



**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](mailto: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 RISE AND FALL OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: 1950-1965

By

Lane E. Holdcroft

M.S.  
Agricultural Economics  
1976

A Research Paper Under Plan B

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements of the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Agricultural Economics

1976

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to take this opportunity to express my heartfelt appreciation to those who provided encouragement and counsel in the preparation of this paper, namely, Drs. Carl K. Eicher, Akhter Hameed Khan, and George E. Rossmiller.

Dr. Eicher, as my major professor, through his keen perception and understanding of the current rural development thrust, and Dr. Rossmiller, as a member of my guidance committee, with his broad analytical perspective and penetrating questions, both contributed much to improving the modest effort which follows. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Khan, the other member of my guidance committee, who first suggested the need for this paper. His counsel, based on long experience and deep knowledge of rural development endeavors around the world, including the community development movement, was invaluable in the preparation of this paper.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction . . . . .	1
Part I. " <u>The Rise and Fall</u> " . . . . .	7
1. Origins . . . . .	8
2. Ideology and Techniques . . . . .	12
3. Decade of Prominence . . . . .	20
4. Era of Decline . . . . .	25
5. Some Implications for Integrated Rural Development. . .	32
Part II. " <u>Selected Literature Review</u> " . . . . .	37
1. Principles . . . . .	38
2. Training . . . . .	47
3. Country Studies . . . . .	49
4. Evaluation . . . . .	56
Part III. " <u>Bibliographies</u> " . . . . .	75
1. General Bibliography . . . . .	76
2. Bibliography of Community Development Bibliographies. .	85

## INTRODUCTION

Over the past three years a re-emergence of interest in the community development movement in the developing world of the 1950's and early 1960's has occurred, due primarily to the current interest in rural development as an approach to improve the well-being of the world's rural poor. It is unusual in current rural development conferences of scholars, researchers or practitioners not to hear frequent reference to the failures or successes of the earlier community development programs.<sup>1</sup>

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

Both the United States and the United Nations described community development as a process. The U.S. referred to it as a "a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action; define their common and individual needs and solve their problems; execute these plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources; and supplement these resources when necessary

---

<sup>1</sup>For a recent example of this kind of dialogue see, The Role of Social Sciences in Rural Development, A conference held at the Rockefeller Foundation, April 29-30, 1975, Report dated January, 1976.

with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community."<sup>2</sup>

The United Nations viewed community development as the process, "by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress."<sup>3</sup>

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

While various types of private and government-directed rural community reconstruction programs with a variety of labels had existed in both the developed and developing world for centuries, only after World War II did they become comprehensive, more numerous and national in scope. In 1948, the term "community development" was first used officially at the British Colonial Office's Cambridge Conference on

---

<sup>2</sup>Foreign Operations Administration, 1956.

<sup>3</sup>United Nations, 1955.

the Development of African Initiative. It was proposed to help the British African territories prepare for independence while improving local government and developing the territories economically. Shortly thereafter the term and concept spread rapidly to various external donor agencies, as well as to many national governments.

A number of modest national community development efforts were launched, primarily in British territories in Africa around 1950. The first major community development program was initiated in India in 1952 with considerable support from the Ford Foundation and the U.S. foreign economic assistance agency. This was followed soon thereafter by national programs in the Philippines, Indonesia, Iran and Pakistan.

In the decade after the national program was initiated in India, the community development movement experienced phenomenal international growth. This rapid growth was due primarily to promotion and financial support by the United States. By 1960 the United Nations estimated that over sixty developing nations in Asia, Africa and Latin America had launched community development programs. About half of these were national in scope and the remainder were regional programs of lesser importance. But even by 1960, some community development programs were faltering, and by 1965 most had been terminated or drastically reduced in scope to the extent that they were no longer considered by national leaders to be major rural development efforts. External donors, including United Nations agencies and the United States appeared disillusioned and were directing their resources in support of new initiatives such as the technology of the "green revolution."

During community development's decade of prominence, sparked by the many reports published by United Nations agencies, the United States

foreign aid agency, and other governments, e.g., India, professional journals in the social sciences also focused on this new movement. Regretfully, however, very little was done during that era or since to bring together the theory and empirical evidence into a coherent body of knowledge. Furthermore, there is a paucity of published materials that document the successes, as well as the failures of community development institutions and programs.

This in part is a function of the diverse nature of community development, which was seen by its advocates as a democratic social movement embracing the idea of the balanced, integrated development of the whole of community life. As such it became recognized as the legitimate concern of subject matter specialists with such varied interests as agricultural production, cooperative development, rural education, rural health, local government, social welfare, cultural change, development economics, and rural organizations -- to name only a few. Each tended to stress the unique contribution of their subject matter to the process in their publications, suggesting that any shortcomings were to be found in another subject matter area.

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

As one who assisted in launching the community development program in Korea and has been involved since in rural development efforts in



Asia and Africa, I have been particularly interested in the implications of community development for the new rural development thrust.

The modest purpose of this paper is to examine the community development movement from a historical perspective in an effort to enhance our understanding of that earlier movement and draw from this experience some implications of usefulness in the formulation of current and future rural development strategies, policies, programs and projects. Particularly, the reader who is involved in the current rural development effort, but missed the earlier community development movement will find this paper of value. Also it is hoped that others might be encouraged by this modest effort to further research the existing community development literature and draw upon the wisdom of those who were associated with the movement for additional lessons and insights that would strengthen current and future rural development efforts.

Part I of this paper is intended to provide the reader with an understanding of the origins of the community development movement, its ideology and methodology, as well as reasons for its rapid expansion and causes of its precipitous decline. Throughout Part I particular attention is given to the American role as the spread of movement was dominated by the United States. However, this should not be interpreted as meaning that other bilateral, multi-lateral and private philanthropic external donors did not subscribe to and support various community development endeavors in the developing world. On the contrary, many provided significant support for community development programs and projects, albeit by comparison on a relatively small scale. The last section of Part I provides a discussion of some lessons and insights with implications for the current rural development thrust.

Part II introduces a selected review of the community development literature and provides some background for Part I. It is intended to include the most influential and perceptive, as well as representative, publications of that era. Part II is somewhat arbitrarily divided into principles, training, country studies and evaluation. These categories may be misleading in that many of the publications included in the review deal with two or more of the four topical divisions. Thus, for example, points related to training and evaluation are also found in the section on country studies.

Part III provides a comprehensive listing of all major and some representative community development publications, or other publications containing important insights regarding community development. Also, particularly for those who desire to undertake further research, a bibliography of bibliographies, is included, albeit perhaps incomplete.

PART I  
THE RISE AND FALL

## 1. Origins

The community development concept and approach as encouraged in the developing world in the 1950's by the United States, both directly through the United States foreign economic assistance agency and indirectly through various United Nations agencies, had its early roots in: a) experiences in rural reconstruction of the British Colonial Service, primarily in the subcontinent of Asia, b) United States voluntary agency activities abroad and, c) domestic programs in adult education, community development services, and social welfare. The term "community development" was introduced in the United States in the 1930's to denote the non-government complement to municipal planning. In the late 1940's, its usage became world-wide to indicate developing nations' government programs directed at stimulating local initiative to undertake developmental activities.

The term "community development" was first used officially at the British Colonial Office's Cambridge conference on the development of African initiative in 1948. The term and concept, as derived primarily from the Asian subcontinent, was urged upon British colonial officers in attendance as a way to help the African territories prepare for independence while improving local government and developing the territories economically. Shortly thereafter the term and concept were spread rapidly by the United States and United Nations, as well as the British Colonial Service and adopted by many national governments, particularly in Africa and Asia.

Both the United States and United Nations in the early 1950's drew heavily upon the synthesis of earlier rural reconstruction

efforts in India. India had more well documented experience with rural reconstruction and community development than any other single country in the world. Prominent personalities particularly influential in pioneering pre-independence rural development in India and in influencing the United States and United Nations concept of community development were Gandhi and Tagore. Also Brayne's experiments and writings on rural developments in the Punjab provided significant lessons, as did the work of agricultural missionaries at various locations in India and elsewhere. These experiments provided ample evidence that rural people would respond and take initiative when they realized that they would benefit from community efforts. The Indian post-independence projects, including Etawah, Nilokheri, and Faridabad were of great importance as prototypes for the Indian national community effort that was launched in 1952, as well as other early national community development programs in the developing world.<sup>4</sup>

The second source of related experiences grew out of American and European voluntary agency efforts in the developing world. These included the work of missionary groups as well as non-sectarian philanthropic institutions such as the Near East Foundation and the Ford Foundation. The Near East Foundation assisted in launching the Varamin Plain Project in Iran in the late 1940's which became a prototype for the more ambitious national community development program initiated in 1953. The Ford Foundation during the same period supported several rural development efforts in Pakistan and India.

---

<sup>4</sup>See Part III and the Bibliography of this paper for a listing and discussion of significant publications covering rural reconstruction and community development efforts on the sub-continent.

The third set of experiences that influenced the community development concept and approach spread in the developing world were those from domestic United States and British adult education, community services, and social welfare programs, many of which were initiated in the 1930's. In the United States, these included the community service components of state agricultural extension services, "New Deal" rural development efforts, as well as other university-related public service activities which received their leadership primarily from sociologists, rural sociologists, and anthropologists.<sup>5</sup> The post-war work of the Universities of Kentucky and Washington in assisting to revitalize communities in their states was particularly well known. The domestic and international interest in the 1950's, led a number of American and British universities to offer interdisciplinary masters degree programs in community development.

The social welfare experience in the United States and Europe also contributed to the ideology underlying the concept and approach of community development. Social welfare was and is rooted in relief and other charitable efforts to help the poor, but such programs historically have focused primarily on working with the urban poor. The United Nations definition of social welfare, which is generally accepted in the United States suggests its close relationship to community development of the 1950's and 1960's.

"Social welfare is an organized activity that aims at helping towards a mutual adjustment of individuals and their

---

<sup>5</sup>"New Deal" efforts of particular relevance here include programs of the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation and its successor agency, the Rural Resettlement Administration, as well as the better known Works Progress Administration.

social environment. This objective is achieved through the use of techniques and methods which are designed to enable individuals, groups and communities to meet their needs and solve their problems of adjustment to a changing pattern of society, and through cooperative action to improve economic and social conditions."<sup>6</sup>

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

---

<sup>6</sup>The Development of National Social Welfare Programs, United Nations, New York 1959, and quoted in the popular textbook, Introduction to Social Welfare, (3rd Edition), Walter A. Friedlander, Prentice Hall, 1968.

