(G
BOOK NUMBER
Dp/LG481.G5
In1
Africana Par.

THE ROLE OF EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING SOCIETIES

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA LIBRARY

AN INAUGURAL LECTURE
DELIVERED IN THE
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF GHANA
ON 15 FEBRUARY 1961
BY

ADAM CURLE

GHANA UNIVERSITY PRESS · 1961

THE
ROLE OF EDUCATION IN DEVELOPING SOCIETIES

An Inaugural Lecture
delivered in the University College of Ghana
on 15 February 1961

BY

ADAM CURLE
Professor of Education

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA LIBRARY

GHANA UNIVERSITY PRESS
1961

Oxford University Press, Amen House, London E.C.4
GLASGOW NEW YORK TORONTO MELBOURNE WELLINGTON
BOMBAY CALCUTTA MADRAS KARACHI LAHORE DACCA
CAPE TOWN SALISBURY NAIROBI IBADAN ACCRA
KUALA LUMPUR HONG KONG

Distributed in Ghana by the University of Accra

Distributed throughout the rest of the world by
Oxford University Press

© *Ghana University Press 1961*

G98356

DP/LG481.G5 IN1
Africana

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN

I

My predecessor, Professor L. J. Lewis, gave in 1956 an open lecture, which was informed by both scholarship and realistically applied experience, on 'Education and Social Growth'.[1] I propose to discuss a cognate topic. I approach this task in some trepidation, since I cannot hope to emulate his competence. Yet I am emboldened that forays into this field have been, as it were, sanctioned by the doyen of educational studies in this University College. I should hasten to add that this description of Professor Lewis, though correct in its implication of respected wisdom, is inaccurate in the covert suggestion of dotage. Happily, Professor Lewis, as most of us know, is still young and active. Though he has left Africa he has merely withdrawn to a more strategic position—the Chair in Education in Tropical Areas at the London University Institute of Education—from which to deploy the fruits of his wisdom over a larger part of the earth's surface. This is more than fortunate for Ghana as it is for many other countries. It is even fortunate for you tonight, for the knowledge that John Lewis may take an interest in the second of a series of lectures initiated by himself has made me particularly keen to avoid, so far as possible, talking nonsense.

I have chosen to discuss this topic because I believe it is of the utmost importance to the world. The development of the currently under-developed areas is almost as vital to our safety and survival as is disarmament. At a more local level, I believe it is of significance to Ghana that these subjects should be studied intensively, if only because so many less developed countries look to her for guidance. For my part, I shall be satisfied if I can stimulate anyone to think of the relationship of education and development.

---

[1] L. J. Lewis, *Education and Social Growth*. An open lecture delivered in Legon Hall on 12 Nov., 1956. Printed by Thomas Nelson and Sons for the University College of (the Gold Coast) Ghana.

I propose to begin with an account of the sociological elements which contribute to under-development, and shall point out that it is not usually the absence of resources which makes for poverty but a failure—largely attributable to social causes—to develop them. I should admit at this early stage that it is extremely presumptuous to generalize about social forces in those countries containing the majority of the world's population which, because of their poverty and technical backwardness, are generally termed under-developed.[1] Nevertheless, admitting the extreme variations of culture, history, climate, and ecology, the economic problems of the majority are comparable—hence the growing and respectable literature of development economics. And when the economic problems are similar, so may be elements of the social situations out of which they arise. I shall suggest the nature of some of these basic elements, emphasizing now that their occurrence in different societies does not necessarily mean that those societies are in other ways similar.

I go on to claim that education is the master key for development, but that in an under-developed country it is subject to the same difficulties as anything else. I should say here that I use the word 'education' fairly loosely throughout. Normally I mean the structure of schools and universities with its associated administrative system, but I include the broadly educative influence of the community development movement, and indeed anything else which stimulates thought and creative effort.

I next discuss means of promoting educational growth, and refer to some of the qualities which an educational system in an under-developed country might possess. The focus then changes to the content of more general social growth through community development. I suggest that two elements appear to be commonly related—though not necessarily causally—in situations where development is progressing satisfactorily: these are a well-developed educational system; and egalitarian policies, normally expressed through democratic administrative machinery. Finally I shall attempt to evaluate the role of education in development.

---

[1] The United Nations classifies as under-developed: Africa, Central America and the Caribbean, tropical South America, Asia (other than Japan and Asiatic U.S.S.R.), and the Pacific Islands. The population of these areas is calculated as 65·5 per cent. of the world's inhabitants, and it is also calculated that by the year 2000 it will have risen to 76·3 per cent. *Report by the Director General*, International Labour Office: Geneva, 1959. U.N. Document E/3245.

II

The middle of the twentieth century is notable for what Gunnar Myrdal called the 'Great Awakening'.[1] This is the dual drive towards national independence and economic development. Among the economically established nations too there has been an awakening, an awakening of awareness, of conscience even, that so many peoples of the world are still suffering the direst effects of poverty; and an awakening of understanding that this could be a source of danger to themselves. Thus altruism, self-interest, and fear are subtly blended, following the general tendency for human motives to be mixed, in the efforts of the richer countries to help the poor ones.

It is not always easy for us to recognize the scale of world poverty. Approximately two-thirds of the population of the world lives in countries, rated by the United Nations as under-developed, where the *per capita* income is less than one-fifteenth that of the average for the remaining third.[2] It would not be so serious if this statement simply meant that the under-developed countries were poorer than the rest. We might then reasonably assume that with modern techniques of production, and with the aid which is poured into them from external sources, they would soon catch up.

But the under-developed countries are under-developed—if I may indulge in a circular argument—because they have not been able to develop themselves. They are not simply less prosperous models of the wealthy nations, for there are embedded in their structure factors which make for inertia and even retrogression. Since the end of the Second World War the average income in many countries has actually diminished, while in the great majority of those where it has increased, it has not done so to anything like the extent that it has done in the countries of North America, Australasia, and Western Europe. The gap between the rich and the poor, the haves and the have-nots, despite all the efforts of the World Bank, the Colombo Plan, and comparable organizations, is becoming steadily wider. This is a matter of concern for the whole world.

---

[1] Gunnar Myrdal, *Economic Theory and the Under-developed Regions*, London: Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1957, pp. 7–8.

[2] 'Well known statistics for 1949 compiled by the Statistical Office of the United Nations suggest that about two-thirds of the population of the world lived in countries which together produced less than one-sixth of the income of the world. Average income per head in these countries was about 50 dollars as compared with an average of over 900 dollars in the remaining group of the richest countries.' P. T. Bauer and B. S. Yamey, *The Economics of Under-developed Countries*, London: James Nisbet & Co. Ltd. and University Press, 1957, p. 3. (The figures referred to are contained in *National and Per Capita Incomes in 70 Countries, 1949*, Statistical Office of the United Nations, New York, 1950.)

(Let me observe in parenthesis that relative standards are as important for the preservation of harmony as absolute ones. If *A* is the richest man in the community with £1,000 a year, and *B* has £900, *B* will feel relatively affluent and fairly well satisfied. But if *A*'s salary is increased to £3,000 and *B*'s to £1,500, *B* will soon feel both impoverished and resentful towards *A*.)

