

Centro Interamericano de Documentación e Información Agrícola
1979
IICA-CIDIA

110A
C00
687



PRESENTATION OF
DOCTOR JOSE EMILIO G. ARAUJO, DIRECTOR GENERAL
OF THE INTER-AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL SCIENCES
AT A SESSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS SECTION OF THE
ADULT EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

61280009



Boston, November 8th., 1979

IICA
689

Faint, illegible text at the top of the page, possibly a header or title.

00002749

~~00002749~~

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am sure that you are aware of the difficulties involved in fully exploring the inter-relationship between adult education, food and development, in a short presentation such as this.

Some of the conceptual problems, difficult to tackle in themselves and due to the lack of reliable, systematic data, are further complicated by the rather wide differences existing among the various underdeveloped regions of the world. In addition to these conceptual problems several widespread misconceptions have fogged the issues during the last two decades. Not surprisingly, many of these misconceptions and false assumptions may be found at the root of national policies relating to food production, distribution and consumption, of those dealing with development (particularly with rural and agricultural development), and also of adult education policies and programs.

Since my experience is mainly in Latin America and the Caribbean, please allow me to restrict my words to this part of our world.

To begin with, food and development have been closely linked in Latin American development thinking during the last decade. Undoubtedly, the food emergencies and the lack of "food-security" in some regions of Africa and Asia have greatly influenced us in these matters. Taking our region as a whole, however, these problems have lacked the urgency and the relative importance that they have had in other areas.

During the Inter-American Conference on Agriculture, in 1971, we all shared the certainty that, in order to reduce underdevelopment, rapid solutions had to be found for problems of production and productivity (associated with the generation and adaptation of technology), and for the improvement of the living conditions of the rural population through the elimination of structural constraints on development.

The crucial nature of the decade was then defined in terms of the urgency with which these challenges had to be met. On the one hand, a severe imbalance was foreseen between demand for food and global food production. Great urgency was also attached to the need for modifying the composition of demand and improving the diet of the population. On the other hand, it was strongly felt that a drastic reversal was needed in the thirty-year tendency towards the concentration of productive resources, which had not brought about a simultaneous increase in the economic and social efficiency of the productive system.

Attention was also called, at the beginning of the decade, to the slowness with which productive jobs were being created within and outside agriculture, taking into account the speed of growth of the economically active population, the volume of rural-urban migrations, the deficient education of the young, and their scarce preparation for either rural or urban jobs.

Finally, it was emphasized that -before the seventies were over- a considerable improvement should be sought in international terms of trade for Latin America's agricultural imports and exports.

In the early seventies, the Member States of the Inter-American System as well as those that have joined since that time (especially in the Caribbean) have begun to intensify their experimentation with new approaches, conceived specifically to solve the types of problems that surfaced during the 1971 Conference.

These efforts have not been limited to rhetorical changes in style and approach. In many cases, they have been accompanied by drastic changes in the composition of public investments in agriculture. In other cases, they have led to sweeping institutional reforms of the agricultural sector. Still in others, attempts have been made to establish new forms of social organization of production and consumption.

In spite of all this, even the most superficial analysis reveals the unrelenting deterioration of the development process in the agricultural sector. The bulk of the problems and limitations singled out at the beginning of this decade continue to exist, and many of the new models tested have suffered a fate similar to that of the systems we were criticizing nine years ago.

It would be too long to analyze in depth the causes of this breakdown. The major aspects of the process are fairly well known and may be found in the recent literature on rural and agricultural development in Latin America.

Two new elements, however, have come to the fore during this decade. They will be part of our forecasts in the future, and they will remain -as far as we know- major constraints to finding new solutions. I refer specifically to oil prices, on the one hand, and, on the other, to the sequel of negative effects originated in some of the most important technological advances of our time.

In the early seventies, we did not clearly foresee the oil crisis, with its concomitant price increases for oil and other industrial products. It has severely affected the economies of all countries that are non-producers and exporters of petroleum, which include most of Latin America and the Caribbean. Given the structure of our productive systems, the agrarian sector has been particularly affected by this crisis. The very foundations of our technological strategies took for granted ample supplies of fuel and fertilizer at a given price level. Significant changes in the prices, however, have undermined the basis of our strategies and left us with no alternate plans and with a footing too weak to provide the basis for new strategies.

An immediate result is that this process has exercised a negative effect on the cost and volume of production that has not been compensated by any increase in prices for agricultural products. With certain short-term exceptions, agricultural prices have continued to be relatively depressed on international markets and have remained relatively low on domestic markets.