## 2. Ideology and Techniques

Essentially community development was seen by its free world advocates as the democratic response to totalitarianism. In the "Cold War" era of the 1950's, American leadership believed that the developing nations in the free world were under a two pronged threat from international communism: a) the potential of external military aggression and, b) the possibility of internal revolution growing out of subversion via communist agrarian movements.

Commencing in 1945, American leaders tended to portray military and economic assistance to the Congress and the American public as remedies for what ailed the world. It was assumed that America could assure the existence of anti or non-communist governments through the provision of substantial amounts of economic assistance. Only in the late 1950's was there a growing realization on the part of the political Administration, the Congress, and the American public that economic assistance was a necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the attainment of American foreign policy objectives. These objectives were categorized as humanitarian, national security and economic.<sup>7</sup>

Military assistance was seen as necessary to counter the potential of external military aggression, while economic assistance would build democracy and thereby prevent the possibility of internal revolution. Both American and United Nations' decision makers saw in the community development concept and approach the means to democratically mobilize rural people as a resource for, and the objective of, economic, social

---

<sup>7</sup>For an excellent discussion of the "Cold War" and its impact on American foreign assistance see Mason, 1955.



and political development -- as the appropriate democratic response to the threat of an international communism during this "Cold War" era. Advocates of community development maintained that its central purpose was to develop stable, effective democratic nations and as such community development was, in fact, carrying out the long term objective of American foreign policy. It was expected that this multi-disciplinary approach to comprehensive development at the grass-roots level would improve the welfare and increase the productivity of village people, thereby conquering both poverty and disaffection. Thus the stage was set for America to take the lead in promoting community development in the developing world.

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

"The period 1950 to 1955 witnessed the start of foreign governmental financial assistance programs unprecedented in the history of international capital movement. The scene was completely dominated by the economic assistance rendered by the United States government whose interest in South Asia suddenly blossomed under the influence of the Cold War. Furthermore, the United States abandoned any idea of multilateral action and adopted a national foreign policy whose major instrumentality was bilateral economic and military aid. The growing threat of Communist penetration in South Asia amid continuing guerrilla warfare in several of the countries, Communist success in China and the Korean War impelled the United States to consider South Asia a region of prime significance. As a

result, South Asia was no longer to be bypassed. Total United States' grants and loan commitments to the South Asian countries for the period 1951 to 1955 exceeded two billion, a sum not much below total United States net capital outflows to all countries during any comparable time span in the 1920's. Indeed, from the end of the Second World War through fiscal year 1958 the United States alone supplied over 80 percent of the greatly enlarged total of grants and net credit to South Asia."<sup>8</sup>

As the democratic response to totalitarianism, community development was described by the Government of the United States as, "a process of social action in which the people of a community organize themselves for planning and action, define their common and individual needs and problems, make group and individual plans to meet their needs and solve their problems, execute these plans with a maximum reliance upon community resources, and supplement these resources when necessary with services and materials from governmental and non-governmental agencies outside the community."

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

---

<sup>8</sup>See page 627, Volume I of Asian Drama: In Inquiry into the Poverty of Nations, Gunnar Murdahl, Pantheon, 1968.

common problems on a community basis were seen as the essential elements of community development.

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

Community development was seen as dealing with a complex unit, the total community, and using a flexible dynamic approach adapted to local circumstances. Precise definitions were believed to be neither realistically possible nor desirable. Endeavors to separate community development by definition from everything else in the universe were believed to result in phrasing which might be useful as a basic assumption for discussion or for research purposes, but was considered fruitless as an action concept. Rigid definition was seen as producing rigid, ritualized and standardized programs which would be self defeating because they would be unrealistic and lack flexibility.

The broad approach encouraged by the United States and United Nations Agencies in the initiation of community development programs in the developing nations was the initiation of comprehensive development schemes in individual villages on the basis of what village people perceived to be their "felt needs." Community development activities were customarily initiated by sending into the village a specially trained

civil servant known as a "multipurpose village level worker." These village level workers were generally secondary school graduates who had received several months of pre-service training in a community development institute. By living in a village and working with village people, the village level worker was supposed to gain the villagers' confidence. He was to serve as a catalyst, one who would guide and assist villagers in identifying their felt needs and then translating these felt needs into village development plans and finally in implementation of these plans -- always working through the real village leaders. The village level worker was supposed to have some skills in a variety of subjects such as village organization and mobilization, as well as technical areas such as literacy, agriculture, and health. And where he lacked special skills, technicians from specialized government agencies were supposed to backstop him. Usually the village level worker administered "matching" grants to villagers wherein the villagers' labor and some locally available materials would be combined with grants-in-kind from the national community development organization in order to carry out village projects. However, the product of successful community development was seen as not only wells, roads, schools, other community facilities, and new crops -- it was the development of stable, self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.

Its proponents likened community development to an enterprise by which the government and the rural people of a nation would be brought together, thus improving the lot of the more downtrodden and less fortunate peoples. Consistent with this view of community development, however, was a broader one which saw community development as an

important technique for modernizing an entire society and creating an effective political system.

Where national community development efforts were being implemented, usually a large new bureaucracy was established at the national, regional, and local levels to administer the community development program and attempt to coordinate the rural programs of technical ministries and regional offices, e.g. agricultural, education and health. Most often, these new community development organizations were well financed, primarily by external donors and staffed with expatriate advisors. With their large foreign and domestic training programs they were able usually to recruit highly motivated, relatively well educated young men and women for both headquarters and field staff positions.

Some 28 delegates from ten nations at the 1960 SEATO sponsored conference on community development held in the Philippines suggested the following "pre-conditions and apparatus necessary for a successful program." These provide an excellent summary of the thinking of community development practitioners at that time.<sup>9</sup>

- A. There are certain objectives common to most free nations towards which a community development programme is of particular value, but each country has its own needs resulting from its own individual characteristics. The chief aim of a successful community development programme is not wells, roads, schools and new crops. It is stable self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.
- B. A programme should encourage the people to organize themselves and to exercise initiative in improving their communities and

---

<sup>9</sup>SEATO, 1960.

- ways of living through co-operative efforts on a self-help basis.
- C. The administrative organization should have a structure which assures the highest status for the programme and in its support secures the maximum effective co-ordination of the activities of technical agencies.
  - D. The Community Development programme should foster the growth of local government and develop local leadership.
  - E. Continuing research and evaluation are essential to the success of Community Development, not only in relation to the initiation of programmes, but also in relation to follow-through action.
  - F. The Community Development programme should enjoy strong and continuing support from the head of government and receive the highest priority in the development of the national economy.
  - G. Planning and policy making for Community Development should be carried out at a ministerial or a higher level by an agency specifically created for the purpose, rather than in a functional department such as agriculture, education or health.
  - H. Co-ordination of technical services is of vital importance at all levels of administration and these services should be rendered on the basis of actual village needs.
  - J. The village council, which is composed entirely of representatives of the village, should be the basic unit for Community Development, and arrangements should be made to enable it to raise funds for the projects it decides to undertake. In order that village people can develop initiative and self-confidence, the village councils, in their determination of priorities and in the allocation of their resources, should have as wide powers as possible.

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

Thus it can be seen that community development would appeal to those free world and developing nation leaders looking for an ideology and technique to combat the threat of dissident agrarian movements and improve the living conditions of rural populaces. Community development not only held forth the promise of building stable "grass roots" democratic institutions, but also improvements in the material well being of rural people -- without revolutionary changes in the existing political and economic order.

Furthermore, the community development approach seemed to have nearly universal application to rural societies and the United States was willing to finance most of the costs associated with launching national and pilot community development schemes.

### 3. A Decade of Prominence

The community development movement blossomed in the developing world during the decade of the 1950's. With its promotion and financial support by the United States directly via bilateral assistance programs and indirectly through the United Nations, by the end of the decade over sixty nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America had launched national or smaller regional pilot community development programs. In some instances relatively modest efforts launched by the British Colonial Service in African and Asian nations in the early post-war period were expanded rapidly with United States and/or United Nations assistance.

The greatly publicized launching of the most ambitious of national community development programs in India in 1952 gave the movement an added impetus. Until about 1956 the Indian program served as a prototype in the initiation of numerous other national programs in Asia. Leaders in the Indian program served as consultants and provided training materials for the initiation of new program efforts elsewhere and numerous government officials from around the world visited India to observe and/or receive training in that nation's community development program.

Although a few United States foreign aid field missions had already established community development offices to assist newly launched community development programs, in 1954 a Community Development Division was established in the foreign aid agency's Washington headquarters under the leadership of Louis Miniclier. This Community Development Division, through its personnel and consultants,



was instrumental in promoting community development around the world over the following several years.

A relatively small number of personalities spear-headed this effort. This group of proponents of the community development approach was composed mostly of sociologists and anthropologists with lesser numbers of educators, economists, agriculturalists, political scientists, and social welfare specialists. Some of the more prominent advocates of the community development approach included Carl Taylor, Douglas Ensminger, Melvin Tumin, George Foster, and Richard Poston. Others who also provided intellectual and in some instances operational program leadership included Margaret Read and Thomas Batten of London University, Paul Taylor, Lyle Hayden, Lucian Pye, John Badeau, Ernest Witte, and Louis Miniclier. Most of this group provided leadership in the American bilateral effort, as well as the various United Nations agencies and private foundations which were advocating the community development approach.<sup>10</sup>

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

---

<sup>10</sup>See Part II and the Bibliography of this paper for a discussion and listing of publications authored by most of these personalities.

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

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

Many of the personalities mentioned above served on three major American foreign aid teams in 1955 that visited and reported in glowing terms on community development programs that had been already launched in Bolivia, Egypt, Iran, Jamaica, Peru, Puerto Rico, Gold Coast, India, Pakistan and the Philippines. These favorable reports generated increased interest in the potential of community development and encouraged the initiation of community development programs elsewhere.

In countries where governments indicated an interest in initiating community development programs, the usual pattern was that small teams of community development "experts" would assist the host government in formulating a preliminary program proposal. This would be followed usually by the establishment of a new host country government unit and

a Community Development Division in the United States country aid mission (USOM). Then observation trips were arranged for senior government personnel to attend the international conferences and observe programs already launched. Also the training of prospective community development officers in the host country or another developing country with an active community development program would commence. Generally the United States would provide technical advisors, supplies and equipment, training for host country personnel, and most of the budgetary support needed for program implementation. In some instances, rather than direct United States government assistance, the United States foreign aid agency would finance assistance by American universities or voluntary agencies (foundations or humanitarian organizations). It was thought that those institutions might better assist developing nations in the planning and implementation of community development programs because of their previous experience in domestic and foreign rural programs directed at building local institutions.

