

*How old ideas become new: the ever returning program of “community development”<sup>1</sup>*

Ana Lucia Grondona  
University of Buenos Aires

Index

- I. Introduction
- II. Community Development in technocratic discourse. A historization
  - a. The colonial version
  - b. The American way, Community Action’s resonances
  - c. International Agencies, translating and transferring ideas
- III. Argentina: the complexity of translations and traditions
- IV. Community Development in catholic discourse. Some history
  - a. The Spanish tradition
  - b. Community, government and development in the Social Doctrine of the Church.
- V. Conclusions

*I. Introduction*

The paper I’m presenting emerges from a current research on social policy planning in Argentina. More specifically, I’ve studied the articulations of different discourses in recent Argentinean social programs. Among the discourses that built recent social policy I’ve found two of them are particularly important, what I’ve called neoliberal technocratic discourse and the moral discourse. Although we’ve constructed a discourse typology that includes other two types (the pragmatic discourse and the right-recognition discourse), the ongoing research has shown that the intertwining of moral and technocratic discourses in the design and implementation of social policy is very important, although slightly understudied. Therefore, I’ve decided to focus on this issue.

By *technocratic neoliberal discourse* I refer to the discourse that appeared to fully

---

<sup>1</sup> Work in progress, please don’t quote.

hegemonize social policies since the late 1980s -such was the case of social policies in Argentina until the 2001 crisis. The logic of these social programs was fully comparable to the typical neo-classical behaviorist principles, which suppose that state intervention should be based on microeconomic models that calculate likely behavior of individuals. This "predictability" is based upon the notion that each individual acts rationally and driven by self-interest. The issue, isn't that of "aggregate demand" (Keynesian question *par excellence*), but that of the dispositions and attitudes of individuals. This form of intervention is not only a stranger to the idea of "rights" but also to the idea of "society" (as a complex set of bonds of solidarity), reducing social *liaisons* to exchange (especially material one) between individuals. Thus, from this perspective, social policy reduces itself to those marginalized and unable to play in market relations. For these populations "safety nets" are designed in order to manage the "social risk" to which they are target. These policies are based on the "promotion" of individual responsibility and decentralization of state intervention (Salama Valier and 1996, Rosenfeld 1998 and Cardarelli, 2003 Grassi, Hintze 1994). This discourse is mainly produced by international agencies (particularly the World Bank) and by local think tanks (Center for Macroeconomic Studies of Argentina, University of San Andrés, etc.)

From the *moral discourse* perspective, the intensification of social problems after the 2001 crisis was associated with the erosion of collective moral values. The exponent of this type of arguments is the Mesa del Diálogo Argentino<sup>2</sup> and the churches that participated in this space. From this perspective, social policies are a way of helping those in need in the context of a social, moral and spiritual decline that threatens social disintegration by degrading family. Therefore, social policy doesn't have only economical, but moral objectives, mainly the strengthening of family bonds. Also, from this point of view, the labor required as a counterpart to recipients ensured its moral character as part of the task of "rebuilding" the fabric of values, including especially the "culture of work".

I've studied the articulation of both these discourses analyzing an extensive corpus that includes official documents (such as normative, evaluations, manuals, etc), documents

---

<sup>2</sup> An initiative taken by president Eduardo Duhalde during the worst moment of the political crisis in order to generate new consensus.

produced by different international agencies (World Bank, Interamerican Development Bank, CEPAL, United Nations, etc.), documents produced by the Catholic Church (like Carita's monthly news paper, encyclicals, etc). The construction of this corpus is one of the main processes of my research, since it's always open to the questions posed by the ongoing analysis of documents. In order to focus my research on what would otherwise have been an almost infinite dispersion of meaning, I've taken a few signifiers that I have found particularly important in the construction of the meaning harbored by workfare programs: 1)un/employable, 2) human and integral development, 3) social/human capital and local and community development. I find these are significant notions since they answer three fundamental questions: 1) which is the criterion to target and distinguish populations? 2) which is the objective posed by these policies in their formulation? 3) which are the main designed means to accomplish these goals? After selecting these signifiers, I started an archeological research in order to "discover" the multiple meanings these have had and the different struggles they've served as an arena for. In order to do so, I followed a path from one document to the next, constructing a corpus for each of these signifiers. Some of them are intertwined, or have been through out their history, therefore I've had to analyze their articulations. This paper presents the findings referring to one of this signifiers: community development.

In the following pages we analyze the construction of meaning of "community development" both in technocratic<sup>3</sup> and in moral discourse, as well as the particular manner in which they intertwined in the emergence of community development in Argentinean social policy in the 1960s.

## *II. Community Development in technocratic discourse. A historization*

### **a) The colonial version**

---

<sup>3</sup> Although I referred to neoliberal discourse, since here I'm presenting a more genealogical approach of my research, I will be referring to technocratic but not neoliberal rationale. Nevertheless I understand that current signifiers of this discourse such as "empowerment" or "community action" find their meaning in the discursive memories of prior discourses such as the development discourse.

One of the main traditions of “community development” (CD) is the one that emerged from the Colonial Office interventions in Asia and Africa since the Mass Education Report of 1944<sup>4</sup>. Community Development was proposed as an educational strategy that intended to go beyond formal education and literacy, promoting self-management capabilities and the ideals of an "active citizenship". Furthermore, it searched to generate local leaders, both capable and reliable, that could serve as a link with technocratic officers and help achieve development. This strategy was strongly attached to rural areas, a space particularly stigmatized as “backward”. From the Colonial Office’s perspective, the contents of CD should be tailored according to the needs and attitudes of local populations in order to penetrate the daily life and facilitate the "passage to modernity." As this agency put it, CD was an essential strategy to "conquer the hearts of the people", since colonized populations were to become the main agents of their own development. Rather than leaning on the expertise of the technicians of the time, CD counted on the initiative of villagers.

Concern for community development can not be understood outside the colonial context to which we will refer briefly. Indeed, this concern emerged from the 1920s profound international crisis, which brought new concerns whereas colonies should have a self-sustaining economical power, and be able to provide not only a market for goods from the metropolis, but means to build long-term financial security.

These concerns, added to those emerging in the mid-thirties because of the nascent nationalism and the growing international demand regarding the poor conditions of life in the colonies (for example by the League of Nations), presented an early context of transition to the hegemony of a non-colonial power (U.S). Indeed, the conflict in the West Indies was a practical demonstration of the consequences that many years of indifference to living conditions could have. These events probably served as a catalyst for the emergence of the first development policy for the colonies. In fact, there were two clear answers to this political horizon: on the one hand the creation of the Department of Social Services of the Colonial Office in 1938, and the Colonial Development and Welfare Act (CDWA) in 1940, on the other. This law established that taxes paid by the colonies should return to them in

---

<sup>4</sup> We based this section on the following bibliography: Kark, Daniel (2008) Passmore, (Gloria S/D), Bhattacharyya; Jnanabrata 2004; Popple, Keith and Quinney, Anne 2002 y Abedin, Najmul (2000)

pursuit of their development and welfare. For the first time to the threat of insurgent movements, there was talk of "partnership" between metropolis and colonies.

