



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

THE DEVELOPMENT OF EMERGING NATIONS

Douglas Ensminger
Ford Foundation, New Delhi, India

I want to discuss with you some of the problems facing this troubled world in trying to find the road to peace because I think these problems have significance in the way you feel about educational work in this particular area.

When Paul Hoffman, president of the Ford Foundation, approached me in August 1951 to go to India, I refused. Then in October he came to Washington to see me. He had recently returned from a visit to India himself and was convinced that the peace of the world for generations to come might well be determined by what happened in India. He told me it was my moral obligation to go. I tell this story to you who are engaged in this program of international understanding because it seems to me that we have to get across to the people an understanding that each of us has a moral obligation to see what we can contribute in bringing us peace. You people in educational work can help the American people understand that they as individuals should be just as much concerned and just as much involved in this as the people in Congress, members of the cabinet, and the man who occupies the White House.

Some time ago, a prominent Indian was in my office in Delhi roundly condemning the Ford Foundation for giving so much of its money to the government of India rather than making grants to private organizations and institutions, of which only a few exist in India. After listening to him criticize the government of India for about twenty minutes I said, "It is your government. If I felt the same way about my government, I would say the first person who needs to be criticized is myself." I hold the view that in a democracy we as individuals are the government. We are not going to get any place in the international scene by blaming the administration, a given party, or somebody else.

Frequently, people ask me, "Why have you spent eleven years of your life in India and why are you going back?" My answer is: If India can demonstrate to itself and to the rest of the developing nations in Asia that it can through democratic methods and democratic institutions eliminate disease, poverty, and hunger, then democracy will have a home in Asia. If India does not succeed in that task, the implications are clear. All of Asia might well go communist. With Asia, Russia, and the satellite countries all communist, communism would dominate the

major markets of the world. Whether we like it or not our way of life would change. The question is whether the world is going to be dominated by communism and totalitarianism or by democracy and freedom of the individual. When we think about the problem of developing nations, this is the fundamental issue that comes to the forefront.

This has not quite been put into perspective. In our lifetime our nation has been engaged in two major world wars, and in each case we have been victorious in the battlefield. At present we are engaged in a struggle of a different type, which we have yet to understand. In trying to assist the developing nations, we as a nation seem to be frustrated. We worry about the cost. We are impatient with the time involved. Although this is a war in the ideological field, in contrast with the battlefield, we nevertheless can draw some parallels. If World War III, God forbid, should start tomorrow morning, the question of cost would not be an issue. Allocation of our best human resources would not be an issue. The time required to finish the job would not be an issue.

Since coming back to the States I have spent some time talking and listening to people in positions of influence. Congress is critical and the man on the street is either indifferent or cynical. I think we have to recognize the reasons for this situation and change our approach.

We as a nation have to stop thinking that our dollars can solve the problems of the world. They cannot. Money is essential, but it has to be put into proper perspective. We need to understand that although these new nations have old cultures, they are new republics. As nations they are very young; they lack leadership, and a sense of direction. First, we must help the developing nations select the problems which they feel are of sufficient importance to warrant their top leadership and their scarce resources. Second, we have to help them formulate a program that offers hope of solving these problems. Then, and only then, does money become useful. Money has to be regarded only as a resource to implement programs that are of importance to developing nations.

We have to avoid imposing our value system on the world and trying to do the things that we think are important. We go abroad with the idea of extending know how, assuming we have great wisdom. In trying to help developing nations, we in general want them to become an image of ourselves as a nation. We talk a great deal about democracy, but we understand very little about the process by which democratic institutions and democratic methods evolve out of a culture that has no experience with democracy. We want to tell people in other countries what they should do when actually we must help develop an

environment in which they can think creatively and plant ideas in such a way that these ideas become their ideas and grow out of the new environment.

We have to take the time to understand the psychology of the developing nations. We as a nation are so far removed from our early years of freedom that we have forgotten how we ourselves behaved during our early years of independence. When somebody is critical of a young nation, all we have to do is turn to history and read what we said and how we behaved.

We need to recognize that no emerging new nation basically wants technical assistance. Nations that have just gained their freedom are anxious to avoid domination by a foreign power. Also, the individual who is to work with our technician immediately feels his leaders believe he is incompetent. Put yourself in the other person's position of having to explain to your relatives and friends that you were assigned a foreign advisor because your leaders lacked confidence in you. The very process of technical assistance itself creates conflict because the foreign consultant is an agent of change, whereas the situation into which he has been injected tends to resist change. This does not mean we should stop giving assistance, but it does mean that we need to understand the psychological problems involved if we are to be effective.

Big foreign industries were in many cases viewed with apprehension as another form of possible domination from a foreign power. Each year this psychosis about colonialism and domination lessens, and the environment is steadily improving for foreign capital and foreign industries to enter the developing nations of the world. For example, a foreign investment center with an office in Delhi and one in New York has been set up to help determine what industries in India can profit from foreign collaboration and what companies in the United States might be attracted to collaborate with Indian industries.

