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Abstract

Religion has played a significant role in the historical unfolding of what is now understood as ‘development.’ Until recently, however, religious modes of contemporary development have been overlooked in development scholarship. The dissertation uses ethnographic data about the religious ethics undergirding the discourse, and practices of development agents in Catholic Welfare and Development (CWD), a faith-based NGO in Cape Town, South Africa. It explores how the dynamic interrelation between faith and ethics permeated the development encounter and produced particular modalities for the ethical/moral development of the subjectivities of CWD’s developers. Informed by their own development, developers attempted to develop those they considered to be beneficiaries. The dissertation argues, and provides evidence to demonstrate, that, through the shared experience of development as an interpersonal and intersubjective encounter, both developers and beneficiaries were developed and also developed each other. It goes on to suggest that this finding challenges the binary representation of development relationships (developer/beneficiary) and that — despite the asymmetry of the reciprocities involved — it is misleading to think in such dichotomous terms, precisely because doing that misrepresents the power and agency wielded by each subject-position in every development encounter. Underpinning the work’s argument is an attempt to go beyond the post-development critique in the anthropology of development and to shift from monolithic representations of ‘the development industry’ as homogenous, and to engage with the diversity of practices found within ‘alternatives to development.’
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I have never been particularly enthusiastic about dancing. As I dance, I tend to channel the movements of a dying android — rigid, lethargic, and spasmodic. I can, however, manage to sway back and forth successfully, arms wrapped around my partner’s waist, as I did at my wedding. These are elementary movements most adolescents are capable of mastering. I witnessed as much growing up in the United States. Like most American teenagers, I attended the major ‘rites of passage’ social events — the prom and homecoming — and observed and participated in slow dances with partners of both the comely and unappealing variety. Despite at least biannual practice, I never warmed up to the idea of publicly ‘getting down.’ The idea of a crowd of people being exposed to my clumsy shimmying leaves me cringing in dread; yet another example of public performance as incubus. After four blissful years of having no reason to dance in public, I found myself the unwitting student of ballroom dancing. As I reflect upon my distress at that moment, standing in front of nearly 100 people, I am amused that in all of my preparations to undertake anthropological fieldwork with a faith-based development organisation, I never once considered the need for proper dancing shoes.

In the meeting hall of Athlone’s Catholic Parish in Cape Town, South Africa, employees of Catholic Welfare and Development (CWD) huddled together with volunteers, beneficiaries,¹ and interns, like myself, listening intently and participating in activities as the day unfolded. We had all ventured out to the location for an organisational meeting called an ‘All-In.’ These meetings occur triannually and focus on fellowship and the development of staff. This, my second, All-In had a

¹ Despite it being problematic to assume that people always receive some benefit from development interventions, I will be using the word ‘beneficiary’ throughout this dissertation, since it is used by CWD staff amongst whom I conducted research to refer to those they serve.
springtime theme that fortified CWD’s valorization of the ‘holistic’ development of the person. Primary emphasis was placed on physical health through nutrition and exercise while the spiritual dimension of life — highly valued by most employees — was broadened through prayer and scripture readings. We were there to learn; we were there to be nurtured; in short, we were there to be developed. As stated that day by CWD’s Operational Manager, Zukile Tom: ‘Development doesn’t have to do with just beneficiaries; development has to do with us.’

As the morning hours concluded, we were treated to a dance performance by two beneficiaries of CWD’s youth development efforts. A young man, sharply dressed in a black tuxedo, and a young woman, dressed in a low-cut red-sequined evening gown, walked hand-in-hand toward the centre of the room. A hushed silence fell as the music swelled and the couple gracefully waltzed, only to be quickly interrupted by the uproarious cheers of the rapt audience further coaxing the performers into grander spins and igniting the passionate confidence emanating from their eyes, as if gazing into a distance unconfined by the walls of the local parish and the often impermeable boundaries of the informal settlements of the Cape Flats.

These two young people were not taught to dance by CWD’s development workers; rather, ‘Peer Educators’ — earlier CWD beneficiaries, trained in life skills, leadership and ‘personal motivation’ (CWD 2010: 21) — had worked on a voluntary basis to educate them and others in ballroom dance technique. Such Peer Educators have significant autonomy, but they also work in conjunction with CWD’s Youth Interfacing Programme (YIP) and at CWD’s Community Development Centre (CDC) in Cape Town’s sprawling Khayelitsha township.

Following the performance, all those present were invited to rise and dance. Comfortably glued to my seat, I observed the staff members’ joy as they jubilantly grooved alongside one another. As I watched, I spoke with a staff member who had helped organise the most recent ‘Friday

According to Bornstein’s (2005) study of Protestant NGOs in Zimbabwe, ‘holism’ hinges on the idea that progress should occur in more than just the socio-economic sphere. Similarly, several of my interlocutors advocated a ‘holistic’ development at CWD that recognised the importance of the spiritual dimension of life.

YIP is one of CWD’s ‘community-based programmes,’ and it is a primary ‘focus area’ for the organisation. It seeks to develop the faculties, talents, and leadership skills of youth living in Cape Flats suburbs (otherwise known as townships and some of which are informal settlements). The programme’s vision is to facilitate the creation of ‘liberated, motivated, active and caring youth in South Africa who are committed to leading responsible lives.’

In South Africa, the term township must be understood in light of the history of Apartheid. When ‘non-whites’ were forced from cities such as Cape Town, they were relocated into suburbs (or townships) on the outskirts of the city. Such suburbs were segregated from the white population (and still remain so for the most part) and were (are) challenged with poor access to resources, such as sewage systems, water, electricity, and employment opportunities.
Learning Space’ (FLS)\(^5\) that had focused on ballroom dancing as a form of exercise. She said that the young dancing couple had taught several staff some ballroom techniques at the FLS and that a portion of this All-In was to act as an extension of the FLS’s dancing lessons. This new information told me there was a good chance I soon would have to brave the horror of the dance floor.

I was not mistaken. After lunch, the All-In’s organisers began inviting people to receive a modest parcel of the fathomless discourse of dance. When few accepted the call, volunteers were chosen. Surrounded by some of my most intimate interlocutors, I was targeted by a barrage of pointing fingers and engulfed in a cacophony of voices yelling: ‘Grant! Grant will do it’ and ‘Get out there Grant!’ In retrospect, I am very thankful to have had so many friends willing to humiliate me in public. What is a better measure of friendship and rapport than the ability to laugh with and tease others within a protective bond (Ross 2010: 147-148)? After reading so much about the precarious relationships between anthropologists and the development industry (See Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Mosse 2005), I had never expected to be embraced so warmly by CWD’s workers. Yet, as I joined my fellow beneficiaries at the centre of the room, none of this happened to cross my mind — only terror.

We were first set into rows. The space between each person was measured according to wingspan. Instructed to hold out our arms as if in some full body cast embracing an invisible partner, we slid our feet forward — right, left, together; left, right, together. When we could move no further, we repeated the same movements backwards. Lacking the support of a real partner, my arms began to tire and droop.

We began phase two of the lesson just as my arms finally refused to remain upright. I found a good teacher from the Khayelitsha CDC dedicated to developing my technique. To ward off ambiguity and maintain traditional gender norms, I was designated as the one to lead my partner in the dance. Luckily, I was not expected to lead on my own. My partner would tap my right shoulder when I was to lead with my right and tap my left shoulder when I was to lead with my left. I was leading and being led simultaneously. We switched partners. This time I found myself dancing with the young woman who had performed earlier in the day. She guided me much as my previous partner had. As we moved across the floor, I heard the loud cheers and chants of those who had insisted upon my participation: ‘Go Grant! Go Grant! Go Grant!’ I could discern every laugh as I stumbled around the hall in a euphoric blur comprising half fear half joy. I noticed the muscles of my face aching. I was unaccustomed to smiling this intently.

\(^5\) ‘Friday Learning Spaces’ offer an intermittently occurring forum for staff education and development.
The possibility that one can concurrently lead and be led, develop while being developed, and benefit despite being benefactor complicates the roles typically outlined in descriptions of the development encounter. Yet such apparent contradictions saturate the experience of development at CWD. There is, of course, a surface distinction between developer and beneficiary. The reality, however, is far more complex; and it has significant implications for how anthropologists might configure agency and consider power dynamics. As will be demonstrated in this dissertation, development — in its practical application, at least at CWD, and abstract conception — defies easy definition and challenges the tendency of anthropologists both to portray development as a hegemonic monolith and to construct rigid boundaries between ‘developer’ and ‘beneficiary.’ With CWD as exemplar, I argue that development must be seen as a complex process of change in which the line between ‘development worker’ and ‘beneficiary’ is seldom unequivocal: the beneficiary is developed and the developer is developed.

The preceding narrative illustrates several themes shaping this dissertation. First, it demonstrates the ethnographic nature of this project. I conducted 8 weeks of intensive anthropological research at CWD over June and July 2011 with some additional supplementary fieldwork between August and December 2011. My research was heavily dependent upon the method of participant observation and the context of my fieldsite. A second theme is that of context: there I address questions about the religious identity and development approach of the organisation and show how CWD is wrapped up in a unique Catholic development discourse that is as much the product of Catholicism as it is of development trends and of the South African context.

Thirdly, I seek to demonstrate that, as in (but not limited to) the dancing narrative, there is a reciprocity to development — that may eventually become symmetrical — that problematises the rigid binarism of (static) developer versus (passive) beneficiary. My research has suggested that binary oppositions in development are not viable for good analysis.6 Extending this point, I have found that agency is best theorised according to ability to produce an effect (Laidlaw 2010; Latour 2005), and that power — particularly its role in governmentality, ethics, and subjectivity (See Foucault 1998 and 2010; Rabinow 1998; Mahmood 2005) — is ubiquitous and not the sole property of inflexible apparatuses of a globalised political economy. Furthermore, within this third theme is a recognition that development fundamentally occurs at intersubjective encounter events in which people make meaning, define roles, acknowledge expectations, exchange knowledges, and essentially co-emerge. To say this, however, is not to dismiss some level of self-fashioning.

---

6 See Mahmood (2005) for a similar approach that problematises the binary oppositions between freedom and subjection and religion and politics in the context of an Islamic women’s pedagogical movement in Egypt.
Theoretical movements in psychoanalysis (Ettinger 2005; 2006; Devisch 2006; 2007) and subjectivity (Jackson 1998; Guattari 1995; Foucault 1998 and 2010) have been instrumental in enabling me to develop this dimension of my research. By looking at how the ‘developer-as-subject’ is formed, I bring the issues of binarism, power, and agency into focus.

*Anthropology as Ethnography*

I first contacted CWD in August 2010. In my initial email, I rather awkwardly introduced myself and my interest in doing an anthropological study on the Catholic nature of the organisation. After nervously waiting about a week to see if anyone in the organisation would entertain my academic ramblings, I received an email from Judith Turner who specializes in training and development of CWD staff. I had my first face-to-face interview with her in September. It was not until my second interview in November, with Michail Rasool in the Marketing Department (he later became one of my closest informants), that CWD’s management finally decided that I would be accepted as a Research Intern. On 1 June 2011, I arrived for my first day of fieldwork.

From the outset, I knew that the project would need to be multi-sited. However, due to the practical needs associated with such a short term project, it was necessary to limit my fieldwork to two sites: the Marketing and Fundraising Department at the main office (a former convent also referred to as ‘37a’) in the suburb of Green Point, adjacent to Cape Town’s CBD; and the Elsies River Community Development Centre (CDC) located on the Cape Flats, 20 kilometres east of the CBD [see Fig. 1 (map) on Page 8]. My first day of fieldwork found me a home in the Marketing and Fundraising Department. As evidenced by his great care and interest as he introduced me throughout the main office, Michail seemed very pleased with my presence. Following my extensive introduction, he showed me to my office alongside his own.

I spent a significant part of my first few weeks at CWD learning the organisation and participating in marketing activities: writing newsletter articles, attending event planning meetings, covering special events, and taking pictures. During my second week, Michail introduced me to Natasja Solomon, the Elsies River CDC manager. Natasja quickly became my other primary informant. I spent many days in Elsies River with Natasja; we had frequent talks and I joined her for many of her programmes, of which a week-long holiday programme for schoolchildren (see Chapter 3) was the most significant. My strategic placement at both CWD’s main office and the Elsies River CDC allowed me to witness both the administrative and practical aspects of CWD’s...
development practices. While much of my fieldwork was confined to these two sites, I also visited other CDCs — in Khayelitsha, Gugulethu, Delft, and Tafelsig — and various programmes where I observed operations and interviewed staff. Attending organisational meetings was also an invaluable way for me to gather data. Through the systematic use of participant observation, interviewing, and ‘snowball sampling’ (Bernard 2006: 185), I compiled the data presented here.

Before proceeding, it is necessary for me to be clear that I have neither intended to determine nor to assess the success or failure of CWD’s programmes, nor generally to critique South African programmes focused on development through education. Rather, I am interested in how those working at CWD understand development, foster the organisation’s emphasis on learning, and perceive the roles that faith, religious knowledge and ethical principles and practice play in the agency’s development discourse.

The dissertation may be characterised as an attempt, in Nader’s (1972) words, to ‘study up.’ This is also the study’s primary limitation since I cannot presume to know how CWD’s work is perceived by those the organisation serves. That dimension can of course be addressed by future projects; but time constraints have precluded it here where my primary interest is in how staff members perceived their relationships with beneficiaries and reflected upon shared experiences — often commemorated in their own expressed ‘development narratives’ and ‘testimonials’8 — to determine programme success or failure and also, importantly, to modify their development practices.

