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

Contents

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 Matabeleland. 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 servies 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.

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. 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 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 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.

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. That 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 surcharges; 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

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.

TRAINING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

T. L. JORDAN

Northern Rhodesia Department of Community Development

I feel that the first thing that has to be done is to give a definition for what it is we are training. This immediately brings up the question, 'What is our conception of community development?' This seems to be of paramount importance because I have found after reading the experiences of other countries and from my own in Northern Rhodesia, that the biggest hindrance to progress in the field of community development has been this very thing. The field has not been defined.

In tackling this problem, allow me first to take the negative side and give a few examples of what I feel community development is not. And these are not quotations out of books but are drawn from actual experience. The first is the bed and breakfast and taxi service for other departments idea.

Now what happens? A department wishes to run a course at the centre of agriculture, fisheries, or for boma messengers. The department in question rings up the Community Development Officer asking if it is possible for the centre to accommodate whatever the number may be for a certain time. This is arranged and the Community Development Officer then has to see that accommodation is made ready, food ordered and cooks laid on to do the cooking. He has to inspect the kitchen and dining room in order to cut down the number of complaints when the trainees arrive. All the officer of the department running the course does is to give the lectures and hand on to the Community Development Officer any complaints—maize meal not of No. 1 grade, not enough meat in the diet, too much fish, or too much beans.

And this bed and breakfast idea is not confined only to departments actually running courses at the centre. A District Commissioner or a District Officer will ring up and ask that a party of Chiefs and Councillors intend spending a few days in the area visiting projects and would like to be accommodated at the centre during their stay. So they come and have to be cared for.

Then there is the taxi service. Departments running courses frequently take their trainees out to see actual work in the field and here again the Community Development Officer is called upon to supply transport, plus drivers for this purpose. On these trips, too, he is asked to provide a packed lunch for the trainees. Then, Community Development as the Public Works Department of the Public Administration. This is a great favourite. When funds are short and there are buildings to be erected all that has to be done is to call in the Community Development Officer who in turn supplies Instructors free of charge. A Native Authority wishes to

build a courthouse and here again community development is called in. This sort of help is then given the name 'Extension work'.

The next example may be called the fifth rate Trade School for illiterate artisans. There is a minimum standard of entrance to Trades Schools. It was Standard VI but is now being raised to Form II. So the only place left for men below this standard is the Community Development Centres. Any type of trade is taught, namely carpentry, bricklaying, tailoring, leatherwork, tinsmithing, basketry for the blind, and so on. The idea of this is that once the men have completed their course they will return to their villages and help raise the standard of living. But this rarely happens. Once the course is over the trainee makes a bee-line for the towns to find employment, with the result that more harm than good is being done. Instead of training men for work in rural communities, they are being trained to leave them.

Sometimes community development workers are used as government spokesmen acting as conciliators between other Departments and the people. A department goes into the field to implement some scheme which it thinks good for the people. Opposition and sometimes even hostility is encountered. Nothing can be done except to call in the Community Development Officer and hope he will win the people round. The result is that the people in turn look on community development as the other department dressed in different clothes. This is how a Director of Agriculture sums up agricultural extension work.

> 'Community Development Centres in Northern Rhodesia, run by the Provincial Administration, are logical indirect channels for extension work since agriculture is a very important feature of the work. The local agriculture extension staff are committed to providing every possible assistance with the courses and demonstrations on agricultural subjects in co-operation with the Community Development Assistants. This work, if it is well done, goes a long way to improving public opinion and mitigating the suspicion and reaction that naturally occur when agricultural development is introduced in each new and hereto totally undeveloped area. These centres are the only point of contact with the women on agricultural development and are probably the best contact at this stage'.

To some, community development is a way of teaching people how to spend their money after other departments have taught them how to earn it. This is a conception held by some departments. They feel that their duty is to teach people to become improved farmers, growing more maize or nuts and improving stock. When this is done and more money is in circulation community development arrives on the scene teaching them how to spend it on better housing or teaching the women how to make brown stew.

