

Historical Rationale of the Policy of Community Development in the African Rural Areas of Rhodesia

Gloria C. Passmore

*Department of Political Science, University of Rhodesia,
Salisbury.*

The policy of community development in Rhodesia is the culmination of a long period of trial and error in attempting to influence the African rural population to follow more progressive ways of living. In the early years of occupation under Charter Company rule, the policy towards the indigenous people was merely to preserve law and order and leave them undisturbed in their tribal setting. In 1911, a Committee of Enquiry urged that agricultural and industrial training should be provided through 'peripatetic' instructors who would help rural Africans to improve their circumstances,¹ but no action was taken on this proposal.

In 1920 the idea of providing occupational training was revived by H. S. Keigwin, a Native Commissioner who had served as secretary to the 1911 inquiry. Keigwin had recently visited centres at Tigerkloof and Lovedale in South Africa, and attended a conference on adult training in London. He submitted a memorandum to the Rhodesian administration proposing the establishment of institutions where Africans could be instructed in simple trades, agriculture and home industries.² The result of his memorandum was the opening in 1920 of the earliest government training centre, the Domboshawa School, near

Salisbury. Keigwin was appointed as the first Director of Native Development, and thus was launched what came to be known as the policy of 'native development'.

POLICY OF 'NATIVE DEVELOPMENT'

The policy was given impetus by the findings of two commissions of enquiry which reported in the mid-twenties. The first in 1924, the Woolley Commission, enquired into the cost of administering the territory as a basis for compensating the British South Africa Company when responsible self-government was granted to the colony. The commission commented on the cost which had been incurred in providing relief to the tribal areas in the drought of 1921-1922. It was concerned that little had been done to help the indigenous people to improve their circumstances during the years of occupation: 'There has been too much shepherding and not enough discipline.'³

The need to provide a system of education which would help to raise standards in the reserves was considered in 1925 by a further commission, under the chairmanship of F. L. Hadfield.⁴ The Education Commission repeated the recommendation which had been made earlier for instructors to be employed who would tour the rural areas. In consequence the Domboshawa

School was used for the training of agricultural demonstrators, the first of whom were posted to the reserves in 1927. A direct consequence of the commission's investigations was the decision to establish a Department of Native Development, through which all aspects of African advancement, in the school, in the kraal and on the land, would in future be furthered. The Native Development Act (No. 5 of 1929) was passed to facilitate this work; and as Keigwin had left the service, a former head of Native Education in Natal, Harold Jowitt, was appointed Director of Native Development in charge of the new Department. In addition to agricultural instructors, community demonstrators skilled in building and other trades were employed to help spread a knowledge of better practices.

The policy of Native Development did not last for more than six years. Administrative difficulties arising from the division of responsibility between the Native Development Department, Native Affairs Department and the missions rendered the system impracticable. The functions of 'native development' reverted to the Chief Native Commissioner from 1934.

POLICY OF AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION

The training of agricultural demonstrators had been initiated at Domboshawa under the guidance of Emory Alvord. He was an American agricultural missionary who had originally joined the Mount Silinda Mission, where he had experimented with the training of indigenous Africans for the educating of their fellow tribesmen in better methods of husbandry. In 1926, Alvord was appointed by the government as Agriculturist for the Instruction of Natives. He and his agricultural demonstrators formed the nucleus of what later became the Department of Native Agriculture, in the Ministry of Native Affairs. The work of Alvord's department set the tenor of development policy in the rural areas over the next 17 years. This was to focus upon improving conditions through concentrated methods of agricultural extension. Several new categories of demonstrators, specialised in erosion control, forestry, live-stock management, and irrigation, were introduced and European land development officers employed to supervise their work.

