

MOBRAL

WORKING DRAFT

*Muito importante para o NEOBRAZ: a fazer a versão
ideal, e final*
25/10/78

IIEP/S48/11A
Paris, 6 October 1978
Original : English

INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR EDUCATIONAL PLANNING
(established by Unesco)
7-9, rue Eugène-Delacroix, 75016 Paris

BASIC EDUCATION FOR MEETING BASIC HUMAN
NEEDS OF THE RURAL POOR

by

Philip H. Coombs
ICED, USA

This document has been prepared for participants in the Seminar on
Long-Term Prospects for the Development of Education
to be held in Paris from 23 to 26 October 1978

MOBRAL — SEDOC

Setor de Documentação

Registro n.º 2210 F

Origem doação

Preço Cr\$ 100,00

Data 11/04/83 19 83


RUBRICA

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Characteristics of the rural poor	2
Virtues and limitations of the basic needs approach	4
Where education fits in to meeting basic human needs	7
Various ways of providing a rural basic education	12
Some organizational and planning implications	15
Summary and Conclusions	18

Recent writings on the "basic needs approach," which have proliferated rapidly, have paid surprisingly little attention to education. To be sure, they regularly inscribe Education (generally meaning primary schooling) on the standard list of basic needs of the world's poor, but there the matter ends. Rarely is there any recognition of the urgent learning needs of out-of-school youth and adults, or of the fact that appropriate learning components are needed within virtually every kind of program for meeting the various basic needs of poorer people in developing countries.

Equally surprising, the prolific recent writings on "basic education" have, in reverse, largely ignored basic human needs, except to regard education as clearly one of the most important. Here again, however, "basic education" is frequently confused with primary schooling and the important learning needs of out-of-school youths and adults are ignored.

It is high time, I suggest, to bring these twin concepts of basic needs and basic education together, for either without the other makes little sense. It is also time to clarify the differences between primary schooling and the kinds of "basic education" required (in conjunction with other factors) to help poverty-stricken people of all ages to meet their basic needs.

This paper attempts to shed some light on these matters. It focuses mainly on the rural poor in the developing world because they comprise the great majority of all the poor and because it was the growing concern over their plight that gave birth to the basic needs approach. Much that is said here, however, also applies to the urban poor, for they are largely

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

an extension of the rural poverty situation.

My remarks, I should also explain, will be strongly influenced by the evidence, impressions, and general observations about rural people and rural development that my ICED colleagues and I have accumulated over the past several years doing on-the-spot analytical case studies of a wide assortment of rural projects and programs. These programs are located in over two dozen countries spread across all of the major developing regions. They range in subject from agriculture and rural industry to health, family planning, and special activities for women and out-of-school youth.

Against this background I shall view rural development and the needs of the rural poor from the grass roots level looking up rather than from the national or international level looking down. Things look very different from this local vantage point than from on high, and the difference shakes whatever faith one may once have had in tidy national plans, finely-honed project designs and those bewitching quantitative models that forecast the future. One soon discovers, for example, that some of the rural projects that looked so good on paper and were considered "success cases" back at headquarters are in fact having little or no beneficial impact on the lives of local people, especially the poorest. Occasionally, however, one also runs into a project or program that is yielding useful results, but not of the kind intended. I offer this explanation at the outset because some of my later statements may seem at odds with the conventional wisdom expressed in international policy papers and seminars.

Characteristics of the Rural Poor

At the risk of repeating the obvious it may be useful to begin with a few pertinent facts about the rural poor. It has been estimated that out of more than 1,800 million people in the developing world in 1972 about

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

1,200 million--or two out of every three--could be classified as "seriously poor," and of these roughly 700 million--or one out of every three in the total population--were downright "destitute." They are living (if it can be called living) in what Robert McNamara dubbed absolute poverty, eking out a bare subsistence from day to day under sub-human conditions on the ragged edge of sheer survival. Their absolute number is said to have doubled between 1960 and 1972.

