

Speaker 1: Jorge Ishizawa: *The Vicissitudes of a Post-Graduate Curriculum based on Andean Campesino Agriculture*

Pratec is not educational institution. We are reticent practitioners of education. We have been brought once again into education perhaps because our young communities, the campesinos, say is that the real problem they are facing is loss of respect. They say we have lost respect for our lands for our mountains, our water, and there is loss of respect among ourselves and that is the problem. And the school has to do a lot with it. That is their perception. So it is inevitable that working with Andean campesinos we find ourselves face to face with educational problems. We have been dealing with higher education. But nowadays we have been pulled into looking at the whole education system, starting with primary school level.

When my colleagues at Pratec and I think of Multiversity, we wish to see a living community linked and immersed into living communities. This is very important. This has been our experience and I would like to show you this, through the concrete case of the work we are doing in the Andes.

(Screening of Video)

When I mentioned our vision of Multiversity as a living community linked to living communities, these are the living communities we are referring to. Actually when we started working we didn't have this close relationship with these communities neither did we have the local groups working with these communities accompanying them in the field. When we started off this work in 1986/87 the purpose of our work was rather limited. What we wanted to do is to draw on this Lokavidya (peoples' knowledge) and make it softwareable with other technical personnel who were working in rural development projects because what they were doing in the field was perfectly ignorant of this Lokavidya and we thought that it was important to incorporate these local ways of doing things.

But of course when we got into that, we soon realized that we didn't have partners in the local NGOs working throughout the Andes. So our colleague the late visited these rural development NGOs and found that none of them were willing to collaborate in this process of recovering or making this Lokavidya public.

So we had to create our own community from colleagues. And I guess that is the first step in every community which wants to grow and become a living community. So that is the reason we started this de-forming or de-training economists and people who did field work in local rural NGOs. We still have to develop appropriate curriculum for this. I should mention here that there was an awareness of this situation in local universities, not in the ones in Lima but there were some 15 faculties of rural economies throughout the Andes, in Peru. All of them were teaching modern agriculture and none of them being placed in a center of origin of agriculture, they didn't teach the campesino type of agriculture – they didn't teach Lokavidya.

So the university authorities asked the founder of Pratec to set up a curriculum to train the university teachers. It turned out that it was necessary to de-train them first and for all of us to unlearn what we have learnt at the university to be able to have access to this Lokavidya. That was a tremendously difficult process because we saw that all these processes of de-colonization of the mind were too deeply involved in western type of education - western type of agronomy, anthropology, social science, economics and all that. So to develop that curriculum was a difficult thing to do.

So Pratec had this initial idea of making a contrast between western knowledge that is not based on local treatment of aspects like social organization, water, landscape or whatever and opposed that to the local understanding of the same categories. Of course what they found is that the categories simply did not apply – the people had different understanding of these things. So the way to go about it was to go to the people and talk about it. That is how we have testimonies of the people about how they understand rituals and how things happen in their places. Of course that was a tremendous undertaking because we had no way of doing it formally, or in a way that was fundable. So we had to rely on people who had gone through the early versions of our annual course on Andean agriculture and find funds for small local NGOs who started the communities in their activities.

These early NGOs were staffed especially by agronomists who wanted to go back to their communities to unlearn and relearn what they had forgotten in the universities Interesting things happened. One of the testimonies of these early pioneers was that for the first time they could talk with their parents about how they did agriculture. One of them said that he found out his mother knew a lot more than his father.

Since 1995 Pratec has been able to get funds for a joint project and we formed Nacasis i.e Nuclear for Andean Cultural Affiliation and their idea of cultural affiliation was very much our motto what we wanted to do and that was centered on agriculture and....

So the whole curriculum turns around the idea of Chakra and what is done in it. And the curriculum was designed so that people from these rural development NGOs could come and share their field experience. People also came from universities. By 1995 when we started this joint project that could be funded, there were about 60 graduates We ended that programme in 1999. There were no more people and there were no more funds.

In 2002 when we started this project on in-situ conservation of plants there were already about 17 of these local NGOs. Then we thought of scaling this course up to masters programme. We had the luck or misfortune, depends on how you look at it, of getting into an agreement with a local university, which actually was initially rather reticent of taking Lokavidya into the university. But they finally agreed and after 3 years they are rather happy about it. I don't know if it will last. Our agreement was for only 4 years. The scaling up meant incorporating global concerns into this training that we are giving as this annual course for staff members of the Nuclear for Cultural Affirmation.

