them to evaluate 61 different policy items, I found that the educated and barely educated gave responses at least as knowledgeable and thoughtful as did the secondary and university graduates.

My point is that one should not underestimate the knowledge and concern of the uneducated, even though they may not choose to share it with persons outside their own immediate circle, and they may have difficulty articulating it to urbanites. I will come back to this point: intelligence is not correlated with education. It can happen that the uneducated are more intelligent than are the educated, though the uneducated cannot do much with their talents under most circumstances.

## II. Inhibitions which Derive from Government Structure

Unfortunately, it often happens, at least in other countries, that the agencies of government themselves are not always supportive of people's participation. The structure of government is often complex and remote as far as the common people are concerned, and the attitudes of government personnel often discourage the common people from taking initiative. It may be that participation by local people is fruitless because decision-making power is reserved for higher levels.

A. Attitudes: One of the clearest examples of how bureaucratic orientations can squelch participation comes from the research of Conlin in Peru. There, after land reforms, the large estates were given to the peasants who had tilled them to manage and operate. This was an open invitation to have active and constructive participation. But after the peasants had selected their management committees, agricultural technicians were sent by the government to "advise" them. In the case reported, when the committee and technician toured the estate and came to the first field, the technician said it would be a good one for growing wheat. The peasants explained it had been in wheat and they wanted to put it into another crop the next year, according to their rotation. The next field the technician again said would be good for wheat. The peasants said that according to their rotation, it should lie fallow for a year first and then switched to wheat. The technician insisted it too should be planted to wheat, citing "economies of scale." (Actually, he may have been thinking mostly about wheat crops would benefit urban Peruvians since wheat would be marketed and potatoes or other crops consumed mostly locally.) The third field he also suggested for wheat, though the peasants said it was not suited for wheat because of drainage problems. By the time they got to the fourth field, the technician noticed that the peasants were no longer following him. They had stopped under a tree and were having a smoke. What did the technician say? "Isn't that just like peasants -- they can't keep their minds on anything for very long!" He obviously did not understand why they had given up on "consulting" with him. Yet they dutifully recommended to their fellow peasants that the "plan" proposed by the technician be followed, because they lacked the power and the confidence to follow their own experienced judgement. How often this kind of thing happens in Nepal, you know better than I do.

B. Structure: The structure of government, which is usually rather centralized, also affects people's participation. Our Rural Development Committee at Cornell in 1973 and 1974 undertook a study to analyze the role of local government and other local organisations in promoting rural development in 16 countries, from China, Japan, South Korea and Taiwan in East Asia, to Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines and Thailand in Southeast Asia, to India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Sri Lanka in South Asia, to Egypt, Israel, Turkey and Yugoslavia in the Near East.<sup>1/</sup> This represented a wide range of experiences and political systems. In analyzing the structure and performance of rural local institutions, we found that half the cases qualified as "more organized" and the other half as "less organized," in terms of the extent to which there was effective linkage between central governments and their rural constituents through a multi-tiered system, and to which rural institutions like local government, cooperatives and farmers' associations were involved in performing functions of rural development such as planning, resource mobilization, provision and integration of services, claim-making and control over administration. In terms both of agricultural productivity and social welfare criteria, the better organized cases with functioning rural local organisations showed much better performance.

We found that in many countries, communication and cooperation really only extended at best down to about the district level, with villages and hamlets remaining uncontacted, unconnected and uninvolved. Their performance in rural development was much poorer. One of the most dramatic cases in this regard was Indonesia, where the village (desa) was not effectively organized for interaction with and broad participation in programmes at the district (kabupaten) level. (There have been some more recent efforts to remedy this.) In analyzing this case study, the image we got of this system was that of a big fruit tree, which was too tall for the people to pick the fruit, when it was ripe and when they

<sup>1/</sup> Norman Uphoff and Milton Esman, Local Organization for Rural Development: Analysis of Asian Experience, Cornell University, Rural Development Committee, 1974.

wanted it. Things reached the village from time to time, but unpredictably and not necessarily when the villagers wanted it, or what they most needed. It was as though the fruit tree dropped fruit down on the people from time to time, and not always ripe fruit, or not always what they wanted. They would get "hit on the head," so to speak, by things coming from above. Shortly before elections, the Indonesian government would "shake the tree" and various fruits would come falling down to the villages, only to stop again after the election was past.

If Indonesian villagers had some effective local organisations, like village councils or genuine cooperatives, with some supporting government staff and paraprofessionals based in the village, they would be then able to "reach up and pick the fruits," when as as they needed them, instead of being "hit on the head" unpredictably and often not usefully. Any comparisons of Indonesia with other cases I will leave to others. You can consider to what extent some greater decentralization-cum-local organisation would serve to support broader people's participation.

### III. Concluding Remarks

One of the main conclusions from our 16-country comparative study was that two fallacies need to be guarded against in trying to promote participation and development. The first is the "paternalist" fallacy, that the educated class has some kind of monopoly on wisdom, intelligence and virtue, that the rural poor have none of these qualities and depend entirely on the direction and control of the educated bureaucratic class for their advancement. The other is the "populist" fallacy, the reverse belief that the rural people are all-wise, all-knowing and all-virtuous and that the educated class is venal, inept and ill-intentioned. The implication of this view is that government should be kept far away from the rural people so they can develop by themselves. We found no merit in either view and found that the most productive approach was to try to draw on the

respective strengths of both the educated class and the rural population in a two-way collaboration.

The paternalist view equates education with intelligence. Yet if there is anything which is well established scientifically by now, it is that intelligence is unevenly but widely distributed across all classes, races and castes. In proportion to their numbers, all social groups produce about the same share of brilliant people, average people and not-so-bright people. In a country where 90% of the population lives in the rural sector and 80% are illiterate, most of the brainpower, most of the intellectual talent of the country must be in the rural sector and among the rural poor. The talent may not have been fully developed for lack of educational opportunity or (perhaps more important) for lack of experience in serving in leadership or technical roles where intelligence could blossom. This is a hard fact for educated people, myself included, to grasp fully and to accept emotionally even if we nod our heads in conscious agreement. There are people out there in the rural sector who are much more intelligent than we are, and we should put whatever talents we have at the service of lifting up the talent "out there" because everyone will benefit from its emergence and perfection. Any country which tries to develop while the vast majority of its mental strength is slumbering or dormant has little chance of success. So hopefully we can see an end to paternalistic approaches to development work.

