

FACULTY OF
EDUCATION
OCCASIONAL
PAPER NO. 3



COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT
1963

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA

FACULTY OF EDUCATION : OCCASIONAL PAPER NO. 3

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

with special reference to rural areas

PAPERS DISCUSSED AT A CONFERENCE ORGANIZED BY
THE INSTITUTE OF ADULT EDUCATION, AUGUST, 1962

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA

SALISBURY

1963

(C) UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA

Contents

	Page
Introduction	iii
What is community development? <i>James W. Green</i>	1
The rôle of government in community development <i>R. Howman</i>	12
Financing community development <i>N. K. Kinkead-Weekes</i>	26
Training for community development <i>T. I. Jordan</i>	36
Excerpts from discussions during the Conference	47
Recommended reading	50

REPRINTED BY
OFFSET LITHOGRAPHY
IN
THE LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE
OF RHODESIA

1967

INTRODUCTION

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT has become almost as popular a subject of international discussion as the problems of Africa. It is the new technique which is taking the under-developed (better known as the developing) areas of the world by storm. In Central Africa it was introduced in Northern Rhodesia some years ago, in Nyasaland it is being actively pursued and in Southern Rhodesia it is being officially talked about. It is thus a very live issue for the Rhodesias and Nyasaland.

Some see community development as a piece of government policy, and up to a point it is. Community development projects usually depend on government support and are most successfully accomplished where the government has the confidence of the people. But to think of community development simply in terms of official policy is to lose the real essence of the idea. In a final summing-up to the Conference, Professor T. Paterson of the Royal College of Science and Technology reminded his audience that community development is a means towards achieving a greater end. True, it produces many material manifestations which are of immense practical value. But much more important is the spirit it engenders within the community itself—a spirit which enables nations and communities to discover their real strength. In Central Africa it could be a means whereby petty prejudices are forgotten and a genuine spirit of community fostered amongst all people.

Community development relies on patient consultation and sound planning. It is not something which can be expected to yield quick and startling results. It needs careful administration with a watchful eye on finance. It demands that those engaged in roles of professional leadership should be thoroughly trained for their tasks. But even if all this is done, community development will not become a living reality without enthusiasm for it amongst the people. There must be a feeling of pride and joy in the movement. This was graphically described by Miss Freda Gwilliam, of the Department of Technical Co-operation, who gave a paper describing the growth of community development in African territories.

Miss Gwilliam also outlined how the idea had first originated in the United Kingdom—a surprise to many who had regarded the whole concept as an American creation—and how its shape is constantly changing in the light of new experience and fresh challenges. In her talk she also described the great contribution Britain has made to those countries desirous of taking help from her in the spheres of training and technical advice on community development.

Adult education and community development are two inter-woven strands. Community development is a massive movement of education encouraging people to take responsibility and show initiative in all aspects of living. This implies that community development will give fresh impetus

to the demands for education both amongst children and their parents, demands which will necessitate swift and imaginative action by government departments, churches and voluntary organizations. Furthermore, it is inevitable that once community development gets under way and a renaissance takes place in the lives of the people, the demands for political representation, at both local and national level, will increase. This is only to be expected since it is unrealistic to think that people will become enthusiastic over material gains without also having a proper say in the councils which control their daily lives.

This conference was held in response to a 'real' need if not a 'felt' one. Southern Rhodesia has reached the stage of giving urgent consideration to the idea of community development and it seemed important, therefore, to give the public a chance of discussing a matter of such national importance. It would also provide people in the south with an opportunity of learning from the experience gained in the two northern territories, and those who were able to attend from Northern Rhodesia contributed very greatly to the success of the conference.

The Institute of Adult Education is deeply indebted to Miss F. Gwilliam, Dr. J. W. Green, Mr. R. Howman, Mr. T. I. Jordan, Mr. N. K. Kinkead-Weekes and Professor T. Paterson for giving papers at this Conference, and to Professor J. Clyde Mitchell for chairing and guiding some of the deliberations.

E.K.T.C.

WHAT IS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

JAMES W. GREEN

Consultant to the Southern Rhodesian Government

A variety of descriptive names has been applied to community development, each designed to give its substance in encapsulated form. It has been termed 'a *method* of applying behavioural sciences for human welfare', 'a *process* of social action', 'a *programme* of social, economic and political development', and 'a *silent revolution* of rising expectations and how to meet them'. None of these, of course, constitute an adequate definition, nor were they intended to be such. Community development is really self-explanatory, i.e., it is development of the local community by the community itself, with or without outside assistance. Thus it is just the opposite of compulsion and paternalism—of doing things for people, or of compelling people to do things for themselves simply because some person or agency outside the community thinks these things are good for the people.

