

INTRODUCTION

A framework for community development

Community development is a complex field of study and form of practice. Considered for years one of the most significant social forces in the process of planned change (CAMPFENS, 1999), it seems to attract each time more interest in a world increasingly faced with global challenges and a common destiny. Be it in rural or urban areas, in rich or poor nations, practices of community development can be found in virtually all regions of the world. These practices are concerned with the improvement of the most varied number of community conditions; respond to international, national and regional contexts and involve different actors, such as social movements and grass root organizations, social institutions, NGOs, international co-operation agencies, governments, as well as professionals from different disciplines- among them, museology.

From the view of museology, the world of community development carries aspects that are vital for understanding the place it does and may occupy in the global efforts to promote change and a better future. Thus, before proceeding with the exploration of museology contents, it is important to set a broader framework for community development, in which contexts, approaches, and current characteristics of the field will be presented. This framework intends to serve as an introduction for museology contents and as a reference to which museological proposals will be confronted by end of this thesis, in order to point out the place museology does and is able to occupy in development, as said before.

The source for this framework is to be found in the book "Community development around the world: practice, theory,

research, training” (1999), edited by Hubert Campfens³. The book aims to provide an understanding of the current state of the arts in the field of community development by means of a cross-cultural⁴ and a cross-section approach, which serve as basis for a new framework theory that pulls together current shifting patterns and common themes in the field of community development.

Global transformation and community development

Campfens departs from the premise that community development is an evolving concept and form of practice, which in the last decades has gone through a radical change due to the dramatic impact of global restructuring. This global transformation has resulted in new tensions at the community and group levels; these tensions have, in turn, influenced the practice and theory of community development. In this regard the author stresses:

“While it is useful to place a study of CD [community development] in a national context, CD must also be placed in an international context that takes note of the unprecedented mega-level changes that are affecting communities across the globe. These changes suggest that we are moving rapidly out of the era of nation states toward a global society dominated by regional market economies and growing interdependence (...) Concomitant with this trend toward a system of internationalized capital, many governments are turning to neoliberal monetarist policies, and this has undermined the politics of social democracy that legitimated the rise of the welfare state in many countries throughout much of this century.”

³ Professor of Community Development and Social Planning in the Faculty of Social Work at Wilfrid Laurier University, Ontario, Canada.

⁴ Based on the exploration of case studies from six countries representing the major regions of the world: Canada, Netherlands, Israel, Bangladesh, Ghana and Chile

According to the author, neo-conservatism, world trade, and the communications revolution are the forces on the world scene most responsible for such megachanges. Having their counterpart in the transformations in the economic, political and social order of each society, concretely these changes consist of the following:

- strong trends toward decentralization and localism, especially in matter related to social development;
- a push for a reduced welfare state in most Northern countries, and the promotion of self-reliance and self-help based on the assumption that it will counter dependency and foster enterprise;
- a growing involvement of the voluntary sector in both Northern and Third world countries;
- the emergence of new grass roots based social movements and their organizations;
- a change in the composition of local communities, with an increase in cultural diversity as a result of rural-urban migration and major population movements (of immigrants, refugees, and migrant workers) across cultural boundaries.

Campfens adds to the row of new political and cultural phenomena to redirect functions and roles of community development practitioners, the disastrous impact of the structural adjustment policies⁵ (SAPs) on the poor Third World nations and the fact that “the rich in the world are getting richer and the poor are becoming poorer”. This, “is not merely a Third World problem; it is also true for the United States, where an ‘underclass’ is developing rapidly,

⁵ Structural adjustment policies (SAPs) have been used as a condition imposed by the IMF (International Monetary Fund) for the loans to finance Third World countries debts. These SAPs involves cutting off existing subsidies for the poor, reducing the state bureaucracy, raising prices for goods and services while reducing wages for labour, devaluating the currency, etc.

and for all other countries in the North.” The author explains that each of these trends has a major influence in which problems are addresses, the level of intervention and the dynamics of practice.

New actors of community development

The new relations between the state and civil society, originated from the struggles with global restructuring and changing ideologies, brought substantial changes to the nature of community development practitioners. If in the 50’s and 60’s community development was promoted by governments and by the United Nations⁶, through its affiliated institutions, today new actors come into scene, carrying out community development in ways that differ greatly from the approaches of earlier decades. The author stresses:

“One very clear trend is the increasing involvement since the early 1980s of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), or voluntary sector agencies, in a field previously dominated by programs initiated and administered by governments. It is estimated that in the South alone, NGOs number in the hundreds of thousands. Many of these Southern NGOs have links with the thousands of international NGOs, which are based mainly in the member countries of the Organization for Economic Co-operation Development (OECD). In the North, where they have a long history as part of the voluntary sector, NGOs are attracting greater attention; more and more, in response to governments pulling back the ‘safety net’ provided by welfare state programs, people are looking for alternative forms of support.”

