

Second Edition

# Community Development in Canada

Jason D. Brown  
University of Western Ontario

David Hannis  
Grant MacEwan University

2012

**Pearson Canada**  
Toronto

## Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Brown, Jason, 1968–

Community development in Canada / Jason D. Brown, David Hannis. — 2nd ed.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-205-75470-0

I. Community development—Canada—Textbooks. I. Hannis, David, 1945–  
II. Title.

HN110.Z9C6 2012

307.1'40971

C2010-905918-2

Copyright © 2012, 2008 by Pearson Canada Inc., Toronto, Ontario.

Pearson Prentice Hall. All rights reserved. This publication is protected by copyright and permission should be obtained from the publisher prior to any prohibited reproduction, storage in a retrieval system, or transmission in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or likewise. For information regarding permission, write to the Permissions Department.

ISBN 978-0-20-575470-0

Vice President, Editorial Director: Gary Bennett

Editor-in-Chief: Ky Pruesse

Editor, Humanities and Social Sciences: Joel Gladstone

Marketing Manager: Lisa Gillis

Development Editor: Rema Celio

Project Manager: Cheryl Noseworthy

Production Editor: Raj Singh / MPS

Copy Editor: Caroline Kaiser

Proofreader: Melissa Churchill

Composition: MPS Limited, a Macmillan Company

Art Director: Julia Hall

Cover Design: Anthony Leung

Cover Image: GettyImages

1 2 3 4 5    15 14 13 12 11

Printed and bound in United States of America.



# Introduction to Community Development

## LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After reading this chapter, you will be able to

1. Distinguish between top-down and bottom-up approaches to community development.
2. Identify the main features of community development process and practice.
3. Apply factors that can have a negative effect on communities.
4. Apply factors that can have a positive effect on communities.
5. Understand different perceived roles of a community developer.
6. Understand that there is a range of initiatives across Canada that exemplify community development.

The wide range of definitions for *community* and *community development* shows that no two communities or processes are exactly alike. Yet there are some challenges that many communities face, as well as strengths they possess, that can be relevant in community development efforts. While communities are of central importance to individual and family well-being, human services and health professionals often pay little attention to working at the community level. There are several reasons why community development work is difficult for these professionals and their employers to understand and appreciate, which we will discuss in Chapter Seven. However, the results of community development work can have multiple and significant positive effects on an entire community. In this chapter, we review some definitions of community development before turning our attention to factors that weaken and strengthen communities. We identify some perceptions about community development practice, and provide examples of how community development addresses basic needs in different locations across Canada.

## WHAT IS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT?

There are many definitions of *community development*, and they vary considerably, based on their goals and approaches. One way to distinguish definitions from one another is to recognize the differences between those that imply a top-down versus a bottom-up approach. **Top-down** approaches impose a goal and often a process on a community. From a top-down perspective, the goal of community development and the way that goal will be achieved are already defined. For example, let's say a developer wants to purchase land in a community for commercial interests. She or he may organize a community meeting to discuss the matter with local residents. Attendees at such a meeting may include

high-ranking political officials who support the initiative, which may lead to an increase to the civic tax base. The developer's purpose, in this example, is to get community support for the idea by persuading community members that the proposed project would be good for them in the long run. In this example, the community does not determine the goal and approach; rather, the developer imposes both. Sometimes these kinds of initiatives are characterized as community development or community-building activities. But few contemporary community workers with grassroots connections would support this approach.

Instead, the bottom-up approach has received most of the attention and support of scholars and activists, as well as grassroots leaders and community members. A **bottom-up** approach assumes that the community determines the appropriate goals and objectives for itself. Indeed, there are many definitions of this perspective. The goals of development differ, depending on the community. However, they often revolve around people coming together to "gain some control over . . . a frustrating and changing world" (Biddle & Biddle, 1965, p. 78). The need to gain control over externally imposed conditions is important for any local community development work (Bhattacharyya, 1995). Bottom-up community development may begin in response to a local issue, such as local substance-use problems, or in response to an externally imposed condition. One example of an imposed external condition would be the arrival of the logging industry to a small, remote community without the community's consent and involvement. This would have multiple impacts, some of which, if not managed appropriately, would be negative. For example, the arrival of the logging industry could diminish the quality of life in the community (e.g., new bars will open, housing will be less available); create inequities within the community (e.g., some community members might get new jobs while others will not); compromise democratic functioning (e.g., the industry executives could become significant influences); restrict community members' potential (e.g., logging might become the main industry in the community); and strip away a sense of community while reinforcing the myth of individualism (Rubin & Rubin, 2001). In response to this externally imposed condition (i.e., the arrival of the logging industry), the goals of bottom-up community development may be to restore quality of life, diminish inequities, reinstate democratic functioning, enhance members' potential, and restore a sense of community among members.

Community development is, fundamentally, a democratic and social process (Minkler, 1990). It is "a process that increases the assets and attributes which a community is able to draw upon in order to improve their lives" (Gibbon, Labonte, & Laverack, 2002, p. 485). As well, community development is "people acting collectively with others who share some common concern" (Checkoway, 1997, p. 13). It is "the capacity of local populations to respond collectively to events and issues that affect them" (Gilchrist, 2003, p. 16). Finally, community development is "working with people at a local level to promote active participation in identifying local needs and organizing to meet those needs" (Wright, 2004, p. 386). The success of community development work depends on "collective problem-solving, self-help, and empowerment" (Schiele, Jackson, & Fairfax, 2005, p. 22).

The sustainability of community development efforts is important, and ways to ensure longevity can be informal or formalized. For example, informally identifying issues and problems and then generating and applying plans for change can enhance strength and self-sufficiency, and aid in maintaining strong interpersonal relationships (Williams, Labonte, & O'Brien, 2003). Others suggest that the sustainability of community

development efforts requires local people to “form their own organizations to provide a long-term capacity for problem-solving” (Rubin & Rubin, 2001, p. 3).

Another way to describe community development is to distinguish it from other forms of community work (Poppo, 1995). **Community development** emphasizes self-help and mutual support, and it also enhances local capacity for problem solving and promotes collective action to bring matters to political decision makers. **Community action**, on the other hand, focuses on direct action against public or non-public bodies that perpetuate structural divisions in society. **Community organization** is about collaborating with community agencies to promote joint initiatives, while **social planning** is concerned with assessing needs and capacities for the purpose of program planning and evaluation. And **service extension** seeks to expand the services of local agencies to meet the needs of underserved members of the community.

## NURTURING COMMUNITY

Community development takes different forms and paths depending on local needs and assets. However, there are some general factors that have an impact on a community's strength. We have identified 13 factors that have either negative or positive impacts on communities. Every community has its own unique blend of needs and challenges, and different factors may be more or less of a priority than others. The list that follows is not exhaustive, but offers a starting point for discussions about purposes and approaches for local community development.

