**Ilona Vercseg: Chapters in the History of Community Development in Europe[[1]](#footnote-1)**

*Preface*

To start our orientation in the above subject, we shall first outline the processes influencing the evolution and spread of community development, and its turning into a profession. The initial overview titled *Origins and Growth* covers not only Europe, but also North America (including Canada to some extent) as well as some outstanding international achievements and organizations, and thus contributes to developing a more profound understanding of the processes that led to the creation of community development in Europe, and within it, Central Eastern Europe and Hungary.

Having acquired a deeper understanding of the profession’s development in Europe, in the section titled *Chapters in the History of Community Development in Europe* we move on to give brief presentations of the professional history of community development in different European countries. Here, we focus on countries which deserve special attention because they have maintained community development practices that have proved to be significant for professionals in other countries as well. We also present some historic aspects - often by simply highlighting important points of connection - which have not necessarily played a decisive role in the international professional arena, but are nevertheless noteworthy and important for us because of the common characteristics of our recent past. Naturally, we can only discuss countries and processes that have come within sight of Hungarian community development since it was born almost 40 years ago.

The final part of the study - *What have we brought from Europe? What have we given Europe?* - describes the European integration of community development as a process. This large scale informal community learning process is based on the personal experiences and international projects of our community, the Hungarian Association for Community Development. Focusing on the turning points in this process, we can identify trends, similarities and differences, as well as draw the necessary conclusions.

The history of a profession is embedded in the history of a given society, as well as in global historical processes. For this reason, writing the story of community development is practically an impossible task unless we stay strictly with the profession and draw the scope of our orientation on that basis. However, a profession cannot be examined in itself, because it is in tight symbiosis with society. New, often unexpectedly ‘explosive’ changes and processes emerge, redrawing political and socio-political maps and bringing about new forms of intervention, while organizations disappear and are replaced by new ones. The stories hereby presented are yesterday’s stories, and we can only find comfort in knowing that this is now all part of professional history.

Hence, our enterprise holds many traps, pitfalls and potential mistakes, and we only have two hopes. Firstly, that something is more than nothing. In case we want to go beyond our scope and have an insight on what others do, then we have to get to know their efforts and projects, thus getting a benchmark that we can relate to from the aspect of our own work.

Secondly, everything that can be written down about community development falls under a collective genre both in terms of its establishment and interpretation. For this reason, we refer any further orientation inspired by this paper - namely, the task of getting to know a given national or historical context - to the reader. In line with the most fundamental operational principle of community development, both the authors and the reader function in a community working mode. Using the plural here was not accidental: as suggested by the references, this story was written by several of us fellow community development professionals from around Europe.

A venture of this kind has its own limitations. The author/editor’s original ambition was to write an integrated analytic study, but on the way it turned out that when it comes to professional history, such an effort is not feasible. Professional history is difficult to detach not only from social history, but also from professional activities. For example, the settlement movement is regarded as a cornerstone in every country where settlements exist or used to exist. However, the work performed within those settlements comes under professional activities, and the circle of professional areas on which this work focuses (caring for the poor, citizen action, citizen learning, sustainable development, etc.) reflects a stage in the social history of the given country. In this way, the historical aspect cannot be grasped in itself. So why do we keep trying? We do so to expand our professional and European perspective and to get an impression about what sort of impact our activities have in a broader context.

Hence, this compilation does not build on analysis, but on presentations. Eventually, this can prove to be a more credible treatment than a unified analysis, given that we rely on the accounts of colleagues who work in the given country and analyze their own situation and professional moves besides the historical facts. This study, therefore, is a sort of handbook, and a source of information, since it presents, wherever possible, organizations that can serve as important nodes of orientation and networking for those who would like to get a profound insight into the community development practice of a given country.

Finally, where no Hungarian version is available, we recommend English-language sources as a starting point. At the moment, this is how far the researching and translating capacities of community development professionals in Hungary have allowed us to go. Nevertheless, we are confident that through the new generations continuously joining our work, this activity will be carried on in the future.
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*The past 25 years have been a special historic period for both Europe and Hungary - the era of hope and disillusionment*.

The West had never been so close!

Today, the West may seem farther away than ever...

**Meeting People**

We started meeting foreign professionals in 1990, which had a tremendous impact on us.[[3]](#footnote-3) *Angelika Krüger*[[4]](#footnote-4) came to visit us first, and in 1991 she brought Flemish *Wim van Rees*[[5]](#footnote-5) with her for a visit and to get to know each other. As a result, we organized a meeting in Budapest and an international workshop in the Hungarian village of Gyulaj for the *Combined European Bureau for Social Development[[6]](#footnote-6)* (CEBSD) as soon as in 1992. At that point, *HACD became an official member of this European professional network, and our membership has been active ever since*.