Therefore, there is no reason for you to make difficult the subject of our conference. That is my job, as I shall proceed to demonstrate in the next hour! For example, 'community development is an organized activity, inclusive as to participants and beneficiary, with multiple interests and objectives, and operated in a delimited geographic area'. Believe it or not, the person who wrote that was a friend of mine—but now we just don't speak any more!

Before we proceed further perhaps I should make clear what is meant by 'community'. As we all know, it is an ambiguous term with many meanings—the community of nations in the U.N., 'the English-speaking community', 'the Jewish community', 'the Church community', etc. However valid these meanings may be in their respective contexts, community as used in modern community development refers to a much smaller geographically-based entity. Aristotle was not far from the mark when he stated that 'a community is a form of social organization lying between the family and the state'. I like a more specific description such as: 'a community is a locality with a set of basic interacting social institutions (families, schools, religious bodies, economic enterprises, etc.), through the functioning of which the people have a potential ability to act as an entity on matters of common concern'.

More simply put, it is the area which the people living within it define as their community. In the tribal areas of Southern Rhodesia it was traditionally the area under the control of a headman (sub-chief) called a 'dhunu' in Mashonaland and an 'isigaba of a mlisa' in Matabeliland. Within its boundaries the major concerns of life were carried on. Two functions were especially important, the control of land by the headman and thereby the entry to the community, and his function as adjudicator of disputes between its members. In other words, the 'dunhu' was the economic

and judicial unit of the society. The traditional dunhu, as is true with communities anywhere, has not remained static. It has been modified especially by population increase and by the forcible resettlement of large numbers of people. Research into this matter shows that some traditional units have now split into as many as six or eight *de facto* communities each containing from as few as five to more than twenty villages each.

Returning now to community development it is apparent that it is a very simple concept but one which is complex in its execution. For community development as a process of social and cultural change implies a great increase in the assumption of responsibility by the people, a reallocation of the functions and organization of government, a new 'partnership' between the people and the central government, and an integration of the efforts of government officials through becoming true 'servants of the people'. Obviously then, community development is not something to be tacked on to existing governmental structures. Furthermore, its philosophical bases which are found in both western and non-western thought, have consequences for economic, social, political, administrative and personal growth and development. But, before setting the stage for a discussion of these matters let us have a brief look at the historical origins and evolution of community development.

ORIGINS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The term community development is one which originated in Africa, or at least was first used by administrators concerned primarily with Africa. It is not, I am glad to say, an American importation! It was at the 1948 Cambridge Summer Conference that the term community development replaced mass education. The latter was abandoned for a variety of reasons, including the fact that 'mass' had undesirable political overtones, 'education' when translated into most vernaculars was rendered narrowly as 'schools', and even when understood broadly as adult education it proved to be an inadequate stimulus to community action.

Development of the community by the people of the community has, of course, been carried on by the people of every frontier society such as those of the U.S.A., Canada, and the Rhodesias. Such central governments as existed were usually too poor to build up local community schools, roads, churches, and the like. Indeed, they did not accept these matters of local concern as a responsibility of the central government. Local government, of course, did not exist until it was created by the people themselves, usually out of the need for maintaining the results of communal construction effort, and for extending services requiring the consistent support of all the people in the community.

Social welfare organizations have been another major developer of methods and practices of community development. Just as it was gradually realized that rehabilitation of families depended largely upon positive work with the groups to which the family members belonged, so it became

apparent that an increase in group effectiveness was often dependent upon changes in the community and of co-operative effort of its special interest organizations. The settlement houses erected in the problem areas of cities in the U.S.A. and Britain are examples of concrete efforts to weld together the diverse elements of the community for community action.

Like their counterparts in social welfare, the professional proponents of extensive technical education in health, literacy, agriculture, small-scale industry and other fields have found that the effectiveness of their work on individuals and families was much enhanced if the community was behind their efforts. Then too there were many projects which inherently required co-operative effort of the entire community for their success, such as small-scale drainage and irrigation works, one-variety crop areas, control of insects, immunization against infectious diseases and marketing of agricultural products. For example, in Pakistan the Department of Education made adult literacy an integral part of the national community development programme. As its Director stated, all past efforts in this field by his department had failed owing to the lack of acceptance by the people of literacy training as a normal activity for adults. Under the community development programme literacy became a necessity, or at least fashionable, and literacy classes an acceptable activity in which adults might participate without fear of ridicule. The failure of the massive 'Grow More Food' campaigns in both Pakistan and India forced the governments of these countries to reject the campaign method of planning for people on the basis of assumed 'real' needs and instead to approach them in terms of their 'felt' needs, as the people themselves defined them. Similarly, in Japan the health authorities told me in 1957 that much of their success in reducing the birth rate by half in a decade lay in getting the people to use the clinics through a community approach.