### Factors That Weaken Communities

Factors that weaken communities include a lack of a sense of history, stigma, transience, and fragmentation, and a lack of services, local decision making, and boundaries.

**Lack of a Sense of Collective History** A lack of a shared understanding about our history can make us feel disconnected from present realities and destined to repeat the mistakes of the past. This can be true at both local and national levels. The starting point for building a sense of community is often interviewing older residents, reviewing records, and gathering artifacts that tell us something about our collective past and allow us to celebrate our culture.

**Stigma** No one wants to live in a community that the outside world perceives as second-rate or dangerous. In such places, people may feel ashamed, fearful of their neighbourhoods, unwilling to make a long-term commitment to the area, and anxious to move on as quickly as possible. Rates of illness, crime, addictions, and other social problems may be high in such communities.

**High Mobility** All neighbourhoods go through natural evolutionary cycles as families age, children move away, and the elderly relocate. This movement poses problems for planners, who periodically have to contend with underutilized schools, churches, and other facilities in aging communities.

A certain amount of transience is to be expected in any community. When the rate of movement, however, becomes unacceptably high, it can affect the quality of life for all

residents. Often, safety is a concern when people don't know their neighbourhoods and when they are reluctant to invest the time in getting to know them.

**Fragmentation** Another factor that can weaken a neighbourhood is the existence of people from different social classes and ethnic backgrounds who do not work together. Planners have sometimes attempted to avoid the creation of stigmatized communities by, for example, dispersing social housing across a range of different communities. However, this strategy has not always been successful. Unless deliberate effort is made to view diversity as community strength, people will interact with those from their own social class and ethnic group exclusively and ignore or label others. When communities are fractured, it is difficult to work toward common goals, and blaming can become widespread.

In some communities, the tensions arising from perceived social and ethnic differences are often felt most acutely by children in schools and take the form of bullying, name-calling, racism, and the formation of gangs. It is difficult to build a sense of identity when such behaviours are allowed to continue unchecked.

**Lack of Services** If you've ever watched the British soap opera *Coronation Street*, you were likely struck by the amount of commercial activity taking place in that relatively small geographic area. There is the pub—the Rover's Return—a school, a sweet shop, a grocery store, a garage, a small factory, a café, a taxi company, a hairdresser, and, not too far away, a supermarket. A seniors' residence is close by, and apparently there is enough work in the area to support several self-employed people, including a window cleaner and a builder. This is, of course, a TV show. The chances of finding such a self-contained community in Britain are almost as remote as finding one here in Canada, although such communities were widespread 50 years ago.

Today, one issue facing urban and rural communities alike has been the loss of such locally owned businesses. Go into any urban community, and the chances of finding a neighbourhood corner store, bank, post office, drugstore, hardware store, or other owner-operated business are increasingly unlikely. Similarly, in many rural communities, small local businesses have closed their doors as their former clients have deserted them in favour of stores located in distant urban centres. Governments and other large organizations, including banks, grain elevators, companies, and railroads, have often compounded this problem: many have closed local operations in the name of greater economic efficiency. As local services begin to disappear, so too do residents, which causes an overall deterioration in the quality of life for those who remain behind.

**Lack of Local Decision-Making Authority** A strong community is one where residents feel they have some control over the decisions that affect them. The quickest way to encourage apathy and learned helplessness is to remove people's ability to have real input into decision-making processes at the local level. Too often, community consultation simply never takes place at all. If it does, it is interpreted as merely informing residents about decisions that have already been made, rather than engaging in constructive and open dialogue early in the decision-making process.

When decisions are arrived at collectively, honestly, and respectfully, more people are likely to be committed to the project's eventual success. Conversely, when individuals feel that no one is really interested in listening to them, or that they have been manipulated, they become demoralized and apathetic. They are also less willing to become

energetic and collaborative members of the community. For example, some years ago in a large Canadian city, parks planners became frustrated when their attempts to beautify a neighbourhood by planting trees always ended in failure because local youths repeatedly vandalized the saplings. In dismay, they were ready to give up until one person had the bright idea of consulting the community, which, in turn, suggested that the youths themselves should be involved in this process. The result was that the young people decided that they would like to plant their own trees in their community. The parks department provided the trees and technical support, the trees were planted, and the vandalism came to an end.

**Lack of Boundaries** People can be somewhat territorial. In our communities we often identify with geographic areas that are surrounded by natural barriers, such as arterial roads, railroad tracks, rivers, and so forth. In the early 1970s, Oscar Newman (1973), an innovative architect and urban planner in the U.S., coined the phrase *defensible space* to describe this phenomenon.

Oscar Newman's thesis was that at the neighbourhood level, we can design communities in a way that can encourage (or discourage) interaction between neighbours, and, by giving residents some sense of psychological control over public areas, vandalism and crime rates can be reduced. Thus, in some areas, residents of public housing high-rises have been given the right to paint the common areas on the floors outside their apartments a colour of their choice and even to hold block parties there, which has promoted a stronger sense of community.

## Factors That Strengthen Communities

Factors that strengthen communities include the presence of a wide range of organizations, a sense of identity, a gathering place, a common need, good transportation, and participation in decisions about land use.

**Active Voluntary Organizations** John McKnight, a community organizer from the U.S., mentioned that one of the first things he does when he visits a new community is to look in the Yellow Pages under the heading **Voluntary Organizations** to get a sense of the health of that community (McKnight & Kretzmann, 1994). Many communities have multiple listings under Associations, Societies, and Foundations, and there are probably countless more. In addition, many have an extensive network of community leagues and social, recreational, and sometimes political events in neighbourhoods. While these non-profit organizations are often struggling to fulfill their mandates and raise funds, their existence suggests that not all communities have surrendered all of their functions to distant bureaucracies. McKnight has argued that the more functions the community provides, the stronger our democracy, and that, conversely, without vibrant communities our democracy is dead (McKnight, 1995).

**Identity** One of the first tasks a community worker often has when entering a community is to recognize evidence of collective pride through recorded history, or a logo for a community organization or sports team. Fun-filled events, such as carnivals and street dances, can bring a community together. Local newspapers, newsletters, and skills-exchange opportunities also play a useful role in promoting a sense of community identity.

**Community Centre** A focal point where residents can meet together informally is important for the creation of a vibrant community.

**Common Need or Enemy** People are often much more willing to be collaborative when they are confronting a common issue. Senior citizens in Britain, for instance, are often heard talking about the wonderful community spirit that existed during World War II. And the loss of commitment to mutuality and co-operation, which once existed among the settlers on the Prairies, is an often-voiced concern among older Canadians.

**Good Transportation Systems** One challenge facing urban planners is how to move traffic from the ever-expanding suburbs to the downtown core without eroding the quality of life in some of the older, more centrally located neighbourhoods. Good transportation systems outside neighbourhoods, including roads, public transit, sidewalks, and bike paths, and well-designed safe roads within communities, have a major impact on those communities.