⁶ As part of the following: the independence and decolonization movements in Africa and Asia; attempts to modernize the underdeveloped, largely agricultural societies and “backward” regions of the developed countries; and the War on Poverty launched by governments in the more affluent nations of the West in the late 1960s.

He adds that there has been a significant growth in “second generation” NGOs, which emphasize developmental strategies rather than the traditional “charity” and “welfare” activities. Other NGOs that belong to a “third generation” have adopted more catalytic roles, i.e. “in coalition with others, they strive to achieve reforms at the regional and national levels that support people-centred and sustainable development at the local level”. Others focus mainly on educating the public about development issues, or acting as advocates for specific groups. Finally, there are the “fourth generation” NGOs, which “align themselves with social movements (e.g. environmental, human rights, and women’s movements) for the purpose of mobilizing a movement around people-centred development vision.”

A second trend refers to the rise of social and co-operative movements, many of which serve as agents of community development. These are movements “that exist to create change, being guided by an ideological agenda that challenges the prevailing practices of those industrial systems of the state and civil society that determine the nature of development and the allocation of resources” They are “often driven by the search for alternatives to the capitalist industrial model. To the state-controlled social programs, and to the centralized, hierarchical, top-down, institutionalized structures of decision-making”.

Such groups may apply alternatives focused on economic benefits, social relations or political dimensions. For example, some initiatives aim at redirecting the economy towards the community and the environment, through the creation of participatory and community-based organizations that empower residents, generate income and job opportunities and finance community infrastructure and social services. Other initiatives are focused on the desire “to create a more co-operative, people-oriented society based on mutual aid as an antidote to the highly individualistic, competitive, and alienating

environment prevalent in the economically developed nations of the West”. Those examples that privilege the political dimension, emphasize, for instance community empowerment or the democratization of development enterprises.

As to the relation between new actors of development and established powers, the author explains:

“Many of the current social and co-operative movements carry traces of past movements and intellectual traditions, and arise in the context of a variety of factors and actors that influence their shape. Furthermore, those movements which seek alternative forms of development enter into an antagonist relationship with those groups which want to maintain control over the instruments of transformation and the ‘productions of social life’ (...) For example, current governments may not be very interested in supporting those alternative models of development which challenges the private sector or empower the population to voice its demands and discontents. Consequently, those struggling for economic survival in a rapidly transforming society may prefer to avoid conflict, opting instead for more collaborative approaches (i.e. partnerships) with business and government.

In the current economic and ideological environment, where debt reduction and limiting the state’s responsibility in social welfare have become priorities in the political agenda, governments may look more favourably on community initiatives that promote alternative forms of development (...) this helps governments to achieve their political agendas but also leaves ‘political space’ for those involved in CED, mutual aid and related activities.”

New priorities

In comparison to past decades, new priorities have also emerged in the field of community development. As Campfens stresses, while poverty alleviation and prevention remains a top priority since the decades of 50 and 60, other issues arise, calling for community and state-levels as well as institutional initiatives. In this way, old and new actors of development are faced with problems and issues such as:

- the devastating threat of AIDS, as well as the drug epidemic, crime and vandalism;
- the heightened awareness of the importance of the environment and its relationship to the quality of life;
- the rise of the interethnic groups tensions and multicultural neighbourhoods. This requires conflict resolution strategies and effective approaches to social integration;
- a shift in community development practice that, besides the traditional emphasis on locality development and functional community work, includes a focus on population groups and “people development”;
- the increased interest in community economic development as an alternative or complementary model to macroeconomic development that addresses both economic and social issues at the local level.

On the nature of community development

As said before, Campfens presents community development as an evolving concept and form of practice. Be it in time or space, it varies immensely in order to fit its environment – local but also regional, national and international, as the author strives to demonstrate. He explains:

“Simply put, CD is a demonstration of the ideas, values and ideals of the society in which it is carried out. From a humanitarian perspective, it may be seen as a search for community, mutual aid, social support, and human liberation in an alienating, oppressive, competitive and individualistic society. In its more pragmatic institutional sense, it may be viewed as a means for mobilizing communities to join state or institutional initiatives that are aimed at alleviating poverty, solving social problems, strengthening families, fostering democracy, and achieving modernization and socio-economic development.”