The fact that it is far easier to apply measures reducing the death-rate than those which increase the production of food or goods, forces open the gap between the rich nations and the poor ones. Whereas changes leading to greater production would normally be associated eventually with reduced fertility, a simple lessening of mortality through vaccination campaigns, spraying, or improved water supply, leaves intact most of the social and psychological factors which lead to uncontrolled breeding.[1] It is, of course, obvious that if countries in which occurs this population explosion are to increase their standards of living, they should invest relatively more than the wealthier countries. But generally their rate of capital formation and of investment is considerably less. The answer to the population problem is, naturally, not less development but more—and as quickly as possible—so that the technical catches up with the medical and we have relatively higher production to balance against the relatively fewer births expected in the more advanced communities.[2]

---

[1] It should be emphasized, however, that measures of this type alone by no means guarantee a high level of health.

[2] This may be exemplified by the projection of existing trends contained in *The Future Growth of World Population*. Population studies, ST/SOA/Series A/28, United Nations, New York, 1958. This suggests that while the population of Western Europe will only have increased by about one-third between 1950 and 2000, that of Africa and of most of Asia will have tripled, and that of Central and tropical South America will have quadrupled.

What I have just said could be interpreted as implying that mortality has been sufficiently, if not excessively, reduced. This in my opinion is not so. An Indian baby at birth can still only anticipate living to the age of about thirty as against one in, say, New Zealand, whose life expectancy is approximately seventy years.[1] Development is for nothing if it is not for people, and the essential, irreducible requirement of people is life. It does not matter much what is done for them if they are not alive to enjoy it. Consequently I take it as a basic postulate that the principal objective of development is to create conditions in which people live longer. This, of course, has many implications, for these conditions are also those in which human beings are healthier and more productive of everything except their own kind.

III

We must now turn to scan some of the structural elements of under-developed societies, those which nourish what Myrdal refers to as the 'tradition of stagnation which has entrenched itself in their entire culture'.[2]

It is a sad fact that, once the process of development starts in one sector of a society, the inequalities within that society tend to increase, just as do the inequalities between the complete society and those which are more highly developed. Trade, labour, and enterprise are apt to move towards the progressive areas, leaving the poor zones still poorer, and by so doing saddling the country with problem areas which defy attempts at development, and eventually retard national growth as a whole.[3] This economic stratification could be shown to be related to the other forms of stratification. In the first place tribalism, regionalism, the power of the landlord, and even the intense solidarity of the large family group militate against the development and efficiency of the national administration, and of organizations national in scope through which alone major developments can be brought about. I hasten to add that these more local loyalties and community affiliations are of the greatest value when there is no stable central body caring for the safety and well-being of individuals. In many societies the family can be a miniature welfare state in which no individual suffers from want unless all do. But these ties, strengthened as they are by personal sentiments and social sanctions, draw support away from the passionless and impersonal organizations of the state, save in so far as they can be diverted to the service of a particular family, tribe, or province. Another form of stratification is that of class or caste. Most under-developed countries are under-developed because they constitute, or until recently constituted, strictly differentiated societies in which there was little mobility and little leavening of the old *élite* with new talent. (Often there was not only a stratification of the local population, but also an additional layer on top composed of representatives of a colonial power.) In such societies, where not only positions of authority but also humble occupations were frequently hereditary, the concept of social mobility was as strange to the lower strata of society as it was distasteful to the upper. Who would imagine even in the India of today that an Untouchable could become President?

---

[1] Of course the relationship of life expectation to development is highly complex, but in general we may accept the tentative view of W. S. and E. S. Woytinski, *World Population and Production*, New York: The Twentieth Century Fund, 1953, pp. 182–3: 'If social progress is measured by assuring a child a chance to live out on full life span, some of the least developed countries appear to be half a century behind the United States, others a full century.'

[2] Gunnar Myrdal, op. cit., p. 5.

[3] This situation is analysed, so far as Europe is concerned, in 'Problems of Regional Development and Industrial Location in Europe', *Economic Survey of Europe in 1954*, Geneva: United Nations, 1955, pp. 136 ff. It is tellingly illustrated in Ghana by the reduction in the number of northerners who were trained as teachers in the Northern Region by over 60 per cent. between 1958 and 1960.

Some of the old patterns of domination have now been broken. The colonial rulers have almost all gone and in many places the power of the dominant family, tribe, or caste has been weakened. But it is not in general true that power and wealth are distributed more evenly. On the contrary, just as variations between localities have become more pronounced, so has the gap between the individuals who are rich, powerful, and highly educated, and those who are poor, impotent, and illiterate. The fact that today's industrial or commercial *élite* may come of a different stock from yesterday's land-based rulers makes little difference to the general pattern of growth.

What matters is the gap, and for two main reasons. The first is that large proportions of the population are inevitably left more or less as they were. These are the people, the sixty to eighty per cent. who are illiterate in most under-developed societies, whose thinking is what Rostow terms pre-Newtonian,[1] who consider the physical world to be a datum of God or Nature and cannot readily grasp that it can be understood, manipulated, or experimentally adapted. They live at a subsistence level, in time of famine or other disaster a drain on the national economy, never an asset to it. Yet among these millions there must reside a vast reservoir of talent, talent which could transform half the globe but which, locked up untrained and inert within the traditional economy, actually retards development.

The second consequence of the gap is equally serious. It is that the emerging economic structure, essentially non-egalitarian in form whatever the intention of its architects, favours non-democratic policies. I shall return to this idea later, and at the moment will only quote briefly the example of Pakistan. There the democratically framed constitution of 1955 proved unworkable because, whatever the legal rights of the people, authority still resided in the hands of relatively few extremely powerful men. The only way to prevent the consequent corruption and abuses was by the imposition of another régime openly but benevolently authoritarian.

I have been describing a society without a middle class, the 'New Class' as Galbraith terms it,[2] without a group of professional persons living by their training and skill rather than gaining position by birth, wealth, or political affiliation. It is a society in which those human resources upon which depend the administration and all technical, scientific, and cultural development are drawn from a disproportionately—and inadequately—small reserve. In consequence the ruling classes, however they are determined, will acquire that dangerously ingrown quality which has ruined so many administrations; irrelevant considerations such as family will have a disproportionate influence in appointment, promotion, and decision; and the healthy stimulus of competition will be reduced and replaced by intrigue and jockeying for position. The young countries have become desperately aware of their lack of trained and professional people and in consequence many are drawn into the vacuum who are but partially suitable. This much is bad, but it must be added that a terrific impetus comes from the eventual shock of recognition that despite every possible compromise and temporary expedient, the only ultimate solution, assuming the desire for development, is to educate people.

---

[1] W. W. Rostow, *The Stages of Economic Growth: a non-communist manifesto*, Cambridge University Press, 1960, p. 4.