TRAINING FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

T. I. JORDAN

Northern Rhodesia Department of Community Development

I feel that the first thing that has to be done is to give a definition for what it is we are training. This immediately brings up the question, 'What is our conception of community development?' This seems to be of paramount importance because I have found after reading the experiences of other countries and from my own in Northern Rhodesia, that the biggest hindrance to progress in the field of community development has been this very thing. The field has not been defined.

In tackling this problem, allow me first to take the negative side and give a few examples of what I feel community development is not. And these are not quotations out of books but are drawn from actual experience. The first is the bed and breakfast and taxi service for other departments idea.

Now what happens? A department wishes to run a course at the centre of agriculture, fisheries, or for boma messengers. The department in question rings up the Community Development Officer asking if it is possible for the centre to accommodate whatever the number may be for a certain time. This is arranged and the Community Development Officer then has to see that accommodation is made ready, food ordered and cooks laid on to do the cooking. He has to inspect the kitchen and dining room in order to cut down the number of complaints when the trainees arrive. All the officer of the department running the course does is to give the lectures and hand on to the Community Development Officer any complaints—maize meal not of No. 1 grade, not enough meat in the diet, too much fish, or too much beans.

And this bed and breakfast idea is not confined only to departments actually running courses at the centre. A District Commissioner or a District Officer will ring up and ask that a party of Chiefs and Councillors intend spending a few days in the area visiting projects and would like to be accommodated at the centre during their stay. So they come and have to be cared for.

Then there is the taxi service. Departments running courses frequently take their trainees out to see actual work in the field and here again the Community Development Officer is called upon to supply transport, plus drivers for this purpose. On these trips, too, he is asked to provide a packed lunch for the trainees. Then, Community Development as the Public Works Department of the Public Administration. This is a great favourite. When funds are short and there are buildings to be erected all that has to be done is to call in the Community Development Officer who in turn supplies Instructors free of charge. A Native Authority wishes to

In fact the general impression one gets of what the other departments think of community development is a good all round skivvy. This was brought home very clearly recently when the departments met to evaluate the annual Monze Agricultural Show and to make arrangements for the running of the 1963 one. Owing to staff changes at that time community development was unable to be represented but a few days after the new Community Development Officer arrived he received a minute stating that at the meeting it was unanimously agreed that all arrangements for the 1963 show—erecting of stands, sending out the schedules of exhibits, arranging for judges, and the whole running of the show—should be the responsibility of the Community Development Centre. In short the tying up of the Community Development Officer and most of his staff for a period of three to four months.

WHAT IS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

You will note that the emphasis is on *community*. This is most important. Many community development workers feel that all they need do is change individuals, forgetting that we cannot change an individual without its having an effect on the community in which the individual lives. Processes of change directed at the individual inevitably affect the community in which he or she lives, therefore all processes of change must be regarded within the context of the community.

It was John Donne who wrote:

'No man is an island, entire of itself:
Every man is a piece of the continent,
A part of the main: a clot washed away by the sea
Europe is the less, as well as if a promontorie were,
As well as if a manor of thy friends or of thy own were;
Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind;
And therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls;
It tolls for thee.'

There are definite dangers in encouraging individuals in a community to accept change. Each society has certain norms of behaviour which enables each member to identify itself with the group, to be accepted by the group, and to gain prestige in the group. Take the example of the city bank worker who all his life has arrived at the office dressed in his pin-striped trousers, black jacket, bowler hat and umbrella. It is unthinkable to imagine him arriving at the bank one morning dressed in a cowboy's outfit. If it could happen he would not be allowed to start work. Social sanctions are employed against individuals who depart from the norm of behaviour. There is the example too, of the young cadet who arrived in the Northern Province with a beard. It was not a proper beard, but one of those hairy strips reaching from ear to ear. Now there is nothing in government General Orders to say that an officer should not have a beard. But the other officers in his group looked distastefully on the beard and

associated it with the members of an African political party who wore similar beards, with the result that the social sanctions were so strong that the beard came off.