We have to send better qualified technicians abroad. The technician's first job is to gain the confidence of the people. This means he has to establish himself intellectually and philosophically before he can get around to technical discussions. Those who can pass the mental and philosophical tests influence thinking. Those who cannot pass the mental tests buck the line, but they do not influence basic decisions. As an American citizen, I think it is high time we stopped apologizing to ourselves and to the world because we cannot send our best people abroad. This is a terrible indictment of America.

Our people need to be prepared to stay with programs for an extended period of time. Being human, we want to see fulfillment of the program objective for which we went abroad, and tend to become

impatient because the program more frequently than not fails to move through its full cycle in less than five to ten years. The building of a new institution abroad in ten years can be considered a very successful undertaking. Many times the greatest contribution a person going abroad for a two-year period can make is getting new and significant ideas accepted. We know from experience that a good part of our time in the educational field is spent in creating a favorable climate for the acceptance of significant ideas.

We have to approach the development program with a much better understanding of the time involved. Let me give you an illustration. India is very little different from most other countries of the world so far as illiteracy is concerned. In an average Indian village with a population of 600 people or about 100 families plus or minus, 82 to 85 percent of the people are illiterate. What changes can we expect of the Indian villager who is 40 years of age and over and illiterate? We know from experience we can get him to accept an improved agricultural practice. We can educate him to have his children vaccinated against smallpox. We can get him to do some other things, but basically he will remain mentally oriented to the traditions of the past.

Good primary education is available for the children and if we are successful in our extension education program, we can expect considerable progress toward acceptance of science and technology by the time the present adult villager's children become adults. But the real breakthrough will come only when this present illiterate villager's grandchildren become adults. This is three generations. We tend to condemn ourselves for failure because we are not achieving change in these countries faster. We would stop condemning ourselves and be more effective in our work if we understood the cultural process of change. An Iowa study showed that eleven years elapsed before 85 percent of the farmers adopted hybrid corn. Yet we go abroad expecting other countries to adopt improved practices overnight.

In bringing about change we must understand the influence of traditional ways of thinking, living, and making a living. Several years ago I came to a realization that the process of changing the illiterate Indian village cultivator is different only in degree from changing the educated American farmer of today. You can go into an Indian village with a carefully worked out result demonstration and guarantee that agricultural supplies will be available in the future to carry out these new agricultural practices, and get the people to change. Many people over the years felt that the Hindu religion was holding these people back. What we find is holding them back are the traditions of the past and the fact that they live on the margin of life and death, security and

insecurity, or any margin you want to name. Since they live on these margins, they cannot take any risk by adopting a new practice until it has been demonstrated. The result demonstration takes the risk out of a new practice.

Education is the most universally expressed need of the people of India. The difficulty is providing sufficient educational facilities and teachers. The constitution of India stipulates that every boy and girl up to 11 should have an opportunity to go to school. One of the problems is that teachers do not want to go to villages when they are so deficient in amenities. Another problem is financing. Many of the village teachers of India get the equivalent of \$11 a month. Good teachers could probably be obtained, believe it or not, for \$20 a month, but if this additional amount is included in the national budget, other expenditures would have to be reduced.

One of the difficulties most of these countries face is that they have to do something with all their problems. They cannot deal with education and neglect industrialization, agriculture, health, etc. Integrating all phases of development is a tremendous undertaking.

Four United States universities, the Universities of Illinois, Missouri, Ohio, and Kansas, are aiding rural universities in India. These four universities are playing a very important role in helping India develop its educational institutions for agriculture.

To be sure, there is a danger that education can cause greater unrest if it only produces more educated unemployed. This can be avoided by helping developing nations to project their manpower requirements for ten, twenty, and thirty years and to orient their educational institutions for the training of the required manpower.

Rapid population growth is a problem facing many developing nations. During the ten years I have been in India, the population has increased by no less than 80 million people. The world cannot continue to be indifferent to this problem because development brings rising expectations, and the people become frustrated when change cannot be achieved fast enough to assure actual benefits to the growing population.

Fortunately India as a nation has been advocating family planning and population control over a period of ten years and has now arrived at a national policy with respect to family planning in the absence of any political, religious, or cultural block. One of the limiting factors in assisting families plan for the spacing of their children is lack of a method that is biologically safe, socially acceptable, economically feasible, and practicable under the conditions in which the people live.

Another obstacle to population control is communication of information to the illiterate masses. Still another problem is how to change basic values. In India having a son is of tremendous importance to the father as well as the mother. Since the mother is something of an outcast in the community if she cannot bear a son, this places considerable pressure on her. In the past because of the health problem the chances of the first son dying were very great so a couple had a second son. The second son might also die, so they had a third. So they kept on, hoping one would finally survive. Today none of the sons is so likely to die, but much educational work is needed to change attitudes.

We need to understand that many places in the world will continue to have unrest until the causes of poverty are removed from the masses. The amount of progress a nation makes in gross national product, while important, may or may not improve the living conditions of the masses. If the great majority of the people are still locked in poverty, disease, and ignorance, we are going to have unrest. This is a problem that we have not successfully met.

In closing this session, I would like to say that your work in international understanding is most important. We must continue our quest for peace.