In the 1940s change in the colonies appeared to be imminent, the consequent development of an "explosive temper" should be somehow managed. According to the committee that developed the Mass Education Report, colonies should be able to plan their own development and produce active citizen and a much stronger sense of community.

The key novelty of the perspective of CD plans would be neither literacy nor the use of propaganda to intervene in the collective views, but the approach of the active participation of the population as a fundamental objective of intervention. As part of a diagnosis, which spoke of the apathy and passivity of the colonized, CD made an unprecedented emphasis on the involvement of individuals and communities in the process of development, in terms of Margaret Read: "helping people to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps" (in Kark 2008: 114). The general idea was for technicians to give people tools that would help them comprehend that development was *desirable* and even more through their own efforts. In addition, there should be a translation of Western values in local terms, so as to construct an ideal of citizenship itself. Community Development implied a kind of "moral reform" capable of building a sense of "selfless individualism," which held entrepreneurship and innovation, as well as cooperation. Thus CD was a way of "managing" the social question, but also a way of deploying it more in its most acute contradictions.

According to Daniel Kark's thesis on community development in Africa, this strategy was basically an "inconsistent instrument" for numerous metropolitan concerns. Among these concerns prevailed the concern for the image of British colonialism in post-war world order, the absence of a substantial class for the type of economic development that Britain had in mind for its colonies and a more general Fabian-humanitarianism that came to office in 1945 (reinforced by the particular growth of the CO in the 1940s and the conformation of an administrative milieu interested in the "native people" and critical of the poor conditions of the colonies). The alternative of CD was closely intertwined with the perspective that the Colonial Office had regarding the best strategy for economical development of the colonies. Basically, this perspective involved very little financial support from the metropolis (in financial trouble after the 1930s crisis and the war effort). In these sense, CD

became a very tempting idea, since it didn't mobilized financial resources, but drew on the local effort instead. Not only was CD "cheap" in an economic sense, but also in a political manner. Community development as a participating channel came as a poor substitute to the promise of more political autonomy. Agreeing to accept indigenous participation in development process and general access to education appeared to present much less political risks than enabling a stronger political participation. Also, Community Development came as a interesting way of dealing with "an irresolvable tension between the desire to extend control and planning from the centre while simultaneously advocating greater local initiative and authority" (Kark 2008: 92) The extension of local accountability didn't imply the loss of power in the centre. Secretary of CO Creech Jones conceptualized this kind of strategy that combined communitarism and centralization of decisions as "constructive imperialism", a very suggestive oxymoron. Despite Labors preached ideals, pragmatism and paternal racism failed to differentiate its strategy from the Tory's

In synthesis, as Kark puts it CD "allowed a cheap method of addressing social deprivation without jeopardising the economic development required for British recovery", it would produce "mature individuals, who combined within themselves initiative and the best aspects of traditional society, would able to take their place within a productive economy" (...)"Mass Education allowed the retort that everything was being done to produce mature, well-informed communities and individuals capable of taking control of self-governing nations (...) Above all, metropolitan control would be maintained – liberal ideals of the gradual preparation of Africans for their eventual national independence would be predicated on the development of Africans as independent individuals within independent communities" (Kark 2008: 101)

At this point we would like to mark some differences with a classic work that has put under the microscope these "ancestors" of 1990s empowerment strategies. I'm referring to Rosenfeld and Cardarelli's *Las participaciones de la pobreza*. These authors conceptualize the period of the 1950s CD as "adaptive microparticipation." The concept is very suggestive, as is the analysis in which the authors demonstrate intertwinement between CD and national development projects, as well as the fact that community-not society-was understood to be the core of social transformation (1998: 35). *Las participaciones...* has been extremely useful for our reconstruction of CD history, the role played by international

organizations and its entry into the local milieu of policy design. However, I believe this study somehow underestimates the complexity of CD 1950's paradigm of CD. For example, it does so when it claims that what distinguished 1960's community empowerment schemes was the incorporation of "training capacity" and methodologies associated with socio-educational processes. I believe that these were aspects already present in CD during the previous decades. Community development always had to do with the acknowledgment of the fact that to produce economic growth one needs individuals with an impulse for development and *capacities* and *desires* for such development.

To a large extent, CD raised in terms of what could be thought as "production of subjectivity", as a kind of psico-social development included in economic development programs, in order to guarantee the values and ideals necessary to build a modern society. In this sense, CD was a "novel approach to development as a whole" (Kark 2008: 110). However, unlike what might be expected, CD did not discard traditional knowledge, on the contrary, there was a strong call to use this knowledge to solve problems posed by modernization. In particular, tradition was an important guarantee of stability that was not to be dismissed<sup>5</sup>. We could even say that to some extent, the discourse of CD appears to be a romantic approach to some traditional African institutions, such as the village councils.

The agenda for CD fell into oblivion shortly after the Labour Party lost the 1951 elections. Of course, in terms of the experts an important part of the problem was that "the Africans refused to enter the grounds." More probably, it was too late for the opening of participation to avoid collapse. The legitimacy of the empire was irreparably damaged. Thus, CD, a relatively cheap way (as far as finances and power go) to tackle social issues with the very effort of the population of the colonies, was blocked by a context in which it seemed "too late" for "transformist" solutions (Gramsci). However, if we think in the context following the fall of the Berlin wall, in a world already won by the "free enterprise", we can rapidly see the reemergence of CD under new disguises (empowerment, local development or social capital).

---

<sup>5</sup> This kind of utterance reaper further ahead when we analyze the link between "culture of poverty" and "community action".

Along with the British colonial tradition of community development I've found another colonial tradition that I understand has been important in the construction of the semantic field I'm interested in analyzing. I'm referring to the French tradition of *Animation social*, to which I shall refer to very briefly.

In the literature reviewed, there appears to be a consensus on the "origin" of the term. This would have appeared first in 1945 in a decree of the Direction for Popular Education of the Education Ministry (Labourie, 1988 in Martinez Ucar 2002: 1). Sociocultural animation appeared in the late forties as a mode of intervention in marginal French colonial populations. The expansion of sociocultural animation as a form of intervention in the "social" was closely linked to the emergence of "social centers" defined by a French official in a United Nations document of 1952 as organizations that "with the collaboration of users, are trying to solve the problems of the population of a specific neighborhood or geographical area, by making freely available a suitable set of services and collective utilities, educational and health institutions, *animated* by a social assistant responsible for the center". The framework in which these centers were articulated was that of modernization and urbanization of Asian and African the colonies. According to the same paper, ways of thinking were not to be changed overnight nor would ancient social structures; wanting to change them too quickly (*quemando etapas*) implied risks, for example, instead of encouraging a gradual evolution, deploying a revolutionary processes and emphasizing the imbalances. These "centers" were, then, designed as educational spaces of "moral action" (sic) through which, for example, problems of "disintegration" caused by the urbanization process and the separation from local "community" could be managed.

As in the case of community development we find that sociocultural animation appears to be a technique that strongly operates in subjectivity in order to adjust current individuals an traditional knowledge to a modernized context.