But going to the opposite extreme is no solution. It was also evident from our study of the experience in 16 countries that for the rural sector to be organised and mobilised, for the talents of the rural population to be tapped, there needed to be a system of organisation reaching down to and up from the village. Establishing and maintaining such a system of opportunity and cooperation required leadership from above (though not only from above -- there needed to be a cadre of local leaders working hard for mobilisation and uplift at the village level, but they could not succeed and probably would not emerge without

encouragement and support from above). We found no basis for the populist presumption that effective local organisation can "trickle-up" from the grassroots by itself. There can be good and honourable examples of local initiative, but unless it is supported and protected, it is likely to wither or be stamped out by vested interests at the local level.

Some might say that only persons from among the rural poor can give leadership and direction to the rural poor. I would agree that authentic development from the grassroots cannot be sustained without leadership and talent emerging at that level. But the tasks of rural uplift are great enough that the leadership and talents of persons beyond the rural sector must be mobilised. Persons from more advantaged classes can serve the advancement of the poor majority if they respect the needs and capabilities of the majority and if they have no exaggerated idea of their own importance. Leadership has to be on two fronts, at the center giving direction and support, and at the local level encouraging, criticising, proposing, disciplining, planning, etc. There is some danger that central leadership, even with the best of intentions will act paternalistically toward local leaders, and will discourage them by patronising them, or will set a bad example which encourages in turn paternalistic behaviour by local leaders toward their own constituents. Paternalism is ultimately a greater danger to authentic rural development than populism because it easily pervades even well-intentioned efforts. Everyone tends to judge in his own interest, assuming his motives and performance are good while finding fault and weaknesses in others. From experience elsewhere it appears that rural development can be assisted by humility in the strong and confidence in the weak.

There are no perfect solutions because people are not perfect. Even countries that have had revolutions find that selfishness and pettiness cannot simply be wished away. But that is no reason for not trying to enhance and expand the

opportunities for those persons who now stand largely outside the system because of neglect or because of social and institutional inhibitions. Each country has to seek its own solutions to problems such as these I have outlined. There are no reliable models for export, but experience from elsewhere can be studied and learned from. The best place to start is, of course, with one's own experience, and that is what you can do in the discussion groups.

REPORTS OF DISCUSSION GROUPS

III. A. FACTORS OF DIFFERENCE IN SEX, CASTE AND ETHNIC STATUS

Chairman: Hon. Mrs. Angur B. Joshi, Member, Rastriya Panchayat

Moderator: Mr. Dor B. Bista, Executive Director, Center for Nepal and Asian Studies, T.U.

There was some discussion at the outset whether differences in ethnicity and caste should be regarded as significant factors inhibiting participation in Nepal, and whether the discussion should focus rather more on differences in sex. The agreement after some discussion was that even though discrimination based on caste or ethnicity is illegal and is not abetted by government regulations, the actual effects of differences in ethnicity and caste should not be played down. In spite of the equal provisions made by the law, the factors of caste and ethnic discrimination still continue to wield a negative influence on opportunities available to underprivileged groups. There are as yet many ethnic and caste groups which are not adequately represented in the government bureaucracy and other bodies of the government. At the same time, what differences there are in the status of different castes and ethnic groups are not entirely due to such social differences, but mainly due to the lack of economic opportunities based on other factors such as education and employment. This in itself is a hopeful sign because it means that with serious efforts to improve these opportunities, the disadvantages of caste or ethnic status can be reduced.

With this background, the suggestions which emerged from the discussion were as follow:

- (1) Training can be a potential positive factor for development, especially for assisting the economically and socially underprivileged. Therefore, training preference should be given to underprivileged castes, ethnic groups and women.

- (2) Representatives from underprivileged groups and castes should be included in decision making bodies. In this regard, it was suggested that the system of nomination in the district, town and village panchayats be retained for the effective participation of women, the underprivileged and the different ethnic groups.
- (3) In certain cases, preferential treatment with regard to job opportunities should be made in favour of trained women because equal treatment among unequal groups might lead to the perpetuation of inequality.
- (4) It was noted that the training programme for women presently puts overwhelming emphasis upon traditional skills such as knitting, sewing, etc. and not on more basic economic activities. Thus, although more than 40% of the women are engaged in Nepalese agriculture, there are no provisions for training agriculture technicians from among women, and extension programs in agriculture are not directed to women. Taking women more seriously as agricultural producers with regard to training should increase their effective participation in development and should spur development.
- (5) It was suggested by some participants that suitable skills training for women should be provided in the form of trade schools.
- (6) At present, enrollment of girls in schools is very low. There have been instances in some areas where provision of free tuition facilities and books have given a definite boost to enrollment of girls. If such steps are taken for other underprivileged groups, their enrollment should also increase.
- (7) It was suggested by some that women should/ be set aside as a separate class in society, since they could also fit into any other organization such as youth organization or farmers organization.

In this connection, a separate women's organisation under the system of class organisation was not appropriate. This did not mean there should not be women's organisations, however, to promote things of interest to women.

- (8) There are still certain laws that tend to discrimination against women and these need to be reformed. Any such status inequality inhibits women's full participation. As the speaker Mr. Obaidullah Khan had said citing the Chinese proverb, "women hold up half the sky."

### III. B. FACTORS OF DIFFERENCE IN LAND TENURE STATUS

Chairman: Dr. Mohan M. Sainju Member, National Planning Commission

Moderator: Mr. Ram Bahadur K.C., National Planning Commission

Nepal is no exception to the general rule that persons with little or no land in the rural sector find it much more difficult to participate in the several aspects of development effort. Their voices are not heard much in planning and decision making and of course, they are mostly bypassed in the benefits of development, which go generally to persons with larger landholdings. If development is to be meaningful to all the rural people, and particularly to the poorer sections, attention needs to be paid to differences in land tenure as they affect people's opportunities for participation.

The land reform programme in Nepal has been designed to be an indispensable part of institutional reform to bring about a more egalitarian development of agriculture and promote active participation in all development activities. However, it is found that the programme, despite its noble objectives and ambitious content, has in its overall performance not met expectations.