We thought it was just a matter of getting people to talk about globalisation, international markets and so on. Actually it meant radical structuring of the curriculum

and only after 3 years we realized the mess we got into. We need a lot of help and I hope Multiversity will help us with this. After having listened to the sessions this morning, I am sure this is the place to ask for help.

The other thing that happened is that people who got involved with this process, be it the annual course or the masters program, realized that we were all learning to become cultural mediators - which is, not being in the middle of different traditions, but standing on the tradition that we came from i e this community that we are related to or of which we are a part of, and being able to understand the other culture we are trying to decolonize from. I don't think we have achieved complete success in this but of course we are trying and it is another call for help.

I was not in the beginning of the foundation of Pratec. Actually I am one of the victims of the annual course. So I have lived the experience and later I was able to form part of the teaching team and I guess I am a privileged witness of the process. So I have written the piece which has been circulated in which I have given some background and how this developed. What I think it is interesting is the idea of relating academics with communities. That is not an easy process. It is very difficult to do but I think it is worthwhile and I think our effort shows that it may be possible to do so. We have not been completely successful. We have had many lapses but one of the things we are convinced of is that the effort is worthwhile.

DISCUSSION

Gloria: What kind of monetary compensation do the peasants get? What is their status now? Are the peasants seen as consultants or are they seen in some other capacity? I recall that when I asked some Kenyan scientists whether they paid the people from whom they got information about how certain plants are effective for cure of certain illnesses they said they didn't pay anything. What formula are we in fact going to suggest for that kind of collaborative situation? What safe guards do we have to put in place to avoid exploitation of the knowledge of these people? Should we draft a code of ethics with respect to intellectual property rights? I am asking these questions in the context of your new collaboration with the university

Jorge: Let me clarify our relationship with the community. This is a reason why I started by saying that we try to belong to the community. We are not professionals. One of the things that we go through is a process of deprofessionalization. We are an NGO but we are non profit. Secondly the NACA model is that one belongs to the community, so it is technical personnel going back to the community. It does not happen in all the NACAs but we try to have familial relations with the community. So we are not partners, we are not outsiders, we are family. The driving force behind ritual agriculture is affection and respect.

Jamaria (from Malaysia): In USA they subsidize the farmers with billions of dollars in order to make sure they are competitive and can control the market. In this context do you think that by having this kind of agriculture activity where dependence of the

community on other farmers is created, these peasants can become real champions? What can make you a champion is to be self-sufficient, literate, independent and then you have your own power.

Chiu: How do different communities relate to each other in this programme and to what extent is your organization able to enhance or establish new relations in this area of intercommunity relationships?

Tarik: I remember a teacher once tell me that he has severe pangs of conscience when teaching because on the one hand he wants to teach what he knows, but on the other he realizes that sometimes the knowledge that he imparts to the students will be used to control others. So his dilemma is, should be teaching them all that he knows? Or should he hide his knowledge? It's a question that comes up constantly as you teach. Is there this danger of making these communities more controllable? This is a fundamental problem in social science. Social science is an agent of unfreedom because by trying to predict the world and predict what society does, it actually creates a means of control. And this unfreedom is built into social science itself. We have to recognize this and think about it in a political sense. So, what is the theory of politics or the theory of change in relation to the external forces? What is the nature of intervention in the community itself? What is the nature of politics in the community?

SESSION 12: *Education Initiatives in Pakistan*

The following is a combination of two presentations on two disparate strategies that have been adopted in Pakistan. The Aga Khan Education Service basically works within the system in some sort of formal academia and with whatever latitude it can generate. The other initiative is the IDSP model, housed in Quetta in Baluchistan which has now gone completely out the formal institutional frameworks of learning and development etc.

Speaker 1: Yasmin Bano: *The Aga Khan Education Service Model*

Let me introduce the Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan It is an NGO which facilitates education across the Pakistan state. This NGO has 109 of its own schools which are established, funded and run by Aga Khan Education Service, Pakistan. There are also a number of schools which are established by communities and we work with those community-based schools in order to provide them support in designing curricula and teachers' professional development. Besides this, there are certain public and private schools with which we have partnerships. In this presentation we are going to present the work which we are doing with formal Aga Khan schools in Karachi.

The title of the slide show is 'From early education to university education'. We feel that the problem that we are discussing in this conference and the problem which we are facing at higher education is actually deep rooted in early education.