Success of the community approach has led to the adoption of community development as a major mechanism for helping people to help themselves in their local communities by such international organizations as the United Nations, UNESCO, the United Kingdom Colonial and Commonwealth Relations Offices and the foreign aid agencies of the U.S.A. government. In addition, various countries have adopted community development as a basic policy. India did this in 1952 when the Prime Minister inaugurated community development as the cornerstone of rural development in the sub-continent. All 550,000 villages and their 350 million inhabitants will be involved by October of 1963. Pakistan also adopted this approach in 1953 and made excellent progress for several years until the political situation deteriorated so badly that a military dictatorship was imposed. The late President Magsaysay of the Philippines in 1956 also adopted community development as the method of helping the thousands of small barrios in his country to advance. Five years after his untimely death the Presidential Assistant for Community Development still administers this nation-wide programme from the office of the President. Many other countries have adopted the community development approach in modified form including Ghana, Uganda, Kenya, Tanganyika, Nigeria, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Iran and South Korea.

Lest it be thought that community development is purely a governmental approach, it should be noted that in the U.S.A. some of the largest and most important community development efforts are conceived and carried out by private business interests in co-operation with local communities. Government agencies, such as the agricultural extension service, participate in these privately-sponsored programmes by providing educational or other technical services as requested by the people of the communities themselves. But it is the private companies pursuing their own economic self-interest who are the stimulators and sponsors of community development. In one instance a chain of banks employed a community development specialist and gave him considerable sums of money to be used as prizes to communities which excelled others of their county and region in developing themselves in any of a thousand different ways ranging from community club houses to such individually-centred items as acquisition of electrical appliances. Those administering the banking system had discovered that no matter what communities did in the way of development, the end result was an increase in the turnover rate of money in the community and the influx of new money from the stimulus to greater economic activity occasioned by development of other types. In other words, *any* kind of development resulted in the demand for more banking services. Therefore, no attempt was made to direct the kind of development but merely to stimulate the people to increase the pace of fulfilling their own needs. Similarly, several large electric power companies in the south-eastern U.S.A. found that when their community development agents stimulated the members of a community to develop within their own priorities of felt needs, it resulted in an increase in the consumption of electric power and thus of their profits. Another example is of a seventeen-county development scheme sponsored by a regional Chamber of Commerce and using competition for prizes and prestige as a stimulus to communities to develop along their own lines. These examples show that community development is not a government monopoly but a social process which can be successfully sponsored by any social or economic organization willing to trust the judgment of the people and to work within the framework of the people's priorities, rather than attempting to impose the sponsoring organizations' concepts of what these priorities ought to be.

All these diverse efforts to help communities to help themselves have quite naturally led to the study of community development by many behavioural scientists and the creation of a large and growing body of research literature. In fact, it was through such study that I myself became interested in this field and in helping governments to understand and adapt it to their own particular situations. Based upon such study, a definition of community development has been formulated which is, I believe, operationally useful:

'Community development is a continuous, or intermittent, process of social action by which the people of a community organize themselves informally or formally for democratic planning and action; define their common and group "felt" needs and problems; make group and individual plans to meet their felt needs and solve their problems; execute these plans

with a maximum of reliance upon resources found within the community; and supplement community resources when necessary with services and material assistance from governmental or private agencies outside the community.'

PHILOSOPHICAL BASES OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

As I stated earlier, community development has its roots firmly embedded in the philosophy of both western and some non-western thought. In preparing this paper four propositions came to mind as the roots of community development.

The first is that human growth and development is the paramount good. Thus growth in the capacity of individuals to solve their own problems and assume responsibility for themselves is infinitely more important than the physical goods and services which such effort produces, or which may be given to them. A necessary corollary is that people grow as they achieve, and this human growth is the most important product of achievement although the ostensible purpose may be the production of physical items.