The second area of concern has to do specifically with the massive introduction of technological progress to increase the volume of production of certain crops. These efforts, springing from the age-old hope of eliminating hunger from the world, have sought to generate new technology whose primary effect would be to increase the overall production per unit of land without reducing the quality and nutritional value of the food, or perhaps even enhance it.

The basic thesis of the so-called "green revolution" has been to modify the technological strategy that has been implicit in agricultural development in recent decades, maximizing the use of sophisticated inputs to achieve quantitative production goals by approaching the biological "ceiling" of various crops.

A study carried out by the United States Institute for Food and Development Policy revealed that this new technological strategy has had two major effects:

Experience shows that, in the first place, it has led to concentration of the land. The commercial farmer (and in the Third World countries this generally excludes the small and medium-sized producers) has made investment decisions to increase the farm's available land resources. These expansion decisions have worked to the detriment of the small or medium-sized farmer who, unable to obtain the new high-cost technologies, is squeezed out of competition and must sell his land. The money he receives from the sale of the land is too little for him to undertake other independent productive activities, and the labor market, urban as well as rural, is unable to absorb him. Thus, he is no longer involved even in the subsistence level family production in which he engaged before. In the medium term, this situation leads inexorably to the stagnation, or even the reduction, of the internal demand for food products. We have not determined with absolute certainty the elasticity of demand of these former small producers. Nor do we know where their income will be coming from. In the second place, all indications are that these new strategies have boosted the volume of production without necessarily bringing about true increases in the supply of food products for human consumption in underdeveloped countries where they are needed most. In fact, the decision to increase production is not necessarily associated in the mind of the commercial farmer with the public sector's decision to increase the availability of high-quality food for large sectors of the population that normally have limited access to it. The farmer decides to produce whatever will yield the highest return, and in many cases this means producing feed grains for animal consumption. Due to high prices and international market conditions, these animals will eventually be consumed by the wealthiest sectors of the rich countries.

In summary, we know how to produce more and how to work miracles with soil, seeds, and agrochemicals. In the effort to apply our knowledge, we concentrate land, we dispossess the small and medium-sized farmers instead of turning them into competent agricultural entrepreneurs, we reduce the supply of food to broad segments of the population in underdeveloped countries, we stabilize prices and increase food supplies in developed countries, and -by the way- we contribute to the wages paid for the production of high added-value inputs in developed countries.

The "oil crisis" is with us to stay. There is not much we can do to change the rules of the game that control it. However, the selection and development of new technological strategies is something that does concern us, for which we can develop and apply the rules ourselves.

The international organizations and the countries contributing to development efforts are largely responsible for these problems. We have been accused, and perhaps rightly so, of not formulating appropriate models for use by developing nations. We are told that our very definition of the problems stubbornly persists in viewing the developing countries through the eyes of developed countries, and that the cooperation we offer is nothing but a prescription put together by university professors in developed nations, concerned about solving their own problems which have very little to do with ours. At the same time, we are accused of seeing the problem of hunger as one of supply rather than of demand. We see the problem of production exclusively as the outcome of low productivity; the producer himself rarely enters the picture. We treat the challenge of development as a growth issue rather than a question of equity. We handle institutional weakness as a problem of efficiency rather than an imperative of effectiveness.

Ladies and Gentlemen:

Let me share with you some of the approaches that we have developed at the Inter-American Institute of Agricultural Sciences in relation with these matters.

First, in the opinion of our organization, food production in itself is not a basic problem. Taking our countries as a whole, the Latin American and Caribbean region does have the physical base, especially in terms of land and water resources, not only to supply its own needs for food in the short term, but also to help supply other regions of the world.

Second, we feel that the fundamental constraint hampering any dramatic increases in food production is not technological; this does not mean, however, that we should stop trying to generate new technologies based on the availability and actual combination of productive factors.

Third, we do not feel that all producers should be raising food crops. We do feel that all farmers, particularly the small ones, should be competent entrepreneurs, that all agricultural enterprises should make rational use of the production factors they have at hand, and that they should combine these factors in such a way as to maximize overall profitability and the adequate use and combination of available resources. We cannot forget that land available to the small farmers is only a small percentage of the total. Recent information shows, for example, that minifundia farmers and landless workers constitute some 72% of the people employed in agriculture.