Many excellent colleagues have had an influence on us. We cannot introduce all of them here, only the ones we regard as our most important influencers:

Apart from Angelika and Wim, we met *Charlie McConnell*[[7]](#footnote-7) from Scotland, *Koos Vos[[8]](#footnote-8)* from Belgium (professional development), *Hans Andersson[[9]](#footnote-9)* from Sweden (democracy and partnership), *Stuart Hashagen* from Scotland (professional profile of community development), *Judith Reynolds* from England and *Elisabet Mattsson* from Sweden (cooperative development), *John Grayson* from England and *Marion Horton* from Scotland (Civil College, the interrelations of adult education and community development), Danish born *Kirsten Paaby* from Norway (sustainable development), *Oonagh McArdle* from Ireland and *Ruben David Fernandez* from Spain (community workers’ cooperatives, higher education, and methods). Polish *Pawel Jordan* taught us ways of networking, and from *Bohdan Skrzypczak* we learnt how to integrate community development into the practices of other professions. The organization of *Czech Ivana Bursiková* seeks to put civil society politics on the agenda. Many others have played a decisive role in our lives, but perhaps the most influential of all has been *Paul Henderson*[[10]](#footnote-10) from England.

*Chuck Hirt*, who lives in Slovakia, has played a decisive role in the founding and running of the Central and Eastern European Citizens Network (CEE CE), which has become a partner organization of CEBSD/EUCDN. We have also learnt a lot from the founders of this organization, especially from *Igor Stojanovič* from Bosnia and *Milĵenko Dereta* from Serbia.

There are many colleagues who are not part of any of these European networks, but are still very important to us. Among them are *Marjorie Mayo* from England, *Henri Braakenburg* from Belgium (community radio, settlements) and the *Josefina Fernandez i Barrera*, Catalunya Spain (volunteering), and the list is long.

During the intensive and experience-laden visits, study tours, conferences, as well as our joint projects, our foreign colleagues and *we kept discovering something important in each other’s work* that we could relate to our own practice and integrate into our work. For some foreigners, we might have represented their own professional past (e.g. settlements, community education, creating identity in block housing estates), but also their own prospects for developing civil society (*Budapest Declaration*[[11]](#footnote-11)). At the same time, we saw our future in foreign work, with all its attractive and deterrent traits.

This professional perspective was attractive to us, thanks to the higher level of expertise and varied areas of application. However, recognizing the extent to which community development was used by the state as an instrument for tackling poverty, the most difficult issue of them all, and how much community development professionals had an insecure livelihood, organizing their work from project to project most of the time, had a deterrent effect. When we gained our first experiences, these aspects were a novelty for us. By today, however, we have gotten to know this world all too well.

**Reinforcement**

The first strong impression we had about our Western colleagues was that *they were seriously interested* in our country, our professional work, our organizations and our person. Obviously, the historic times we were living in also increased this interest, but the decades that have passed since have confirmed that this sort of *openness and showing of interest* is indeed part of our Western European colleagues’ culture. Our answers to their questions have led us to new discoveries, and perhaps this is why the self-introduction of groups and local communities has become a valuable methodological aspect of community development in Hungary.

It would be great if we, Hungarians, could be this open towards the lives of others. In any case, the fact that they gave positive feedback about our activities was a huge reinforcement for us.

**Cultural exchange**

By now it has also become clear that *European interactions are not only professional, but also cultural in nature*.

For example, the way in which people in Europe relate to each other was rather attractive - freedom, democracy and self-consciousness are inherent in all social interactions. We, on the other hand, are constantly learning what the *culture of democracy* means in families, at the workplace, on the streets, while shopping or going about our business, or in the representation of local issues, in the local and social public sphere, and in decision-making. The interpretation of democracy as a way of life, as a social relationship, as a working method and as active citizenship, provides an incredibly rich area of study for us.