A system known as centralization was instigated by Alvord and his workers in an attempt to improve pasture and stock, prevent erosion, and stabilize the shifting methods of cultivation practised by tribesmen. This process substituted for the traditional cluster of homesteads a

system of village-lines, with dwellings ranged side by side to divide the arable from the grazing areas. By 1949, nine million acres had undergone centralization. More than 104 000 brick-built homes had been erected in place of the traditional pole and dagga huts, affecting 40 per cent of the rural population.⁵ Overall standards of cultivation, however, had only slightly improved in spite of the increased yields which had been shown possible on thousands of demonstration plots. Alvord is reported to have reached the conclusion that:

We have wasted our time . . . in conducting agricultural and demonstration work . . . average yields have been ten times the yield on ordinary native lands. The lessons to be learned have been preached for sixteen years, yet the vast majority have made no change . . .⁶

In 1948 Alvord gave figures to show that no more than eight per cent of African farmers had actually adopted sound tillage practices.⁷ The situation, he said, called for the enforcement of proper land husbandry methods if future conditions in the reserves were not to deteriorate rapidly with the increasing rate of growth in the African population.

Gathering concern about soil-erosion had led in 1939 to the appointment of a commission under Robert McIlwaine to enquire into the natural resources of the colony. The commission reported that at the existing rate of progress it would take 250 years to repair the damage already done to the tribal areas.⁸ Consequently the Natural Resources Act (No. 9 of 1941) was passed to provide means of enforcing appropriate conservation measures. A five-year plan for the destocking of affected areas was set in action in 1945. This was a complex task since cattle were an inseparable part of the social and spiritual system of the tribespeople. They were used for the payment of bride-price, for sacrifice and tribute, and constituted a symbol of standing in the tribal community. By 1947 it had become clear that the solution lay not alone in restricting the right to hold stock, but the right to farm land in the African rural areas.

COMPULSION IN LAND HUSBANDRY

These questions were among the problems considered by the Commission on Native Production and Trade, under the chairmanship of W. E. Godlonton, in 1944. The Commission observed of the reserve farmers that 'A considerable number made feeble efforts to follow the new

methods. But the great majority were indifferent, suspicious or hostile'.⁹

In the commission's view, the only solution to the problem of stemming deterioration in the soil and improving conditions in the tribal areas, was some form of 'compulsory planned production'.

Legislative measures were finally taken in an attempt to enforce tribal farmers to observe proper farming and conservation methods, under the African Land Husbandry Act (No. 52 of 1951). The objects of this statute were to stem the fragmentation of the land and to promote good farming habits, making the right to cultivate land conditional upon the observance of sound methods of husbandry. In terms of the Act, communal holdings were to be reallocated as individual farming rights. The size of holdings was to be determined in accordance with stringent scientific criteria for each area. Where districts were densely populated the allocation of farming rights might necessitate the resettlement of surplus tribespeople on land elsewhere. The Act was implemented over the next ten years with all the technological resources at the disposal of the administration. More than £17 million was expended with the aid of a World Bank Loan, on providing the necessary physical development in the form of roads, bridges, dams, fencing and other facilities.¹⁰ Primary development of the African rural areas in this way made unprecedented strides over this period. By the end of the fifties, however, only ten per cent of African land was being farmed on the basis of individual tenure.¹¹

It had been anticipated that the Land Husbandry Act would have the effect of rendering a number of Africans landless, particularly men who were away on migrant labour on the date prescribed for allocation purposes. It was confidently believed that the residue would be permanently absorbed by the flourishing urban labour market. This expectation, however, was not fulfilled. The threatened break-up of the Central African Federation led to a reduction in employment opportunities and large numbers of Africans who had formerly derived a part of their income from the land now found themselves not only unemployed but landless.

The situation was exacerbated by a decision which had been taken in 1950, to effect the resettlement in tribal areas of all Africans who had formerly been permitted to occupy European

Crown Land. The aftermath of the Second World War, with its influx of immigrants and returning soldiers had led to pressure for farming land. By 1960 some 113 000 African men, women and children had been compulsorily removed together with their stock and household goods to Tribal Trust areas.¹² The move had been eased by the addition of some eight million acres of land already occupied by Africans (to be known as the Special Native Area) to the regions already covered by reserves and purchase areas.¹³

The findings of the Commission appointed in 1960 to inquire into disturbances which had arisen in the Mangwende Reserve, underlined the resentment and hostility towards government measures to which the destocking, resettlement and land husbandry schemes had contributed. The Commission pointed out how the blind application of technically efficient programmes for advancement had cut across traditional custom and disrupted the basic patterns of social life:

There is no doubt that the implementation of the Land Husbandry Act has evoked resistances with a strong emotional undercurrent which is closely related to the African concepts of land rights and the security of tenure. These play a major role in the Mangwende Reserve and elsewhere . . .¹⁴

Both the resettlement and the land husbandry schemes were discontinued, except on a voluntary basis, from the early sixties.