Fourth, we feel that food production development programs must never be formulated by turning a deaf ear to, and divorcing ourselves from the overall development policies of the rural sector. In many countries, we simply cannot ask the agricultural sector to supply us with food while, at the same time, it generates the bulk of our foreign exchange, provides employment for the most of the rural population, and continues, as it always has, to subsidize the urban industrial sector.

Fifth, in view of the above factors, we feel that it is impossible to divorce overall food production and sectoral development programs and policies from the rational selection of public investment alternatives made by each country at the national level, according to its own development models and styles for the medium and long terms.

Sixth, we feel that development cannot be a goal achieved by international organizations. Quite the contrary, we must be careful to see that these organizations do not distort the development process. Development can be achieved only by national-level institutions and organizations committed to cohesive policy lines. These must be well organized and coordinated and must have the resources and flexibility they need to learn that the viability and success of the programs are established and proven only by being and working with the farmer. They must also be able to adapt themselves to the constantly changing needs and aspirations of the rural sector.

Finally, and not to belabor the point, we at IICA have noticed that the decision to develop the agricultural sector is fundamentally an ethical and rational one. As such, it becomes unworkable unless it is preceded by a true commitment to equity. Development for the few is not true development, just as any increases in gross production of grains are irrelevant and meaningless if they serve only to increase hunger.

Consequently, we at IICA feel that our major efforts to accelerate the development of the rural sector and to increase food production in the future for Latin America and the Caribbean must address the causes of underdevelopment and low production, avoiding attempts to concentrate only on the occasional manifestations of these phenomena, regardless of how dramatic these may be.

With this analysis of our activities, and aware of the inevitable differences that exist from one country to another, we have defined the following eight specific approaches. We feel they represent the most rational method for attacking the causes of underdevelopment at this point in time:

ONE: We feel that concrete action should be taken explicitly to generate jobs in the agricultural sector, with the understanding that we want permanent rather than cyclical employment. We are seeking jobs with a level of productivity consistent with the actual combination of productive factors, that will guarantee an income at least comparable to minimum wages in the urban sector.

We understand that, in all cases, this action must include high-priority treatment of depressed areas, groups living under extreme poverty, the unemployed, landless wage-earners, tenant farmers, and small subsistence farmers.

We also understand that, depending on the characteristics of each case, these actions can include programs for expanding agricultural frontiers reorganizing rural regional structures, implementing agrarian reform, or adopting a combination of these actions.

TWO: We must guarantee the steady expansion of such basic services as health, education, housing, and social security benefits to include full coverage in the rural areas.

This implies a process of finding new orientations and a new balance in social investments among the various sectors, which is closely tied to our efforts to include the concept of equity in our development.

Moreover, we are convinced that domestic demand can expand not only through higher incomes, but also through measures that specifically modify the income elasticity of domestic demand by seeking a priori solutions of certain basic needs.

THREE: We would like to implement the design and large-scale testing of technological strategies based on the volume and nature of available resources.

We realize that this involves the massive development and implementation of production systems that make optimum use of soil productive capacity, maximize farm profitability, and optimize the level at which productive factors are used in their various combinations.

We also recognize that, over a relatively long initial period, this could involve the total reorganization of national research and extension systems to meet the needs of the small farmers and the associative enterprises. This is based on the assumption that the commercial agricultural sectors are able to select the technology that most interests them, have access to it, and have the means of acquiring it.

FOUR: Education is our fourth concern. In a few minutes I will develop some ideas on the contribution of adult education to this process. In general, however, we would systematically develop educational and training efforts to serve the interests of development and equity. This involves, for one thing, expanding educational coverage to achieve at least the levels that exist in the urban sector and improving the internal efficiency of the system. We would also

like to make the content of these educational systems more relevant to the world of rural labor and to seek non-conventional methods for organizing the educational process.

This also involves organizing education according to the needs of productive work, with form and content as dynamic as the changes in the labor market itself.

Finally, we must re-train all the personnel working in rural development. They must be given the skills they need to deal effectively with the inevitable changes in the volume and nature of the newly generated demand for services of all kinds.

FIVE: We must make concrete efforts to correct market weaknesses caused by structural factors. This would guarantee the farmer a fairer percentage of the final price and considerably reduce losses during and after the harvest.

We feel that the highly dependent circumstances of the small and medium-sized farmers and associative enterprises, when they must deal with agents of the traditional marketing system, can be corrected only through farmer organization and decisive state cooperation in the form of programs selectively geared to these groups.