[2] J. K. Galbraith, *The Affluent Society*, London: Hamish Hamilton, 1958, pp. 266–71.

But before expanding this idea, the dominant theme of this lecture, I must emphasize the worst feature of this lack of a middle class: the weakness of the administration. This typifies the under-developed countries, both cause and effect of their under-development. Lewis observed, and most would agree with him, that 'a strong, competent and incorrupt administration'[1] is the essential prerequisite for development planning, and he goes on to say that it is precisely this which is lacking in the majority of backward countries.

It may seem strange that no mention has yet been made, save incidentally, of what many must feel to be the salient characteristics of under-developed societies: intense poverty, coupled with low primary school enrolment; an average calorie intake below requirement; prevalence of such diseases as malaria, hookworm, and smallpox, together with inadequate hospital facilities and a high ratio of population per physician. (In this connexion it may be noted that the doctor–population proportion ranges, according to United Nations statistics, from one to 600 in the U.S.S.R. to one to 210,000 in Ethiopia.)[2] It is true that these conditions—though with certain exceptions where backwardness in some respects is matched by development in others[3]—tend to be correlated but they do not create under development, nor do they indicate, as is sometimes assumed, an irremediable poverty. Some of the under-developed countries, it is true, lack physical resources, but others do not. What they lack is the ability to exploit them, and this want derives from the social-psychological situation I have tried to describe: they lack, in short, the human resources to develop the material ones. It is a useful service, undoubtedly, to make a direct attack on the medical or agricultural problems of a country, but we need not think that we have done more than to postpone the next famine or epidemic unless we have also assisted at the level of training and education. It is more useful to help a country to train ten specialists in a subject than to lend it a hundred to carry out a particular job. For these reasons we should concentrate our attack on the central causative elements in the social sources of under-development: inequalities of wealth, opportunity, power, education, and influence; and the separation of one group from another because of these inequalities, or because of exclusive sub-national loyalties, usually traditional, of tribe or province.[1] These are the things which impede an effective mobilization of national effort, which hamstring and pervert the administration, and which deprive the nation of its most valuable asset—a healthy and educated citizenry. And we pay for this in the currency of human lives. Millions of people die annually because more than half the world is caught up in this self-perpetuating situation.

---

[1] W. Arthur Lewis, *The Principles of Economic Planning*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1959 edn., p. 122.

[2] *Report on the World Social Situation*, New York: United Nations, 1957. This report also illustrates the frequent correlation of various 'objective indices' of under-development.

[3] As, for example, in some of the oil-rich countries of Latin America and the Middle East where *per capita* production (but *not* the standard of living) is exceptionally high, or some of the young Asian and African countries which have achieved remarkable primary school enrolments.

IV

The argument I have been putting forward should not be taken as suggesting an unchanging condition of society. On the contrary, the under-developed countries in general have made stupendous efforts. Programmes of industrialization have started, populations have shifted, new towns have arisen, political revolutions have occurred. But given a continuance of the conditions we have been considering, these changes will have had no more effect upon essential poverty than the writhing of a fettered giant on his chains.

---

[1] I am aware that a case can be made for the social and economic desirability of inequality. To those who support it on social grounds, I would recommend R. H. Tawney, *Equality*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1931. I would remind those who support it on economic grounds of the remarkable post-war economic growth of such highly egalitarian societies as Norway. (See A. Bourneuf, *The Planned Revival*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.) It is also a fact that life expectancy in Norway after the age of 60 is the highest in the world. Tinbergen, who makes but few references to social conditions, says that 'the most extreme inequality in income' should be corrected by Governments attempting to create the general conditions for development, since 'inequalities (are) easily conducive to social unrest and lack of co-operative spirit in production'. But this illustrates only one of the negative aspects of inequality (Jan Tinbergen, *The Design of Development*, The Economic Development Institute (International Bank for Reconstruction and Development), Baltimore; The Johns Hopkins Press, 1958, p. 5).

Nevertheless some of the problems of the under-developed countries are engendered by these changes, whether or not they lead to growth. As the processes of change gather momentum, as new techniques of production are adopted, new resources exploited, new plant established—and as organizational patterns concomitantly alter—so fresh problems arise. These are not the stark and ultimate problems of famine and epidemic. They are social and psychological rather than physical. I would refer to them as 'interim social problems', meaning that they are the difficulties which arise when we know enough to alter our material environment, but not yet enough to change ourselves to fit into the fresh conditions we have created.

This negative aspect of social change has received a considerable amount of attention. It is hardly necessary for me to dilate upon the confusion and uncertainty which occur when, for example, hitherto static and isolated communities are brought into rude contact with the wider civilization through the discovery of oil, the erection of a barrage, or the building of a factory. We may belong to the school of thought which would at all costs preserve the integrity of such communities, or we may consider—as I do—that isolation in our world only postpones dangerously the necessity for adaptation and integration.[1] But in either case we must admit that for better or for worse the social organization of such a group is apt not to survive the shock: not at least in its original shape. There is, almost inevitably, an interim period during which society passes through Redfield's stages of 'disorganisation, secularisation and individualisation'[2] with concomitant *anomie* amongst individuals. During this period there may be some degree of social chaos, of disturbed and non-functional relationships in home and community. Exotic cults offering mystical panaceas and dictatorial political systems may batten equally on the prevalent uncertainty, replacing in

[1] This question is discussed in relation to the development of several small communities by Adam Curle, 'Tradition, Planning and Development', *The Sociological Review*, vol. viii, No. 2, 1960, pp. 223–38.

[2] Robert Redfield, *The Folk Culture of Yucatan*, Chicago: The Chicago University Press, 1941.

exaggerated or fantastic forms the lost focus of stability. Other communities, sensing the threat to their integrity, withdraw into an almost paranoid isolation. But much of the difficulty is comparable to the breaking down of adhesions, which may be as painful socially and emotionally as it can be physically—and as necessary to health and mobility. Undue emphasis has perhaps been placed upon pathological extremes of reaction. Far the largest proportion of the world's population exists in communities which have to a greater or lesser extent been changing for years. Their minds are not split by the conflict between the old and the new, the magical and the scientific, and their social life has long lost, if indeed it ever possessed, that pristine harmony with which some would credit it.[1] I am reminded in this connexion, if I may briefly digress, of Galbraith's concept of 'conventional wisdom'.[2] Our early mentors in anthropology emphasized the integration of society, largely because their field work lay among isolated communities.[3] Their ideas on this topic were new and valuable, but we have tended to transfer them whole and uncritically to situations of movement, change, and culture contact to which they can only apply in a highly modified fashion. The social scientist finds it harder to understand than the man in the street that tension and conflict are inseparable corollaries of social evolution.[4] We may increase or diminish them, but it would be vain to consider them simply as morbid conditions to be eradicated if possible. Few peoples of the world live in such a state of idyllic simplicity that one hesitates to intrude with vulgar ideas of vaccination against smallpox, or of increasing food production. Some do, it is true, and I have in fact met one or two of them, but they are not many. The vast majority suffer unnecessarily from hunger, disease, and ignorance, realize the fact, and are unhappy about it. They feel, though many may sense it but dimly, that there is something more to the human condition. If one asks them, most of them will say that they want their children to be healthy and to have enough to eat because only thus can they become what they were intended to be.