#### **b) The American way, Community Action's resonances**

One of the other traditions that community development feeds from is USA's Community Action Programs (CAP), which became one of the strongest emphasis of the 1960's *War on*



*Poverty*. As Alice O'Connor (2002) describes in *Poverty knowledge*<sup>6</sup>, the stress posed in CAP as a way of fighting poverty resulted from a complex negotiation between governmental agencies, but also, as a contingent “discovery” made by the Council of Economic Advisors in the 1964 Economic Report. Paradoxically, what O'Connor calls “the first concentrated effort to bring the analytic tools of new economics to the problem of poverty”, came out as a hybrid and complex concept of poverty that opened the door to another kind of poverty expertise, in particular one attached to the sociological idea of community action and the behaviorist diagnosis of “culture of poverty”<sup>7</sup>. Community Action Programs assumed poverty as a psychological and cultural condition in which federal state should act as a catalyst of local initiatives, empowering communities to take action and to participate in the planning and executing of policies<sup>8</sup> (159). As every Community based intervention, CAP was also an answer to popular unrest, more specifically ghetto uplift in the 1960 (O'Connor 1999: 178)

Although CAP is probably the most immediate and clear antecedent of USA's social policy influence in community development strategies in the third world, this country has a large history of intertwinement between “community” and social intervention. Such was the case of Jane Addams Hull House Movement, a bottom-up initiative that built community as a space of encounter between the working classes and middle class “poverty expert” women engaged in educational and moral intervention. Mainly concerned with industrial disorganization –such as the one denounced by William Beveridge and the Fabian Socialist in Great Britain-, the social survey movement understood these local communities as spaces to be transformed by the action of middle class residents who lived and mapped the life conditions of poor population. Informed by a *normalizing* ethos, not so much in the

---

<sup>6</sup> We strongly base this section in O'Connor's work.

<sup>7</sup> “Culture of poverty” is, to our understanding, mainly a kind of behavior. Oscar Lewis has said that “people living in culture of poverty have a strong sense of marginality, abandonment, dependency” Despite the difference amongst these authors, we find it interesting that for Redfield also *folks societies* could be defined by a type of behavior – “behavior in folk society is traditional, spontaneous, an uncritical (Redfield 1947: 300)

<sup>8</sup> Shriver offered one of the clearest elaborations of this traditionally conservative point of view. In a speech to the Advertising Council on May 5, 1964, he declared, “What will work in Cleveland will not work in Los Angeles, and a program which Chicago might use to fight urban slum poverty will not take root in the rocky soil of Appalachia. That is why the heart of poverty legislation is *local* community action and *voluntary* participation”

construction of social control *dispositifs*, but primarily in the intention of organizing industrial relations, these interventions in poverty were guided by an *economic*, rather than cultural, diagnosis of poverty.

In a gesture that would many times be seen throughout last century's social policy history, Chicago school sociologist would criticize what we've called "normalizing ethos", this "passive" type of participation. Isaac Thomas, for example, saw the settlements as artificial and unfamiliar impositions that came from the outside, and underlined the importance of which would become a principal of community action: leadership and reorganization should emerge from within community and not from middle-class neighbors. Also, Chicago-school trainees built a subjective view of urban marginality and "disorganization" that would be taken up again further in history under notions such as "culture of poverty". "Community" became the name of what appeared to have been lost in the process of urbanization (mainly through migratory processes), but also the place where solutions should be found. In this perspective structural and economic diagnosis lost ground in favor of an interpretation that presented poverty as a symptom of disorganization, that is, the failure of community organization readjustment to urban modernized contexts. In this sense, we find Robert E. Park's definition of community very interesting, since it includes not only a group of individuals in a certain territory, but specifically, a "set of institutions" that distinguish with precision "the community from other social groups". Some of these institutions included churches, schools, play grounds, city hall, theatres, etc. Park understood that communities could be classified according to the number and variety of these institutions (cultural, political and professional) (Park 1999: 102).

In the 1930's, many Chicago-trained sociologist participated in one of the oldest community action antecedents: Chicago Area Projects, designed by Clifford Shaw. These projects aimed to experiment with delinquency prevention by reinforcing community institutions and generating local solidarity, emphasizing strongly on neighborhood rather than social work solutions. Mainly, the purpose was to reconstitute community as a social control mechanism, not by the organization of outside philanthropy, put with the indigenous effort. Chicago's ideas on community disorganization and reorganization would have both an immediate and a far-reaching in social policy, mainly redirecting intervention from work conditions towards community organization and social assimilation. From this

perspective, community empowerment was seen as an instrument for social change (O'Connor 51-55).

Despite the regained hegemony of economic diagnosis over poverty, after the Great Depression, many anthropologists and sociologists continued studying poverty from a “cultural” perspective. Among these studies, a debate flourished to whether modern liberal culture and consumerism was impacting on poverty (*vgr.* Robert Lynd<sup>9</sup>), or if, on the contrary, traditional patterns worked as a barrier for a more active participation in the greater society (*vgr.* Carl Withers).

This perspective of poverty as a subcultural problem was deepened by southern regionalists explanations that viewed poverty as a result of what was called “cotton culture”, an underdeveloped economy that had to deal with colonialism and cultural lag. Cultural behaviors such as matriarchic families were an obstacle to economic growth and general participation in modern society.

Psychological and cultural diagnosis of poverty wasn't used as a conservative argument about the futility of liberal antipoverty actions, but rather as a way of brothering and tailoring state intervention in this phenomenon.

The generalization of “culture of poverty” implied several conditions, the first one was a general consensus around the fact that the USA was becoming an almost classless society with a small substratum of poor people, the second one was the institutionalization of behavioral sciences which emphasized on the idea of “maladjustment”, the third one a reinforcement of patriarchal values as a psychological and social norm, and the fourth, the emergence of poverty as a global and threatening issue, especially after revolutionary process in Latin America and Africa<sup>10</sup> (O'Connor 2002). Regarding this last point, poverty

---

<sup>9</sup> About the link amongst Robert S: Lynd and the Chicago School, that we've mentioned earlier, Caplow: 1980)

<sup>10</sup> Regarding the linkage between “culture of poverty” and colonial power: “es más común que se desarrolle cuando un sistema social estratificado y económico atraviesa por un proceso de desintegración o de sustitución por otro, como en el caso de la transición del feudalismo al capitalismo o en el transcurso de la revolución industrial. A veces resulta de la conquista imperial También puede ocurrir en el proceso de destribalización, tal como el que ahora tiene lugar en África, donde, por ejemplo, los migrantes tribales a las ciudades desarrollan «culturas de patio» notablemente similares a las vecindades de la ciudad de México” (Lewis 1968)

struggle of the sixties should be read parallel to the *Alliance for Progress*<sup>11</sup>. As Oscar Lewis –who developed this concept- explained in *Los hijos de Sanchez*, although in “our country (USA), there is no menace of revolution (...) in the less developed countries of the world, those who live in the culture of poverty may organize themselves in a political movement that searches fundamental revolutionary change, *this is one of the reasons for which it's existence poses terribly urgent issues*” (Lewis 1968)

