This conference has dealt with an important and unique set of problems. It has come to grips with certain problems which should be the concern of the whole university, and home economists are to be commended both (a) in being able to conceptualize so many of these so well and (b) in bringing them before the academic community in a manner which may be inviting to other disciplines.

The Challenge to Lead Women to Their Full Potential

More important, however, the conference has focused on the importance of women and the home in their potential role and contribution to social progress and economic development. This is a challenge of great order: to lead women of the world to their full potential in social progress. This is an aggregate and ultimate challenge, and an over-all objective for home economics, even though this end may sometimes seem obscured to the home economist working on day-to-day tasks of a country or institutional program in a particular discipline. It is more than a challenge; it is a responsibility if societies are to rise to the possibilities of their resources in extending social welfare. Societies, after all, are only the sum of individuals and families.

The Challenge to Draw Attention to Home Economics' Potential Contribution

A second major challenge, although it equally is a responsibility, is for home economics to bring the full vision of its potential contribution to the forefront. It is particularly important to get program administrators, budget directors, policy makers, and societies in general to understand the potential of home economics. As a collection of disciplines with equal focus on the families, households, women, social action, and the entire consumer complex or welfare function, the home economics area is broad. It should be so recognized. Unfortunately, the resource or production side usually receives emphasis in international developmental and aid programs. However, home economics affects many more persons and families and a greater proportion of the population of all countries. One reason why it does is simply because all workers or human resources are members of these groups, but not all members of these groups are in the labor force. Undoubtedly, the task of bringing this vision to program administrators rests with home economists. At this conference and elsewhere, you have be

*Dr. Heady is professor of economics and executive director, Center for Agricultural and Economic Development at Iowa State University.*
begun to build up the necessary momentum. Don't let it slacken. The social progress and welfare function of societies will be advanced most, in terms of the number of persons involved and the development of woman's fullest potential, only if an appropriate investment is made in the area of home economics.

Home economics also is challenged in working with a far more complex set of human resources and social conditions than are those professions which deal with commerce, industrialization, etc. in the development of countries. Several factors contribute to this condition: Females generally have less favorable opportunities for education in developing countries. Women have a restricted role and voice in these countries. Moreover, general customs tend to confine woman to the home and work force and keep her away from the main stream of collective social action.

But because professional workers in home economics are more involved with these complexities, they generally have a better understanding of the effect of various facets of culture and customs on the desire for, the potential rate of, and the best means to desired change. You have, more than at any conference I have previously attended, reflected a penetrating insight into these phenomena. It would be useful, or could be even considered a challenge, for the home economics profession to orient this knowledge and concern for the benefit of all professional workers who participate in international programs, regardless of their field of specialization. Fewer mistakes and false starts would arise if this were possible. Perhaps home economics should take the initiative in creating one or more institutes which provide orientation in cultures, customs, values, and related phenomena for all professional workers preparing for assignments abroad.

In international programs, home economics deals or should deal with phenomena which, although somewhat directly attached to them, extends far beyond women and homes. Women not only are the homemakers, if we can borrow imperfectly a term from our own society which has only one meaning -- they also serve a much more important role and function in the unskilled labor force. They are, although given inadequate opportunity for development, an essential part of the stock of human resources. Added to these functions, they perform a heavy burden in simultaneously bearing large families and in attempting to maintain health, housing, nutrition, and family welfare generally under highly adverse conditions.

Of course, we are all aware of a strata of high income households in developing countries. However, while the relatively less complex and parallel approaches in research, education, and family counsel in highly developed societies apply quite widely to these households, such households make up the numerically insignificant sector of the population in the less developed societies. Hence, home economics has its most important assignment and challenge in an economic and social realm where the woman serves as a homemaker, laborer, family determinant, population expediter, health officer, and house builder -- and performs a complex of other functions and duties. In fact, in most developing countries, it is impossible and generally not useful to try to distinguish
between the activities of the household as a producing unit and as a consuming unit where the household produces hardly more food than for its own needs.

For this same reason, many of our aggregative theories of development under-emphasize the social, economic, and motivational significances of the complex phenomena involved. They abstract too far from the individual units and cultural orientations which can serve importantly either to restrain or catalyze economic development and social progress. We thus are faced with an extreme void in theories and models which provide conceptual and quantitative frameworks for more systematic approaches in moving ahead through this complicated set of interrelationships of producing and consuming units and in various roles of the individual and family. One of the prime needs is to develop a relevant set of theories and concepts which will provide systematic direction in handling the complex set of phenomena and interrelationships involved. Because of its fundamental importance, home economists should both devote resources to this process, and help to see that others do so.

The Task of Securing Recognition of the Complexity of Phenomena Centering About Women, Households, Families and Values

Another major task before us is to find means, as this conference has partly done, to obtain proper recognition of the complexity as well as the importance of the phenomena which center around households, women, families, values, and other facets of the interrelationships in production and consumption or in savings and investment. Even in economic terms, the direct and indirect relationships in consumption or the household are of equal importance with those in production in specifying the organization of resources, commodities, and facilities which will maximize the welfare level. This obvious fact is not recognized sufficiently in our own international investments for development, and even in university programs which place an overly dominating emphasis on programs aimed at production.