**Balanced Land-Use Plans** Strong communities have adequate parklands, accessible services, a good supply of well-maintained housing, a strong economic base, and well-developed land-use plans to manage population density and design and promote sustainable development.

## SOME MYTHS ABOUT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT WORK

Community development work is still not well understood, as the following example from one of the authors' work experiences illustrates:

Several years ago I resigned my position as the director of a small community development team in a municipal social services department in England and was on my way to Canada. As I said my farewells to some of the other workers in this rather conservative organization, I vividly recall Alice's effusive handshake as she wished me well. "Goodbye," she declared. "I still don't know what you do, but you seem to be a good guy." This apparent ignorance from someone I had spent many hours trying to educate about my role was disappointing, but not entirely unexpected. This was not to be the first time I would come across such a lack of understanding about the nature of community work from people in the human services field. Professionals who schedule their time tightly and well and see most of their clients in their offices can't always fathom what community workers do during their frequent absences from the office. Yet the fact that the "burnout" rate is relatively high among neighbourhood workers suggests that their task might actually be more demanding than it at first appears. (David Hannis, personal recollection)

Part of the challenge of doing community development work is dealing with how it is perceived by other professionals in the human services field. Indeed, from our experience, there are several beliefs about community work that we have heard from colleagues that do not necessarily fit with our experiences of the job.

## **Myth 1: Community Work Is Easy**

Professional community-work practitioners sometimes have difficulty justifying what they do to their busy office-based colleagues, to administrators, and to their employers. To outsiders, community workers can seem to be fairly disorganized and unaccountable. They come in late in the morning (because they go to a lot of meetings at night) and produce few immediate and tangible results from their work (because good process takes time). Their activities sometimes encourage community members to make waves and upset politicians (that is what participatory democracy is all about), and they are sometimes seen as being too critical of conventional ways of addressing social need (i.e., having philosophical and practical differences). Community work is never easy. It is difficult to maintain a normal family/social life when so much of your time is spent working at night (often immersed in emotionally draining activities) for employers who may be indifferent, or even hostile, toward the activities being pursued. To minimize some of these tensions, it is important that clear job descriptions exist, and that workers know their boundaries.

## **Myth 2: Anyone with a Professional Credential or a Big Heart Can Be Effective**

Many excellent community workers lack formal qualifications, yet seem to have an instinct for this type of work. Conversely, some well-credentialed professionals have difficulty grasping the egalitarian nature of this type of practice. Part of the problem is the lack of opportunities over the past couple of decades for people to access good community-work training.

## **Myth 3: Community Services Are Well Funded**

Historically, many social services were delivered by non-government agencies. Later, these agencies were gradually taken over by bureaucratized organizations. For the past few years, in the wake of downsizing, a rediscovery of community has been accompanied by attempts to return services to the community. In some cases, this represents the dumping of complex tasks onto communities that are not appropriately funded to deal with them.

## **Myth 4: All Communities Are Democratic**

Sometimes policy-makers assume that the person speaking on behalf of a community is well informed, accountable, and elected. This is not always true. People purporting to represent a community may, in fact, be speaking for themselves or only for a particular interest group. Community organizations often have difficulty filling elected positions, and acclamation is an all-too-frequent occurrence. Under such conditions, the ablest citizens may not be invited to represent the community.

### **Myth 5: All Communities Speak with One Voice**

Communities are diverse and multi-faceted. Too often, however, policy-makers hear only the loudest voice. It is important that organizations committed to listening to the community ensure that they use effective processes for involving a broad range of opinions.

### **Myth 6: Outcomes Are Easy to Measure**

Since the process of effective community work is often slow, preventive, and “transformative,” it is difficult to provide administrators with the kind of hard evidence of effectiveness they favour. You can count volunteer hours, gather the socioeconomic characteristics of the persons served, document the number of hours worked and tasks performed, and ask people to supply some subjective data. But these figures do not really capture the essence of community work. For this reason, it is often difficult to assess the effectiveness of interventions at the community level.

### **Myth 7: Solutions Are Easy to Find and Implement**

The origins of many of the problems apparent at the community level are structural in nature. Examples include unemployment caused by the globalization of trade, poverty resulting from gender inequalities, and marginalization reflecting the pervasiveness of racism. Solutions to such difficulties are hard to find and implement at the local level—but finding them is certainly not impossible, as many strong community groups and organizations can attest!

### **Myth 8: Community Development Is the Same in All Communities**

Most community development textbooks are written by urban-based experts and founded on urban-based practice. Working in a rural setting, however, reflects different realities. The distribution of power is much more transparent in small communities, and the activities of community workers can be more visible. Small communities frequently have fewer financial resources, although the diversity of human skills is often great. Under such circumstances, attempting to organize local people to gain greater access to resources can be a particularly challenging undertaking.

## **EXAMPLES: MEETING BASIC NEEDS**

Community development is not a universal solution for resolving all of the complex social issues of our time. But, as the following examples demonstrate, many communities have come together to effectively address some of their basic needs for food, shelter, employment, safety, and a sense of place.

### **Food**

Increasing concerns about food additives, genetic modification, preservation of the environment, and the promotion of sustainable, small-scale farming practices, have led to many creative community responses toward producing food and beautifying the urban environment. Examples include community gardens, farmers’ markets, community

kitchens, co-operative greenhouses, and farmer-direct purchasing schemes. In Canada, some examples of these innovative community activities include Providence Farm on Vancouver Island, British Columbia, and Churchill Park Greenhouse Co-op Association in Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan. Both of these initiatives also provide employment opportunities for people born with developmental handicaps. The Raging Spoon, a restaurant on Toronto's trendy Queen St. West, hires survivors of mental illness. Field to Table, a non-profit Toronto-based organization, supplies "Good Food Boxes" to low-income families. Restaurants in Toronto (Rivers) and Edmonton (Kids in the Hall) provide training and work experience for at-risk youth. In Winnipeg's inner city, the Neechi Foods Co-operative Limited is an Aboriginal, worker-owned retail food co-operative store (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2006b; Roberts, Macrae, & Stahlbrand, 1999).

## Shelter

Intentional communities have a long history in Canada. They became popular in the 1960s. In many urban centres, for example, housing co-operatives, where people live together in stigma-free, affordable, diverse, supportive communities, have been around in Canada for several decades. Co-operative housing, where residents live in intentional communities but own, rather than rent, their units, is a more recent initiative. And an even more recent trend in Canada has been the development of land trusts, which attempt to provide affordable housing by creating non-profit trusts that own the lots on which the owner-occupied housing is built. In Canada, the first of these was in Quebec City and the second was in Edmonton, Alberta. Such trusts provide affordable family housing and also rejuvenate some of the older inner-city neighbourhoods. In Winnipeg, Just Housing, a neighbourhood revitalization project, is purchasing and renovating older homes and hiring social assistance recipients to receive the training to carry out that work. The houses are made available on a rent-to-own or non-profit rental basis (McIntyre, 1998).