That is to say that interpretations and approaches (in time and space) add new applications to central values and principles of community development –which certainly exist according to the author. In this regard, it is interesting to note that Campfens understands that the rise of new trends and priorities to the field of community development has led to a review of the practice and strategic approaches, but not to a significant change of central values and principles of community development:

“(…) we find that the social values and principles that underline CD practice have not changed much since the earlier days of CD⁷, with perhaps a few notable exceptions (...) Mobilizing and nurturing communities remains a central purpose of CD- albeit with a more discriminating understanding of ‘community’ in terms of social structure and scope. Social integration, leadership, development, local or group initiative-taking, and promotion of a more participatory democracy, continue to be the essence of CD. What *has* changed in CD is that concern has increase for social justice and human rights. This change has moved CD away from its narrow focus on localities and group

⁷ Which correspond to the decades of 50 and 60.

development and toward the larger socio-political sphere of society.”

Social values and principles of community development

Campfens presents the common social values and principles that underline the practice of community development as follows:

- co-operative, responsible and active communities of involved men and women should be nurtured and mobilized for the purpose of mutual-aid, self-help, problem-solving, social integration and/or social action;
- at all levels of society, down to the very lowest, participation must be enhanced, and the ideal of participatory democracy must be fostered, in order to counter the apathy, frustration and resentment that often rise from feelings of powerlessness and oppression in the face of unresponsive power structures;
- as much as possible and feasible, community development should rely on the capacity and initiatives of relevant groups and local communities to identify needs, define problems, and plan and execute appropriate courses of action; in this, the goals are to foster confidence in community leadership, to increase competency and to reduce dependence of the state, institutional and professional interventions;
- community resources (human, technical and financial) and, where necessary, resources from outside the community (in form of partnership with governments, intuitions and professional groups) should be mobilized and deployed in an appropriate manner in order to ensure balanced, sustainable forms of development;
- community integration should be promoted in terms of two sets of relations: “social relations” among diverse groups distinguished by social class or significant differences in economic status, ethnicity, culture, racial identity, religion, gender, age, length of residence, or other such characteristics

that may cause tensions or lead to open conflict; and “structural relations” among those institutions- such as public sector agencies, private sector organizations, not-for-profit or charitable organizations and community organizations and associations- that take care of social challenges at the community level. Regarding the latter, the aim is to avoid unnecessary competition, lack of co-ordination and duplication of services;

- activities, such as circles of solidarity, should be organized that empower marginal or excluded population groups by linking them with the progressive forces in different social sectors and classes in the search for economic, social and political alternatives;
- those who are marginalized, excluded or oppressed should be given the essential tools that will enable them to critically analyse and become conscious of their situation in structural terms, so that they can envisage possibilities of change.

According to the author, the emphasis accorded to any of these social values and principles depends greatly on whether the practice involves a social movement, a process of change or a concrete program. He also stresses on the different types of sponsorships as conditioning aspects. “These differences in sponsorship and emphasis make it particularly difficult to offer a general definition of CD that includes all possible practice situations.”

Intellectual traditions

In order to stress on the complex and contradictory nature of community development today, Campfens appeals to the analysis of intellectual traditions which underline its practice and theory. These traditions, according to him, range from those preoccupied with societal guidance through the application of scientific knowledge and technical reason to the more radical intellectual traditions. The firsts would basically correspond to a conservative ideology, “representing

those societal interests and professional disciplines that take existing power relations as given”:

“The supporters of this position proclaim their political neutrality, express predominantly technical concerns, view their primary mission as to serve the state and society’s dominant institutions, and apply their scientific knowledge to the task of reconstructing society through social engineering and centrally directed planning. In other words, in advancing the public interests of the state and major institutions, they place their faith in ‘technical reason’”.

In opposition, one is able find those intellectual disciplines that look to alternative forms of development based on oppositional or counter movements:

“Rather than addressing the concerns of the ruling elite, they focus on the people who, as victims of the existing order and members of the underclass, need to be mobilized. This approach is based on the belief that the underclass is fundamentally opposed to the bureaucratic state, to hierarchical relations, and to other such manifestations of alienating power. They place their faith in political and social processes at the grass root levels and within civil society; in doing so, they reject the strong emphasis on rationality and technology that is embodied in the scientific approach to modernization and scientific planning.”

These two opposing intellectual positions (social guidance and oppositional movements) can be identified in two aspects, which for Campfens are of particular interest for community development: social mobilization and social learning.

As to social mobilization, the author explains that during the 60’s the tradition of social guidance have, together with parallel economic

development doctrines, served as basis for the modernization and industrialization strategies applied by the UN agencies, the international financial institutions, the corporate sector, and the ruling elites of the development nations. It was in this context that community development gained prominence and was called upon to join in national efforts to achieve socio-economic development. Campfens adds:

“Besides state agencies, many institutions and NGOs have launched CD, co-operative, and participatory programs that fall within the tradition of societal guidance and social reform. These institutionalists (to use a generic term) are less likely to question existing power relations in society. Their tendency is to focus on the weakness in organizations that undermine the effectiveness of program delivery (...) The search for participation in government or in institutionally initiated programs is perceived by critics as little more than a loyalty ritual for gaining favours and access to essential goods and services.

However, even those NGO practitioners who acknowledge that co-operation and communalism in the social mobilization tradition are the underpinnings of community development in the South and the North have come to acknowledge that it is the state which ultimately determines how much change will be tolerated as a result of such programs.”

In the other hand, oppositional movements can be distinguished from social reform and societal guidance in that “they assert the primacy of direct collective action from below”:

“Their main concerns relate to the moral ordering of human life and to the political practices of social emancipation and human liberation. The oppositional movements share two

things: a political analysis that calls attention to the pervasive alienation of human beings under institutions of capitalism; and a determination to change the established relations of power and to achieve social solidarity.”

However, according to the author, they differ in the strategies they choose. These can be grouped under the following:

“Confrontation politics”

Of which inspiration can be found in Marxist ideas on the social class struggles (albeit in forms less driven by ideology) and in the labour union movement. Corresponds to the most activist forms of community development in the late 60s/early 70s, being often carried out in depressed urban neighbourhoods of Western industrialized countries and responding to increasing demands for a more participatory democracy and equitable sharing of opportunities and goods offered by society. Despite of Marxist influence, those initiatives did not aim at fundamentally transforming society (i.e. capitalism) but at “getting a better deal for those living in its margins.” According to Campfens, the same happens with strategies adopted by more recent oppositional movements.

“Politics of disengagement”

Of which inspiration can be found in the Utopians from the XIX century. Rejecting the state as the main vehicle through which to order civil society, and believing in the recreation of “alternatives communities” that would demonstrate more human ways of living based on voluntarism, Utopians laid the foundations for socialism, social reform, trade unionism and co-operativist movement- also inspiring the community movement. In the XIX and XX centuries this lead to the creation of communes and “intentional communities”, such as the Amish religion communities, hippie communes and the modern Israeli kibbutzim.

“Politics of free association and mutual aid”

Of which inspiration can be found in the writings of social anarchists, who strongly rejected all forms of authority (especially of the state) and believed in seeking social reform through grass root mobilization and peaceful means, as well as in creating of alternative, self-governing communities based on the principle of mutual aid and self-help. Many of the modern mutual-aid associations, co-operatives and communitarian movements find their intellectual root in the social anarchists. “Within this tradition, operative principles of voluntary associations include the following: co-operation, mutual aid and exchange, direct participatory democracy, the practice of consensus in decision-making and the formation of a federative structure. The federative principle assumes the need for local action groups to form coalitions to facilitate leadership training and to acquire technical, material, and financial resources. Coalitions also help local groups pursue common objectives in the larger society. The special appeal of communitarianism in an alienating modern society lies in its potential to liberate individuals from oppression so that they can recover their essential humanity and practice political community in free association with others.”

In regard to social learning, the author explains that its practice has contributed greatly to the professional practice of community development. According to theorists, social learning comprises a knowledge derived from experience and validated in practice. It is a complex process that involves the action itself; a political strategy (which includes tactics aimed at overcoming resistance and drawn on a theory of practice that will guide the actor’s conduct in specific roles); theories of reality that assist us in understanding the world (which includes theory of history and theory of the specific situation the social learner is engaged in); and values that inspire and direct action⁸.

⁸ Together, these four elements form the “social practice”.

Campfens explains that the early social learning tradition (dating back to the 40's) had in the "experts", i.e. trained technicians, the principal actors in resolving the contradictions and problems in society, "since they were especially equipped to undertake and inquiry to the facts (following scientific principles) and arrive at the 'true' answer to the problems at hand." In the late 40's, new experiments in the field of group dynamics in the USA drove the role of "experts" from "experts in problem solving" to "change agents", whose responsibility became to act as an enabler, guide or trainer with relevant groups. Target groups' individuals were called upon becoming both actors and learners in changing reality. Applied in the field of community development in the 50's, this approach became highly influential in the training of community workers around the world. Professional "experts" were viewed as "guides" (i.e. one who helps the community more effectively in the direction it chooses) or "enables" (i.e. a person who facilitates the development process). These last would have roles such as: awakening and focusing discontent among people at the community level about economic and social conditions; encouraging associations and organizations to assume responsibility for action; nourishing good interpersonal relations; and emphasizing common objectives. Such view on professional roles was later complemented by insights originated from more revolutionary settings, such as the grass root movements in the Third World and feminist practice, driving concerns towards the different forms of oppression in society. With this, "the notion of awakening and focusing discontent has become a central feature of practice with social movements."

In addition, during the 70's, Paulo Freire's work on popular education and his ideas on oppression and conscientization brought a revolution to social practice. In contrast to the focus on what social actors will "do" in order to bring about change, conscientization practice concerns what participants will "be". Critical consciousness implies a search for knowledge: a critical reflection of reality which

is followed by action that “carries an ideological option up to and including the transformation of one’s world.” This laid the foundation for the “pedagogy of liberation”, which assumes that alienation and isolation generate a state of dependency and domination by the established powers. “It involves a process of desmasking, through action and reflection, the oppressive condition of institutional practice, and acquiring the capacity for conscious and creative intervention.” According to Campfens, when popular education principles are applied in community development, they call for a new concept of professional practice: the practitioner does not assume a top-down, authoritarian position, instead, a horizontal one, that involves dialogue and mutual learning. Community groups are not regarded as recipients of pedagogical or social labour; they become the very subject (actor) of education and collective organizational expression⁹.

Finally, the author stresses on a “reconstruction” that characterizes the image of the contemporary “development expert” today:

“Proponents of participatory action research, popular education, and liberation theology, have contributed to the deconstruction of the ‘development expert’. Their critique has gone beyond arguing in favour of the adoption of small-scale appropriate technology in development projects; warning against the danger of the community becoming dependent on outside or foreign experts; and recognizing the

⁹ Sharing many principles with popular education, the Liberation Theology also brought contributions to social learning, in ideals such as: if the is to be effective action, the poor and oppressed must be listened and the world must be seen through their eyes; knowledge of the truth and awareness of conditions is not sufficient to acquire a new vision, material and immaterial conditions must be created in order to enable the truth and arrive at truth; the poor must be treated as actors of their own transformation instead of object of charity; priority in development and liberation should be given to the poor (people), rather than to science and technology.

need for human or community capacity-building and empowerment.

Their fundamental concern is with the pre-eminence of Western science and technical reason, and with the present reliance on the modernist framework in defining development. Post modern feminists, in addition to the above, are concerned about the patriarchal character of the knowledge produced about women and their needs. They join other critics by calling for a ‘development expert’ who can be open and listen thoughtfully to others; and who can cut loose from the universalizing theories, conceptual frameworks, and rational discourses on basic needs to allow different voices and experiences to be heard; and who will design policies and practices based on the concrete, spatial, environmental, and cultural contexts in which people live.”

Context matters

Campfens also departs from the premise that community development practice needs to be placed in a national and international context that acknowledges the following:

- new forces at work at the global level;
- the vast differences in political systems and policy practices of governments;
- differing economic conditions and social inequalities;
- the social and ethno-cultural composition of different populations;
- differences in relations between the state and civil society.

Such discrepancies make clear that - although it may be relevant to search for common strategic approaches to local development or for a general methodology of intervention - there cannot be a universal formula for community development. Thus, results of such a search

are only valuable provided they are “applied thoughtfully and take into account numerous differences in the political, economic, social and cultural context.” Campfens exemplifies these differences in context and the consequent difference in the own definition development takes in practice:

“For example, in Bangladesh, which has a traditional rural society rooted in Islam, the central question is how to deal humanely with massive poverty and with a rapidly expanding population that is fast approaching its ecological limits. In Israel, one of the main questions of community development is how to integrate the large numbers of Jewish immigrants- who come from a variety of countries and differ greatly in socio-cultural background- into a modern, prosperous society that is an active welfare state. Also of central importance there is how to maintain political and social stability in a heterogeneous society (...) In the Netherlands some of the main factors at play in community development are the existence of an advanced welfare state, and highly individualistic and consumer-oriented lifestyle now enjoyed by a growing majority. Some people perceive these factors as contributing to a loss of community and undermining the long-standing tradition of mutual aid at the interpersonal level that once extended beyond the immediate family and close friends¹⁰.”

Placed in a broader framework of development, such discrepancies generate what the author considers the main contrasts in national/regional contexts, which come to characterize and define the practice of community development today. These contrasts are listed as:

¹⁰ More recently, it is also possible to see other issues rising in the country that certainly play a role in development policies and practice, such as the integration of immigrants, increasing poverty (specially among immigrants), and political asylum.

North-South/ rich-poor

Refers to the discrepancies between the (rich) countries of the North and the (poor) countries of the South, particularly regarding per capita GNP and human development measurements. With this, issues such as the magnitude of poverty, population growth, the lack of resources, lack of major economic problems, among many others, come to set the policy priorities of national governments and determine local community development practices.

Urban/rural

Refers to the proportion of the population that resides in urban centres as opposed to rural areas. This generates tendencies such as the focus on issues related more to ensuring equitable access to public services and power, and to promoting client and citizen participation in urban settings (with community workers focusing on depriving neighbourhoods and groups); and the focus of traditional state-administered programs of community development on promoting community self-help and self-reliance as part of a general plan for rural development. Campfens explains that, with a strong trend toward rural-urban migration in many countries, community development is now taking on greater significance and dealing with other problems besides poverty. Nevertheless, the author also believes that the differences in rural and urban community development are less pronounced than they were twenty years ago, with rural community development moving away from a locality-focused toward a more integrated regional approach that emphasizes target groups.

Ethno-cultural and religious heterogeneity/ homogeneity

This set priorities such as promoting integration of immigrants, fostering civic culture and positive social relations between groups, conflict resolution, among others, in heterogeneous societies.

Decentralization/ centralization

In direct opposition to centralization (top-down), decentralization (bottom-up) generates local initiatives and the participation of local authorities, NGOs, business sector, grass root organizations, etc. With this, there is a higher level of community spirit and social capital. According to Campfens, decentralization has revived the locality development model, with diverse actors (including the state) being drawn into new horizontal and co-operative partnership arrangements. In contrast, centralization tends to hinder voluntarism, an active civil society and grass root initiatives and control.

Current approaches to community development

According to the author, the changes in the macro-context, and the differences between countries in structure, trends and priorities, have given rise to a great diversity of approaches to community development and of organizing, planning and development practices among community workers. Current approaches to community development accompany important trends, which Campfens highlights as:

- in contrast to the past, when the state (through national, provincial or municipal agencies; or society's major institutions) was the one to initiate the action and then sought community participation in the tradition of "societal guidance", today action is initiated by different category of actors: the NGOs (representing the ideology of voluntarism); autonomous grass root groups (following the tradition of "oppositional movements") and collectives. "The most widespread of the newer practices involves organizations whose members are linked in horizontal rather than vertical relationships. This trend reflects how the ideology-driven policy agendas of governments have led to a major restructuring of relations between the state and civil society, and to new expectations that the needs of

communities and groups must be met by sectors other than the state.”

- today, targets of community action and organizing strategies correspond to a broad range of “publics”, from population groups (e.g. single parent-women, youth, families, elderly, ethno-cultural minorities, etc.) and rural/urban communities to the public at large. This shows that “community development practice is moving away from a singular preoccupation with the local community, and toward a strategy that incorporates multiple targets. This is particularly true of programs that aim at poverty alleviation or social integration. In some instances, however, the ‘community as a locality’ is the proper target for development initiatives...”

The author also presents a typology of approaches to community development. He stresses that this should not be equated to “models”, instead, it focuses only on the “dominant” concept apparent in each of the approaches taken in practice. This typology includes:

- the *continuum* concept of community development, which aims at achieving human development through group, community and international development. This includes the advancement of human rights;
- the *group* or *co-operative* concept, which is aimed at individual, social and economic development in the tradition of mutual aid, social support, and social action;
- the territorially bounded *locality* concept, which views the local community as a physical, economic, social and politic unit in its own right. Here, the concern is with the quality of life and the optimum involvement and participation of individuals and organizational members in community affairs;

-
- the *structural-functional* concept, in which community development forms part of a larger policy framework that focuses on the various partners in development- that is, state, agencies, institutions, NGOs, the voluntary sector, the business sector, and the target group or community as presumed beneficiary;
 - the *categorical* concept, in which community development forms part of a larger policy framework that aims to alleviate or prevent social problems (e.g. poverty) that disproportionately affects certain groups or communities which have found themselves economically, socially or politically excluded from the benefits, resources or opportunities offered by society;
 - the *self-management* concept, in which community development takes a bottom-up, empowering approach to the development of communities or groups;
 - the *social learning* or *educational* concept of community development, which brings together professional experts, with their “universal knowledge” and the local residents, with their “popular knowledge” and “lived experience”;
 - the *intergroup* concept of community development, which focuses on mutual understanding, conflict resolution and social integration.

Common themes in the field of community development

The raise of social movements leading development practices, as well as innovative public and institutional policies have brought up some emerging themes in the field of community development. According to Campfens, they can be presented as:

A proactive policy on nurturing associative communities

Due to strong ideological forcers at work (speread by the neoconservative position), there is a trend of endowing the voluntary sector and local communities with the responsibility for the care and

support people in need, with a minimal role of the state. According to the author, these forces are trying to recover certain traditional values including mutual aid, self-help and self-reliance, social through informal networks and civic solidarity, and self-determination. He adds: “however it is not sufficient rationale for states to remove themselves from the sphere of social welfare and social development, especially in an age of profound economic and social transformation. To counter the modern forces of individualism, secularization, materialism, and anomie, there must more than ever be proactive policies that nurture communities through association, local community building, and social integration. To suggest that one can revert to the solidarity and mutual aid traditions of the extended family, village, parish and neighbourhood, ignores the fact that these traditions has deep cultural and religious roots that are disappearing rapidly in the developed nations of the North and even in the Third World, where structural adjustments are taking place.”

