

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.

## THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

R. HOWMAN

*Southern Rhodesia Ministry of Internal Affairs*

I sometimes wish this term community development had never been invented. It has been described as a new, unknown system which should not be rushed into; that we were adopting untested novel ideas without proper trial, so first try out pilot schemes; that it was just a set of techniques that any modern Service already used, so why all the ballyhoo; that it was a sinister attempt to nationalize private enterprise in social welfare; that it was nothing but an attempt to turn administrators into social welfare workers; and finally it meant that government ceases to rule, to plan, to impose and throws everything to the tender mercies of the wishes of the people, so Departments are being sabotaged, and chaos and decay are inevitable consequences.

I hope to show you how wrong or misinformed all such notions are.

### POLITICAL THINKING

My subject is the role of government in community development. I would like to reverse this, just to introduce my comments, by asking you to ponder for a moment, the influence of a policy of community development on Government. For it opens up exciting new ideas and methods.

Most of our thinking is based on a mental picture of the two extremes—the state and the individual. An authority from above which must somehow dominate. A mass of individuals which must somehow be dominated. We expect adaptation to the state, its laws, its institutions, its standards and values—a huge, remote, impersonal affair represented by an army of officials and plans of economic and material progress.

Now what has happened? A new factor, a new dimension, has been interposed between the state and the individual—that of the community. We need to think about this. It will lead to many changes in our thinking. Not only shall we think in terms of the rights and freedoms of the individual, as against the state, but also the rights and freedoms of communities. We can picture the importance of communities, small in scale, responding to the diversity of needs and standards of people living together, sharing together, experiencing together, in communities of their own making. Integration into communities, not the state, becomes the prime objective and each community becomes, to use the Paterson Commission's words, 'an enterprise with

purpose, functions to achieve that purpose and a structure of function', so that the state becomes a group of communities, not a mass of individuals who have to be integrated into a common mould.

One could describe community development as a kind of reaction against mass living all over the world, in Europe as much as elsewhere, its stress is on the dignity, self-respect and sense of responsibility which flow when man feels he is controlling his own particular social environment and weaving his own pattern of life from below—a thing he craves to do. He does not wish to be a nonentity in a mass.

Community development, as a philosophy of politics, is to my mind the only one which faces the facts of multi-cultural living. We have seen Africans go through a stage when they seemed to reject their own culture. This, except for a few individuals, was only very superficial but it was enough for many Europeans to assume that African society was in a process of wholesale acceptance of Western standards, values and ways of life. It was just a question of time. Such an assumption, and the policies based on it, left out of account the fact that communities do not change in the same way as isolated individuals. The signs are clear that Africans are now revaluing their culture, not rejecting it, and there is a sentiment of a return to much of the past. Nobody likes to feel inferior and there is a fresh spirit of searching for a new way, a synthesis of old and new, a new pride, which, I believe, can be catered for much more effectively in communities than in nationalist political parties.

A policy of community development not only recognizes this deeply human need but requires an attitude of respect and appreciation of cultural differences; a doing away with assumptions of cultural arrogance and a gearing of the whole public service towards assisting and teaching communities to adapt themselves, in their own way, to the conditions of the modern world.

Given this approach the problem then arises—how do we integrate communities into the larger wholes which modern life demands?

## CENTRAL AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Community development is not a new idea or scheme. The first community development agent in England for hundreds of years was the local padre with his parish council meeting in church, and the earliest record of a rate was in the 1300's, when 6d. on land and 1d. per head of cattle was levied to repair a church roof. When the machine age came in and people became industrialized it was public-spirited local leaders who formed local groups to tackle the filth of man and pigs in the streets, the mud and dust, the crime and disorder, and provided the first services of paving, rubbish removal, drains, lighting and the Night Watchman.

This was the impulse, the enthusiasm, the local felt need to do something for the community, which set in motion the movement for Local Government that later received the recognition of the state and culminated in the Municipal Corporation Act of 1835.

Even then the local communities varied immensely in their reactions and it was only with the coming of the railways and then the motor car that public opinion began to feel the need for certain standards everywhere and expected Government to intervene. Remember that the famous 'Dirty Forties' saw two cholera epidemics (in 1848 and 1854) which, as one writer put it, provided 'recurrent lashes to the thick skin of public opinion' after decades of violent resistance to efforts in public sanitation.