The redistributive aspect under ceiling enforcement, despite some indirect effects in breaking down individual holdings could not be effective in reducing land concentration, eradicating absentee landlordism, and improving the status of the small, marginal and landless cultivators.

Measures have been taken to provide tenant security and fixation of rent. But tenant evictions and reportedly voluntary surrenders are not unusual. Legislative and administrative measures are still said to be inadequate and complicated.

Compulsory savings scheme, a novel feature of the land reform programme that accumulated nearly Rs. 150 million and increased institutional loans to 22% of the total and helped serve small and marginal farmers, has been suspended, and the PDLT designed to mobilise local resources and multiply development activities has still to gather momentum.

It is generally accepted that more equitable distribution of land and security of tenure, whether to smallowners or tenant-tillers, is helpful in promoting greater and active participation in development. This is based on both statistical information and observation, though further empirical studies are needed. What evidence we do have suggests that yields are considerably higher on smaller, owner-operated, intensively-cultivated plots, and that such owner-operators are in a better position to participate actively in panchayat and other community affairs.

For supporting increased people's participation, the following suggestions were made:

- (1) Agricultural development is a central ingredient in getting rural development through people's participation. Agricultural development

will be propelled with more participation if there is greater distribution of land to those who till it.

- (2) The existing land reform measures, particularly those related to distribution and tenancy rent, should be effectively implemented. Commitment to land reform both at the policy and implementation level should be strengthened to help secure people's participation in a sustained way.
- (3) Suitable peasants' organizations should be sought, and decision making authority with respect to policy and implementation of land reform should be given to Village Assemblies and other such organizations.\*
- (4) It is further suggested that land reform should not be implemented in isolation, but rather needs integrated support from other sectors of development activity, such as credit, extension, marketing, etc.
- (5) One possible approach to improving land tenure status for many who do not have access to land now could be the scheme for panchayat ownership of land as suggested by Mr. M.C.Regmi, which seeks to achieve the objectives of the Panchayat System through a synthesis between individual land ownership and collective authority of local panchayats.\*\*

---

\* A study of experience with land reform implementation in some 30 countries by Prof. J.D. Montgomery showed that involvement of such peasants' organizations in implementation at the grassroots was an essential ingredient for achieving benefits in income, security and influence for the peasants.

\*\*The details of such a scheme can be worked out, but it implied in essence, Panchayat ownership of land, development and use of surplus and savings through local panchayats, retaining the individual's right to use, cultivate and even dispose of property but only within the Panchayat jurisdiction and regulations.

III. C. RELATIONS BETWEEN CIVIL SERVANTS AND RURAL PEOPLE

Chairman: Mr. Jagat M. Adhikary, Vice-Chancellor, Tribhuvan University

Moderator: Dr. Prachanda Pradhan, Professor, CEDA.

There was a very lively discussion on this subject, considering in what ways the relations between civil servants and rural people inhibit people's participation in development efforts. Numerous observations were made. The administration is the mechanism for translating into action the policies relating to the "public interest" and the "public good." In the Nepalese context, however, as in other developing countries, the administration does not play a neutral role; rather administration in this context is powerful in the field of policy formulation and policy implementation. Although 94% of the Nepalese people live in rural areas, it was noted that concentration of efforts are seen more in the urban sector benefiting only a small section of the population. Of course, members of the bureaucracy are drawn from rural life, but they lose their identity with rural people and adopt the norms, values and culture of the bureaucratic system which pushes them away from the life style of the rural people.

The language used in the bureaucracy is different from the language of the rural folk. The standards and values are different, thereby resulting in the gap between the aspirations of the rural people and the delivery of services. Even the programs intended for the rural people are not made known adequately to the people. Examples of participation of the local people in the initiation of programs are difficult to find. Civil servants feel that whatever they feel good should be good for the rural people. Integrated Rural Development Program of Rasuwa-Nuwakot, for example, has very little participation from the rural people. Sporadic attempts to bring the civil servants close to rural life through Back to Village National Campaign and tour of the secretaries in the remote districts of Nepal of foot for certain days have not born much fruit.

Civil servants can be categorised into two groups: one has little contact with

with the rural people, and another has direct relations with them. Health officers, agricultural technicians, CDOs, etc. are the people relating directly to the rural folk. These people should have proper training towards accountability to the rural people. Opinions were expressed that the rural people have very little chance for dialogue with civil servants. The lack of dialogue extends not only to the common villagers but even to village panchas and members of the District Panchayat. Occasional conflicts between the CDO and Chairman of District Panchayat have hampered the development activities and delivery of services to the rural people.

Programs for rural development are prepared on the basis of technicians' reports and administrators implement them with no chance for people's participation in shaping such programs. The bureaucratic mechanism has developed in such a way that it avoids the rural people's participation. Under the existing system of rules and power within the administration, civil servants become more boss-oriented than client-oriented. Reorientation of the civil service is urgently needed. One of the participants even suggested that civil servants be sent to rural areas for some time like under the National Development Service so that the challenges of the life of rural people could be better identified and to become better acquainted with the problems of the rural people. The idea should be that civil servants feel they work with the people not just for the people.

To bridge the widening gap between civil servants and rural people, the following suggestions were put forward:

- (1) The role of people's representatives should be strengthened, so they are able to assist and get programmes based on the people's needs implemented. It was felt in the discussion that at present, people's representatives could not function as the countervailing element with the dominating role of bureaucracy.
- (2) The need for decentralisation and bringing decision points closer to the people was also suggested. So long as decision points remain far from the people, confidence of the people could not be commanded by the district civil servants, who did not themselves have enough authority to act on the people's behalf.