## Employment

Many of the examples already mentioned have strengthened community while providing local employment. One consequence of globalization and the growth of big business has been **financial leakage**: profits earned locally have drained away to more distant places. Local economic development initiatives stem this flow of capital and recycle money through the community. Some communities have gone one step further and moved toward a barter system, much to the chagrin of Revenue Canada. Thus, in Calgary, members of the Arusha Centre can exchange hundreds of goods and services using a local scrip equal to \$10 of Bank of Canada money (Roberts, Macrae, & Stahlbrand, 1999).

In addition, a steady and escalating interest in job creation at the local level has resulted in a number of creative economic development initiatives. In Toronto, survivors of mental illness have formed their own courier service, and in Edmonton, the Women's Economic and Business Solutions Society (WEBBS) has been established as a non-profit business incubator to provide employment for women. One of its first initiatives has been to facilitate the training of women as carpenters and, in the process, enhance the earning potential of these women.

Some of these micro-businesses have been funded by Community Loan Funds, which provide low-interest loans to individuals wanting to set up small businesses. In Edmonton,

the Community Loan Fund was founded in 1995 and now has a capital base of over \$1 million. Many loans, ranging from \$300 to \$10 000, have been made with a default rate of about 3 percent on the total amount of funds loaned. This rate is much lower than that given by banks lending only to qualified recipients.

## Safety

In recent years, some police departments have rediscovered the advantages of community policing. Beat cops have become a more regular feature of our communities. In addition, initiatives such as Block Parents and Neighbourhood Watch encourage citizens to play a more vital role in crime prevention. In Edmonton, a Safer Cities initiative has nurtured closer ties between citizens and policy-makers around such issues as street prostitution. This initiative has also sponsored partnerships between police officers and social workers in tackling, for example, spousal violence and elder abuse.

## Sense of Place

While policy-makers do not always instinctively listen to citizens, many progressive jurisdictions have established mechanisms to enhance citizen participation and promote a stronger sense of community identity. Again in Edmonton, efforts have been made to encourage more residential housing downtown, and community workers have been actively engaged in promoting vital neighbourhoods. In addition, a citizen action project in a central district has recently received funding to undertake some important community work, and another group of citizens has established a coalition of representatives from churches, trade unions, adult education institutions, and social service agencies to work toward greater structural change at the community level by using some of the organizing principles pioneered by the late Saul Alinsky, the “father of community organizing.” We will discuss the contributions of Alinsky in Chapter Three.

## Summary

- Community development is defined as a community-led process.
- Community development can be distinguished from community action, community organization, social planning, and service extension.
- There are several factors that weaken communities, including a lack of collective history, stigma, high mobility, fragmentation, and a lack of services, local decision-making authority, and boundaries.
- There are several factors that strengthen communities, including active voluntary organizations, a community centre, a common need, good transportation, and balanced land-use plans.
- There are several myths about community development work, including the following: it is easy, any individual can be effective, services are well funded, all communities are democratic and speak with one voice, outcomes are easy to measure, solutions are easy to find, and community development is the same in every community.
- Community development has been effective at addressing basic local needs in different communities across Canada.

## Discussion Questions

1. How do you see community development? What parts of the definitions resonate with your experiences?
2. What are the pros and cons of top-down and bottom-up community work?
3. Are there factors missing from the list in this chapter that weaken or strengthen communities?
4. What rewards would you anticipate from doing community development work?
5. In your communities, what development initiatives could be used to address basic needs, such as food, shelter, employment, safety, and sense of place? What challenges would you anticipate?

## Weblinks

[www.well.com/~bbear/hc\\_articles.html](http://www.well.com/~bbear/hc_articles.html) The Change Project

<http://comm-dev.org/> Community Development Society

[www.sfu.ca/cscd/](http://www.sfu.ca/cscd/) Centre for Sustainable Community Development

[www.hrsdc.gc.ca/en/gateways/topics/cyd-gxr.shtml](http://www.hrsdc.gc.ca/en/gateways/topics/cyd-gxr.shtml) Human Resources and Development Canada

[www.newwestced.bc.ca/](http://www.newwestced.bc.ca/) New Westminister Community Development Society

[www.enterweb.org/community.htm](http://www.enterweb.org/community.htm) Community Development on ENTERWeb

[www.manitobamarketplace.com/toolbox.html](http://www.manitobamarketplace.com/toolbox.html) Manitoba Community Development Toolbox



## Key Terms

Bottom-up development,  
p. 9

Community action, p. 10

Community development,  
p. 10

Community organization,  
p. 10

Defensible space, p. 12

Financial leakage, p. 16

Service extension, p. 10

Social planning, p. 10

Top-down development,  
p. 8

Voluntary organizations,  
p. 12

# History of Community Development

## LEARNING OBJECTIVES

**After reading this chapter, you will be able to**

1. Describe historical events that illustrate community development.
2. Recognize the role of government and local communities in community development during Canada's postwar period.
3. Understand the roles played by international figures in contemporary community development.
4. Understand the part played by indigenous and Western figures in Canadian community development practice.
5. Compare and contrast the styles, circumstances, approaches, and effects of six key influences on Canadian community development.

Various influences have shaped contemporary community development. For example, some of the prominent figures in the field—through their own personal style and the circumstances in which they found themselves—have had a major impact on the evolution of community development in North America. Some influences can be traced back to Biblical times, and some indigenous influences can be traced to the time before Europeans landed in North America. (These influences are covered in detail in Chapter Nine.) Community organizers who have made significant contributions to Canadian community development include three Americans. Two of these individuals—Jane Addams and Saul Alinsky—worked in Chicago's urban core neighbourhoods, and the other—Myles Horton—hailed from rural Tennessee. The Brazilian educator Paulo Freire has also had a significant impact on community development practice in Canada. Canadians Jimmy Tompkins and Moses Coady from Antigonish, Nova Scotia, as well as Georges Erasmus from the Dene community of Rae Edzo in the Northwest Territories, have made tremendous contributions in their own country. In this chapter, we briefly introduce some leaders who have shaped community development in Canada, and then profile the seven leaders mentioned above, who are often referred to in contemporary community practice literature. The leaders' profiles include attention to their personal styles, settings they worked in, their approaches, as well as the impact of their efforts.

## HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

It is difficult to determine exactly when community development as an intentional activity began. The Old Testament tells of how Moses and his brother Aaron organized one of the first recorded non-violent revolutions in history when they encouraged the Israelites to band together and begin their great exodus to escape the oppression of the Egyptians. Centuries later, Saul of Tarsus (St. Paul) organized the first Christian communities into small, strong communities founded on principles of equality and sharing. Years later in medieval Italy, St. Francis of Assisi, in response to the poverty and corruption that existed around him, began to organize religious communities dedicated to the relief of suffering. His pioneering work provided the impetus for a movement of religious orders that swept through all of Europe. In North America in the 1700s, the brilliant Shawnee organizer Tecumseh formed a powerful confederacy of North American Aboriginal peoples to act as a defence against the advancing Euro-Americans.

In the nineteenth century, the European **New Towns Movement** began with the pioneering work of Ebenezer Howard. This movement involved the creation of several new towns. Residents of the older cities were encouraged to relocate as community workers. They were among the first employees to be hired in these new communities, designed to facilitate healthy social networks. In Canada, new towns were created or moved throughout the West by the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR). The CPR, which held great power by virtue of the placement of train stations, was given title to the surrounding land by the federal government. In fact, the cities of Moose Jaw, Saskatchewan, and Medicine Hat, Alberta, were founded by the CPR (Berton, 2001).

The turn of the twentieth century witnessed the work of Jane Addams as the major founder of the Settlement House Movement in the U.S.; the work of Sylvia Pankhurst in organizing the women's suffrage movement in the U.K.; and the work of Mohandas K. Gandhi in advocating for India's oppressed people. More recently, the work of Chicago-based Saul Alinsky, Canada's Moses Coady, Brazil's Paulo Freire, Tennessee-based Myles Horton, César Chávez (who organized the United Farm Workers of America), and Dorothy Day and the Catholic Workers Movement are all examples of successful community organizers at work (Lee, 1999).

## Community Development After World War II

A particular push for community development strategies in Canada came after World War II. It became apparent during that time that the days of the British Empire were numbered. During the war, Britain had become so preoccupied with the hostilities that many of her colonies found themselves virtually abandoned. Consequently, these territories were forced to take more responsibility for running their own affairs. This development helped nurture a growing nationalism after the war. As the breakup of the British Empire became inevitable, the British authorities began to focus on helping their colonies prepare for independence. They did this by supporting community development and self-help initiatives aimed at building strong nations and maintaining loyalties to Britain.

In many of the colonies, the 1960s were seen as a "golden age" for community development. Economies were strong. Governments put a lot of money into social services. In Canada, the welfare state was growing. By the late sixties, medicare was born, the social safety net had been established, slums were being torn down, and more people than ever had access to an expanded post-secondary education system. Yet the perfect community

was still a long way off. People continued to live in poverty, despite the significant expenditures on social programs (Ife, 2002). The government began to look for new ways to combat this problem. As a result, more money became available to support innovative community-based initiatives.

Against a background of growing hostility toward the Vietnam War and the accompanying groundswell of anti-establishment feeling, the Canadian government began to fund the **Company of Young Canadians (CYC)**. In 1966, the CYC gave many youths a channel to funnel their energies into helping others; many were activists. However, the CYC ended in 1977; the fact that it was abolished so early is perhaps a testament to its success in bringing pressure to bear on the institutions of the time. (It also seems to support the adage that you should “never bite the hand that feeds you.”) Many important leaders are among the alumni of this organization, including Georges Erasmus, whom we profile in this chapter.

During the 1960s, the efforts of many community workers were focused on organizing the poor to take direct social action to secure a bigger piece of the “economic pie.” At the same time, many authorities stressed the need to reorganize the way social programs were delivered. During this time, for example, many multi-service, community-based centres were established. The federal government began appointing community developers to work in communities throughout the country, and some provincial departments for community development were created. Two examples of initiatives during this period are the Preventive Social Services Act in Alberta, and the creation of community-based neighbourhood centres in Quebec.

**Preventive Social Services Act** The 1966 **Preventive Social Services Act (PSS)** was introduced in Alberta during the last days of the Social Credit government and was a successful and relatively unusual community-based initiative (Bella, 1978). This unique legislation channelled federal and provincial funds toward both rural and urban municipalities, which were then required to determine their own priorities for preventive social programs. Local PSS boards were established, and PSS directors were hired to assist local people to address their own issues. Priority was given to programs designed to keep people off welfare, discourage dependency, promote family life, and encourage self-improvement (Bella, 1980). Local taxpayers bore 20 percent of the cost of these programs, with the remainder of the funds coming from the provincial government, which, in turn, could recoup some of its expenses from the federal government.

**Local Community Service Centres** The province of Quebec established the first of many neighbourhood-based health and social service centres (CLSCs or *centre local de services communautaires*) in 1970 with an emphasis on providing services responsive to local social and economic priorities. These centres continue to this day, with each centre serving populations of between 40 000 and 45 000 and employing community intervention practitioners to facilitate participation, consultation, democratization, and planning (CLSC, 2006). Recent research on this initiative indicates that the responsiveness of these centres to local residents is rated highly, and that the cost savings to the health-care system in particular are substantial (Hagan & Garon, 1998).

## KEY FIGURES

The major contributors to community development practice in Canada were both Canadian and non-Canadian, and the significance of their work continues to influence the approaches that Canadian activists take. Jane Addams, an American, borrowed from London, England, the notion of the **settlement home**—that is, a multi-service neighbourhood organization that worked to meet basic needs and take political action for those living in poverty. The Settlement House Movement swept central and western America. Several hundred settlement houses now exist.

Myles Horton, another activist, was inspired during a trip to Denmark, where he observed training programs for grassroots activists interested in political change. The Highlander Folk School, which he founded, continues to be a leader in social change, led by grassroots groups in rural Tennessee.

Saul Alinsky, who saw and approached issues as political battles between the rich and the poor, was arguably one of the most controversial organizers of his time. He started the **Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF)**, which was dedicated to building organizations for political power and social change. There are currently 56 IAF affiliate organizations throughout the world.

Paulo Freire, the Brazilian educator, saw the power of adult education as a means of both oppression and liberation. Freire educated adults to develop a critical awareness of the structures that oppressed them, because he believed that groups with this **critical consciousness** could change their circumstances.

Jimmy Tompkins and Moses Coady also realized the importance of education in community development. They used study groups to teach workers that they could create their own economic organizations, which would help them keep their own profits, locally. **Economic co-ops**, owned by the workers themselves, sprung up and provided a local alternative to the financial institutions owned and operated by those who lived far away from the communities they served.

Today, the Aboriginal leader Georges Erasmus has been involved in local, territorial, and national political scenes for many years. He has skilfully bridged cultures and advocated for the integrity of treaties signed years ago. Moreover, he has kept Aboriginal rights issues in the political spotlight, and has advocated for Aboriginal self-government and restitution for survivors of the residential schools.