---

[1] A powerful exposition of this view is given by M. J. Field, *The Search for Security: an ethno-psychiatric study*, London: Faber & Faber, 1960, pp. 52–53.

[2] J. K. Galbraith, op. cit., pp. 5–15.

[3] A. R. Radcliffe Brown and B. Malinowski, whose work marks the watershed between philosophical fact-collection and the empiricism of modern anthropology, both carried out their field-work in isolated island communities. There is a valuable discussion of the idea of plural social systems in J. C. Mitchell, *Tribalism and the Plural Society. An Inaugural Lecture given in the University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland*, London: Oxford University Press, 1960.

[4] Max Gluckman in fact considers that they may contribute towards general social harmony. *Custom and Conflict in Africa*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1955, pp. 24–26.

But, as I have said, there is a stage in the attainment of this ideal when there is confusion and uncertainty and when the indices of social disorder mount alarmingly. This is particularly apparent in those fulcra of development, the great industrial cities. In Europe and in America in the recent past, in Africa and Asia in the present, the complex of physical and social miseries in many towns is a fearful side effect of humanity's surge towards material well-being. Urban conditions exemplify a point I made earlier; that while certain groups advance towards greater affluence and comfort, others—frequently those through whose labour they have profited—are in worse straits than before.[1]

I have mentioned these interim social problems for two reasons. Firstly, because they present genuine difficulties, genuine problems of adaptation and readjustment, and very real dangers for development itself. Secondly, because people tend to exaggerate their menace to the point where it becomes a brake on development. We may not agree with the conservatism implied in the latter view, but it is not always easy, when faced with practical situations, to avoid being influenced by it.

We should remind ourselves, however, of the resilience and adaptability of human nature. Every example of social change bringing disorder may be matched by another illustrating the emergence of new and coherent patterns. This is even the case in communities such as Tikopea and Manus,[2] which are similar in isolation to those from which our earlier teachers drew their theoretical framework of the integrated social system. Nor is there any valid reason for the frequent assertion that the introduction of change implies an increase in mental illness. This is a belief normally held on theoretical grounds. Persons having first-hand knowledge of simple societies, while conceding that a change in structure may lead to a change in the existing social mechanism for dealing with emotional disorder, will seldom agree that there is less tension in 'primitive' than in 'modern' society.[1] The focus of anxiety, it is true, may differ and so be hard for members of other cultures to recognize. (And it should be added that the views of those who support either side of the argument are almost entirely impressionistic and qualitative.)

---

[1] See *Social Implications of Industrialisation and Urbanisation in Africa South of the Sahara*, prepared under the auspices of UNESCO by the International African Institute. London: United Nations, 1956. This is a comprehensive compilation of facts, mostly grim, about urban conditions.

[2] See Raymond Firth, *Social Change in Tikopea*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1959; and Margaret Mead, *New Lives for Old*, London: Gollancz, 1956. Both books give accounts of changes in island communities first studied by their authors more than a quarter of a century earlier.

We should recall another fact. The more traumatic social change may be, and the more we may deplore it for this reason, the more we should appreciate that those problems of adaptation reflect the intransigent rigidity of the system which has gone or is going. To anticipate later arguments, I would suggest that the sort of society whose changing is most painful tends also to be one in which there is least freedom for people to develop their potentiality—and therefore to be the one which most needs to be changed.

To conclude this stage of the discussion I should like to emphasize two facts. Firstly, that the worst aspects of the interim social problems result rather from political decision and economic opportunism than from coherent development planning. Secondly, that the breaking away from old patterns, however difficult and disagreeable it may sometimes be, is simultaneously an opening up of opportunity: particularly an opportunity for education to offer both new types of solution to existing problems, and new skills to be employed in achieving those solutions.

V

There is a kind of depressing logic about the way in which the social elements of under-development combine to perpetuate each other. Winslow writes, in a book concerned with the economics of health, that 'poverty and disease formed a vicious circle. Men and women were sick because they were poor: they became poorer because they were sick, and sicker because they were poorer'.[1] Another authority sums up similar arguments with the simple proposition that 'a country is poor because it is poor'.[2]

---

[1] The work of M. J. Field (cited at p. 13, n. 1 above) is essential reading on this and related topics. Dr. Field, who is fully qualified both as an anthropologist and as a psychiatrist and who has known intimately the people of whom she writes for over twenty years, makes most studies of the subject—at least those with which I am acquainted—seem amateurish.

I have tried to show briefly how the type of divergence existing within countries tends to retard development and how—paradoxically—even the greater development of one area often depresses another. I have suggested that a supine and incapable administration, the lack of a middle class, the internal divisions, and the poverty and general physical backwardness of the under-developed countries are all points of the circumference of the vicious circle. The enemies of development are separation and inequality, but if progress in one field simply leads to regression in another, and larger one, what can one do? How can one break out from the sphere of circular causation? How, in short, is development to be achieved? Quite obviously a large part of the answer concerns things we either do not know or cannot do—otherwise all societies would already be developed. A most powerful impetus towards development comes from the achievement of national independence, but how to keep up the pace once the original excitement has abated; what fixative should be applied, so to speak, to pride, ambition, and hope? But one part of the answer which we do know and can apply is education. In fact I would go so far as to say that in modern conditions what Rostow called 'take off' cannot be achieved without considerable educational development ('Take off' is his term for 'the great watershed in the life of modern societies . . . when the old blocks and resistances to steady growth are overcome. The forces operating for economic progress . . . expand and come to dominate the society.')[3] I have tried to emphasize that the problems facing the under-developed countries are human problems primarily and physical ones only secondarily. I have tried to express them as matters of mutual understanding, of training, of adaptability, of organizing capacity, and of ability rightly placed.[1] Because these matters have not been adequately dealt with, social and physical conditions have arisen making it even harder to deal with them. I personally would express the vicious circle by saying that countries are under-developed because most of their people are under-developed, and that when people are under-developed national institutions acquire a form which impedes progress and the growth of egalitarian policies. Education seems to me the most effective way of developing people. This is expressed forcibly in the Pakistan Second Five-Year Plan:

---

[1] C. E. A. Winslow, *The Cost of Sickness and the Price of Health*, Monograph Series No. 7, Geneva: World Health Organization, 1951, p. 9.

[2] R. Nurske, *Problems of Capital Formation in Under-developed Countries*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 7th impression, 1960, p. 4.

[3] W. W. Rostow, op. cit., p. 7.

