

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.

## FINANCING COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

N. K. KINKEAD-WEEKES

*Anglo-American Corporation*

In starting 'from scratch' on this subject, I have had to pose to myself the sort of questions which I would have preferred to hear an expert answering. Thus what I have to say I hope you will regard as little more than some aspects of enquiry into the subject, some lines of thought and implications which occur to me in regard to it, and which, if nothing else, I hope may either be answered or challenged by some of the experts who are here.

I should say straight away what has struck me most in the descriptions we have had of community development is the magical quality referred to as its 'cumulative effect'. Strike the spark of community enterprise and initiative, one understands, and you start a flame. Kindle the flame, and you start a fire. And what is more, the responsibility thus imposed on the local people by themselves of maintaining that fire, is so compelling, that more and more kindling will be made available to keep it going, and to spread it further.

This I firmly and gladly believe. But it has its implications, certainly by analogy in other fields, when it comes to finance. It reminds me, for instance, of the well-known answer of a famous trade unionist who, asked what it was that trade unionists really wanted, said he could answer that shortly in one word: 'More'.

It is this 'more' aspect of successful community development which, to me, begins to pose the real problems inherent in its financing. Not that we should be frightened of them; but, if community development as a policy or 'technique' (that is, as a positive, organized stimulus to community enterprise and advance) has this dynamic which I am certain it has, then any people or Government which sets itself upon this path should recognize from the outset the seeds which it bears for the future—certainly in the sphere of finance, but also, because of the interdependence of finance and administration, in that of politics.

One can of course think of community development purely in a narrow context, namely as comprehending only those special types of community project which have a strictly local content, determined by purely local needs. But that in my view is to bluff oneself because once accepted as a positive 'policy' or 'technique' or 'approach', it must become applicable to all aspects of development, whether economic, social or political, and over the whole range of development projects, too, from the most humble realization of the local need to the most ambitious aspect of the National Development Plan.

Community development can clearly never in itself be a substitute for normal development programmes, it can only be a part of them. And because of the seeds of development which it bears for the future (because of this 'cumulative effect'), it should also not be regarded as a means of achieving economic development 'on the cheap'. It is tempting to think of this technique as a magical means of making a £ or a million £'s of economic development money go a little further, or spread a little wider. This may well be so, as regards the initial cost of purely locally based social and physical improvements—but the striking of this community spark, it seems to me, will light the flames of greater and cumulative economic demands thereafter, the cost of which may well be enormous and the frustrations equally enormous if the demands are not met.

Truly, community development seems to me a critical justification for the old adage 'don't start something you can't finish!' It is in its relation to normal development, in other words getting beyond the narrow start, that the financing problems of this policy are of most interest to me.

In talking of finance, I must evidently consider the financing of community development in this narrower sense I refer to. I feel I must necessarily touch on the wider picture financially, and enquire therefore at various points into what seem to me several different 'stages', as it were, of the community development process.

I have them in mind as follows:

1. The preparation and staffing stage;
2. The launching stage—the execution of locally based community projects as such;
3. 'Maintaining the momentum';
4. The association of community development with the National Development Plan.

I have since learnt with interest that a somewhat similar 'staging' was established originally in the vast Community Development Programme of India, but has since been compressed into only two stages, both of them part of the National Development Service.

Perhaps I make my point too quickly, and should get back to finance. I should interpose by saying that at any time in talking of 'finance' we imply, I take it, not merely money but money's worth, that is, all those elements as well as money which contribute to the asset value of the development objective, including thought, services, labour and raw materials, whether paid for or not. Furthermore, it is perhaps trite to say that for most community development projects both the 'intrinsic' and the 'extrinsic' content of finance have to be considered, the intrinsic

being those elements which the community (whether a village, or a nation) can be either encouraged or compelled to disgorge, and the extrinsic being those necessary to make up the shortfall in asset requirements which the local entity cannot itself provide. In relation, furthermore, to any one of these 'stages' which I have supposed, the normal broad issues common to any financing problem arise.

These are:

1. What is the money (or labour, materials or services) needed for?
2. How much?
3. Where is it *going* to come from?
4. Who is going to spend it, who takes the decisions, who decides priorities and allocations, and on what basis?

That is to say, this last is concerned with the administration of the finance, without which money itself can have no application.

I may say here that I propose to enquire more into the principles of financing and financial administration than into the extent of money required or likely to be available, or the sources from which it may come. There are many such sources hypothetically available—from central and local government taxation and surcharge; from voluntary agencies; from international agencies such as the Agency for International Development (AID), UNESCO and UNICEF, the FAO and WHO; the U.K. Department of Technical Co-operation; international private foundations, and many others. And it may be interesting in our more detailed discussions to have a look at some of these, and to attempt to clarify what they are, how they operate, and the extent to which it may be possible for us to tap them.