The period between 1984 and 1994 was a *decade of intensive French-Hungarian exchanges* that has resulted in long-lasting cultural changes in the lives of many French and Hungarian local communities. Hence, we look at those years as the decade of our getting embedded in Europe in a cultural sense. In 1994 *Paul Blin*, one of the most prominent figures in this process, was awarded the *Pro Cultura Hungarica* memorial plaque by Minister of Culture Gábor Fodor (‘To the President of the Society of Hungarophil Communities in France, in recognition of 10 years of activity in the area of Hungarian-French cultural and organizational exchanges.’) This was an opportunity for Paul to speak, upon being interviewed by his colleague and friend, Tamás A. Varga, with a sort of self-revelation that was unusual of him. He talked about his life, rendering perceptible his way of humanistic thinking that was behind his actions, and recalling some memorable exchanges. The interview was translated into Hungarian by *Judit Solymosi*, who worked in those French-Hungarian exchanges in a self-sacrificing way. (Blin, 1994)

We are through the period of ‘illusion’, as we are experiencing abuses of democracy, the emptying out of democratic institutions, manipulation, populism, and giving preference to interest groups - and unfortunately the list is much longer. *Marjorie Mayo*[[12]](#footnote-12) was the first to reveal to us the increasingly sophisticated, and, consequently, more efficient and immoral ‘solutions’ used for performing those abuses. In 1993, she organized a study tour for ten Debrecen community development professionals to the *Ruskin College* in Oxford, presenting - among other things - the results of their running research project to reveal the true cause behind the closure of the Oxford Rover Automobile Factory. (Giczey, 1993)

It is very instructive to learn about how to live and find ways forward (to each other) in societies with complicated social fabrics that exist in permanent change and division. It is not an overstatement to say that making contacts is a precondition for staying alive, which was an important message for Hungarians who once lived in a society that was all too homogeneous. The culture of a people who got more sophisticated through experiencing the primary and further stages of oppression, yet were generally missing freedom, got compared with societies which were much freer than theirs. Another thing that soon became clear was that this heavily criticized homogenous culture also had a number of positive elements as compared to the cultural crisis of a society that was increasingly falling to pieces after the change of regime.

**Similarities**

*Origin and Growth*. There is an evident parallel between the settlement houses that were popular around the end of the 19th century and the *Open House* experiment that started in 1976 and is presented in this paper in the section about the history of community development in Hungary. Both types of institutions have stimulated community development and adult education.

S*ocio-cultural animation* (animation socioculturelle) can be seen as the French version of community development, which had a great impact on cultural management and popular education in Hungary, all the more so as in France, too, (community) cultural centers (maisons de la culture) provided the basis for social/community/civic life. It was a very amusing recognition that cultural centers, which spread in Hungary following the Russian pattern, had been introduced in Russia due to French influence.

We also found a substantial match regarding the need for community development. The need for mediation, the need for renewal, and the challenge posed by cultural change and democratization are equally important for every EU country, even if the social context of each country offers different modes of entry and management.

**Differences**

*In terms of democratic knowledge and skills, our countries are on different levels.* This kind of knowledge and skills are fundamental to the development of the community development profession. For example, contacts, networks and advocacy/lobbying will occur on different levels in a country with a rich democratic culture as compared to a country which is just beginning to build democracy.

The *social leaderships* of different countries relate differently to making the *acquisition of democratic skills and knowledge widely available*, and the same can be said about the professional interventions (e.g. community development) that speed up these processes. The professional history of community development shows that governments and local governments in democratic countries with advanced economies have counted with this development potential since the end of the 19th century, providing jobs and subsidies to allow for their wider operation. In case of a threat (war, termination of colonial status, social tensions arising from the emergence of multiculturalism, economic crisis, etc.), these social policy instruments and institutions enjoy increased support in these countries. This, in turn, puts an increased moral burden on professionals and may even cause a professional identity crisis, since the social leadership sometimes fails to or only partially provides the necessary conditions for performing these duties, which means that their efforts are not always crowned with success.

In light of the foregoing, it is clear that *each country is on a different level in terms of developing social intervention professions*. Where many people are engaged in them and an increasing number of people turn, from local activists, into professionals, the exchange of experience and practical solutions happens in a wide range as well. The reason for this is that professional information and exchange mechanisms (conferences, seminars, workshops, working groups, organizations, networks and collaborations) are put in place, and in parallel, a training system is created with different modules that are built on each other and reinforce each other, and involve different levels of education (basic, intermediate and advanced), teachers, curricula and a complete infrastructure. In this situation, it is possible to keep the question of values, ethical problems, intervention modes, as well as maintaining quality assurance, on the agenda. This is what we call the *standing conference on community development*, that is, the permanent exchange of the profession. The values ​​and ethical standards based on the consensus of professionals result in a strong commitment and increase the social legitimacy of the profession, while also allowing for reaching a consensus in terms of defining and updating the standards of community development.