### Jane Addams: Settlement Houses

Jane Addams (1860–1935) was born in the small community of Cedarville, Illinois. Her father was a member of the state legislature, director of a bank and a railroad, and close friends with Abraham Lincoln (Bettis, 2006). Addams attended college and was active in student affairs. After graduation, her attendance at medical school did not sit well with her stepmother or father, and, after the sudden death of her father a few years later, she decided to leave school. It was during this period in her life that her approach to community development started to take shape (Nobel Foundation, 2006). She became inspired during a vacation, where, after witnessing severe poverty while touring Europe, she encountered East London's **Toynbee Hall**, a settlement for university students from Oxford and Cambridge to work with people from the community. Addams's impression of the place was very positive.

It is a community for University men who live there, have their recreation and clubs and society all among the poor people, yet in the same style they would live in their own circle. It is so free from “professional doing good”, so unaffectedly sincere and so productive of good results in its classes and libraries so that it seems perfectly ideal. (Addams, 1930)

The first Settlement House in North America was based on Toynbee Hall and opened in 1889 (Barbuto, 1999). Addams and her friend Ellen Starr rented an abandoned mansion in an industrial neighbourhood in Chicago. Most of the people living in the area had recently immigrated from Italy and Germany. Addams and Starr invited local residents to the home for book readings and art displays, and soon found that the women needed a place for their children to go (Hull House, 2006). Driven by the needs of the community, a kindergarten was opened, a space for mothers to gather was created, a club for teens began, and cultural events were held. Hull House, as it was called, grew to include 13 buildings, with 70 residents (Addams, 1930). The purpose was to help local immigrants retain whatever they wanted from their history and culture, while giving them a hand adjusting to life in a new country. This involved not only providing support services, but political activism to improve living conditions in the local community and for the poor who lived outside of it (Lasch, 1966).

Addams was involved in multiple efforts at legal reform. She and others lobbied the state of Illinois on laws related to child labour, factory inspections, and juvenile justice. She worked tirelessly to protect immigrants from exploitation, limit working hours, make education compulsory, and recognize labour unions. She led the campaign for women’s voting rights, and was a founder of the American Civil Liberties Union as well as the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People. In 1931, she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize (Carson, 1990). The **Settlement House Movement**, as it became known, grew (Hutchinson-Crocker, 1992), and by 1910, the National Federation of Settlements listed over 400 settlement houses, primarily in midwestern and eastern urban centres (Lasch-Quinn, 1993).

## Myles Horton: Highlander Folk School

In 1932, Myles Horton (1905–1990) founded the **Highlander Folk School** in Tennessee. He received his early training at the Union Theological Seminary and modelled the Highlander Centre on the Danish folk schools he observed on a trip to Copenhagen. The school continues to be an important social change training institution for “grassroots” activists (Horton, 1990).

Essentially, Myles Horton believed that the solutions to community problems could be found at the local level, without relying on outside experts. Horton, therefore, tried to bring ordinary people together in discussion groups to share their experiences and, together, seek solutions. He believed in peer education; people should do their own research and become their own experts. Horton encouraged people to test out their ideas in practice, analyze their actions, and learn from this process.

Horton’s early work was in Tennessee among his neighbouring farmers, miners, woodcutters, and mill hands, who had no access to formal educational institutions. The Highlander Folk School became an institution committed to social change and to workers’ right to organize. As Horton’s ideas developed, he became active in the Civil Rights Movement, and Highlander began to focus its resources and programs on school

desegregation, voter education, citizenship schools, and other aspects of the Civil Rights Movement.

During the 1960s, the original Highlander Folk School was replaced by the Highlander Research and Education Centre, which continued to play a key role among the disenfranchised and extremely poor people in Tennessee as part of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations' "War on Poverty." In 1982, Highlander Centre was nominated for a Nobel Peace Prize, and in 1990, *Time* magazine called Highlander "one of the South's most influential institutions of social change" (McWhorter, 2001).

## Saul Alinsky: Industrial Areas Foundation

Social workers come to the people of the slums under the aegis of benevolence and goodness, not to organize the people, not to help them rebel and fight their way out of the muck—NO! They come to get these people "adjusted"; adjusted so they will live in hell and like it too. (Alinsky, 1969, p. 82)

Saul David Alinsky (1909–1972) was one of the most controversial community organizers in North America. He was the only son of Jewish Russian immigrants; his mother was 17 when he was born. His father owned a tailor's shop located in the slums of Chicago's west side, and the family lived in the back of the store. Years later, Alinsky recalled that his idea of luxury had been "where I could use the bathroom without one of my parents banging on the door for me to get out because a customer wanted to get in" (Horwitt, 1992, p. 35).

In 1930, Alinsky graduated from the University of Chicago after studying archaeology and sociology. One of his first jobs was to study crime and the activities of the infamous gangster Al Capone, and by the time he was in his mid-twenties, Alinsky was beginning to be recognized as a notable criminologist. At a time when many experts agreed that the major causes of crime were poor housing, discrimination, economic insecurity, unemployment, and disease, Alinsky—in his abrasive and condescending speaking style—argued that supervised recreation, camping programs, and "character building" efforts did not address the real issues of power and powerlessness.

Alinsky's criticisms of hypercritical professionals, whether they were business people, social workers, church leaders, criminologists, academics, or anyone else, were relentless. While studying juvenile delinquency in a south-side Chicago slum, Alinsky observed the activities of the trade unions as they tried to organize the packing-house workers in the abattoirs and learned that coalitions were the most effective way to achieve social change.

As Alinsky's career developed, he formed an organization through which he hired either himself or one of his 12 "apostles" to work with marginalized groups to achieve specific, concrete change (Finks, 1984). He befriended senior members of various religious denominations, film stars (including Humphrey Bogart), and other prominent groups in order to fund his activities. As a professional activist, he worked alongside the poor and helped them develop the confidence and practical skills to challenge established sources of power, from city hall to a large corporation.

Alinsky's model of social change was confrontational, and his planning was like that of a military strategist preparing for a major battle. Alinsky was bright, witty, abrasive, and caring, and urged people to pick a target, freeze it, personalize it, and then polarize it (Alinsky, 1972). He would force mayors and corporate officials alike to respond to large

groups of people, demanding more jobs or better pay, while the media eagerly captured their discomfort on film.

Alinsky sought allies in the Christian church and would often use Biblical quotations to support his position, such as, “He that is not with me is against me” (Luke 11:25). Alinsky married three times and died of a heart attack in 1972. Since his death, his organizing principles have continued to find expression through the training activities of the U.S.-based Industrial Areas Foundation, which has been involved with more than 50 “people organizations,” ranging from East Brooklyn to the east side of Los Angeles, as well as in other countries.