If you look at the amount of time which a child spends in early education (primary education, secondary education, higher secondary education) before entering university level, it comprises almost 15 years. Let's look at what happens in those 15 years. During these 15 years very strong foundations are built for accepting foreign texts as authentic knowledge. In school, whether primary, secondary or higher secondary, text books are presented as the sole source of knowledge. Examinations are built around the text book, classroom activities are built around the text book, students are not allowed to share their own knowledge in their own words in an examination paper. They are forced to memorize definitions, laws and descriptions which are given in the text books. So for 15 years students are put through these practices in a rigorous manner and this helps them to eventually take text book knowledge, especially text books which are prescribed by foreigners, as authentic sources of knowledge.

Besides this, there is conditioned learning. At all levels of school, students are motivated to learn either through incentives or punishments. You do this and you will get A grade, or 3 stars. Otherwise there is the fear of punishment. There is also irresponsible learning taking place. Students are exposed to different ideas but not how to use their learning in a responsible manner. Further, extensive damage occurs to innate learning capabilities, because the way the schools are structured and the way the teaching and learning happens, the student's natural learning capabilities are not nurtured. They are forced to learn what is given in the text books They are forced to accept what the teacher is saying. They are never trusted that they have valid ideas and that they can learn by themselves as well. Besides, since there is no provision for exploration and creativity, their skills and attitudes for thinking, questioning, arguing and self learning are totally destroyed. The attitude of sharing and caring is entirely missing. Schools are highly competitive and students are expected to compete with each other rather than to support and share with each other. The teaching-learning processes in the schools facilitate learners to build in several false assumptions and beliefs about learning and teaching, learners, teachers, purpose of education and educated persons. They are taught that an educated person is one who has a formal degree Those children who do not go to school are not educated. People who can be trusted are the teachers The sole source of knowledge is the text book or a teacher. So all these false assumptions are built in the initial 15 years.

Then what happens? When these children with all these rigid views of knowledge and false assumptions enter university they feel they are the perfect people to accept and support White studies. Because by then they don't have the capabilities to question what they are learning. They don't have any skills to question. Instead they support and accept it and recognition from the West is something which those students desire. So, if you want to bring a change at the higher level you need to bring a change at the lower level because when students enter the university with all those inbuilt ideas it becomes difficult to change.

Keeping in mind this scenario, we have taken certain steps in our Aga Khan education service schools to bring about some changes at the school level.

The first thing we did was identifying and analyzing the issue. Why are schools the way they are? Why are they focusing so much on text books? Why are creativity and exploration are not nurtured enough? One of our biggest revelations was that the teachers, heads of institutions, people who are working with schools, were actually unaware of the assumptions and beliefs on which they were carrying out their own practices. When they a group of some 400 teachers and teacher-educators were put in certain situations and they were facilitated to reflect on their own assumptions & beliefs, it was amazing to find out that all of them had the same beliefs about teaching, teachers, learning & education and the striking thing was that none of them realized that they were having those beliefs and how these were impacting on their practices.

The other major thing we realized was that those beliefs affect our practices and so schools become centers of monolithic approaches. If we look at our schools there is one syllabus, one text book, one uniform, one way of assessment, one way of teaching, one right answer to the question asked. There are no other ways. Why are schools so monolithic? The reason is because we have beliefs about teaching and learning in the same monolithic way and because of this there is no space for genuine creativity and exploration. In the name of creativity and exploration, several superficial activities are going on but there is no space for genuine creativity. Likewise, schools are places of conforming authority. What the teacher is saying is correct. Emphasis is on marks orientated performance. Structures are hierarchical.

Besides this, when we looked at the curriculum and the text book and the things that were discussed in the classroom we found that was disjointedness. What was taught in the classroom and what is happening in the society are two different things altogether. So there is a mismatch between both. Besides, there is heavy reliance on foreign experts to improve our own school rather than harnessing the potential of the available local resources.

So after analyzing all these issues and challenges, what we did was to create consciousness because we felt that instead of bringing change, it is very important for people to understand and realize why we are asking them to bring change.

Our first level of intervention was done with the teacher-educator and curriculum-developer i.e the people who were working with the schools and providing guidance to the schools. We helped them to understand what the real issues are, the roots of schooling and political agenda behind it, their own beliefs about teaching, education, teacher-learning and other critical issues of the school.