In line with this, in the professional networks of different countries there are differences in terms of fundamental values, principles and legitimacy issues as well. In addition to this being something culturally determined, we hereby wish to focus on two of the most important, fundamental values, namely the principles of *community and participation*. In countries where the profession’s basic principles are considered to be the essential building blocks of democracy, incorporating the values formulated during the social practice (*equality, diversity, tolerance, cooperation, partnership, solidarity, etc.*) into the profession has tended to be prioritized. We are committed to these values as well, but we still lack consensus-based professional agreements of the above-mentioned magnitude.

**Different focuses of professional work**

As I have already described elsewhere (Vercseg, 2011), community development by its nature tends to *move together with a constantly changing society*, shaping, expanding, deepening and altering its scope, initiatives and activity focuses according to the movements of society. *If we look at these focuses on the European level, the list includes almost every major professional area of the past decades*:

• the development of civil society,

• theory and research, experimental work,

• sustainable development, environment,

• training: training of activists, professional training from vocational training to higher education,

• working with minorities and immigrants,

• community-based economic development - social economy,

• community work with disadvantaged people - combating poverty,

• community education, adult education, lifelong learning, and cultural development,

• community organization,

• community planning,

• community development policy and legislation on the European, national and local levels,

• multiculturalism, racism and anti-discrimination work,

• professional development: standards, *standing conference on community development*,

• influencing society and policies,

• urban development - urban regeneration,

• rural development,

• community development in other professions (e.g. architecture, landscape planning, etc.)

Taking into account the activity focuses of our age is an exciting project in itself, since it demonstrates a wide range of professional actions. That said, actual areas of application vary from country to country and depend on local cultural conditions, the state of democracy, and the prevailing social/community conditions. We often have the experience that when we learn about a good practice somewhere in Europe and think it could be beneficial in the domestic setting as well, ‘transplanting’ it does not (always) work because the soil, the dominant mindset, simply rejects it as something that is alien to our traditions and our environment does not justify it as relevant: our regulations and support systems do not favor it.

**And what have *we* given Europe?**

In addition to the above, my answer to this question is that so far it has been the roots - that is, cultural development, socio-cultural animation and civic/community adult education - that have drawn the most attention from our foreign colleagues and inspired them to organize several international *Grundtvig programs* of varying scale.[[13]](#footnote-13) The Civil College Foundation has played a leading role in this process, not only inspiring such adult education programs, but - in partnership with the Hungarian Association for Community Development - also organizing several of them, as evidenced by several important European documents.[[14]](#footnote-14)

We have achieved a similarly significant impact by putting, from the very beginning, *the development of civil society* in the focus of domestic activities, and for a long time it indeed seemed that time was on our side. In my work just cited I have already described how ‘civil society... is capable of combining all the “traditional” forms of professional intervention that community development has developed in the area of overcoming disadvantage, including the excluded, multicultural coexistence, the integration of minorities, etc. abroad and, to a lesser extent, at home. (Vercseg, 2011: 69)

These were the exact recognitions that have reinforced European community development professionals in that *they have to be even more active in the context of civil society*. These ideas were synthetized in a more comprehensive manner - and the areas of community development intervention in the context of civil society defined - between March 25-28, 2004, at the international conference *Building Civil Society in Europe through Community Development* organized by the Combined European Bureau for Social Development (CEBSD), the Hungarian Association for Community Development (HACD) and the International Association for Community Development (IACD). The event was attended by 130 delegates from 33 EU and non-EU countries including community workers, researchers, donors, decision-makers, and representatives of governments, social organizations and communities, with the goal to prepare the 10 candidate countries for EU accession. *Apart from defining what community development is (Preamble)*, the joint declaration issued at the conference (Budapest Declaration, 2004) *identified 9 main areas of activity for community development*:

• Community development policy and legislation on the European, national and local governmental levels

• Community development training

• Community development theory and research

• Community Development and rural development

• Community development and urban regeneration

• Community development, sustainable development and the environment

• Community development, lifelong learning and cultural development

• Community development, local economic development and social economy

• Community development, minorities, immigration, racism and discrimination.

As a result of the conference, a number of consultation and planning processes and policy work were initiated in the participating countries, primarily at national and European level. CEBSD and CEE CN became part of organizations that represent professional interests on the European level.

However, all this happened before the years of the economic crisis beginning in 2008. Since then, a most mixed image has emerged in terms of professional practice. There are places where basic institutions have been closed or transformed, or a self-organizing (national!) professional organization has remained without support for years (Republic of Ireland, United Kingdom, the Netherlands). Nevertheless, community development has survived because it has become an integral part of the given country’s culture, and the professional knowledge and practices acquired are now operated and financed by other public institutions. It is common for organizations to secure their survival in a permanent battle. And there are the lucky ones who, thanks to their high level of democracy or special status, not only survive, but even have a chance to develop.
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