In those early days everything depended on local initiative, local felt needs and there emerged local small scale organization which only very slowly grew up into larger scale bodies to merge into the impersonal, remote and complex service of the state. There were no technical experts, no central plans, no system of public finance, no audit, no civil service. These came later when local initiative, local participation and a sense of responsibility for local affairs had already become a going concern in the shape of millions of attitudes in support and a multitude of tiny local authorities—in fact a chaos of them which the Local Government Act of 1894 set out to put into order, and multipurpose District Councils were established.

What is the lesson to be drawn? That in England and Western countries as well as the U.S.A., local government and the development of the community came first and central government much later as the unifying influence.

But in Africa central government has come first.<sup>a</sup> The whole apparatus of a modern state, a public service with experts in control of health, education, agriculture, veterinary and administration has been dumped, so to speak, on a people who knew nothing of such matters. With this has come a highly centralised, distant and calculated type of national planning from above—an all pervading attitude of 'we know what you really need'.

This abnormal situation has had two profound effects on the rôle of government. First an exaggerated regard for efficiency and the maintenance of strict standards; a genuine fear that services will go to pot if too much attention is given to the wishes of the people, and a reluctance to devolve power or decision to local levels.

The second and much more serious aspect is really the theme of this Conference—the effect on the people.



## PATERNALISM

Such a situation cannot escape being characterised as paternalism when the people react against it, as they must inevitably do as they become more educated, more aware of themselves, more articulate, and as a political consciousness asserts itself. But when 'paternalism' is taken up as a political slogan let us not overlook the fact that, as a stage in the evolution of a people, it has had an indispensable and highly important rôle to perform. There is nothing discreditable about a system which has provoked such an avalanche of public demand as that which now confronts government in the fields of curative health and educational facilities. Only 45 years ago a clinic stood empty and had to be abandoned after eight years. Parents would not send their children to school. There is nothing discreditable about a system which has transformed the village layout, the nature of the huts and houses, the communications and the methods of utilizing the land, where 30 years ago a model village had not the slightest effect for eight years on the tumbled down miserable shacks which were the traditional type of architecture. There is nothing discreditable about protective and veterinary services which have seen cattle increase from 55,000 to 2 million over 60 years, not to mention the change in quality and value.

Where paternalism can be criticised, and discredited, is when, having performed its function of demonstrating what can be done, of stirring up demands for this and that, of provoking agitation for a better style of life, it prolongs itself beyond its due span and seeks to continue to plan, to execute, to order and impose and does not respond to the new psychological environment it has brought into being among the people.

There must be a limit to paternalism. The danger is that with sights set on material achievements, statistically evident progress, government departments become set on quick results, insist on efficiency, intrude more and more into the daily life of the people and build up more and more staff to rehabilitate and control. They also find themselves increasingly involved in maintaining their services, their achievements. The rôle of policing and safeguarding their efforts begins to dominate their existence and they absorb more and more of government resources when investment in people, their training and local institutions, seems to be the key to the problem.

It is so easy to go ahead with technical or material objectives at the expense of the community. I offer you four consequences to consider:—

First, where a demand is provoked, it piles up into an inexhaustible clamour for more, without any appreciation of the costs involved in planning, training, financing, administering. Where the state

simply cannot provide, ignorant bitterness and political hostility against the state follows.

Secondly, where a demand is not provoked, you have a regime of *what is good for you*, usually a technical prescription which is often not far away from a tyranny and generally a waste of resources. The imposition of destocking because there is a need to conserve natural resources might be compared to a law prohibiting smoking because of a need to conserve human resources.

Thirdly, all development, all innovation, all initiative, all responsibility are apt to be regarded as the business of government. 'We want government to do . . .' become the first words on everybody's lips, at every meeting, and when anything goes wrong there is always government to blame. An attitude of dependency, of spoonfeeding, of apathy and disinterestedness breaks the heart of the officer of government in the field and when this attitude changes into resentment, hostility and political outbursts the results are far-reaching.

Lastly, such a system promotes and gives ample scope for individual initiative and personal progress. Indeed individual self-help is apparent all around us—business men, master farmers, bus operators, the lot—but what of communal organization, communal responsibility, communal initiative and communal self-help? The man who grows a fine crop of maize or cotton knows no more than his grandfather about the economics, the marketing, the business, the organizational side of his activities because development schemes and production plans have all been devised for him—until co-operatives came in.