Our next level of intervention was with the teachers and the teacher training process which are professional development of teachers. We persuaded them to change from the technical model of teacher-development to the intellectual model. The technical model is where teachers are given lectures about their subject-contents, or cook book recipes of pedagogy. They are shown the way you can manage the classes, they are given strategies. Rather than going through this technical model we engaged teachers in a critical discourse on subjects such as teaching, learning, the purpose of schools and of education.

Our intention was that they being intellectuals and thinkers, they have to understand this role so that they can facilitate their students to enhance their own thinking skills and ideas.

We also engaged teachers in the process of enquiry and self learning because unless and until teachers themselves are exposed to these processes they cannot carry them out in the classroom. So we created forums where groups of teachers were given opportunities to re-look their own curricula, come up with ideas, make changes and then implement them in the classroom.

Our third intervention level was to change the institutional framework, because just bringing change in the teacher's conceptions and beliefs is not enough unless an environment is also created. The first step was to replace the word subjects with learning areas. The moment you say you are teaching science as a subject or English as a subject the focus immediately goes to the prescribed text books and then every effort is made by teachers and students to complete the text books and get ready for the examination.

Instead if you eliminate the word subject and introduce the concept of learning area a whole new world unfolds. Science as a learning area doesn't mean you have to complete the text book. It means that science has certain expectations and you are free to explore them, use lots of resources, one of which could be text books. But you can go beyond text books, beyond the prescribed pedagogy and you can create your own projects. That helped to demystify the myths of text books.

When we created learning areas, we tried to give importance to all subjects. Generally in schools, English, Mathematics, Science and Social Studies are considered important subjects. Native languages, religious studies, art and aesthetics are not considered to be important. But when we brought in the concept of learning areas, we gave equal importance to all of them and since the restrictions of text books were over, teachers and students were encouraged to use non formal sources of learning as well for e.g. inviting parents into the classroom for story telling or for helping students to understand health and hygiene practices.

At the institutional level we also replaced the word departments with learning areas. No more heads of departments too. The concept of head of department was replaced with learning coordinators so there are people who coordinate learning rather than heading or giving instructions to others. The role of the school head was changed from supervisor/administrator to learning facilitator. The word department encourages compartmentalization and heads creates a notion of hierarchy rather than collaboration and learning. Instead there are learning areas so there is freedom. It is not necessary that science learning area has to restrict itself to science. Science learning area can collaborate with languages, arts and aesthetics, and so on.

We tried to remove the restrictions in terms of time and spaces. For e.g. there was no compulsion of 40 minutes period and changing subjects every 40 minutes. Schools were given freedom to create new timings the way they want to structure a day. There were

also policy level changes for e.g. assessment policy, lesson planning, notion of completion of syllabus and budget allocation all underwent changes.

All these interventions helped to create a new kind of school. At present, in Aga Khan early childhood development schools, the teachers themselves are creating books for students. These are local story books where, after going to the community and talking to the people, asking them to relate a story, those stories were documented and presented in the form of a book which will be the part of the students' reading series. Likewise local games were explored and formally documented.

There is a change in the school's perception about parents too. Rather than looking at parents as problem creators, they are taking them as learning partners. Parents come into the classroom, they work with the teachers in different areas: story telling, health and hygiene, moral and cultural values, local art. In fact the relationship with the parents has become better.

In some of our rural schools we are bringing community practices into the classroom. Take for e.g. the concept of katcheri i.e people meeting together, sharing their problems, finding solutions. The same concept is brought into the classroom. The school day starts with katcheri. Students sit together and discuss rather than looking to the teacher to provide them with solutions. There is also integration of social issues in various learning areas and a conscious effort is made to promote local languages. For e.g. in our school time table, besides teaching the national language or local language there is structured time where students are encouraged to share their mother tongue with each other. They share their customs, culture, they try to understand each others languages and culture and they also try to use the words they have learnt. In some cases they decided to greet each other one day in one language and another day in another language. So that is promoting a respect for all native languages rather than being ashamed of one's native language. Some teachers came with the idea of including content related to moral cultural values and personal development, so they created a programme which is regularly being implemented.

This is a brief description of the way the Aga Khan schools are working within the system to bring about change in education.

Speaker 2: Wasif Rizvi: *The IDSP Model*

IDSP is an acronym for Institute for Development Studies and Practice. It is actually a misnomer and we are in search of a better description to narrate what we have been doing.