- (3) A reorientation program for the civil service should be planned so that the basis of their decisions will involve looking to the rural people for suggestions and evaluations.
- (4) Attention should be given to establishing much better communication between government programmes and recipient rural people. This means two-way communication about the programmes, not just telling people about them, but listening too.
- (5) The present system for posting civil servants to rural areas was discussed, and some thought it not conducive to good rural development performance. In the first place, when civil servants are placed in such areas as part of a punishment, they do not have enthusiasm and zeal to work in such situations. Second, when civil servants like to go to the remote and rural areas to earn more marks toward promotion, their motivation for genuine service is low. Those who stay unwillingly in rural areas as part of punishment get more marks toward promotion, at the same time the rural people do not get the desired services from the administration. Some reconsideration of policy should be undertaken.
- (6) The narrow base of the present bureaucratic personnel structure should be made easier for disadvantaged people. Also, choice of jobs outside the bureaucracy should be expanded.
- (7) Structurally, a bottom-up planning system should be introduced so that people will be able to participate in the initiation, implementation and evaluation of rural development programmes.

EXCERPTS FROM CONCLUDING REMARKS BY HON. DR. B. P. SHRESTHA, VICE-CHAIRMAN,  
NATIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION

(Dr. Shrestha has worked with the National Planning Commission of Nepal since 1968, first as Member and now as Vice-Chairman. Before joining the NPC he served on a number of committees constituted by His Majesty's Government from time to time. He also taught Development Economics at Tribhuvan University and at several universities in the U.S.)

The reports just presented represent a wide spectrum of very innovative ideas and creative suggestions, which I am sure will be very stimulating and rewarding to all of us who are concerned with rural development activities. As a matter of fact, the seminar is organized at a very appropriate time, for you are all aware that our next Five-Year Plan is at the moment in a process of conception, and the type of cross-fertilization of ideas which has already taken place here may certainly contribute to this process of conception. I further hope that the inputs of the seminar might also create further conditions for what I might call the "intellectual incubation" for the next plan.

Probably you will agree that in a number of developing countries after several years of planning exercises and genuine and sincere development efforts, probably these exercises and efforts have failed either to fulfill legitimate expectations of the masses in rural areas or to create adequate conditions for obtaining a level of life at a reasonable level in these developing countries.

This poor state of affairs can be explained in several ways. But it is partly because of our bureaucratic, or at best technocratic, planning process. Or it might be because of what one might call an elitist approach to development, a kind of development effort largely dominated by a few urban elites. The entire delivery system, the entire organizational structure, the entire machinery which is supposed to be geared up to the felt needs of the common man, looks like an inverted pyramid. It is characterized by top-heavy paraphernalia but without any broad base at the grass root level.

Now as you know, in some developing countries where a higher level of growth has been somehow maintained, there seems to be a relationship between this higher level of growth and the corresponding decrease in the incidence of poverty, in the incidence of disease and squalor. With the prevailing planning process, the present development approach, achieving a higher growth rate can mean a further widening of the gap between the haves and have-nots, between the vast rural masses and the few urban elites. In this sense, perhaps the slow growth rate in most of the developing countries, maintaining a traditional balance based on feudal economic relationships, is acting as something of a deterrent to further widening of the gap between the haves and have-nots. Therefore, I think we have reached a stage where we have to seek an effective and workable alternative, so that the entire process of development can really get down to the bottom.

Now Nepal has been working out an alternative model within our political institutions and framework, and I feel that Nepal's panchayat polity is capable of providing this alternative. In several developing countries they are looking for an appropriate institutional or organizational network which is capable of taking development to the bottom, which is capable of enlisting active support of the people at the grass root level. But Nepal is fortunate in having under the panchayat system as many as 3,000 village panchayats and 75 district panchayats. We all know that these village and district panchayats are basically political units, but they are also entrusted with several development activities. Over the years, if we are to make an objective assessment, I think these panchayats have demonstrated their capacity for undertaking numerous development activities in several areas that have direct relevance to the day-to-day life of people in the rural areas.

In the last few years, hundreds and hundreds of miles of road are under construction through the local panchayats by effectively utilising local resources and local leadership. If these activities were to be undertaken in a normal bureaucratic way, through the usual government ministries and departments, it would have cost several crores of rupees from the exchequer just to compensate for the land needed for these projects. Therefore, I feel very strongly that a country like Nepal can attain a desirable level of development, can have the type of development we really look for, only if we are capable of harnessing the tremendous opportunities and potentialities under our panchayat system.

If they are harnessed, it will not only speed up the development process, it will also change the very nature of our development. In a situation like our own, probably a reasonable level of development, with distributive justice, can only be obtained under what can be called a participatory development process. This requires participation in decision-making and implementation, participation in the means of production and participation in the sense of having opportunities for gainful employment. To the extent that there is participation of local institutions and local people in decision-making and implementation, there is every reason to believe that such decisions will at least not be detrimental to their interests, and I think there is reason to believe the decisions will be in their best interest. To the extent there is participation in the means of production, there is at least a proportional claim on every incremental output generated in the economic system. To this extent, that participation will open up opportunities for gainful employment, it will lead to a process whereby the abundant but redundant labour force will be gradually converted into capital.

In fact, I sometimes suggest something like a Robinson Crusoe type of model for countries like Nepal. As you may know, Robinson Crusoe created everything

virtually out of nothing. And how? By conversion of his musclepower into capital. I think that is how we will have to carry out the capital formation process in rural areas, using labour power which is now going to waste on an enormous scale.

As many developing countries, Nepal has to address herself to some immediate problems. We have been able to expand transportation and communication facilities, to expand educational institutions. With this there is a growing awareness of the people even in the rural areas. They are more articulate than they were even 10 years ago. There is more popular demand for the simple amenities of human life, basic human needs such as wholesome drinking water, minimum health care, minimum education, suspension bridges over turbulent rivers. These popular demands are mounting, day after day, year after year. Of course, over the past decade, we have made considerable progress in all these areas, more so in the last few years. But we have to make tremendous efforts on all these fronts before we can provide these services, these simple amenities of life to a significant segment of our population. Piped water supply is available to a very negligible fraction of our population. There are literally thousands and thousands of rivers without bridges on widely used trails in the hills and in the terai. There are a majority of villages where the simple amenities of life, available in Kathmandu here, are not available. Now the challenge we face at the moment is how fast and how best to meet the growing and legitimate demands of the people.