We realized that this is not a simple question of improving the efficiency of the traditional marketing channels, but rather it must, above all seek to support the development of rural enterprises of sufficient size and scale through programs designed especially for these groups. We feel that such programs must include actions to support efforts to organize farmers, provide marketing services and training, and make available adequate financing of rural infrastructure in order to improve the conditions of storage and processing of agricultural products.

SIX: We must give high priority to the transformation of traditional farming into entrepreneurial farming.

To our way of thinking, this implies both farmer training (small farmers as well as those who have joined together in associative enterprises) and the development of appropriate managerial tools. We also recognize that such tools must be based on actual availability of production factors, that they must

take into account the significance of risk for small and medium-sized farms and for associative enterprises, and that they must be useful for the development of appropriate management systems for these type of enterprises.

SEVEN: We must equip national institutions to plan and manage rural and agricultural development policies. This implies not only the ability to handle internal variables, but also the real possibility of controlling the flow of technical and financial resources from the foreign sector.

This goes beyond the old familiar concept of "training national counterparts" which is so often the beginning and end of any "institution building" provided from abroad.

We are referring rather to the edification of solid organizations to oversee the design and implementation of truly national and regional policies. These organizations would be committed to the policies and would have the resources to develop their functions independently of foreign support and on the basis of internal inter-agency coordination.

EIGHT: Finally, we feel that the effort to attack the causes of underdevelopment and inequitable distribution places fundamental importance on all concrete efforts to achieve a more reasonable distribution and use of land. Such actions include programs for agrarian reform, reorganization of rural land tenure systems, the orderly and systematic expansion of the agricultural frontiers, and various combinations of these approaches.

IICA is convinced that the development of activities of this type will enable us to make significant progress toward an equitable development process that will provide substantial increases in the supply and demand of food products in the medium term.

Up to now I have attempted to explore the relationship between "food and development" both from the point of view of increasing the production (supply) of food, as well as from the perspective of strengthening demand. In doing so, I have looked into some questions dealing with economic and technological constraints to development -new and old- and into some questions dealing with the "~~human~~ factor".

Allow me now to further examine this "human factor" and what possible roles adult education may perform within the scope of "food and development".

While nobody can deny that adult education has some role to perform within this context, the definition of which roles has varied widely over the years and among different regions of the world.

One common approach, covering all forms of education (including formal and non-formal) has attempted to link its content to a more or less strict adaptation of skills to employment opportunities. Under this perspective, the "right" education is that which organizes learning experiences to correspond to technological and attitudinal demands posed (for example) by the rapidly expanding industrial sector. The application of this approach to rural areas in general, and rural development in particular, has usually resulted in major emphases being placed on the development of technological packages (of one kind or another) to be transferred to the producer, and in the improvement of the "delivery systems" for them.

A second, more recent approach, has attached to education a much more dynamic, all-embracing role as an inevitable prime mover of the process of change itself. As such actions in education involve not only those related to the more or less passive acquisition of new skills, but also the organization of farmers and rural workers, their systematic analysis and discovery of their own problems and their solutions, their increased participation in making decisions that affect their lives and their growing influence in society as a whole.

Both approaches, with all their implications and ramifications, have deeply influenced the theory and organization of adult education programs for rural Latin America.

The first approach has its roots in agricultural extension work developed in the United States. Surprisingly enough, many of the principles that go with extension as it has been developed here, bring it quite close to what we have as a second approach. Nobody could argue that the pragmatic extension agent who lived and worked with the farmers did not in fact do more than just act as an agent for the introduction of new technology.

Somehow, though, in the process of moving the very rich experience of extension work to other parts of the world, and particularly to Latin America, it became quite barren and inflexible. More than a dynamic factor in changing the lives of people, it often turned into a more or less hollow ritual financed by the state to provide employment to a number of professionals, without truly affecting the way in which people organized their lives, their production and their communities.

As often happens with institutional "transplants", the basic principles are lost in the process. Thus, extension work as it was organized and applied in most cases in Latin America, did little more than pass on ready made recipes which might have been useful for an American farmer of the 1920's or 1930's, but . . . which are not necessarily in line with the kind of resources available to the Latin American farmer and to the kinds of markets to which he has access. And precisely there you have an example of how the principle gets lost and the ritual survives.

Generalizations, however, are always hard and often give false impressions. It is true that this approach has done more than what I just indicated and has progressively become broader and more complex, in order to include new programs and perspectives for Latin America. One of the very reasons for this change may be precisely its lack of success.