These destitute people are heavily concentrated in South and Southeast Asia but other developing regions have their share. There are considerable variations, of course, among individual countries. The great bulk, as earlier noted, live in rural areas, either with no land of their own at all or with too little to feed themselves. It is their children who are concealed behind those shockingly high statistics of non-schoolgoers and early drop-outs found in so many rural areas. On the average school day one finds them out scavenging for spilled grain or scraps to help keep the family alive, or cleaning a more affluent neighbor's house to earn a meagre dish of rice for lunch, or at home tending younger siblings while the mother works. Disease and malnutrition are written all over their little bodies. For them four years of primary schooling, and for their parents the idea of becoming literate, is an irrelevant and impossible dream.

These families are the most vulnerable to natural or manmade disasters. When the radio reported recently that thousands of people had been swept away by a monsoon flood in India, other thousands buried alive by an earthquake in Iran, and several hundred civilian by-standers shot up in a political revolt in Nicaragua, one could be almost certain that the bulk of these tragic victims were from the destitute group. It is important to note that within this group the women and young children are the most vulnerable; they carry a disproportionate share of the burdens and penalties of poverty.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

No elaborate social science survey and computer run are required to ascertain the "basic needs" of these people. They are, in the first instance, the most rudimentary essentials for physical survival: enough nutritious food and safe water to keep alive; protection against crippling and killer diseases; minimal maternal and child care; family planning services; shelter against the harsh elements; and, central to all of these, an opportunity to earn a minimal family income. As will be shown later, appropriate education is an essential requirement for meeting each of these survival needs. Despite conventional doctrine, however, literacy is not the first among these educational needs (though it may become important later after the initial survival needs have been met).

Stamps

There are many popular myths about villages and villagers, even among educated people who operate rural services. One of the most common is that they are essentially all alike; thus what is appropriate for one village or rural family is appropriate for all. Another myth is that illiterate rural people who have not been to school are ignorant and don't know their own best interests; hence they must be treated like children and told what is good for them. A third myth is that poor rural people are inherently lazy, if they had any spunk or drive they would not be poor. History testifies that rural programs built on these false premises are bound to falter, as a great many have.

Stamps

Virtues and Limitations of the Basic Needs Approach

The basic needs approach is offered as a solution, or at least partial solution, to the conditions of extreme poverty described above. How valid and workable a solution is it? In commenting on this question I hope not to become embroiled in the confusing and increasingly esoteric debate over what the basic needs approach really is or ought to be and whether it is

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

sound or unsound, humanistically motivated or a capitalistic plot, or just another fashionable piece of international rhetoric that no one really intends to implement.

To me the prime virtue of this basic needs idea is that it starts where any good development strategy ought to start--with the condition, needs, and aspirations of the people themselves, not with an abstract and dehumanized quantitative model. Further, it abandons the old trickle-down theory that never really worked and calls instead for a direct and pointed attack on the roots of poverty. It also stirs up fresh thinking in all sorts of places and challenges those who disagree to come up with a better idea.

The basic needs approach as presented to date, however, is like a compass that points in the right direction but offers no roadmap on how to get there. This is the heart of the problem. Anyone attempting to draw such a roadmap will do well, I suggest, to consider the following point.

First, the basic needs approach is clearly not a total development strategy in itself (nor was it ever intended to be by its initial architects). The overall strategy of which it is but one part must provide not only for more equitable distribution (implicit in the basic needs approach) but also for steady and substantial economic growth. Redistribution alone, even if it were politically and administratively feasible, could only result in a broader sharing of misery. There must be more produced to distribute.

Second, and I make this point because some educators are apparently hesitant on this score, I fail to see as a one time student of economics any inherent conflict between a concerted effort by developing countries to alleviate domestic poverty through a basic needs approach, and parallel efforts to improve their trading position through some sort of "new inter-

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

national economic order." Logically the two efforts should be entirely complementary and mutually reinforcing. Improved trade arrangements could fuel the economic growth essential to making a real dent on widespread poverty. But accelerated economic growth without a simultaneous attack on domestic poverty and inequality would simply perpetuate and enlarge the existing lopsided pattern of income distribution. The issue, it seems, finally comes down to whose ox is being gored and whose nest is being feathered.