> The essential goal must be to provide an informed leadership, a responsible citenzenry, and to train manpower. It is through the advancement of education alone that these goals can be reached. No uneducated community has progressed far in the modern world, and no educated community with initiative and leadership has remained backward. An illiterate society clings to customs, traditions, and outmoded practices; it resists the forces of change which stimulate the acquisition of new knowledge and new skills. Training of human beings in all fields of endeavour is essential if a break-through is to be effected from a state of chronic backwardness, and the country is to move rapidly forward towards the attainment of the desired social and economic goals.[2]

Inadequate administration, the inequalities and social laminations leading to inadequate administration, consequent inability of the country to overcome its difficulties, and the resultant isolation of the illiterate, non-contributory masses—these are all problems to be attacked from many angles but problems, surely, which will only be solved by massive investment in human beings.

Although referring to the 'affluent' rather than to the under-developed society, Galbraith remarks that the 'first and

---

[1] Adequate selection in under-developed countries constitutes a whole problem in its own. A valuable conspectus is contained in *Conference on Educational and Occupational Selection sponsored by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, Legon (University College of Ghana) 27 March–9th April, 1960*, ed. A. Taylor (to be published by the O.U.P.), while there is a general discussion of the social difficulties in Adam Curle, 'Problems of Locating and Utilising Talent in Under-Developed Countries', *The Year Book of Education 1961*, London: Evans Bros., 1961 (in the press).

[2] *The Second Five-Year Plan 1960–1965*. Government of Pakistan Planning Commission, June 1960, p. 337. In this connexion, the terse statement of Tinbergen (op. cit., p. 5), coming from so eminent and laconic an economist, must be given due respect: 'a very important condition for development is the provision of education and training at all levels'.

UNIVERSITY OF GHANA LIBRARY

strategic step in an attack on poverty is to see that it is no longer self-perpetuating. This means that the investment in children from families presently afflicted be as little below normal as possible.' He goes on to say that 'poverty is self-perpetuating because the poorest communities are poorest in the services which would eliminate it', and concludes by saying that the principal limiting factor is 'overwhelmingly . . . our failure to invest in people'.[1]

The two obvious forms of investment are health and education. Both clearly are indispensable, but I give primacy to education because it is more fundamental. Health measures, indeed, must to some extent fail without an education to train the practitioners, and without an education which will give the lay men and women some elementary understanding of such matters as nutrition and hygiene and some appreciation of medical care and advice: I remember that friends in Asia attempting to combat cholera found the greatest difficulties in getting the epidemic under control because the people did not know enough to grasp the appropriateness of the precautions they were asked to take.

✓The most obvious importance of education is that it produces the people to do the jobs upon which development depends—the scientists, the agricultural experts, the engineers, and all the others necessary to material growth, as well as the administrators, business men, teachers, lawyers, clerks, and others who are equally essential in creating the framework within which development occurs. Importing scientists or sending nationals away for training, however necessary or desirable, can never supply the number and depth of range of trained personnel essential to an effective development programme.

But the significance of an educational programme does not so much lie in its direct and immediate contribution to development works, vital though this is. It lies rather in its general raising of the human level, and in drawing people away from social and intellectual attitudes which make all growth impossible. A critical spirit, a view beyond the next village, objectivity replacing blind identification, these are the qualities education should inculcate, qualities which may be applied to any problem, whether technical, social, or moral. It will, of course, be a

[1] J. K. Galbraith, op. cit., pp. 257–8.

remarkable education which achieves any of them to a great extent, but an almost equally unusual one which achieves none of them at all. It is upon the gradual emergence of the educated, critical, creative mind unfettered by sterile traditions and cleavages that development depends. The under-developed countries, through the very attributes I have tried to describe, are naturally lacking in minds both flexible and empirical. Consequently they have failed to develop the types of flexible and empirical organization which are absolutely indispensable to their growth.

The emergence of a strong middle class, and the gradual infiltration of the administration from top to bottom, from Principal Secretary to clerk, by educated persons, will go far towards creating the social revolution which *is* development. But there is perhaps an even more seminal role for education in the whole process of national evolution. Education, if spread widely and without discrimination, is the greatest force in the world making for equality. Obviously if confined to children of the *élite* it can only perpetuate class distinctions, but education given to the children of the poor, the backward, and the hitherto neglected is a dynamic force making for positive change. I would emphasize, too, that we may look for the results of establishing a school long before the first pupils have finished their education. A school is a symbol of hope whose effect upon the whole community should never be underestimated.

VI

Having stressed the saving role of education, it must be admitted that the educational system of an under-developed country is subject to all the handicaps affecting development as a whole. The majority of such systems are loosely and ineffectively controlled by a weak national organization, which is capable neither of administering nor of protecting the system from those who would corrupt or use it for their own ends. There are enormous disparities in the efficiency of different schools and there may be whole groups of schools run by various religious, social, or political bodies which are in competition with each other, having entirely separate examination systems and standards of performance. Some schools and colleges may be excellent but are virtually reserved for the sons of the *élite*, while others are so bad as to be of no use save to satisfy a population whose ignorance is only lightened by a reverential yearning for knowledge. I should like to note in passing an interesting mechanism for preserving social equilibrium. This occurs in some of the under-developed countries where the best colleges demand the highest entrance standards. Though these colleges are not officially reserved for the upper classes, in fact only they can afford to send their children to the sort of preparatory schools from which they can gain the entrance qualification. In this way education, the levelling influence *par excellence*, may actually serve to widen the gap between the upper and lower levels of society. This indeed is bound to happen in some degree whatever the form of selection to higher education, until educational opportunity is given equally to children throughout the country.

Besides the inherent problems of an under-developed educational structure, we are forced to consider in addition the blowings-out and the squeezings-in, the pressures this way and that, to which it is liable once the society of which it forms part shares in the Great Awakening.

The first buffets are certainly salutary, jolting it into movement. Reactive nationalism, as has been termed the surge of independent spirit in the countries newly freed, or seeking equality, or both, impinges at once upon education. Indeed for many people one of the main outward forms of independence is the spread of education. The cry for more schools, which has almost invariable political support—for not only is it a good vote-catcher, but education is genuinely prized—is both good and bad. Schools are needed, there is no doubt of that, and the exercise of expansion is good for the administration. But all too often no one knows where to stop. It was advocated at one stage in East Pakistan that in order to get the education of the Province into a reasonable condition, 5,000 absolutely useless schools in which the teachers' average salary was about 30 shillings a month, should be closed down and the staff and funds reallocated to others which would be adequate if strengthened. This type of expansion, in which the facile erection of buildings cannot be matched by the production of teachers, inevitably leads to a disastrous lowering of standards. But this is an argument which may have little influence upon governments. The thrust of reactive nationalism is towards an assertive demonstration of equality with other countries. It leads, for example, to a greater concern for establishing institutions housed in splendid buildings than for the less spectacular task of maintaining standards of entry to them, or of work done in them.