OPPOSING CLAIMS

It was evident that the technical measures aimed at uplifting conditions in the reserves had not achieved their purpose. A report of the Chief Native Commissioner, surveying the history of African administration in Southern Rhodesia, asked what was the common factor which had led to results so different from those anticipated. The answer, the report suggested, was that:

a barrier of human beings lay between technical knowledge and the soil. And that barrier comprises not a multitude of individuals living in isolation . . . but a cultural organization with its own structure, organization, patterns of thinking, feeling and acting . . .¹⁵

The realization was forced upon the administration that for standards to be improved, the active participation of the people must be secured. Future efforts at reconstruction must be directed not alone at individuals, but at the close-knit social system of which they were a part. A communal response was necessary if measures to raise

standards were to prevail against custom, ignorance, and the resentment which had been aroused. Methods of group-motivation must be utilized if the barrier of traditional values was to be penetrated and basic changes in attitude brought about through which development might proceed.

Concern for the so called 'human element' was not a new notion in district administration in Rhodesia. Forty years before, Keigwin had emphasized the importance of building a sound basis of community life. Throughout the period of the destocking, resettlement and land husbandry schemes concern had been growing at the pressure of administrative duties which prevented district personnel from maintaining the close contact with the rural people, which was one of their basic functions. The position was aggravated by chronic shortages of staff and an establishment which had remained virtually static since before the Second World War.

RISE OF THE COUNCIL SYSTEM

In 1936 the Chief Native Commissioner, Charles Bullock, had urged the need for involving the African population in their own development: 'It is hoped that the efforts of our staff may be augmented by better organised assistance from the Natives themselves.'¹⁶ There existed a suitable instrument for co-operation in the as yet nebulous concept of the African councils. Provision for such councils had existed in Southern Rhodesia since the granting of Responsible Government under the Constitution of 1923. The type of councils envisaged at that time, however, had been little more than advisory bodies consisting of chiefs and their nominees. The Native Councils Act (No. 38 of 1937) was passed in an endeavour to make these bodies more effective by permitting representation of indigenous Africans through nominations put forward by the local communities. There was an amending Act (No. 25 of 1943) to give councils taxing powers through which local amenities such as roads, sanitation, education, conservation and other services might be provided. Although by 1948 some 52 councils had been established the Chief Native Commissioner, L. Powys-Jones, reported that progress in this direction was slow.¹⁷

In 1952, a senior native commissioner in the Department of Native Affairs, H. R. G. Howman, was seconded to study native councils, law and courts in the countries of British East and Central Africa. Although these countries followed the Colonial Office system of Indirect Rule, it was

felt that much was to be learnt from their experience (in Southern Rhodesia the African rural areas were directly administered by officials of the Native Department). Roger Howman combined both practical and academic qualities for this task. He had served in various districts and had studied at the University of South Africa and London School of Economics. In 1944 he had urged the establishment of native reserves planning authorities through which African communities might learn the rudiments of local management. He was particularly interested in the application of group and community concepts to the problems of administration; and in NADA, the annual journal of the Native Department, and elsewhere, he had consistently urged the need to work through groups and to 'foster the corporate life of the African'.¹⁸

The result of Howman's tour was a report which laid the foundations for the future policy of community development and local government in Rhodesia.¹⁹ Howman saw the African councils not solely as an instrument of group co-operation, but as a medium for responsible local self-government, through which continuing development might take place. The report set out conditions which Howman considered basic to success in local government. First, councils must not be established except on the expressed wish of the people. Second, councils must be vested with responsibilities which were regarded as vital by their ratepayers. In particular they should render services in the fields of education and health, the areas in which the interests of the rural people were most deeply centred. Finally, if local government was to be successful, the central government must cease to undertake the running of many of the local services it had provided in the past. There must be a revision of the functions of government ministries in order to ensure that those services which could beneficially be devolved to local authorities, were in fact made the responsibility of African councils. The money directly spent on such work by the central government should more appropriately be allocated as grants to councils to assist them in the performance of these functions.