It follows then that the development of human groups with their definition of positions and rôles, the establishment of their own goals and norms, and the devising of methods of co-operating with each other to attain their objectives, are more important than any amount of purely economic development brought about by atomization of groups and compulsive measures. Beyond the group the development of self-reliant communities able to participate as autonomous units in their own total growth and self-government is more important than all the physical benefits which can accrue from the greater efficiency of totalitarianism or the paternalism of a benevolent but distant central government. Furthermore, as an added dividend, the growth in such individual capacity, group coherence and communal self-reliance through the community development process when *placed first* produces greater material benefits than concentration on material production. In other words, if you follow a method that puts human growth and development first, the people themselves will take care of producing material things.

May I put in a personal reference at this point to say that it is the evidence of such human growth and development that keeps me in this business of community development. I have seen villagers who all their lives, like their forebears for generations before them, had folded their hands and implored their gods and the government to look after them. These same villagers, when given responsibility and assistance through the community development process, straightened their backs, unfolded their hands and showed both in word and deed that they were to a large extent masters of their own fate and not the mere pawns of forces which

they could not control. Witnessing such growth in human capacities is more thrilling than seeing the thousands of miles of roads built, of canals and drainage-ways dug, of schools and clinics constructed, which issue from the community development process. For these are mere by-products of the process compared to the human changes which take place.

The second of these philosophical bases may be stated as follows: that freedom of choice transcends plans by others, no matter how imperfect the choices nor how perfect the plans. This proposition means that the people of a community must be free to decide what they want to do in their own priority of felt needs, and equally as important, what they don't want to do within the scope of the community good. That is, choice must be based upon how the people define their own needs and set their own priorities, and not on the basis of what outsiders, whether administrators or technicians, think is good for them. Does this mean a downgrading of the administrator and technician, making them less necessary? By no means; rather they become absolutely indispensable in helping people to give effect to their own choices.

The third basis follows from the second; that the local good is primarily a local concern. By local good I mean that which the doing of or the failure to do affects primarily the people of a community and does not infringe upon the rights of those not of the community. Examples of such items of local good are primary schools, health services (except for infectious diseases), water supplies, housing, local (not national or administrative) roads, production of agricultural or cottage industry products, and the like. If these things are done or are not done, it is primarily the people of the local community who benefit or who suffer. On the other hand, the national good remains a concern primarily of the national government. Items which transcend the local community or even a combination of local communities, such as Karibas, national roads and national defence, are clearly not the responsibility of the local community. But sheer scope is not the only criteria for vesting control in the national government. Those things which the doing of or failure to do within the community infringe upon the rights of others outside the community, clearly cannot be left to the discretion of the local community. Examples of such things are the control of infectious diseases of men and animals and of the wanton waste of the natural resources of soil and water (which forfeit the rights of future generations).

Of course it may be argued that if children are not forced by the national government to go to primary school, they will not contribute to the gross national product, nor pay taxes, and therefore the national good suffers. Or, if people are not forced to produce more there will be less for all to share. These arguments may be accepted as logically correct but they lead straight to stateism and dictatorship. Furthermore, it is an illusion that a national government can in fact control all spheres of the local good. Even Russia, with her total disregard of the individual and after forty years of the most extreme compulsion ever devised by man, has been

unsuccessful in making her own peasants increase agricultural production in accordance with plans of the all-powerful central state.

The fourth basis is the belief that all peoples have the innate capacity to manage their own local affairs. No matter how illiterate they may be they have an intimate knowledge of the complex of factors in the local situation and in inherent wisdom gained from long experience with things that affect them in their daily lives. Furthermore, they corporately have the ability to synthesize the complex of factors affecting them and to reach wise decisions about them. And, finally, they have the potential of increasing their capacities and of growing in ability to govern themselves when assisted, not dominated, by the state and its administrative and technical officials.

It is, I hope, apparent that these four propositions mutually support one another. Even if human growth and development are given paramount importance, it will be meaningless to do so without permitting freedom of choice, including the right to make wrong choices. But such choices can be permitted only for matters which are primarily of local concern and for which the participants have local knowledge, wisdom, and the ability to manage with the assistance of technicians and administrators.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Gone are the days when economics saw man as merely a creature moving in response to the laws of the market-place. Today, economists increasingly see economic development as part and parcel of total development—the social and political are inextricably tied together with the economic. Experience in underdeveloped countries has shown them that development is unlikely to take place unless people acknowledge certain values. We shall discuss very briefly a few of these which are considered as prerequisite to economic development, and to the holding of which community development contributes.