This is the tendency towards inflation. Almost equally dangerous and perhaps even more common is the tendency towards deflation. It may be difficult to believe, but there are still countries which differentiate between 'non-productive' development, which is anything to do with the well-being of men and women, and 'productive' development, which is anything to do with the things produced by those same men and women. It is still by no means universally recognized that human beings are the most essential raw material of any nation, and that it is on their health and efficiency alone that production depends. Be that as it may, we find a remarkably widespread tendency for any country going through economic crisis to slash its budget for health, housing, education, and other things which do not in the short term, or obviously, bring in returns.[1]

Many officials of education ministries throughout the world have replied to the threat of cuts by emphasizing the importance to development of the production of scientists, engineers, agriculturists, and the like. But in this lies another danger: that the education system may be diverted to serve the immediate and tangible needs of the community and thus to neglect the long-term aim of inculcating the wisdom and judgement which will lead to a transformation of society. For, if one of my main arguments is accepted, an under-developed country must be radically changed if it is to achieve economic maturity. This is not reached by a mere development of techniques, but by a development of society itself.

And behind this lurks yet another possibility. In the urgent desire for development, and the fear of regional and tribalistic forces which retard development, the authorities may assume such a degree of control over education, particularly higher education, as is incompatible with its healthy expansion. In extreme cases students have even been used as pawns in the political game.

---

[1] An educationist, like a forester, takes a long view, but persons not accustomed to think like this understandably tend to yield to the pressure of emergency. It must be added that some politicians are concerned with the next election. The full results of depriving education may not be apparent until long after this has passed, but money saved thereby and employed with demonstrable effect may help to win it!

I have remarked that the Great Awakening stirs the interest in education. But unfortunately it also offers the most dazzling openings to those who would be of the greatest value to the schools. In no under-developed country—or for that matter in many developed ones—is it easy to attract enough able graduates to teaching, particularly to teaching in the rural areas. From this point of view—and from this point of view only—the independence of former colonial territories may be deplored, for the ranks of today's leaders are filled with yesterday's teachers. Before ideals of freedom are realized, they are served in a most practical way through education, but independence brings glittering opportunities for service with which the humble task of teaching can hardly compete.

VII

Having cursorily viewed the general social problems of developing societies, having suggested that education has an essential role in promoting that development, and having glanced at some of the specific problems of education, we must now consider how an educational system may overcome its own difficulties and contribute most effectively to the society of which it forms part. This may be thought of at three levels which I will call research, planning, and 'professional'.

I mention research first because, despite the voluminous outpourings of educationists—perhaps the most verbose of professional groups—we know extraordinarily little about the symbiotic relationship between education and development.[1] We know, at least I hope we know, that education there must be, and plenty of it, but how much,[2] of what types, and how administered in order to attain particular goals we know not. Yet without this knowledge much of our planning is inevitably haphazard and wasteful. Our ignorance demands an intensive comparative study of the relationship between educational plans, policies, and performance on the one hand, and development aimed at, achieved, and projected on the other. There is an almost unlimited field for work here. I would only suggest that the emphasis should be empirical. Indices of growth and inter-action should be sought in both quantitative and qualitative forms, and new methods refined for describing social processes.

---

[1] There has, of course, been some useful work, as in *The Year Book of Education 1954*, ed. R. King Hall, N. Hans, and J. A. Lauwerys, London: Evans Bros., 1954. The theme of this volume is 'Education and the Transformation of Societies', and it contains many important articles, but it does not tackle the central problems of the interdependence of education, and economic and general development.

[2] The recent *Report of Conference on Education in East Africa sponsored by the Africa Liaison Committee of the American Council of Education*, Princeton, New Jersey, 1960 (mimeographed), remarks that 'there is undoubtedly need for the expenditure of further large sums, both capital and recurrent, if the educational position in East

The first problem of planning, including educational planning, is to get the idea of planning accepted and to ensure that it is built in to the national administrative structure. This will give to an educational plan or programme the necessary stability for coherent implementation, and the necessary relationship with development problems in general to give it realism.

The actual content of the plan must depend so greatly on local circumstances that I can do little more than to suggest some of the major considerations. The principal decision will concern the proportion of the national resources to be devoted to education, and here one can only emphasize that education is not a luxury: it is the very germ of growth. Then comes a series of difficult choices regarding what may be termed balance. The problems of balance concern the division of resources between different branches of education: primary, secondary, university, technical, teacher training, medical and so on. A further dimension to this problem is that of quantity and quality.

Obviously the answer found to these problems depends so closely on the existing educational structure, the supply of trained persons, the type of resources to be developed, and on the findings of the sort of research I have referred to, that it

---

Africa is to be enabled rapidly to meet the needs of those areas. The East African Governments actually devote a high proportion of their capital and as much as about 20% of their budgets to education and are receiving considerable assistance both directly and indirectly from Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom . . . this . . . represents a challenge to the Western World.' This passage also represents thoroughly realistic thinking. The key question for research is not 'how much can we *afford* to spend?', but 'how much is it *essential* to spend in order to avoid the disasters of under-development?'

would be vain to lay down formal rules. I shall confine myself to a few broad principles affecting the role of education as I have tried to describe it. To start with, whatever decisions are taken on these intricate issues, steps must be considered for strengthening the sinews of the system: educational administration through its streamlining; and the teachers themselves through their training and their inspection, and through assistance to the development of their professional organizations. This last point is of particular importance. It costs virtually nothing to encourage the establishment of institutions which will help the profession to develop *as* a profession, yet therefrom will emerge what is perhaps always—or do we flatter ourselves?—the most soberly constructive group in society, one which is of the greatest value in its development. In no circumstances should these measures be neglected. They are the most effective means of forging an educational system with a sharp cutting edge to slice through the tangles of prejudice and ineptitude through which all development has to pass. Such steps have the additional advantage of not being particularly taxing to a country's resources, while the fact that they are on a small scale renders them less susceptible than more grandiose growths to abuse and distortion.

A broad principle which is frequently enunciated in educational planning (as in, for example, the First Five-Year Plan of Pakistan) is that the existing organization should be improved before it is expanded. In general this principle may be advocated, but it should be borne in mind that a nation's development is not merely a matter of economic calculation. It is affected also by such potent imponderables as pride and hope. I have already suggested that the mere existence of a school raises community morale and I believe we should be prepared to lower our standards of primary education to a certain extent for the sake of the general stimulus to development which it affords. This stimulus should create conditions of social growth in which we can eventually raise the standard once more. This cycle has been passed through in most of the economically advanced countries, but we are often over-cautious in our approach to the under-developed ones. I would only add that in this case we should not go to the extremes of East Pakistan which I recently quoted, nor should we permit a reduction of our standards in the secondary schools. These will for some time supply the great bulk of competent persons to run the country and should be given considerable support.

I have observed that the balance of technological, professional, and general education should to a considerable extent reflect the character of the whole development programme. But it is important not to be misled into over-simplifying the problems of growth. The question is not simply how to effect an improvement in agriculture, an increase in the tempo of industrialization, a more efficient exploitation of mineral resources. It is essentially how to create an efficient society which is capable amongst other things of handling these technical problems. Judgement and wisdom, therefore, should be sought as qualities of the educated man or woman no less than technical competence.