Now in tribal communities we find that the norms of social behaviour are stronger and more well defined, which means that reaction will be stronger. The point is that all change affects the community and therefore all development should be thought of in the context of community. How is this to be achieved?

First we will see how it should not be done.

Professor Foster gives the following fable in his book *Traditional cultures and the impact of technological change*. Once upon a time a monkey and a fish were caught up in a great flood. The monkey, agile and experienced, had the good fortune to scramble up a tree to safety. As he looked down into the raging waters, he saw the fish struggling against the swift current. Filled with a humanitarian desire to help his less fortunate fellow, he reached down and scooped the fish from the water. To the monkey's surprise, the fish was not not very grateful for this aid. He used this fable to show the unsuspected pitfalls the poorly oriented worker can fall into. 'The educational adviser,' he says, 'unless he is a careful student of his own culture and the culture in which he works, will be acting much like the monkey; and with the most laudable intentions, he may make decisions equally disastrous.'

One of the grave dangers in community development work is for the Development Worker to decide the specific form development should take assuming that he knows better than the people what the people need.

At a conference some years ago on technical assistance to Asian countries, representatives from East Asia all felt 'that much of the technical assistance rendered by various agencies over the last few years had been at least ineffective and often positively harmful, because it was based on the export from the West of material and techniques designed to produce measurable results quickly, and operated by "experts" more familiar with techniques than sensitive to situations. Experts who knew the answer before they got there were no use at all.'

THE DIRECTIVE APPROACH

This achieves some results sometimes, but what happens in almost every case where this approach is made, is that once the pressure is removed the results just evaporate. It is both costly and nearly always ineffective.

There are dozens of examples of this approach failing, of which the Anchau Rural Development Scheme in Nigeria is one. The purpose was to eradicate sleeping sickness. Extensive surveys were made of the population, streams, hamlets, paths, trade route, soil, water and fuel consumption. A positive economic programme was developed which was to be implemented by government officers who were highly trained experts. A fly free barrier 70 miles long by 10 miles wide was made. The scheme started in 1937 but it was not until 1945 that the first propaganda team visited the area and at the end of ten years the officer in charge of the scheme reported that if the officers were withdrawn the scheme would collapse.

Listen to what a community development worker from Macedonia had to say as early as 1939:

'There would be no objection to the use of coercion in rural areas if its use could ensure permanent benefits. But it has been tried in many places without results . . . A programme based on coercion requires a large personnel to enforce all the rules and regulations, and this makes it far too expensive. If it were possible to secure results at a reasonable cost by this means, the sanitary conditions in all countries would be much better than they are today.'

Each department should field its own team of workers. This is another approach in which we find another difficulty. Each department puts into the field its own extension workers who usually work in rivalry to one another. A society in which a man or woman lives is a cohesive body and therefore the approach to the man or woman in the village should be a cohesive one because development in one field can affect and upset a social balance of many factors, including working patterns, prestige, social position, religion and so forth.

How then is it possible to move communities to change?

It is quite obvious that if the communities knew how to change and had the facilities to do so they would have developed long ago. Therefore it seems that the first step is to provide information by the informal dissemination of ideas. I stress 'informal' because people have very strong views on authority and have very well defined reactions to it.

This process of communication must also be reciprocal and it places on the community development worker the responsibility, not only of giving out information, but also listening to the reaction. My speaking to you is an example.

The basis of all real development work is not the original ideas, accurate and well supported scientifically though they may be, but the people's reaction to them.

This is of paramount importance because the people with whom we deal are not abstracts but are real people and the development that will take place is going to affect their lives. It is they who have to take the chance and it is they who have the strongest vested interest in what will happen.

Having stimulated a group with certain ideas and information, then the next task, and this is possibly the most important of all, is to listen to what they have to say. *This is no easy task and requires much patience and a great deal of understanding.*

What sort of things are people going to say about their development? Many will say nothing at all because they are so used to being ordered that they will be suspicious. Others, with no opinions of their own will ask for the moon because they only know how to beg, and to rely on charms to persuade the powers, whoever they may be, to grant their requests. You know the sort of thing: 'You are our fathers and we are your children.'