The fact is, however, that the limited coverage of the formal educational system and the slow expansion of diversified employment opportunities in traditional latifundia-minifundia agriculture, together with growing pressures for expanded services and opportunities, have pushed national institutions into diversifying the traditional approaches. The early basic and often incomplete primary school system -though still far from equal to urban standards- has expanded; some secondary and technical school opportunities have appeared since the early sixties; technical assistance and extension programs have increasingly developed with a more widespread small farmer and cooperative farmer focus. Almost everywhere -at one time or another- literacy and basic education campaigns have been undertaken. More recently "rural development" programs and projects are being implemented by national governments, with a small farmer focus and a strong education and training component, often

financed with strong international support. Approximately two-thirds of the countries of Latin America have such programs at present. Finally, some more or less isolated attempts are being aimed at the integration of all educational programs (formal and non-formal, for children as well as for adults) at the local level, closely linked with the solution of concrete community problems.

The process of expanding and diversifying this approach has also involved a proliferation of the institutions involved in their design and implementation. Among them, Ministries of Agriculture, Education and Health have been strong. Special national "programs" or "campaigns" have also appeared on the scene, often complemented by other institutions such as Ministries of Labor, churches, and voluntary organizations, and even the military. It is only rarely, though, that these various agencies work together, even if they are engaged in programs which are similar or complementary in nature.

As these efforts become more widespread, preoccupations as to their efficiency and effectiveness have increasingly followed paths similar to those noted among institutions dealing with adult education in more developed regions of the world. Thus, considerable efforts are being devoted to such programs as those falling under the general heading of "distance learning" for rural areas (of which we may find examples in almost every country of Latin America), open schooling, etc. Research is beginning to follow similar initiatives, and resources are increasingly being devoted to adult learning, methodologies for transferring technology, communications and the use of mass media, etc.

Although still too early to seriously undertake an evaluation on the combined effects of all these efforts, a quick glance at the partial results at hand is not too encouraging. It is possible that part of the blame should fall on adult educators and educational planners, who have perhaps unwittingly raised expectations on education's direct contribution to development, far above what education (as conceived and implemented) could in all fairness do.

The fact remains that in terms of number as well as in terms of quality and effects, advances in rural education in Latin America have not been

impressive. As a whole, illiteracy has not been greatly reduced in percentage terms mainly due to population growth, deficiencies in school coverage during the sixties and seventies, and the limited impact of most adult literacy programs (success stories, as you know, are the exception). Although the coverage of the formal school system has dramatically expanded, it has done so less rapidly in rural than in urban contexts, and only modest advances have been made in the percentage of rural population covered by the system.

In terms of "quality" and "impact", the situation is not much brighter. Recent literature shows an important gap between content and needs, great deficiencies in teacher preparation, lack of relevance of the whole educational effort (particularly in formal education) for required skills, given the prevailing and foreseeable labor market conditions, high costs, etc.

Even more, schooling has been identified as one of the major "push-factors" in the migration process to urban areas, without necessarily qualifying people to live and work there. Non-formal programs in general, and adult education in particular, have only reinforced this tendency, particularly when they have been viewed mainly as a second chance at formal schooling, or as a complement to cover its deficiencies.

The contribution of education to the context of "food and development", as we have defined it, has also been limited in this approach. As I said before, we feel that producing food is not a major problem. In our experience, if we have useful, reasonable ways of increasing yields or improving profits, the educational process involved in their adoption by the farmer -including the small farmer- is not too complicated. This is particularly true if this process starts with the idea that what he does is reasonable within the context of what he knows and the risks he can take, and that he will only accept alternatives as long as they are at least as reasonable as his own. The role of education in this process is not that complex. The key may rest with the generation of such reasonable alternatives, and -as experience has shown- the educator usually has far more to learn in this process than the farmer himself.

One role that education has almost completely failed to play in this first approach involves acting on the "demand side" of the food and development question. By this I mean, mostly, that all these different kinds of programs have consistently fallen short on some key achievements:

First:

They have not really succeeded in making the farmer and the rural wage earner truly aware of the major constraints to the improvement of his lot, and the ways in which these constraints may be lifted.

Second:

They have failed to convince the farmers and rural workers to organize and pool their resources (and I am talking of their intelligence and their work, as much as of their material resources) as a means to be heard, to obtain services, and to give size and scale to their enterprises.

Third:

Educators and educational programs have not been truly capable of adapting what they know to the real needs of the rural population, and particularly to the small farmer. There is such a thing as a set of management tools for the small farm, or the cooperative farm. To utilize management tools and principles useful only to the large scale commercial-farming enterprises is of limited value, and may damage both the farmer and the credibility of the educational program.