Now here we have two alternative approaches, one of them the bureaucratic experience, and the other the panchayat experience. If the government were to put up a suspension bridge or to complete a drinking water project, normally it takes three years. This does not mean a department undertakes only one bridge or one water project at a time, but on the average, it takes about three years

and costs not less than a million rupees. This is the average time involved and the average cost required just to put up a suspension bridge in the remote areas. You can imagine how long it will take and how much resources we would need in order to put up several thousand bridges so badly needed in many parts of our mountains, our hills and of course in several places in the terai. Therefore if one is to try to continue to reach the people, to try to meet their demands through normal bureaucratic processes, I am afraid we cannot do it in several decades with the possible resources at the disposal of His Majesty's Government

This is the one extreme type of experience we have. At the other extreme, we have the experience such as reported in the case of bridge construction such as we have heard of in the case of Baglung. There, the driving force behind this impressive work is here among us today, Hon. Gauchan. With a financial grant of less than 700,000 rupees, the Baglung district by mobilising local resources, local leadership, local talent and of course local panchayat institutions has undertaken construction of as many as 60 bridges, small and big, wooden and suspension bridges. Thirty have already been completed, and the rest are in the process of implementation.

These are the two kinds of experiences we have had. Now we have reached the stage where we have to make some choices. We should try to take advantage of both -- of the skills and knowledge of the technocrats, the experience of the bureaucrats, and of the local skill, the local leadership, the local talent of the local people through their local institutions. This may be seen as a model for our next plan in so far as participation is concerned.

In our planning, we are working with three sectors, the public sector, the private sector and the panchayat sector. Planning in Nepal is essentially a public sector program. Decisions in the private sector are influenced rather

by inducement rather than direction. As far as the public sector is concerned, I think its activities will have to be circumscribed, its area will have to be narrowed down. I think probably in the next plan, the public sector programmes may be somewhat reduced, to include only those activities which have regional and national importance. These will be done through the normal bureaucratic process, though where possible with the cooperation of the local people.

There may be a radical departure for the panchayat sector. So far it has included those small activities which are undertaken by the local panchayats with their local resources, supplemented by grants from the centre. Of course, these development activities are very important because, as I have said earlier, these activities have very direct relevance to the day to day life of the common people, like drinking water, suspension bridges, small canals and things like that. But probably in the next plan, we will have to stretch the panchayat sector, probably we have to extend the area of responsibility, the area of activity of the panchayat sector so as to include some of the activities now undertaken by the departments at the district level.

The panchayat sector may have two major components: (1) those activities normally undertaken by mobilisation of local resources, supplemented by grants from the centre; and (2) those activities being undertaken now by the offices of the departments and ministries, the projects and activities which have district importance. Perhaps we cannot initially leave all of these to the District Panchayats, but probably we can move ahead step by step toward making the entire district level development administration responsible to the District Panchayat. I won't go into details on how this could be worked out, but I think such a development would give tremendous opportunities for more effective and more meaningful participation by the local people through their own local institutions.

As a matter of fact, at the moment the panchayat sector is operating on a very limited scale, with very serious constraints. Most of the development activities are undertaken rather on an ad hoc basis. Village panchayats and district panchayats do not know how much financial grant they are getting from the centre. They have no perspective. One can think of having something like a Five-Year Plan for each district. Each district plan would be an integral part of the total national Five-Year Plan. If this can be done, probably the district panchayats and village panchayats will have at least a five-year perspective. They will know what they are getting over five years, what financial and technical support they can expect from the centre. They will also know what efforts they must make on their own by mobilising their talents and resources.

These have been ideas presented in a nutshell, how planning from below could work. In our context, planning from below means planning through panchayats. I think development is essentially a political process. We cannot think of development in a political vacuum. Nor can we think of a development strategy without reference to given political institutions. Therefore, I think the kind of polity we have at present can work. We can make this kind of institution more responsive to the people. Probably this is the development model which is most appropriate and which after some years of experience will really be workable. Thank you.

EXCEPTS FROM REMARKS BY HON. MR. OMKAR P. GAUCHAN, MEMBER, RASTRIYA PANCHAYAT

(In the discussion following the discussion group reports, one member of the seminar who was particularly impressed with the account of successful bridge construction in Baglung District under the leadership of Hon. Mr. Gauchan, suggested that just as the Chinese had coined the slogan, "Learn from Ta-chai," we in Nepal might "Learn from Baglung." Hon. Mr. Gauchan was invited to share with the seminar some of the experience with people's participation there.)

In the course of discussions here, much mention has been made about the bridge construction works in Baglung. I would be glad to throw some light upon our activity in Baglung.

To begin with, I must say that in considering how the projects were undertaken successfully there, the most important contributing factor was the wide participation by the people. The concerned workers and panchas deserve credit for the activity. The distinguishing feature of our projects was that the bridges were constructed with use of local technology only, technology which has been handed down over the past half century. We did not have to depend upon outside agencies for technical assistance. Consequently we were able to mobilise largely local resources with use of traditional technologies. We were able to do without cement, which has been introduced in my district only in the past 20-30 years. Our people are not as familiar with its use as they are with stone construction. This is a local, and plentiful, material. We used local iron which is locally processed by traditional methods. Chains were made out of this iron for use in the construction of bridges. Only cables were brought from outside.

Regarding the question of institutionalization which has been raised in the discussion group reports, we certainly require institutions from the local village level to the national level if we are to be able to mobilise fully people's efforts. We already have this arrangement in the panchayat system, in which institutional arrangements are available even at the ward level. These institutions should be

responsible for development activities. As we have at hand these institutional arrangements required for development in panchayats, it would be foolhardy to think of anything else. .

At the same time, I would like to say that I do not subscribe to the view that only panchayats alone can undertake development activities. It is generally experienced that community leaders do not always like to be at the place where development activities take place but at the same time they can contribute substantially to the activities even if not on-the-spot. In this situation the work can be organised and managed by other persons from the community who have some technical skills. Development activities are effective when they are locally initiated and undertaken. It is not always profitable to depend upon institutions only, in my experience with bridge building in Baglung. For in spite of good intentions, the rules and regulations of the institutions often are very complicated. They can become impediments to expeditions completion of development works.

So, my observation is that we need to have institutions for development, but greater vent should be given to local initiative and not always relying on institutions only. This is how we go a long way towards fully utilising available resources and forces for development.