Africans live on the fringes of government plans and executive action. They have been atomized, reduced to a species of human sand held together by nothing or only very little. Profound psychological forces are on the loose. They have to be tied up into new civic wholes. There is the problem.

### NEEDS, APATHY

You have already heard of *felt needs*. May I just add this. Everyone talks about *needs*: 'You need to use fertilizer,' 'You need a latrine,' 'You need better seed.' Every extension agent justifies his work because he sees a need for it and builds up fine plans to meet the need. When little or nothing happens it is easy to say the people in the mass are stupid, ignorant, lazy, and continue to batter against resistance, apathy and non-co-operation. What can be the matter, the people so obviously need these things!

I suggest you distinguish between *real needs* and *felt needs*. These examples are all *real needs* and as such they are an abstraction,

an idea or theory only and they imply someone wiser, someone who knows what is good for someone else. But what of felt needs? They are only there when a person acts or talks as if he needs something; they are springs of action, something that provokes action.

Successful schemes can usually be traced to an unsuspected contact with a felt need, or the conversion of a real need into a felt need, but when this does not happen and only a real need is involved then the scheme will die or Government keeps it going and suffers the consequences. All the propaganda, the lectures, the pep talks and demonstrations in the world will be so much waste unless a sufficiency of people *feel* something is well worth their while. Then they move mountains.

When we talk of apathy and indifference, what do we mean? That such things as may have been accomplished have been almost wholly the work of officials and were only done because they wanted them done. If Africans were associated with the process then that was a device for doing what government *wanted*, and they were there perhaps because they wanted to stand well with officials, or because there was some profit in it, or because some of them had to. It was never their concern, not their priority, not their *want* and so the scheme collapsed or was only kept going by subsidies as a kind of disguised *progress by compulsion*.

There were of course always individuals who responded and these were hailed as evidence of success. Generally, however, these ideas of pushing Africans into civilization with talk of revolutionary changes, only affected a comparative few who, for reasons of their own, responded, often as a purely temporary expedient, to the campaign to change them. The main problem is the mass who will not be pushed beyond their own pace of change in their minds and outlook. This in turn is derived from a whole complex of attitudes, beliefs, standards, values, social institutions and motives which together make up what anthropologists call culture. In its simplest terms the problem is to change attitudes and an attitude is learned behaviour. Learned from whom? The community and the family. So to generate change, far more effective results come from changing the community, the system in which an individual lives, rather than trying to manipulate the individual as if he was the source of his attitudes, and an independent atom. This atomistic approach is condemned by all social scientists. Once this is appreciated, nine-tenths of the problem can be seen to be a psychological, or sociological, or human problem and not so much the technical problem departments of government so often make it out to be, although most of them now contend that their extension concepts are designed to ensure participation in their programmes.

## COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT

I suggest to you that what now goes under the name of community development is simply the application of the human sciences, the coming

down into practical administration of the findings, the theories, the principles that research in the human sciences have disclosed and thus government has accepted a new dimension in the public service—a humanistic discipline to counter-balance an undue reliance on other scientific disciplines devoted to material or technical goals and progress.

What can government do about it?

I suggest that it subjects every activity of every department, except those of national significance, to the crucial test: does it insist on and promote local communal responsibility, initiative, and participation?

How are these attributes to be inculcated in practice and how are they to be attained quickly enough to meet the political challenge posed by those who clamour for political control and demand rights without acquaintance with the most elementary notions of political obligations, public finance and public administration? These people who seek to float into power on a massive wave of public irresponsibility, of sheer ignorance, of apathy given emotional strength by a reaction against what they feel to be a tyranny of European *good for you*, and the wonderful feeling of being enveloped in a cause. Politics I learn, in its Greek sense, means 'responsible membership' and Municipality comes from *Municipium* meaning 'acceptance of obligations'. What have we done but to get mixed up in a topsy-turvy system where we have representative institutions at the top of the pyramid and very little at the bottom. No wonder some claim that democracy is an unworkable system in Africa!

The statutory machinery which government should make a concerted drive to establish at the bottom is a system of elected local government councils, but deeper insights into the way of social living show that government must reach lower down than this to get communities moving. It must go for the natural areas of communal action, first *recognizing and consolidating* into social units which we propose to call Community Boards, secondly *provoking them to action*, and thirdly integrating them into larger more viable bodies to be called Development Authorities. The fourth stage comes when these Development Authorities, which are informal consultative bodies dependent on the District Commissioner for funds and executive powers are ready to accept the self-control, the independence and the responsibilities of a statutory, formal local government Council.