The prominent anthropologist we've just quoted, was one of the intellectuals who acted as consultants for U.S aids agencies of the “third world”. Lewis critiqued Robert Redfield's view on folk societies as being romantic and even traditionalist<sup>12</sup>. This rousseauian utopia, in the eyes of Lewis, obscured the violence, disruption and maladjustment of “traditional communities”. As Susan Rigdon (1988) puts it, “Lewis believed in change” and had “no romance for folk societies or for poverty in general and did not much fear what urbanization, industrialization and technology might do to traditional societies (...) he thought more in terms of the transformation of material conditions” (43) In a context where traditional culture was becoming a political concern (O'Connor: 115), Lewis constructed the concept of “culture of poverty”, which would prove itself useful both for the implementation on policies in the US and in third world countries. This anthropologist was determined to undermine what he understood as escapist views that insisted on viewing “communities” as the reverse of corrupted modern metropolis, on the contrary, he aimed to stress the problems of suffering of peasantry in order to “envisage the possibility of

---

<sup>11</sup> Also, one could analyze the reception of some of the ideas we've discussed in this paper in local intellectuals. Foreexample, one could study the impact that Redfield's theory about folk societies had on Gino Germani's analysis of peronism (mentioned in Neiburg 1995: 544)

<sup>12</sup> In order to describe folk societies, Redfield served himself of classical sociological themes such as Durkheim's mechanic solidarity or Tönnies *gemeinschaft*. The most prominent quality of these societies was that they met their recurrent problems of life in a conventionalized way (Redfield 1947: 298) The cities, on the other hand were related to a process of secularization, individualization and, overall, disorganization (idem: 307). Redfield imagined these categories as ideal types in a weberian way. Therefore, he said “in every tribal settlement there is civilization, in every city there is the folk” (Redfield 1954: 59). Redfield was especially interested in figures such as the “peasant”, which represents the values of pre-civilized tribe and the urbanite (idem: 66) For Redfield modernization was a complex passage, which in many cases triggered “an effort of the "backward" peoples to re- cover from their disruptive encounters with the West by returning to the "sacred centers" of their ancient indigenous civilizations”.

fundamental changes in technology, means of communication, and general fund knowledge, which would alter meaning of peasant life” (Lewis, in Rigdon: 43). Despite the anthropologist “original intentions” –quite debated, mainly concerning his Marxists background- this concept would serve as a way of naming the problem of development as a deviation of cultural patterns that should be worked upon directly. Development, from this point of view, would depend very strongly on psychological factors, which meant that *policy should act upon conducts*. Community action and community development would be a way of doing such thing. In fact, most of the traits that Lewis included under the name of culture of poverty were behavioral (dependency, present-time orientation, lack of impulse control, weak ego structure, etc.)

Throughout its history, Community Action, as an intervention technique articulated with the diagnosis of “culture of poverty”, proved to be quite ambiguous. On the one hand, community empowerment programs were financed by clearly not contra-hegemonic agencies, such as Ford Foundation (1961’s Gray area projects) and the Russel Sage Foundation (through Leonard Cottrell’s<sup>13</sup> ant delinquency experiments in the late 1950’s) but, on the other hand, experiences such as the one undertaken by Saul Alinsky in the 1930’s took a strong political direction, more than a therapeutic one. USA’s community based policies, as others we’ve seen, showed to be a political arena of struggle for both recognition and redistribution.

In its political struggle within field of social policy design Community Action would have a hard time overcoming analytical consensus; mainly because since it has always had abstract objectives that can’t be easily quantified. Therefore, during Nixon administration it began to lose its strength, recovering some of it during Clinton’s administration. Concerning the “Trojan horse” of “culture of poverty” diagnose, paradoxly, although during the sixties this discourse had worked as an argument in favor of state intervention in poverty, and even as a critique of capitalism, some decades after, it would reconvert into a conservative argument that emphasized the futility of intervention in poor populations.

---

<sup>13</sup> This author’s concept of “community competence” becomes very interesting if compared with the more contemporaneous notion of *social capital*.

### **c) International Agencies, translating and transferring ideas**

In order to understand how these ideas entered Latin-American context we have to emphasize on the role played by international agencies in transferring ideas.

During 1954 Community Development officially entered as a concept to the United Nations discourse, crystallizing in 1955 as a recommendation resolution (585c), according to which the most economically backward regions could use the “latent energy of the people in activities to improve the situation of communities through their own efforts”. The following year the UN produced a very important for the literature on CD: "Community Development and Services", where it is redefined as "those processes by which the efforts of people are added to those of its government to improve the economic, social and structural community to integrate the country's life and enable them to contribute fully to national progress "(Res 585, UN in 1955: p51). One of the key words in this definition is, without a doubt "integrate". This signifier brings a new set of concepts that articulate CD with the "invention" of the problem of "marginalization". Integrating those marginalized to development with their own efforts, this would be the main target. The definition also says " this complex process involved, therefore, two essential elements: the participation of the people themselves in efforts to improve their living standard, depending as much as possible on their own initiative, provision of technical services and other measures in ways that encourage initiative, self-help and mutual aid, and increase their effectiveness. Community development finds expression in programs to achieve a variety of concrete improvements "(idem).

The reception of CD made by the discourse of international agencies also incorporated the idea that it was a way of promoting the transition from traditional to modern societies, through the creation of a community spirit of responsibility and initiative. We find, as we did in the colonial cases, the diagnosis that communities have become apathetic and no longer understand their problems arising from the economic context. We can even find utterances that argue that "slums are still the product of individual or collective apathy which prevents effective implementation of any local or external resources" (UN 1963: 80). Thus, what had to be guaranteed was a technique to reverse these resistances, this obstacles that blocked development. Once again, it was necessary to intervene in a subjectivity transformation. This idea was reinforced in a 1972 document of the UN in which the CD is

proposed as a way to change attitudes and practices opposed to social improvement and economic development, creating new ones that support the development, responsiveness and adaptability to change (which synthesize decades later as "flexibility"). We found a very similar speech at the IDB, according to which people in Latin-America "are not interested in innovations and suggested that he preferred to continue its precarious existence under the wisdom and ways of doing traditional" (BID 1966: 2). According to the same document, this is a major obstacle, as there is no development without aspirations for development and without a sense of responsibility over their own destiny. We also recovered one of the central features of the tradition of both CD and sociocultural animation, working with "felt needs."

However, quite early in CD history (1963 and 1972 IDB), agencies began to realize the dangers posed by community empowerment, especially by the focus set on "needs felt by the community", since they might not be in agreement with more general needs of *national* development. In this regard, in 1972, we read a warning about the need to educate people to discover their "true" needs. Indeed, the linkage between CD and some kind of national plan is one of the characteristics that distinguish this mode of intervention of contemporary community empowerment, whether as Caritas or the secular version of the World Bank. Also, although CD is presented as a tool for development and psychosocial enhancement able to govern the "frustration of the people's aspirations for a better life" it could also "lead to political instability, unless we master these social tensions, can be carried out truly effective programs" (MOORE BID in 1966: 90) In this sense, CD appears to be a risky and double-edged weapon, while "if compared to the irreversible momentum of popular participation they (the officials) look with disdain or suspicion the efforts of citizens by preventing or replacing them with paternalism, clientelism or bureaucratic obstruction, it will only contribute to increase the frustrations and raising tensions to a truly explosive" (Ware in IDB 1966: 282).