After the national program in India was initiated in 1952 with massive support from the Ford Foundation and the United States foreign assistance agency, United States-assisted programs were launched in Iran 1953, Pakistan 1953, Philippines 1955, Jordan 1956, Indonesia 1957 and Korea 1958. Smaller programs were also launched with United States assistance in Iraq 1952, Afganistan 1953, Egypt 1953, Lebanon 1954 and Ceylon and Nepal in 1956. At the zenith of its importance in the American foreign assistance program in 1959, twenty-five nations were receiving major United States assistance in the implementation of community development programs and the United States foreign aid agency employed 105 direct hire and contract community development

advisors. During the ten year period ending in 1962, the United States directly provided some \$50 million in support of community development programs in over 30 countries via its bilateral foreign economic assistance agency, and a somewhat lesser amount via the several United Nations agencies that funded community development efforts in another 30 countries.

Under the leadership of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, generally the United Nations agencies fostered the community development movement in much the same manner as did the United States foreign aid agency, albeit on a reduced scale. Numerous international community development conferences were sponsored on various aspects of community development. Also technical and capital assistance was provided in launching pilot programs, in addition to the preparation of numerous widely disseminated influential publications dealing with community development.

#### 4. The Era of Decline

By 1960, some community development programs, including the major Indian effort, were faltering and by 1965 most national community development programs had been terminated or drastically reduced. The precipitous decline was due primarily to: a) the sharp reduction in American support, and b) disillusionment on the part of many political leaders in developing countries with the performance of their community development programs in terms of reaching stated objectives.

Although the Foreign Assistance Act of 1962 indicated continued strong American congressional support for community development, this Congressional guidance to "encourage greater emphasis on community development in the less developed nations," never materialized. The following is an excerpt from the Report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

"Section 109 amends section 461 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 which relates to assistance to countries having agrarian economies. The amendment directs that, in such countries, emphasis shall be placed, among other programs, on community development to promote stable and responsible governmental institutions at the local level.

During the past 10 years, through its foreign assistance programs, the United States has spent approximately \$50 million in support of community development programs in 30 countries. Almost one-half of this amount was allocated to help launch major programs in India, Pakistan, and the Philippines. Prior to 1955, United States assistance for community development

emphasized equipment and supplies, such as vehicles for village workers. Since 1955, the emphasis has shifted to providing technicians and participant training in addition to small amounts of supplies and equipment.

Basically, community development approaches the local community as a whole and is directed toward helping the people, on the village level, to participate effectively and with knowledge in shaping the future of their own community and of their nation.

The product of successful community development is not only wells, roads, schools, other community facilities, and new crops; it is, more properly, the development of stable, self-reliant communities with an assured sense of social and political responsibility.

The committee believes that community development can be a dynamic force leading to economic improvement, social advancement, and orderly political growth. The amendment proposed in this section has been approved by the committee in order to encourage greater emphasis on community development in the less-developed nations."<sup>11</sup>

In spite of efforts on the part of its American advocates to maintain Congressional support and turn the tide in the early 1960's, from the beginning of the decade United States support continually

---

<sup>11</sup> Foreign Assistance Act of 1962, June 7, 1962. Report on H.R. 11921 to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 as amended, and for other purposes. Chapter 6, Section 1.09.

declined. Even between 1959 and 1960 the number of developing nations receiving major United States support dropped from twenty-five to nineteen and the number of American community development advisors from 105 to 68. By 1963 the United States foreign aid agency's headquarters Community Development Division had been abolished, as had most United States aid field mission community development offices. Only a few countries continued to receive United States support for their community development programs. When major United States assistance was reduced or terminated, community development programs were terminated, drastically redirected or greatly reduced by host country governments. Interestingly enough, the only programs labeled community development to later receive massive United States support were in Indo-China.

The leadership of the United States foreign aid agency in the early 1960's was concerned not only by the lack of continued host country support of community development programs, but disillusioned with the continuing widespread internal conflict and animosity between agency community development and technical services personnel, particularly agriculturalists. This conflict permeated the foreign aid agency both in Washington and field missions, from whence it spread to host country ministries and agencies. It was an ideological battle, which at all levels pitted the generalist against the specialist, the social scientist (excluding economists) against the technologist, the pluralist against the monoist. Usually these conflicts were resolved in favor of field mission and host country technical services personnel who were bureaucratically more established and more positive in their philosophy.

By 1963, where community development offices had not been eliminated, community development and agricultural offices in United States field missions were combined as rural development offices in line with the recommendations of Stanley Andrews.<sup>12</sup> And where not eliminated, most host country community development ministries or agencies became a unit of the agriculture or interior ministry, depending on whether the then current development focus was on local government or agricultural technology.

The United Nations and a few private philanthropic organizations continued to fund some community development activities throughout the 1960's, but without American and host country government support these efforts have been relatively minor and increasingly shifted from a development to social welfare orientation. Even support by the British Government for the University of London to provide community development training and publish a periodical was terminated in 1964, this support having commenced in the late 1940's.<sup>13</sup>

Perhaps the most universal criticism of the community development movement was that its programs were inefficient in reaching economic goals. It was assumed that man would respond rationally to economic incentives and since underdevelopment was defined in economic terms, programs that more directly focused on economic growth were considered more deserving of support. Particularly as central planning agency

---

<sup>12</sup>See Part II for a review of Andrew's report. In most cases a rural development office was formed after the demise of the host country's community development program and new offices focused primarily on agricultural development.

<sup>13</sup>The widely read periodical, Community Development Bulletin, was published quarterly from December 1949 to December 1964 in English and French.



personnel became established and influential in decision-making in developing countries during the 1950's, they criticized community development programs as being "uneconomic" and a "low priority investment" of scarce domestic and external development resources. Related to this issue was the concern in many nations that community development programs were not contributing to alleviation of the basic problems of food scarcity and poverty.

The community development program in India was a case in point that is the best documented.<sup>14</sup> The stated objective of the Indian program was, through popular participation of village people to transform the economic and social life of the villages, to alleviate poverty and the scarcity of food. A massive comprehensive self-help program embracing primarily agriculture, health, education, public works and social welfare was implemented for over a decade. Yet program performance, measured in terms of reaching its stated objective, was poor. Poverty and food scarcity were not reduced, but rather became more wide-spread during that decade, as did disparities of wealth between the large farmers and peasants in the rural areas. Critics pointed to the wide disparity in the distribution of benefits of the program between accessible and remote villages, within villages between cultivators and other village groups and among cultivators between the wealthier and the poorer farmers. Evaluators report that the program was not really accepted by people nor did it reach the poor, rather it was characterized by a

---

<sup>14</sup>Part II of this paper, Country Studies and Evaluation, includes a review of the major publications which describe the Indian program content and discuss its decline.

"top-down" bureaucratic empire which ignored agricultural production.

The leaders of the Indian community development program recognized early that the development of village level initiative and action were lacking. There was a propensity on the part of village level workers to work with the traditional elite, to ignore the poor, and lead or direct villagers rather than develop local leadership. This basic problem of being unable to arouse popular participation in comprehensive development plagued most efforts and was a weakness in the community development approach. The existence of an informal concensus mechanism and spirit of cooperation in all village societies was wrongly assumed.

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

India also provides an example of how national community development programs evolved to reflect changes in national emphasis over the decade commencing in 1952. During the initial years social welfare, public works activities and changes in villagers attitudes, rather than material results were emphasized. Then food production became the priority program focus in the late fifties. In the early 1960's the focus shifted to local self-government and cooperative development as the community movement there receded and technical agriculture came to the fore again. The evolution of the Indian program from social welfare to cooperatives and local government with technical agriculture

programs in the end reigning supreme was the general pattern in the "rise and fall" of community development programs around the world.

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

## 5. Some Implications for Integrated Rural Development

There appear to be several, at least preliminary, insights and lessons that can be drawn from the experience of the "rise and fall" of the community development movement with implications for the current integrated rural development thrust. While not universal or in any sense absolute, they may provide useful guidance in the formulation and implementation of current integrated rural development strategies, policies, programs and projects.

A) It is improbable that new national ministries or agencies of government can be established which will be able to effectively implement rural development programs. The experience of numerous national community development efforts would suggest that the problem of coordination among various government agencies responsible for providing services to rural people can not be resolved by a single new ministry or agency, even with the strong support of the Chief of State. Difficulties arise from rivalries between the traditional technical ministries, i.e., agriculture, health and education, especially their extension departments and the rural development agency. To be effective, integrated rural development, like community development, inevitably affects and makes demands on the technical ministries. Thus a loss of independence and status is perceived that militates against cooperation. National "community" development organizations in developing countries were unable to provide the mechanism for coordinating rural development efforts as expected and there is no evidence that a national "rural" development organization could do any better today. Perhaps one of the most successful mechanisms

for local level coordination during the community development era occurred where all local technical extension personnel and community development workers received administrative supervision from the district government administrator rather than representatives of their technical ministries and national community development agency.

Furthermore, the establishment of new ministries or agencies tends to result in large bureaucracies with a "top down" orientation in terms of decision-making and resource allocation. Personnel at all levels perceive their proper relationship with their more junior colleagues as one of transmitting orders and instructions. This leads to inadequate upward communication from those who work closest to the people, and results in the senior administrators and trainers becoming out of touch with the real problems and difficulties of field personnel and local level program implementation.

B) Political leaders and administrators of rural development programs must exercise restraint in rapidly expanding successful pilot programs. In many nations, including India, the community development program was expanded very rapidly as the result of efforts by politicians to spread the program into their constituencies as soon as possible. The rapid recruitment of large numbers of personnel lowered their quality and the quality of their training. Village level workers were assigned too many responsibilities in too many villages and the damage which resulted was often worse than if no work had been attempted.

Pilot programs are usually successful because adequate resources are provided for material and human inputs required to make the program

successful. Often plans for the expansion of these programs do not take into account the additional resources and time required to replicate the more carefully nurtured initial pilot schemes.

C) Rural development projects must commence with an income producing component, usually one which entails increasing agricultural output through the introduction of a profitable "package" of technology. With an income producing "center piece," then sequentially other components such as health, sanitation and education, can follow.