But all this is too hypothetical for my immediate scope, for it seems to me that we must first concentrate on getting right our basis of financing and administration, in order to make our community development work. That will not only increase the extent to which we can raise finance from our own internal resources as well as from outside; but so far as the latter is concerned, it will in many respects be a pre-condition for our doing so.

These ingredients of finance which I have mentioned (namely, What for? How much? Where from? and, How to spend?) must be carried through every aspect of the community development process; and each of them, moreover, will obviously vary not only according to the nature and stage of the particular development project involved, but also according to the political, economic and social context in which the process is taking effect. For example, it may reasonably be assumed that the same factors will not always apply in matters of urban community development,

as they would in development in the rural areas; and they will also vary immensely according to the nature of the economy, the homogeneity or otherwise of the people, and of course the relationship between them and their government. These variations can be imagined, for instance, in a graduated comparison of conditions applicable, for instance, in Tanganyika, through Nyasaland, to Northern Rhodesia and then Southern Rhodesia.

In these circumstances I think you will perhaps forgive me if I tend to talk or ask my questions in generalizations, though I shall attempt to relate them to our own particular circumstances.

With these different concepts in mind, I come back to the 'stages' in the development process which I mentioned earlier.

The first stage is, by and large, concerned with preparation, with planning, and with propaganda, and of course, with staff. The needs at this stage are for planners, experts, instructors and training establishments. The aim (including the mobilisation of voluntary agencies to assist in the process) is to establish and equip a corps of localised community development officers and helpers. The requirements are for places to train them, people to plan and carry out the training, and for all the necessary tools of the job to set them up in their various areas of operation.

If we are talking about a national 'policy', then this initial stage seems to comprehend almost inevitably the setting up of a specialized community development department or Service, with its own budget. Apart therefore from such voluntary aid as can be introduced and mobilised locally by voluntary institutions in the training process, the responsibility for financing and establishing a community development service must in principle be a national or central government responsibility.

The next question then of how much money is required, is basically one of 'the cloth' available, and I know insufficient of this subject to presume to give you any indices. Some comparable figures, I think, are that in Ghana about £100,000 was utilised initially in setting up a series of community development projects as such, and thereafter a separate budget of around £500,000 a year was allocated to the community development machine (about 50% of it for staff). A similar sort of sum is provided on aggregate in the Northern Rhodesia Government's Four Year Development Plan. But whatever the amount, I would hazard a guess that this part of the exercise is not especially expensive. Perhaps that is one of its attractions! And, moreover, it is at this initial stage of a community development 'policy', once it is seen to be genuine and begins to prognosticate a definite aggregate of local projects, that it seems easiest to secure aid from international agencies--that is, for defined objectives rather than as mere contributions to the national treasury, which they don't like.

In regard to international agencies, however, I would stress relative to these initial stages, the word 'aid' rather than 'finance' in its strict sense, for it is a feature of international assistance agencies that there is a plentiful supply of experts, of principles, of ideas, and of technical surveys and propaganda—but much less in the way of hard cash (and that only on strict commercial terms) for the eventual recurrent costs and expansion of individual community projects, to which successful community development inevitably leads.

I think, therefore, that the financing of community development at the original planning and staffing stage is not a frightening prospect. Where primarily a government function, it is capable of being determined in the ordinary course of government budgeting, is not unduly alarming in cost, and is capable of being set up initially in tolerable association with normal government departments.

It is at the next or second stage, when these activities begin to be launched into specific projects in the local communities (whether sociologically, educationally or agriculturally) that the inherent problems of community development financing seem to me to arise—that is, when community projects have been encouraged and identified: when they are in process of being established: when expert extension services are required: and when they subsequently require to be maintained on a local basis of recurrent expenditure or (because they become part of an aggregate of many similar projects elsewhere) when they begin to merge into or impinge upon national development schemes.

The needs at the beginnings of this launching stage are of a strictly local nature, and within their own limitations, can generate important local contributions in capital formation and even to a certain degree in current revenue. This indeed is a fairly painless means of local taxation, a factor which I understand became quickly recognised in Ghana and in India, so that community development agencies began to insist on the local contribution being in materials and labour rather than in cash, because the cash contribution inhibited the collection of normal taxation!

Thus, in examining for this stage the question of 'how much', the intrinsic or local element of finance is predominant, and quite evidently provides the first principle of the community development technique, namely that help will be given to those who help themselves, and that no such help will be available until the local community has evinced its readiness, in a demonstrable way, to contribute its own share. This share may well be very considerable. The normal ratio which apparently can be accepted is at least 50 per cent, but in certain instances where, for instance, the labour content is high, can go as high as 80 or 90 per cent. Inevitably however, public funds must also be available to some degree, to meet those elements of materials or skills which the local community cannot itself provide. And that of course creates the other side of the penny, namely, where this supplementary finance is to come from, who is to administer it, and upon what principles.