Along with the International Development Bank, the Economic Commission for Latin-America and the Caribbean and the United Nations, one of the main promoters of Community Development was the Organization of American States, which had a special role after the Alliance for Progress in 1961. In this sense, there was an intellectual who played a key role in the translation and diffusion of CD, we are referring to Ander-Egg.

This social worker and sociologist would be a reference point for international agencies related to the theme. Thus, the 1964 edition of his text "Methodology and practice of community development", a very popular text book among social works, was prologued by the Head of Community Development and Social Welfare of the OAS. During the late 1950's and even more after 1961, Community Development in Latin-America was mostly destined to rural areas involved in agrarian reforms, intertwined with the classical issues of modernization.

### *III. Argentina: the complexity of translations and traditions*

Community Development in Argentina wasn't institutionalized during the late fifties, nor after the Alliance of Progress. This delay was probably due to the fact that Argentina didn't have an agrarian reform and had little peasantry. Therefore, CD was a policy designed to act upon urban marginal populations. It was institutionalized through the 1967 Act (17.271) that created the Secretariat of Promotion and Community Assistance. This Act intended to "promote and develop an awareness in the population that will projected itself towards their effective participation in community life" (art. 16 paragraph 1), and "develop, implement and manage programs and community development organization on the basis of national planning and providing advice on the matter "(paragraph 3), as well as "encouraging people's participation in social issues, coordinating the actions of private entities and the state to obtain the most appropriate use of existing studies and their orientation towards community development programs "(paragraph 17).

According to Cardarelli and Rosenfeld's (1998) CD went very well with the ideology of the military government in office. In order to understand the emergency conditions of CD as a suitable political answer to the Argentinean context, we ought to briefly review some of its's history.

The government in office before de 1966 *coup d'état* had been weekend for several months. It's political basis had been quite narrow from the beginning, since the main political party was banned from elections and it's leader (Juan Domingo Perón) was exiled in Spain. Having to manage popular unrest under the facade of a semi-democratic republicanism had brought the government to an acute political crisis. Many representatives of both sides of



Argentinean politics agreed upon the need to over through Illia. This two sides of the hegemonic struggle reflected Argentina's paradoxical economic structure, known by the concept of "stop and go", this is to say, the growth of industrialization was recurrently interrupted by the lack of foreign currency, due to the decrease of agroexports caused by policies to promote industries (mainly currency change). Therefore, industrial interests were opposed to agrarian interests. This structural problem traduced itself as the political struggle of two alliances, one that harbored national *bourgeoisie* and trade unions (the political basis of Peron), and the other one that pivoted around the landlords of *La Pampa Húmeda* (which didn't have political representation, but used military interventions throughout the XXth century). As we've pointed out, despite their difference, representatives of both sides celebrated the end of Illia's government. Hence, the dictatorship inaugurated in 1966 had to deal with diverse and almost antagonistic perspectives. Also, it's anticomunist and antiliberal character (in the strictly political sense), helped to gather nationalistic but contradictory expectations from right and left. Thus, Onganía's administration was a government in dispute. Given this paper's interest we won't examine all the competing forces, but will mention only two: the technocratic impulse (liberal in the economy and conservative in cultural aspects) and catholic integrism. It's economical liberalism was clearly stated by General Alsogaray who told US authorities that the new government would "strive to establish a modern economy of free enterprise taking full account of social obligations. It would not be a 19th century free enterprise type, but akin to that which exists as example, in Western Germany".<sup>14</sup>

The 1966-1970 dictatorship had both a modernizing intention and an authoritarian concept of power management. Therefore, CD was quite suitable as a way of building participation without the inconveniences posed by political participation, given the proscription of

---

<sup>14</sup>Telegram 2019 from Buenos Aires, June 30 (1507Z), reported that the head of the military household, General Julio Alsogaray, had indirectly requested a private meeting with the Chargé d'Affaires. Saccio proposed to accept the invitation on the condition that he "need only listen and make no comment." (Ibid., DEF 9 ARG) The Department cabled its concurrence. (Telegram 1465 to Buenos Aires, June 30, 12:27 p.m.; ibid.) Conversation took place in office of Alvaro Alsogaray under conditions outlined in Embtel 2019./2/ No one else present. Statement in three parts: 1. Why the golpe took place, 2. What the new government proposes to do, 3. The structure of the new government.

peronism. Guided by a technocratic conception of state intervention, the general understanding of this administration was that Argentina should be guided to development by professional *savoir faire*, avoiding the traps of corrupted participatory. Community participation was a way of substituting political representation. As Onganía put it in a private conversation with President Johnson in Punta del Este in 1967 the “main problem that Argentina faced was the existence of an archaic governmental structure which has the task of governing a modern country, (..) this archaic governmental structure had proved to be unable to utilize the human resources of the country as they should be used. (...) The function of the government was to provide guidance and supervision to the individual and to private enterprise so that the latter could go about the process of developing the country”. As Onganía also stated in this meeting, “the first stage of the Argentine revolution it would be necessary to systematize the government's machinery. The second stage called for a reorganization of the entire community, including its material, spiritual, and intellectual values, so that Argentina could become what it should be”.<sup>15</sup>

The dictatorship strongly relayed upon a corporative and communitarian ideology. According to Rouquié's (1986) study of discourse, meaning was constructed around two main signifiers: “integrated community” and “modernization”.

Community Development within the 1966-1970 *regime* strongly fed itself from development discourse, such as the one generated by international agencies and based on colonial and US experiences. Onganía believed in development, especially as a strategy to avoid communist expansion. He was also permeated by the National Security Doctrine - although he didn't agree with the division of labor proposed for the southern hemisphere. In fact, he understood that state should be organized in three subsystems: 1) planification of

---

<sup>15</sup>Source: National Archives and Records Administration, RG 59, Central Files 1967-69, POL 15-1 US/Johnson. Confidential; Priority. Drafted by Barnes and Dreyfuss on April 18, cleared by Solomon and Rostow, and approved by Sayre. Conversation between Presidents Johnson and Onganía, at the San Rafael Hotel, Punta del Este, April 13, 1967 at 6:30 p.m. Present at the meeting were: President Johnson, Mr. Walt W. Rostow, and Assistant Secretary Solomon for the United States; and President Onganía, Foreign Minister Costa Mendez and two unidentified persons for Argentina.

national development, 2) planification of security 3) planification of science and technology (Rouquié 1986: 266).

As in the entire region, development was tied to the problem of marginal populations as potentially disruptive. Marginality was diagnosed basically from two different points of views: on the one hand there were those who saw marginality as a cultural problem caused by the lack of modern values and active participation if these populations, on the other hand there were structuralist-marxists analysis that saw marginality as a symptom of economic dependency. Of course, the mainstream vision articulated in the 1966-1970 was closer to the first diagnosis. Therefore, CD presented itself as a way of intervening in the subjectivity of marginal populations and building both capacities and a will for economic modernization, basically a technique to *adjust* subjects to market society. This understanding of poverty and development fed upon aspects of both colonial and USA's tradition of Community Action, especially in that related to CD as a way of managing popular unrest. As in the other cases, as we will see shortly, this technique proved to have ambiguous results.