In particular we have to remember two things. Firstly, tardiand in development is occasioned by certain social formations ness their attendant attitudes of mind which can only be modified by men possessing in a high degree the qualities conferred by education. Secondly, that the very process of development creates what I have termed interim social problems. These too must be tackled with skill and insight if development in one sphere does not simply lead to regression in another. Because the operational tools for this are such things as curriculum construction and teaching techniques, the focus of our attention should shift to the 'professional' problems of education.

I would in the first place make a plea for vigorous and practical teaching of the social sciences—mainly of course at the university level. These provide the tools for understanding and at least partially controlling some of the more undesirable side effects of social change. Next I would stress the claims of such 'useless' subjects as philosophy, literature, and comparative religion. If such subjects are considered desirable in the older countries, how much more vital are they in the newer in which, through the rapidity of change, the moral pattern is confused. In these lands much difficult rethinking on the nature and purposes of social life has to be carried out in a very short time. Thirdly, it must be emphasized that these perplexing problems of social growth cannot be coped with by alien learning only. It unfortunately happens that developing countries are apt to acquire an ambivalent attitude towards their own culture, both despising it for being 'primitive' and according it a patriotic excess of veneration. I should like to see this redressed by making studies of indigenous culture, literature, music, art, and the like, more widespread and objective. The present unbalanced attitude means that these subjects do not contribute as they should to national growth. The local culture, whether praised or scorned, contains many traditional strengths upon which a new moral and social synthesis must be built.

Together with these three specific desiderata, some more general comment may be made upon the structure of the curriculum.[1] This is a vast topic and one which has perhaps been more fully discussed than any other aspect of education in the under-developed countries. The scope of education in these areas was defined thus thirty years ago:

> Education should be adapted to the mentality, attitudes, occupations and traditions of the various peoples (of Africa), conserving so far as possible all sound and healthy elements in the fabric of their social life; adapting them where necessary to changed circumstances and progressive ideas, an agent of natural growth and evolution. Its aim should be to render the individual more efficient in his or her condition of life, whatever it may be, and to promote the advancement of the community as a whole through the improvement of agriculture, the development of native industries, the improvement of health, the training of people in the management of their own affairs, and the circulation of true ideals of citenzenship and service.[2]

All of this, I believe, is still valid, but it requires supplementation by a progressive boldness to counteract the slight suggestion of conservatism. In the past there has been a tendency to consider rapid change dangerous. What was desirable was a slow steady evolution and the curriculum was adapted towards attaining it. One cannot exactly call this view reactionary. There is much to be said for it: rapid change *is* in many respects dangerous. But rapid change is what we have got, and the world of the 1950's and the 1960's is very different from that of the pre-war decades. It is a world which presents us with problems that can only be mastered by assimilating, and as rapidly as possible, the newest techniques of the social, physical, and biological sciences.

---

[1] A synoptic discussion of the issue is given by Adam Curle, *The School Curriculum and Social and Cultural Tradition*, UNESCO: Paris, 1956 (mimeographed).

[2] *Educational Policy in British Tropical Africa* (British Colonial Office White Paper), London: H.M.S.O. 1925.

But at the same time the curriculum must be firmly grounded in the needs of daily reality. The importance of such subjects as hygiene, home economics, and horticulture is that they are not only desirable in themselves but provide a comprehensible base from which to explore the more complex theoretical issues. Into the bargain, they establish a functional link between the educational system and the community.

VIII

Reference to the relationship between education and community brings me back by another route to a central problem of the whole socio-developmental nexus, and suggests a fresh dimension of approach.

The problems of under-development are social problems. They are problems of separation, disunity, and inequality shown not only in the world and in the national communities, but even at the level of the village: indeed particularly at the level of the village, where all too often landlordism necessitates vigorous measures of land reform if the level of morale and economy is to be raised, and if nationally vital capital is to be released into productive channels. The tendency has been for these inequalities to increase, for the gap to widen between rich and poor, and for new forms of political or industrial exploitation to keep the gap wedged open. Even without the temptation for the rich and powerful to make use of the poor and helpless, we have to reckon with the inexorable principle that equality is, for purely practical reasons, harder to achieve in such conditions however much it may be desired by the authorities. As Myrdal states the situation, 'egalitarian policies . . . meet with greater difficulties in a poor country although it needs them more because the weakness of the spread effects has created greater inequalities'.[1]

Again I have to ask, how do we break out of this vicious circle? Previously I answered that we could do so through education.

[1] Gunnar Myrdal, op. cit., p. 40.

Now, speaking more from the social angle I would say—and the two are far from incompatible—that we escape through the growth of democracy. The democratic political forces inherent in egalitarianism are crowbars to rend the rigid social barriers creating and maintaining under-development. But this answer, like many others, raises even more questions. Why have so many of the new countries abandoned democratic constitutions? Is it possible to operate a democracy with an uneducated people? How can the impotent masses exercise their democratic rights in the face of opposition by landlords and tribal leaders?

The answer lies I believe in the spheres—frequently united—of community development and fundamental education. This form of activity, often including and always associated with more formal aspects of education, is far more than a means of raising the quality of rural (and in some cases urban) life. Community development has been defined as 'a process designed to create conditions of economic and social progress for the whole community with its active participation and the fullest possible reliance upon the community's initiative'.[1] Essentially it is a method of stimulating communities to manage their own affairs constructively, an operational training ground for democracy which has real and cogent meaning for people since the decisions they have to make do not concern ideological issues which may seem remote, but practical matters of immediate importance to themselves. As is the wider democracy, it is based upon the twin principles of participation and responsibility.[2] But these are nurtured by common concern for what is of manifest significance to all. From the exercise of these two principles empirically applied, grows—and I use the word advisably to express a phenomenon so universal as to appear natural—the appropriate form of organization for the administration of community services and expansion.

---

[1] *Principles of Community Development.* Report by the Secretary General to the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, E/CIV5/303, 31 Jan. 1955, p. 13.

[2] These are principles whose significance for human beings could, in a longer paper, be shown to be as cogent at the psychological as at the social level. (See, for example, Adam Curle, 'Transitional Communities and Social Reconnection', Part I, *Human Relations*, vol. i, No. 1, 1947, pp. 2–28, and with E. L. Trist, Part II in *Human Relations*, vol. i, No. 3, 1948, pp. 240–88.) Our understanding of participation at these levels would seem of extreme importance in attempting to lay the foundations of both mental and social health.

It is an important aspect of community development that it depends not only on participation and responsibility within the community, but also between the community and the authorities stimulating the development. In this way a bridge is built over which—in both directions—pass knowledge and understanding. This has many advantages. Here I will only mention that the effective linking of the smaller with the larger community through which the smaller acquires a sense of functional belonging to the larger eradicates one of the more dangerous side-effects of social change—the sense of being at the mercy of implacable outside forces, with reactions running a sad gamut of subservience, resentment, apathy, and disorder. Here on the contrary people are taking part—initiating indeed—in processes of change most closely affecting themselves, processes which are developing in response to needs which the people themselves are best qualified to express.