Some of the principles indeed are not difficult to find or to imagine, and tend largely to suggest themselves. For instance:—

1. That the local people should themselves decide what it is they want.
2. That only such aid should be given as is necessary to supplement the local resources and contribution.
3. That the aid be given judiciously, in particular that it be given at the right time, expeditiously, and neither too much nor too soon, nor too little nor too late. It should also, I imagine, be like Caesar's wife; and should therefore be seen to be given to those who help themselves, and not to the mendicants or those who do not warrant it.
4. There should also be timely and proper technical aid, to be sure that what is done is well done, and will not have to be pulled down or stand condemned as a handicap or an eyesore.

All this of course implies a critical devolution of responsibility in decision, in allocation and in administration, to the local area; and that indeed seems the crux of all local development financing in its narrowest sense.

In purely embryonic form this may be easy enough to devise. As I have said, in Ghana mass education and community development techniques were initially started by the simple device of allocating a round sum of money (I think £100,000) to 50 different local community areas; so that each area had £2,000 available to it under dispensation, as it were, from a local development committee.

One also anticipates that this narrow-based community development will be devolved naturally to community development agencies, development boards and so on, acting as far as possible in consultation with, or within the Local Authority where that exists.

But what are the implications of this?

If there is no well-established representative Local Authority, the trend would be to place the power of decision and dispensation in the hands of the Local Development Committee or of the Community Development Officer himself, with the consequent temptation to reintroduce dispensation 'from above'; and who, once his initial funds run out has to be re-financed, and who also, by reference back to his own special Community Development 'centre' or Headquarters, would tend to cut across the normal ministerial departments.

Alternatively, if there is a Local Authority or as such Authority develops, a political content seems bound to grow—and to breed that typical parochialism in local affairs, as well as pressure on the centre for more and more funds, which are naturally characteristic of local interests anywhere.

Inexorably this process begins to put the entire accent on the development of strong Local Authorities, both positively and negatively. Negatively, because without it the community development concept will die; positively, because successful community development leads to more and more successful development, and to more and more needs for local 'self-imposed responsibility' for its maintenance. Thus, the fruit, to my mind, is the inevitable emergence of the responsible, elected Local Authority, politically orientated, and armed eventually with the local taxing power.

Parochialism thus tends to become a force set against centralised control and planning—and where are the finance and effort then to go? To the local need, or to the national need? And how is this to be judged?—by its social content, or by its economic value in terms of the resources and funds available?

The questions then, that seem to me to arise, are questions of holding the balance between these various elements. I would pose them as follows:

How can a balance between the local ambitions and preferences of the community on the one hand and the more enlightened community development agency or officer on the other be maintained—without damage to the essential element of community initiative and enthusiasm? In other words, how far can one go in letting the local horse have its head?

How can the balance between local allocation of community development funds quickly and expeditiously, and the desirability on the other hand for centralized control and accountability be maintained? How to hold the balance, as an element of this, between local *laissez-faire* and comprehensive project planning? This I may say seems particularly important for the introduction of external development finance at the actual project stage, for funds of any magnitude are not likely to be forthcoming except on a basis of planned and demonstrable content.

How can the balance between the 'local need' and the 'national need', that is, between the economists' criterion of economic national benefit, and the sociologists' criterion of community progress and happiness be maintained?

I come back to a view I expressed earlier, that is, that finance for community self-help, at any rate that sort which has an economic content, must be related to, and where possible integrated with, regional and national development at the earliest possible stage; and that the budget and its administration must therefore take account of both. Where materials, technical services and money are all in short supply, they must, in my view, be allocated to purposes which result in the greatest possible public benefit. This may consequently limit to some extent the type of community

activity for which public funds can be made available; and thus voluntary funds should be encouraged as far as possible towards the more sociological objectives.

May I then attempt to answer some of these questions of principle? The answers seem to me to lie in a necessary flexibility of approach—both on the question of objectives, as well as on the mechanics of budgeting, allocation and administration in order to achieve them.

I have in mind certain features which I hope may be helpful for discussion, under five main heads.

First, there should be accepted in practice some differentiation between different types of community development, and the treatment to be accorded them.