It is a universal and fundamental fact of human behaviour that in any given situation those who have no responsibility will tend to act in an irresponsible manner and will usually be guided by the narrowest of self interest. Therefore, to encourage people to think, speak and act responsibly about their own development they must be given some measure of responsibility. The one thing which continually came up throughout the recent Arusha conference on Agricultural Extension was: How do we find local leaders? How can we know what the villager thinks?

Clunies Ross in the *Community Development Bulletin* of 1961 said:

'First, I am convinced that the social development programme, including community development, social welfare, informal education, agricultural extension, health education, youth work and programmes especially designed for women and the home, in any rapidly developing country will be most effective when it is intimately related to its economic and civic development, so that there is a common purpose towards which all activity is directed.'

Communities therefore must be encouraged to accept a measure of responsibility for their own development, either collectively or through a system of true local leaders representing the people and chosen by them to represent their interests. And development agencies must respect the responsibility of that local opinion, no matter in what particular way or form it is made articulate. They must listen to it, and be guided by it. Then, and only then, will they be in a position to provide the community with the facilities and technical advice which they, the members of that community, think they need.

To sum up. The process of promoting communities to change consists of three stages which may take place consecutively, or to a certain degree concurrently. The first is the stimulation of ideas, that is informal education. Next is the need to encourage the community to form some body or vehicle to consider its needs and to express its views, and lastly to accept the responsibility of the views of the community, and to shape plans for economic or social development in consultation with them and according to their order of priorities.

This then is something of the background on which we have planned our training programme for community development workers. I do not intend dealing with the training of professional staff and this is not my field. But I would say in passing that it is quite impossible to build up a good development agency without the men and women who are in charge of Community Development Centres being properly trained in the techniques of community development and who have a real sense of vocation to the task. Picking up folk from here and there and thinking that they will make good development officers is just nonsense. It has the same disastrous effect as a butcher removing a man's gall bladder. And after reading Professor Kolbie's paper at Arusha on the professional training of extension workers, it would appear that the qualities required of such officers make them extremely hard to find.

SELECTION OF TRAINEES

I put this first as I feel it is the most important. Little can be done with poor material.

The educational standard of the trainees ranges from Std. VI to Form IV. Some of them have a practical background, holding City and Guilds certificates in carpentry or brickwork, others come straight from their academic training, and others from Community Development Centres where they have had experience of both working at the centre and in the field.

The educational standard of the trainees is an important one and it is most likely that in the near future we shall have to lift our sights above the Std. VI man. But as I read in an article on training: 'This relaxation of educational standards is, no doubt, a temporary expedient, but it has far reaching effects. One of these is to make possible the recruitment of persons from various social strata in the community and thereby diffuse new ideas through the community as a whole.'

Much more important than the educational standard is the one of personal suitability. Personality deficiencies are not easily remedied.

As a matter of fact, it is extremely doubtful if they can be remedied at all. The psychologists say they cannot.

What qualities do we look for when selecting? There are many but the important ones are enthusiasm, friendliness, maturity and honesty. The trainees should have the capacity to like village life and have a genuine liking for village people. Many of them have not these qualities.

CONTENT OF THE COURSE

The course lasts for 11 months and is divided into 4 stages, as follows:—

1. The first month is spent on an 'Outward Bound Venture' course.
2. Four months at the Training Wing.
3. Four months at a Community Development Centre on field work.
4. Two months back at the Training Wing.

The 'Outward Bound Venture' course is run on lines similar to those in Britain and other parts of the world. This is a really tough exercise and gives us the opportunity of seeing how the men stand up to hardship and discipline. It is only very occasionally, and this generally for some special reason, that a man with a bad report from the course makes a good community worker.

The second stage of four months at the Training Wing is divided roughly into half theory and half practical. It is felt that the practical side is most important, because the trainees should not only know the theory of what should be done but should be able actually to do the job themselves. There is no better way of winning people's confidence than by actually working alongside them. There is too, a strong feeling with the ordinary villager that once a man has risen above Std. VI he is above working with his hands.