The first of these is that people must want development and be willing to pay for it through harder and better quality work, more savings and the use of modern technology. In community development, because the community begins with the things it wants for itself, and for which its people have to work and help pay, this value is made operational. The people can see that in this way they can achieve their own ends. Furthermore, obtaining these ends leads to an 'entraining of wants.' Successful attainment of some ends, while leading to a temporary reduction of wants, sooner rather than later leads to the desire for other things which they now know are obtainable. This is simple a truism, of course, to all of us with wives!

The second value is that there must be prestige symbols and rewards for initiative and entrepreneurial activity. Again the community develop-

ment process provides a mechanism for defining these symbols and rewards, first in the social approval which accrues to those who lead the community in attaining its defined ends, and second in creating or further bolstering the norm of greater individual gain as a basis for contributing further to other community ends. In other words, the usual resistance of a static society to change which sees the elevation of the economic level of individuals as a threat to the established status system; for example the pattern of relationships between individuals and between families, is now seen not as a threat but as the way to attain the community's ends.

A third value closely related to the others is the confidence of people in their ability to improve their own lot through their own efforts. So long as they believe that only through the intervention of outside forces, of having things done for them, will their lot be bettered, so long will development be restricted to the little the outside forces can achieve. And with the always limited resources available, these outside forces, chiefly central governments, can accomplish but little in the thousands of communities under their control. But community development, by concentrating upon things which people can do for themselves with a minimum of outside help, gives this confidence through concrete demonstrations of the peoples' ability to achieve their own ends through their mutual efforts. In simpler words, successful achievement leads to a belief in their capacity to achieve.

The fourth value is that of growth perspective, that is the desire for growth plus a perception of the way which leads to it. But this perception is dependent upon growth itself—a vicious circle. Community development has the power to break this circle in a static society. By concentrating upon attainable and wanted ends the enthusiasm to attain them is generated and the perspective of growth is developed by doing the possible here and now. In addition to furthering the holding of these intangible values, community development promotes and is part of economic development by utilizing unused community resources in the construction of the infrastructure demanded by large-scale economic development. Previously idle labour, the greatest economic assets of most communities, is put to a productive use and new skills, both manual and managerial, are developed. The building of a new school, the construction of a new road or clinic requires both unskilled and skilled labour as well as those with skill in management. Use is also made of local building materials of stone, sand and timber, which would otherwise have no economic value. Land which is marginal for other purposes is often put to productive use in communal undertakings such as vegetable gardens, fish ponds and playing fields, from which the whole community benefits. When community development gets under way it becomes a necessity to save to pay the continuing costs of old projects and the initial costs of new ones. There is much less available to be dissipated on elaborate weddings or beer parties and other entertainments. In several countries advantage of this fact has been taken by governments sponsoring community development to gain acceptance of a restriction on such conspicuous consumption, in the very areas where such proposed restrictions had been rejected in the pre-community develop-

ment period. The sums saved in this way and used for development are very large in the aggregate.

Of even greater significance for economic development than the items so far mentioned is the incentive built into community development for increasing production. At first glance it seems that community development is largely concerned with providing amenities which cost money to build and maintain. Schools, dispensaries, drains in the streets, roads, wells, women's clubs, etc., are all good in themselves, but it may be asked if they should not come later when production has been raised to provide a surplus to pay for them. This is very good logic but is most inconsistent with human behaviour. How many of you save enough money to pay cash for your automobile, your home, household equipment or other large items? Of course you don't. You first get the item wanted and then through regular payments you are enabled to enjoy it while paying for it. As the billions of pounds of hire-purchase agreements so tellingly illustrate in the most advanced countries of Europe and America, this is the way that highly urbanized and educated people behave who have high incomes and the capacity as individuals to control to a large extent their economic and social situations. To expect a tribesman whose income is comparatively tiny, whose social and cultural situation is far more restrictive of individual behaviour, who lives in a community with a high leisure preference, who accepts as right the claims of kinsmen for any surplus beyond his immediate needs—I repeat, to expect these tribesmen to save and then spend is little short of ridiculous.

Rather the process works the other way around. A community is helped to get the things it wants with grants-in-aid and technical assistance, provided in varying amounts by the central government. The community must pay a part not only of the initial cost but of the recurring costs as well—nothing in community development is free. It is this necessity of having to continue to pay for what is wanted which provides the mass incentive to produce. If the school, the clinic, and other amenities constructed and owned by the community will simply close down unless the community does its part, then the community does its part. Also, people will give up some of their leisure for work which is easier to do now that everyone has to do it. They will take the considerable economic risks involved in purchasing fertilizers and other production inputs. They can now risk the demands of relatives for the increased output because these relatives know that it must be used to pay the local government rates. Thus community development becomes the incentive to increased agricultural production which in underdeveloped countries is the usual source of finance for industrial and other development.