Let me first give you a brief background of Baluchistan. Baluchistan is west of Pakistan, a sort of renegade province which had some insurgency rebellious movements against the Centre and so on. It has many very small ethnic groups with different religious practices as well. Its proximity to Iran and Afghanistan and shares with them a history of wanting to have a nationalist movement. It was the first area in Pakistan to be

afflicted with false emancipatory-isms. The people of Baluchistan had a nationalism movement a communism movement, socialism and so on. Thereafter, this land was discovered by Development and suddenly there was the arrival of hordes of experts, NGOs, development agencies and so on.

Development is a bit like Wall Street, at least in Pakistan. There was the high of 80s. It was a time when Zia-ul-haq was engaged in a proxy war for the Americans in Afghanistan. Then suddenly there was the low of the 90s. What it created was a wasteland of what we call the errand boys and girls of development in Baluchistan. Those were all the community experts and community motivators and mobilisers who were employed by the USA and the World Bank and suddenly when money left the errand boys and girls didn't have much to do.

Then, 7 or 8 years ago, a lady named who was part of the development boom in Baluchistan and had been working in Baluchistan for many years felt bad about all this and came up with the idea of creating a space in which she thought she could empower the local people, house them in a premise and invite the development experts of Pakistan and to build their capacity in some way. So we had all sorts of left, liberal, forward looking, human rights, women rights, children rights, trees rights, kind of people coming in and starting to train these people.

In fact, when we started IDSP we actually created a despicable development training institute. As disrespectful to everything that Baluchistan as the USA or the World Bank or General Motors could have been. We had people who would come in as experts and had no idea of the place or its people, could not speak a single word of a single language spoken in Baluchistan. And yet they would come to train the local people.

But within 6 months we realized that what we were reconstituting something we had set out to de-construct. So the first step we took was to demystify this expert. We said this is an institute and a space for people who are from Baluchistan. Everything that the people know about themselves is far greater than anything outside experts can tell them about running their lives. So we decided that young women and men from Baluchistan would become the faculty of the institute. This was to the great dismay of the University of Balugisthan which actually launched a court case on IDSP protesting out faculty. The University challenged these people who didn't have any master's degree, or PhD, who couldn't speak English or write, calling themselves faculty. IDSP was just a tiny institute somewhere in Quetta and it had caused this ripple. And every single NGO in the area started to attack IDSP in some way or the other. So IDSP's first battle was against the development industry itself in collusion with the academia because they seem to reinforce each other.

Now our Baluchi faculty didn't know development or academic theory. So they came up with a learning regime of their own called the reclamation of the trinity of learning which is faith, literature and culture. The primary source of learning at IDSP became all sorts of local literature. Every kind of social commentary was made possible through

understanding the vast literature, poetry, cultural practises spoken and written in Pashtu, Baluchi, Urdu, Barawhi etc.

The next step was to examine what is the person who comes to IDSP, when that person goes back to the community. And the role that they played was that sense of regenerating or reclaiming a sense of dignity and confidence to disengage from the development industry. Many communities in Baluchistan consciously decided to disengage from all NGOs, all development aid, with the state too even at some level and to say we don't need anything from you and we don't want you to ask anything from us. We want to regenerate and reconstitute our life the way we believe it needs to be lived.

It hasn't caused a great deal of ripple at any political level yet but it is coming close to that because we are the brink of being labeled as some sort of anarchists, opting out of the nation state.

The other issue is that there is always the risk of over romanticizing the local. Here faith plays a cleansing role. A great deal of critical challenge is launched on pathological local practices, especially treatment of women etc. We found out that if people have a better understanding of their faith, they are able to reflect and reconstitute some of their own practices.

So at IDSP the Baluchis are the experts. They decide, they have a learning space. All that people like me do is to provide and facilitate some resources for them in order to sustain that learning space. And when I go there I bring my own contribution to the learning space in the shape of my own faith and a sense of Urdu poetry that I understand. I have seen that when they engage in the understanding of local poetry and local customs, that artistic symbiosis is valued not only for its romantic content but is actually a generative force to develop viable sustainable existence in social reconstruction models.

DISCUSSION

Sunil: I thought that the last part where you talked about the danger of romanticizing the local did not fit into the strain in which you spoke earlier. Given the kind of approach you have described, why do you have to put this balancing touch somewhere?