Appendix A: Schedule of Seminar

Programme for Seminar/Workshop

(on

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT IN NEPAL

July 24 - 26, 1978

Hotel Blue Star

July 24th - Monday

- Registration 9:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.
- Morning Session 10:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m.
- Chairman Honourable Minister for Food, Agriculture and Irrigation, Mr. Rabindra Nath Sharma.
- Welcome Address Home and Panchayat Secretary, Mr. Sher B. Shahi.
- Inaugural Address Honourable Minister for Home Panchayat, Mr. Khadga B. Singh.
- Remarks by Chairman . . . . .
- Vote of Thanks Seminar Coordinator Dr. Ram P. Yadav, Deputy Director, APROSC.
- Tea Break 11:00 a.m.

PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION EXPERIENCE IN OTHER COUNTRIES

- Presentation Mr. A.Z.M. Obaidullah Khan, Secretary of Agriculture, Government of Bangladesh.
- Comments and questions from the audience

MEANING OF PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN DEVELOPMENT

- Presentation Mr. Sam Butterfield, Director, USAID/ Nepal
- Comments and questions from the audience.
- Lunch 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. (Hotel Blue Star)

Afternoon Session 2:00 to 5:00 p.m.

EXPERIENCE WITH PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN NEPAL

- Presentation Mr. Kul Shekhar Sharma, Governor, Nepal Rashttra Bank
- Comments and questions from the audience

Tea Break 2:45 p.m.

Discussion Groups on Experience with People's Participation in Nepal:

(a) Agriculture, Irrigation and Soil Water and Forest Conservation

Chairman Mr. C.B. Gurung, Member Secretary, Social Services Central Coordination Committee.

Moderator Mr. B.P. Sinha, Director, Regional Directorate of Agriculture, Biratnagar.

(b) Health, Family Planning Education and Other Social Services

Chairman Mrs. Kamal Rana, Chairman, Women's Services Coordinating Committee.

Moderator Dr. B.B. Karki, Health Integration Division, Department of Health.

(c) Rural Works (Roads, Bridges, Water Supply) and Cottage Industries

Chairman Honourable Mr. Omkar P. Gauchan, Member, National Panchayat.

Moderator Mr. Shanta B. Rai, Director, Local Development Department.

July 25th - Tuesday

Morning Session 9:00 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

MECHANISMS FOR ENCOURAGING PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

Presentation Dr. Mohamad Mohsin, Member Secretary, Back to Village National Campaign.

Comments and questions from the audience

Tea Break 10:00 a.m.

Discussion Groups on Mechanisms for Encouraging People's Participation

(a) District and Village Panchayats and Class Organizations

Chairman Honourable Mr. Radha P. Ghimire, Member, National Panchayat

Moderator Mr. Kalika B. Mathema, Back to Village National Campaign

(b) Sajha Cooperatives, Small Farmers Development and Action Groups, and Local Development Committees at Ward or Panchayat Level

Chairman Honourable Dr. Damber N. Yadav, Member, National Panchayat

Moderator Mr. Sri Krishna Upadhyya, Deputy General Manager, Agricultural Development Bank of Nepal

(c) **Trained Paraprofessionals from Village and Village-Level Workers as Mechanisms for People's Participation**

Chairman Honourable Mr. N.B. Chand, Member Rastriya Panchayat

Moderator Mr. Ram N. Shrestha, Training Chief, Home Panchayat Ministry

Lunch 1:00 to 2:00 p.m. (Hotel Blue Star)

Afternoon Session 2:00 to 5:00 p.m.

PROBLEMS INHIBITING ACHIEVEMENT OF BROADER PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION

Presentation Dr. Norman Uphoff, Chairman, Rural Development Committee, Cornell University.

Comments and questions from the audience

Tea Break 2:45 p.m.

**Discussion Groups on Problems Inhibiting Achievement of People's Participation**

(a) **Factors of Difference in Sex, Caste or Ethnic Status**

Chairman Honourable Mrs. Angur B. Joshi, Member, National Panchayat

Moderator Mr. Dor B. Bista, Executive Director, Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies, T.U.

(b) **Factors of Difference in Land Tenure Status**

Chairman Honourable Dr. Mohan M. Sainju, Member, National Planning Commission

Moderator Mr. Ram Bahadur K.C., National Planning Commission

(c) **Relationships between Civil Servants and Rural People**

Chairman Mr. Jagat Mohan Adhikary, Vice Chancellor, T.U.

Moderator Dr. Prachanda Pradhan, Professor, CEDA, T.U.

July 26th - Wednesday

Morning - no session: Preparation of Reports from Discussion Groups

Afternoon Session 2:00 to 5:00 p.m.

Chairman Honourable Dr. Badri P. Shrestha, Vice-Chairman, National Planning Commission

Presentation of Reports by Moderators, followed by discussion

Concluding Remarks by Chairman

Vote of Thanks Seminar Coordinator Dr. Ram P. Yadav, Deputy Director, APROSC

Dinner 7:30 p.m. (Hotel Yak & Yeti)

Appendix B: List of Participants

1. Mr. Adhikari, Chandra Kant -- Small Farmers Development Project, Nuwakot
2. Hon'ble Adhikari, D.P. -- State Minister for water and power
3. Mr. Adhikari, Jagat Mohan -- Vice-Chancellor, T.U.
4. Mr. Adhikari, Nar Kant -- Secretary, Ministry of Food, Agri. & Irrigation
5. Mr. Adhikari, Raghu -- Economist, APROSC.
6. Mr. Adhikari, Surendra Bir -- Assistant Editor, APROSC
7. Dr. Agrawal, G.R. -- CEDA
8. Dr. Apedaile, L.P. -- K- Bird Projects
9. Mr. Baird, Alec -- KHARDEP
10. Dr. Baral, Lok Raj -- Head of Dept., Political Science, T.U.
11. Mr. Banskota, Kamal -- Economist, APROSC
12. Mr. Basnet, Khagendra Bd. -- APROSC
13. Mr. Basnet, Narendra -- Registrar, Dept. of Cooperatives
14. Dr. Basnet, Prabha -- Research Officer, Ministry of Education
15. Mr. Baidya, H.R. -- Programming Officer, US Peace Corps
16. Mr. Babylon, John -- Economist, USAID
17. Dr. Bannett, Lynn -- Advisor, CEDA
18. Mr. Bhatta, Bhim D. --- CEDA
19. Mr. Bhattarai, A.N. -- Deputy Director General, Dept. of Agriculture
20. Mr. Bhattarai, B. Pd. -- Director, Training Division, APROSC
21. Mr. Bhattarai, Tara Dev -- Secretary, Ministry of Health
22. Mr. Bista, Dor B. -- Executive Director, CNAS
23. Dr. Bista, Khem B. -- CEDA
24. Ms. Britton, Margaret -- USAID
25. Dr. Burger, Veit --- ADC Research Specialist, APROSC
26. Mr. Butterfield, Samuel H. --- Director, USAID
27. Mr. Campbell, D.D. --- British Embassy
- 27.\* Dr. Campbell, Gabriel ---- Anthropologist, USAID