**CWD and the Catholic Discourse of Development**

On 30 June 2011, a week after arranging the visit, I drove my aging but reliable Nissan Sentra to a retirement village in Hout Bay, a Cape Town suburb alongside the western (Atlantic) seaboard south of the city centre, to visit CWD’s co-founder, Muriel Howell. Arriving at her gate, I rang the bell to her flat. Muriel answered in a kind but frail voice and sent her husband out to lead me to their home. Upon my entering, she greeted me warmly and motioned me to take a seat in a nearby chair. We immediately jumped into discussing her autobiography and its overlap with the historical trajectory of CWD. Most of this information she communicated to me through a few

---

8 I find it necessary to differentiate between ‘development narratives’ and ‘testimonials.’ What I am calling ‘development narratives’ are used to critically examine development practice and intersubjective interactions (See Chapter 4). Testimonials, on the other hand, are narratives of the development encounter that commonly demonstrate success. They are marketable vignettes that act as one way of communicating efficacy to (potential) donors and to development workers themselves. The translation of efficacy to donors plays an important role in determining the success of interventions and the continuation of funding (Mosse 2005).
handwritten pages she had prepared. Born into a Catholic family, she had maintained a substantial involvement in the Church throughout her life. Having graduated from the University of Cape Town (UCT) in 1949 with a social work degree, she had worked — including a lengthy internship in Cape Town’s District Six⁹ — serving a variety of different populations (i.e. criminal offenders, abused children, alcoholics) over the next 20 years.

Along with fellow social worker Sister Elizabeth Meyer whom Muriel had befriended while both worked in UCT’s Social Work Department in 1966 — during what she called ‘the dark days of Apartheid’ — she pondered the Church’s role in alleviating the suffering caused by the structural inequalities of Apartheid. The two eventually sought the guidance of Cardinal Owen McCann. They asked for funds to feed 1,000 people but also made it clear that they wanted to do more than just provide welfare; they wanted to hire social workers to help those they serve. After a scheduled trip to the Vatican, Cardinal McCann returned to Cape Town with a R6,000¹⁰ grant from Caritas Internationalis¹¹ in Rome. Muriel and Sister Elizabeth left UCT and began the Catholic Welfare Bureau (CWB) — later named Catholic Welfare and Development — on 2 February 1970.

CWB was initially housed in three rooms at Cape Town’s Catholic Chancery and included just four staff members. From this location, they provided counselling services and, after they had purchased a vehicle, Sister Elizabeth began conducting home visits which she continued until she left CWB in 1976. Muriel oversaw CWB’s operations until 1980 when she turned over the responsibility to a man she saw as her apprentice, Peter Templeton. Under Templeton’s leadership, CWB thrived and the organisation’s name changed to CWD. Jasper Walsh succeeded Templeton followed by Lungisa Huna the current director.

CWD has grown significantly in its 40 years and is now, arguably, the largest NGO in the Western Cape (CWD 2009: 5). With a variety of programmes scattered across Cape Town’s over 300 informal settlements, CWD’s reach is immense. Yet, since the overwhelming inequalities perpetuated by economic disparity in Cape Town are so vast, and since no one organisation alone can hope to remediate their consequences, CWD collaborates with several stakeholders and Western Cape NGOs in providing services to those in need. CWD draws its funding—R43.5 million in

---

⁹ District 6 was a residential area in the CBD of Cape Town. In the 1960s, the apartheid government forcefully relocated the residents (approximately 60,000) of this area to the surrounding townships (McEachern 1998: 502).

¹⁰ The 2012 equivalent of R6,000 is greater than R300,000. In 2009/2010, CWD received R43.5 million from various donors (CWD 2010).

¹¹ Caritas Internationalis (CI) is a collective of 165 Catholic Organisations that have combined their resources to combat poverty and provide development services. CI is located in Vatican City and continues to be a significant donor to CWD.
2009/10—from the South African government, various companies, bequests, international and local donors, and funding agencies. Nearly 70% of CWD’s budget is reportedly spent on development; the remainder being used to develop fundraising capacity, to cover administration costs, to distribute as welfare payments, and to invest in future projects (CWD 2010: 42-43). CWD supports 4 key focus areas: Economic Development (ECODEV), Early Childhood Development (ELSO), Health and Nutrition (WARMTH), and Youth Interfacing (YIP). Within these focus areas, strategies — intended to ‘eradicate poverty,’ create ‘self-reliance,’ promote ‘human dignity,’ and ‘build the voice of the voiceless’ — are implemented through artistic, athletic, therapeutic, gerontological, and refugee projects. CWD (2010) also maintains CDCs (See Fig. 1) through which programmes are carried out in Atlantis, Mbekweni, Tafelsig, Weltevreden, Masiphumelele, Gugulethu, Khayelitsha, Elsies River, and Delft townships (CWD 2010).

---

12 CWD is currently working on establishing a new focus area called Vulnerable Women and Children, which integrates two specialised programmes: Women in Need, which offers homeless women skills training and provides education to their children, and Bonne Esperance, which provides living quarters, therapy, and skills training for refugees.
At CWD, the Catholic Social Teachings (CSTs) provide the ideological structure through which one can approach practical and participatory development. CWD’s Mission Statement (see Appendix 1) clearly states that: ‘We strive to promote an integrated and inclusive approach that recognizes human dignity in accordance with the Social Teachings of the Catholic Church’ (CWD 2009: 2). The CSTs allow for a surface distinction to be made between Catholic discourse and the dominant development discourse of economic prosperity and technological progress. The CSTs and the Gospels act as the epistemological and ontological foundation for CWD’s development discourse.

In this dissertation, I demonstrate that use of these religious knowledges — and debatably secular one’s like ‘participation’ — enables the construction of a vision of development that is fundamentally pedagogical, diachronic, dialogical and overtly concerned with what is best described as ethical subjectivity. I show that such a pedagogical emphasis saturates the ordinary activities of CWD and that it creates the ‘culture of learning’ described to me by CWD Director Lungisa Huna and that is illustrated in my introductory dancing narrative. It is this preoccupation with learning (which in this context has profound religious undertones) that ultimately, I show, allows for the rejection of inflexible divides between development workers and beneficiaries — a binary opposition that, I argue oversimplifies the development encounter and marginalises persons who, precisely because of their marginality, are frequently deemed to be in need of development interventions.

**Emergent Subjectivity and the Cycle of Faith**

As indicated in the dancing narrative and the preceding section, a central facet of my analysis is to problematise that binary opposition between beneficiary and developer. My argument, therefore, is concerned with challenging conceptions of power and reconfiguring agency within the development encounter. Its main focus, however, is the production, maintenance, and modification of the subjectivities of development professionals. I argue and seek to demonstrate that it is through understanding the extent to which CWD developers engage in processes of subjective becoming that one can critique conceptions of binarism, power, and agency.

---

13 The Catholic Social Teachings are a doctrinal collection developed through papal encyclicals since the late 19th century. The Catholic concern with human dignity and social and economic justice can be found within the CSTs. Other important themes present in the CSTs — relevant to this dissertation — are solidarity, subsidiarity, option for the poor, and the equality of women.
I use subjectivity\textsuperscript{14} in this dissertation to refer to the relation of self — comprising one’s emergent truths, desires, practices, and perspectives — to others, and to the influence present in a variety of encounters, whether social, political, economic, or religious. One’s subjectivity is constituted by ethical criteria, accepted practices, and other particular knowledges that guide how to perform in relation to self, to others, and to discursive power.

As I show, a developer’s ‘becoming’ and ‘being’ is dependent upon self-initiative, discursive influences and relational experiences. In other words, my argument is that a developer at CWD develops through Catholicism and specialised (possibly ‘secular’) knowledge, the practice of those knowledges, the evaluation (i.e. ‘reflection and mindfulness’) of experiences gained through such practice, and the refinement of knowledge as per suggestions gathered through an evaluative process (See Fig. 2). I have called this process ‘The Cycle of Faith.’\textsuperscript{15} As I show in the chapters below, it comprises a practice-oriented, epistemological process of subject (re)construction — in

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure2.png}
\caption{The Cycle of Faith}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{14} Subjectivity at CWD is inextricable from ethics. The ideal subject is an ethical subject who performs in terms of the criteria and meets the expectations outlined by the Catholic tradition found in the Gospels and the CST. Whenever I use the terms ‘subjectivity’ and ‘ethical subjectivity,’ I am referring to the same abstract notion. That is because I see the two as coterminous. I use the modifier (‘ethical’) as a way occasionally to reiterate the importance of ethics in the constitution of any human subject.

\textsuperscript{15} Such diagrams and processes are not unusual to find when considering approaches to organisational learning (O’Keeffe 2002). Furthermore, the ‘Pastoral Circle’ — co-created by CWD’s Zukile Tom — explores similar themes in the context of parish development (O’Leary and Tom 2003). The ‘Cycle of Faith’ also parallels some aspects of Participatory Action Research (PAR), which is historically linked to pedagogical methods within liberation theology (i.e. Paulo Freire). What differentiates the Cycle of Faith is its focus on the emergence, practice, and evaluation of subjectivity. I am concerned with how such processes affect the production of the subject and then, in turn, affect development practice.
CWD’s case, a profoundly religious one — that is heavily influenced by reflection on events of experiential intersubjectivity and learning.

The complex relations within this process are made intelligible only within componential structures of subjectivity — similar to what Guattari (1995) calls ‘machines of subjectivation’ and, to some extent, similar in operation to what Ortner (1989), following Bourdieu (1977) and Sahlins (1981), calls ‘schemas’ — which compartmentalise the chaos of multitudinous possibilities and disjunctures through ‘refrains’ or recurrent themes (such as those found in the Gospels and the CSTs) and that ‘attract’ components to one’s subjective structure.

Throughout this dissertation, I draw on Guattari’s (1995) notion of a componential ‘machine of subjectivation’ to conceptualise the subjective structures of individual developers. I define a ‘machine of subjectivation’ as an auto-reproductive, componential structure of subjectivities, one that constitutes a bricolage or assemblage. Structures of subjectivity, according to Guattari (1995: 13, 93 cited in Watson 2005: 311-312), are best understood through autopoiesis, a term referring to the ‘auto-reproductive capacity of structure.’ Following Guattari (1995: 16-17), I use autopoiesis to describe component-switching occurrences within ‘machines of subjectivation.’ In my Cycle of Faith diagram (Fig. 2), the ‘machine of subjectivation’ is subsumed under the general ‘Knowledge’ heading of Phase I. As the self is exposed to new possibilities, the components constituting one’s subjectivity — the constituent elements of one’s subjectivity — are exchanged or reinforced. Moreover, they are the criteria and knowledge (i.e. values, techniques, modes of subjectivation, etc.) that one practices in order to be an ethical subject. My general concern here is with any subjective component that influences relations of development, by which I mean the normative philosophy and practice of development that governs relationships between beneficiaries and developers. Subjectivity must be corporeally and behaviourally practiced — knowledge must be enacted for it to have any bearing on the constitution of subjectivity.

Working from the premise that subjects are perpetually emerging through experience and reflection on such experience, I argue that structures of subjectivity are not the sole determinants of subject constitution; I am thus concerned with the extent and manner in which CWD’s employees participate in a self-fashioning process — comprising reflective moments on and of development narratives — to meet a set of desired ethical standards and expectations.

In Chapter 2, I explore how CWD workers practice reflection and mindfulness to ensure that they manifest the subjectivity they desire. Drawing on the ethico-aesthetic dimensions of Guattari’s and Foucault’s work on ethical subjectivity, I argue that the relation between autopoietical structure

---

16 See Radcliffe-Brown (1940) for more on this distinction between relations and relationships.
and individual subjects must be understood on an ethico-aesthetic level, by which I mean the principled creativity involved in subjectivity production. Such production of subjectivity thus includes ethical work (i.e. techniques of the self) that must be done for one to produce oneself as an ethical subject. The ethico-aesthetic dimension points to the necessity of practice in subjectivity production. I use the term ‘self-fashioning’ to refer to such self-creative practices of the constructed ethical subject.

The creation of one’s subjectivity can, however, never be a truly self-guided endeavour. Along with influential discourses, intersubjective experiences complicate subjective desires. The co-creative potential undergirding the intersubjective encounter — something that I see as a dimension of Foucault’s (1998 and 2010) governmentality notion — thus cannot be dismissed. Following psychoanalyst Ettinger (2005 and 2006), I am interested in what she describes as ‘copoiesis.’ For the purposes of this dissertation, however, I do not delve into the unconscious ‘sub-subjective’ territory of Ettinger’s matrixial trans-subjectivity. My ethnographic data cannot attest to such psychoanalytic depths. Rather, I use elements of Ettinger’s ‘theoretical complex’ to conceptualize the asymmetrical co-emergence of subjectivities (See Chapter 4 for more detail). Furthermore, unlike Ettinger (2006: 219), I do not deviate from Guattari’s notion of autopoiesis as a conceptual tool. For me, copoiesis is a concept closely interlinked with self-fashioning. Both are mechanisms for the (re)production of subjectivity: the former represents the creative potential of intersubjective experience while the latter represents the creative potential of self initiative. In other words, I use the term ‘co-emergence’ — in place of copoiesis (except when dealing directly with Ettinger’s theory) — to refer to the co-creative, intersubjective dimension of subject production.

As evident in the Cycle of Faith diagram, I am concerned with how ethico-aesthetic mechanisms of subject production contribute to the constitution of the structural subjectivity of CWD’s Catholic development professionals. In other words, I am interested in the subjective components that influence their relations of development and how such components are modified or reinforced through developer initiative and the intersubjective experiences occurring between developers and beneficiaries.

What I have called the Cycle of Faith is thus an analytical construct that I use to integrate subjectivity theory and Catholic terminology. Anthropologist Erica Bornstein (2005: 58-65) has already, to some extent, unpacked faith-related practice and shown it to be both discursive and practice-oriented. My intention is to expand further upon the lived practical reality of faith to unpack its role in subjectivity and to theorise better how it may be observed in anthropological research.
In this dissertation, I differentiate between ‘faith’ and ‘Faith.’ The lower case version denotes the standard definition of faith as ‘trust’; the upper case version refers to both knowledge and practice, both of which are central to Phase I of the Cycle of Faith. To outline how I understand Faith, I have turned to theological materials. As outlined in the Decrees of the First Vatican Council, ‘we know at the one level by natural reason, at the other by divine faith [revelation]’ (Tanner 1990). The production of a development worker’s subjectivity at CWD is dependent upon both knowledge forms (i.e. revelation, the CSTs, specialised knowledge of participatory development trends, etc.). That these two epistemological modalities are directly linked to action is reflected in James 2:17: ‘Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone.’