Fourth:

Even when they have been partially successful in the achievement of some of these goals, many educational programs still fail to "institutionalize" what they do at the level of a given community. The fact that one problem has been solved may not be enough if the educational process has not been made a permanent feature in the community environment, capable of identifying, analyzing and solving other problems as they appear in the future.

Naturally, while these general observations hold true for most cases, some interesting programs and projects promise somewhat more. IICA is involved in two such programs (in Haiti and Northeast Brazil). During the next two or

three years we hope to be able to evaluate this work and disseminate what we have been doing and the results of these experiences.

It is possible, however, that the functional nature of this first approach may have limitations in itself, and that we should not assign education such a key role in development under this perspective. Rather, it would seem that the major contribution it could make would be mainly of an "instrumental" nature, in support of the achievement of broad economic and social development objectives.

The second approach, however, would place education in general -and adult education in particular- as the key factor in mobilizing people to define what development means for them, and to organize themselves in order to accelerate the process.

I am referring, in particular, to Paulo Freire's teachings and experiences. I am sure that you are all familiar with his views, his failures and his successes. I am also referring with deep admiration, to the work initiated in Tanzania by inspiration of Dr. Julius Nyerere, President of that country and a spiritual brother of Paulo Freire.

In a speech delivered in Dar Es Salaam in May, 1974, President Nyerere said: "...the purpose of education is liberation through the development of man as a member of society.... it is not to turn out technicians who can be used as instruments in the expansion of the economy. It is to turn out men and women who have the technical knowledge and ability to expand the economy for the benefit of man in society".

In a series of workshops organized by IICA en Peru between 1973 and 1975, education then was understood as:

"... (placing) the social object at the center of the educational process not only as an object of knowledge, but also -and fundamentally- as an object of transformation. Education stops being the transmission of socially pre-determined contents, to become an action for re-discovering reality in transformation and for the transformation of the social object".

As a result of the experiences in Tanzania, as well as in some parts of Latin America, several attempts have been made to redefine the role of education following these principles, with varying degrees of success. A common feature of these experiences has been that education and the educator are not easily identifiable with our stereotype of school and teacher. The adult educator is easily mistaken for just another member of the village, a community development worker, a health officer, and agricultural extensionist, etc. The truth is, in most cases he will be precisely that... as well as an adult educator.

Other features in common? they will all be trying to organize people to teach things to each other... if by teaching we understand defining their problems, searching for causes, identifying ways of solving them and skills needed to put solutions into effect, and further organizing themselves to do so. It is possible that we shall not even see literacy work underway. It may be that illiteracy has not yet been identified as a priority problem to solve, but perhaps infant mortality or water supply have been identified, and that is where "education" is taking place

As you can imagine "re-inventing" education along these lines may be difficult, particularly for specialists. It may also be difficult for people to understand that this is education, when all they have been led to expect from traditional education is a diploma, or a degree. But if you just use this concept (as is being done in some places) without specifically calling it "education" you may find that people take to it quite naturally; since this is the way they usually learn, especially in rural areas.

"Re-inventing" education, as we have termed it, should not be taken to mean that we should do away with other forms. Quite the contrary: in the same way that we can identify teaching methodologies most adequate for what we call "functional education" training for specific skills and technologies, this type of education should be seen as a basic approach on which all other forms would be

Of course, achieving this is not a simple affair: as President Nyerere said,

"The Tanzania Government, like governments elsewhere, is faced with real problems of choice and priorities in education and in the organization of society for human liberation. If we knew how to effect all the changes which are necessary -or even knew all those for which there is necessity- I would not be telling you of our failures. We would be too busy correcting them".

To finish, ladies and gentlemen, I believe that -in the same way as the problems of food and development are not solved by food production alone- the role of adult education in helping to solve them is not to try and do it alone. We have learnt this, time and time again, during the last decades. In all fairness we may say, however, that without a truly liberated man -this means not only that he is free, but also that he has the skills to remain free- these problems cannot be solved equitably and permanently.

Thank you very much.

FECHA DE DEVOLUCION

IICA
C00
687
Autor

PRESENTATION OF DOCTOR
JOSE EMILIO G. ARAUJO,
DIRECTOR GENERAL OF THE
...

Título

Nombre del solicitante

Fecha Devolución

| Fecha Devolución | |
|------------------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |



