Introductory Remarks

• The “problem of community development”

• Professionalization of community development is worsening the situation!

• Why not go back to the roots: doing what we are supposed to be doing.

• We are not the first in the “back to the roots” quest
Ledwith’s Critical Praxis Model: An Example of Back to the Roots Quest
“Clothing” our model with our experiences of community development in Honduras and Malawi
Case Study: Honduras

Managing the Directive/Non Directive Divide
Honduras

CCD in Honduras

• Honduran organization
• Interdenominational
• Part of web of Protestant Christian development organizations tied into the worldwide ecumenical movement
• Funding from Church World Service, Lutheran World Relief, a host of ecumenical European NGOs
CCD in Honduras

- 1988 budget of some $500,000/year
- Headquarters in Tegucigalpa, capital city
- 20-50 staff
- 50 isolated rural communities in 4 regions of Honduras
CCD in Honduras

• Context in the 1980s
  – Honduras 2\textsuperscript{nd} poorest country in Western Hemisphere
  – Population over 90% mestizo, some indigenous and AfroHonduran
  – 98% Catholic, growing Protestant movement, primarily Pentecostal
CCD in Honduras

- Context (continued)
  - Majority of people in rural area
  - Highly skewed land tenure
  - Strong campesino and labor organizations
CCD in Honduras

• Context (continued)
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CCD in Honduras

• Context (continued)
  – Majority of people in rural area
  – Highly skewed land tenure
  – Strong campesino and labor organizations
CCD Development Theory

• Theological justification and inspiration from Liberation Theology and Popular Education that emphasized the non-directive, critical pedagogical practice.

• CD Implementation was “holistic” in terms of the areas it sought to cover with its projects, looking at this as a process.
CCD Development Theory

- Use material projects to:
  - Increase quality of living of communities
  - Help communities develop strong organizations for sustainability
  - Develop capacity for critical analysis of structures of power responsible for poverty and limiting development: “facilitators of knowledge”
Types of Knowledge Facilitated

• Technical
  – Health, agriculture, income generation, and literacy

• Organizational
  – Creation of women’s, men’s, community development groups, cooperatives, and “political” groups

• Political
  – Understanding of “reality,” root causes of community problems, including gender, class, culture, age, and the structuring of power relationships with both local and supra local dimensions
Technical Knowledge

• Agricultural Projects
  – Crop planting methods
  – Soil conservation
  – Composting and natural fertilizers
  – Rotating funds for agricultural inputs
  – Diversification of crops
  – Silo construction and other grain storage programs
Technical Knowledge

- Agroanimal Projects
- Geared towards nutrition as well as income generation
  - Goats
  - Rabbits
  - Cattle
Technical Knowledge

• Agroanimal Projects
• Geared towards nutrition as well as income generation
  – Goats
  – Rabbits
  – Cattle
Organizational Knowledge

• Organization building, leadership training:
  – Men’s and women’s groups and a community-wide group
    • Help form them if not in existence
    • Training on leading groups and group processes
  – Organize production cooperatives
  – Organize “political” groups
Political Knowledge

• Community leaders and groups research root causes of community problems

• Emphasis on identifying and scrutinizing variables such as gender, class, culture, age, power relationships within and outside the community in the economic and resource area

• Draw up solutions to those problems based on research and organizing people to tackle them.
Managing the Directive Divide

• Two stages in its Community Development efforts as it learned
  – First, the time frame went from 5 years to 10 years and longer
  – Second, saw that it had imposed the kinds of organizational efforts it required from the community.
  – Changed this to a more open approach that stressed the research of community problems by the community groups themselves and the prioritization of projects based on that research
Malawi: Starting Dialogic Community Development

- January 2004: Eastern University students visit Zowe, a remote rural community in northern Malawi.

- Three students after graduation in May 2005 go to live in the community and facilitate development.

- Support first through Eastern University (1 year) changed to Giving Heart Ministries, Inc (6 years) ending up with a new non-profit organization: Pamoza International (1 year).

- Main challenges: (a) understanding of development (dealing with conventionalism), (b) external orientation, and (c) inadequate creativity and innovativeness.
What these cases reveal about community development

• Importance of non-directive standpoint in the doing of community development.

• Centrality of critical praxis and dialogic pedagogy aimed at four community development requisites/fundamentals.

• Pitting the underprivileged against the privileged may not be beneficial; transforming the character of a community is pivotal.
Dialogic Community Development

EMPOWERMENT AND LIBERATION:
- Collective Action
- Benevolent Social Ties
- Decency
- Faith, Hope, & Love
- Freedom
- Trust
- Diligence
- Creativity
- Accountability
- Responsibility
- Procedural Efficiency
- Stewardship
- Integrity & Aptitude
- Caring & Sharing
- Respectful Governance
(Spiritual, Socio-cultural, and Political Security)

SUSTAINABLE WEALTH GENERATION AND DISTRIBUTION:
- Assets and Resources
- Entitlements
- Banking/Money Keeping
- Livelihood Activities
- Shared Holdings
- Micro-Savings/Micro-Credit
- Community Businesses
- Income Use & Investments
- Property Rights
- Less Dead Capital
- Industry

IMPROVEMENT IN:
- Health
- Education
- Nutrition
- Food Supply
- Sanitation
- Water Supply
- Energy Supply
- Housing
- Dressing
- Entertainment
- Infrastructures (roads, markets, community centers, libraries, etc.)
- Joyful Life / Shalom
(Security in Life Chances)

ENVIRONMENTAL STEWARDSHIP:
- Land Conservation
- Natural Beauty
- Water Reservoirs
- Forests Conservation
- Air Quality
- Soil Management
- Energy Conservation
- Land Use
- Habitat Preservation

CONDITION/QUALITY OF NATURAL RESOURCES

ENTREPRENEURSHIP

CHARACTER LIFE COURSE OUTCOMES

Critical Praxis

(Religious, Socio-cultural, and Political Security)
Character of a Community

• The moral wealth of a community.

• Attributes: relationship of power, solidarity, and interdependence hinging on self-interest/self-sacrifice, power/love, change/unity, and imagination/hope behavioral polarities.

• Attained through empowerment and liberation that enacts progressive structuration.

• Goal is spiritual, socio-cultural, and political security.
Entrepreneurship

- The question of some people being entrepreneurial and others non-entrepreneurial.

- Economic versus social entrepreneurship.

- Community entrepreneurship: integrating both economic and social entrepreneurship.

- Goal: Economic security
Entrepreneurship Model in Agrarian Communities
Life Course Outcomes

• The “seen” products of community development.

• Have been main concerns of conventional community development.

• Goal: attain security in life chances.
Quality of Natural Resources

- Living space, waste depository, and resource supply functions of the environment.

- The population, Organization, Environment, and Technology (POET) Relationship and the Conflict in the Functions of the Environment.

- Goal is Environmental Security.
CONCLUSIONS:
Towards Non-Directive Community Development
Conclusions

• There are many possible approaches to Community Development and theories that back them up.

• There is wide agreement that a non-directive approach has the best chance for ensuring lasting and sustainable development.

• But current practice tends to lapse into a directive approach because of the pressure to produce quick results, and into a focus primarily on the material aspects of development, which tend to yield short-term positive gains but little in terms of lasting impact.
Conclusions

• There is little lasting impact because the problems of development are complex, rooted in the multifaceted social, material, spiritual, and cultural nature of reality, structured by relationships of power that create and reproduce constraints at the individual, family, community level.

• A non-directive approach in the way we have outlined, one which emphasizes the development of critical reflection and action in the context of material projects, tends to have a better chance of producing powerful and sustaining processes.