Some might suggest the maintenance of a clearcut distinction in every way between 'community development', and 'development'. For the reasons I have given, I think this is neither possible nor desirable. It may be possible, on the other hand, to maintain something of a distinction in type between those community development projects which fit in potentially with pre-determined national economic goals and those, on the other hand, which have primarily a sociological local content. The provision, for instance, of dams, roads, and other elements of economic infrastructure (as well perhaps as some elements of technical or trade training) could readily be integrated with the overall regional or national development plans. By way of example, the economic success of a major road or dam may well depend on the feeder systems capable of being constructed to it by community self-help. But matters of mainly sociological local content (such as hygiene, beautification, home economics and cultural activity generally) may, in my view, have to be planned and funded on a quite different sort of basis, from separate resources and without either such extensive or such rigorous standards.

There must, I feel, be some concession here; to proceed otherwise may be to court the danger of substantial funds and community effort being dissipated on innumerable small projects, some possibly of inferior quality and of no economic content—a bottomless maw, perhaps of unco-ordinated sanitary arrangements!

I have in mind, secondly, that so far at any rate as projects of economic content are concerned, there must be, within the concept of local decentralisation, the integration of planning at the local level also—between community development and other technical development departments.

This problem seems to me not so much one of adjusting conflicting national and local requirements, as one, first, of integration of the extension services at the local level; next, of ensuring good communication and

**liaison between national and local levels in the planning process; and last, of flexibility in the allocation of funds and the making known of priorities.**

In the administrative organization, I feel there should be a two-way flow of economic development planning, so that community development activities can be planned with knowledge of what the regional and national plan on the subject matter is, and likewise, regional or national measures can be planned with a knowledge of what the local self-help resources are likely to be.

How to create this interdependence of planning, administration and finance is, of course, a critical question, the answer to which I can only presume to outline by suggesting that it must lie somewhere within the principles, first, of integrated local control and planning in immediate contact with the technical departments; secondly, of the Community Development Officer acting as catalyst and co-ordinator rather than as the executive; and thirdly, of a quick-fire reference back by the District Organization to some central planning authority with strong persuasive or even executive powers. This Central Authority should be in the closest contact with expert advisory and development organizations, such as the Development Corporations and their Rural Industries branches.

Next, on the question of actual finance there seems to me to be the need also for immense flexibility, both in budgeting—in the period and conditions of spending and accountability; and in the provision in advance of block allocations or revolving loans to regions, based on their own forward plans. Allocations, in other words, which are certain, even though they may be limited, or less than the regional demands.

Fourthly, to provide this source of flexible budgeting seems to me to require some special Development Fund—directly allocable under Treasury and decentralized Treasury control, to regional authorities. This, I have noted with interest, is recommended in the Phillips Commission Report.

Fifthly, every effort must surely be made to mobilize not merely local community initiative and labour, but local community savings as well through the energetic development of co-operatives (in itself a major topic for this Conference), of specialised credit institutions, savings clubs and so on, and, finally, of course, through the local rate or tax.

Thus, I come back full circle to the recognition once again that the initiation of community development carries with it the seeds of localization throughout, and has, thus, not merely an economic content, but a very important political and fiscal content as well, which one can foresee—that is, the creation of new fiscal and tax measures to meet the ever-increasing flow of development demands; first, by the local authorities themselves to meet the cumulative responsibility of their own local creations; and secondly, by the central authority, as more and more pressure comes to be exerted on the national funds, and less and less is to be found (because of the pressure on them from all over the world) from international

sources. A first measure which springs readily to mind is a tax on undeveloped land.

Thus in due course humble community development projects, wherever they have an economic content, must it seems to me inexorably become integrated in the long run (and stand or fall with) the national economic scheme, as well as with the national government structure and all that that implies.

Community development is a means, not an end, and a means not merely of economic development, but of social and political advance as well. It is in very truth, the handmaiden of nationalism.

What that will mean for us here is in the hands of the politicians. But whether our future is to be found in a democratized or in a totalitarian system, I would like to state my belief that even socialist-oriented governments in Africa will find increasingly the need, in their development machinery and finance, to adjust to one another the two great assets that are still available to them, namely, the communalism of the African rural society, and the dynamics of private enterprise.

This is perhaps meat for an entirely different paper, but I would like merely to say that I consider much attention must and should still be given to developing here what I may refer to purely for purposes of description, as the 'Gezira type' and the 'Mungwi type' of co-operative development organization.

By the 'Gezira type' I mean that type of organization achieved in the Gezira irrigation schemes in the Sudan: that is, the association in a tripartite undertaking of government land and services, communal labour, and private commercial investment and management taking shares in a common enterprise. This is a basis which incorporates disciplined economic management into rural development schemes, with a sharing of profits to the benefit of all.

The 'Mungwi type' of organization (analogous to the Rural Development scheme at Mungwi in Northern Rhodesia) envisages the association of a centralized establishment of technical and community development training and skilled co-operative management, within a periphery of communal agricultural settlement and extension.

If the stimulation of local effort through community development can lead in due course to new development machinery of this type, then its introduction, in my view, will be beneficial to our country.



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/>