AFRICAN COUNCILS ACT

A new African Councils Act (No. 19 of 1957) was then passed which embodied the proposals put forward by Roger Howman, and in fact was largely drafted by him. The measure aimed, in the words of P. B. Fletcher, the Minister of Native Affairs:

to educate the African in the important responsibilities of citizenship, by creating an environment in which democratic values, social responsibility, collective self-help and progressive leadership can emerge.²⁰

The Act provided that there must be a collective demand for a council before a warrant would be granted. It also recognized the need both for traditional and more modern elements to be represented. Provision was made for the *ex officio* membership of chiefs and headmen (the chiefs as vice-presidents), and for the choosing of elected members by the people of the locality. Powers accorded to African councils were to be similar to those of town management boards. The Minister might confer upon a council any function which in his opinion was for the general welfare of the inhabitants of the area. In the exercise of this power, the Act laid down that he should be guided by the value of such a function in 'promoting initiative and responsibility,' 'the development and economic progress of the area with the active participation of the inhabitants,' and in fostering 'the sense of community and citizenship' (section 53 (2)). The Mangwende Commission described the African Councils Act as:

A rare and outstanding document . . . It interprets change as a human problem, and it seeks to meet this problem by the mobilization of human resources and ambitions within the African communities themselves.²¹

The promulgation of the new councils legislation coincided with the peak of the land husbandry scheme and support for the councils again fell far short of expectations. Councils became associated in the minds of the rural people with the unpopular process of destocking and land allocation. In some areas the word 'council' was confused with 'cancel', meaning to cancel your stock or your land. Native commissioners, understaffed and burdened with administrative work had little time for explaining the implications of the new system.

PROCESS OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

In 1959, the Chief Native Commissioner, S. E. Morris, sent a circular to all Native Commissioners enclosing a copy of the Handbook on Community Development which had been issued by the British Colonial Office in 1958.²² The burden of the circular was that councils were intended to serve as channels for organized effort on the part of communities that were conscious of shared

interests and a drive to participate in local improvement. The emphasis was on 'getting people to work together' rather than on the concrete achievements which were the corollary. All rural staff were enjoined to study the principles of community development set out in the Handbook, for closer application in their day-to-day work.

Community development, initiated formally in India in 1952, had recently come into international prominence. By 1962 more than 80 countries had introduced community development in one form or another, 40 having nationally-sponsored programmes.²³ Community development had been defined in many ways. The most widely applicable was the description given in 1963 by a Group of Experts appointed by the United Nations Organisation to advise on current practice in this field:

The term community development has come into international usage to connote the processes by which the efforts of the people themselves are united with those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural conditions of communities, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation, and to enable them to contribute fully to national progress. This complex of processes is, therefore, made up of two essential elements, the participation by the people themselves in efforts to improve their own standards of living, with as much reliance as possible on their own initiative; and the provision of technical and other services in ways which encourage initiative, self-help and mutual help and make these more effective. It is expressed in programmes designed to achieve a wide variety of purposes.²⁴

Implicit in the process of community development was the principle that motivation for change must be evoked from within the people. The dynamic for action lay within their own strongfelt needs. The assumption was made that if a person possessed a powerful desire for some objective he would more readily be encouraged to take action for securing it, than for some alternative judged 'good for him' by an external agency. In traditional societies where the behaviour of an individual was inhibited by the reactions of other members of the community with whom he lived in close inter-relationship, motivation should be aroused on a group or communal basis, so as to carry the sanction as

well as the strength of the wider social unit. The first steps in community development were therefore to help people become more consciously aware of their personal needs, assist them to articulate their problems, and arouse in them the drive to initiate as well as participate in self-betterment schemes. Corollaries to this process were sound procedures for problem-solving, decision-taking, project-planning, utilization of available resources, provision for maintenance and expansion of development projects, evaluation, and planning for future community action.