Before analyzing the path of CD during the seventies and its ambiguity, we would like to retrace the other political rationality that led the 1966-1970 dictatorship. Juan Carlos Onganía, who led the government, could be described as an integral catholic. He had actively participated in what is known as *cursillos de cristiandad*, a practice initiated by Eduardo Bonin in the 1940s franquist Spain, that involved assisting to seminars in which members would knit strong interrelations. Many of the government members were recruited from this group. Also, government was conformed by members of other catholic groups such as *Ateneo de la República*, *Ciudad Católica*, *Asociación de Dirigentes de Empresas Cristianos* and the classical *Opus Dei*.

Among the members of Onganía's cabinet, many were members of *Ciudad Católica*, the local version of *Cité Catholique*, originally created in France by Jean Ousset (former assistant of Charles Maurras, ideologist of *Action Française*) and Jean Masson. According to the directives of its leader, this group replicated the organizational scheme of leftists study groups such of those in Indochina, this is to say, small decentralized cells of no more than eight or twelve members, that would discuss and write on different issues. In order to acquire homogeneity and unity, they printed the bulletin *Verbo*. The ideological orientation

of this group was clearly anti-marxist and contra-revolutionary and had interconnection with military groups involved in contra-insurgence activity in the Algerian war and with the *Organisation de l'Armée Secrète* (OAS).

The Argentinean version of this group was initiated by Georges Grasset, former spiritual leader of OAS. Between its first members were General Juan Francisco Guevara and its first director, Engineer Mateo Roberto Gorostiaga. Both were members of Onganía's government and played a special role designing its communitarian interventions. Guevara had translated Ousset's central text "Marxism-Leninism" –its prologue was written by the cardinal and Archbishop of Buenos Aires Antonio Caggiano. In 1965 he founded the *Movimiento Nacional Comunitario*. Guevara strongly drew his communitarism from Luis Sánchez Agesta, responsible for the franquist "Organic Law of State" of 1967, which substituted liberal constitution with the organization of town councils in both a corporative and communitarian manner. Onganía's regime tried to replicate this model and designed a new state structure in which town councils would join in a Community Council that would be integrated by corporations and substitute the parliament<sup>16</sup>.

M. Roberto Gorostiaga, on the other hand, was the one to convince Onganía to consecrate Argentina to the "Sacred heart of Mother Mary" in 1969. He was an important member of the Cabinet, as Subsecretary of Community Assistance and Participation. Gorostiaga left office in 1967<sup>17</sup>. He was replaced by Santiago de Estrada, a member of the *Cursillos de cristiandad*, who had been ambassador in the Vatican and would come to be the Minister of Social Security of the 1976 dictatorship.

Other "communitarist experts" recruited from catholic groups was Guillermo Borda, a renowned catholic lawyer, who acted as Secretary of the Supreme Court and as the Minister of Internal Affairs of Onganía's government<sup>18</sup>. He was one of the most faithful anticommunist in office, mainly known for being responsible for the intervention of the

---

<sup>16</sup> Guevara would come again to office as Minister of Planification in the military regime of 1976.

<sup>17</sup> Gorostiaga would also be part of the military government of 1976, as Minister of Public Works in the Province of Buenos Aires

<sup>18</sup> The appointment of Borda had impact within the administration, since it steered conflict with the liberal faction of Alsogaray.

University of Buenos Aires and for 1967 anti-communist law, which punished Marxists propaganda with up to eight years imprisonment.

As Scirica (2004: 9) explains, the catholic thinkers and policy makers of the regime “aimed to blur the contractualist sustenance of the liberal regime. The communitarian philosophy-presented as its replacement and enhanced as the return to "ancient liberties" - contained political, economic, moral and social aspects interrelated in a complementary whole. Their paths led to a common goal: to defeat liberalism, in its political angles (partisan division), socioeconomic (class struggle, mass society and atomization) and moral (progressiveness), through the professional and local organization (...). The articulation of individual interests with the group should be based on the rebuilding of coexistence through the reconstruction of the intermediate bodies. Thus, human links would be restored in a structured community in which state intervention would be curtailed and social bonds would lay upon functional organization and moral life together”

As we´ve shown, both catholic and technocratic modernizing ideologies played a key role in the emergence of community development in Argentina. Therefore, we understand that the traditions articulated in Argentinean CD shouldn´t be reduced to the technocrat discourse, but also include catholic tradition. Nonetheless, as we´ve exposed earlier, community action and community development is intrinsically ambiguous. Together with conservative and traditionalist communitarism, Argentina witnessed the emergence of another kind of community action. What is more, it was also strongly tied to Catholic Church. The country had a long tradition of community based action such as the *curas obreros*, but during the sixties and seventies this tradition would be reinforced by what was known as *movimiento de sacerdotes para el Tercer Mundo*. This movement spread throughout Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay and Uruguay with very different trades. The 1968 Medellin Conference held by the Latin American Episcopal Conference was probably the highest point in the development of this movement, since in 1979 Puebla meeting many of the conquests obtained in 1968 would be lost. We can´t extend much further in this subject, but we wanted to state that community action was ambiguous also in Argentina and even between catholics.

Community Development was no longer a priority after 1970, probably due to the political crisis initiated after the political uplift known as the *Cordobazo* and the conformation of a political scenario marked by the organization of urban guerrilla. Nevertheless during Peron's third administration, Community Promotion would reenter as a political issue, and once again during the dictatorship that begun in 1976. None of these re-emergences recuperated the contra-hegemonic sense of community action given by ground activists.

In the next section we analyze catholic tradition. First, we will shortly review franquist *animation*, since it is intertwined with communitarian intervention techniques that informed Argentinean CA, and secondly, we expose some of the most important dimensions of community development in the Churches Social Doctrine.

#### IV *Community Development in catholic discourse. Some history*

##### **a) The Spanish tradition**

The Spanish tradition of community development and sociocultural animation goes back to the experiences of the *Universidades del Pueblo* and organizations like the *Juventud Obrera Católica*. In this case, we can clearly observe the constitutively ambiguous nature of animation and community action, since it has both a background in the educational strategies of the "educational mission" of the Second Republic and in the ones of the *Falangistas* or *Acción Católica*. Indeed, the history of animation has a special place for *Cátedras Ambulantes* of the Female Section of the Spanish *Falange* and *Juntas de Ofensiva Nacional Sindicalista*<sup>19</sup>. The *catedras* were a mode of intervention in poorly communicated rural areas. They consisted of a vehicle equipped in which members of the *catedras* (doctors, teachers, officials from the Ministry of Agriculture, etc) moved from town to town and organized lessons that taught subjects such as home-economics, culture, politics, religion, literacy, and how to rely on resources in the area, how to organize community development and cooperatives, and for boys and girls, leisure activities such as crafts, games, gymnastics, singing and dancing. On the other hand, they were also oriented

---

<sup>19</sup> La Sección Femenina es fundada en 1937 por un grupo de mujeres que no habían sido admitidas como militantes de la Falange. Este grupo fue presidido hasta 1977 por Pilar Primo Rivera (hermana de José Antonio)

towards disseminating health and hygiene habits (Noval Clement 1999:189). The *catedras* began their activities in 1946.