Where the scarcity of food is a problem, this approach is especially critical. Many observers were properly critical of the Indian program for initially investing in community buildings, schools, clinics and social welfare activities which only increased consumption and population growth, rather, than stressing agricultural production from the onset of the community development program.<sup>15</sup> In those instances in a variety of countries where the "felt needs" of villagers precipitated the community development program fostering an agricultural or other income producing component, over time that community often became renowned as an example of a successful community development effort. Where there was failure in an agricultural production scheme, the problems were usually the technology employed and/or the share cropping arrangements.

D) The implementation of rural development programs, particularly those directed at also reaching the less privileged, is much more difficult than the planning stage. Insuring participation by all segments

---

<sup>15</sup>See Part II for further discussion of this point, particularly Dumont and Nair.

of rural society, including the landless and near landless in an effort to alleviate poverty was an objective rarely accomplished in any of the community development programs. In most instances village community development workers tended to identify with the traditional village elite to whom most of the program benefits accrued. Unfortunately very little has been written that analyzed the impact of the political and social milieu on villager's participation in specific micro-level community development projects.

E) Encouraging development of participatory, democratic local institutions as an objective of rural development programs is a most difficult and elusive goal. While most community development programs espoused development of participatory democracy, self-reliance and local initiative, in practice there was often a large amount of paternalism and direction of local level programs by the village community development worker. The reason usually given for the lack of participation by villagers was the inherent fatalism of rural people and their general apathy towards improving their own levels of living. Initial stimulation and guidance by the village worker was seen as required and this usually evolved into direction of village programs.

F) Lastly, those involved in current rural development endeavors in a particular country should study the earlier community development experience in that country prior to the design and implementation of new rural development initiatives. There are undoubtedly numerous country-specific lessons from that earlier movement that, if ignored, will be repeated with the recent re-emergence of emphasis on rural development.

Further research and analysis of the community development literature might be particularly useful in providing lessons and insights

with regard to some of the key problem areas that plague current rural development endeavors, including the coordination of rural programs at all levels of government, the education of rural people and arousing widespread participation of rural people in building local institutions that serve rural people. These potential research areas provide excellent opportunities for those trained in public administration, extension education, political science, economics, and sociology. Lessons and insights can be drawn from the community development experience, as well as from other approaches of the past two decades considered to be more successful, e.g., China, Taiwan and South Korea.

Another area deserving further research by those involved in analyzing past rural and community development efforts is the relationship between rural or community development programs and the macro-economic environment. It would appear that many of the so-called failures in community development programs around the world were inevitable, given the then existing national development policy environment.



PART II  
SELECTED LITERATURE REVIEW

## 1. Principles

Principles of Community Development, Social Progress Through Local Action,  
Report by the Secretary General, United Nations, Economic and Social Council,  
January 1955.

This publication was very influential in the era of initiating new national community development programs around the world. It deals with the policy of promoting healthy and balanced growth through local action in the rural areas of developing countries. Community development is tentatively defined as "a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance upon the community's initiative". Used in a generic sense, community development is said to include: a) physical improvements such as roads, housing, irrigation, drainage and better farming practices, b) functional activities such as health, education and recreation, and c) community action involving group discussion, community analyses of local needs, setting up committees, seeking needed technical assistance, and the selection and training of personnel. Community development, it is said, "implies the integration of two sets of forces making for human welfare, neither of which can do the job alone, a) the opportunity and capacity for cooperation, self-help, ability to assimilate and adapt new ways of living that is at least latent in every group, and b) the fund of techniques and tools in every social and economic field, drawn from worldwide experience and now in use or available to national governments and offices".

The report stresses the existence of community resources, e.g., labor, building materials, land, savings and local leadership that combined with government resources, encouragement, guidance and technical direction will result in local progress, thus contributing to national development. In spite of

a variety of approaches and different program content between countries, the report points out a growing convergence upon goals of higher productivity of primary products and utility goods by improved methods and effective social organization to bring the surplus labor of men and women to bear on their own social improvement. It emphasizes that village problems cannot be successfully attacked in isolation as a village is a highly integrated unit and a sound approach involves all of the community's various aspects, i.e., the physical, social and economic aspects of development must be taken into consideration simultaneously. Thus there must be improved coordination of government administrative machinery at all levels and new channels of communication between the rural community and specialized services of the government and voluntary agencies.

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

- 1) Activities correspond to basic needs of the community and initial projects should respond to the expressed needs of the people.
- 2) Multi-purpose village programs.
- 3) Increasing village participation in community affairs and strengthening existing forms of local governments.
- 4) Training local leadership.
- 5) Greater reliance on women and youth in development.
- 6) Changed attitudes are more important than material achievement.

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

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

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

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

In discussing the relationship of agencies and communities, the need for understanding villager's values, customs and beliefs is emphasized as important for any success, as is the need to work with whole groups and communities (rather than individuals) since group opinion influences the attitude and conduct of individual members.

Such topics as principles of agency operations, directing change, aiding community projects, projects in disorganized communities, (where friction exists between factions), building communities (where none existed), the school and the community, making people literate, introducing new ideas, working with groups,

selecting and training village workers are all dealt with in a straight forward and readable manner.

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

- a) Stimulating people to decide what it is they want and then helping them get it through collective effort.
- b) Introducing people to new kinds of satisfactions and ways of realizing them, and by equipping people to make wise choices between alternative satisfactions.
- c) Maintaining existing groups or developing new ones to ensure that each individual has opportunities of developing his personality and achieving status and significance in his relationships with other people.

Some Social Requirements for Effective community Development, Melvin M. Tumin, Background Paper - Conference on Community Development and National Change, MIT, 1957, Article in Community Development Review, No. 11, December 1958.

This paper was widely disseminated as an article in several community development publications and was much discussed by scholars and practitioners in the late 1950's. The author identified from the large body of reported experiences persisting themes and pervasive problem areas, and developed fifteen elements that he considered to be the sum total of the community development

process. Believing that the "science" of community development was too immature to allow systematic formulation of propositions, the fifteen elements could be used to predict trends and likelihoods in community development efforts.

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

The author, recognizing that these conflicts arise from competing premises regarding the nature of man, society and social change, then attempted to derive from the experience of both schools of thought which assumptions best stood the test of time. While no simplistic conclusions are reached, the success of local community development projects is considered to be proportional to the extent by which the material well being of the society is improving and the extent to which those improvements set in motion additional improvements.

Finally the author makes the plea that each proposal for community development be considered on its own merits, without the benefit of any "halo effect" from the terms in which it is phrased. Thus one must be extremely cautious in

predictions of probable outcomes especially before careful evaluation of the merits of a proposal.

Varieties of Extension Education and Community Development, A. T. Mosher, Comparative Extension Publication Number 2, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, 1958.

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

Professor Mosher makes the point that all varieties of extension education and community development are directed at furthering rural development and that rural development requirements are many and diverse. Thus, no one process is a panacea and each can make a substantial and important contribution. However, there are many difficulties in deciding which of the processes can be successfully combined with each other or with other governmental activities essential to rural development. He points out that no aspect of rural development is independent of many others in the developing world where the interplay between agricultural techniques, forms of social organization, personal ethics and philosophy and religion is obvious.

Historical comparisons between the socio-economic structure of the developing nations and the United States are discussed in the context of rural development decision making and organization. In the choice of processes, two

considerations are flagged, i.e., a) employ processes that correspond to the present distribution of decision making and will prepare the way for redistribution of decision making, and b) new types of organization that are appropriate for a more dynamic society. In general there is the necessity for designing distinctive programs to meet each set of actual conditions and the overall pattern of programs needs to be comprehensive. Account should be taken of the need for more specialized programs in more progressive regions.

In comparing national and pilot programs, the advantage of size and disadvantages of standardization in not taking into account regional differences as well as over-centralization is discussed. The most important task of any rural development effort is identified as helping rural people develop confidence. And to do this requires that extension agents and community development workers have a great concern for rural people as people.

Differences Between Extension Education and Community Development, Joseph Di Franco, Comparative Extension Publication Number 5, New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, 1958.

By 1958, two distinct and widespread approaches to rural development had emerged, namely community development and extension education. Proponents of each approach were critical of the other and the purpose of this publication was to analyze and compare extension education and community development. It discussed the similarities and dissimilarities of both approaches with regard to objectives, process, organization and principles and then drew some conclusions. Supporters of each approach welcomed this paper as an objective attempt to overcome the growing conflict between extension education and community development.



The publication concluded that there were more similarities than dissimilarities and that differences arose from different philosophies, objectives and organization that were often only a matter of emphasis, e.g., extension education placed more emphasis on the individual action than did community development which focused more group action, and extension education concentrated more on agricultural production while community development was more concerned with all aspects of human welfare.

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

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

The author of this paper served as a short-term consultant to several national community development programs, including Korea, where this paper was presented just prior to the launching of the Korea national program. The paper was widely quoted in Korea and provides us with the rationale being used by community development advocates for the launching of new national programs in the "cold war" era.

It refers to the India and Philippine programs as having strong support by those nations' political leaders who felt a challenge to their leadership in the villages as coming from supporters of totalitarian programs of development. It points out that community development chooses democratic methods of stimulating change in preference to totalitarian methods and that popular vigor, initiative and participation are not only the strength of democracy; they are the antidote for authoritarianism as well as instruments of progress.

In discussing the relationship of community development to technical programs in agriculture, health and education, the point is made that community development will accelerate the pace and amplify development by providing more manpower and employing unused village resources. Thus the effectiveness of all rural programs will be enhanced by community development which had been successfully tested in other countries with similar problems.

The paper reviews briefly the concept of community development and its application to Korea, drawing on experience from India, Pakistan, Indonesia and the Philippines, as well as quoting United Nations and U.S. foreign aid agency reports. Finally it suggested that although community development was starting later in Korea than in other Asian countries, Korea could become "a leader and show-place before the world of what rural community development can do materially, politically and culturally".

## 2. Training

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

This publication was used by national program staffs in preparing training programs for new village level workers for community development programs in many countries around the world that launched programs after 1956. Its first section deals with an analysis of the common aims of community development workers, namely winning the confidence of the people, promoting community spirit, aiding cooperative action, developing individual's powers of constructive action, helping the community make use of its resources, interpreting changing needs of the community and helping the community to effect practical improvements. The second section deals with the content and method of training and selection of personnel to be trained. It stresses, for example, in recruiting workers such points as flexible scholastic standards, personal qualities and ways of testing them and geographic considerations. In content and methods of training, such points as use of "core content", needs of particular workers and principles or approach to community development work are flagged. Also a section deals with adapting "core content" to trainee ability and function is discussed. "Core content" consists, in general, of goals of the community development program, techniques such as surveying, recording, evaluation and development methods and skills (how to work with villagers).