Where such Councils already exist then it is vital to underpin them with a cluster of Community Boards or local elected committees.

This infra-council or pre-council activity and structure must be most flexible, adaptable and informal. This is the vital sphere of the Community Development Agent. Without proper cultivation of this seedbed either Councils will not grow up or those already in being are likely to be weak,

languishing and ill-nourished. This is the field we do not know, the genuinely new idea of training and putting into the field, as a new category of government staff, the multi-purpose Agent of Change who is deliberately equipped with techniques in the human sciences to arouse public opinion and then convert it into communal action.

The other problem, that of evolving or strengthening statutory Councils, is a very old problem. A hundred years ago Mill urged that local government bodies should be established in England for the public education of citizens and not so much for their administrative value. Ever since, the twin functions or dual purposes, of local government, that of civic education of people and that of the provision and administration of public services, have run into immense difficulties.

I think it is generally accepted that one fundamental condition for any sound and flourishing local government body is that there must be a genuine community to support it. Industrialization tends to break up communities and admiration for sheer size or numbers kills communities.

But government has to be equally concerned with administrative and financial competence to run services, especially when it has to support such bodies. A multiplicity of tiny authorities based on community feeling may be the best for citizenship purposes or community development, but if they have overlapping functions, lack the means to carry them out and have little or no viability, then obviously the inefficiency and waste means that government has either to eliminate small units or so organize them that a two-tier structure evolves.

There can be no doubt that one of the most important considerations government has to face, in determining what functions to permit local government to assume, is that of the size of local government units. Every service has a human catchment area. A clinic requires so many beds for a particular staff and each bed requires so many people living in an area to keep the beds filled. A £30 per month Council Secretary requires a certain volume of work, which in turn depends on so many ratepayers to justify his job and salary. These aspects seem to point to a solution in a two-tier system where community feelings and education in citizenship find expression in the lower tier and business efficiency, economic power and administrative ability are concentrated in the upper tier.

I think it is very important to face the grim reality of these two approaches to local government. If government is concerned with efficiency and getting things done then it will bring pressure to bear in favour of big units with their financial advantages and the administrative convenience of dealing with only a few bodies. On the other hand if the development of the community is the objective and local government is conceived of as a method primarily of saturating the people with new ideas of citizenship and mobilising group action, then small units are needed. A Minister of Health in England expressed it this way:—

**'Local Government is part of the emotional, spiritual and aesthetic equipment of modern society and therefore it is something to which we cannot apply the test of efficiency, because of we apply that test to the ends of life as well as to the means of life, then we have a soulless and stereotyped community'.**

If efficiency and achievement is made the test, and local government looked upon as an agent of central government, then we shall probably come to this verdict, in the words of a recent Conference: 'Local government in Africa is described as ineffective, at worst obstructive, and throws administrative development into confusion'. This is the result of making local government a cog in a central machine, a kind of bottom layer of government departments which simply use local government as an agent to carry out their plans. This is not community development, nor is it genuine self-government at the local level. It is more local administration.

The rôle of government with regard to local government is a highly complex and interdependent relationship and one that is constantly changing. No formula lasts long.

If it be accepted that the conservation and development of the community, both at local government and lower levels, is the primary aim, and the key to the future of Southern Rhodesia, then I suggest the following principles emerge:

First, the local body must be allowed to do the things it wants to do, within the law, and can do within the limits of its own resources. This is the zone of *felt needs*. If the things the local body *wants* to do require or deserve financial support and more competent personnel then the price they must pay for government assistance is compliance with government conditions. As a result of being assisted to do what they want to do it is probable that local bodies will gain confidence, not only in themselves but also in government, and particularly the Community Development Agents, with the result that they will do things which they are not exactly keen on but to which they have no real objections. Let us not under-estimate the enormous new potential for development that lies in attitudes of confidence and self-reliance. All the things which *ought* to be done to protect the national good and which the people will not do or are unable to do should be done by Government.

From these principles there flow the following conclusions:

First, if real responsibility and civic education in its widest sense of learning by decision-making is to be achieved we must, in the local field, allow the local council to decide its own priorities on the basis of its own *felt needs*.

Secondly, there must be a classification or diversion of services into the old British categories of 'national and onerous' on the one hand and

'local and beneficial' on the other, to which, later, was added a third category—services intermediate between these two, that is both having national and local significance which necessitates a partnership between central government and local government.

Next, government must so arrange and order its public services that every department in it is, at field level, co-ordinated to promote the development of the communities and their statutory flowering in local government. Long ago a Royal Commission in England, in 1868, said 'a single and powerful Ministry was necessary to set local life in motion . . . not to threaten local initiative but to revive a local government strangled by its own confusion and in danger of complete collapse. . . .' Here is the integrated approach of community development. It means that through concerted effort of all departments, government lends its weight and 'know-how' to local government, and a council is provided which as it grows into Health Committees, Agricultural Committees, Education Committees, Veterinary Committees and so on, each served by the appropriate technical or professional Extension officer of government who is alert to provide the right advice or assistance at the right time in the right place.

Fourthly, the rôle of government is not at all that of a *laissez-faire* approach. Not only does it retain full and strict responsibility for all matters not of purely local significance (national interests, national resources, national health, etc.) but it has a duty to promote, teach and *respect* communities and assist in every way their adaptation to modern life. Its responsibilities certainly do not end with the establishment of local government, for in the national interest it must provide discipline, standards, advice and assistance together with safeguards against abuses, corruption and mismanagement.

Lastly, government has a duty to make direct contact with individuals, for in the last resort it is the feelings, the incentives, the skills and capacities of individuals, which determine the qualities of progress of both the state and local bodies. This it does through its Education Department in the case of children and through Adult Education and Extension Services of every kind—agriculture, health, home economics, veterinary, information—all of which are primarily concerned with teaching or advising on what *ought* to be done, all seeking to convert 'real needs' into 'felt needs', but at no time let loose to organize society, to step outside their own technical speciality, or to spread their particular gospel by grandiose conceptions of their own brand of Extension. This means co-ordination of all their functions if chaos and confusion are to be avoided. But co-ordination for the sake of control is meaningless, and rightfully resented. Co-ordination is only a means, a structure, a pattern to achieve a purpose or target and that cannot be a particular specialism's target. It can only be the whole in the overall objective of the development of communities in their natural environment, a kind of human ecology,

and their statutory expression in local government. This is where those specialists who claim that community development is a useful aid to their own purposes are so grievously misinformed.

May I now direct your attention to three absolutely vital aspects in the rôle of government, that of training, of finance and of departmental staff organization.

## TRAINING

Training is to be discussed later and I merely mention it here to stress how important a rôle government has to play in this aspect of community development. It is not academic or classroom education that is needed but a new kind of education of a practical nature designed to give the necessary skills and outlook to everyone from elected members of community boards and council chairmen, to every person or official whose duties are influential in the community development process.

## FINANCE

Under the old system central funds went hand in hand with central planning. Each department was furnished with funds to get on with its job and these were dispersed throughout every district. Every officer's approach was to ask for as much as possible and the centre was concerned to cut him down and share out as fairly as possible.

The community development approach requires vast financial changes; changes in both systems, structure and attitudes of officers. There has to be a detailed distinction between primary development costs which are the responsibility of Government, and secondary development which becomes the responsibility of the community boards or councils. There has to be a carefully drawn line, probably in every department, between what is a central government function or responsibility and what is a local government function or responsibility, particularly in education and health, for these are the really *massive* felt needs of the people at present, with enormous potential power to induce people to organize themselves. The dispersal of government funds for development should be co-ordinated and flow through only one grant-in-aid system on a basis of helping those who help themselves with proper attention to local resources; and the officers themselves, instead of getting all they can, change round to assessing the response of the people.

There is nothing new in this. Trial and error in England has already shown that the foundations of effective power over local authorities lies in a wise grants-in-aid system and 'attempts to send a current of energy through the local machinery' failed when commands and penalties were used. And even more control came in when, in 1929,



the large number of grants from different departments were abolished and one Minister became responsible. He could then watch the operation of a local authority as a whole, reduce any grant for deficiency in any service, apply financial incentive to start a new service or step up an existing one, check any excessive, unbalanced or wasteful expenditure and apply himself to that basic problem of local government finance, how to provide sufficient money to meet costs without imposing an impossible burden on the local people, and yet without being so generous that local independence, initiative and vigour are sapped.