The main task on the theory side is to try and teach what is meant by community development, what the trainee will be expected to do when he is working with communities and the techniques of community development.

The first subject is dealt with by giving lectures on what has been done in the field of community development in other countries and in Northern Rhodesia.

The second subject is the really important one, that is the approach to community development. This is not easy and generally means changing the whole thinking of the trainee. It is a universal trait in human behaviour that it loves to play the rôle of being the boss and giving orders. This is quite useless in community development. The ability to listen, to take the views of others into consideration, to be sympathetic, to have an unlimited amount of patience, to be on friendly terms with all sections of the community, to have the ability to work in a team and to be self-reliant are essential ingredients of a good development worker.

How is this change brought about? Lectures on approach are given at the very beginning of the course and this theme continues throughout the four months. Group dynamics are used, not only as a means to try and solve problems which the trainees are likely to meet in the field, but as training in the art of being able to listen and appreciate other points of view. The first few groups on a course are bedlam, with each trainee impatient, shouting and breaking in when someone else is speaking. In fact in a very short time they are all trying to speak. They will not give way on their point of view lest they lose prestige. But with guidance the change after a few weeks is astonishing. *It is no easy task to sit and listen.* I have tried out Europeans, getting them to act as leaders of a group session and nearly always they do all the talking, answering the questions, and in a very short time the whole thing has turned into a lecture. It calls for a lot of self-discipline, especially if one knows the answers, to sit and listen to what others have to say on the subject.

Rôle playing, character aims, project work and making the trainees responsible for their own messing arrangements are other methods used to create the right approach in working with village people and engendering the team spirit and the ability to rely on themselves.

Simple social psychology is also taught. It is important that the trainees have some idea of how people act the way they do, how groups function, the effects of customs and beliefs on a community and how it is that some folk are leaders and others follow.

Time is devoted to Visual Aids, the making of posters, flannel graphs, drama and other means of helping them win the confidence of the people and to 'get over' the message.

In the field the trainees will be working side by side with the staff of other departments such as Agriculture, Health, Forestry and Education. It is not the intention to make them experts in these fields but it is important that they know something of what these departments are trying to do. Officers of these departments give lectures on their policy and these talks are followed up by the trainees visiting actual work in the field. For example, after an agricultural talk they would go out to see an improved African farmer.

Another agency with whom the trainees will come into close contact are the Native Authorities, so it is most important that they know how they work and are financed. A chief and his councillors are brought in during the course to give talks and this is followed by the trainees being posted to Native Authority headquarters.

Time is given to the importance of women's work, budgeting, African loans system, health talks and village hygiene, report writing and the running of youth clubs. Office routine is not included as the last thing we want to do is to train them to sit behind a desk.

On the practical side emphasis is placed on gardening. It is little use the trainees preaching to the villagers the importance of growing vegetables when they have no garden of their own. Gardening, too, helps on the 'approach' side. It teaches patience and how good care brings forth good results. It has been said 'that a man who does not love the soil has little love for human nature'.

Time is given over to simple carpentry, brickwork and maintenance of cycles. All these help to 'open the door', when they finally work in the villages.

During the four months we try and arrange for them to take on a small project in the field, such as helping to repair a dam or building simple bridges. Here the trainees work alongside the villagers.

On the third stage the trainees are posted out to one of the Community Development Centres where they see community development in action. A short time is spent at the centre itself seeing how it works but the main part of the four months is spent in the field on extension work with other experienced staff. Reports on their progress are sent in after two months and at the end of the four months. Where possible the Training Officer visits as many of the trainees as he is able during their field work but this is not easy as they are scattered all over the Territory.

The fourth and last stage of the training consists of a further two months back at the Training Wing. It is rather difficult to give details of this, as it will not be until next October that the first batch of trainees return for this part of their course. However, what we have in mind is a type of workshop approach with plenty of group work in which the trainees will be able to share their field experiences, find out where they went wrong and thrash out their problems.