Alinsky (1972) had several rules for power tactics, which he listed in his book, *Rules for Radicals*. They are paraphrased here:

- Power isn’t what you have, but what the other side thinks you have.
- Do not go outside of the expertise of your people.
- Go outside of the expertise of the target whenever possible.
- Force the targets to live by their own rules.
- Ridicule is potent.
- A good tactic is enjoyable, and one that drags on is not good.
- Keep applying pressure.
- A threat is worse than the actual experience.
- Use others’ mistakes for your benefit.
- Have an alternative in mind in case the target comes to you.
- Pick a target, then freeze it; make it personal and polarized.

## Paulo Freire: Education for Critical Consciousness

Paulo Freire (1921–1997) is one of the most interesting and controversial figures in adult education in the developing world. Born in Recife, Brazil, his ideas developed from his own childhood experiences of living among the poor and oppressed.

Freire made some observations about the characteristics of the oppressed. He noted that they frequently exhibited a kindly acceptance, sometimes supported by selected Biblical quotes, such as “Blessed are the poor.” He also noted a self-deprecation among the oppressed, a devaluing of their knowledge, as well as learned helplessness and a belief that they were sick, lazy, and unproductive. In addition to this lack of confidence, Freire noted that the oppressed had an almost magical belief in the invulnerability of the oppressor. When working with the oppressed, Freire recognized a culture of silence that characterized their behaviour (Freire, 1985). He saw the poor as submerged in their world, preoccupied with meeting basic needs, and consequently unable to develop a critical consciousness. His philosophy was similar to Myles Horton’s. Although for most of their careers the two men did not know each other, they did eventually meet later in life. Their conversations have been captured in Brenda Bell’s 1990 book, *We Make the Road by Walking*.

Freire noted that the relationship between the oppressed and the oppressor is characterized by dehumanization. The oppressed are dehumanized by their life situation, while the oppressors are dehumanized by their necessity to oppress. Freire advocated a new pedagogy (i.e., process of education). First, he aimed at **conscientization**—that is, helping people to recognize the social, political, and economic contradictions that surround them

and helping them to take action against these oppressive elements. He noted that the oppressed may themselves at first fear this new awareness, along with the destabilization that can accompany challenges to the myths that support the existing social order.

For Freire, education was a liberating process, not one that perpetuated oppression. He argued that true learning does not take place when it is presented as a “narrative” between a teacher (the expert) and students (patient, listening objects). According to Freire, learning is not about the mere memorizing of facts, but is the integration of knowledge (Freire, 1973). Such knowledge must make sense to the students and the world they live in.

Effective education, according to Freire, has to be authentic and relevant, and has to take the form of a genuine dialogue between teachers and students. If students and educators are to be equally liberated, educators need to establish a climate for learning where learners do not become docile listeners, but rather partner with their teachers to become critical co-learners in search of answers. Traditional teaching serves to numb and hamper creative power. Problem-posing education, on the other hand, consists of authentic reflection and involves a constant unveiling of reality. Traditional teachers, according to Freire, are little more than “bankers” dispensing packages of knowledge with scant regard to its relevance.

Freire suggested that the role of a good teacher is not to dispense words of truth, but rather to listen and to pose questions that stimulate critical discussion and draw out creative ideas. According to Freire, education should not serve as a tool to fit people into their appropriate slots in an unjust society. Education should liberate people and allow them to achieve their full potential.

In his book *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (1970), Freire outlined the elements of ineffective education:

- The teacher is always right.
- The teacher knows more than the students.
- The teacher must be listened to at all times.
- The teacher doles out consequences.
- The students comply.
- The teacher determines what is important.
- The teacher controls the learning process.

## Jimmy Tompkins and Moses Coady: Economic Co-ops

Antigonish is a small Nova Scotia town that became the centre of a unique initiative in adult education and social change during the 1920s and 1930s. The **Antigonish Movement** has mostly been associated with a charismatic personality and Roman Catholic priest, Moses Coady, but of equal importance were his cousin Father Jimmy Tompkins and the organizational genius A. B. MacDonald (Lotz & Welton, 1987).

Jimmy Tompkins (1870–1953) arrived in Antigonish in 1902, at a time when the area was experiencing severe economic depression. Rugged Scots farmers whose farms were too small to support their large families had originally settled the region. At the same time, the middlemen—“Cod Lords”—dominated the fishing industry and controlled the local economies (Lotz & Welton, 1997). The poverty that pervaded the area at the turn of the century became even more severe with the collapse of fish prices after World War I.

This not only caused more suffering, but also quickened the pace of rural and regional depopulation.

Tompkins also believed that the key to social change was education. He envisioned a role for St. Francis Xavier University in Antigonish to provide the missing link between “knowledge and the little people” (Lotz & Welton, 1987). Tompkins was an abrasive and persistent advocate who antagonized the local bishop to the point that he banished Tompkins to the windswept, desolate, and impoverished fishing village of Canso (Miffelen, 1974). Tompkins was not silenced by that move, however, and through the media he was able to alert the Canadian public to the deplorable conditions that existed in such communities as Canso. His efforts eventually led to a Royal Commission that, in 1928, recommended the establishment of producer co-operatives to raise the incomes of fishermen in the area.

Tompkins did not introduce co-operative principles to Canada. These had arrived from Rochdale, England, in 1875, and had failed before in the Maritimes. Tompkins saw adult education as a way of ensuring the success of such ventures. The Workers’ Educational Associations in the U.K., the Danish Folk School Movement, and the Swedish Discussion Circles influenced his thinking. In 1921, the first **People’s School**, a six-week residential course, took place at St. Francis Xavier University (Coady International Institute, 1986). As well, over the next few years, Tompkins played a key role in establishing libraries throughout the region. The U.S.-based Carnegie Foundation largely funded these latter efforts.

The Antigonish Movement gathered momentum after the report of the Royal Commission and the establishment of a department at St. Francis Xavier University dedicated to adult education. After this, Moses Coady (1882–1959) became a dominant figure. The Antigonish Movement stressed the importance of self-help and mutual support, and linked adult education to social change (Coady, 1939). In this way, it offered an alternative to militant political action.

Coady was an inspiring orator. His starting point for social change was to call a mass meeting, which Coady would often address himself. From there, “study clubs” formed to discuss specific local problems and to explore solutions (Delaney, 1985). Field workers from the university supported these efforts, and pamphlets were produced to help with discussions. Later, these efforts were enhanced by the newly established local libraries and by the advent of radio, which spawned “listening-in” groups. In addition to these activities, rural and industrial conferences were held to promote the principles of co-operation and self-help.

At its peak, at the outbreak of World War II, the Antigonish Movement had initiated 2265 study clubs throughout the Maritimes, involving 19 600 people (MacLellan, 1985). These clubs led to the formation of 451 credit unions and 210 co-operative retail stores (MacLellan, 1985). Shortly after the death of Moses Coady in 1959, the **Coady International Institute** was established at St. Francis Xavier University (MacDonald, 1987). Current work of the institute centres on asset-based community development, micro-finance, advocacy and networking, youth programs, peace building and conflict resolution, First Nations fisheries, as well as various global partnerships (Coady Institute, 2010).