While much of the above is based upon my own brief theological inquiry, several informants appreciated or agreed with my assessment of Faith and how it works at CWD. Therefore, in CWD’s context, I argue, Faith consists of both knowledge and action. Development, like Faith, can also not exist just as an abstraction; it must be practiced. My argument is that it is through practice that the Catholic subject becomes.

Experiences are gained through informed practice (Phase II) which can either reveal the need for modifications in what has been reasoned, or reinforce the veracity of particular knowledge and practices, while also expanding a person’s faith — in both development practices and religious teachings — to the point of conviction or certainty (Phase III). Engaging in such a process allows the developer to modify knowledge and action and to (re)outline the ideal subjectivity for themselves by inserting new possibilities into that componential structure (Phase IV), thereby allowing for the fluid kinds of subjectivities that I show below are present at CWD. Even if an experience leads to a need for modification, one’s faith is not destroyed — if the process itself is not validating, the possibility of confirmation remains potentially realisable through future practice. In Chapter 4, I demonstrate how that pertains for the CWD developers for whom the question of the validity of Faith (knowledge and action) becomes empirically observable and the evidence collected through experiences with beneficiaries becomes capable of ensuring future action and spiritual steadfastness.

As I show, beneficiaries play an important role in influencing what constitutes the desired ethical subjectivity of a CWD developer and, in turn, the ideal CWD development practice. As in my opening narrative: the developer may visibly be leading; but underneath the surface reality lies a self being guided by interpersonal interactions and discursive influence towards its ever shifting ideal. To support this argument, I present evidence that complicates any sense of dualistic relationships between developer and beneficiary; and I do so through applying a combination of
Foucault’s, Guattari’s, Ettinger’s, and Latour’s ideas to develop ways of understanding agency, power, ethics, and relational subjectivity that enable me to critique the developer/beneficiary binary. I consider the analytical modalities I use in ever greater depth as they become relevant to my analysis of the ethnographic data.

The remainder of this dissertation comprises four chapters. Chapter 2 explores the internalised components (i.e. the 10 Core Values) of a developer’s ethical subjectivity and the techniques (i.e. reflection upon experiences, such as the intersubjective development encounter) by which such subjects were consciously self-produced through reinforcement or modification. The chapter details a complete movement through the Cycle of Faith occurring within the microcosm of the individual psyche. Chapter 3 examines the practice of each developers’ subjectivity in relation to others — rather than directly on the self — and how that kind of encounter is intended to exert influence over the ethical subjectivities and concomitant practices of beneficiaries. The chapter considers only the first two phases of the Cycle of Faith: the movement from knowledge in practice to the production of the intersubjective encounter event of development. Chapter 2 and 3 together show that development at CWD could be understood as work of the self on self and of the self on others. Each chapter details how various discursive modalities and techniques — governed by an overarching ‘refrain’ (Guattari 1995) of Catholicism — were employed to bring coherence to development practice. They show how, in the making of themselves as subjects, developers needed to perform the criteria that constitute them, and by doing so, they provided beneficiaries with new possibilities.

Their encounters with the beneficiaries, as discussed and illustrated in Chapter 4, also either reinforced subjective components or supplied the developer with new possibilities for performing the relations of development. Chapter 5 concludes the dissertation by pointing out that the previous analysis has shown that development should be understood as reciprocal, that developers’ specialised subjectivities are flexible and emergent, that agency should be reconfigured to account for the evident influence of those allegedly at ‘the bottom’ of development interventions, and that the developer/beneficiary binary should be rejected.
Chapter Two

Developing the Developer, Part I:
Ethical Pedagogies and Subject Self-Fashioning

‘Man, this pew is hard,’ I thought. I looked around wondering if anyone else was thinking about the pews’ unyielding nature. Everyone had delicately manoeuvred themselves throughout the church; some were very quiet and seemingly reflective; some gently thumbed through the programme of the ‘Thanksgiving Mass’; some whispered to their neighbours; others bowed their heads; two women in front of me genuflected and performed the sign of the cross before taking their seats. I sat near the back in my bothersome seat. My fidgeting subsided as I perused the programme. The Thanksgiving Mass looked to be rather detailed, and I began to look forward to the possibility of observing some intricate rituals. This was the fourth (and largest) Mass I had ever attended. Outside of my fieldwork experience, I had only attended a Catholic Mass once. I grew up attending a non-denominational church in an Indianapolis suburb. By my mid-20s, I had finally attended a Catholic Mass; but by that point, I was no longer a Christian having converted to the Bahá’í Faith when I was 21.

Immersed in the programme and unaccustomed to the ritual movements of Catholic Mass, I looked up from my service-programme reading when I heard singing and saw everyone standing up. I arose just as a procession of five priests made their way from the front of the church (stage right), around the last row of pews, and up the centre aisle back toward the stage. The ‘entrance hymn’ having concluded, the ‘Introductory Rites’ began, followed, in turn, by ‘The Liturgy of the Word’ comprising three scriptural readings from both the Old and New Testaments. Father Jerome Aranes, CWD’s spiritual director and one of the five processing priests, then approached the pulpit

17 I have chosen to reveal my religious background not because I fear some abstract loss of objectivity, but because I feel my religious ‘otherness’ (and similarity) created unique experiences that have played an interesting role in my arguments. Several Catholic CWD employees knew of my religious beliefs. It was never a (noticeable) concern for them. Within CWD, there are employees who identify with other Christian denominations and with Islam, while some consider themselves nonbelievers.

18 The Introductory Rites consisted of the Penitential Rite, the Gloria in Excelsis Deo, and an opening prayer.
and shared a story of a young boy approaching his confirmation day. Before his confirmation, Fr. Aranes had asked him: ‘What do you want to be when you grow up?’ The boy reportedly replied: ‘I want to be a drug lord.’ Despite the training he had received through confirmation classes, we were told, the boy did not recognise the contradiction: one could not be a drug lord and a good Catholic. Fr. Aranes proceeded to suggest that ‘we are failing as role models.’ His homily challenged development workers in the congregation to pursue the ideal telos and manifest it to the people they serve. He insisted: ‘It has to start with me...I must present myself as something better than what is out there ... what do you bring to this agency? What kind of a role model are you?’

Settled in my back row pew, I studiously took notes throughout the homily. The Mass progressed even as I argued with myself about how Foucauldian ethics pertained to the homily. Completely immersed in my internal discursive haze, I nearly missed something that turned out to be incredibly important: the Liturgy of the Eucharist. This was no ordinary Eucharist. Three women had suddenly lined up beside me. One held the paten; another held the chalice; the third held a

---

19 The paten is a plate that holds the Eucharistic bread.

20 The chalice holds the wine for the Eucharist.
double-sided poster (See Fig. 3 above) of CWD’s 10 Core Values over her head: *professionalism, integrity, harmony, passion, accountability, creativity, respect, collaboration, learning, and organisational pride*. The three then reverently marched down the centre aisle. Upon reaching the podium, they handed over the Eucharistic offerings for consecration. Archbishop Emeritus Lawrence Patrick Henry received the 10 Core Values poster and showed both sides to the audience before placing it at the base of the altar. The clergy then began consecrating the Eucharist — ritually transforming the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. As the bread and wine were transubstantiated, the Core Values poster remained at the base of the altar, subjected to the influence of the ritual. Much like the Eucharistic materials, the Values were seen as prayer offerings in need of consecration and, according to Father Aranes, given to God to ensure future blessings in a display of divine reciprocity. Through this process, a religious dialectic was formed in which the Values became distinctly Catholic and capable of creating Catholic subjects. My argument is that these newly consecrated Values are the key to understanding Catholic subjectivity at CWD — especially the value of ‘learning.’

CWD’s 10 Core Values were identified in March 2011 at a Development Committee (DEVCOM) meeting, attended by managers of CWD’s CDCs, focus areas, special programmes, and internal departments.\(^{21}\) I heard of diverse reasons why it was necessary for CWD to identify these Values and, thereby, to expand the organisation’s development discourse. Firstly, Michail insisted, the overwhelming needs in the Western Cape necessitated an urgent response that distracted the organisation from reflecting upon its own discourse. As he said: ‘It’s in the servicing of the system that we lose sight of our intentions.’ Complicating matters, Michail also asserted that the hegemonic discourses of secularisation and modernity had tended to suppress the religious discourse of CWD:

> We adopt the attitude of the more dominant civil society world. We’re governed by instincts of self-preservation, conduct ourselves in a particular way, and adopt the dominant discourse, in which the religious voice does not have dominance ... we caught that bug in our agency — of playing down our religion in our discourse.

\(^{21}\) According to Michail, DEVCOM is where ‘all managers discuss strategy.’
Connected to this reasoning is the continuing ubiquity of poverty and inequality in South Africa, and that the ‘dominant discourse’ has failed to alleviate the woes of poor people and to establish the idea of ‘human dignity’ prescribed by the CSTs. Interestingly, these values, according to CWD director Lungisa Huna, are a way of ‘proclaiming a stance to humanity’ — a stance that, I would argue, can publicly reconfigure the ethics undergirding development.

Secondly, several informants signalled that the Core Values are a practical way of addressing staff development needs. Due to recent structural changes (i.e. new employees, promotions, and new programmes), administrative staff perceived a need for a clear presentation of CWD’s ‘Catholic ethos.’ The 10 Core Values, therefore, were understood to act as a pedagogical modality by which the ideal developer can be and is produced.

Thirdly, the Values were perceived, according to CWD’s Operational Manager, Zukile Tom, to represent a kind of ‘facelift’ for the organisation, capable of attracting new donors and professionals interested in working with CWD. He said: ‘The Values were selected because the people who uphold these Values want to work with us.’ The Values, therefore, were imagined as a marketing tool communicating CWD’s development ethic to others who hold to these Values. As part of the African NGO industry where corruption is present and competition for funding is fierce, this was explicitly seen by CWD staff as an important way for CWD to distinguish itself.

There is clear variation in how CWD staff understood the production of the Core Values and how, as a set, they related to their respective religious convictions. While each of the three perceptions outlined above is relevant, and while to some extent they overlap, it is the second that informs the crux of my argument that the Core Values form a facet of Catholic development discourse that is implemented within a systematic pedagogy intended to produce a particular subjective state. Through what I call CWD’s ‘tripartite training system’ — including DEVCOM, the All-In, and the Retreat — I show below how this discursive modality is expanded upon and archaeologically linked to Catholicism. I show too how the ideal subjectivity of a CWD employee is meant to be achieved through the practice of these Values in a development setting — whether that be the internal development of the self or the facilitated development of the beneficiary — through approved development techniques. The three training modalities — which occur triannually — offer fora through which ‘staff development’ can occur. They also function on different levels. DEVCOM, for example, had established the Core Values at the level of institutional discourse. The All-In introduced the Values and opened them to discussion within the larger agency. The Retreat offered individual employees the opportunity independently to reflect upon the Values. While other programmes for ‘staff development’ are identified later in this dissertation, the tripartite training
system is primary. In this chapter, I investigate how the 10 Core Values are mobilised as tools for producing the subjectivity of development workers at both CWD’s All-Ins and its Retreats.

Subjectivity Acquisition and Discourse Expansion at the All-In

I arrived at St. Joseph’s Home for Chronically Ill Children — in Cape Town’s Montana suburb — around 8:30am on 3 June 2011 to help set-up for my first All-In. The All-In was centred upon the agency’s unveiling of the 10 Core Values to every employee. After only three days of fieldwork, I thus found myself already being exposed to a clear example of how Catholic ethics work at CWD. Upon arrival, I immediately began helping Michail and others arrange chairs and tables in the hall before troubleshooting equipment for multimedia presentations. As approximately one hundred people began filtering in, Michail and I — with some assistance from Zukile — projected Michail’s introductory Power Point presentation so everyone could see it. With the hall now filled, Michail directed everyone to seats for the beginning of the All-In.

Opening his presentation, Michail acknowledged the efforts of the Marketing and Finance Departments, the members of which had organised the All-In, before contextualising the day’s purpose and theme: Values. He said: ‘We’ve been so busy [responding to ‘practical needs’] we haven’t thought about why we do what we do.’ He then identified the ‘spiritual’ nature of the organisation, saying: ‘We are a Catholic organisation.’ Michail then guided everyone through an archaeology of the 10 Core Values reminding all that they are based upon the CSTs. Asking about the extent of people’s awareness of the CSTs, Michail received only a few mumbled affirmations from the audience. The CSTs, Michail said, are ‘based on the social precepts of Christ’s teachings’ that in turn derive from the ‘Two Great Commandments of Jesus’: love God and love your neighbour. It is the responsibility of CWD employees, he added, ‘to make sense of these two commandments’ through ‘God-centered’ practice which emphasises that ‘one fundamentally governs one’s [own] work to make it effective.’

This implies that the Core Values are a modality for self-governance and what, drawing on Foucault (1998 and 2010) and Guattari (1995), I am calling the self-fashioning of the ethical subject or, using Foucault’s terminology, subjectivation. Drawing on the Foucault’s later work during his ‘ethical turn’ (see Rabinow 1998: xxiv-xl; Faubian 2001; Mahmood 2005: 30-31; Lambek 2010a: 24-25), I argue that these Values are criteria or guidelines (Lambek 2010a) acquired and acted upon through development practice and techniques of self.