Alongside these courses which train the male community development assistants, there are courses for the training of women staff. These vary in duration from short refresher courses of two months to longer ones of up to four months. During the longer courses the women join in with the men in group work, Visual Aids, and other tasks. Perhaps this side of

our women's training needs redesigning. I feel, personally, that we should train our women on the same basis as the men and for them to do their practical homecraft and teaching when the men are doing their practical work. The real difficulty here would be to find women with suitable qualifications. Furthermore most of them want to marry and unless they marry a community development assistant they would be lost.

Apart from our internal training programme some of our staff have already received training outside the Territory. Two of our European Officers have taken a year's course in 'Community Development' at London University. One senior African has just returned from a year's course at Manchester University, another will be leaving for the same course next month. Two others are now in England attending the conference at Cambridge on 'Community Development', one went on a six months' visit to see Community Development, two women development assistants have been to England this year on different courses and in January next year two Community Development Assistants will be going to an American University for a 12 months' course.

To close I would like to give you seven aims for the community development worker. They are:—

1. To win the trust and confidence of the people and thereby become their valued adviser;

2. To make no attempt to define or answer the needs of the people but to encourage them to undertake the task and to help them with advice and the minimum of assistance necessary to ensure the success of their project;

3. To place before people all the known facts so that they can make up their own minds wisely;

4. To encourage people to think of themselves as communities;

5. To encourage communities to accept the responsibility for organising their own affairs with self respect;

6. Until such time as a form of local government develops with the power to represent the true wishes of the people and which is resposible to the people themselves, to represent to government the desires and attitudes of the people towards their own development;

7. To remember at all times that the task is not simply development, is not rural development as such, nor is it economic development, but it is Community Development. And that the subject of the work is not material things, but men with their weaknesses, ignorance, and sometimes fear. But more than this, men with their ambitions, desires, pride and self respect, who are living in communities.

EXCERPTS FROM DISCUSSIONS DURING THE CONFERENCE

The rôle of non-governmental organizations

Is there a part for private enterprise and voluntary organizations to play in community development? Much of the emphasis in community development is inevitably either on the rôle of government or on the local communities, and this tends to obscure the essential part which the non-governmental organizations can play.

In rural community development there is the need to underpin much of the development undertaken by aid and advice from private commercial enterprises. Examples of this are the development of co-operatives, improved trading techniques, better means of transporting both supplies and people and the introduction of fertilizers. In these cases the initiative often rests with private firms to see that technical aid and funds are made available to rural communities.

The voluntary organizations, with which are included the churches, also should support the community development programme. In many cases a church or local club may be the starting point from which the whole development programme grows. Since adult education and community development are closely linked, the demands from adults for instruction in literacy and basic education and in all aspects of social and political education, will inevitably increase. Here is a distinctive contribution which the voluntary organizations could make.

Government, private enterprise, voluntary organizations and the people must work together as a team if the full benefits of community development are to be obtained. This is not a competitive enterprise but a co-operative adventure. It is the task of the Community Development worker to bring these various agencies harmoniously together for the common good.

Aspects of community development of particular interest to women

Women have an important part to play in community development, and without their good will and participation any scheme is likely to fail. Whilst the specific community development project may not be solely for the women-folk it is essential that they, as home-makers, should appreciate the value of the enterprise to the community. Thus a community may build a school, and the children of the village thereby receive primary education. Unless what is taught in the school, however, is supported in the home, much of the value will be lost. It is essential, therefore, that parallel with community development projects there should be the establishment of adult classes, many of which would be of particular interest to women. These would include homecrafts, child care, hygiene, dress-making, and gardening, but also discussions on matters of local and national concern. In this way the influence of women would be felt in all aspects of community living.

Much of this work should be undertaken through the existing womens' organizations which, if bold enough to accept the challenge, will discover that community development increases rather than diminishes the demands made upon them.