Self-reliance and the role of the state

Due to neoliberal forces (as a reinforcement of neo-conservatism) and the demands involved in the establishment of free markets, which also reject the notion that state should embody the value of mutual solidarity (through which wealth is redistributed through income assistance and social services), there is a pressure to push social welfare and social development towards local communities, social organizations and the philanthropic sector, i.e. away from the business sector and the state. The author emphasizes however, that cases related to this trend have shown that without appropriate social policies and substantial assistance from the state, popular organizations and other actors were not able to rise above poverty and address quality of life issues.

People development focus

People development focus has gained momentum in recent years. This focus “acknowledges that the classical ‘locality development’ and ‘communitywide participation’ models of community development have a limited capacity to address the personal needs of the more vulnerable or excluded members of society. These people and supportive institutions are becoming aware that in order to advance their own welfare and to protect their own interests, beliefs, and lifestyles in a social and cultural environment that is becoming increasingly diverse, they must come together as groups and form relations with the larger society through circles of solidarity.” According to Campfens, the people development model in community development departs from the locality development model in two essential ways. First, in development activities, concerns itself as much with individuals as with the community, relying on group development, leadership training, popular education and consciousness-raising. Secondly, “community” is sought and strengthened in places provided for conviviality- co-operatives, grass root organizations, circles of solidarity, as well as in committed relationships in which the participants share common interests (which frequently are extended beyond the locality, in issues that involve social justice or economic fairness, for example).

Program integration (multidimensionality) and organizational partnerships

Refers to state and institutional initiatives in search of greater program integration and new organizational partnerships involving the community and voluntary sector. Such initiatives, in practice, are a response to a number of social forces pursuing very different agendas. According to Campfens, these initiatives must face some challenges. First, they must be able to overcome the nineteenth-century view that the state and its bureaucracy, the civic and voluntary sectors, the business sector, and the community are separate entities; once in such a scheme of things, the various players pursue their respective interests at cross-purposes to each other, with

the community as a loser. An addition challenge is to overcome the boundaries erected during this century through the process of specialization among the disciplines and professions. Finally, he stresses that such approaches may be more realistic in the Western countries, with their liberal democracies and strong traditions of voluntarism and community activism. “They would be more difficult to follow where a centralized state system is entrenched, to the detriment of people’s lives at the community level; and where strong traditions of religion, paternalism, and patronage resist any change that is perceived as undermining the established order.”

Popular and community participation

“Participation is the sine qua non of community development. Without it, policies and programs that aim at people development, poverty alleviation, local development, community health, and social integration of the marginalized and excluded are likely to meet with little success.” Campfens calls attention for a series of aspects involved in community and popular participation today. Among them, it is possible to find:

- development programs that see popular participation mainly as cost-saving devices are bound to fail unless other benefits, which are perceived as benefits by community participants, are aimed for and incorporated into participatory program planning. On the list of “real” benefits are increasing spending power, new or better services and facilities, acquisition of technology, etc. At the more intangible level, participants must feel themselves empowered through their involvement in decision-making, and their increased awareness and exercise of their rights and responsibilities, as well as through skills learning, group solidarity, and community or group self-management;
- the degree to which popular participation can be actively promoted among disadvantaged and excluded groups, especially as a strategy for socio-political and cultural

development (i.e. not simply economic development), will vary depending on the government in power, the nature of democracy and cultural traditions.

- for participation to be effective as a central value of community development, a number of additional factors must be in play: an open and democratic environment, reform in public administration, democratization of professional experts and officials, formation of self-managing organizations, training for community activism and leadership, involvement of NGOs, creation of collective decision-making structures at various levels that extend from the micro to the meso and macro levels and link participatory activities with policy frameworks.