Foucault envisioned his ethical analysis — commonly known as his ‘ethical fourfold’ (Rabinow 1998; Mahmood 2005) — as the formula by which one could release oneself
from subjection, create one’s own subjectivity, and encourage such a mode of subject formation in others to create a democratic existence capable of ‘speaking truth to power’ (see Rabinow 1998; Foucault 2010). Foucault’s ethics have, however, been used outside of their original intent and employed in contexts that challenge notions of what constitutes subjection. Mahmood (2005), for example, appropriates Foucauldian ethics into the context of an Islamic women’s pedagogical movement in Egypt. In liberal feminist discourse, the actions of these Muslim women could be attributed to the reproduction of patriarchal religious norms and false consciousness. Yet Mahmood (2005) argues and indeed demonstrates that the women desire the pious forms dictated by the Qur’an, understand freedom and subjection differently from liberal feminist discourse and manage thereby to create themselves in the image of their own culturally informed ethical ideal.

In this dissertation I take Mahmood’s argument and apply it in a way that uses Foucauldian ethics in the context of Catholic development workers at CWD. To demonstrate how I do that and how I use Foucault’s ethical fourfold, it is necessary first to identify its constituent elements. Foucault (See Rabinow 1998: xxiv-xl; Mahmood 2005: 30-31) distinguished and considered the interrelations between ‘Ethical Substance’ (intellect and body), ‘Modes of Subjectivation’ (the way one relates to normative obligations, criteria, ideals, rules, and laws), ‘Ethical Work’ or ‘Techniques of Self’ (monitoring self to ensure one achieves one’s desired ethical form), and ‘Telos’ (ethical models by which to judge oneself).

It is, as I show, through particular forms of telos (i.e. Jesus, saints, exceptional co-workers, etc.) and through ethical work (i.e. development practice, reflection, mindfulness, evaluation, etc.) that CWD employees engage with the criteria and expectations of the organisation to reinforce or modify the state of their minds and bodies. I show too that such a practice-oriented process, in which the ethical form is developed, aids in the construction of a governable subject attuned to the expectations of social normativity. Yet it is one in which the individual self must take responsibility for her/his development. Doing so does not designate one a victim of subjection or a dupe of false consciousness. To judge so absolutely would be to marginalize others, to deny them their sincerity, and to allow oneself to be cut off from any understanding of freedom outside of one’s own milieu. My goal here, therefore, is to show that CWD’s employees are active, willing, and informed participants in the construction of their own subjectivities. That said, however, it is also the case that the willingness of CWD’s operational structure to accommodate multiple voices and views allows for such a stance — which points to the need to recognize that in circumstances where subjection and repression prevent the establishment of anything resembling a democratised commons, it is likely to be very difficult to support self-fashioning.
Returning now to the All-In: Following Michail’s introduction, we broke into groups of approximately fifteen to discuss what turned out to be pretty much newly revealed Values for the participants. Each group was assigned three Values to discuss and later to present to the entire organisation. My group was asked to explore how harmony, learning, and organisational pride might apply to our work; I focus here on only harmony and learning.

Those in my group said that harmony was found in ‘striving for synergy as an organisation and then among programmes.’ They also spoke of a ‘dual-flow’ of information at CWD that moved freely between staff, and from ‘top to bottom’ and ‘bottom to top.’ Harmony at CWD, they explained, depends upon these communicative flows. As will be demonstrated in Chapter 4, such communicative flows between development professionals enable possibilities for learning that characterise much of the Cycle of Faith (see Chapter 1). They also said that they perceived learning as a prerequisite for ‘living’ in a changing world and necessary for the survival of CWD (‘an organisation that doesn’t learn dies’). The importance of learning was also extended to beneficiaries whom they said were to be given ‘opportunities’ to learn and become — echoing CWD’s Mission Statement (see Appendix 1) — ‘self-reliant communities.’

I was surprised that, after Michail’s painstaking efforts to link the Values to Catholicism, members of my group neglected to mention the religious dimension of our three Values, at least prior to my eliciting such comment. This suggested a taken-for-grantedness about the role Jesus’s teachings played in their work. The explicitness of Jesus’s ministry was veiled by the everyday challenges of development work and addressed by the ‘ordinary’ ethical practice of ‘judgment’ (Lambek 2010a: 2-3) — or ‘evaluation’ — and commitment to specific ‘criteria’ such as the Core Values (Lambek 2010b: 43). With some coaxing, however, they began to draw out what was, to them, obvious — when encountering beneficiaries, they were ‘seeing the image of God’; giving was a way of ‘showing love’ and ‘resembling [Jesus]’; and manifesting the Core Values in practice is impossible without the Christian ‘love’ in the ‘Two Great Commandments of Jesus.’ Following this elicited discussion, I came to realise that for several CWD employees the ‘gift’ of Jesus’s self sacrifice through crucifixion was a mode of understanding their ‘gift’ of development and welfare service to those they regarded as the beneficiaries of their efforts. While not always consciously expressed, they thus seemed to perceive themselves as making sacrifices daily and giving the love of God to their beneficiaries.

With Michail’s presentation and its discussion over, the All-In’s programme turned to several other activities and presentations — a game, a raffle, and the presentations of ‘Excellence Awards’ and of new staff members (each of which have little bearing on my argument).
focused on Zukile’s Operations Report where he too drew in the Core Values and linked their practice to the continued vitality and longevity of CWD: ‘We can’t let our organisation slow down and die because we don’t share these Values.’ He also demonstrated the ubiquity of the Values in even the most routine practices. For example, he illustrated how some Core Values pertained to annual leave and used this to discuss the practical ethics of requesting leave and taking off for sick days. On the screen behind him, Zukile’s Power Point presentation reminded employees that ‘If you don’t have the passion for learning your organisation, then you will not be able to carry the name of CWD with pride’ (original italics). The very act of learning procedural knowledge was thus presented as a prerequisite for having organisational pride. The ideal subject at CWD thus had to know the proper criteria and practise accordingly.

In the final presentation of the day, CWD’s Director, Lungisa Huna, approached the front of the room amidst cheers and applause and carrying a notebook filled with her thoughts on the day’s events. In her speech she challenged every worker to ‘own up’ to the Core Values and ‘walk the talk.’ Asserting that the Values have always been a part of CWD, she added that ‘today we have pronounced them much more’ and that it is insufficient just to identify the Core Values. Rather, she said, the ‘Values are acted out and lived by ... they are not just a list; they come out in the way we act, talk to each other, and work with communities.’ Her comments provided particular insight into ethics at CWD in that they pointed to how a practice-oriented approach to ethical subjectivity requires self-fashioning — ‘you must take ownership of these Values’ — and demands that subjects apply what they learn in their work. By the close of the All-In, it was evident that the Core Values had to be internalised and evinced daily. To help develop capacity to do so, the upcoming Retreat (discussed below) offered employees the chance to reflect upon and be mindful of the quality of their development practice.

Techniques of the Self at CWD’s Retreat

It is morning on 1 July 2011, and again I am at St. Joseph’s Home for Chronically Ill Children. This time I am here to observe CWD’s Retreat. By now a full month of research is behind me, and I am anticipating another day of insights into ethics at CWD.

As previously, I began by helping to arrange chairs, for approximately fifty people. Father Matsepane Morare — Nyanga’s parish priest and the Retreat facilitator — greeted people as he entered the room and set up at the front of the hall. Nervously I approached him to introduce myself and explain my research to him. In my own ramblingly, tangential way of expressing myself, I asked for his consent to my taking notes on his presentation. His response was unexpected.
than simply acquiescing to or vehemently refusing my request, he explicitly encouraged me to participate fully in the activities rather than just write down verbatim everything he said. Since he was effectively challenging me to be a participant observer, I assured him that I had every intention of doing so and graciously thanked him.

The Retreat’s stated theme was ‘Guided by Values — Personally and Organisationally.’ Its purpose was to offer space for employees to reflect upon the reasons for their actions, how those actions could be perfected, how ‘love’ relates to those actions, and how the 10 Core Values are inseparable from both the idea of ‘love’ and development work — especially since, for CWD employees, ‘love’ animates the criteria (i.e. the Core Values) practised and perfected through CWD’s development work. The day was also seen as an opportunity for employees to ‘recommit’ to the Values. The words ‘reflect(ion)’ and ‘mindful(ness)’ were used often throughout the day to describe the ethical work people were doing. Fr. Morare also clarified that the event was focused on Core Values: which are ‘already there’ in each person, yet ‘we need to find them and bring them out.’ According to Fr. Morare, the Values are present in each person regardless of their religious convictions or lack thereof. The ‘Retreat’ was, for him, not about ‘strengthening faith’ but about ‘strengthening yourself...to become a better human being’ and ‘getting in touch with something bigger than yourself.’ The moment when that occurs, he said, is an ‘opportunity’ offering ‘a time to reflect,’ which is something ‘the outside world doesn’t allow for.’

In the day’s first reflection exercise, Fr. Morare requested the group to disperse for approximately 45 minutes and for each person privately to ponder the past year and their level of happiness. He encouraged everyone to ‘dig...until there is nothing hidden underneath’ and to answer the question: ‘Where am I?’ The process of constructing radical self-awareness complemented the second reflection exercise which was to incorporate scripture in each person’s pursuit of refined future practice, based on ‘love.’ Through implementation of reflective activities, each employee’s capacity for reflection and mindfulness was being developed.

Such activities are usefully described as ‘techniques of the self’ (Foucault 1980: 162; Mahmood 2005: 30-31). They are techniques that act as a way for one to act upon one’s self in a variety of ways — such as bodily, intellectually, practically, and emotionally — ‘to attain a certain state of perfection’ (Foucault 1980: 162).

As I saw it, and as I demonstrate below, the Retreat’s exercises were intended to inculcate such reflective techniques in developers as a way to perfect their practice, a practice that manifests in a way similar to what Lambek (2010b: 42-43) describes as ‘judgment.’ Through judgment – or ‘evaluation’ — ethical subjects determine proper action, act accordingly, and reflect upon what has
been done (Lambek 2010b: 42-43). Furthermore, as Lambek (2010b: 43) argues, for judgment to be possible, subjects need criteria for the evaluation of actions. CWD’s 10 Core Values and the ideals presented in the CSTs and scripture constitute precisely those kinds of criteria since they help CWD developers determine what constitutes relevant and effective action.

Before we can proceed, however, we must briefly revisit the ‘Cycle of Faith’ to outline my method. One example I describe in the present chapter exemplifies a way in which the cycle is completed (others will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4). It does so by explaining how, through CWD’s tripartite training system, employees have acquired knowledge and acted upon it — specifically through techniques of reflection and mindfulness — thus creating experiences of the intellect that can be incorporated into one’s epistemic catalogue and later acted upon. Yet, this is a deeply personal process, one which requires ability to know the inner states of others and considerable passage of time to determine whether any change has occurred.\(^{22}\)

I focus here on my own experiences which I consider reflexively as an ethnographic artifact to describe the private moments of the Retreat’s exercises. Just as I conformed to this exercise to greater or lesser extents, I must assume the same for the other participants, although of course each person will have differing levels of conviction, different capacities for reflection and concentration, and differing historical trajectories that affect the contents of their reflection.

Many people had left the main hall for other areas possibly better suited for quiet reflection. I remained in my seat and began writing notes on my thoughts. As Fr. Morare had suggested, I tried to take the exercise seriously and to participate fully. Influenced by my role as an anthropological researcher at a Catholic NGO, my meditation centred on the academic and religious dimensions of my life. Since I am not a CWD employee and since my daily work is not devoted to practical development interventions, my reflections are not directly related to improving my practice as a CWD developer. However, I would suggest that my reflections nonetheless demonstrate similar processes to those the CWD employees were undergoing. Throughout this brief 45 minutes, for example, I was acting upon my self to analyse my feelings during the past year of my life and critiquing my actions to discover where my behaviour might have been lacking and how I might refine my practice. Whether or not the activity resulted in a greater mindfulness in me of the ethical practice of development, it did compel me to consider my subjectivity in relation to an ideal form and to create my self accordingly.

\(^{22}\) The overall efficacy of the tripartite training system is, therefore, beyond the scope of this dissertation, but the process, its intentions, and its initial effects are not.
I wrote first about the happiness I have experienced in the past year and my satisfaction with the status of my education. Through my academic inquiry into development, I felt as if I was doing good work and ‘helping people’ by ‘accumulating knowledge [on development] and discovering its practical application.’ I connected this view directly to my religious beliefs that stress the obligation of having a profession and that one’s work is a form of worship (Baha’u’llah 1873: 19). I recognised too that, in focusing intently on my own education, I had neglected other responsibilities in my life. For example, I was consumed by coursework during the first semester of the 2011 school year, and I had neglected to fulfill adequately what I perceived as my responsibilities to the UCT Bahá’í Society where I am a committee member. After my fieldwork concluded, I remedied this by being more active in the Society’s event planning. While this shortcoming was something I had reflected on before the exercise, the ‘Retreat’ gave me another opportunity to reflect upon it and recommit myself to improving my conduct, which I did.

To some extent, the exercise helped me improve my understanding of who I am and who I want to be. By participating in the activity, I managed consciously to experience an act of self-fashioning. Though my resultant subjectivity is not equivalent to CWD’s ideal, I would argue that the two are commensurable. As Lungisa had said in her speech at the All-In, ‘you may call [your personal values] something different, but they will speak to the Values you’ve seen today.’ Such values are admittedly not the sole property of Catholicism, but within CWD — as illustrated by the ritual transformation of the Core Values described in the vignette opening this chapter — they are framed and sanctified within a Catholic discourse to which each employee is subjected.