INTERNATIONAL HELP

In 1959 the Southern Rhodesia Government sought technical assistance from the American Government through its International Co-operation Administration (superseded in 1961 by the Agency for International Development). The services of an international consultant in community development, Dr. James Green, were made available to the country from August 1960 to mid-1964. His terms of reference were to study the administrative and local government structure in the country in the light of modern principles of community development.

Dr. Green found 'an elaborate bureaucracy' consisting of strongly-organized ministries each faced with mounting difficulty in overcoming the resistance and apathy of the population.²⁵ A pre-requisite for community development said Dr. Green was the need for an integrated system of administration. Community development was not a policy which could simply be 'tacked on' to the existing administration, particularly not one which was essentially paternalistic. The so called fragmented system under which each ministry sought the expansion of its own services must give way to common commitment. The goal was not bigger and better departments but more responsible and progressive communities. This implied a re-definition of the functions of all ministries and the revision of the basis of financing local services, the provision of organizations to afford a channel of communication from community to top levels of government, the development of community boards intermediate between the councils and the people, the introduction of a new category of village-level workers, and adequate provision for continuing evaluation and research.

Dr. Green reiterated the need foreseen by Roger Howman for councils to render services in the vital areas of education, health and other fields. To be consistent in its policy of encouraging civic responsibility, the government must

transfer appropriate functions to local auspices. Integrated administration of the various services rendered by the government to the rural communities implied the existence of an 'integer' at the point of contact with the community. His role was that of *animadteur*, to animate the community to achieve its paramount interests and to encourage them to take advantage of the necessary technical and other aid that was available.²⁶ The training of such personnel was to be in human relations and group-motivation. They would know the range of available resources and conditions for their use. They would understand the simple technical skills performed by the various ministries at village-level, so as to advise on what technical workers might be summoned and when to summon them. An integral part of their work would be to encourage the formation of community boards through which informal action and planning could take place at the neighbourhood level.

COMMISSIONS OF INQUIRY

Shortly after Dr. Green's arrival events in other contexts led to the appointment of three independent commissions of inquiry which were to have far-reaching effect upon African administration. In October 1960 troubles following the deposition of a chief, lack of co-operation with the administration, and lack of support for the local council in the Mangwende Reserve led to the investigation of the effects of previous administrative policy in this area. The problems were found by the Mangwende Commission of Inquiry to be associated with resentment arising from the Land Husbandry Act, lack of sufficient communication between district administrator, chief, council and the people, and lack of respect for tribal status. The Commission urged that priority of attention should in future be given to the problems of human relationships in African development policy.¹⁴

The acute staffing difficulties of the Native Affairs Division, upon which warnings had been issued for years past, culminated in 1959 in monetary losses. These of themselves were of little consequence and might have occurred in any large organization, investigations, however, directed attention towards the whole cumbersome structure and organization which had developed within the Division. It was realized that if the new policy of promoting social development and civic responsibility were to be pursued a complete reorganization and rationalization of the Division would be necessary.

The Robinson Commission was appointed in November, 1960 to inquire into these and related questions. In particular the commission was asked to study the relationship between the Native Affairs and District Courts Departments in judicial matters which consumed so much of the Native Commissioner's attention. The commission recommended sweeping changes in African administration to relieve district officials of some of their burden of extraneous work: the transfer of criminal jurisdiction to the District Courts Department, the establishment of a separate Department of African Agriculture, and the taking over of specialized duties by departments concerned with social welfare, veterinary services and labour. The commission recommended the creation of a department for district administration for all races, which would have as one of its main functions the promotion of local self-government in the African rural areas.²⁷

In March, 1962 a further commission was appointed, its duty being to examine the whole structure and organization of the Public Services in Southern Rhodesia. This one-man Commission, in the person of Professor T. T. Paterson, took account of the recommendations of the Mangwende and Robinson Commissions as well as those of the Advisor on Community Development. A system for reorganisation of the civil service incorporating provision for an integrated approach by all Ministries towards community development and local government as its statutory manifestation, was put forward by Dr. Paterson.²⁸

The findings of the three commissions coincided in significant respects. The technically oriented policy of the past with its emphasis on economic advance had failed. The social effects of policy upon a tribal people had been neglected with detrimental consequences. District staff with their increasing responsibilities had been unable to contend with the human aspects of their work. They must be freed for greater concentration upon this task in future. The commissions stressed the need to concentrate upon community action and local government in providing a sound social foundation from which development might proceed. Prerequisite to this policy was an integrated approach by all ministries concerned, involving the reorganisation of their functions, the devolution of powers from central to local government, and a policy of financial and other aid to encourage local initiative.