Wasif: The least of my intentions is to please anybody. I speak in a spirit of self-reflection. A critique that needs to be generated on local practices, is not done to please the western ear or western palate but it is an acknowledgement that after years of oppression, annihilation, disconnect, destruction, etc. in order to reconstitute and regenerate what has been lost, one has to have some sense of a center of gravity of moral or spiritual principles, to ensure that this spirit of fairness and justice is preserved. There are issues within the Baluchi and the Pashtun traditions which are identified by them in the great traditions of Baluchi, Baravi etc. and their own sense of understanding their society. How they engage with those issues and what reference points they use to deal

with them is completely different. Most of the time, it's their faith and their understanding of Islam that sees them through.

Norma: Yasmin has highlighted the fact that one of the drawbacks of the system as it exists is that the students believe that textbook knowledge is authentic. I want to know whether in the alterations and changes that you have made, this problem has been addressed. Have you created any new textbooks which are able to convey to students that the textbook speaks perhaps only one version of the whole and that there may be other views on the subject as well?

Yasmin: First of all, we haven't created any new textbooks. The textbooks which were available and which were being used are still being used. The change that we have made is that when teachers interact with students in the classroom they do not emphasise on learning by heart what is given in the textbooks. Students are given full freedom to express themselves. Students are also encouraged to construct their own knowledge by going to the library, by surfing the net etc. They are encouraged not to depend on the textbook and this in itself demystifies the textbook and it is a way of conveying to them that there are other avenues through which knowledge can be obtained.

Chiu: When we talk about doing community work, there exists a kind of dubiousness about who we are. Since we are doing community work, it means we are not part of the community. The community becomes the object, whose work we are doing. It can be very complicated this 'we' and 'not-we' relation. If we are really doing local work and their cultural heritage is different from ours, there is a necessity to essentialise something which is claimed by the local. Or sometimes even over-essentialise what they themselves do not even think to be so serious. To what extent is this essentialising is strategically aware? This is similar to Sunil's question, whether to romanticize or not.

Another problem is, if I honestly work with the people I respect, how do I place myself amongst them, knowing that I am different yet a friend and cooperate. If they have conflicts how do I react? I cannot be a third party, standing aside. Or is it possible for both of us to agree that there is a better way to achieve it whether I take the responsibility to voice that out. That is the question of the sociology of action. Whether in this case you have to put yourself on the top spot and be brave and honest enough to challenge for the overall, more rounded approach, and through a process, even argue struggle etc. That's what you will always face if you work with other groups. So my policy is that if we really agree on a common goal, then even if we argue to the risk of possible friction that's secondary and an inevitable risk that we have to take.

Roby: What forms of distrust and dislike between the different ethnic groups - the Pashtos, the Baluchis, etc. - did you encounter in your work and how did you deal with that kind of mutual distrust between the different groups.

Wasif: When they were able to locate the origin of the distrust in all the alien ideologies that they were adopting to describe their own political energy, the sense of distrust started to diffuse. Once the space was available for them to reflect on their inherent issues, not

based on the conventional terms of mediation, but to regenerate and be able to understand how they were co-existing in the past without the recent conflict etc. they were able to realize that there are lots of bridges.

Gloria: It seems to me that 3 models have been presented to us today. One, the model from the Andes (Pratek), which is collaboration with the mainstream universities. The second model is aimed at changing the framework in terms of the old mainstream universities to make them more flexible. The third, as described by IDSP, is to create parallel institutions. I'd like to know about funding, the student pool, age group, gender and whether the IDSP institution is in competition with some of the other institutions

Wasif: We would like to see IDSP as a disengaged space. It does not recognize any engagements with institutions even if it may appear to be a parallel institution. One of the objectives is to ensure that the unfair, overwhelming control and legitimacy of learning institutions is somehow minimized and it is recognized that there are other valid, learning spaces.

As regards resources, in the beginning when we started, since it was labeled as a liberal development studies institute, there was a lot of funding available from all sorts of funding agencies, but once we deviated from that the funding stopped. Now the money comes mostly from private sources. Since it is basically a center where many community activists come and go, they are able to contribute their own resources to the projects they may undertake. People who are involved with IDSP sustain those portions of the work that they are doing. The idea is not to strain any single funding source.

Sunil: While listening to the presentations of Vimbai and Wasif I had a constant feeling that their work derives a lot of strength from the success of the nationalist movement and the radical government in power at present. However their presentations do not identify that as a major source of strength for what they are able to do. I am suggesting that let there be more justice and let there be acknowledgement of these strengths because that will serve a greater purpose.

END