Third, the basic needs approach can never be successful as a cut-and-dried formula, which is the risk it runs in the hands of international econometricians. It must be flexibly adapted not only to differences among countries but to differences among areas within countries and, most important, among various subgroups within the same rural community. The record is replete with instances in which the agricultural production and income of a particular rural area increased dramatically, yet the poorest members ended up no better off than before--or even worse off, as when many subsistence farm families in Asia became landless during the Green Revolution. International and national planners remote from all these local diversities are prone to fix global norms, targets, and time schedules, to envisage neat and uniform administrative structures (running always from the top-down) and to create standardized packages, messages, and instructional materials intended to fit all people in all situations. But if the experience with rural development over the past 20 years teaches anything, it is that this excessive passion for quantification, standardization and a top-down approach is self-deceiving and counter-productive.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

My final observation is that this laudable goal of helping the world's poor to escape from the throes of absolute poverty is by far the most complex and difficult international development goal yet to be tackled. The plain truth, seen from the grass roots level, is that nobody yet really knows very much about how to implement it (though there are many useful ideas emerging). The best and probably only way to learn how to do it is to examine critically the practical experiences of selected rural programs that have useful lessons to teach, both positive and negative (the latter often being the most important). But major funding and operational agencies have seriously neglected this opportunity to learn important lessons of experience, always being so preoccupied with the next crop of projects to have time to learn useful lessons from the old ones. This, incidentally, has been the basic purpose of the ICED case studies mentioned earlier, but a far wider effort along these lines is needed.

The main point here, however, is that making sizeable gains toward the goal of uplifting the rural poor will inevitably require tremendous and persistent effort by many parties over many years. It will also involve many uncomfortable changes from top to bottom in existing perceptions, attitudes, structures, and behavior. Therefore it is extremely important not to underestimate these complexities and the obstacles and resistances bound to be encountered, and not to set unrealistic targets for the Year 2000 or any other year that will raise false hopes and inevitably end in disillusionment.. There has been enough experience with such unrealistic targets before, including educational targets, to justify repeating the same mistakes.

Where Education Fits in to Meeting
Basic Human Needs

Let us move directly now to the central topic of this paper: how

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

and where education fits into the basic needs approach.

To talk sense about education--especially "basic education"--in this context, the first essential is to liberate one's mind from all the conventional forms and rituals of formal schooling that becloud one's vision. In place of a narrow institutional view of education which, for example, equates "basic education" with four years or more of primary schooling, one must start with a much broader functional view that equates education with a wide diversity of learnings that rural people require, all during their life, to meet their basic needs and to get ahead. Certain of these essential kinds of learning, to be sure, can be acquired in school or in various types of nonformal school-equivalency programs, but for the most part they must be acquired in other ways. Seen in this broader perspective, education is a dynamic, cumulative life-long process applying to all people regardless of age, sex, or station in life.

To say this is not to denigrate the importance of formal primary schooling. It is simply to recognize that these schools by their very nature are best suited to providing only certain types of learning for young people, especially the "3-Rs," but they are clearly not designed to serve the full spectrum of essential learning needs either of children or of teenagers and adults. Schools are not all-purpose weapons and were never meant to be. They should be encouraged and helped to do better what they are capable of doing. But they should not be over-loaded with additional inappropriate tasks or else they will end up doing nothing well.

Two further hard realities must be reckoned with in considering rural primary schooling in the poorest developing countries. One concerns its availability, the other its "fitness." Almost without exception these poorer countries have been making valiant efforts and sacrifices over the

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

past 20 years to expand access to schooling with the goal of achieving universal primary education by the early or mid-1980s. Yet today the great majority of their rural school-age children and youth are still not in school and Unesco predicts an increase in the number of out-of-schoolers by 1985. Despite the much rosier impression conveyed by published national statistics of enrolments and participation rates, it is not unusual today to find only 10 percent of the children in a rural area (fewer of the girls) completing the primary cycle, and only one or two out of ten of these completers continuing on to secondary school. Considering the present severe strain on the national budgets of low income countries, the high percentage of the total budget already going to education, the modest economic growth rates of these countries, and the race their primary schools are having against high birth rates simply to keep present pupil participation rates from falling, not to mention other equally incorrigible factors that are keeping the poorest rural youngsters out of school, it is plainly unrealistic to suppose that universal schooling in their rural areas can be even within shooting distance by the end of this century.