The remainder of this publication consists of training material from several national community development training programs under way in 1956. In perusing these materials the reader can better understand the role of and expectations for the local level worker in community development programs.

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

This book was published in 1962 when the community development movement had begun to decline, yet it was influential with community development planners and administrators in modifying the type of training provided for community development in several countries. The author discusses the then current training programs, recommends changes and describes techniques and methods that evolved over the years from the community development training course at the University of London Institute of Education.

The book is significant in that it gives the reader an understanding of the form and content of the community development approach to working with village people as well as training methods and techniques used in community development programs. The emphasis is on being able to stimulate, educate, inform, communicate, and convince groups of people -- a mixture of informal adult education, rural sociology, human psychology and cultural anthropology.

### 3. Country Studies

Community Development in Ghana, Peter DuSautoy, Oxford University Press, 1958.

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

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

The author concludes that some ingredients for successful community development include:

- a) A community development organization is essential -- one that doesn't forget the people it is intended to benefit,
- b) An enthusiasm and sense of mission on the part of all community development personnel is required,

- c) The concept of self-help and incentives from the central government are important,
- d) The community development organization and other government agencies must coordinate their work,
- e) A force of nationalism outside politics is needed, and
- f) While money is not essential to community development, if available its allocation should reflect local opinion.

Focus on the Barrio: The Story Behind the Birth of the Philippine Community Program under President Ramon Magsaysay, Jose V. Abueva, University of the Philippines, Institute of Public Administration, 1959.

This excellent book provides an understanding of the background and reasons for the community development movement in the Philippines. It is a study of the conditions and processes that formulated the Philippines major community development movement.

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

- a) Diffusion of democratic values in a changing society
- b) Agrarian and political unrest
- c) Socio-economic studies
- d) Experiments in changing rural villages
- e) External ideas of rural reconstruction and community development and
- f) The campaign and victory of Magsaysay.

The point is well made that President Magsaysay saw community development as being in the public interest in terms of improving the welfare of barrio

people and that his leadership made the national program possible. In fact, he dominated the Congress in making policy for the community development program until his untimely death.

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

This book provides a very comprehensive treatment of the community development movement in India from 1952 until 1960 and in the second edition until 1966. It provides in considerable detail the concept, major features, administration, progress and targets of the community development program in part one. Part two deals with all welfare and development components of the program including agriculture, cooperative development, village industries, communications, education, health and sanitation, training, housing and social welfare. Part three discusses the programs in the tribal and Gramdan areas and urban community development, while part four deals with evaluations and appraisals of the community development program. Part four makes reference to the findings of major evaluations, e.g., the wide disparity in the distribution of benefits between accessible and remote villages, within villages between cultivating and other groups of villagers, and among cultivators between those wealthier farmers and those with less. Also the lack of progress in changing villagers attitudes as reflec-

ted in villagers participation in community activities and organization, the unwillingness of the community development worker to divest himself of power, and the top-down administration of the program are other findings reported. The Seventh Report of the Program Evaluation Organization indicated that the whole general level of achievement of the community development program was still low and far from adequate.

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

Community Development - A Chronicle 1954 - 1961, S.K. Dey, Government of India, Ministry of Community Development Panchayati Raj and Cooperation, 1962.

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

By 1957, the Minister recognized that the development of village level initiative and action were lacking in the program and that there was a failure



in the Ministry of community development to recognize excellence in the technical areas of agriculture, education and health. In 1960, he admits that priority should have been given to food production and the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) at the initiation of the community development program eight years earlier.

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

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

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

The book defines community development in general, discusses the India program--its approach, activities, administration and role in local self-government and cooperative development. In discussing evaluations of the program, there is a tendency for the author to be defensive, e.g., he suggests that the community development program should not be blamed for not solving the food problem as the community development program was not set up to solve that problem, and that critical evaluations weakened faith in the community development movement.

The Pilot Development Project, Etawah, D.P. Singh, Paper produced for Expert Consultation on Integrated Rural Development, FAO, Rome, 1976.

This paper describes the Etawah project, which was one of the successful early post-Independence Indian village level development efforts, that served as a proto-type for the massive national community development program. Begun under the sponsorship of the Uttar Pradesh provincial government in 1948 with 64 villages, it expanded in three years to include over 300 villages.

The distinguishing features of the project are described as:

- a) Attempting a synthesis of the various view-points into a more comprehensive and more coherent picture of rural development based on the combined efforts of the people, government, voluntary workers and others concerned,
- b) In adopting a trial and experiment approach to find out "what would work and what wouldn't and why", and
- c) In actually testing out, on a small scale in a small area, the numerous ideas, programs, organizational and administrative patterns, and techniques of development with a view to selecting for replication in other areas those that proved to <sup>be</sup> sound and suitable.

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

The major objectives of the project were considered to be:

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

scale industry",

- b) "To ascertain how quickly those results may be obtainable, consistent with their becoming permanently part of the people's mental, spiritual and technical equipment and outlook after the special pressure is lifted."
- c) "To see whether these results, if attainable, could be had at a cost in material and personnel which would be within the reach of the State (Province) by the existing departments and agencies".

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

The program of work consisted of increasing agricultural production, cooperative development, rural industries, rural works, adult and formal education, health and sanitation, maternal and child welfare and a variety of other lesser community activities.

#### 4. Evaluation

Community Development and National Change, Summary of Conference, Endicott House, December 13-15, 1957, Irwin T. Sanders, Office of Public Services, International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C., 1958.

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

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

- A. How can community development programs be made to work when success depends upon an elite, usually Westernized and out of touch with peasant communities, who control the government and all other major institutions of the society,
- B. How can the dilemma of requiring a great deal of authority, power, and political administration at the center of national community development programs while at the same time releasing a substantial

amount of it in decentralized fashion away from the center to small communities be reconciled,

- C. How effective is community development as an approach to economic development,
- D. By what authority do outsiders initiate rural change, to what degree can they predict the results of their efforts and what are some of the social mechanisms of change, and
- E. In what ways can the practice of community development be made more effective.

There was a divergence of opinion among conference participants with regard to the effectiveness of community development programs as indicated by the following statements of the more negative and positive positions expressed:

The skeptics:

- A. If your goals are economic ones as measured in terms of gross national product or some other index of economic achievement, community development represents an inefficient method of trying to reach these goals.
- B. If you do not work out some way of preventing population increase the relatively slow economic gains which accrue will be absorbed by the increase and not result in a higher level of living.
- C. Since social changes are so unpredictable any effort to promote change is fraught with danger for all concerned.
- D. Since community development programs call for leaders who are achievement-oriented, they cannot succeed unless such leaders are present and can evoke a following. But most underdeveloped countries lack achievement-oriented people and so there is little hope that community development programs can work well in such places.

- E. In many, if not most situations, it is better to work through old-time agencies (agriculture, health, education, welfare) than to try to channel village improvement through a community development program.
- F. In some countries a community development program raises the popular level of aspirations and sense of participation, which is politically disturbing to "the powers that be" and therefore endangers regimes supposedly "friendly."

The endorsers;

- A. If one is interested in what happens to people--materially, psychologically, socially--then community development is a fruitful way of betterment.
- B. It is sound on economic grounds, even viewed from the standpoint of the whole economy, since it makes use of an underutilized labor supply with a minimum use of capital investment.
- C. It leads to political stability in that it is a means of preparing peasants for effective and enlightened participation in the national state.
- D. It is an economical use of scarce government specialists in health, welfare, agriculture and education since the community development worker can extend their usefulness many-fold.
- E. The villages of the world are bound to experience cataclysmic change in any event and community development represents one of the best ways by which local people and national leaders can help guide this change.
- F. Through the proper use of what the social scientists already know much can be predicted as to community development outcomes. Programs could be more sure-fire than they now are.

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

Community Development and National Development, Report by an Ad Hoc Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations for the Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, 1963.

The United Nations report is the result of an ad hoc group's work for the United Nations Secretary General, "on certain rural issues that arise currently in community development programs, including the relation of community development programs to national development programs including land reform, ways of increasing the economic and social impact of such programs, and effective organizational and administrative arrangements to carry out such programs in countries of differing economic and administrative systems".

This report was used by community development proponents in countries where national programs were declining in 1963, to try to gain additional support from national leaders and planners. The report does not make reference to the decline of community development programs <sup>by this time</sup> in a number of countries and calls for the United Nations to "significantly expand the means at its disposal to encourage the improvement and extension of community development programs". The report states that community development can be adapted not only to prevailing circumstances of individual countries, but also to various stages of development of each country. Furthermore, it calls for specific provision for the inclusion of community development processes in national planning at the risk of otherwise failing to enlist the understanding of and support of people needed to reach national purposes at crucial points.

Reference is made to "one of the persistent difficulties, which reduces the contribution of community development at both the international and national levels, of infusing a sense of common purpose in specialized agencies and departments which rely on community initiative to create conditions favorable to economic and social progress". Thus the report calls for departments of government in developing

countries and cooperating international agencies to thoroughly understand the philosophy and practice of community development and the broad purposes to which their skills and interests relate. The above discussion reflects the growing animosities between national community development agencies on the one hand and the technical ministries (primarily agriculture, health and education) in a number of countries on the other.

The report also emphasizes: a) the need for farmer cooperatives and agrarian reform as often essential preconditions for community development, b) the role community development can play in strengthening or creating conditions for the establishment of local self-government and voluntary local organization, c) the need to give more attention to the family unit and women as key sub-groups in the community, and d) recommends greater attention to urban community development pilot programs.

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

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

The author is critical of the U.S. foreign aid agency for not emphasizing community development more as an approach to development. He attributed this to the threat that community development posed to the professional and bureaucratic interests of U.S. foreign aid officials, particularly those



identified with agricultural extension programs. This lack of understanding was attributed to the importance of technology and specialization in American life-- which is inappropriate to development of villages in the developing world.

Furthermore, the author believed that no amount of technical assistance or economic aid rendered in accordance with the lines of specialization found in America would be sufficient to deal with the basic difficulties of the developing world.

The community development movement was seen as a means to develop local democratic institutions and a way of bringing the central government and rural people together. The end purpose of community development was considered, not physical and economic improvement, but rather to build and strengthen the processes of a free, self-determining society in order to provide man with an environment which in itself creates initiative for the responsible solution to problems.

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

This controversial report by a former senior U.S. foreign aid official had major impact on the thinking of U.S. foreign aid officials with regard to the role of community development in national development.

It documents an attempt by the author to review the community development process and programs in nine countries to see what had happened over a ten year period and make some broad judgements as to why things happened as they did.

It recommends that community development programs:

- A. Not be launched on the basis of "since community development is good every country must have it," but rather only after all government agencies understand it and their role vis-a-vis community development, and agree to its existence.
- B. That the application of the "process" of community development rather than the "doctrine" of community development should be of prime concern and the actual partnership of other agencies should be institutionally incorporated into the total program, rather than the agricultural extension, public health, fundamental education, etc. services being used in community development programs.
- C. Therefore it suggests the need to submerge the identification of community development, agricultural extension, public health, etc., under a task force concept with another appropriate name such as rural development. The leadership of programs would then depend upon the priority problem being addressed, but the process of community development should be employed by all agencies and their field agents.
- D. No community development program should be undertaken without first a pilot effort.
- E. More training should take place in community development concepts and the process in the developing world for all technicians, including Americans.

The report discusses briefly the origins of community development concepts and the process, provides an overview of the community development as a process to be employed by all agencies involved in helping rural or urban people, rather than a doctrine requiring a new national agency and its own program.

Report of the Inter-Regional Conference on Community Development and its Role in Nation Building, Seoul, Korea: May 1961. Published by the International Cooperation Administration, July 1961.

This is the report of the conference on community development sponsored by the Republic of Korea and the U.S. foreign aid agency which was attended by representatives from fourteen countries. It is significant as the last of a series of six international community development conferences sponsored by the U.S. that contributed to the spread of community development programs around the world.

By 1961 national leaders in India and several other countries were disillusioned with community development as an approach to development, and there is some reference to this in the paper presented by Douglas Ensminger, head of the Ford Foundation program in India. In discussing the role of national leaders in the process of village growth and development, he points out that in 1959 India's top administrators, political leaders, and Westerners who looked at the process of change in India began to express great dissatisfaction at India's achievements in community development and some said the community development program had failed. What these people lacked was an understanding of the process and time required in change. While community development can be expected to give many immediate gains, such as improvement in agriculture and health practices, time is required to develop village people into self-reliant, educated and responsive citizens.

The report also includes insightful papers on the Philippines, Nigeria, Thailand and Korea programs, as well as papers from work group meetings on training, research and evaluation, grant aid for villages and evaluation of community development success and failures.

In the discussion of successes and failures, the evidences of success are

given as: a) community development has been adopted by a number of countries to combat rural poverty and the threat of communism and b) there are more community development conferences, publications, films and increasing numbers of colleges provide community development studies.

Resistance to community development is categorized as:

- a) Resistance of village people to change,
- b) Resistance of bureaucrats to change,
- c) Resistance of leaders and organized power groups (vested interests) to change,
- d) Controversy between the advocates of the "education approach" and those who want "quick results", and
- e) Controversy between those who emphasize "things" and those who stress "attitudes" and "values".

Senator John Sparkman of the United States addressed the conference as an ardent advocate of community development and stated "the genius of community development is clear: it is the most effective way of harnessing the motivation and aspirations of the millions of ordinary people to the gigantic effort of national development. The potentially explosive rising tide of expectations becomes transformed into what President Kennedy has call the people revolution of hope".

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

This book by four prominent foreign authorities on India's development ef-

forts since Independence is a fascinating study of that nation's progress and problems. Chapter 9, "The Community Development Extension Program" by Douglas Ensminger is of particular usefulness to those interested in India's community development program. This chapter discusses the early origins of community development in India, prominent personalities involved, the rationale of community development (e.g., why British or American extension approaches would be inadequate), and the progress and problems in the community development program as it developed. Some of the weaknesses in the program are identified as the lack of trained and experienced personnel employed during the period of rapid program expansion, the lack of community development and extension technical know-how, false theories and an inadequate understanding of how to motivate individuals and local groups, too much "top-down" direction, and the failure to use community development methods in agricultural extension where it is necessary to reach large numbers of cultivators to disseminate improved agricultural practices.

Lands Alive (Terres Vivantes), Rene Dumont, London: The Merlin Press 1965.

Based upon observations of rural programs in numerous countries around the world, the author, a widely read agronomist and critic of those who do not understand the need for more food, questions whether agricultural progress will be adequate to maintain parity with population growth in the world.

In three thought-provoking and revealing chapters devoted to a discussion of India, the author, as an early critic of the community development program there, maintains that the program priority of the community development leadership of "changing villagers attitudes towards progress as being more important

than material results," was wrong. Rather from the onset of the program it should have stressed agricultural production, not investments in community buildings, schools, clinics, and social welfare activities which only increased consumption and population, further decreasing per capita production.

The author considers <sup>another</sup> / major weakness of the community development approach was that the many tasks assigned village community development workers in numerous subject matter areas comprised an impossible assignment for one relatively untrained generalist.

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

This book perceptively reports the diversity of attitudes and aspirations of India's village people towards life and work in the late 1950's. Those interviews with villagers in community development program areas provide some insights with regard to the effectiveness of the community development approach in India to rural development and in broader terms the effectiveness of policies and programs of the government to involve rural people in a remaking of social and economic relations in that nation.

Some of the author's observations were that in community development, as well as other districts, the disparities of wealth between the rich and poor were increasing, that the community development program was benefiting primarily the wealthier villages, that the villagers' community improvement projects were often identified by the community development agency's officers rather than the villagers and were not being maintained by the villagers, that most community development projects did not increase the villagers income and that the

success of the village councils (panchayats) was a function of the attitudes and leadership abilities of the council members. The best farmers were identified as those who were traditionally agriculturalist by caste, not necessarily those most favorably endowed with better land and other material resources. The need for policies and programs that are region-specific is suggested, as the better alternative to those centrally framed for universal and uniform application throughout the nation.

The author questions the usual assumption that the desire for higher levels of living is more or less universal and suggests that this is the reason why new techniques and innovations are not readily adopted by village people. Thus there is the need in economic planning to take into account sociology and the level of desire for change. In order for self-sustaining development, there must be change in the value systems and social structures of the rural communities and the government's basic problem is how to induce this change in a democratic framework.

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

While not focused on the community development movement, per se, this well known study of village life in North India provides the reader with an understanding of the technological, economic and social change from 1930, when the original study was completed, and thirty years later when the villagers were being provided some government services, including community development. The authors were generally impressed by the progress of rural development sponsored by the government throughout India and attribute much of the credit for initiating the

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

Administration and Economic Development in India, Eds., R. Braibanti & J. Spengler, Durham Duke University Press and Cambridge University Press, 1963.

In this very excellent book by several distinguished authorities on India, Chapter 3, entitled "The Village in the Framework of Development" by Hugh Tinker, and Chapter 4, entitled "Administrative Coordination and Economic Development in the Districts of India" by Richard L. Park, provide a number of insights with regard to the community development programs in India. Tinker indicates that the program was not really accepted by the people nor did it teach the poor, but rather was characterized as a bureaucratic empire. Still the author did not consider it a lost cause and he held hope for the Panchayati Raj (local self-government), calling it a major step forward. Park traced the origins of the community development program, discussed the conflict between the traditional and the development administration, and central versus decentralized administration. He considers the major dilemma of community development to have been



whether agricultural production should receive the highest priority, and faults the program for lack of the villagers' involvement, as well as for over time losing touch with the people the program was designed to benefit.

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

This report, which called for an all-out emergency food production program, greatly influenced the policies and programs of the Government of India with regard to community development. It urged that the community development and technical ministries give top priority to food production by increasing the number of technical agricultural personnel assigned to blocks and villages and that community development village level workers focus first on technical agricultural tasks. It pointed out that agricultural research and extension must be adapted to local conditions and faulted the community development program for not involving villagers in planning. The community development program is described as trying to be all things to all people and not giving adequate attention to food production. It was critical of the Block Development Officers for not understanding agriculture and using village level workers as errand boys.

After this report was published, the focus of the government's rural programs clearly shifted to food production. Among India's leaders, disillusionment with the community development program had commenced and the program declined thereafter.

Community Development and Panchayati Raj, Nehru, Jawaharlal, Government of India, Ministry of Community Development, Cooperation and Panchayati Raj, 1963.

This compilation of speeches by Prime Minister Nehru covering the period from initiation of the community development program in 1952 until 1963 when the program emphasis had shifted to the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) and cooperative development is of value in that it reveals Nehru's hopes and concerns with regard to rural development in India as they evolved during that decade.

During the first three years, Nehru emphasized that the community development program was the nation's most important undertaking, basic to India's development and successful in all respects. Then from 1956 to 1958 he refers increasingly to the need to emphasize agricultural production, in 1958 stating that the success of the community development program will be measured in food production. By 1958 it is clear that Nehru has some other reservations about the success of the community development program. He urges community development personnel to shed their "official" character and to gain the confidence of the rural people and states that community development has regretfully only partially succeeded in mobilizing villages. By 1960 the focus is on strengthening local government administration through the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) and local economic development through local cooperatives. He chides the community development program for being too centralized and village level workers for considering themselves the "big boss", but expects that community development's loss of appeal will be overcome by the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) which would change society. From 1961 to 1963, his interest is on the Panchayati Raj (local self-government) which is of "revolutionary importance" as it gives power and authority to the villagers. At this

time he sees community development as being the first step and Panchayati Raj (local self-government) and cooperatives as the second step which would bring political and economic development to India.

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

This recent paper is significant in that the author, who was prominent in the international community development movement and head of the Ford Foundation program in India for nineteen years, shares his views regarding the close relationship of the earlier community development movement with the current rural development emphasis, as well as his perception of the rise and decline of the community development program in India.

Dr. Ensminger sees rural development as a reincarnation of community development in that both have multiple interest objectives directed at improving the conditions of the rural poor. He identifies two major differences between rural development now and in the 1950's. The first is that 25 years of experience with the economic development approach of relying on the trickle-down theory has resulted in the plight of the poor worsening as they have not been involved as participants in development. The second is that in the 1950's political leaders and planners used as their development model that of the West with industrialization and modernized capital intensive agriculture receiving major emphasis.

The author believes that the key question is, "development for what purpose?", and that political leaders must be clear about what kind of society

that they want to emerge out of and from development. When this question is posed and answered, then integrated rural development emerges as one of the more promising alternatives for adoption and the formulation of policies and development strategies for the future. If the objective is to contribute to removal of the conditions which create poverty, then agriculture, poverty, rural-urban emigration and family planning should be dealt with through an integrated rural development program.

He states that experience of the 1950's indicates that the objectives sought in family planning and agriculture are more likely to be achieved through integrated rural development with priority emphasis among rural development program activities placed on improving the economic base, which in most instances means improving agricultural production.

In reviewing the experience in India, he points out that while Prime Minister Nehru and other political leaders saw in community development a way to improve the living conditions of the poverty-ridden, neglected village people, India's planners saw it as the method of getting village cultivators to increase their agricultural production. Neither understood the complexity and therefore time required to transform village India's economy and culture. Thus there was disillusionment when food self-sufficiency was not reached, even though India then lacked new agricultural technology and government policies didn't provide incentives for farmers to increase production. It was then that the community development program became the "scapegoat" supposedly responsible for failure to achieve food self-sufficiency. The author opines that it just may be that with its past community development experience, India possibly is now ready for integrated rural development.

Reflecting on past experiences with many development strategies, Dr.

Ensminger concludes that in all too many cases the quest is for a single panacea approach to solve a single problem, while few countries are clear about the kind of society they want from their development projects and programs. Tanzania and China are possible exceptions, both having spelled out that they want all people to benefit equally from development.

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

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

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

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

In discussing the role of the village worker and the conflict between being a servant of the people and a functionary responding to the demands of the technical ministries, including loan collection, and sales agent, the natural tendency of the village worker to emphasize the latter is noted as a basic problem of the earlier program.

Dr. Ensminger sees the need of the 1970's to be in educating village people to effectively utilize the schools, roads, wells, health centers that now exist and to make education relevant to village life, rather than preparatory for higher formal education. With the current infrastructure, technology and price incentives, he predicts that by the end of this decade Indians can look forward to food self-sufficiency and recommends that community development accept greater responsibility for strengthening the village's economic base.

In discussing the disadvantaged, poorer villagers, he points out that their levels of living have not significantly improved since independence. To change this they must have access to economic opportunities to earn a decent living and opportunities for education. And the record reveals that very little has been done through national policies and legislation to provide access to economic opportunities and opportunities for education. Thus there is need for land reform and favorable terms of trade for farmers, as well as increased rural works programs.

In looking ahead, Dr. Ensminger recommends national policies that support an integrated, area-based, rural development program, with top priority for agriculture and family planning. Panchayats, cooperatives and schools are seen as the key local people's institutions.

PART III  
BIBLIOGRAPHIES

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abueva, Jose V. 1959. Focus on the Barrio; the Story Behind the Birth of the Philippine Community Development Program under President Ramon Magsaysay. University of the Philippines, Institute of Public Administration.
- Agarwal, S. N. 1944. The Gandhian Plan of Economic Development for India. Bombay.
- Alderfer, H. Freed. 1964. Local Government in Developing Countries. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Almond, Gabriel and James Coleman. 1960. The Politics of the Developing Areas. Princeton University Press.
- Anderson, D. David. 1960. The National Community Development Program of Jordan -- Its Aims and Accomplishments. USOM/Jordan. November.
- Andrews, Stanley. 1961. A Comment and Review of Community Development Projects - in Selected Countries of Africa, the Middle East and Asia. International Cooperation Administration, Washington, D.C. August.
- Anstey, Vera. 1952. The Economic Development of India. Longmans, Green and Company.
- Appleby, Paul H. 1956. Re-Examination of India's Administrative System. Government of India Publication.
- Batten, Thomas R. 1957. Communities and Their Development. London: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. "The Trouble Spots." From Kurukshetra, Vol. 9, No. 1. October.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. Training for Community Development: A Critical Study of Method. London: Oxford University Press.
- Bell, Daniel W., et al. 1950. Report to the President of the United States Economic Survey Mission to the Philippines. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Bhattacharyya, S. N. 1970. Community Development: Analysis of the Programme in India. Calcutta: Academic Publishers.



- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. Community Development in Developing Countries. Calcutta: Academic Publishers.
- Binamira, Ramon P. 1957. The Philippine Community Development Program. Office of the Presidential Assistant on Community Development, Manila.
- Braibanti, R. and J. Spengler, Editors. 1963. Administration and Economic Development in India. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Brayne, F. L. 1929. Socrates in an Indian Village. Oxford University Press.
- Brown, Lucy W. 1961. "Community Development and the Progress of Near East and South Asian Countries." International Cooperation Administration. June.
- Chai, Alice Yun. 1968. Community Development in Korea. East-West Center.
- Cohen, Ronald. 1961. "The Success that Failed; An Experiment in Culture Change in Africa." Anthropologica.
- Cool, John C. 1962. The Panchayat System and Self-Help Development. Community Development Advisor, AID Mission Kathmandu, Nepal. March.
- Council for Social Development. 1970. Action for Rural Change: Readings in Indian Community Development. Munshiram Manokarlal, New Delhi.
- Community Development Foundation. 1968. Messages on Community Development from Heads of State to International Society for Community Development. Supplement. New York, N.Y.
- Danda, Ajit Kumar. 1966. Planned Development and Leadership in an Indian Village. Thesis, Cornell University.
- Dayal, Rajeshwar. 1960. Community Development Program in India. Allahabad: Kitals Mahal.
- Dey, Sushil K. 1960. Spare-Time Production for Gain: Proposal for a new programme for rural communities. Food and Agriculture Organization of the U.N.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. Community Development - A Chronicle 1954-1961. Government of India, Ministry of Community Development, Panchayati Raj and Cooperation.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. Community Development. Calcutta: Asia Publishing House.

- DiFranco, Joseph. 1958. Differences Between Extension Education and Community Development. Comparative Extension Pub. No. 5. Cornell University. October.
- Dube, S. C. 1958. India's Changing Villages -- Human Factors in Community Development. Cornell University Press.
- Dumont, Rene. 1965. Lands Alive (Terres Vivantes). London: The Merlin Press.
- du Sautoy, Peter. 1958. Community Development in Ghana. London: Oxford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. "A Guide for the Administrator to the Principles of Community Development," Journal of Local Administration Overseas. Volume 2, No. 4. October.
- Dutta, R. C. 1950. Economic History of India. London University.
- Ensminger, Douglas. 1972. Rural India in Transition. All India Panchayat Parishad, 23-A, Kailash Colony, New Delhi. March.
- Espiritu, Socorro C. and Chester L. Hunt. 1964. Social Foundations of Community Development: Readings on the Philippines. Manila: R. M. Garcia Publishing House.
- Fairholm, G. W. 1964. "Local Government and Community Development in the Northern Emirates of Northern Nigeria," Journal of Local Administration Overseas. Volume 3, No. 3. July.
- Fellows, P. A. 1963. "Community Development in Ethiopia," International Review of Community Development. Volume 11.
- Foreign Operations Administration. 1956. Community Development Review, Volume 1. Washington, D.C.
- Friedlander, Walter A. 1968. Introduction to Social Welfare. Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Government of India. 1954. The Village Agricultural Industrial Development Programme: Manual for Village Workers. The Village-Aid Administration, Ministry of Economic Affairs, Government of Pakistan.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956. Manual for Village Level Workers. Issued by Community Projects Administration. January.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956. Report of the Team for the Study of Community Project and National Extension Service. (Mehta Report.) New Delhi.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956. Village Aid -- Five Year Plan, 1955-56 - 1959-60. Karachi: Government of Pakistan Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1957. Report 1956-57. (Fifty Annual Report) Ministry of Community Development.

- . . . Report of Community Development Evaluation Mission in India 1958-59. United Nations Report. Commissioner of Government of India, Ministry of Community Development.
- . 1959. Report on India's Food Crisis and Steps to Meet It. Agricultural Production Team. Ministry of Food and Agriculture and Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation. New Delhi.
- . 1960. The Seventh Evaluation Report on Community Development and Some Allied Fields. Programme Evaluation Organisation Planning Commission.
- . . . Annual Conference on Community Development and Panchayatiraj at Springar, July 1965, Main Recommendations, Proceedings, and Agenda Notes. Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation, New Delhi.
- . 1970. Program Evaluation Organization 70: Evaluation Study of Post-Stage II Community Development Blocks. Program Evaluation Organization Planning Commission. January.
- Government of the Philippines. 1965. A Brief Statement of the Community Development Program. President Association for Community Development, Manila. June.
- Green, James W. 1961. "Success and Failure in Technical Assistance: A Case Study." Reprinted from Human Organization. Volume 20, No. 1. Spring.
- Haney, Emil B. Jr. 1964. The Israeli Kibbutzim - Blueprints for Community Development. A paper presented to Prof. Wm. Glade, School of Commerce, University of Wisconsin. January.
- Hayden, Lyle J. 1949. Living Standards in Rural Iran - A Case Study. Reprinted from Middle East Journal. Volume III, No. 2.
- Hough, Richard L. 1968. The JCRR Experience in Taiwan and Its Application in Other Countries. Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. April.
- International Cooperation Administration. Team I. 1955. Community Development Programs in India, Pakistan and the Philippines. Washington, D.C. October.
- . Team III. 1955. Community Development Programs in India, Iran, Egypt and Gold Coast. Washington, D.C. December.
- . 1959. "Concept and Policy." Community Development Conference-Training. Bandarawela, Ceylon. May.
- . 1961. "Community Development in the Near East and South Asia." Community Development Division. January.

- Jain, S. C. 1967. Community Development and Panchayati Raj in India. Calcutta: Allied Publishers.
- Karnjanaprakorn, Choop. 1965. "The Role of Informal Organization in Community Development: Thai Experience," Thai Journal of Public Administration. Volume VI, No. 2. October.
- Kempe, M. E. and L. D. Smith, Editors. 1971. Community Development - Kenya Strategies for Improving Rural Welfare. Proceedings of a Workshop held at the Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi. May - June.
- Khan, Iltija Husain. 1964. Community Development in India: A Critical Evaluation. Aligarh: Aligarh Muslim University.
- Madigan, Francis C., S.J. 1962. The Farmer Said No: A Study of Background Factors Associated with Dispositions to Cooperate with or be Resistant to Community Development Projects. Quezon City, Philippines: Community Development Research Council, University of the Philippines.
- Malaviya, H. D. 1956. Village Panchayats in India. New Delhi: Ananda Press.
- Mason, Edward S. 1955. Promoting Economic Development -- The U.S. and Southern Asia. Claremont, California.
- Mayer, Albert and Associates. 1958. Pilot Project, India. University of California Press.
- Mezirow, Jack D. 1963. Dynamics of Community Development. New York: Scarecrow Press, Inc.
- Millikan, Max F. and D. L. Blackmer, Editors. 1961. The Emerging Nations. Little, Brown and Company.
- Miner, William R. 1961. Seven Case Capsules from Korea's Community Development Program. Bureau of Community Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry and Community Development Division, United States Operations Mission to Korea.
- Mosher, A. T. 1958. Varieties of Extension Education and Community Development. Comparative Extension Publication No. 2. Cornell University.
- Mukerji, B. 1961. Community Development in India. Calcutta: Orient Longmans.
- Nair, Kusum. 1966. Blossoms in the Dust: The Human Factor in Indian Development. New York: Praeger.

- Najjar, Halim. 1970. Community Development: The Facts and the Myth. Beirut: The Rihani House.
- Namboodiripad, E. M. S. 1958. The Mahatma and the Ism. New Delhi: People's Publishing House.
- Narayan, Shriman. 1960. Principles of Gandhian Planning. Kitab Mahal, 56A, Zero Road, Allahabad-3.
- Neal, Ernest. 1964. "A Report on Community Development in The Philippines, East Pakistan and India." Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. March.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. Hope for the Wretched: A Narrative Report of Technical Assistance Experiences. Agency for International Development.
- Near East Foundation. 1960. "Community Deve-opment in Korea: An Address by John S. Badeau." New York. April.
- Nehru, Jawaharlal. 1962. An Autobiography. New Delhi.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. Community Development and Panchayati Raj. Government of India, Ministry of Community Development, Cooperation and Panchayati Raj.
- Ogden, Jean. 1958. Conference Summary -- Community Development -- Africa. Tripoli, Libya. March.
- Paulson, Belden. 1964. "Difficulties and Prospects for Community Development in Northeast Brazil." Reprinted from Inter-American Economic Affairs. Volume 17, No. 4. Spring.
- Poston, Richard W. 1962. Democracy Speaks Many Tongues, Community Development Around the World. Harper and Row.
- Pye, Lucian W. 1961. "Community Development: Political Implications of Community Development - a Background Paper." Care-Peace Corps-Community Development Project, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, New Jersey.
- Raynolds, Dana D. 1967. Role of Local Government and Voluntary Organization in Community Development. Washington, D.C.: Society for International Development.
- Republic of Korea. 1958. Community Development Addresses - ROK National Community Development Conference: Seoul, Korea, August 21, 1958. National Council of Community Development, Ministry of Reconstruction, Seoul, Korea.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. Community Development Programs: Annual Report (1958 and 1959). National Council of Community Development.

- . 1959. Community Organization: Selected Articles. The National Council of Community Development, Ministry of Reconstruction.
- . 1959. Interviewing: Selected Articles. National Council of Community Development, Ministry of Reconstruction.
- . 1960. Community Development Programs: Annual Report - 1960. National Council of Community Development.
- . 1961. Community Development in Korea. National Council of Community Development, Ministry of Reconstruction, Seoul.
- . 1961. Report of the Inter-regional Conference on Community Development and Its Role in Nation Building. International Cooperation Administration.
- . 1961. Your Work with Villagers: A Guide for NACOM Village Workers. National Council of Community Development, Seoul, Korea.
- . 1961. 1961: Community Development Program in Korea. National Council of Community Development, Ministry of Reconstruction, Seoul, Korea.
- . 1962. An Outline of Agricultural Guidance Work in Korea. Office of Rural Development, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Suwon, Korea.
- . 1963. Rural Guidance Work in Korea. Office of Rural Development, Suwon, Korea.
- . 1965. Report of the Workshop on Professional Education for Community Development - April 17-19, 1965. Office of Rural Development, Chung Ang University and ECAFE, Seoul, Korea.
- . 1967. Rural Guidance Work in Korea - A Decade of Rural Progress - (1957-1967). Office of Rural Development, Suwon, Korea.
- Ruopp, Phillips, Editor. 1959. Approaches to Community Development: A Symposium Introductory to Problems and Methods of Village Welfare in Underdeveloped Areas. The Hague: W. van Hoeve.
- Sanders, Everette N. . "Strengthening Ties between Village People and the Royal Thai Government through Community Development."
- Sanders, Irwin T. 1957. Community Development and National Change. Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Shields, James J. Jr. 1967. Education in Community Development: Its Function in Technical Assistance. New York, N.Y.: Praeger.
- South-East Asia Treaty Organization. 1960. Report of the SEATO Conference on Community Development. Baguio, Philippines. December.
- Study Conference on Community Development. 1957. Community Development: A Handbook. Colonial Office, Great Britain. London:
- Taylor, Carl C. et al. 1966. India's Roots of Democracy: A Sociological Analysis of Rural India's Experience in Planned Development Since Independence. New York: Praeger.
- Taylor, Paul S. 1958. "Community Development." Seoul, Korea: UNC/OEC.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. "Community Development as a Tool of the Agency for International Development." Agency for International Development.
- Thorner, Daniel. 1956. The Agrarian Prospect in India. Delhi: University of Delhi Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Alice. 1962. Land and Labor in India. Asia Publishing House.
- Tumin, Melvin M. 1958. "Some Social Requirements for Effective Community Development," in Community Development Review. No. 11, December.
- UNESCO. 1967. The Participation of Women in Community Development Programmes: Preliminary Report of the Secretary General. New York, N.Y.: Commission on the Status of Women. February.
- United Nations. 1955. Principles of Community Development - Social Progress Through Local Action. Economic and Social Council. January.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1957. Study Kit on Training for Community Development. Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1958. Report of the Mission to Survey Community Development in Africa. Secretariat, Technical Assistance Administration, New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. Public Administration Aspects of Community Development Programmes. Technical Assistance Programme, Office for Public Administration, New York.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. ECA Regional Workshop on Planning and Administration of National Programmes of Community Development. Economic Commission for Africa, Addis Ababa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. Community Development and Economic Development. Bangkok.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962. Report of the Asian Seminar on Planning and Administration of National Community Development Programmes: Bangkok, Thailand - 22 August - 1 September, 1961. New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. Community Development Evaluation Mission to Ghana. Economic Commission for Africa.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. Community Development and National Development. Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. The Role of Local Leadership for Community Development in Asian Countries. Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East, Bangkok. August.
- United States Operations Mission to Korea. 1961. Community Development in Korea: An Evaluation Survey of the NACOM Grant-in-Aid Program. Community Development Division, San Francisco.
- Valsan, E. H. 1970. Community Development Programs and Rural Local Government. Praeger.
- Violich, Francis, and Juan B. Astica. 1967. Community Development and the Urban Planning Process in Latin America. University of California, Los Angeles.
- Whyte, William Foote. 1975. Organizing for Agricultural Development. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books.
- Wickwar, Hardy. 1968. "Community Development Administration in the 1960's," International Review of Administrative Sciences. No. 3.
- Wiser, William and Charlotte. 1963. Behind Mud Walls 1930-1960. University of California Press.
- Woodhead, Sir John. 1945. The Famine Inquiry Commission -- Final Report. Madras: Superintendent Government Press.
- Wraith, R. E. 1964. "Community Development in Nigeria," Journal of Local Administration Overseas. Volume 3, No. 2. April.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BIBLIOGRAPHIES

- Agency for International Development. 1966. Index of Technical Publications. Community Development Publications. TCR/ISDS. March.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1956-1963. Community Development Review Subject Index. Community Development Reference Service, Office of Development Administration, Bureau for Technical Assistance, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. CDP-10. No. 1, January through Vol. 8, No. 2, June.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1970. Index of Community Development Publications. Community Development Reference Service, Office of Development Administration, Bureau for Technical Assistance, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. CDP-11. April.
- Cordero, Felicidad V. An Annotated Bibliography on Community Development in the Philippines from 1946-59. (Content and Methodology). University of Philippines Community Development Council. Vol. 1.
- Dunham, Arthur and Rameshwar Nath Paul. 1959. "Community Development --a Working Bibliography," Community Development Review. IV. March.
- Jantzen, Carl R. and Iwao Ishino. 1962. A Working Bibliography on Community Development. Bibliography No. 2. Institute for Community Development and Services, Continuing Education Service, Michigan State University. December.
- Lackey, Alvin S. 1963. "A Working Bibliography on Community Development," Community Development Review. Department of State, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. June.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Editor. 1972. Community Development Abstracts. Prepared for Essay Press, New York. Volume 2.
- London University. 1961-1962. Bulletin of Acquisitions: A Selective List of Articles, Reports and other Publications. Community Development Clearing House. Institute of Education. London: The Clearing House. Vol. II. November - May.

- Manny, Elsie Sherman. 1956. Rural Community Organization; Selected Annotated References. Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Mezirow, Jack D. 1963. The Literature of Community Development--A Bibliographic Guide. Department of State, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. May.
- Ministry of Community Development and Cooperation Musoorie (U.P.). 1962. Bibliography on Community Development. Government of India, The Clearing House, National Institute of Community Development. No. 5, July - September.
- Sociological Abstracts, Inc. 1964. Community Development Abstracts. Prepared for Agency for International Development. Volume 1.
- South Pacific Commission. 1953. A Bibliography of Co-operation in the South Pacific. Revised ed. Noumea. Technical Paper No. 51.
- United Nations. Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. 1954. Education for Community Development; a Selected Bibliography. Paris. Educational Studies and Documents, no. 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Secretariat. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. 1960. United Nations Series on Community Development. Selective Book List. Document ST/SOA/SER. 0/33, ST/TAA/SER. D/33. New York.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Secretariat. Department of Social Affairs. 1953. Selected List of Books, Pamphlets and Periodicals in English on Community Organization and Development. Document ST/SOA/SER. 0 15, ST/TAA/SER. D/5. New York.
- U.S. Foreign Operations Administration. 1955. A Selected Bibliography on Community Development. Washington, D.C.: F.O.A., Community Development Division. May.
- U.S. International Cooperation Administration. 1960. Bibliography on Community Development. Washington: Community Development Division. (Mimeo.)