Four government Working Parties were appointed from senior officials of departments to

consider the Robinson Commission's Report. They provided a sorting process through which the findings not only of this commission but of the other enquiries were examined. The Paterson Commission had not yet reported but the Working Parties were appraised of its impending recommendations. They also took into consideration the practical implications of Dr. Green's proposals. The result was the submission to the Cabinet of a broad plan for the implementation of community development and local government as national policy in Rhodesia.

NEW DIRECTION

The new policy was formally set out in a Statement of Policy and Directive issued by the Prime Minister in July 1965 which said that:

community development . . . may be summed up in so far as central Government's role is concerned, as an active, planned and organized effort to place *responsibility* for decision-making in local affairs on the freely chosen representatives of responsible people at the community and local government levels, and to assist people to acquire the attitudes, knowledge, skills and resources required to solve, through communal self-help and organization, as wide a range of *local* problems as possible in their own order of priority.²⁹

The distinctive feature of the community development process in Rhodesian policy was its identification with local government, a direct outcome of the historical pathway along which the policy had been reached. The identity of association between the two concepts was in line with the trends in international thinking. Evaluation of community development experience in various parts of the world had led the United Nations Organization to put forward the proposal for the 1961-1971 Development Decade, that special attention should be paid by all member countries to 'the closer identification of community development with local government'.³⁰

The Prime Minister's Directive instructed Ministries as follows:

That the process of community development implies the organization and development of responsible, self-reliant and coherent communities within a comprehensive multi-purpose framework of local government. This means the promotion, at the local government level, of viable, formal statutory local government councils with their subsidiary functional organs in the form of com-

mittees for agriculture, natural resources, education, etc.; and at the community level, of informal or formal community boards. It is through this network that all ministries will work...³¹

The statement envisaged community development promoted simultaneously on two planes: through encouraging small communities to organize themselves and establish community boards for neighbourhood development, advancing gradually to local government status; and through encouraging groups of communities to form more sophisticated organizations in the direct form of African councils.

Every ministry of government was instructed by the Directive to redefine its functions in conformity with the policy, to plan the necessary changes in its organization, and to arrange for personnel to be reoriented to the new emphasis in approach.

ROLE OF EDUCATION

The major ministry to come under examination in terms of the Prime Minister's Directive was the Ministry of Education. The observation had been made in 1953 by the Howman Report that the objective for which the African population were most eager to undertake community action was education. In 1962 a Commission under the chairmanship of Professor A. V. Judges inquired into the whole question of education in Rhodesia. Evidence accumulated by the commission indicated that local people in African rural areas were anxious to play a larger part in controlling the primary schools, which had to a large extent been built and equipped by their efforts.

Substantial evidence had been forthcoming from the side of the missions, in their turn, to indicate that many were concerned at the volume of purely educational work in which they had become involved. It was felt that these services far outweighed the amount of schooling originally found necessary for evangelical purposes. The Judges Commission linked these findings with the conclusion reached by earlier enquiries that the time had come for local people to participate more actively in local development:

The policy in this country in common with all rapidly developing territories, must be to encourage an attitude of mind among all its peoples so that they will readily recognize their responsibilities and accept opportunities to participate actively and imaginatively in programmes that add to their prosperity. It is in the field of education that this spirit of

conscious involvement finds a most ready expression; and this perhaps is the point at which to bring encouragement to bear.³²

The commission urged the institution of local education authorities either as *ad hoc* boards or as instruments of general-purpose popular councils. The commission observed that the finances of the missions were fully extended. Those of the central government should more properly be devoted to the costly provision of secondary schooling, higher education and teacher training, rather than primary education which of itself yielded little return. Local government offered a resource which had largely been untapped in the provision of primary education in Rhodesia, although local authorities in other countries, such as Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda, Malawi and Zambia, carried a full share of responsibility in this field.