Even if it could be, however, what then? Most observers agree that these urban-oriented rural primary schools are ill-suited to the realistic life prospects and needs of most rural children. They benefit primarily a small minority lucky enough to escape their village and climb further up the academic ladder with a fair chance of landing a modern type job in the city. Meanwhile their peers who stay behind are left with a frustrating sense of failure.

This is not to suggest that there is no room or hope for improving and reforming rural primary education to make it more functionally relevant to rural life. But it must be kept in mind that the children of the most

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

destitute rural families are always last in the queue to get into school, and generally the first to drop out. Hence a future strategy of expanding and improving rural primary schools in the name of improving the chances of the poorest of the poor could prove to be nothing more than another go at the old trickle-down approach.

The pertinent question here, however, is not whether and how soon four years or more of primary schooling can become a reality for the poorest rural children, but whether this can be realistically considered an adequate "basic education" to meet their basic needs. Quite clearly it cannot. A few years of primary schooling that is well adapted to the local needs and circumstances can certainly help but it is certainly far from sufficient, as will be seen when one examines the ubiquitous role of learning in the process of rural development.

By its very nature rural development requires extensive changes in the attitudes and behavior of the rural people themselves--changes in their methods of farming and other work, in their dietary and health practices, in family and community relationships, and in a host of other respects. The fundamental role of education--viewed broadly as learning--is to provide rural people with new insights into their own life and circumstances and with a wide range of new knowledge and skills that will encourage and enable them to accept and adopt various changes when they can see for themselves that it is in their own interest to do so. Contrary to the tacit assumption of many extension programs, rural people do not abandon their customary practices in favor of new ones simply because some visiting expert or "message" from the center tells them it would be good for them. They have been burned too often with bad advice and confused by conflicting advice.

Any program that has the goal of helping rural families to improve

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

their condition--whether its focus is on agriculture, rural industry, health care, family planning, raising the status of women or some combination of these--is an educational program. Different kinds of knowledge, skills, and information must be disseminated to various groups in such a program, including both the participant-beneficiaries themselves and the various categories of workers involved in operating the program. Technical skills and knowledge is not all they need. They must also learn to build and participate in local institutions that carry out the development activities. Most basic of all, the poorest families who have been sitting fatalistically on the sidelines looking in from the outside must acquire a new awareness of the roots of their problems, the possibilities for change, and what they can do themselves to help bring about such change. In short, an educational approach needs to permeate all the activities of a rural development effort because an effective development program is in itself an educational experience in the truest and broadest sense.

Consider as just one example the wide variety of things the members of a poor rural family must learn and the many new practices they must adopt in order to protect and improve their health. The typical list might include: a variety of new sanitary practices; new methods of maternal and infant care; preventive measures against common diseases; new methods of food preservation and preparation; changes in the customary family diet (particularly for pregnant or lactating mothers and infants and young children); growing new types of nutritious foods to improve the family diet; adoption of family planning to regulate the spacing of new births and the size of the family. A similar list could be made with respect to other basic needs of poor rural families.

No single institution, fixed curriculum or standard set of pedagogical

11/1/55

PES

11/1/55

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

methods could possibly serve all of these different learning needs and clienteles, ranging from young children to elderly adults and shifting constantly as local development gains momentum. An examination of the variety of educational activities in a broad sample of rural situations reveals the wide range of alternative educational approaches available and their respective strengths and limitations.

Various Ways of Providing A Rural Basic Education

There is not space here to go into the great variety of possible ways to provide or acquire the diversified basic education that rural people require to meet their basic human needs but a few general observations may be helpful.