The extreme of the latter position is, of course, expressed within socialist countries where the criterion and almost the end of economic organization is industrialization and the rate of economic growth, with the consumer sector taking a secondary role and serving mainly as a means. (E.g., goods are allocated to consumption on a basis designed to prevent social unrest, but labor and national income otherwise are oriented towards savings and investment to promote the rate of economic growth for the welfare of future generations or other remote ends.) The obsession with development, both in theory and practice, with less regard for and sometimes even at the expense of present welfare betterment, is even suggested in the label, AID, under which the United States makes its major international investment. This label directly emphasizes development, with welfare betterment suggested only secondarily.

Welfare betterment is, as mentioned earlier, as much dependent on reorganizations on the consumption, family, utility, or cultural side, as it is dependent on reorganizations on the resource and production side. Certainly
welfare betterment (i.e., in the set of relationships defining the production and investment functions) is the ultimate end of economic development. Quite obviously, that set of phenomena and relationships to which home economics is most closely related is consumption and welfare betterment.

**The Task of Continuing the Dialogue on the Goals of International Development Programs**

Another major task is to continue the dialogue partly initiated here, to better define the goals and ends in international development programs, and to arrange for the best use of the nation's scientific and educational resources available for these purposes. The goals and objectives are themselves important to our programs, both on and off campus. While some institutions have well-defined goals in respect to economic development per se and international programs, I am not certain that this is generally the case. What are the real purposes? To some institutions, the goal appears to be simply that of being in style—"We need to have an international program because others do." In other cases, an international program is largely a means to the university—a means of obtaining conventional on-campus activities through the diversion of contractual overhead funds. In still other cases, international programs are promoted to put foreign students on the home campus as a means of broadening the horizons of domestic students, or even to give the university's professors an opportunity to broaden themselves abroad. These purposes are discussed in relation to international programs about as frequently as are the most effective and efficient means of actually attaining economic development and welfare betterment. Perhaps equally often, the stated purposes in development and welfare serve only as a veneer covering a core of other purposes.

While this conference has aided, I doubt that our system as a whole has yet sufficiently faced the overriding purpose and justification—development and welfare improvement—which should be the foundation of international programs. I believe that our university programs will be organized quite differently when we do so. For example, universities would specialize more for the foreign student; they would provide specialized curricula for such students; they might put less emphasis on the scientific niceties and styles of science and economic development, and more emphasis on applied knowledge and research methodology.

Pure science is one of the lowest cost imports for a developing country, as compared to applied research concentrating on unique conditions which are not duplicated elsewhere. In some fields, concentration on training in methodology, oriented to the environment of developed countries, is now so highly emphasized that foreign students, upon their return home, turn immediately to theoretical research which has the goals of getting articles published in Western journals and impressing their colleagues with whom they became acquainted in study in the United States. This product typically represents a smaller return on the developmental investment than would the solution of pressing practical problems in the context of the particular conditions of the country. In my own opinion, the programs of some of our "giant universities" (in international programs) tend to direct students more towards theoretical research than towards more direct and short-run utilitarian goals of economic development and social welfare betterment.
The Task of Securing More Effective Allocation of Research and Educational Resources in International Programs

Another major remaining institutional task is to bring about a more effective allocation of research and educational resources which can be diverted to international programs. While funds for this purpose are increasing, available manpower is extremely limited and will grow increasingly so in the next decade as domestic student enrollment increases. Our current system of national university involvement largely "grew up" without systematic planning. We still find several institutions involved in a single country where one or two could serve better, institutions competing with each other for university or developmental contracts in other countries, and a few universities spread thinly over many contracts while others are scarcely engaged. We find two universities engaged in foreign contract work, each in work for which the other is most suited in terms of specialized staff, geographic location and climatic conditions, and educational and research traditions. These over-all problems of the university network which need to be resolved if we are to systematize the use of our scientific resources and cause them to be most productive in international development programs.

With more funds becoming available for research on economic development, home economics should claim an appropriate and larger share of it. And this research should transcend realms traditionally put aside for home economics, since phenomena rather than the historic definitions are important. Because home economics is closer to the family, to women and the deepest rooted customs and values it properly can tackle such research areas as the following:

Education as it relates to human resource development (and particularly women, the relatively under-privileged in education by all societies);

The role of customs, values, and cultures in restraining women to the home and in restraining the family from the main stream of social progress;

The interrelationships of the firm and the household as these relate to rates of economic progress; and others.

The Challenges Facing Home Economics

I have outlined some major tasks that are still before us, in improving university or institutional international programs. The papers and discussions of this conference have dealt quite deeply and excellently with problems and practice for developing curricula, research programs, and administrative procedures. I have no doubt that the rising enthusiasm and interest of home economists will stimulate action along lines suggested at this conference. There can be much greater room for action, and a more productive outcome of such action, however, if the remaining university and institutional problems outlined can be more widely discussed, systematic research and educational programs for people from developing countries can be developed, and overall solutions proposed.
Perhaps it is within the realm and challenge of home economics to lead the way and do so over its very broad and important set of disciplines. You have advantage both in (a) a wide collection of disciplines within home economics focusing on the central economic and social concern of societies and (b) a better identified collective interest, as compared, for example, with the range of disciplines which relate to the production and physical resource side of economic development. Challenge and opportunity exist for you to lead the way. Further, considerably more of the intellectual leadership in the international programs should come from home economics and closely related and similarly oriented disciplines. It is not impossible (and highly probable) that the basic and long-run solutions in international poverty and development will come from the family and household side rather than from the physical resources and commodity supply side, where effort now is concentrated. The potential of population restraints, as compared to production improvement, alone poses this possibility over the long run. The initiative is with you and it should be exercised.