Nevertheless, the term "animation" would not appear until 1959, used by the *Mujeres de la Acción Católica*, who created the "family and social training centers" to promote women (Martinez Salas 1984 Ucar 2002). Again, as in the case of France, "animation" and community action would appear under the structure of "social centers".

An important milestone in the history of Spanish animation would be in 1967 in Aranjuez, where the international meeting "The Sociocultural Animation of youth in rural areas" took place. Interestingly, the place where this meeting occurred was a *Escuela Nacional de Oirientación Rural* organized by the *Sección Femenina* of the *Falange*. Among the key attendees at the meeting was Mossèn Joan Batlles, sent by the Pope. The final document of this meeting, stresses the need to "integrate" rural youth into society and promote their participation in its development, opening their horizons to re-evaluate their "traditional values" and "promote community spirit". In order to avoid the traps from the past and induce development, there was a need to "develop an attitude of active curiosity, participation and taking responsibility." As we can see, once again community animation appears closely linked with development and passage from traditional to modern societies based on subjective and attitudinal changes in which it has assumed responsibility for the process (self-development, spirit of initiative).

#### **b) Community, government and development in the Social Doctrine of the Church.**

In the common sense of many who do not know the full extent of so-called Social Doctrine of the Church, one can often find the preconception that the concern for community development is typical of the Church's renewal since the Second Vatican Council or the Second CELAM Conference in Medellin in 1968.

However, although the Basic Ecclesial Communities are particular phenomenon to which we shall return briefly, the appeal to "participate" in communities, or, more broadly, in "civil society" has a long doctrinal tradition (besides historical forms of intervention such as that mentioned in the case of the *Spanish Falange*). The more remote history of what is strictly known as the Social Doctrine of the Church is the encyclical *Rerum Novarum* of 1891. There, Leon XIII is clear about the importance on intermediate groups:

54. Associations of every kind, and especially those of working men, are now far more common than heretofore (..) Now, there is a good deal of evidence in favor of the opinion that many of these societies are in the hands of secret leaders, and are managed on principles ill - according with Christianity and the public well-being; and that they do their utmost to get within their grasp the whole field of labor, and force working men either to join them or to starve. Under these circumstances Christian working men must do one of two things: either join associations in which their religion will be exposed to peril, or form associations among themselves and unite their forces so as to shake off courageously the yoke of so unrighteous and intolerable an oppression.

Christian workers are faced with the choice of registering or associations which may fear threats to the religion, or form their own societies with one another, thus combining their energies to get rid of this unjust and courageously unbearable oppression. What no doubt that they do not want to expose to danger the way, the supreme good of man must decide unhesitatingly for the latter position? (*Rerum Novarum*)

In this excerpt the anti-comunist character of specific anti-communist of the 1891 Encyclical can be clearly seen. It may be even read as a response to the Socialist International which had taken place two years earlier. Faced with the threat of the organization of working population under socialism, communism or anarchism, rather than propose an atomistic alternative, Leon XIII recognizes the value of intermediary organizations and the need for the state to protect them without interfering in their internal constitution.

The next step in the conformation of the Social Doctrine would be the encyclical *Quadragesimo Anno* in 1931, in which the "liberal threat" was added to the old "communist menace". Pio XI's encyclical was strongly influenced by the crisis that had erupted two years before. In this document the principle of subsidiarity is exposed for the first time:

The State will more freely, powerfully, and effectively do all those things that belong to it alone because it alone can do them: directing, watching, urging, restraining, as occasion requires and necessity demands. Therefore, those in power should be sure that the more perfectly a graduated order is kept among the various associations, in observance of the principle of "subsidiary function," the stronger social authority and effectiveness will be the happier and more prosperous the condition of the State (*Quadragesimo Anno*)

The principle of subsidiarity is a fundamental principle of the Social Doctrine, even nowadays. However, it is likely that throughout its more than seventy years of history, it has concerned, or rather, articulated, various schemes of government, different modes of managing populations. It seems that in 1931 the principle was tied to a scheme in which subsidiarity rested to a large extent in the respect of corporate actors such as trade unions,



entrepreneurs and even the Church. This was in consonance with the post crisis (and more clearly the post war) consensus regarding the consolidation of welfare states and the model of tripartite negotiations as the best way of dealing with the social question.

In the encyclical *Mater et Magistra* of 1961 the principle of subsidiarity articulated with the development challenge and its discourse. Therefore, in this encyclical one can find definitions very close to the UN's description of Community Development: "everything must be done to ensure that citizens of the less developed areas are treated as responsible human beings, and are allowed to play the major role in achieving their own economic, social and cultural advancement" (*Mater et Magistra* 151). Some years later (1965), in the document *Gaudium et Spes* of the Second Vatican Council, the need for "community development" would be posed even more clearly:

Citizens (...) should remember that it is their right and duty, which is also to be recognized by the civil authority, to contribute to the true progress of their own community according to their ability. Especially in underdeveloped areas, where all resources must urgently be employed, those who hold back their unproductive resources or who deprive their community of the material or spiritual aid that it needs-saving the personal right of migration-gravely endanger the common good. (*Gaudium et Spes*, 65)

Along with this recommendation of communities to get involved in their own growth, the document advised against leaving development to the "judgment of a few men or groups possessing too much economic power or of the political community alone or of certain more powerful nations"; on the contrary, it should be democratized. The 1969 Medellin conference of the Latin American Episcopal Council recuperated these same topics, but added a special concern regarding the poor and marginalized populations (which became known as "preferential option for the poor"). In this context, CD is described in terms of what we would now call "governance." The document explained that "development is the new name for peace" and that underdevelopment was an unjust situation that promoted tensions that conspired against it:

It is necessary that small sociological basic communities develop, in order to balance against minority groups, who are the power groups. This is only possible by the animation of the same communities using the natural elements and acting with their respective means.

We believe that national communities have a global organization. In them the whole population, especially the working classes, ought to have, through territorial and functional structures, a responsive and active, creative and decisive role in building a

society. These intermediate structures between the individual and the state must be held freely, without undue intervention by the authority or dominant groups, in view of their development and their participation in the realization of common good. They are the vital fabric of society. They are also the real expression of freedom and solidarity among citizens. (Medellín 1968)

In this quote there seems to be a clear redefinition of the principle of subsidiarity that distances itself from the terms of "corporate governance" that we mentioned above, to rearticulate as "territorial government", in particular urban marginal areas that came as a result of the "modernization" process and internal migration.

In the document of Medellín's Conference, the call for participation and community development as keys to the modernization process, was linked (as in the colonial discourse) with the question of education. However in this case with the so-called "liberating education", related to the tradition of Paulo Freire's pedagogy of the oppressed:

Our reflection on this view, leads us to propose a vision of education, more in line with the development that we advocate for our continent, and would call the "liberating education", that is, a kind of education that makes of each one the subject of its own development. Education is indeed the key to freeing people from servitude and making possible for them to go from "less humane living conditions to more humane conditions," considering that man is responsible and the main architect of his success or its failure. " (Medellín 1968, own emphasis)

As we see in the last sentence of the paragraph above, the development issue reappears as a matter of attitudes and subjective configurations. Thus, community development, seems to be, once again, a new form of government/constitution of subjects. In this form of government, the Church would have a key role, particularly as an advocate of the "basic communities", integrative social tissue.