First, these kinds of knowledge are generally best learned when the learning is directly tied to immediate life concerns and to actions that use the knowledge. Knowledge presented in abstract form in a classroom-like setting detached from real life is least likely to sink in, especially for learners who are unaccustomed to classroom learning and to dealing in intellectual abstractions. The discussion method centering on live problems in their home or community which the participants themselves identify and explore is almost invariably more effective than the lecture method where a teacher or instructor "tells them." Such discussions and other local learning processes, of course, must be fertilized and enriched with new kinds of knowledge coming into the community from the outside.

"Core" (local)

"Keo mai" (outside)

This is where various visitors from the outside such as extension agents and relatives returning from the city, and various communications media such as posters, films, broadcasts, bulletins, and simple newspapers can play an important role, provided they are well programmed and tailored to the interests, needs and learning styles of the particular audience.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

Broadcasts from the city by a learned expert on nutrition, or new rice varieties or family planning generally go right past the villagers without leaving a trace. But well conceived broadcasts can have a sizeable impact and enrich the local "learning environment."

A second point, often overlooked, concerns the differentiation of audiences within the same community. For some purposes an educational effort may appropriately be directed at the whole community, such as a program aimed at acquainting the rural people in one part of the country with the folk-tales, music and arts of another part. But for many purposes the effort must be tailored to the special circumstances, needs and interests of a smaller, more homogeneous sub-group--such as out-of-school boys or girls from poorer homes, marginal farmers, destitute widows, young married couples, or indigent leather workers or similar special occupational groups in distress. An agricultural extension program geared to the technical and economic capabilities of larger commercial farmers in the area will not fit the needs and feasibilities of small subsistence farmers; they need a quite different approach.

Third, much of this learning does not have to be (and indeed cannot be) provided by professional instructors or discreet educational courses or programs. Much of it is done--and often best done--in conjunction with their other activities by various workers in a program who may not even think of themselves as teachers. The local health worker and midwife, for example, can perform very important and continuous educational functions during their household rounds and their consultations in the local clinic. They too, of course, require special training in order to perform their duties effectively, and there are also many alternative ways for these "program operators" to acquire the knowledge and skills and attitudes they need to do

Perfecto

7mo
mes

a good job. Incidentally, two week intensive training courses at some urban center far from the scene of their future work is one of the most popular methods but often the least effective. Villages also have their own built-in "teachers" who can spread skills and knowledge--the more progressive farmers (often not the largest ones), the blacksmith, carpenter, stonemason and tailor, and the old man who can recite local history. All these educational resources, however, are best used when they are mobilized within the framework of a locally organized and dynamic community-wide development effort.

PETRA

Fourth, ICED's observations in various developing countries indicate that programs bearing the label "adult education" are frequently not addressed to the kinds of basic learning needs of poor rural adults discussed above, though there are numerous exceptions, particularly involving voluntary organizations. The bulk of adult education programs, especially those sponsored by ministries of education, turn out to be mainly literacy classes whose appeal to the poorest rural adults is low and whose record of success even with less poor adults is generally disappointing. The basic learning needs of rural adults are actually more extensively served by programs and activities that bear no "education" label but nevertheless contain significant educational components.

Certs

From this brief description of the diverse roles that education must play in rural development it should be clear that education is not a separate "sector" but rather an essential common ingredient that nourishes and invigorates every sort of development activity in all sectors. There is no surer way to divorce education from the mainstream of development and to subject it to charges of irrelevancy and ineffectiveness than to treat it as a separate sector unto itself, owned and operated by "education specialists." In the process of rural development everyone sooner or later becomes both a teacher and a learner.

Impresiones
de la
Educación

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

Some Organizational and Planning Implications

The kind of local rural development process we have envisaged here clearly cannot be planned in detail in the capital or administered simply from the top down. Nor can the great variety of educational activities described above be made to conform to any preconceived overall educational plan. They have to be largely pragmatic responses to various perceived needs and opportunities that surface as the development process unfolds. Although the ways and approaches to implanting the educational ingredients in the development program have to be considered at the stage of conceptualizing and planning the program, no educational master plan constructed before the event can possibly anticipate all the learning needs and opportunities that may eventually arise.