After the first reflection exercise and a short tea break, the group reassembled and shared thoughts on the experience. The process of reflection allowed participants to critically deconstruct their actions and intentions so as to improve or perfect their practice of the Core Values. Many affirmed their appreciation for the exercise but neglected to share publicly any further details. A counsellor from one of the CDCs, however, offered a thorough description of her reflection. She said it had given her the opportunity to be mindful of how her own emotional well-being influenced her work. Explaining that she would like to be more mindful of her happiness and her current position in life, she said that, for her, a counsellor’s happiness is important because beneficiaries can tell if their counsellor is unhappy; and if they did it would be detrimental to the helping relationship. She added that her reflection had given her space to ask questions — for example, ‘Am I being selfish?’ — that aided her in her assessment of the effect of her emotions on her work. By participating in the process, she perceived the possibility of herself becoming an even better professional than she was previously, capable of practicing her trade with the utmost integrity.
Following the plenary discussion, Fr. Morare introduced the next reflection exercise, one where our task was to meditate upon the question ‘where are we going?’ Everyone was asked to think about this question through one of two biblical passages that Fr. Morare suggested. I chose I Corinthians 13: 1-13\(^{23}\) (see Appendix 2) which focuses on the theme of charity and ‘love’, and I identified three points in my notebook: (1) ‘Knowledge of love completes my actions’ (2) this ‘make[s] my [acts of] giving righteous’ (3) and ‘I felt inspired by the knowledge I was receiving and the need for more learning.’ At that moment, I perceived my future action as needing the vitality of ‘love.’ At the close of personal reflections, everyone reconvened, and Fr. Morare explained that the exercise was about ‘moving beyond ourselves to help other people’ and infusing CWD’s work with love.

Following lunch — which featured convivial conversations amongst participants — another plenary session began with each person being asked to consider how ‘love’ relates to the 10 Core Values. Starting with the person sitting to Fr. Morare’s left, each shared their thoughts on love’s place in CWD’s work. I was initially overcome with anxiety about having to share my thoughts but, as each person presented their opinions, it became clear that everyone — barring just one or two — held the same perspective: love was a necessary component in each of the 10 Core Values. A nun stated: ‘love is in all of them — they are all based on what is in the Bible.’ A CDC manager summed up what everyone was saying: ‘Love is the overarching value that makes the others.’

This showed that it was commonly understood that one cannot practice the Core Values without ‘love,’ and also that the Values are criteria for on-going judgment — ideal ways to approach living one’s life — invigorated by ‘love’ and in need of perfection through practice. Indeed, Fr. Morare’s final words for the day highlighted the point:

If you take these as rules of CWD, you have failed... this must come from your heart; it must live in you... I hope out of this day we have fed each other and have benefitted by the spirit... so that we become better people. That we become the people God wants us to be... to become the people we are supposed to be.

CWD’s ideal ethical subject, empowered through love, is thus understood to manifest the 10 Core Values and thereby to become what God has desired them to be, what they are ‘supposed to be.’ The example demonstrates that ethical subjectivity at CWD can be described as practice-oriented self-fashioning. In such process of self-creation, the individual acts upon its self (through ‘techniques’ like reflection and mindfulness) and evaluates the experience of these acts to determine the

\(^{23}\) Participants could also choose to reflect on Luke 9: 23-25 (see Appendix 2).
properness of present behaviour and, if need be, to mould that behaviour to meet the guidelines in the ideal. Yet such a description of subjectivity becomes problematic — and increasingly complex — when the practice of one’s subjecthood reaches beyond the self and into the intersubjective domain of the development encounter. I therefore turn to that concern in the chapters that follow.

Conclusion: Practicing Ethical Subjectivity and Moving Beyond Self-Fashioning

In this chapter, I have approached the production of individual subjects at CWD through the lens of Foucauldian ethical self-fashioning. However, I have argued that the notion of self creation does not adequately describe the process by which the CWD subject is formed. Several questions arise: what are the origins of the criteria employees use to self create? If the tools we use for self-fashioning originate from sources outside ourselves, is it accurate to say we self create? If not, are there conditions that both allow and constrict our capacity to self create? Is relational creation a better way of thinking about subjectivity? Can relational creation and self creation be interlinked? In the next two chapters, I attempt to answer these questions: first by examining the practice of one’s ethical subjectivity through ‘on-the-ground’ development work; and then by exploring the effects of intersubjective experiences on the state of subject criteria and development practice.
With motivational signs in hand, a group of children gather by a well-traveled road in Elsies River. They proudly display signs they have constructed to coax drivers to ‘Hoot because God loves you’ and ‘Hoot because you are special’ (See Photo 1). Rambunctious celebration ensues as they are enveloped by a wonderful cacophony of car horns and showered with the attention and support of community members drawn to their irresistible spirit.

To imagine this scene is to get a sense of what occurred in Elsies River over the week July 4th to 8th, 2011 when CWD’s Elsies River Community Development Centre hosted a holiday programme for approximately 30 local children. The programme offered an opportunity for the children to spend their school-holiday time participating in productive activities designed to empower them. The week’s theme was ‘I am special.’
CWD staff and volunteers offered their time and much energy to make the week meaningful for the children, facilitating and guiding the children through various artistic, recreational, and motivational activities. According to Natasja Solomon, the Elsies River CDC manager, ‘The programme made the children realize that they are special.’

While primarily focused on children, the programme also aspired to reach the broader Elsies River population. Solomon said, ‘It was about creating an awareness of CWD’s presence in the community. We are using a holistic approach where we work with the children to get to the parents. We are trying to reach a point where the entire family can be integrated. We want to build relationships with parents.’

During the programme, the children constructed many craft-oriented projects (similar to the motivational signs), which were not only shared amongst their fellow participants but also proudly displayed in nearby streets. The facilitators accompanied the children on a procession, displaying some of their artistic projects. As they marched through their neighbourhood, the children sang and danced to attract more children to the programme.

According to Solomon, these excursions “taught the children that they could make an impact in the community; that they could affect the world around them. It was very empowering for them.”

A dance instructor also gave the participants a lesson. Every child was guided through stretches and relaxation before they learned a synchronized dance to a worship song. The children used this knowledge to organise their own dance routines that many shared at the programme’s final day Talent Show.

Solomon stated, “Most of these children have so much talent. It was nice for them to have the opportunity to showcase it.”

The Talent Show displayed more than just the physical nimbleness of those who danced. It also featured singing and rapping talents. One of the older youth who attended shared an original, inspirational rap about the history of Elsies River and how he is personally committed to rising above the multitude of bad influences he faces daily.

Throughout the week, the programme’s facilitators strove to generate a strong moral consciousness amongst the participants. The activities were just one avenue for developing moral capacity in the children.

Often, the children were encouraged to be living examples of such moral development. Solomon constructed and shared narratives about the actions of particular children, with all in attendance. Whether the narrative illustrated humbleness, forgiveness, kindness or faith, the
subjects of the stories became role models for their peers: they became active participants — and developers in their own right — in reinforcing CWD’s foundational values.

At the end of the week’s events, the children were able confidently (and rather loudly) to agree that they are indeed special. In a locality where drug addiction, gang activity, and domestic violence are ubiquitous, learning that one is special is a powerful and important lesson to learn.

I wrote the above as a contribution for an article\textsuperscript{24} and as part of my duties as an intern in CWD’s Marketing Department (see Appendix 3 for more examples). Written as a journalistic feature, it was meant to market CWD’s work. Hopefully, however, aspects of my anthropological training are evident in some of my descriptions. Several parts of the article foreshadow the argument now fully formed in this dissertation. It is evident in the above that the CWD employees involved in the ‘holiday programme’ implementation were interested in developing the subjectivity of participants — as ‘special’ individuals, invested community members, and moral paragons — and in developing their capacity to meet ethical criteria. In this instance, the CWD programme seems to have been concerned with the development of ethical subjects through pedagogical activities and with maintaining that diachronically through the inception of intimate local relationships. It exemplified the most common form of development work I witnessed and participated in at CWD. Since I am not, however, concerned with a simple typology of CWD’s development practice, I use this chapter to focus on how the facilitated self-production of a developer’s subjectivity is refashioned as something to be developed in others.

Before offering an ethnographic analysis of three ‘on-the-ground’ examples of development at CWD — including additional material on the holiday programme — I first introduce my main informant, Elsies River’s CDC manager Natasja Solomon, and I outline the training she has received in order better to describe how her subjectivity and religious convictions are observable through her development practice. I argue that her training has been and thus is internalised, and that it thereby contributes to her production as a subject. Secondly, I show how this internalisation of norms, techniques, and ethical criteria are then translated to CWD beneficiaries through development practice, potentially resulting in a change in the subjectivities of beneficiaries which in

\textsuperscript{24} This article appeared in a significantly reduced form with additional text by Michail Rassool in the July-September 2011 issue (NO. 62) of the Archdiocesan News. The text here reflects my concern to use language familiar to my anticipated readers, for example, my use of words such as ‘community.’ I am aware of the dangers inherent in assumptions that sets of neighbours necessarily constitute communities of any kind (Thornton and Ramphele 1988; Kepe 1999).
turn influences the developers’ subjectivities — an issue to which I return in Chapter 4. Drawing on my experiences with personnel at the Elsies River and Tafelsig CDCs, I illustrate the processes through which CWD staff attempted to accomplish their development goals. Development, in such a context, becomes less directly about materiality and more about enhancing abstract notions of normativity within the subject,25 or setting parameters for practice that guide one’s engagement with the material and social world. Material development, thereby, follows subject development. At CWD, this process — as with all processes of subjectivation — is inextricable from ethics.

The Production of Development Leaders at CWD

As shown in Chapter 2, developers were exposed to training exercises that were meant to transform them into ideal subjects and exceptional development implementers. Through the All-In and the Retreat, the 10 Core Values were presented as sanctified criteria that produce, when enacted, the subjectivity of the Catholic developer. I argue there that the Core Values can be seen as analytical tools or criteria — provided by my informants — by which religion, ethics, and one’s subjectivity become manifest in development practice. Whenever these Values are present in CWD’s work, Faith becomes an observable phenomenon. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that such a discursive modality would have already found extensive purchase in the everyday expressed discourse of CWD’s development practice. My informants, therefore, did not often or readily appropriate the specialised rhetoric of the Core Values; yet they managed to live and communicate the Values to beneficiaries, albeit without articulating them through the new discourse — and in that regard their practice accorded with what Lungisa and Fr. Morare had asserted regarding the Core Values being prevalent but uncultivated (see Chapter 2).

Furthermore, it is important to recognise that the 10 Core Values exist within a heterogeneous epistemology which includes knowledge of particular philosophies and practices that have been systematically instilled through pedagogical modalities — namely CWD’s Emerging Leaders Programme (ELP) and Training For Transformation (TFT) — even before implementation of those 10 Core Values. By coupling these pedagogical modalities with the 10 Core Values, one can see how the ‘Catholic Ethos’ manifests in developers’ practice and how this ethos is

25 In South Africa, such attempts at instilling normativities can be linked back to the ‘colonisation of consciousness’ that occurred during the civilizing mission (see Comaroffs 1991 and 1997). More recently, the discourse of ‘ordentlikheid’ (the afrikaans word for ‘decency’) has been employed to accomplish similar ends: normalizing behaviours seen as ordentlik amongst participants in a housing project (Ross 2010); instilling ‘proper’ behaviours in the context of teenage sexuality and pregnancy (Salo 2002 and Botha 2010); and in the training of ‘poor whites’ to be ‘good whites’ (Teppo 2004). In all of these examples, Christianity played some role in the normalizing processes.
communicated to beneficiaries as being what constitutes development. Development at CWD is often intended to instill ethical values in beneficiaries. However, to provide a proper commentary on the techniques by which these values are developed amongst beneficiaries — the primary concern of this chapter — I must first excavate their origin in the CWD developer’s training.

Education and training are important aspects of CWD’s development practice in relation both to developers and to beneficiaries. Such emphases can be traced back to the educational initiatives of Dominican Sisters in Cape Town during the late 19th and early 20th centuries who opened several schools for poor people and young women (Boner 1998: 47). Pedagogical responsibilities have historically fallen along gendered lines and continue to do so today. Just as the Sisters implemented education programmes in the past, women play a substantial role (all managers and most CDC staff are women) in the development training activities CWD offers. Natasja described her role as a developer as being a ‘vocation’ or a ministry enabled by Vatican II’s support of lay leadership — suggesting that lay women are increasingly claiming the educational development positions previously held by the Sisters in Cape Town.

The ELP perpetuates this focus on women as creative development providers. To fill the asserted ‘void’ of black South African women in leadership roles, the ELP has been implemented to ‘nurture...thinking and reflective leaders’ through an ‘action or experiential learning process’ (Huna 2011a: 1-2). Reflective techniques are used to enable participants to ‘interrogat[e] one’s own leadership’ (ibid.). Participants are said to ‘contextualise’ their leadership ‘stories’ to better understand their selves, ‘which need further building and enhancement’ (Huna 2011b: 1; 3). In this chapter, I argue that these reflective techniques are employed by Natasja in her development projects to reach similar ends. By learning reflective techniques through staff development programmes, and by teaching similar techniques to beneficiaries, developers are exposed to the same training as those they serve.

---

26 CWD’s main office is a former Dominican convent.

27 As indicated earlier, the founders and early managers of CWD were also women.

28 Vatican II (or the Second Vatican Council) occurred over the period of 1962-1965. The council sought to consider and delineate Catholicism’s raison d’être in contemporary society (see Alberigo 2006). Consideration over the role of the laity can be found in the Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity (Apostolicam Actuositatem).

29 Occhipinti (2005:102) has noted similar involvement amongst the laity at a Catholic NGO in Argentina. In addition, she states that, like CWD, this NGO uses the Church as ‘a basic network’ for finding developers (Occinpinti 2005: 103).

30 The implications of these techniques and the evaluative processes they allow are central to the arguments presented in Chapter 4.
Training for Transformation (TFT) is another programme through which development techniques are learned. It is, however, an external programme that CWD staff members are encouraged to complete. TFT comprises three training manuals which offer a modality for training people to lead, resolve conflict, and promote socio-economic justice (Hope and Timmel 1984). The books are inspired by the adult-centred pedagogy of Paulo Freire (1970) and engage liberation theology with South African Catholicism. CWD uses the TFT manuals extensively: Natasja initially described them as written in ‘the language of CWD’, an example of which appears in ELPs focus on training black South African women in order to support the professional and economic liberation of women. In this chapter, I identify the origins of several of Natasja’s participatory development practices in these books and show how, in her facilitating exercises in which beneficiaries identified their hopes, values, and expectations for the development programme, she adhered to TFT techniques, such as the sharing of success stories and creative activities that encourage people to ‘own’ their development (Hope and Timmel 1984: 67-71). Her doing that mirrored Lungisa’s encouragement of employees, at the All-In, to ‘own’ the Core Values.

Ethical Subjectivity at Elsies River’s Holiday Programme

Introducing this chapter is an article I wrote about the Elsies River CDC’s (see Photos 2, 3 and 4 on the next page) holiday programme. I now draw out the themes and processes presented there and how they reflect the production and extension of ethical subjectivity. I argue that the holiday programme’s implementers attempted to train the children with whom they were dealing through self-fashioning activities that were expected, in turn, to be publicly practiced.

I participated as a facilitator for three days of the programme. My responsibilities as a facilitator were never explicitly outlined, but I found that I expended significant energy ensuring that the children remained on task and maintained good behaviour (i.e. no fighting, no swearing, no

---

31 While the extent of CWD’s political practice is beyond the scope of this paper, it is important to acknowledge the radical political discourse (arguably Liberation Theology) that undergirds CWD’s development. Freirean concepts such as ‘conscientização’ and ‘decoding’ (both entangled in processes of action and reflection) are implicit in many of my observations (Freire 1970). For Freire (ibid.), such techniques act as modalities for liberation and for the dissolution of the status-quo.

32 Each of the CDCs hosted their own holiday programmes. I, however, did not observe or participate in any of the other programmes. It is my understanding that the programmes were similar, but there is no standardised curriculum. Therefore, I only speak to Elsies River’s programme and refuse to universalise my findings to the other CDCs.
teasing, etc.). By participating in this fashion, I too became a developer of their ethical subjectivities.

I had arrived at the Elsies River CDC at 8:30am for the first day of the holiday programme. Upon entering, I greeted the staff and volunteers present and entered Natasja’s office to store my belongings for the day. Sitting opposite Natasja to discuss the programme’s schedule, we enjoyed what turned out to be our customary early morning coffee, kindly provided by Sheila, a CWD volunteer. The first day’s plan consisted of two craft projects and a neighbourhood street parade to display the children’s artistic accomplishments. Throughout the week, creative activities were repeatedly utilized apparently to develop the ideal ethical form in the children and to ‘empower’ them, as participants, to realise their own ‘specialness’; or, according to Natasja, to ‘help them develop greater self-esteem and confidence.’ Other than the dance workshop mentioned in this chapter’s introduction, most of the activities were craft oriented.

On the first day I joined a couple of volunteers cutting poster board for the day’s first craft activity while the children, who soon numbered over ten, entered noisily. We quickly finished with the poster boards and then began making name tags for the children in the CDC’s waiting room. As we went child to child distributing name tags, some children were watching a video cartoon while others conversed with their friends. I then sat alongside three girls who showed overt interest in both my Americanness and my long curly hair. When they discovered that I speak no Afrikaans, they began translating for me some of the conversations occurring around us. Two or three boys, they said, were talking about their experiences ‘sniffing glue.’ Despite being trained as a substance
abuse counsellor in the United States, I was shocked by such frank discussion of substance abuse by children. I recall marveling at how drug use could be so entrenched in the ordinary that children felt free to discuss their use (and unabashedly laugh about it) in the presence of adults. The boys were of course discouraged by CWD’s volunteers from participating in such activities; but I could not help but feel a bit overwhelmed by the consequences of what Ross (2010) calls the ‘raw life’ — marked by contingency and instability — experienced by these children, and the amount of effort needed from people, such as local residents and CWD developers, to address its consequences.

Natasja soon joined us and introduced the day’s activities and the programme’s theme: ‘I Am Special.’ The children were asked to represent artistically the week’s theme and their expectations of the programme on blank poster boards, and to do so by pasting pictures from magazines and drawing with markers on the boards. The volunteers and I helped them design their posters. When several children wanted to make a big banner that said ‘I AM SPECIAL’ in big bubble letters, I sketched the letters for them to fill with colors and pictures. Several posters also had references to religious values such as God’s love and prayer.

After completing the posters, the children lined up to exit the CDC for a neighbourhood parade to display their work. Once outside the parish compound housing the CDC, the children worked together holding up the large posters and marching down the middle of the street. The parade acted as a nodal event through which I witnessed various social interactions and the precarious milieu of the children’s lives. Walking along, Natasja led two improvised chants:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Everywhere we go} \\
\text{The people want to know} \\
\text{Who we are} \\
\text{We are CWD} \\
\\
\text{We want the children} \\
\text{To come to our programme} \\
\text{Monday to Friday} \\
\text{At CWD}
\end{align*}
\]

Along with the chants, the children also sang an Afrikaans song reportedly identifying each part of the body and committing each to the service of God. During the song, a small assemblage of teenage boys, smoking cigarettes and loitering outside a nearby building, mimicked the children who paid them little attention — possibly because they were receiving positive attention from older

\[33\] According to Natasja, several of the children live in homes where domestic violence and substance abuse are prevalent. During the procession through Elsies River, I smelled marijuana smoke and Natasja reportedly observed people abusing drugs as they watched the children’s parade. Following the programme one day, Natasja confronted a mother who pushed her child to the ground on the parish premises.
adults who had approached both them and the programme facilitators with handshakes and smiles, some even clapping as the children sang and danced. Yet others ignored the proceedings, remaining in their domestic entryways.

The parade made both CWD and its holiday programme visible in the parish compound’s immediate vicinity while promoting a particular subjectivity — one that demanded practice of the values of love, prayerfulness, human dignity, religious service and community investment. In this regard, the effects and intentions of the parade were quite similar to the car-hooting episode of this chapter’s opening narrative. The children were being moulded into developers of Elsies River: through the practice of subjective criteria, they were exposing Elsies River’s population to other possible modes of subjectivation while reminding people of the importance of caring for one’s locality and its residents.

Returning to the CDC, now with approximately ten additional children who had been attracted by the morning’s parade, the children received a snack before being divided into groups for an activity in which Natasja asked them to ‘create their own rules’ and expectations of the programme. She told them: ‘Write down what you think the rules for the programme should be.’ Natasja later told me that she intended this exercise to help the children ‘own’ their values. Each group designed a poster illustrating their perception of ‘the rules’ (see Photo 5) and then presented its poster to the other children there. The posters were all fairly similar; each included rules — or variations thereof — such as ‘no fighting’, ‘no stealing’, ‘no name-calling’, ‘no swearing’, ‘no naughtiness’, and ‘be honest.’ The children were quite active in the process. Watching their gestures it seemed to me that many were trying hard to think of good rules to share. They were able to identify some rules independently; yet they needed occasional prompting questions: ‘is it nice to talk when Auntie Natasja is talking?’ and ‘should you hit each other?’ After completing their lists, they eagerly grabbed the markers scattered on the tables and began to personalise their posters with drawings.
This activity promoted a reflective period — not entirely dissimilar to the reflections employees underwent at the Retreat — that allowed the children to be mindful of the rules of and guidelines for behaviour. The children were asked at the close of the activity: ‘Do you all agree to follow your rules?’ At first they shyly replied, ‘yes’, but, with some additional coaxing from Natasja — ‘I can’t hear you’ — they rose to the challenge and yelled, ‘YES!’

By publicly announcing their rules and values to their peers, the holiday programme participants were at least rhetorically binding themselves to the particular practices presented on their posters (Lambek 2010b: 45). To be expected, of course, the children were not always able to abide by their own stated rules and values. As Lambek (2010b) has argued, people’s behaviours do not always mirror their verbal commitments. Yet, by looking at ethics through the practice of virtues and values, one begins to recognize that any perfection of such criteria must come with time — that the development of ethical subjectivity is a diachronic process and that repeated discursive expression of rules helps to embody them.

Moreover, to some extent, particular children became the telos for other subjects. As illustrated in this chapter’s opening, one of the older participants performed an exuberantly applauded rap at the talent show — one which detailed his commitment to living free of drugs and violence. The youngest participant in the programme also shared her musical talents by singing a Ramadan song that Natasja immediately and publicly praised for the young girl’s public proclamation of her faith.

Natasja also offered occasional narratives objectifying desired values to further developmental goals and that mobilised the children as tools for and of their own development. For example, on the holiday programme’s fourth day, she disciplined two boys for fighting by removing them from the programme and welcoming them back only after they had asked for ‘forgiveness.’ Natasja shared the story of this incident with all the children there on the final day of the programme, thereby making the point that kindness, repentance, and forgiveness are crucial values to practice in interpersonal relationships. Such narrative examples and training activities (i.e. ‘rules’ posters) outlined the appropriate behaviours of subjects and defined the subject’s relation to others.

As demonstrated above, the children were mobilised to influence each other’s subjectivity through the narration of interpersonal interactions and the creative practice of ethical criteria — each of which are guidelines for practice found in the TFT manuals. When the children participated in the parade, the talent show and the car hooting episode, they became partners in the ‘development’ of their locality through publicly practising their ethical subjectivities. Along with Natasja, they thus became developers of the Elsies River population, and they exemplified CWD’s
ideal ‘empowered’ beneficiary through their manoeuvring themselves toward a potential future ‘self-reliance.’ From CWD’s perspective, this could be seen as a ‘success’ in its sustainable development efforts. Yet its efficacy over the *longue durée* and its unintended consequences (Ferguson 1994) cannot be addressed without an intensive long-term research project that is beyond the scope of the present one.\(^{34}\)

The above discussion has demonstrated that CWD’s desired ethical subjectivity was reinforced in the participating children throughout the week through creative activities, public performance, story-telling, repetition, and disciplinary measures. By emerging toward the ethical ideal, participants were perceived to have developed the capacity to influence other participants and the surrounding locality, both to encourage positive change and to attract additional people to CWD’s services. By their then publicly creating themselves as ethical subjects — with religion again playing a significant role — they were understood to be challenging their co-participants and their co-inhabitants of the areas where they resided to mirror their behaviours and to strive to ‘improve’ life in Elsies River.

*Developing Ethical Subjectivity in Other Projects*

The development of ethical subjectivity was not just a concern of the Elsies River holiday programme; it was evident also in other projects I observed. In this section, I briefly identify two examples: another programme in Elsies River and a joint project between Natasja and Sandra Leukes, Tafelsig CDC manager. It needs to be noted, however, that this sort of ethical development is not the only type of development practised by CWD. The organisation also offers intensive projects meant to develop beneficiaries’ professional skills and economic viability. As explained earlier, however, this material development is commonly preceded, at least according to my particular observations, by ethical development. By looking at the synergistic relationship between CWD’s Jobstart programme and Elsies River’s CDC, I offer an example of how this kind of sequenced development process unfolds.

**Elsies River’s Initial Jobstart Training Programme**

On 23 June 2011, I visited Elsies River to observe an initial training meeting for local residents entering CWD’s Jobstart programme on 27 June. Jobstart is part of CWD’s Economic

\(^{34}\) The fundraising department at CWD is currently striving to streamline its methods for assessing project efficacy by increasing its focus on quantitative data (partly in response to donor demands), by maintaining contact with the graduates of CWD programmes (though difficult due to South Africa’s highly mobile labour reserve), and by using psychological indicators to aid in the production and implementation of future projects.
Development Focus Area. It offers training in the culinary arts to enable beneficiaries to develop the business skills that CWD believes they need to find gainful employment. CWD’s CDCs often act as recruitment offices for larger projects like Jobstart. The Elsies River CDC recruited the participants in its Jobstart section from a pool of people who had already sought out the CDC’s services (i.e. counselling, CV composition, faxing, etc.). Natasja reported that she had wanted to host the initial training precisely in order to ground participants in the ethical expectations of the Jobstart programme and thereby ‘to prevent [unwanted behaviours] from happening.’

The training began — as in the holiday programme — with an activity in which the ten participants identified their own programme rules. Together they freely discussed and listed the precepts by which they would govern themselves through the duration of the Jobstart training. They took turns orally identifying values that they felt were important while Natasja wrote what they said onto a poster board and prompted with questions such as ‘what else?’ They selected commitment, respect, trust, patience, and cooperation as important values upon which to centre behaviour before outlining the explicit rules for Jobstart. They also emphasised punctuality and dress, an emphasis reinforced by Natasja’s praise of their coordinated professional attire at the 17 June Jobstart orientation — during which they had toured the classrooms, received schedules, etc. Similar to the narratives she shared during the holiday programme, she told a ‘success story’ that portrayed a past beneficiary as a role model due to her punctuality and proper clothing.

Next, Natasja led the participants in the production of ‘vision boards.’ She informed everyone that they were emulating something she had done during her own ELP training where she had detailed her own goals and dreams. She explained: ‘[vision boards] help you to be mindful of the possibilities; it puts your dreams down on paper and gives you something to aim for.’ As with the holiday programme’s posters, markers and magazines with pictures were provided for the participants to begin making their vision board collages, which they later presented. Most of the participants cut out pictures of houses and couples to represent their desire for a home, a spouse, and a family in the future. One man used his poster to represent his desire to be a chef in the UK. Such actions, in the context of Jobstart, showed that the participants linked their hopes and dreams to their participation and successful completion of the programme, thereby also demonstrating their aspirations to becoming proper citizens and therefore appropriately subjectivised ethical subjects.

---

35 On the second day of the holiday programme (a day I missed), the children had reportedly also made vision boards.

36 This desire for proper housing and the ‘nuclear family’ has also been noted by Ross (2010) and linked to the concept of ordentlikheid.
To conclude the day’s events, Natasja asked the group to reflect upon what they had learned during the day’s exercises. The participants responded that they had learned about — to list only a few — values, cooperation, communication, and confidence. Natasja then encouraged each to take their learnings and goals (as represented on the vision boards) for display in their homes and as inspirational reminders. As she did so she explained to the Jobstart participants that the technique of displaying reminders of her own learnings and dreams had been what had helped her remain conscious of her ‘personal mission,’ which, she told them all, is proudly displayed in her office: ‘Self transformation helps others to grow.’

From my observations, the initial Jobstart training programme offered participants a forum in which each could reflect upon who they are, who they want to be, and what criteria they need to meet to realise their own ideal future. Through the ‘vision boards’, their possible realisation of these desires was linked back directly to the necessity of their ethically negotiating the requirements of the Jobstart programme. By becoming participants, they had at least rhetorically bound themselves to the practice of particular ethical criteria in order ideally to achieve their desires. Closing the meeting, Natasja encouraged the participants, saying: ‘Now...it’s up to you. There’s more inside of you than what you think.’ Throughout the following weeks, I encountered the Jobstart participants at CWD’s main office. I noticed that they were always well dressed. I also saw them all in graduation attire at the Jobstart graduation ceremony in October 2011.

Tafelsig Parish’s Youth Group Workshop

To further demonstrate CWD’s focus on developing ethical subjectivities, I now turn to my second example. CWD occasionally enters explicitly Catholic terrain and offers ‘parish building programmes’ that are funded through the Dutch FBO Mensen met een Missie (called MM Netherlands by informants). On 16 July 2011, I observed a parish-building workshop facilitated by Natasja and Sandra. The participants were part of a church youth group at the Tafelsig parish amongst the members of which there had reportedly been an escalating sense of resentment and anger. The workshop was planned to resolve conflict in the group by offering a forum dedicated to ‘healing’ and ‘forgiveness.’

Quotations collected by Natasja — she told me that she is ‘always hunting for slogans’ — had been displayed on the venue walls. The quotes gave insight into the intentions behind the development intervention about to occur. One read: ‘Healing yourself is connected with healing

---

37 Mensen met een Missie (People with a Mission) is a Dutch Catholic FBO that provides financial support to NGOs. MM Netherlands supplies funding for CWD’s ‘parish building programmes.’ It links its discourse to the missionary tradition of the Catholic Church. For more information, visit http://www.mensenmeteenmissie.nl/
others.’ Another read: ‘Everyone thinks of changing the world, but no one thinks of changing himself.’ First, Natasja and Sandra facilitated the group’s construction of their own rules for and expectations of the workshop, with the participants agreeing that they should practice ‘openness, friendliness, respect, and forgiveness.’ Next, they designed posters based on their perceptions of the group’s current dysfunction and possibilities for the conflict’s remedy. The participants quietly reflected and then produced their posters, enacting a creative version of the reflective exercises I had myself experienced at CWD’s Retreat. Natasja and Sandra encouraged each member to share their thoughts and then write them on a large poster, a practice that appeared to help the participants, as a group, to evaluate the problem and seek its resolution.

Later, having been shown a video about ‘you and your walk with God’ they were required to reflect on that theme and on the need to ‘forgive’ and to ‘let go and let God.’ With Natasja facilitating and reinforcing their efforts, participants indicated that they realized that they needed to ‘rely on God’ if they were to have a healthy group. According to both the participants and the facilitators, the ideas that ‘God is love’ and that ‘love is needed for forgiveness’ comes along with such ‘reliance’ on God. Aiming to ensure a successful youth group, Natasja and Sandra thus worked to provide a pedagogical development intervention that might create subjects who are reliant on God and conscious of ethical Catholic practice.

As in the holiday and the Jobstart training programme, participants here were being expected to engage in work requiring development of particular techniques of the self — techniques intended to develop their ethical subjectivity and, ideally, to ensure an empowered assemblage capable of strengthening their parish and supporting local youth. Though not exclusively, CWD’s programming is often concerned with developing a subject’s capacity for ethical practice and encouraging one’s reliance on God. Expression of the beneficiary’s subjectivity is understood, at least ideally, to conform with behaviours that are commensurable with CWD’s 10 Core Values. Having had similar training experiences, CWD staff — like Natasja and Sandra — worked in ways that reflected their having committed to a practice of development that builds the ethical capacity of the subjects they serve. The inward and outward practice of one’s subjectivity — as evidence, Natasja’s own personal Mission Statement which suggests that she has developed, she continues to self develop and she now helps others to develop — allows the developer to exert influence over the harsh reality of life in Cape Flats suburbs. As is shown in Chapter 4, this process not only affects beneficiaries but the subjectivity of the developer too.
Conclusion: The Modification and Reinforcement of Subjectivity

The ethos of Catholicism that I introduced in Chapter 2 has been shown in this chapter to be translated through CWD into both personal and interpersonal practice. In part, as I have shown, that practice constitutes the CWD subject’s creation within the political ordinary of the organisation’s everyday existence. It is practice that constructs and characterises the ongoing assemblage of that subject. Both the subject’s formation and the processual determination of the pragmatic faculties of the components comprising the subject — through its conformity to criteria and modes of subjectivation — depend upon appropriate practice. In other words, even as subjectivity is practiced and the possibility of its modification is introduced, the very practice that produces the subject allows for the substitution of the components that constitute a particular ‘machine of subjectivation’ (Guattari 1995) whilst simultaneously reinforcing the legitimacy of the process.

What I have also shown in this chapter is that development intervention occurs at intersubjective encounter events during which ethical ideas and subjective criteria are communicated to supposed recipients of development. This process represents one facet of practical development and reveals the intentions behind some of CWD’s development methods. In the next chapter, I move the focus away from professional development implementation to interrogate how the constitution of the ideal subject and its governing criteria is transformed on an organisational and individual level through the evaluation of intersubjective phenomena. I do that by explaining how, through everyday practices, encounters with social (discursive) structures, and interpersonal interactions — whether between children and adults, developers and beneficiaries, co-participants, or co-workers — CWD’s subjects are constantly exposed to the apparatuses by which they are themselves modified. My goal there is to show how that process results in CWD employees becoming reciprocal beneficiaries of those they purport to serve.
Chapter Four

Developing the Developer, Part II:
Intersubjective Influence Upon the Emergent Subjectivity of Developers

Each of the previous chapters opened with a vignette or ethnographic artifact. Here I want briefly to revisit Chapter 1’s dancing vignette where I described previously trained employees and two young beneficiaries from Khayelitsha teaching CWD staff members (including myself) some ballroom dance fundamentals. Growing organisational interest in staff health and well-being amongst CWD’s administration had led to a fun and creative educational event. The event aimed to expose each employee to the administration’s imagining of desirable components for the developer-as-subject and, therefore, to the possibility of a new component of employee subjectivity or, at least, to the need for renewed emphasis on a preexisting concern for health. CWD employees were expected to integrate this new — or to reinforce an old — subjective component and to receive training in a technique by which the subject might practise that component and eventually manifest it corporeally. This kind of introduction of subjective components, and the techniques for their practice, have been explored in earlier chapters, but in each instance in relation to CWD agents themselves. In this chapter, I focus on the role played by beneficiaries — as agents within development narratives — in CWD developers’ subjective becoming.

I argue that beneficiaries are important participants in the production of a development professional’s subjectivity and practices. The dancing vignette illustrates one example of how development knowledge and roles circulate at CWD: as part of a development initiative, youth in Khayelitsha were trained in leadership skills to become Peer Educators. They then coupled those skills with specialised knowledge to help develop the dancing abilities of other youth in their vicinity. Finally, at the All-In, these new beneficiaries developed CWD staff. Development, in this context, appears reciprocal, cyclical and pedagogical. In the dancing example, the acquired expertise of beneficiaries was a mechanism for the (re)constitution of developer subjectivity.
During fieldwork, I found such explicit examples of beneficiaries effectively acting as developers to be quite uncommon, primarily because the development role played by beneficiaries is often very subtle and located in developers’ narratives about the development encounter itself. I now examine that subtlety to demonstrate how, even if it is not immediately obvious, CWD’s beneficiaries do profoundly affect what constitutes the practical criteria and knowledge that constitute a CWD development professional’s ethical subjectivity. Since this influence is seldom direct, it must be identified and analysed through considering developers’ interpretations of narrativised intersubjective encounters that occur in ordinary development practice.

By using reflective techniques to analyse the intersubjective experiences that occur in their development engagements, professional developers are able to be critical of their interpersonal relationships, the efficacy of those relationships, and the appropriateness of their role in those relationships. As part of the logical unfolding of this dissertation, this chapter’s argument is premised on the reflective techniques of the self introduced in Chapter 2 and, in Chapter 3, the actual experiences of interventions aimed at developing beneficiaries’ ethical subjectivities. I demonstrate below that CWD’s development professionals translate into narrative forms their intersubjective experiences, and that those then become interpretable data through which they assess whether an intervention is successful or not.

Mosse (2005) has argued that a development project’s success or failure is often more a matter of narrated interpretation than of objective reality. I build on that argument and suggest that the developers’ perceived efficacy of their development interventions dictates whether developer subjectivity is modified or reinforced.

In order to do that I first consider how CWD development narratives (see Phase III of the Cycle of Faith) — when translated from intersubjective experiences — are used to modify the continually emergent subjectivity of CWD’s employees. I aim to show that new knowledge is introduced as a possible modifier of developer subjectivities (see Phase IV of the Cycle of Faith) through agents’ reflective evaluation of development narratives that call attention to shortcomings in their current practice. Second, I explore how narrated stories of development successes act to reinforce current subject composition. By demonstrating the above, I am able to argue that the developer-as-subject is never homeostatic; rather, I suggest, that the subject is always emerging from the copiousness of possibilities encountered in daily life. I also show that such emergence is the result of co-creation between developer and beneficiary — that the learnings and affirmations

---

38 Roe (2005: 314) has previously used the term ‘development narratives’ to refer to the teleological stories of ‘blueprint development’ that are often misleading and ineffective. However, I am using ‘development narratives’ to refer to the actual experiences of developers and not development mythologies.
internalised by development professionals are often the product of the agentive influence of others. Before presenting the ethnographic data, I briefly outline the theoretical insights that inform this chapter’s analysis.

**Intersubjectivity, Copoiesis, and Development Narratives**

Interpersonal relations are seldom, if ever, entirely one-sided. As Mary Finlayson, a counselor at CWD’s Catholic Counselling Network (CCN), said: ‘You never leave a relationship untouched.’ If we are constantly being ‘touched’ by those we encounter, are we able to maintain any truly concrete subject position? As shown in the dancing vignette, being taught to dance by a youthful beneficiary placed me in an intersubjective realm of becoming, one in which our roles were mutually entangled and draped in ambiguity. In that moment, who was I? What was my subject position? Regardless of how I might characterise my existential state, I was in the process of co-emerging with my dance instructor. I was developing; I was benefitting from the knowledge of an other, who was, in turn, the recipient/beneficiary of CWD’s development efforts, efforts of which I was temporarily part and from which she too was co-emerging. Put rudimentarily, I became a beneficiary even as my youthful instructor became a developer.

Subjectivity in such contexts is relationally created through individual practice. Similar intersubjective experiences, I aim to show, comprise the development encounter, experiences that are then mobilised to produce many of the components through which developers’ subjectivities are realised. Reflection upon such experiences produces new knowledge and reinforces the relational nature of development subjectivities.

As indicated in Chapter 1, I use psychoanalyst Ettinger’s (2005; 2006) ethico-aesthetic concept of ‘copoiesis’ to analyse the creative potential of intersubjective events. I aim to demonstrate that the notion of copoiesis, or relational creation, is useful in understanding the developer-as-subject’s production and the processes that are development intervention practices.

Ettinger (2005; 2006) developed the notion of copoiesis (or what one might also call co-emergence) when considering the shared experience of artwork between artist and viewer. At such encounters, she argued, the viewer has the potential ‘to join in the aesthetic of effects of such transformative events’ (2006: 221) as are signified by works of art where each party (artist and viewer) participates in the ‘transformational knowledge of being born together with the other’ (2006: 221). Ettinger (2005: 704) suggests that ‘the artist can’t not-share with an-other, she

---

39 Devisch (2006; 2007) also draws extensively on Ettinger’s matrixial theory of which copoiesis is a part. Through his ethnographic research, Devisch’s offers another example of intersubjective co-emergence by arguing that co-emergence occurs between the anthropologist and their informants.
can’t not witness the other’ and, as such, this shared experience leaves each party ‘partialised, vulnerable and fragilised.’

My goal is to show how, in the context of CWD, one can see developers and beneficiaries as embodying Ettinger’s archetypes of artist and viewer and the ‘transformative event’ as the development encounter in that it becomes ‘an occasion for [the] transformation’ of the developer at CWD through the conscious assessment of narrated intersubjective moments (2006: 221-222). While, for Ettinger (2006), much of what constitutes copoiesis occurs at an unconscious level, my concern here is with how intersubjective events are consciously assessed through narrative to aid in subjectivity (re)production in a development encounter.

My understanding of development narratives is similar to what Jackson (1998: 23) refers when describing ‘life stories’ — that through storytelling we are able to recreate circumstances of sociality and to ‘renegotiate retrospectively [our] relation with others, recovering a sense of self and of voice that was momentarily taken from [us]’ (1998: 23). Such narration, I suggest, enables the developer-as-subject to seize meaning and, in Jackson’s (1998: 24) terms, to ‘mediate a reinvention of identity.’ In this regard, narratives — as demonstrated in Abu-Lughod’s (1990: 45) discussion of resistance narratives regarding arranged marriages amongst Egyptian Bedouin women — can be seen as vehicles for possibilities, capable of being used to ‘reinvent’ oneself. Furthermore, Ross (2010: 139) echoes Johnson (1990) when she identifies narratives (or ‘stories’) as a form of speech that ‘keep relationships flowing.’ It therefore appears that narratives can function in ways that allow their creators the opportunity to reflect on their experiences, discover latent possibilities, and maintain sociality. In the following sections, I demonstrate how the latent possibilities within the narratives of development professionals at CWD are harvested — through techniques of the self — in order to reconfigure or reinforce the developers’ own subjectivities and also CWD’s development practices.