Urban Community Development

It is easy to comprehend the concept of community in rural areas, since in an indefinable way it is something which is felt. This is not the case of the shapeless aggregations of population known at 'townships' which have developed around the cities and towns of Central Africa. Here it is better to concentrate on smaller units such as blocks of houses or of interest groupings where people have an activity in common even though their places of residence may be widely distributed.

A major problem which will confront the community development worker in urban African areas is the attitude that has been generated over several decades by the all-embracing provider, be it government, municipality or private firm. Everything has been done for the people with the minimum of consultation and on the unsaid assumption that the people, anyway, are incapable of taking their responsibilities seriously. Such an attitude is the complete negation of community development, and unless it is radically changed, and representative local government introduced, the task of the community development worker is going to be a very hard one.

Some authorities had sought to encourage community consciousness through the establishment of community centres. It is doubtful whether such establishments achieve their purpose. The only way to generate a sense of community is through the people themselves, giving them an opportunity of expressing their needs. These needs may ultimately be met through the building of centres, but to attempt to speed the process through building the centre first without consultation, and thereafter trying to find a use for it, is courting disaster.

The lack of security of tenure in urban areas also militates against community development. Unless people have a real stake in the urban community and feel firmly settled, there is little incentive for them to plan and act responsibly for the betterment of the community.

Youth organizations

In a discussion on the rôle of youths and youth organizations in community development, it was inevitable that much that was said turned on the difficulties facing young people and the organizations which serve them. Thus the problem of finding leaders and training them was mentioned, as was also the perennial question of keeping the enthusiasm and loyalty of young people.

Two positive comments emerged with regard to community development. The first was the desirability of encouraging school groups to undertake small local projects within their competence. In this way, the idea of service to the community would be stimulated from an early age. Whilst the projects should be such as would necessitate hard work, they should not become acts of drudgery, and as much gaiety as possible should be introduced. The planning of projects should be done by the pupils themselves in consultation with the staff.

With regard to youth organizations, community development projects should be part of the programme. This presupposes that there are in fact suitable organizations operating in the rural areas which have won the imagination of the young people. It seemed that fresh thinking is required on the type of organization needed, one which is rooted in Africa and not a reflection of something conceived in Britain or elsewhere. This is not to deny that the existing youth organizations are doing fine work, but they neither cover all areas nor in many cases have they managed to hold young people after school-leaving.

Co-operatives

Co-operatives have an obvious economic value. As such they may sometimes be a stimulus towards community development in that the members of a co-operative become keenly aware of needs which must be met if economic development is to continue. They see, for instance, the value of better roads, bridges, and drainage schemes, and are likely to encourage others to assist in meeting these needs. Co-operatives also have an educational value in that their members learn good business procedures, how to organize and administer schemes, and how to handle groups. This expertise can be of great value in carrying out community development projects.

RECOMMENDED READING ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. *Community development division. Introduction to community development for village workers* (Training material series A, vol. 1). Washington, D.C., 1962. 27p.

ALLAHABAD AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE. *Experiment in extension: the Gaon Sathi.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. 240p.

ASKWITH, T. G. *Progress through self-help: principles and practice in community development.* Nairobi, E. African Literature Bureau, 1960. 34p.

BATTEN, T. R. *Communities and their development.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1957. 248p.

BATTEN, T. R. *Training for community development: a critical study of method.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1962. 192p.

BATTEN, T. R. & A. G. DICKSON. *Voluntary action and social progress* (British Council Study Booklet). London, British Council, 1959. 73p.

Community development: the British contribution. London, Central Office of Information, 1962. 38p.

Community development: a handbook prepared by a study conference at Hartwell House, Bucks., September, 1957. H.M.S.O., 1958. 84p.

Community development, rural and urban: a selected bibliography compiled by Arthur Dunham for the 11th International Conference of Social Work, New York, 345 East 46th Street, 1961. 14p.

DUBE, S. C. *India's changing villages: human factors in community development.* Routledge, 1958. 203p.

DU SAUTOY, Peter. *Community development in Ghana.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1958. 205p.

FOSTER, G. M. *Traditional cultures and the impact of technological change.* New York, Harper, 1962. 292p.