General nationwide planning at the national level will remain essential in order to assess broad requirements and the feasibilities of various alternative strategies and to set general priorities and budgetary allocations. Similarly, appropriate central management services and guidance will be needed. But in contrast to the prevailing situation in most developing countries/ where most of the reins are tightly held at the top, there must be a progressively greater decentralization of planning, management, and true decisionmaking functions to lower echelons and reaching right into the local communities themselves.

The practical choice is not between a purely top-down or purely bottom-up system for neither by itself could work effectively. What is called for is a new synthesis between the two in which much more initiative is taken by the community and/central government agencies in which the change their conventional directive role into a facilitating role. When this happy state is reached (and it will obviously take much longer in some situations than others) the chief functions of government agencies and agents will not be to tell the local people what they must do and how they must do it in accordance with preconceived plans,

Emm for the 1984 dec. but pm - 1/17/85 (17/05/85) (17/05/85)

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

directives and messages from on high; rather their main roles will be:

(1) to stimulate local development institutions and initiatives; (2) to provide realistic advice, guidance and technical assistance as needed, including information about appropriate new technologies, training and backstopping of local development workers, and provision of essential health supplies and agricultural inputs; (3) to respond promptly to reasonable requests to break specific local bottlenecks beyond the community's own capacity; (4) to help communities to evaluate and improve their own development efforts; and (5) cutting across all of these, to provide a continuous supply of new knowledge and skills that will develop and enrich each community's human resources and capacity for self-help.

E O
Prodac!

A further important function will be to prod the local elite and power structure where necessary into including the poorest members of the community in all development activities and benefits, even to the point at times of discriminating in their favor. For in a great many rural communities the local elites may be far less committed to helping their poorer brethren than the political leadership at the national level. And in those countries, of course, where the national leadership itself is not seriously committed to improving the lot of the poorest sectors of the population, widespread basic education and the basic needs approach will in all probability have to await a better day.

Finally, when considering the diverse educational elements required to support a basic needs approach it is useful to envisage the gradual building up of a flexible network of educational options and opportunities for all members of rural communities. Such a network must inevitably include a combination and great variety of informal, formal and nonformal educational provisions and various hybrids of these different modes. Some learning

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

provisions will stand separately as distinct educational activities while many others will be integral elements of various development programs.

The basic function of educational planners in this context will be to guide and encourage the evolution of such a network, giving it as much coherence and relevance to evolving learning needs as possible yet without trying to prescribe and manage it in detail. This will be a much more operationally oriented kind of planning than prevails today and will require educational planners to work in close partnership with program operators and planners in other areas.

Primary and secondary schools, reinforced by higher educational institutions, can and must play a key role in this diversified rural learning network. But to do so they must become less urban and more rural oriented and they must aim to prepare their pupils for more effective rural lives and not simply for getting into secondary school and migrating to the city (and it should be possible to provide both types of preparation simultaneously in order to serve all young people equitably). They must also adapt their schedules, curriculum and teaching methods to the practical life necessities of their clients. For higher education to provide strong support not only for the rural learning network but for the overall basic needs approach and overall social and economic change in rural areas, there is strong need to create broad-gauged "rural development colleges and universities" which, unlike most present higher institutions, will concentrate their research activities on solving rural problems and needs of all kinds (not just agriculture) and their instructional activities on developing the human resources needed for authentic rural development. Institutions with faculties seriously dedicated to these purposes could be highly innovative and extremely stimulating places to work and study.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

Summary and Conclusions

This paper has attempted to clarify and knit together the concepts of "basic education" and the "basic needs approach" by viewing them in the broader context of overall rural development and from the perspective of the village level rather than the national or international level. The general picture sketched has necessarily been impressionistic, but several important conclusions emerge.

