

in which these questions are framed, to a pragmatic approach that emphasizes the number and dimensions of the means available for involvement and expects social change to result from the application of those means, and especially to a belief in gradual progress that lays the emphasis on small-scale achievements. If such an approach is adopted, all comprehensive solutions and programs of national importance are rejected and activities are limited to a specific area of the country concerned and to the establishment of so-called functional mechanisms.

Action taken within the framework of what is "possible" is an attempt to create a certain number of "powers" at the grassroots level. It would entail not only developing the latent potential of farmers to the point where they became autonomous but also enabling them to acquire the capacity to become involved at a higher level. They would move up from one level to another, and each successful completion of a task would be the starting-point for the pursuit of a new objective. The attainment of an objective would indicate that a new "power" had been acquired and that their capacity to become involved had been increased.

This view of development has the advantage of, on the one hand, removing a dimension of false humanism and providing a political dimension, inasmuch as it is designed to create powers, and, on the other hand, of forcing the debate to concentrate on the internal problems of potentially recipient countries. This view should be considered further in order to determine whether the power structures developed as a result of the situation created by involvement could counterbalance the power structures generated by social structures.

It would be particularly useful to see how such objectives might be attained, the prerequisite of social upheaval to a change in internal power relations not met.

Even a rapid breakdown of the existing power structures shows that such structures have not yet been dismantled, mainly because any action that challenges the power of the ruling class is not accepted. An experiment is not accepted as long as it does not become a threat to social change but, once the new structure becomes a threat to the established one, the latter reacts and smashes its power. The challenger. It should be remembered that social change is conflict, which is not shifted or controlled but not avoided.

Conclusion

The dilemma of co-operation boils down to a few simple questions: *who does what, whom, with whom, on whose behalf, and asks for what to be done? And who is to do what?*

These questions in their very simplicity cast doubts on misleading assumptions and on many presuppositions that lead back to a fundamental consideration of the conditions that should be met for technical involvement to be practical and effective. In other words, the threshold below which any action within the system is bound to fail. Once the system has made it possible for the energies of the majority to be mobilized and channelled towards social change, the support of all men of good will and power who wish to become involved in a development project will be assured, partly as reparation and partly as a sign of brotherhood.