Chapter- I

Community Development : Meaning, Significance and Historical Background

Development of rural communities through rural strategies, now has become a national slogan in the developing countries of the world because of two major reasons; first, between two – third to three- fourth of population in these countries live in the rural areas, i.e., approximately 85% of the over 800 million poor in the developing world are considered to be in absolute poverty and remaining 15 % are judged to be in relative poverty. Three-fourth of those in absolute poverty are in the developing countries of Asia itself. The population in these countries considered to be in either absolute or relative poverty, more than 80%, as a matter of fact, have been living in rural areas. In this respect, countries like India and Thailand are no exceptions. Secondly, in the early stages of development, agriculture is the main activity of the rural people and also the major source of revenue to the government. The operational goals of rural development extend beyond any particular sector; these include improved productivity, and thus higher incomes for the target groups as well as minimum acceptable levels of food, shelter, education, health services and some other necessities of life.
Accordingly, subject of rural or community development has now attracted sufficient attention and interest of social scientists all over the world. In particular, economists as a group have been exploring ways and means of developing rural areas first by understanding the complexities of rural economy, its interdependence on urban sector, the weaknesses of its institutional set-up and then by suggesting development strategies and specific policy measures for achieving its rapid development. Policy-makers and planners in most of the developing Asian and Pacific nations have been emphasizing the need to transform rural areas where the overwhelming majority of their people are currently living. This emphasis on community development has been due to several factors. For instance, as a result of political mobilization of the peasantry, pressure from below on the national elite in these countries has been increasing. Governments have been concerned about social and economic disparities between rural and urban areas.¹ Other important factors have included the need to mobilize human and financial resources in rural areas, and the desire to seek greater political legitimacy. Therefore, national governments and donor and international agencies have increasingly emphasised the need to eliminate rural poverty,

and modernize agriculture. In this respect, in majority of the countries several policies, programmes and projects have been introduced to increase agricultural productivity; raise incomes and living standards of the rural people; provide employment opportunities; facilitate the participation of the people in local decision-making; and increase access of the rural poor to government facilities and programmes. In most cases, government programmes and projects were incorporated into comprehensive, long-term development plans formulated by central planning agencies. Policies of rural development adopted by developing Asian countries can be classified into three categories:

Technocratic (productivity-orientated);
Reformist (solidarity-orientated);
and Radical (equity-orientated).

**Community Development:**

It has been observed that community development has been a continuous process and going on ever since the beginning of communities or grouping of people into social units. It has been noticed that comparatively in

---

under-developed countries the growth of communities has been a bit slow. Many of these which have recently thrown off the yoke of colonialism have embarked on a programme of community development; differing in size and characters but all aiming at reaching a higher level of living for their rural masses who form the bulk of the population of these countries. As a matter of fact, these programmes have been recognized among the most conspicuous and important of the development programmes adopted by these countries. As community development came to be recognized as an effective and powerful method, capable of being consciously applied, for promoting and strengthening rural improvement in less developed countries, many efforts have been made to define community development. The 1948 Cambridge Conference defined it as under:

“A movement designed to promote better living for the whole community, with the active participation and if possible on the initiative of the community, but if this initiative is not forthcoming spontaneously, then by the use of techniques for arousing and stimulating it in order to secure its active and enthusiastic response to the movement”.

In this respect, United Nations adopted the following definition:

3. See Mukerji, B., Community Development in India (Bombay: Orient Longmans, 1961), p. 1
“The process by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of government 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”.

According to Irwin T. Sanders, community development embodies two major ideas. The first is that of conscious acceleration of economic, technological, and social change (development). The second, that of locality, refers to planned social change in a village, town, or city; it relates to projects that have obvious local significance and that can be initiated and carried out by local people. According to the widely accepted United Nations definitions, communities as units of action combine outside assistance with organized local self-determination and effort. They achieve goals that are both material (a new schoolhouse) and nonmaterial (literacy, lowered infant mortality).

Moreover, the accent on development suggests that the emerging nations move through a series of stages on their way toward modernization. Leaders realize that to achieve economic goals more quickly, large numbers of people,


especially in the rural areas, have to be mobilized. In the Communist Countries the collectivization of agriculture was the method chosen; in several noncommunist countries, such as India and the Philippines, community development or its equivalent is being used. Neither approach has proven a panacea, and each has had pronounced and often unanticipated social effects.

During the colonial period of many developing countries, the central government concentrated upon communications and material resources, upon the local settlements or groups of them for administration of justice and for tax purposes. Nevertheless, the colonial powers did initiate some activities resembling contemporary community development. In Africa there were the mass education programmes in Kenya, Uganda, Gold Coast (now Ghana). In Asia the rural reconstruction in India in the 1930’s and the rural development in Ceylon and mass education in Burma in the 1940’s were programmes that predated the current large-scale community development efforts throughout much of Asia today. The growing interest in community development in Latin America is relatively recent. In the middle East, programmes of rural reconstruction were carried out in the 1930s by the Near East Foundation, but the post-World War-II pioneering efforts were with the rural social centers set
up in the United Arab Republic (then Egypt) by the Ministry of Social Affairs.

Similarly, the term community development now enjoys wide usage in the West, even though community organization still best describes the mobilization of local resources for social welfare purposes. In 1948 the United Nations Organization had one community development adviser in one country; in 1962 it had 47 such experts in 31 countries.

**Intellectual and Social Origins:**

The mixed ancestry of community development gives a clue to the problems of defining the term. Social workers, adult educators, local government officials, economic planners, city planners, and agricultural extension workers consider their respective professional fields to have been forerunners of community development, a fact which supposedly gives them each the right to speak authoritatively about its content and methods.

In their descriptions of the current scene various writers not unexpectedly stress different themes. Arthur Dunham (1960) tends to view community development as organized efforts to improve the conditions of community life and the capacity for community integration and self-direction. Four basic elements ordinarily found are:

6. Ibid., p. 170.
1) A planned programme;
2) Encouragement of self-help;
3) Technical assistance, which may include personnel, equipment, and supplies; and
4) Integrating various specialties for the help of the community.

**Governmental and National Programmes**

T. R. Batten (1957) considers the field of community development "to include any action taken by any agency and primarily designed to benefit the community." He observes that one of the principal problems in using democratic methods in community development is that the central governments put pressure on village-level workers to achieve national goals within given time periods. As a result, the village workers attempt to speed up the programmes with less democratic methods. When the programme is highly formalized, as in many five-year plans, the focus sometimes tends to be upon the programme rather than upon what is happening to the people involved in the programme. The emphasis is upon accomplishing sets of activities in health, welfare, agriculture, industry, recreation, and the like that can be quantified and reported.

As these statements imply, many community development programmes are national in scope and are geared to cover—all governmental
plans, be they three-year, five-year, or ten-year, for improving living and economic conditions. In this connection community development may be said to be a method through which national goals are to be achieved.

The Government of India (India 1958) has been quite specific in treating community development as a method designed to initiate a process of transformation in the social and economic life of the Indian villages. As a method it was supposed to do three things: achieve unity of thinking and action between all development agencies of government and between the official agency, the people's agency, and the people; transform the social and economic outlook of the people, chiefly through village organization; and conduct intensive area development based on a multipurpose approach. Recognition by the Indian Government that agricultural development presented special problems too great to be borne by the Ministry of Community Development has led to abolition of this Ministry. But there has been no decrease in the numbers of community development projects, and community development will no doubt continue to be regarded as the single most important method available to the government for coordinating social with economic planning, though the nomenclature might be changed.

Fredrick G. Friedmann, who has studied UNLA – the Association for the Fight Against Illiteracy – in southern Italy as a form of community
development, observes that “many Western leaders interested in the subject look at community development as an attempt at extending, in the vein of the applied social sciences, proven techniques of ‘handling’ situations to the limited and relatively manageable proportions of a village community and at substituting ‘projects’ on a community level for large – scale government ‘planning’”.\footnote{Ibid., p. XIV.}

In the United Arab Republic “community development” refers to the organization of rural welfare. Unpublished research carried out during the early 1960s by Doreen Warriner in Egypt showed that “self-help” by rural communities and “participation” in solving community problems have been little more than government slogans, since the emphasis has not been upon setting up organizations for the rural community.

**Programmes based on local initiative:**

It must not be assumed that all community development programmes are governmental in nature. In the United States, for example, the stress has been upon local initiative, usually sponsored by private groups or organizations (women’s clubs, men’s civic clubs, junior chambers of commerce, welfare councils), with only an occasional assist from some governmental agency. Thus, community development is viewed as a method
of carrying out specific projects, each worthy in its own right, rather than as part of some detailed national plan or programme. The nonmaterial benefits to the people are thought to be as valuable as the material goals achieved, since it is assumed that the more local residents are involved in planning and decision making, the more they will rely upon their own community resources and less upon the government. This reflects the strong individualistic and ameliorative strains in American culture as well as the value placed on local self-reliance and democratic participation. An OEEC (Organization for European Economic Cooperation) study team from Europe found one of the most surprising features of community development in the United States to be the importance of private efforts in community improvement and the small role played by local government officials in these matters (1960).

Various definitions incorporate this emphasis. J. D. Mezirow, for instance, has stated on several occasions that community development is an organized effort to make possible, through training and education, a wide range of individual participation in the democratic solution of community problems. Richard W. Poston (1958, p. 24) defines community development as "an organized body of knowledge which deals comprehensively with the community in its entirety, and with all of the various functions of community
life as integrated parts of the whole." He suggests that "the ultimate goal of community development is to help evolve through a process of organized study, planning, and action a physical and social environment that is best suited to the maximum growth, development and happiness of human beings as individuals and as productive members of their society."  

Lowry Nelson, Charles E. Ramsey, and Coolie Verner (1960) see community development as an "education-for-action process." It helps people achieve group goal democratically; the leader becomes an agent constructing learning experience rather than the proponent of a programme for community improvement; primary importance is attached to the individual. Furthermore, it is problem-oriented at the community level; the means employed in the solution are more important than the solution itself; and it is one of several types of purposive change.

Noncoercion and the problem of incentives. The definitions just cited show that community development is noncoercive. Totalitarian regimes do not view it as politically realistic or as ideologically desirable, since community development stresses the voluntary rather than regimented
participation of the individual. But for nontotalitarian regimes there are real dilemmas: How long can authorities desiring rapid social change wait for positive results from a slow educational process? Or in working out national economic and social plans, how much weight can they give to the priorities of villagers throughout the land? To what extent can those sponsoring community development rely on local leaders to initiate projects in terms of the “felt needs” of their fellow citizens, or must this initiative come from outside professional workers who stimulate and help local people bring into being some form of local action? Although a community programme is noncoercive, it operates within certain social controls: pressure brought by neighbours upon a villager who fails to carry out his part of the programme; positive incentives (e.g., in the form of wheat) provided to those working on community projects; or national recognition given to the community and its leaders for a well-conducted programme.

Types of Functionaries:

Of course, the resolution of these dilemmas and the type of social control employed will depend upon the leaders of the programme and their underlying assumptions. At least four types of functionaries are found in community development programmes. First, of local leaders are essential if there is to be genuine involvement of the people of the community. In some
countries where community development is tied in with local government, these leaders may be officials; elsewhere, they may be lay, voluntary leaders acting out of a spirit of public service. In developing countries great care is often taken to teach these leaders the importance of using democratic rather than authoritarian procedures in efforts to involve their fellow community members. Special School in Greece, are held for these leaders, because ultimate success depends upon them.

A second type of functionary is the community organizer often called the village-level worker. He is the new element added by community development to earlier, traditional programmes of rural change. He is trained in human-relations skills rather than in any subject-matter field, such as agriculture, health, or recreation. As a generalist, he is supposed to know how to relate these fields to the problem areas that the local people identify, but he does not claim high technical competence in them. By working with local leaders, he initiates, motivates, guide, and educates, supposedly taking into account the goals of the local people as well as the goals of the larger programme that he is promoting. Once action has been decided upon by the community, the village-level worker becomes the expediter, the communication link, the one who marshals outside resources appropriate to the local needs.
But he is relatively without a third type – the subject-matter specialist: agriculturist, sanitarian, literacy expert, and the like. Even before the village-level worker appeared on the scene after World War II, these specialists were trying to carry out changes in their special fields in rural areas. But they were doing it in a piecemeal fashion. One month a health worker would appear suggesting some line of action; later a livestock specialist would show up demanding vaccination for hog cholera. Under community development the local people are expected to prepare an over-all plan involving several of these fields, beginning with the project for which they have the greatest enthusiasm and sufficient means at their disposal. Thus, the subject-matter specialists, as in the case of some recent programmes in the Philippines, are asked to go to a village as a team, not as competing professionals. A community development worker is also part of the team. Elsewhere, as in Ethiopia, the specialists may be assigned to community development authorities for full-time work under these authorities rather than as part of the old-line ministries to which they eventually expect to return. In most countries getting the specialists to work together effectively presents more of a problem than persuading the villagers to agree to a programme of change.10

10. Ibid., p. 172.
This problem is related to the fourth functionary: the person responsible for keeping the administrative machinery of a national programme in running order. In Venezuela, for instance, horizontal and vertical coordination is being achieved at the state level through “regional community development bodies.” The larger the programme, the greater the proportion of energy and money that goes into the mechanics of operation. Vast training programmes, long hours (even years) of negotiation with other government agencies, detailed plans and budgets for three or five years are required. In addition, some officials must maintain a flow of technical materials (pesticides, schoolbooks, drugs, etc.) so that they are on hand for ready use when the local communities need them. One conclusion seems clear: unless the head of the government or some influential official with a charismatic, popular appeal makes community development a major concern, the bureaucratic pressures against its success on a national scale are so great that it is apt to bog down. But where people like Ramon Magsaysay in the Philippines or Jawaharlal Nehru in India have referred to it often in public and given it their full support, the programme has enjoyed a measure of success.

Faith in the Capacity of the Rural People:

It must be noted here that the whole structure of community development stands on the principle, primarily of developing the resources of
the people of the community itself. It means that this programme is based on
the faith that the rural people have almost limitless capacity, strength and
confidence not only to frame but also to fashion a better life for themselves if
they are guided properly and technical, expert and financial assistance is
given at the right time. Here it would be quite appropriate to mention that as a
matter of fact, the state can create the favourable conditions for and give
direction to the nation's growth, but for this growth the main stimulus has to
come from within the minds of the people themselves expressed in an
aspiration for better living and an appreciation of the fact that better living can
be realized through self – exerted leadership and group effort. When we take
into notice the conditions of poverty, illiteracy, ill – health and social and
economic stagnation prevailing in the rural communities, their cultural
isolation and low capacity to profit from science and technology, it is difficult
to have the faith in the limitless capacity of the rural people to fashion a better
life for themselves. However, community development must have this kind of
faith if it is to be community development in real sense. It is because of the
reason that it is based on the knowledge that villagers, even though are largely
illiterate, do know their requirements or needs and have the desire to satisfy
them or how such desire can be stimulated in them.
If villagers seem to be lethargic and indifferent to the process of progress and development, it is because they have remained culturally isolated from the main stream of national life, unable to see the possibilities of progress and have for a long time not been permitted to participate in programmes of their own improvement. In this respect, there is enough evidence already accumulating in various parts of the world operating programmes of community development, differing in kind as regards the content of the programme and under diverse political systems, that such a faith in the people is justified. This constitutes the heart and soul of community development. So many other vital requirements and principles of community development follow from it. Thus, the central purpose of community development is the development of the rural people, of the individual as an individual as well as a member of his village community, and the community as a whole. However, the community has to be the basic unit of development but the importance of the individual is not to be reduced in any way. This has many sociological, psychological, political and economic ramifications. To raise the capacity of the rural people, community development has to promote in them cultural change, to make them progressive minded, desirous of improving their living conditions and capable of doing so through their own efforts and initiative and by adopting a co-
operative way of life for promoting group interests and the interest of the community as a whole. As a result, the development of community solidarity and self-reliance has to be very important objective of community development.

**Rationale Behind Small Community:**

Small communities have been recognized as the basic units of administration and development. Since the purpose is to increase, maximise and utilise all human and physical resources of the people for improving the standard of living, and the experts have experienced why to be meaningful for the local communities the standard of living must be translated into the basic terms of their needs and aspirations, it is easy to understand why each local community must decide for itself to improve its own standard of living. But the trust and faith in the local communities can and should draw inspiration from the view of the higher significance and purpose of such localities which Arthur E Morgan, a former Chairman, T. V. A., has so ably put forward in his brilliant book entitled 'The Community of the Future and the Future of Community', that this process of cultural evolution could take place only in the small social groups – villages – in which nearly all of humanity has lived throughout the long ages until very recent times.

**Objectives of community development:**
1. Changing the outlook of all rural people is an essential as well as a very significant objective of this programme. It is because of the reason that unless the people cultivate the attitude or develop rising expectations for a higher level of living, there would be no motivation for the people to provide the required leadership to assure that village development would become and continue to be a people’s programme.\footnote{Government of India, A Guide to the Community Development Programme (New Delhi: Ministry of Community Development, January 1957), p. 3.}

2. Secondly, the development of responsible and responsive village leadership, and of village organizations and institutions, must be accepted by all as being vital to the success of the programme. If the programme is to become a sustained, living, village self-help programme, it is essential that the leadership for planning and implementing programmes in the rural areas come from the present and yet-to-be developed leaders of the villages. Similarly, much of the responsibility for continuous planning and development must come from village-created and village-led organizations, including among others such groups as village assemblies or rural local bodies, like panchayats in India, co-operative youth clubs, women’s organizations, farmers’ associations, recreation clubs, village development councils, etc. The Community Development Programme in
various countries and especially in developing countries, has kept this objective in mind as one of the most important objectives.

3. Thirdly, when all is said and done, the most important of our resources are the people. Accordingly, this programme, obviously, gives special attention to develop such an atmosphere in which the people could become self-reliant, responsive citizens capable and willing to participate effectively and with knowledge and understanding in the building of their respective nations.

4. Fourthly, with the rising expectations of the rural people for more and better food, clothing, education, health services, better housing, good roads, wells or better drinking water facilities, and recreation, the community development programme keeps it as one of the central objectives, to help them and also to provide the maximum basic facilities to the rural people. This requires a continuous effort and heed and emphasis on improving and modernizing agricultural practices and methods essential for increased agricultural production. Besides, it means that concerned attention must be focussed on improving existing and organizing new village handi-crafts and small scale cottage industries to produce the new things villagers would want and need, and on providing
employment opportunities for the present large number of unemployed empty hands.

5. Fifthly, in accepting the responsibility for helping to rebuild all villages as significant functional democracies, the community programme wants to assume responsibility for training village youth to assume citizenship responsibilities through early and continuous involvement in youth programme and activities and all-round village development.

6. Sixthly, to provide organized assistance to village women and village families is also reasonably good objective of this programme. As a matter of fact, need for food, clothing, housing, recreation, health and hygiene are crystallized within the family and the motivation for their achievement comes from within the family. Therefore, if the village people are to be guided in the expression of their rising level of living and aided in effectively converting their increased incomes into better living, the community development must organize the requisite and essential assistance in this respect. In Thailand, women have been taking a keen interest in this respect these days.

7. It has been observed that essential to the success of the community development programme is the close inter-relation of the village school and the village teacher with all phases of village development. No doubt,
at present in most of the countries, the schools are directly under the
control of the respective governments, yet the role of community
development cannot be minimized. Therefore, if the community
development programme is to succeed in making its maximum
contribution to the recreation of significant village culture, the full
participation of the school and the village teacher is essential. Besides, if
the village teacher is to be restored as a self – respecting citizen and
eventual village leader, his socio – economic status in the village has to be
upgraded. Accordingly, it is one of the basic objectives of this programme
to upgrade the status of the school teacher so that the school teacher might
be able to play a role of real educator, a helper and assistance to the
students as well as the village people. In this way, the teacher can
contribute a lot and can be effective in this process.

8. In addition the community development programme also aims at providing
the information and basic knowledge about safe drinking water supply,
disposal of human waste, house and village drainage, abatement of smoke
and pollution, clean habits, health and hygiene, better communication, co –
operative societies, better seed and agricultural implements, methods of
irrigation and fertilizers for better production and so on so forth. In fact, if
the developing countries want to cut down on the high toll caused by
illness, unemployment, poverty, illiteracy and ignorance, then the villagers would have to be helped to know the causes of all these problems so that they could think of their own to solve these problems with the guidance, technical and some kind of financial assistance to be provided by the state governments in their respective rural areas.

Accordingly, community development is a process of change from the traditional way of living of rural communities to progressive ways of living; as a method by which people can be assisted to develop themselves on their own capacity and resources; as a programme for accomplishing certain activities in fields concerning the welfare of the rural people; and as a movement for progress with a certain ideological content. Thus, the concept of community development is quite dynamic and a multi-purpose programme in which we find the different elements. The objective is quite clear, i.e., promotion of the all-round development of the communities, economic, social and cultural. If we consider it as a process, the focus or emphasis is on the change that takes place in the people socially and psychologically; when we view it as a method, the emphasis is on the ends to be achieved; when taken as a programme, the emphasis is on the activities in specific matters, such as, health, education, agriculture, and when viewed as a movement, the emphasis is on the emotional content or ideology behind the programme. However, for
a complete understanding of community development, it must be viewed as a whole, as a process of change and yet with clearly conceived objectives, as having its own special method or way of working but applying these to promote activities that may need to be taken up in any programme of rural development; and finally as a programme, capable of being developed into a movement with an emotional and ideological appeal.

The above description indicates that there are two fundamental principles or essentials of community development, namely, involvement of and participation by the people themselves in efforts to improve their level of living with as much reliance as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make these more effective. The basic philosophy and reason behind people’s participation is that it is only by getting villagers involved in the process of improving themselves through their own efforts that we can develop their capacity and self-reliance, a co-operative way of life in them and cohesion in the community. Accordingly, it is essential that such a programme concerning rural development should not only have the sanction but the full support and wholehearted participation of the millions of persons living in the hundreds of thousands of village communities which, in fact, constitute the majority of the people of the
developing countries. It is they who have both to accept and execute the programme for their own improvement. In this way, we can transform hundreds of thousands of villages one by one from stagnant, backward and ignorant liabilities to the nation into assets and brought into the main stream of national development. Thus, this is the true significance of people’s participation in a programme of community development. Besides, people’s participation should never be regarded as an expediency or a temporary measure forced on governments by their meagre financial resources to which therefore the people are called upon to add through their own contribution of money, material and labour. Nor should it be regarded as a device to make people adopt improved practices in agriculture, public health, village industries, etc. and execute the programmes formulated by governmental authorities alone. It is important that the people should regard all aspects of community development as their concern and develop their capacity, faith and self-confidence in themselves and in the efficacy of their own co-operative action to solve their local problems. This pre-requisite of community development programme that it should have the fullest participation of the people and must fully involve them in the process of improving themselves through their own effort, determines very largely what programme of activities the communities should take up, how these should be initiated and
developed and how the agencies of government should assist them in executing these programmes? Local problems are the main concern of the people of a village and the programme of community development must deal with these problems. In certain cases the village people might be requiring the outside assistance which is essential. However, they can produce most of their food, clothing and build up their own houses. Similarly, they can improve the village sanitation, organize their own recreation and can help in building their schools, health centres, feeder roads, and can dig their wells and tanks. Through such programmes, the local communities can make far greater contribution, than can action on any other organized level of society, to the task of raising the level of living of all the people in terms of their basic needs and requirements of food, clothing, shelter, health, education, recreation and community life. But the local communities many a time do require technical and expert assistance and guidance and sometimes they need financial help also. As the outside assistance is obviously required to stimulate and strengthen community self – help efforts and must never result in its opposite, so the form and manner in which the assistance is given and its quantum and timing are all very very significant and relevant ones.

It has been observed that community development in the sense of local initiative and self – help has existed in almost all ancient societies as
well as in modern ones in one form or the other. However, its new aspects and scope in the post-war world be in its more comprehensive character, in its combination of voluntary efforts and technical skills, in its organization as a part of national economic and social development programmes. However, such comprehensive and organized community development programmes are to be found and working only in under-development countries. The factor responsible for this is perhaps the existence of the same conditions and situations to a greater or lesser degree in these countries. If we go through these conditions we have found poverty, ignorance and illiteracy of the people and their governments also in some extent. Similarly, a very low level of production has been another reason because of use of outdated and primitive methods of production and also lack of resources for investment on development and a very low rate of capital formation; considerable unemployment and more under-employment; physical and cultural isolation of most of rural communities that constitute the majority of the population and their social and community life often in a state of disintegration and decay; a high percentage of illiteracy; lack of the knowledge of health and hygiene and finally, the very low capacity of the rural people to take advantage of science and technology because they have neither the sufficient resources nor the adequate knowledge in this respect. Accordingly, the net
result is the stagnation in the social and economic life of the community as a whole.

Therefore, the above mentioned conditions or factors have compelled the developing nations to chalk out or plan such a programme of social and economic change of the community life of the rural masses who constitute the bulk of the population of these countries. That is why the programme has to be planned as a dynamic and multi-purpose otherwise it would not serve the purpose. Here the problem is that the under-developed countries have an educated elite (the bureaucracy) at the top in which only a few of whom have a rural background or belong to rural areas and have a scare interest in rural orientation and basic rural problems. Similarly, there is a total lack of adequate and trained administrative and technical staff – an experienced team of officers and workers to shoulder the responsibilities of community development programme.

**The beginning of Community Development Programme in the developing countries:**

---

12. Many of these programmes have changed rapidly and none of them are to be static. For details regarding the earlier account relating mainly to Sri Lanka, India, the Philippines and Thailand, see United Nations Report of the Mission on Community organization and Development in South and Southeast Asia (ST/SOA/Ser-0/10, and ST/TAA/Ser. D/10), December, 1953.
Community Development programmes in one form or the other were started at various times during the last 50 years in most of the developing countries. Some programmes were designated as such and others were given related names such as community schools or agricultural extension programmes or National Extension Service or Rural Development Programmes applying community development principles. Table I clearly shows most of the existing programmes\textsuperscript{13} arranged approximately by size\textsuperscript{14} and with indication of the official starting dates. The estimates of coverage extent are naturally interest but must, as explained in the table, be taken with reservations because of significant intensity – and also because the easier areas to reach tend to be approached first.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{13} Experience in rural mainland China – the rapid shift in two stages from 120 million farm households to 760,000 collective farms (1953 – 1957) and from these to 26,000 communes (1958) – raises problems beyond the scope of community development as understood in the countries considered here.

\textsuperscript{14} It must be emphasised that some of the estimates are necessarily very rough, especially for the smaller programmes.

Table 1
Approximate Coverage of Rural Community Development Programmes in Selected ECAFE Countries
At the End of 1959

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Programme started</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Millions of persons</th>
<th>Thousands of villages</th>
<th>Per cent of total villages in country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>Pakistan (Village AID)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>Viet – Nam, southern</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7(^{18})</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Ceylon (Rural development)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953(^{19})</td>
<td>China: Taiwan (Farmers’ Associations)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948, 1955</td>
<td>Burma (Mass education; Payagyi pilot community development project)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Comparisons of the extent of coverage are in part misleading because the intensity factors (ratio of village level workers to population, extent of training of village level workers, availability of supporting technical staff etc.) vary widely from country to country. For example: the population and villages reported as covered in India are those in development blocks, which are only established when, as a minimum, the block development officer, 10 male village level workers, and extension officers in agriculture, rural engineering, co-operatives, panchayats and/or social education are on duty. In Burma and Indonesia, among others, all population and villages within the assigned area of a village level worker are counted; the Indonesian village workers are moreover on a part-time basis and number less than 500 for a covered rural population of 8 million. In southern Viet–Nam, 100 per cent coverage was obtained at the time the programme was launched, by assigning agents already on duty with the Special Commissariat for Civic Action to serve as community development workers in all districts throughout the country, and directing all villages to participate.

17. Data are for December 1959 except in the case of India (1 April 1960), Iran (March 1960), Nepal (February 1960), Ceylon (December 1958).

18. The hamlets in southern Viet–Nam number about about 11,000; their regrouping into larger villages has recently been intensified.

19. Date of present legislation; farmers’ associations originated in Taiwan around 1900.
It has been observed that the Community Development Programme of India is the most influential\textsuperscript{20} and comprehensive one. Its objectives are clear which are seen as an integrated rural society, an expanding rural economy, and a smoothing of the course of essential and inevitable social change. During several years of experiments in the states of Madras (now Tamilnadu) and Utter Pradesh, starting in 1946 and 1948 respectively, an operating pattern was evolved. Each “block” of about 100 villages had to have its development officer, along with a team of varying size composed of extension workers, specializing in such matters as agriculture and livestock, to advise and supervise 10 or 20 multi-purpose field agents called “Village Level Workers”, each of whom in turn would visit regularly five to ten villages. Similarly, the block to be supported and supervised by the district

\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., p. 5.
officers and the technical agents of functional government ministers agriculture, public health, co-operatives, education, small industries and so on. In the villages the people were supposed to form their own organizations. Under this model, the dual emphasis on the bringing together of technical specialties right down to within reach of the villagers, and on the collective initiative and participation of villagers, clearly bears a close relation to the United Nations' definition. This programme was inaugurated in India on 2nd October, 1952 and National Extension Service was added in it a year later, i.e., on 2nd October, 1953.

By April 1960 it was estimated that 380,000 out of 556,000 census villages, with a total population of some 192 millions, had been included in community development blocks. It was planned that after the coverage of the whole country, in varying degrees of intensity, a point which was expected to be reached late in 1963, it was planned that no less than 5,000 block development officers and 50,000 village-level workers had to be trained and posted, and about the same number of technical specialists and auxiliaries to be adjusted. All these were to be responsible to their state governments through development commissioners, under policy guidance and financial support from the Central Government in New Delhi, where leadership was
given by a separate Ministry of Community Development and Co-operation. Mr. S. K. Dey was the architect behind all this programme.

Out of the same experimental background on the subcontinent, and at approximately the same time, came the Pakistan Village Agricultural and Industrial Development (or Village AID or V-AID) programme. This also made considerable progress towards becoming nationwide in fact as well as aim, and was the second largest community development programme in the world. By December 1959 it established 141 development areas covering more than 27,000 villages, and had upwards of 3,000 V-AID workers on the job, three-fourths of them in the West. Major similarities with the Indian programme were the emphasis on expanded production as an essential (though this is not to say dominant) part of the multiple objectives, and the important place given to multi-purpose village level workers. While Pakistan’s programme has been kept separate from the traditional law and order bureaucracy at the local, operating level, it was not kept in a separate ministry, either at the Centre or in the Provinces, and did not reach an advanced stage in interdepartmental co-ordination. Starting from an initial position in the Ministry of Economic Affairs, it was shifted several times and came to be closely linked with the national Basic Democracies programme inaugurated in late 1959; at this point a major training drive was launched to
acquaint officials and the people’s representative all over the country with the fundamentals of both programmes. Later on it was placed in the Ministry of Health, Labour and Social Welfare, under the name of National Development Organization.\textsuperscript{21} However, in Pakistan community development programme cannot be stated as successful.

However, a quite different pattern was evolved in the Republic of Viet - Nam. After the Geneva Accords of 1954, the southern part of the country had some 2,000 “civic action agents”, responsible through the Special Commissioner for Civic Action to the Head of the Government, working in the villages in mobile teams to promote political security and civic education. From 1957 on, roughly one – half of these agents were assigned to districts specialists ( now about 400 in number ) trained for Civic Action by the departments for six months, and with large number of helpers hired as needed on a daily basis. All existing hamlets and villages were brought into the operation from the outset, and other centres as they were opened for resettlement or new development. The government did provide strong leadership in stimulating the people to formulate their needs. Most of the activity has thus far focused on construction or reconstruction of roads, canals, dykes, schools and other physical infrastructure items. The attack on

\textsuperscript{21} Ibid., p. 6.
this aspect of community development has moved forward with notable energy and speed. A new development which may hold important implications for the future is the effort to establish “farmers’ associations” on the Taiwan model.

Indonesia has had considerable experience in extending help to autonomous mutual-help village projects through separate government departments. Following a United Nations advisory mission in 1955, that country began a national community development programme on a modest and rather thinly staffed basis but with important announced aims. Sixteen new pilot projects, covering each an administrative district, are initiated each year with district (administrative) officers in charge, supported by extension officers of the technical ministries. Special re-orientation courses were given to these officers at a national centre, and small grants were available to assist community projects. All field workers were supposed to serve the programme part-time, as well as higher officers, except for a few in the Community Development Bureau, seconded from the ministries of Interior, Education and other technical ministries concerned. As a basis for intensifying the programme, three or four experimental projects were being started in 1960 to test various community development approaches and techniques in regions with differing natural, productive and social conditions.
Further developments in this respect have been quite encouraging and result oriented.

One of the oldest of the programmes, dating back to 1947, is that of Ceylon. The Department of Rural Development and Cottage Industries, under the Ministry of Home Affairs, is the responsible agency, and its officers, together with the extension officers of other “nation building” departments, assist and guide the work in the field. However, this programme is essentially based on local leaders rather than on a corps of paid village-level government workers. Approximately 7,000 “rural development societies” now cover the island—autonomous and democratic bodies whose main functions are to give their members a new form of social organization through which they can undertake activities for improving neighbourhood life. The tie to the overall national economic development effort is quite loose, and the direct bearing on increased production rather small. Some of the activities depend entirely on the societies’ own effort, some are based on sharing costs with the central authorities, and some (unlike usual aided self-help) are undertaken as local public works projects under contract with the agencies concerned. More than 3,000 women’s societies also operate actively in the villages of Ceylon, side by side with the rural development societies.
The programme in China differs from all others in the region and may perhaps with equal logic be considered either a form of community development or a variant system. The programme is strongly oriented towards promoting the economic activities of the rural communities on a business basis, the main agencies being “farmers’ associations” – 317 township associations (to which over 85 per cent of the island’s farmers population belong as members or associate members) organized into 22 hsien (country) associations and one provincial association. The farmers’ associations have had a long and varied history, reflecting the changing fortunes of the island. Their present functions include marketing, warehousing, processing of farm products, receiving deposits from and extending credit to members, purchase, processing and distribution of farm requisites and daily necessities, and provision of some of the island’s agricultural extension services. Though operated on a democratic and co-operative basis, the associations are organized mainly on government initiative and work under close government supervision and guidance, which includes training of the co-operative personnel. The method of financing their work also differs from that found in other community development programmes, as their agricultural extension activities are partly covered by charges on their members, and their administrative expenses largely by
operating profits and charges, especially for services entrusted to them by government.

The Philippines took up community development work seriously in 1954 by creating a Community Development Planning Council, and in 1956 established the present programme under the Presidential Assistant on Community Development (PACD). The latter was given broad authority to plan and implement the programme and develop co-operation from the other governmental services concerned. There had previously been in some provinces an active programme to develop community schools and use school teachers as general neighbourhood leaders. Of the new barrio (village) community development workers, more than 1,100 — most of them college graduates — were functioning in 6,300 of a total of nearly 25,700 barrios in April 1960. They are general-purpose workers who share the work at the village level to a much greater extent with their specialist team members from the technical departments of the Government than is possible in, for the example, India, with its greater scarcity of technicians. Particular attention is being given to the effort to build up co-operative attitudes through councils that provide representation to the various interested agencies at national, provincial, municipal and barrio levels, and to strengthening local government by training local leaders to fulfil their responsibilities under the
Barrio Charter, a law conferring statutory powers on barrios as from 1\textsuperscript{st} January 1960.

Burma has tried a variety of approaches at the same time. On the basis of legislation enacted in 1948, “mass education” teams have attempted various improvements in a few hundred selected localities. A full-scale community development pilot project was launched at \textit{pyidawtha} (“welfare state”) grants – for local public works – to divisional committees composed of officials and representatives of the people, a programme which resulted in considerable construction activity all over the country. In 1959, a plan was drawn up for an integrated community development programme, but its inauguration was delayed and existing activities were slowed down during national operations for the consolidation of law and order and pending a decision on which agency should administer the broader programme. It was subsequently decided that the Directorate of Social Welfare in the Ministry of Social Services and Religious Affairs, already previously in charge of mass education work, rather than the Ministry of Home Affairs, should have the responsibility.

In Nepal, a Village Development programme was launched in 1956. Dividing the country into 165 blocks, it aims to establish village and rural development centres in various parts of the country for the all-round
development of the local communities, and to achieve full coverage in twenty years altogether. Nineteen centres had been started by June 1959, and nearly one million persons in some 2,000 villages were reported to be involved in the programme’s activities, with the help of more than 600 trained workers. By a year later the coverage figures appear to have risen about 50 per cent.

Iran’s community development projects, which started early, have fluctuated considerably in scope. The Varamin Plains pilot project, begun in 1946 with assistance from the Near East Foundation, served as a model, although elaborated on a scale that made it not fully reproducible elsewhere. The country’s most extensive programme has rested essentially on placing a village worker in each of more than a hundred villages transferred to peasant occupiers under the land reforms, his duty being to facilitate the transition to peasant proprietorship, with access to credit as well as to advice and assistance on questions of livestock, agriculture, co-operatives and preventive medicine. Nearly 400 employees altogether were posted at county, township and village levels in March 1960.

Afghanistan, in an effort to change the social climate of its villages, has a small Rural Development programme which has expanded, in spite of a lack of trained personnel, from two villages in 1954 to 300 served by about 50 village-level workers and an equal number of subject matter
specialists in late 1959. It aims at covering 480 villages (out of some 24,000) and more than doubling the number of trained workers when the current plan period ends in September 1961, and at reaching 1.25 million people, or 16 per cent of the rural population, five years from that date.

Some of the region’s newest community development programme remain to be mentioned. Laos, like the Republic of Viet-Nam, established teams of civic action agents, of whom about 150 were functioning early in 1959. More recently, as the result of a reappraisal, a new plan for rural development beginning in four project areas has been formulated with special assistance from the United Nations.

Cambodia’s Ministry of Planning initiated, in 1959, a community development programme by establishing pilot projects in two provinces and broadening the other existing fundamental education projects. Co-ordination of activities is provided by the provincial governors, and is the responsibility at the national level of an interdepartmental committee under the auspices of the Ministry of Planning. A national training centre for community development workers, of whom some 300 professionals now serve the programme, functions under the Directorate of Fundamental Education in the Ministry of Education.
The Republic of Korea’s present programme, launched on a pilot basis in 1958 after a previous start in 1953, appears to have made a favourable beginning and grown quite rapidly. By the end of 1959, the programme had mustered 165 trained field workers, and it extended to 25 of the country’s 232 guns (counties).

The Federation of Malaya began in 1958 to offer grants to assist state community development projects. In states where this programme can be said to be functioning actively, state-appointed local officers at the sub-district level coordinate the various government extension services for the rural people. At the Federal level, the sponsoring Department of Community Development forms part of a newly establishing Ministry for Rural Development.

In Thailand, following earlier efforts by its Department of Public Welfare, the Ministry of Interior began in 1958 to train its deputy district officers to stimulate village committees to clean up the village and undertake self-help activities. Initially, 170 out of 1,000 deputy district officers were retrained as community development workers, with emphasis on the new attitudes required for such work, and more than 200 fundamental education officers were also trained by the Ministry of Education (in collaboration especially with UNESCO) were assigned to work under the
Ministry of the Interior. Most of the widely scattered projects were kept relatively of small size.

Similarly, the foundation for the Thailand Rural Reconstruction Movement (TRRM) was registered in 1967 and was accepted under Royal Patronage in 1969. Using the concept of rural reconstruction according to Dr. Y. C. James Yen, President of the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction, the work provides rural reconstruction workers (RRWS) to rural villages to help farmers improve their income, health, education, and to learn to become self-reliant. The RRWS began their work for TRRM on 1st May 1968. A group of 15 TRRM staff members was then sent for training for 3 months at the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction in Silang Cavite, Philippines.

Later, in September 1968, Chainat Province was chosen as the area of operation. Meanwhile, a survey of the villages and the selection of sites in the Sankhaburi District in which to establish the village centres, as well as an examination of the economic and social conditions of the area, were made and completed by December 1968. The RRWS were then sent out to work in the villages early in 1969, and the end of 1973 saw a completion of a 5-year operation between RRWS and the villagers.
However, the first 2 years were considered as a starting point of the operation, which were gradually expanded. In 1971 alone, 15 village centres were developed. Qualified workers in agriculture, education, health, and cooperatives were recruited and sent by TRRM to live in the villages to discover farmers' need and to act as leaders and coordinators to urge the farmers to change and improve their living conditions.

**Achievements:**

In Asian countries, which for more than forty years have had the widest experience with community development, certain discernible trends are under way. First, the programmes are stressing economic (including agricultural) goals more heavily than heretofore. Second, they are making greater use of local governments as the need for decentralization becomes more apparent. Third, the training of village-level workers is stressing the practical aspects (for instance, the actual grafting of fruit trees) as well as the theoretical aspects—a new educational departure for these countries. Fourth, new administrative arrangements are being devised to assure the coordination of subject-matter specialists in accomplishment of programmes aims. Undoubtedly, community development programmes do give village people a feeling of political involvement which they would otherwise not have; they have substantial material accomplishments (roads,
school, buildings, new plant varieties, etc.) to their credit. But the biggest gain, perhaps, lies not at the village level but in the better understanding of village problems by higher government officials. The programmes in Africa and Latin America are still too new to provide useful generalizations, expect to indicate that they exhibit wide variety in organizational procedures and types of problems attacked. Land reform tends to be associated with community development more than it was in Asia. In the developed countries community is increasingly being relied upon as a method for local improvements. Social workers, agricultural extension workers, public health educators are being trained in its techniques, and a few institutes have been set up to prepare specialists in community development as a special professional field.

**The future of community development:**

It has been observed that community development is still too young to justify any long-range predictions about its identity as a separate profession or its combination with some other field, such as public administration, agricultural extension, social work etc.

Like any emerging profession, it has begun to develop its applied theory, set forth chiefly in the form of principles of action that should be followed for effective practice. Since community development is so new,
each mature practitioner must perforce come out of some previously existing discipline or profession. This shows up in the lists of principles he sets down or passes on to its associates. Some stress the psychological overtones of motivation and group dynamics; others, the sociological caveats of recognizing social values and social structure; others, the administrative aspects of sound programming; and still others, the anthropological investment in cultural change, the educators’ concern with learning, or the specialists’ concern with appropriate technology.

There is not at the present time a body of tested theory on development. Nor do we know in any systematic way why some programmes succeed, by the developers’ standards, while other programmes fail. To date, this is a crucial test, existing training programmes do not draw upon any identifiable community development theory as such but rely almost entirely upon social – science generalizations developed quite apart from community development activities.