A by-product of this process is the more efficient use made of technicians, who are always in short supply in a developing country. In the absence of mass motivation the extension agent in health, or agriculture, or adult literacy, or small industry, must spend a great deal of his time

in trying to convince the people of a need for his services—in selling his product. But this is no longer true especially in agriculture and small-scale (cottage) industry when true community development is under way. People who were formerly completely apathetic and unresponsive to all the techniques and blandishments of extension education are now *demanding* the services of the technician. Thus he can spend his time on his technology and not waste a large part of it as formerly in a nearly futile round of meetings and the like. Incidentally, this demand requires that the technicians be adequately trained in the results of technical research to meet the greatly increased demands for technical knowledge.

Observation of community development in the field has led a number of development economists to endorse it as an essential component of development. For example, W. Arthur Lewis in his chapter on 'Capital' in *The Theory of Economic Growth* states that 'there is everything to be said for putting into community development all the resources which it can take.' In his chapter on 'Government' he states further that 'community development is the best development of all and every programme should set aside for this work sums amounting to one or two percent of the national output'.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IS POLITICAL DEVELOPMENT

So far I have been talking as if community development was a self-contained process. This notion I want to dispel by stating that it is only the one side of a coin, the other being local government. Neither one is viable without the other. Community development employs a more or less *ad hoc* approach, using informal organizations at the primary community level in order to mobilize enthusiasm, labour and materials for local projects, and, as we have just seen, to motivate people to increase their agricultural and cottage industry production. On the other hand, local government is formal organization at the 'coherence of communities' level, that is the lowest political unit, which may be a tribe, a district or a specially demarcated development area. Essentially it is a banding together of local communities on the basis of common interests to carry on where community development leaves off, especially in levying rates for systematic development and for maintenance of the amenities and services created by community development.

The rural local government system in Southern Rhodesia, known as 'native councils' has been given high praise for its conception as expressed in the Native Councils Act, Regulations and Circulars. However, the present system is gradually dying owing to a number of deficiencies, which, I may add, are all correctable. This is not the time nor place to go into a description of these. All I need indicate is that in most areas native councils are not considered to be really necessary by the people since central government carries on all the major functions of government. Thus the people in a given area get about the same number of services—and in

their view are denied about the same number—whether there is a council in the area or not. No local government can possibly hope to survive unless it is essential to the people. Unless central government gives responsibility to local government for services considered by the people to be necessary, such as primary schools, local roads, and clinics, and then itself refuses to provide such services directly, local government perishes. A second major deficiency in the present system is the vacuum which exists between the people and the council. The community itself has been skipped over in this process of organization and there is no identification of the average villager with his council, especially the larger ones. The answer is the creation of community development boards in each community which wants one, such boards to be assisted on community self-help projects by the local government.

Thus community development and local government between them carry out many of the functions of government which most affect the people. The peoples' representatives develop a sense of responsibility as they have to recognize that income must equal expenditure—that nothing is free. They learn that amenities and services must be maintained as well as built and that the maintenance is often far more expensive than the original cost. They learn to use government technicians and not to be dominated by them. They learn what all of us know who work in governments, that he who governs can expect little gratitude. No matter what is done there will be those who will not like it nor think that enough has been done for them. Therefore, in these and other ways community development and local government prepare people to assume responsibility for government at higher levels, and thus assure a continuity of stable central governments oriented to serving the people.

APPLICABILITY OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT TO SOUTHERN RHODESIA

After two years of intensive and extensive study of African development, local and central government, and indigenous social structure in Southern Rhodesia, I have come to the conclusion that Southern Rhodesians have the need for and the capability of carrying out community development. And I have recommended to Government that they be given the opportunity. This recommendation has received strong support from many quarters including the Mangwende Commission, the Paterson Commission and the various Working Parties set up to implement the Robinson Commission Report. The Southern Rhodesia Government in June, 1962, accepted community development as basic policy for district administration, local government and technical development at the community level, and signed an international agreement to this effect. I am looking forward to the process of implementation within the unique context of factors in this country, and hope that in the papers and the discussions to follow that we shall throw light on the many problems that are bound to arise.



This work is licensed under a
Creative Commons
Attribution – NonCommercial - NoDerivs 3.0 License.

To view a copy of the license please see:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/>

This is a download from the BLDS Digital Library on OpenDocs
<http://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/>