All this is education in the widest sense. It not only includes the founding or expanding of schools, but many activities in which new learning is acquired. In any community development area one will find the nuclei of enterprises in agriculture, irrigation, animal husbandry, co-operative buying and selling, and so on based upon scientific rather than traditional procedures. Thus it provides the beginning of technological situations in which the pre-Newtonian *Weltanschauung* is dissipated as new skills are learnt. In so doing it also contributes directly, as well as indirectly, to the material development of the country.

IX

We have now had a bird's-eye view of some of the main features of education in a developing society or one which is attempting to develop. It has been, admittedly, the view of a short-sighted bird flying very fast and high over complex and confused terrain. However, the combined lack of time and experience makes it the best I can do, and now in conclusion I want to look at it from a different angle. What is it all for, and by what right do we try to do things for and to other people? Why educate them: why strive for development: what difference do these two things really make to the human condition? We all carry on busily attempting to promote them, seldom stopping to question the axiom that they are, for some reason infrequently specified, a 'good thing'.

I have already suggested that the existence of under-developed areas is a potential strain on the fabric of world relations—as recent events in the Congo clearly show—and this purely pragmatic judgement may be left while we explore more intricate issues. I said earlier in my talk that the basic, irreducible boon conferred by development on human life was to prolong it. I would maintain that the essential function of education is the same: material well-being and intellectual pleasures are, after all, of little use to one when dead. Of course much more is implied by prolonging life than the mere extension of years. It means, above all, the reduction of want and misery of every type: it implies war on famine and malnutrition, and on disease; it implies order and safety where there was anarchy and oppression. In fact it includes the assault on all those conditions to oppose which is an absolute imperative of human charity requiring neither justification nor excuse.

But we cannot stop at this point. Is life, we must ask, necessarily a boon? I cannot think that this is so. To the gift of life must be added, if that gift is to be fully used and enjoyed, the grace of freedom. Freedom is a word of many dimensions, most of them controversial, but I shall start by taking it at a very prosaic physical level. The material miseries I have just mentioned, the hunger and illness which often characterize under-development—and which may indeed increase in some areas as others start to progress—are conditions of diminished human potentiality. The physical conditions of under-development fetter man's spirit, crowding in the horizons of his thought. By involving him so closely and so desperately, they take away a large measure of his freedom to become what he might, genetically, have become. It is of course possible to triumph over circumstances, to become stronger and wiser through the struggle not to be crushed. But I am an educationist concerned with the generality of humanity; not with the rare genius, but with the great masses who are oppressed and overburdened and weakened, and who would do a little better if they were not. No one, I believe, who has directly experienced intense poverty coupled with endemic illness and chronic under-nourishment can doubt its limiting effect on thought and action. I am not concerned as to whether this limitation is cause or effect of under-development: they are simply aspects of each other.

The next dimension of freedom is social rather than primarily personal. We have already touched on one aspect of this in our recognition of the relationship between democracy and development, for what is democratic behaviour if it is not the behaviour of men who are free to make their contribution to the government and development of society? It is conventional to approve of this type of freedom, but to do so in this spirit is simply to display the conformity-fixation which is the arch enemy of freedom. No, social freedom seems to me to have value for two reasons: firstly, for its contribution to creative social processes; secondly, because of the implication that people have shaken themselves loose from the almost unconscious conformity to standards and concepts which had become obsolete. This form of freedom is created neither solely by development nor by education, it is a part of both. From this point of view development is not to be valued as a thing in itself but for an intangible—perhaps indefinable—benefit it may bring to human existence. It knocks the shackles from the spirit. Or rather, since prosperity is no protection against enslavement by anxiety, by ambition, by self-esteem, or by any of the myriad lures which snare the mind, it gives us the key with which we can—if we wish—unlock them. Development creates potentialities. It is the responsibility of the educationist to ensure that they are used.

By promoting development and education we are not usurping the privilege of the individual to decide on his own fate. We are not moulding or manipulating people. We are trying to do the very opposite thing: to create conditions in which they may be more free to create their own conditions. But in the last resort development only releases potentialities which may be lost. Freedom may be turned imperceptibly into servitude, the knowledge which is so potent a tool in gaining freedom may harden into prejudice, power over the material world may be used to obtain power over men. This may be prevented from happening if we remind ourselves that freedom is of no more value in itself than is development. It is the use to which freedom is put which is important and freedom 'from' is primarily of value because it implies the more positive freedom 'to'. The freedom 'to' which I would stress is the freedom for a man to do what he has it in him to do, and to become what he has it in him to become by striving for truth, whether through art or science or religion or philosophy or mere living it matters not. I do not say this from devotion to some nebulous abstraction. On the contrary I speak of the one thing which has contributed to man's well-being—the proximate grasp of truth in a few fields. We cannot split up truth. We cannot say, for example, that the truth of physics is more desirable than that of psychology. We cannot pick and choose what to be truthful about, because if we do we shall soon find we can be truthful about nothing. Truth must be cherished as an idea, not as a bundle of information about this and that; and the idea is indivisible.[1]

The development works which we have considered are founded upon nothing if not the application of hard-won truth. Great feats of engineering, of medicine, of agriculture, and of the fundamental physical and biological sciences behind them, have made possible man's freedom from the pressure of his environment. These were not the achievements of people prepared to modify truth for some ideological whimsy. And we should bear in mind that some of the things we most abhor, prejudice, discrimination, and persecution based on class, colour, nation, or political belief, have grown because the truth was not taught.

The truth, to the extent to which we know and seek it, gives us that further dimension of freedom which completes the material and social liberation resulting from and in development; it is the realization of potentiality. And development, as I have just suggested, is based on the application of what is apprehended of truth to the affairs of men. Thus my argument comes full circle and I find myself enunciating a concept so well worn as to be almost platitudinous: that education is the repository of truth, and that without truth all fails.

I reflected for some time before starting to compose this lecture, toying with several possible themes. Eventually I decided to treat this as an occasion for saying what I felt to be of importance about two related subjects in which I am deeply interested. I hoped to say something startling and original. Instead I merely find myself led to conclusions which men more sagacious and experienced than myself reached before me, understood more fully and expressed more felicitously. In attempting to speak of what matters most, I find myself thrown back inexorably upon the monolithic concept of truth, and upon the absolute worth of freedom. If we view education and development within the massive framework of these two values, then we can only see the end of education as the search for truth, and the end of development as the maturity of man. And these two are identical.

---

[1] After writing this passage, I came across a saying attributed to Buddha in the Diamond Sutra: 'The Truth (in the sense of Reality) cannot be cut up into pieces and arranged into a system.'

AHANA LIBRARY *

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS, OXFORD
BY VIVIAN RIDLER
PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS send with compliments a review copy of

The Role of Education
in Developing Societies.
An Inaugural Lecture.
by Adam Curle.

PRICE in
United Kingdom: 3/- net

NO REVIEW should appear before publication of the book on:

23 November 1961.

THE SOURCE of the book should be stated as follows:

Published for the Ghana
University Press,
by
Oxford University Press

The publishers would be grateful for a clipping of your review, which should be sent to them at

AMEN HOUSE,
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.4