28. Hon'ble Mr. Chand, Narendra B. --- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
29. Mr. Chapagain, Devendra P. ---- M.F.A.I.
30. Mr. Colin, Sean --- Anthropologist, KHARDEP.
31. Mr. Dahal, Badri --- APROSC.
32. Mr. Dahal, Punya Pd. ---Under-Secretary, Ministry of Finance.
33. Dr. Dhital, B. P. --- Special Advisor, APROSC.
34. Mr. Dhital, Vijay P. -----Up-pradhan Pancha, Anandabon Panchayat, Rupandehi.
35. Mr. Dhungana, Bhawani P, ----- CEDA.
36. Mr. Dhungana, Dipak --- Chief, Training Division, ADB/N.
37. Hon'ble Mr. Gauchan, Omkar --- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
38. Hon'ble Mr. Ghimire, Radha Pd. ---- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
39. Mr. Giri, Ramesh Pd. ---- APROSC.
40. Mr. Gurung, C.B. --Member Sect., Social Services Central Coordination Committee.
41. Mr. Gurung, Santa Bd. --- CEDA.
42. Mr. Hagger, Ruedi ----- SATA.
43. Mr. Hasegawa, Sukehiro --- Deputy Resident Representative, UNDP.
44. Mr. Jha, Digamber -- Zonal Commisioner, Rapti Zone.
45. Hon'ble Mrs. Joshi, Angur Baba ---- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
46. Dr. Joshi, Narendra D. --- Director General, Department of Health.
47. Dr. Joshi, Durga D. ---- Livestock Specialist.
48. Ms. Joshi, Ram Rajya ---- Economist, APROSC.
49. Mr. Joshi, Rubi ---- Acting Chief, Agricultural Credit Division, NRB.
50. Mr. Joshi, Tek Raj --- Senior Consultant, APROSC.
51. Mr. Kafle, M.P. ----- Joint-Secretary, Ministry of Home Panchayat.
52. Dr. Karki, Benu Bahadur ----- Integration Division, Dept. of Health Services
53. Mr. Karki, Madhav ---- Agriculture Specialist, APROSC.
54. Mr. Karki, Nanda Kumar ---- Chief District Officer, Patan.
55. Dr. Khan, Obaidullah ----- Secretary of Agriculture, Bangladesh.
56. Mr. K C. Bal Gopal ---- Under-Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

57. Mr. K.C. Ram Bd. ----- Under-Secretary, National Planning Commission.
58. Mr. Kayast, Bhuban Man --- Joint Coordinator, CHARDEP.
59. Mr. Koirala, Dirgha R. --- Secretary, Ministry of Industry & Commerce.
60. Mr. Ligal, Prithivi R. ---- Lecturer, T.U.
61. Mr. Mahat, T.B.S. --- Forest Conservation, Chautara.
62. Mr. Malhotra Ram C. ---- UNAPDI, Bangkok.
63. Mr. Malla, K.B. ---- Dept. of Soil & Water Conservation.
64. Prof. Malla, Basudev C. ---- CEDA, T.U.
65. Mr. Manandhar, Prahlad K. ---- Chief of Afforestation.
66. Mr. Mathema, K.B. ---- Back to Village National Campaign.
67. Dr. Mathema P.R. --- Acting Chief Economist, M.F.A.I.
68. Ms. Molnar, Augusta ----- CNAS.
69. Mr. Mishra, Padas R. ---- APROSC.
70. Mr. Mitchnik, David ---- Assistant Coordinator, Rasuwa - Nuwakot I.R.D.
71. Mr. Miyan, Khalil ----- Horticulturist, APROSC.
72. Dr. Mohsin, Mohammad ----- Member Secretary, Back to Village National  
Campaign Central Committee.
73. Mr. Myers, Peter ----- Project Co-Manager, HADP.
74. Mr. Ojha, Yogendra Nath ---- Chief District Officer, Nuwakot.
75. Mr. Pal, Premod. --- Editor, APROSC.
76. Dr. Pahadi, Savitri --- Department of Health Services.
77. Dr. Pandey, Badri R. ----- Chief, Family Planning.
78. Mr. Pandey, C.D. ---- Industrial Services Centre.
79. Mr. Pandey, Krishna Raj ---- Ministry of Works & Transport.
80. Mr. Pandey, Iswari Raj ----- Nepal Rastra Bank.
81. Mr. Pandey, Sushil ----- Economist, APROSC.
82. Mr. Pant, Bed Bahadur --- Member Secretary, Back to Village Campaign.  
Zonal Committee Gandaki Zone.