(1) The basic needs of the rural poor cannot be met in isolation. They can only be met through a broad process of social, economic and political change affecting the entire population of a rural area and linking it more closely to urban areas and to the overall national development process. However, rural development can occur without the poorest families being included, as has already happened in some areas. For the poor to participate equitably, as both contributors and beneficiaries, will generally require special efforts in their behalf within the framework of the broader process.

(2) Rural development in the fullest sense must be achieved primarily through the initiatives of the rural people themselves, acting both individually and collectively through their own local institutions, beginning with the family. Government and other outside agencies nevertheless have vital roles to play, particularly in stimulating, supporting and backstopping local initiatives; in providing prompt help when needed to break local bottlenecks; and in seeing to it that the most disadvantaged and politically voiceless people get fair treatment in their community.

(3) To bring about a more effective partnership for rural development between national governments and rural communities will require far-reaching and difficult changes in existing bureaucratic structures and styles as well as the strengthening of rural communities, organizationally and politically,

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

so that they can help themselves and obtain and use more effectively appropriate help from the outside. What is required in essence is the replacement of the present fragmented, top-down approach by a battery of official development agencies at the center with a new synthesis between a top-down and bottom-up approach in which government agencies assume a facilitating rather than a directive stance and local communities are given a major voice in their own future and challenged to exert themselves to win a better future.

(4) Viewed in this broad perspective the educational requirements for successfully meeting the basic needs of the rural poor (interpreting education broadly as learning and not simply schooling) are extremely diverse in character and enormous in the aggregate. If rural areas are to change and develop then the rural people themselves must change and develop in a great variety of ways. For this they must first see themselves and their surroundings in a fresh light and appreciate their own inherent power to improve their circumstances. In addition they must constantly learn new things--things that cut across all the conventional "sectors" such as agriculture, rural industry, health and family planning and that will encourage them to alter their perceptions, aspirations and behavior in numerous ways. Looked at in this light education is clearly not one more separate "sector" but rather a vital lubricant and source of nourishment for all types of development efforts in all sectors.

(5) Viewed in this perspective it is also clear that a primary school education, even if all rural children including the poorest could secure one in the foreseeable future (which is highly doubtful), cannot realistically be equated with the kind of "basic education" required to meet the basic life needs of rural people. It can contribute significantly (provided the present conventional model is appropriately reformed and

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

reoriented), especially by equipping children with rudimentary knowledge and intellectual skills that can help them later to acquire other essential skills and knowledge. But to lose sight of the equally large and urgent learning needs of the masses of out-of-school rural youth and of the adults who also have important learning needs would result in a very lopsided and counter-productive educational strategy.

(6) What is needed in the long run and what should be started now is a flexible network of highly diverse learning provisions that can serve the whole rural population--children, youth and adults alike--and provide each individual, family and special group with pertinent options to satisfy their ever evolving learning needs, interests and circumstances. Formal education at all levels has strategic roles to play in this network, but it is no substitute for the network. Most of what rural (or any other) people will need or want to learn must be learned outside the structure of the formal system--through organized discreet nonformal education programs of many sorts, through nonformal learning components incorporated within various development programs and, most important of all, informally through their daily experiences and the educative influences all about them.

(7) The kinds of educational activities and the kind of community-based rural development envisaged here cannot be prescribed in detailed master plans conceived in advance, though they will benefit much from a clear framework of forceful policies and strategies. They must evolve pragmatically in response to opportunities and needs as they arise and in adjustment to changing circumstances. Planners in this type of context will deal far less with their quantitative models and projections and far more with operator/implementers of every variety. Their task will be not simply to plan targets but to plan and facilitate their practical implementation.

BASIC HUMAN NEEDS OF RURAL POOR

(8) Finally, we should have no illusions about the many years it will take to get from here to there and the innumerable obstacles and difficulties that will have to be overcome along the way. For this noble and humanistic goal of helping the world's rural poor to pull themselves up by the bootstraps is by all odds the most complex and difficult--and indeed the most heroic--international and national development goal ever articulated. The sooner we all climb down from the heights and tackle the practical problems of implementing it, the sooner significant progress can be made toward achieving this goal.