The social justice agenda and Human Rights

While in the past social justice issues were pursued mainly through social activism strategies -separate from any locality development agenda -today community development practices incorporate a strategy that views disadvantaged in terms of class differentiation, and of differences based on gender, race, ethnicity, religion, age grouping or sexual orientation. According to Campfens, such an analysis has resulted in a more “group development” focused form of practice, which is usually initiated at the local level and eventually extends to the regional, national, and sometimes international levels through participation in such social movements as human and civil rights, feminism, ecology, and so on. Such initiatives are often supported by NGOs¹¹ in their role as educationors and advocates. Campfens also stresses on the contrasts between the practice of

¹¹ The author adds that it is questionable whether NGOs that are dependent on external funding can promote large-scale organized action from the grass roots level. “NGOs, especially international NGOs active in development work, will be tolerated as long as they are not perceived as a threat to vested interest groups.”

social justice in poor and rich countries in view of the dominant global economic model- and its demands:

“The social justice agenda is related to the international debate about individual rights versus collective rights, principally of the poor. Western developed nations, with their liberal cultures, have tended to emphasize the civic and political rights of the individual, which are enshrined in the UN Charter and viewed as synonymous with democracy; advocates of the poor in the Third World countries place greater emphasis on the enforcement of socio-economic rights, which are also backed up by international treaties. Yet NGOs active in international co-operation charge that the IMF ignores these socio-economic rights when it imposes structural adjustment programs (SAPs), which cut food subsidies, health, and education at a severe cost to the poor. The North’s penchant for equating SAPs with democracy and human rights is even more insulting in cases where Southern governments clamp down on dissent in order to force people into new economic straightjackets.”

Finally, the author reminds that the issue of socio-economic rights are also gaining increased attention as well from human rights activists and community workers in developed Northern countries as more and more people find themselves excluded economically, socially and politically as a result of economic restructuring, a shrink welfare state and a hardening position of the public vis-à-vis welfare recipients, refugees, immigrants and migrant workers.

Global networking and the emergence of a “worldwide civil society”
There is an increasing deep concern worldwide on the globalization of forces that undermine mutually and solidarity among people at all levels (in their natural habitat, work places, in their activities as citizens, etc). “To counter such forces and prepare adequately for practice in the twenty-first century, CD [community development]

practitioners must adopt global networking strategies and techniques in their professional activities to strike new partnerships in international social development and link the local with the global, and the global with the local.” Such new action strategies would include the lining of grass roots organizations, NGOs, human rights activists and development workers in both rich and poor countries—through the use of internet, facsimile, teleconferencing, and other electronic devices, in addition to the traditional face-to-face working groups. The challenge for community development in the new century is, thus, to forge circles of mutuality and solidarity around the globe that will lead to the emergence of an active “worldwide civil society” and reinforce development and human rights work done at the local, regional and national levels.

A framework outline

As a conclusion of his work, Campfens presents a framework outline, which summarizes much of the state of the arts in community development today. Such summary presented next.

<p style="text-align: center;">“FRAMEWORK THEORY” OUTLINE FOR POLICY DEVELOPMENT, PROGRAM PLANNING AND CD PRACTICE</p>
--

I. Contextual factors

1. Global environment: A growing interconnected world.

- The move from East-West ideological rivalry to a new reality of North-South and domestic inequalities.
- The rise of international capitalism, speculative money markets, and multinational corporations; and heightened competition for export markets.
- The dominant role of UN-affiliated institutions (such as IMF, the World Bank, and the WTO) in shaping global economic realities.
- Breakthrough in communications technology: facsimile transmission, the internet.

- An increase in social turbulence, human rights abuses, and mass movements: refugees, migrant workers, immigrants.
- Population growth, primarily in the Third World.

2. National and Regional Characteristics

- Urban or rural; rural-urban migrations; urban issues.
- Ethno-cultural/religious homogeneity or heterogeneity.
- State of the economy: underdeveloped or developed (welfare state).
- Relations between state and civil society.
- Democratic environment: multi-party, single-party, dictatorial.
- Centralization or decentralization with emphasis on local initiatives and control.
- Population groups excluded from economic, social and political life.

II. Emerging themes in CD practice

- Nurturing associative communities and mobilizing circles of solidarity.
- Self-reliance, and the role of NGOs and the state.
- The people-development focus.
- The groups and organizational expressions of popular and community participation.
- The social justice agenda and human rights.
- Global networking and a worldwide civil society.

III. Approaches to CD

- The 'continuum' approach to practice extending from the micro to the meso and macro levels, including global networking.
- 'Group' or 'co-operative' development for mutual aid and social action.
- 'Locality' development, concerned with the quality of life in terms of community economic development, and with the

liveability of the physical and neighbourhood environment, and so on.

- ‘Structural-functional’ community work, working toward the development of relevant policy frameworks, and focusing on organizational structures, partnerships, and program integration.
- ‘Categorical’ focused CD, aimed at emancipation and self-reliance and at the alleviation and prevention of social problems; targeting particularly the economically, socially, and politically excluded and marginal population groups.
- The formation of ‘self-managing’ empowering organizations of the poor and excluded.
- The ‘intergroup’ social integration approach relying on mutual understanding and conflict resolution measures.