83. Mr. Pyakural, Kiran N. ---- CEDA
84. Mr. Pickett, Douglas ----- Director, US. Peace Corps.
85. Mr. Pokharel, Tika Prasad ---- CEDA.
86. Ms. Pradhan, Meena ---- CEDA
87. Mr. Pradhan, Bhubanesh K. ----Director General, Dept. of Irrigation.
88. Dr. Pradhan, Bijaya Bd. ---- Chief Advisor, Nepal Rastra Bank.
89. Mr. Pradhan, M.L. ----- Director, Regional Directorat of Agri., Pokhara.
90. Dr. Pradhan, Prachanda --- Professor, CEDA.
91. Mr. Rai, S.B. ----- Director, Local Development Department.
92. Hon'ble Mrs. Rai, Saraswati --- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
93. Mr. Rajbhandari, Heramba B. ----- G.M., Dairy Development Coporation.
94. Dr. Rajbhandari, Kamala Bhakla ----- Senior Consultant, APROSC.
95. Mr. Rajbhandari, Iswari P. ---- Dept. of Cottage Industry.
96. Mr. Rana, Dron Shamsher --- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
97. Hon'ble Mrs. Rana, Kamal -- Chairman, Women's Services Coordination Committee.
98. Mr. Rana, Madhukar S. --- Executive Director, CEDA.
99. Mr. Rana, Pearl J. ----- Senior Advisor, Ministry of Food, Agri. & Irrigation.
100. Mr. Rawal, Ram B. ----- Chairman, Nepal Food Corporation.
101. Mr. Regmi, Iswari Baj ---- Advisor, APROSC.
102. Mr. Regmi, Mahesh C. ---- Regmi Research Project.
103. Mr. Rimal, Madhav --- APROSC.
104. Hon'ble Dr. Sainju, Mohan M. --- Member, National Planning Commission.
105. Dr. Schield, A. ----Director, SATA.
106. Mr. Shahi, Sher Bd. --- Secretary, Home Panchayat Ministry.
107. Mr. Sharma, Bhesh Raj --- Director, Land Reform.
108. Dr. Sharma, Dip Raj --- General Manager, ADB/N.
109. Mr. Sharma, Khagendra Nath ---- Executive Director, Panchayat Training Centre.
110. Mr. Sharma, Kul Shekhar --- Governor, Nepal Rastra Bank.
111. Mr. Sharma, Prayag Raj ---- Professor, CNAS. T.U.

112. Mr. Sharma, Saligram --- Agriculture Credit Division, NRB.
113. Mr. Sharma, Sridhar ---- Economist, APROSC.
114. Dr. Sharma, Suresh Raj ---- Member Secretary, National Education Committee.
115. Mr. Singh, Durgesh Man ---- Senior Economist, APROSC.
116. Mr. Singh, Gambhir Man ---- Chief Conservator, Department of Forestry.
117. Mr. Singh, Narsingh Narayan --- Joint-Secretary, Ministry of Education.
118. Mr. Singh, R.B --- Senior Adviser, Ministry of Food, Agri. & Irrigation.
119. Mr. Singh, Shambhu Man --- Manager, IRDP.
120. Mr. Shrestha, Amrit Man --- Senior Economist, APROSC.
121. Hon'ble Dr. Shrestha, Badri P. --- Vice-Chairman, National Planning Commission.
122. Mr. Shrestha, Bihari Krishna ---- CNAS.
123. Mr. Shrestha, Bhumi N. -----CEDA.
124. Mr. Shrestha, Hari Mohan --- Joint-Secretary, Home Panchayat Ministry.
125. Mr. Shrestha, Hit Singh -- Joint-Secretary, Ministry of Finance.
126. Ms. Shrestha, Indira ---- CEDA.
127. Mr. Shrestha, Iswari Lal ---- Secretary, Ministry of Education.
128. Mr. Shrestha, Krishna Man ---Member-Secretary, Back to Village Campaign  
Zonal Committee, Bagmati Zone.
129. Mr. Shrestha, Ram Narayan --- Training Chief, Panchayat Development Training.
130. Mr. Shrestha, Surya Pd. --- Zonal Commissioner, Bagmati Zone.
131. Mr. Sinha, B.P. ----- Director, Regional Directorate fo Agri. Biratnager.
132. Mr. Stevens, Merve ---- USAID.
133. Mr. Suwal, Prayag Raj ---- District Panchayat Chairman, Kathmandu.
134. Mr. Thakur, Babuwan ---- CDO., Kathmandu.
135. Mr. Thapa, Ajit N. ---- Executive Chairman, Industrial Services Centre.
136. Mr. Thapa, Bidur K. ---- General Manager, AIC.
137. Mr. Thapa, Indus S.----- Department of Cottage Industry.
138. Mr. Thapa, Ganesh Bd. --- Deputy Governor, Nepal Rastra Bank.

139. Mr. Thapa, Nara B. ---- Ministry of Home Panchayat.
140. Dr. Thapa, Rita ----- Chief Health Integrated Division, Dept. of Health Services.
141. Mr. Upadhyaya, Jagdish --- Under-Secretary, National Planning Commission.
142. Mr. Upadhyaya, Kumar P. --- Dept. of Soil & Water Conservation.
143. Dr. Upadhyaya, Iswari Pd. --- Under-Secretary, Ministry of Education.
144. Mr. Upadhyaya, Mahesh Kumar --- Zonal Commissioner, Sagarmatha Zone.
145. Mr. Upadhyaya, R.R. -- Ministry of Home Panchayat.
146. Mr. Upadhyaya, Sri Krishna ---- Deputy General Manager, ADB/N.
147. Dr. Uphoff, Norman --- Professor, Chairman, Rural Dev. Committee, Cornell University.
148. Dr. Vaidya, Tulsiram --- Director, NDS., Kirtipur.
149. Mr. Varma, S.S. ----- Director, ICM.
150. Hon'ble Dr. Yadav, Dambar N. ----- Member, Rastriya Panchayat.
151. Dr. Yadav, Ram Prakash --- Deputy Director, APROSC.

Appendix C. LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADB/N	---	Agricultural Development Bank / Nepal
ADC	---	Agricultural Development Council, Inc.
AIC	---	Agriculture Input Corporation
APROSC	---	Agricultural Projects Services Centre
CDO	---	Chief District Officer
CEDA	---	Centre for Economic Development & Administration
CNAS	---	Centre for Nepal & Asian Studies
DAP	---	District Administration Plan
FP	---	Family Planning
HADP	---	Hill Agriculture Development Project
ICM	---	Indian Cooperation Mission
IHDP	---	Integrated Hill Development Project
JT	---	Junior Technician
JTA	---	Junior Technical Assistant
K BYRD	---	Karnali - Bheri Integrated Rural Development
KHARDEP	---	Kosi Hill Area Development Project
M.F.A.I.	---	Ministry of Food, Agriculture & Irrigation
NDS	---	National Development Services
NRB	---	Nepal Rastra Bank
SATA	---	Swiss Association for Technical Assistance
T.U.	---	Tribhuvan University
UNDP	---	United Nations Development Programme