One year after the meeting in Medellín, in the Argentine Bishops wrote a document called San Miguel, local echo of the meeting was clearly aligned with the proposal by CELAM. San Miguel's document defended the rights of people to create their basic organizations in order to vitalize and strengthen the community organization and ensure the integration of all citizens in the provincial, regional and national levels "(San Miguel Document).

Despite this general optimism regarding CD, once again community-based interventions would prove to be constitutively ambiguous. Indeed, by 1979, the new session of the

CELAM in Puebla, it became clear that the strategy of basic communities was a double edged sword:

In some places, adequate attention has not been given to the work in the formation of Basic Ecclesial Communities. It is unfortunate that in some places clearly political interests are seeking to manipulate and aside from the true communion with their bishops. It is sad that in some places clearly political motifs intend to manipulate these communities and lead them away from true communion with their bishop (Puebla)

One can clearly read in this document the intention of closing doors that had been opened only ten years before.

#### *V. Conclusions:*

As we've seen through these pages, Community Development has a complex and rich tradition that articulates even antagonistic discourses. Ghetto uplift, urban delinquency, marginal urban populations, rural poverty, political unrest. Community development has always been tied to the problem of governing populations in the margins. More specifically, with the production of new kinds of subjects more adequate to economical or social transformations. Also it has been a way of opening some participation without losing political control.

But, how can we understand these strange similarities between the Colonial Office, Colonial France, the Falangist Spain, 1966's Argentinean dictatorship and the discourse of the Catholic Church? Our hypothesis is that all these discourses have in common that they are articulated as an answer to a problem of governance: the limits of the vertical and disciplinary management of populations. However, we believe that it is wrong to assume that this crisis happened in a punctual time in history, the end of la *société salariale*. On the contrary, it is a governmental recurrent crisis which deploy in different national and institutional areas. Faced with this crisis, each of which will have particular characteristics, the interpellation to participate and community appear as techniques that allow certain attitudinal changes, in particular, or subjective in general, which are seen as obstacles to social changes and transformations. Thus, we find the paradox that community space (associated with "tradition") appears as a space not only of government but of modernization, and does so recurrent, but always under the guise of "novelty".

#### **Bibliography**

- Abedin, Najmul (2000) “Community development versus sociocultural and administrative values in rural Bangladesh: 1950s and 1960s”, *Journal of Third World Studies*, Fall 2000
- Bhattacharyya; Jnanabrata 2004 “Theorizing Community Development”. Journal article by *Journal of the Community Development Society*, Vol. 34, 2004 .
- Caplow, Theodore (1980) “Reviewed work(s): Middletown: A Study in American Culture. by Robert S. Lynd ; Helen Merrell Lynd Middletown in Transition: A Study in Cultural Conflicts”, in *Contemporary Sociology*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (Jan., 1980), pp. 46-50
- Cardarelli, G.; Rosenfeld, M. (1998) *Las participaciones de la pobreza : programas y proyectos sociales* (Buenos Aires: Paidós)
- Catalá, Ricardo.; (2008); Los inicios de la ASC en España; 1ª parte; en <http://quadernsanimacio.net>; nº 7; enero de 2008; ISSN 1698-4044
- Fay-Cooper Cole and Fred Eggan (1959), “Robert Redfield, 1897-1958”, in *American Anthropologist*, New Series, Vol. 61, No. 4 (Aug., 1959), pp. 652-662 Published by: Blackwell Publishing on behalf of the American Anthropological Association
- Kark, Daniel (2008) *Equivocal Empire: British Community Development in Central Africa, 1945-55*, A thesis submitted for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy The University of New South Wales, Australia, en 2008
- Labastida, Horacio El desarrollo de la comunidad en America Latina *Revista Mexicana de Sociología*, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1967), pp. 53-68
- Lewis, Oscar (1968) *Los hijos de Sanchez* (Joaquín Mortiz, Mexico)
- Mallimaci, F “El catolicismo argentino desde el liberalismo integral a la hegemonía militar”, en coord. Mallimaci, F *500 años de cristianismo en Argentina*
- Mallimaci, F *El catolicismo integral en la Argentina (1930-1946)* (Buenos Aires, Biblos)
- Neiburg, Federico (1995) “Ciencias sociales y mitologías nacionales: La constitución de la sociología en la Argentina y la invención del peronismo”, in: *Desarrollo Económico*, Vol. 34, No. 136 (Jan. - Mar., 1995), pp. 533-556 Published by: Instituto de Desarrollo Económico y Social
- Nivón, Eduardo and Mantecón, Ana Rosas (1994) “Oscar Lewis revisitado”, en *Alteridades*, 1994 4 (7): Págs. 5-7

- Noval Clemente, Mercedes 1999 “La sección femenina en murcia: educación, cultura e ideología (1.939 – 1977)”
- O’Connor, Alice (2002) *Poverty knowledge. Social Science, social policy and the poor in the twentieth-century U.S history* (Princeton University Press, Oxford)
- Park, Robert Ezra (1999) *La ciudad y otros ensayos de ecología urbana* (Ediciones del Serbal, Buenos Aires)
- Passmore, Gloria “Historical of the Policy of Community Development in the African Rural Areas of Rhodesia” Department of Political Science S/D
- Popple, Keith and Quinney, Anne 2002 “Theory and Practice of Community Development: A Case Study from the United Kingdom”, Journal article by; Journal of the Community Development Society, Vol. 33, 2002
- Redfield, Robert (1947) “The Folk Society” in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 52, No. 4 (Jan., 1947), pp. 293-308 Published by: The University of Chicago Press.
- Robert Redfield and Milton B. Singer (1954) “The Cultural Role of Cities”, in Economic Development and Cultural Change, Vol. 3, No. 1, The Role of Cities in Economic Development and Cultural Change, Part 1 (Oct., 1954), pp. 53-73
- Rouquié, Alain (1986) *Poder militar y sociedad política en la Argentina II* (Hyspamerica: Buenos Aires)
- Salas, M. (1984): «La mujer en los movimientos de animación sociocultural», en AIC, N.º 21, pp. 32-40.
- Scirica, Elena (2004) “Bases de acción para actuar frente a la democracia y sus bases contractualistas. Matriz y despliegue de una propuesta contrarrevolucionaria”, in VII Encuentro corredor de las ideas" Sociedad Civil, Democracia e Integración", Montevideo, 11,12 y 13 de marzo de 2004.
- Susan M. Rigdon (1988) *The Culture Facade: Art, Science, and Politics in the Work of Oscar Lewis*
- Ucar, X. (2002) “Medio siglo de animación sociocultural en España: Balance y perspectivas”, 21 páginas. Revista Iberoamericana de educación. Edición digital. <http://www.campusoei.org/revista/deloslectores/301Ucar.pdf>

- Verbitsky, Horacio (2008) *La violencia evangélica* (Sudamericana: Buenos Aires)
- Zarefsky, David (1986) *President Johnson's War on Poverty: Rhetoric and History*. (University of Alabama Press)