It was largely in keeping with the findings of the Judges Commission that the decision was taken in principle by the Rhodesian Government in 1963, that future responsibility for the provision of primary education should 'fall mainly upon local government and its constituent communities'.³³ Up to that time responsibility for the administration of primary schools had been largely the function of mission authorities, with the cost of teachers' salaries subsidised 100 per cent by the government,* whilst the buildings or funds for buildings, books and equipment were provided by the parents of pupils. The policy of the government was to devote its resources, where practicable, to encouraging local people to accept responsibility for the provision of local services in which they had a vested interest. It was logically consistent with the national policy of community development that monies formerly allocated to missions in respect of primary education, should in future be diverted to local councils wishing to carry out this work. Rigorous controls over standards of education, teachers' conditions of service, and so on, would be preserved as far as possible.

In accordance with this policy a five-year programme to be phased over the period 1967 to 1972 was devised under which teachers' salary-subsidies in respect of new schools or new streams established in existing schools would gradually be made available to councils in place of mission authorities. Future primary schools initiated by the missions would be eligible for

*This figure was reduced to 95 per cent as from 1 January 1971.

assistance on the lower level of subsidy available to private schools. Incentives to councils to provide clinic and preventive health services were offered in the form of grant and other assistance. A suitable division of responsibility between central and local government was arrived at in the areas of road construction, provision of water supplies, dipping and other services. In order to help African councils to meet the cost of their new responsibilities, a review was completed in 1970, of grants for administrative purposes, and extensive assistance was made available towards meeting the cost of employing suitably qualified staff.

The result of the policy of community development and local government was a striking increase in the number of African councils. These rose from 55 in 1962 to 60 in 1965, then multiplied rapidly to 102 by November 1970. This represented more than 50 per cent of the total of 200 estimated as the potential for the country. Community boards numbered 274,³⁴ out of a possible total equivalent to at least the 970 'communities' which had been delineated.³⁵ How much the increase in councils was due to the efforts of district commissioners and their staff in encouraging communities to organize themselves; how much to the effects of the new policy in education; and how much to the incentives provided for councils to run health and other services, are questions for further research. The mushroom growth in councils, however, had two corollaries. The first was the intensified training provided for chiefs, headmen, council-members and staff for the better performance of their new functions. The second

was the reduced attention which it was possible to give to informal community action and the establishment of community boards to serve neighbourhood needs and provide a link between councils and their constituents.

Several questions arise from the trends observable in community development in Rhodesia up to the end of 1970. How soon will it be possible for the second prong of the policy, namely to mobilize village resources and encourage community boards, to be given sufficient attention to ensure popular participation in local affairs in all areas? How far is the education policy, as some suggest, an anomaly in 'enforcing' self-help upon rural communities, and how far is it a legitimate attempt to link the community development process with national planning? Finally, how far can the policy of strengthening the power of the chiefs be further applied to local government, without undermining the principles of responsible citizenship upon which the concept of community development is founded?

It is suggested that the historical origins of the policy should be reviewed in attempting to answer these questions. Direct methods to inculcate better practices down the years, were met in the main with apathy if not resentment. The problem was how to inspire rural people not only to participate in measures for their own advancement, but to pursue them with initiative, responsibility and persistence. The justification or otherwise for any feature of the policy must be the measure to which it achieves its purpose in activating people spontaneously to mobilize their resources for local development.

REFERENCES

1. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1911 *Report of the Native Affairs Committee of Enquiry 1910-11*. Salisbury, Government Printer, A 12, para. 106.
2. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1920 *Report by H. S. Keigwin Native Commissioner on the Suggested Development of Natives*. Salisbury, Government Printer, A 7.
3. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1924 *Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the Cost of Administration of the Colony of Southern Rhodesia*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 20, para. 238.
4. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1925 *Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the matter of Native Education in all its bearings in the Colony of Southern Rhodesia*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 20.
5. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1947 *Report of the Secretary for Native Affairs, Chief Native Commissioner and Director of Native Development for the year 1946*. Attached Annual Report of the Director of Native Agriculture. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 48, pp. 38, 44.
6. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1962 *Report of the Secretary for Native Affairs and Chief Native Commissioner for the year 1961*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 28, p. 25.
7. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1949 *Report of the Secretary for Native Affairs, Chief Native Commissioner and Director of Native Development for the year 1948*. Attached Annual Report of the Director of Native Agriculture. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 27, p. 78.
8. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1939 *Report of the Commission appointed to enquire into the Preservation of the Natural Resources of the Colony*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 40.
9. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1945 *Report of the Native Production and Trade Commission 1944*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 2, p. 26.

10. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1963 *Report of the Secretary for Internal Affairs and Chief Native Commissioner for the year 1962*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 27, p. 16.
11. SOUTHERN RHODESIA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY 1960 *Report of the Select Committee on the Resettlement of Natives*. Salisbury, Government Printer, LASC 3, para 64.
12. *IBID.*, para. 172.
13. *IBID.*, para. 43.
14. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1961 *Report of the Mangwende Reserve Commission of Inquiry 1961*. Salisbury, mimeographed, para. 79.
15. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1962 *Report of the Secretary for Native Affairs and Chief Native Commissioner for the year 1961*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 28, p. 27.
16. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1937 *Report of the Chief Native Commissioner for the year 1936*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 9, p. 9.
17. *Report for 1948* [see note 7 above], p. 5.
18. HOWMAN, H. R. G. 1956 *African Leadership in Transition*. NADA, 33, 13.
19. HOWMAN, H. R. G. 1953 *Report on African Local Government for Southern Rhodesia*. Salisbury, Department of Native Affairs, mimeographed.
20. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1957 *Debates of the Legislative Assembly*. Salisbury, Government Printer, 39, col. 1023.
21. *Report of the Mangwende Reserve Commission of Inquiry*, para. 109.
22. GREAT BRITAIN 1958 *Community Development: A Handbook*. London, HMSO for Colonial Office.
23. MEZIROW, J. D. 1962 'Direction and Scope of Community Development', Berkeley, University of California, Community Development Project, mimeographed, p. 1.
24. UNITED NATIONS 1963 *Community Development and National Development: Report by an ad hoc Group of Experts appointed by the Secretary-General*. New York, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, p. 4.
25. GREEN, J. W. 1962 'Report on African Development and Local Government in Southern Rhodesia: Part One, Native Councils', Salisbury, mimeographed, p. 3.
26. The French equivalent of the community development worker at village-level. The term was not utilised by Dr. Green, but is used here for its aptness.
27. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1961 *Report of the Commission appointed to Inquire into and report on the Administrative and Judicial Functions in the Native Affairs and District Courts Departments*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 22.
28. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1962 *First and Second Reports of the Commission of Inquiry into the Organisation and Development of the Southern Rhodesia Public Services*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 9 and 35.
29. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1965 *Local Government and Community Development: The Roll [sic] of Ministries and Co-ordination. Statement of Policy and Directive by the Prime Minister*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 44, para. 7.
30. UNITED NATIONS 1962 *The United Nations Development Decade. Proposals for Action*. Report of the Secretary-General. New York, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, p. 38.
31. *Local Government and Community Development*, para. 16(c).
32. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1963 *Report of the Southern Rhodesia Education Commission*. Salisbury, Government Printer, CSR 37, para. 795.
33. SOUTHERN RHODESIA 1963 *Ministerial Statement on African Education and Community Development*. Salisbury, Information Service, Release No. 83, 17 May, mimeographed, p. 4.
34. Information from the Ministry of Internal Affairs.
35. LATHAM, C. J. K. 1966 Delineating Communities in Rural Rhodesia. *Rhod. Community Dev. Rev.* 1 (ii), 8-10. Communities in the African rural areas were delineated over a period of four years by a four-man team of district officers, the leader of whom was a trained anthropologist. The work was initiated under the direction of Dr. James Green and the definition of community utilised was: 'Community is a locality (geographic entity) whose boundaries are defined by the people living in it and recognised by them as an entity, and in which there are a number of institutions (family, economic, educational, religious, etc.) serving their basic needs, a sense of togetherness within the locality which exceeds any sense of togetherness with outsiders that they may have, and a potential to work together in matters of common need.' Communities as so defined were found, by the reconnaissance method of enquiry, to coincide largely with the headman's ward or *dunhu*.