HSIN-PAO YANG. *Training rural leaders* (FAO Agricultural Studies, no. 29). Rome, Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, 1957. 135p.

Human problems in technological change; ed. by Edward H. Spicer. New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1952. 301p.

JACKSON, I. C. *Advance in Africa: a study of community development in Eastern Nigeria.* Oxford Univ. Press, 1956. 110p.

LAIDLAW, A. F. *The campus and the community: the global impact of the Antigonish Movement.* Montreal, Harvest House, 1961. 173p.

MILBURN, S. *Methods and techniques in community development in the United Kingdom, dependent and trust territories* (U.N. series on community development). New York, United Nations, 1955. 111p.

MUKERJI, B. *Community development in India.* Calcutta, Orient Longmans, 1961. 312p.

NATIONAL SOCIETY FOR THE STUDY OF EDUCATION. *Community education: principles and practice from world-wide experience*: ed. by Nelson B. Henry (58th yearbook of the N.S.S.E.). Chicago Univ. Press, 1959. 417p.

Social development through family and home: report of a conference at St. Hugh's, Oxford, 1959. H.M.S.O., 1960. 94p.

Social progress through community development. New York, United Nations Bureau of Social Affairs, 1955. 120p.

Study kit on training for community development. New York, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 1957. 69p.

Community development bulletin, published by the Community Development Clearing House, University of London Institute of Education, Malet Place, London, W.C.1. *Quarterly* (in English and French). 5s. p.a., post free. Single copies, 1s. 6d.

Community development review, published by the Community Development Division, Office of Educational & Social Development, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. *Quarterly.* n.p.

International journal of adult and youth education (formerly, *Fundamental and adult education*), published by UNESCO, Paris. *Quarterly* (in English and French). 7s. 6d. p.a.

International review of community development, published by the International Federation of Settlements and Neighbourhood Centres. Piazza Cavalieri di Malta 2, Rome. *Twice a year* (Articles in English, French, Italian, German and Spanish). $3 p.a. Each issue is devoted to a single theme, e.g. Training, community centres.

Kurukshetra: published from the Ministry of Community Development & Co-operation, 371 Krishi Bhavan, New Delhi, India. *Monthly.* 7s. p.a. (Further particulars from the Business Manager, Publications Division, Old Secretariat, Delhi-6, India).

PUBLICATIONS FROM THE UNIVERSITY COLLEGE OF RHODESIA AND NYASALAND

Faculty of Education

Occasional Papers:

1. The education of the less successful secondary school-child (papers and proceedings of a conference held in August, 1962), edited by D. G. Hawkridge. 1963. 7s. 6d.
2. The teaching of Latin in Africa (papers supplementing the proceedings of a Conference held at the College, Aug., 1962), edited by C. R. Whittaker and M. E. Toubkin. 1963. 7s. 6d.
3. Community development, with special reference to rural areas (papers read at a Conference organized by the Institute of Adult Education, Aug., 1962), with an introduction by Edwin Townsend Coles. 1963. 7s. 6d.

Department of African Studies

Occasional Papers:

1. Garbett, G. Kingsley. Growth and change in a Shona ward. 1960.
2. Bell, Mrs. E. M. Polygons: a survey of the African personnel of a Rhodesian factory. 1961.
3. Bell, Mrs. E. M. Polygons: part two. Publication later in 1963.

Miscellaneous Publications

Catalogue of the Courtauld Coin Collection: Roman and related foreign coins, with descriptions of each coin, plates, and an introduction on the monetary history of Rome by Prof. T. F. Carney. Publication expected in late 1963.

Periodicals in the libraries of the Federation: a record of the detailed holdings of the most important learned, special and public libraries in the three territories, compiled by James Hutton, B.A., LL.B., Dipl. Lib. Loose-leaf format, with lettered portfolio binding. Basic volume publ. in 1962. Price: £2 2s. post free.

For a full list of the publications of the College, write to the Librarian (Publications), University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Private Bag 167H, Salisbury, S. Rhodesia.