## Georges Erasmus: Aboriginal Self-Government

Georges Erasmus was born in Fort Rae, Northwest Territories, in 1948. He and his 11 siblings moved with his family to Yellowknife when he was one year old. Georges later graduated from a Catholic high school there. His career in politics was shaped by the history of his Dene community's relationship to the federal government of Canada (Barnsley, 2006).

The Dene peoples had lived for centuries in the Mackenzie Valley and Barren Grounds of the Northwest Territories. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, they were involved in the fur trade. However, awareness of the mineral-rich lands—first gold, then oil—brought increasing numbers of Europeans into the region during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (University of British Columbia, 2006). Treaties were signed during this time. For the Dene peoples, the treaties were seen as peace and friendship agreements. For the Europeans, the treaties were seen as giving them title to the land. In response to Dene concerns about how signed treaties were being honoured, local community residents formed the **Indian Brotherhood** of the Northwest Territories in the 1970s (Governor General of Canada, 2006).

Erasmus was heavily involved in the Indian Brotherhood from the beginning, seeking to protect Dene culture and ways of life, which included reclaiming sovereignty over the northern lands. He started as director of community development and became president of the organization and of its successor, the Dene Nation, at the age of 28. During his presidency, he brought together 25 Dene communities to work out the details of a land claim (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2006a). In 1983, he stepped down as president of the Dene Nation and two years later, became the vice-chief of the national **Assembly of First Nations** (AFN) (Assembly of First Nations, 2006). In 1985, he was elected as the national chief of the AFN, and in that role he brought many Aboriginal issues to the attention of the general public (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, 2006b; Dubuc, Erasmus, & Saul, 2002). He was heavily involved in discussions about the Canadian constitution, for which he became known as the 11th premier (National Aboriginal Achievement Awards, 1998).

Georges Erasmus is likely best known as co-chair of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP) (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1996). The RCAP report led to an official apology from the federal government in the 1987 document "Gathering Strength: Canada's Aboriginal Action Plan," for the abuses of the residential school system (Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 1997). That same year, he was appointed to the Order of Canada, and has since received honorary doctorates from universities across Canada. Georges Erasmus was chair of the **Aboriginal Healing Foundation** (AHF), founded in 1998 with the "mission to encourage and support Aboriginal people in building and reinforcing sustainable healing processes that address the legacy of Physical Abuse and Sexual Abuse in the Residential School system, including intergenerational impacts" (Erasmus, 2006a). During his tenure as chair of the AHF, he gave many addresses, including one to a graduating class at the University of Western Ontario (Erasmus, 2006a), in which he made the following remarks:

I've come to believe an essential and enduring challenge of the future—of your future as Canadian citizens—is to walk along the path of healing and reconciliation.

The wounds of history have not been meaningfully addressed in this country, but must be if we are to build a better relationship between Aboriginal people and Canada.

Or perhaps it is more accurate to say that the challenge of the future is to restore the relationship of mutual respect that once existed in the past and which stands in historic agreements as a model for approaching generations.

Now, you are not responsible for the history of your nation beyond the obligation to study it. It is an inheritance. But you are responsible for what happens in your time, under your watch.

In the 2010 federal budget, Prime Minister Steven Harper cut the funding of the AHF, leading to the closure of the agency and the 134 community-based projects across Canada it supported. Federal dollars budgeted for survivors of the residential schools were also cut, and directed through Health Canada (Aboriginal Healing Foundation, 2010).

## Summary

- It is difficult to determine exactly when community development as an intentional activity began.
- Community development in Canada began before the arrival of Europeans.
- After World War II ended, development became a more popular approach to working with disadvantaged communities.
- In 1889, Jane Addams opened the first Settlement House in North America, which provided for people's basic needs and advocated for legislative reform to address policies that contributed to social inequities.
- In the 1930s in rural Tennessee, Myles Horton opened a school for tradespeople who had limited exposure to public education, for the purpose of training to change unfair business practices.
- In 1941, Saul Alinsky started the Industrial Areas Foundation, based on the expertise of community organizing practitioners, to assist disadvantaged communities in forming large organizations that could take on local political issues.
- In the 1960s, Paulo Freire emphasized techniques to effectively change adult education from a practice of oppression to a practice of liberation from poverty.
- In the 1930s, Jimmy Tompkins and Moses Coady assisted with the development of successful community-owned businesses in eastern Canada.
- From the 1970s to today, Georges Erasmus has kept Aboriginal issues in the Canadian political spotlight, and been an effective and tireless promoter of community healing and self-government initiatives.

## Discussion Questions

1. How did the early life experiences of Jane Addams contribute to her political efforts?
2. Why was the Highlander Folk School needed in southern Tennessee in the 1930s?
3. What kinds of communities are most likely to accept Alinsky's tactics? Which are least likely? Why?

4. Think about your own experience as an adult student. Do your instructors teach for critical consciousness? Why or why not?
5. Why did economic co-ops take off in rural Nova Scotia during the 1930s? Can this model be successful in contemporary urban settings?
6. What is Canada's record of treatment of indigenous peoples? How much progress has been made?

## Weblinks

<http://faculty.uccb.ns.ca/tompkins/> The Tompkins Institute for Human Values and Technology

[www.uccb.ca/CED/ced/main.html](http://www.uccb.ca/CED/ced/main.html) The Third Option: Community Economic Development

[www.hullhouse.org/index.asp](http://www.hullhouse.org/index.asp) Jane Addams Hull House

[www.stfx.ca/institutes/coady/text/index.html](http://www.stfx.ca/institutes/coady/text/index.html) Coady International Institute

[www.highlandercenter.org/](http://www.highlandercenter.org/) Highlander Research and Education Centre

<http://marxists.anu.edu.au/subject/education/freire/pedagogy/index.htm> Pedagogy of the Oppressed

[www.industrialareasfoundation.org/](http://www.industrialareasfoundation.org/) Industrial Areas Foundation

[www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/index\\_e.html](http://www.ainc-inac.gc.ca/ch/rcap/index_e.html) Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples

[www.ahf.ca/](http://www.ahf.ca/) Aboriginal Healing Foundation



## Key Terms

Aboriginal Healing Foundation, p. 28

Antigonish Movement, p. 26

Assembly of First Nations, p. 28

Coady International Institute, p. 27

Company of Young Canadians, p. 21

Conscientization, p. 25

Critical consciousness, p. 22

Economic co-ops, p. 22

Highlander Folk School, p. 23

Indian Brotherhood, p. 28

Industrial Areas Foundation, p. 22

New Towns Movement, p. 20

People's School, p. 27

Preventive Social Services Act, p. 21

Settlement home, p. 22

Settlement House Movement, p. 23

Toynbee Hall, p. 22