The technique of grants is a highly complex matter, but briefly experience has evolved two main classes; the first being block grants on some automatic formula in which questions are not usually asked. It is a means whereby assistance is given as a whole, 'a general irrigation rather than a special watering of some fragile plant'. The second system is through specific grants to assist a particular plant or service, to encourage initiative, to control a strategic point such as the qualifications and competence of key officers, and to impose standards of efficiency.

No central government and no system of community development can afford to minimise the importance of grants-in-aid and loans, as instruments of both control and promotion. But this is a delicate and ever-changing matter which requires that no one grant or loan can be operated in isolation. All are interdependent and must be viewed as a whole, and above all, we still do not know how effectively this will operate in an alien culture, so largely unresponsive to economic incentives.

## ORGANIZATION

Where is the proper home for community development in the structure of the public service? This seems to be a very argumentative problem and different countries have made very varied answers, often I think because of varied concepts.

Some have established a separate Department of Community Development and used it for adult education and to supply support to other departments in the execution of their development plans, namely propaganda and publicity drives, sometimes of a *blitzkrieg* nature, audio-visual aids, films, posters, teams of instructors, indeed any technique to bring about understanding, co-operation and participation in implementing the plans of any department. Here we see community development envisaged as another aid to government, community is just another name for the people, the mass, who must be raised up. It is a kind of special all-round extension service to assist national plans.

Often community development is located in a Social Welfare Department where it tends to become identified with welfare on a group basis. Community halls or centres are provided, all kinds of recreational,

instructional and useful activities are promoted, and clubs of various kinds assisted. Because it is for the good of the locals, at least those attracted in, it is called community development. It is not. It is social welfare.

Other departments, under the plea that their extension services use the same techniques, often lay claim to community development. Then you have the position where health, agriculture, natural resources, veterinary services, adult education, home economics, all tend to build up extensions of their own speciality; some employ psychologists and anthropologists to probe weak spots in the opposition, and promote local organizations, committees of this and that, to further their own interests, their own 'do this' or 'don't do that'.

Can any government afford so many armies of extension agents? What is the response of people to so many salesmen? Can a salesman, no matter how good, do justice to his own particular specialism and at the same time claim he is catering for the illusive and varied felt needs of the people? What are the financial implications and responsibilities of this mass of *ad hoc* bodies? This is not the development of a community, a strengthening of its coherence, its ability to act as a whole in shaping its pattern of life through a local government system. It is the very opposite, a breaking up, a fragmentation, an undermining of local government by the public service of many thrusting prongs reaching down to reform the mass and change its ways.

I suggest we should not put community development anywhere. To do so implies that it is a technique, another arm or instrument of government, a new kind of psychological or sociological warfare between government and the mass it is supposed to make conform whose culture, alleged to be primitive, must be uprooted and reformed, and community development is supposed to ensure this in as kindly a manner as possible.

We have the opportunity, in the present re-organization of the public service, and administration in particular, to incorporate community development not only as a technique but as a philosophy and a process, permeating the approach of all departments to all communities of whatever race, culture or standard of living, and the guardianship of that approach is vested in the District Administration and Department of Local Government. There would be no department of community development as such, but in each locality, at the vital point of contact with people still in process of evolving into the local government sphere, there would be Community Development Agents of the administration.

What we have then is a really modern administration, backed I hope by a Human Science Research unit, focused on and operating in terms of community development. Administration, as a co-ordinator of functions in a team, becomes, to quote a paragraph on Europe approved by the

Paterson Commission Report, 'not the execution of readymade plans and regulation of government but the transfer and translation of the intentions of government into the social, cultural and physical conditions of the area where they should be executed. He must have the means at his disposal to help the community and community development is a method and a process to mobilise the human, financial and physical resources to meet basic needs by combining the effort of government and people. The Administrator must have authority to remind people of their responsibilities and the means to help them fulfil them when they give evidence of serious attempts to organise themselves.'

Very careful consideration will have to be given to explaining these schemes to the people. Certain changes, which involve Federal Government departments, must take place. The signs are not lacking that people are ready for such changes.

I conclude by suggesting that once a policy of community development is accepted by government then, apart from national goals, the national good and national disciplines, we are given a policy to which all government departments and all the specialists who are so indispensable, have to be fitted together. There must be co-ordination at the local level to ensure that development is primarily concerned with strengthening the organic coherence of the community, its capacity for self-help and self-regulation, and its willingness to participate actively and intelligently in development plans of a national nature. The end result is a vigorous system of local government in a state of inter-dependence with central government.



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/>