The Modifications of Developer Subjectivity and Development Practice

During the CWD Retreat that I attended, one employee said: ‘God teaches us through other people...we recognise our mistakes through other people; we learn from other people, and we teach other people.’ Such comments reveal CWDs workers’ recognition of the value of reciprocal learning. As explained in Chapter 2, ‘learning’ is one of CWD’s 10 Core Values. I have argued, furthermore, that it is one of the core criteria used to constitute the subjectivities of CWD’s developers. In this section, I describe how such learning occurs as developers assess their own development narratives — particularly those illustrating the shortcomings of particular development
interventions — and how their doing that enables them to modify their subjectivity and practice. By drawing on two ethnographic examples, I illustrate how CWD’s developers are developed by their beneficiaries. To begin demonstrating my argument, I first revisit and expand on Elsies River’s Jobstart programme, initially presented in Chapter 3.

**Elsies River’s Initial Jobstart Training Programme Revisited**

Elsies River’s Jobstart training programme was intended to develop the ethical subjectivities of participants and to instill in them the knowledge needed successfully to navigate the full Jobstart programme. To review, ten Elsies River residents participated in the Jobstart programme from June through October 2011. At the initial training programme facilitated by Natasja, each participant was asked to participate in creative and reflective exercises which enabled them to consider their vision of the future, the practices that might direct them and the criteria they needed to try to meet in order to reach their chosen goals. I explained in Chapter 3 that such development exercises were linked back to development programmes and techniques of the self — in which my informants participated — and drew their inspiration from Catholic sources, such as Liberation Theology (i.e. TFT manuals) and the CSTs, and the Gospels (i.e. the 10 Core Values).

In Chapter 3, I intentionally excluded an archaeology of Elsies River’s Jobstart training programme knowing that its excavation is more applicable here. Before Natasja became the CDC manager of Elsies River, she had been working with Sandra at the Tafelsig CDC as an administrative assistant. From my observations, the two women shared a strong personal and professional bond. On a couple of early morning occasions when I arrived at Elsies River, Natasja had already been by the Tafelsig CDC to drop something off with Sandra and had briefly spoken with her. As demonstrated in Chapter 3’s parish-building workshop example (and in an additional example presented below), Sandra and Natasja do team up to coordinate development interventions. I recall noting their gestures (i.e. smiles, hugs, etc.) denoting familiarity and comfort in each other’s company. During the parish-building workshop, they took turns leading and sought the other’s insights, each seemingly confident in the other’s ability. From such observations I concluded that their intimate friendship challenged them both to provide what both understood as beneficial development interventions.

Their friendship and professional esteem for each other created a social relationship in which their respective development experiences — whether regarded as successes or failures — could be freely and often shared. Such sharing had led to the development of the Elsies River’s Jobstart training programme. On the first day of the programme, Natasja told me that the content
and structure of that particular day was being implemented after reflection upon the perceived failure of a previous Jobstart group from Tafelsig. Through consultation with Sandra, Natasja explained, she had learned that many of the Tafelsig Jobstart participants had failed to complete the programme. She discovered that they had been stealing, had failed to attend or had arrived excessively late, and were wearing unprofessional attire. Natasja said she had reflected on and carefully considered these problematic interactions between developers and beneficiaries. She explained that she had asked herself: ‘How do I avoid these issues with my group?’ and had through her considered reflection — which acknowledged the behavioural and, I would argue, ethical dimensions of development relationships — come to a decision to implement the initial training programme in a way that would allow participants to establish and reflect upon their dreams and expectations, and especially the criteria they themselves understood they must meet in order to succeed.

Natasja’s comments demonstrate that developers depend on their interactions with each other to assess and modify the relations of development interventions. Yet my primary concern here is the beneficiaries’ influence over such modifications. What the above story shows is how the beneficiaries’ influence on developer subjectivities was subtle and indirect in that the modification of what constitutes the ideal practices of the developer-as-subject was learned from the experience of one developer transmitted as narrative from her to another developer, and then used by the latter to construct a subsequent training programme. In other words, after Sandra translated the intersubjective encounter into a narrative, Natasja created her interpretation of Sandra’s development experience through reflective techniques capable of initiating the possibility of transformation, as theorised by Ettinger (2005 and 2006). However, modification of what constitutes, in the developer’s minds, proper development practice can readily be traced back to the intersubjective experience between Sandra and her participants. Through a form of reflective practice and sharing, Natasja and Sandra were able to modify the relations of development which constitute part of their subjectivities as developers. Using reflection as a technique of the self, Natasja was able to move toward her emergent subjective ideal which, to reiterate, is well stated in her personal mission statement: ‘Self-transformation helps others to grow.’

Furthermore, the above example shows that an amalgamation of self-fashioning and co-emergence are logically necessary for intersubjective events to have conscious influence over subjective components. Natasja’s reflective techniques allowed her consciously to consider Sandra’s development experience — co-produced by the actions of beneficiaries — and reap the new knowledge created in and by it. As Lambek (2010b: 43) argues: ‘Judgment [evaluation] is both of
others, thus social and conventional, and for oneself, thus linked to freedom and self-fashioning, but also to responsibility, care, guilt, forgiveness, and insight, and to recognizing the limits of what one can know or do or understand.’ The co-emergence of ethical subjectivities that occurs in development encounters — the beneficiary as a ‘developed’ person and the professional developer as a reciprocal beneficiary — cannot be understood by self-creation or co-creation alone. It requires recognizing the presence and role of an other.

The Women’s Leadership Empowerment Process

To develop this argument further, I now turn to another ethnographic example. Natasja, Sandra and Pam Sickle, manager of the Delft CDC, had, when I was undertaking fieldwork, recently implemented a joint programme: Women’s Leadership Empowerment Process (WLEP). When I visited the Delft CDC on a very misty day in July 2011, Pam expressed frustration that the young women and children participating in the CDC’s programmes were ‘disappearing.’ She complained that local residents are seeking out the limited welfare — food vouchers — provided by the CDC while avoiding participation in CWD’s development programmes. To illustrate, she narrated how some women had regularly visited the CDC to peel vegetables and, in turn, to receive food vouchers. This informal intervention had not been intended just to supply the women and their families with sustenance; it had also been meant to create a space, according to Pam, in which Delft’s racial volatility could be mediated through the women’s conversations while they worked. Unfortunately, however, the meetings had ceased when funding could no longer cover the cost of the vouchers. As Pam said: ‘Once you take away the welfare, people think that this centre has no more to offer. The problem is: how do we hold onto these people to help them become more self-reliant?’ Attributing the women’s indifference to their lack of confidence and self-esteem, itself, she said, cultivated in an environment of contingency and recurrent illegalities — the ‘raw life’ described by Ross (2010) — Pam implied that such circumstances had stifled residents’ capacity to ‘dream’ of a life of self-reliance. And, she added, that was so much the case that her attempts at a facilitated production of ‘self-reliant communities’ were being significantly hindered by apathy and hopelessness amongst Delft’s population.

When I visited Natasja nearly five months later to inquire about WLEP, she rationalised the programme as a response to the same problems Pam had identified. She described to me the ubiquitous problems of confidence and self-esteem the CDCs encounter daily:

40 One cannot help but recognise similarities and draw parallels between CWD’s WLEP and ELP programmes.
If they don’t feel good about themselves, they won’t come [to development programmes]...there is just so much hopelessness. We have learned that our beneficiaries need to build this confidence.

Natasja conceptualised this need amongst those she saw as beneficiaries through drawing on her experiences with the children attending Elsies River’s holiday programmes. She said that the children there still spoke proudly about how they had affected their community through the holiday programme’s activities (i.e. the parade and the inspirational posters shown to commuters). Several of them, she said, had continued to be involved with the CDC through an aftercare programme, thus enabling her to learn, she reported, that ‘the young people want a change.’ For her, the continued involvement of the children was directly related to the self-esteem building exercises from the holiday programme of which, to reiterate, the theme was ‘I am Special.’

Natasja proceeded to inform me that Pam, Sandra and she had collaborated to develop WLEP. Through reflecting on their narratives of their earlier development intervention efforts — such as that offered previously by Pam — they had reportedly learned that low confidence and poor self-esteem were hindering the development of ‘self-reliant communities’ by preventing beneficiaries from being thoroughly invested in the programmes. Natasja’s narrative, a part of which is quoted and discussed above, appeared to act as a rationalisation for why confidence and self-esteem building were seen as the solution for an experienced lack of beneficiary participation. By facilitating interventions to help local children to feel ‘special’, Natasja suggested, participation had appeared to increase in other Elsies River programmes too.

By reflecting upon their development experiences and the insights they had gained from them, those implementing WLEP intended to develop confidence and self-esteem in their Elsies River, Tafelsig, and Delft participants’ subjectivities. The programme, as explained to me, had ‘three legs’ or steps: personal growth, parenting skills, and leadership. Prior to the final two meetings of the WLEP participants, Natasja said, she had already perceived changes amongst them. She commented that all too often ‘people don’t believe in themselves enough to think that they can do what we [CDC managers] are doing.’ Being from Elsies River herself and, to some extent, an earlier beneficiary of CWD, Natasja saw herself as proof that participants can accomplish much. Indeed, she pointed to one WLEP participant, Yolanda, who had begun co-facilitating Elsies River’s youth-aftercare programme.

Yolanda and I had worked together on the first day of the holiday programme. Natasja had expected her to be present every day for that week-long programme but she failed to show up for
any of the remaining days. Yet, when three months later I went to observe Elsies River’s subsequent holiday programme, on Thursday 6 October 2011, I found Yolanda there as an active volunteer the entire week. According to Natasja, Yolanda had been empowered to be a ‘leader’ through her (Natasja’s) diligent interaction and encouragement. Natasja also described another participant who had reported changing the way she speaks to her children. Natasja said that, since this woman could make such a change in an environment of marital infidelity and criminal activity, WLEP was clearly effective.

I attended the final Elsies River meeting of WLEP’s first phase on 30 November 2011. When the programme had begun in September, there had been 30 participants; 27 were present at its conclusion. Both Mary of CCN and I were there to observe. As we helped to decorate Elsies River’s parish-compound hall, Mary revisited some of our previous discussions during both informal and formal interviews. As I taped a poster listing the participants’ own values (i.e. love, commitment, trust, respect, awareness of self, acceptance, etc.) to the wall, Mary said that, through encounters with beneficiaries, developers ‘learn how to help others in the future’ and also learn about ‘the strength, dignity and integrity of people.’ WLEP, she implied, was the product of such learning. Not only does the shared experience between beneficiaries and developers affect development intervention practice — as in the cases of Natasja, Sandra, and Pam — but it can, according to Mary, influence how developers understand the characteristics that define a good leader, an ethical subject.

At one point, for example, Mary pointed to a poster on which participants had listed what they understood as the characteristics of a good leader — cooperation, honesty, listening (attentive), and helping others. Reflecting briefly upon it, she explained that it showed that beneficiaries now know what it means to be a leader. As she stated: ‘those in leadership positions can forget these traits or be ignorant of them. [Beneficiaries can] remind us of what a leader should be.’

Particularly interesting about this example is that it concerns the subjective experience of an actual artistic piece. As previously discussed, Ettinger (2005 and 2006) imagines artwork as being a potentially transformative event for both artist and viewer. Mary’s comments attest to Ettinger’s argument by her having drawn the conclusions she did after reflecting on the poster-producing beneficiaries’ artwork. She was able to determine from it that WLEP participants had consciously considered, and had accurately identified, leadership characteristics through now (arguably) successful development interventions; and that such insights could and indeed did exert their influence over development professionals.
Returning now to the actual WLEP meeting: the participants sat in a semicircle around the stage in Elsies River’s parish-compound hall. As the morning’s programme unfolded, I became aware of the extent to which a particular ethical subjectivity had been intended to be instilled in the participants and of just how moved they were by the development intervention. To demonstrate, I draw on the programme’s opening meditation when each participant was given a small slip of paper on which was a quote that each woman had to read out aloud. A few reiterated themes emerged: ‘life has no map,’ ‘life is a journey,’ and ‘learning never ends.’ This last phrase, especially, reflects a clear connection to CWD’s Core Value of learning.

After each participant had read their quote, Whitney Houston’s song ‘I Didn’t Know My Own Strength’ was played. I listened closely to the words: ‘Found all that I need here inside of me... I thought I’d never find my way.’ The chorus swelled, in dramatic fashion, as Houston emotionally presented the lyrics: ‘I didn’t know my own strength.’ As the women quietly meditated on the meanings within the song, I noticed three women embracing each other, apparently moved to tears by the song’s emotional impact. I watched as Pam wrapped her arms around the shoulders of one woman and lowered her head next to the woman’s.

Just as Natasja, Pam, and Sandra had practiced the value of learning to create WLEP, its participants were having that value instilled in them, initially through repeated quotations and a song and subsequently through a ‘mapping’ exercise in which the participants were asked to reflect upon what they had learned in the programme and their plans for the next year. According to Pam the participants were to consider ‘our starting point [WLEP began 19 August] and how we will get to our destination.’ After a lengthy period of reflection, the women presented their ‘maps’ in a plenary session. They took turns identifying what they had discovered during the programme and how that had helped them to develop the next step of their ‘journey.’ To point to just a couple: one woman said that she aspires now to open a bakery; another stated that she wants to work in children’s education.

On 12 January 2012, I contacted Natasja to ask her what she had managed to glean from her memories of WLEP’s final day, particularly regarding the weeping women and the plenary discussion. Natasja said:

[As I] listen[ed] to them shar[e] their goals, I felt emotional yet happy at the same time. Listening to [them] share, gave me a sense of reward knowing that I had a part to play in their development. They sounded so confident and self-assured that [they] will be able to achieve the goals mentioned with help from CWD. I think the effects on me are life changing and [I
have a sense of work well done knowing that these women who were once strangers to me opened themselves [and] their lives and allowed us to work with them... as painful as it might have been.

Through WLEP, Natasja perceived that participants had come to ‘discover that indeed they do have value.’ However, according to her, the participants were not the only ones to have experienced some benefit. Natasja said: ‘WLEP has added value to my own life’ and added that the shared experience of WLEP had taught her that, in order effectively to encourage participants, she must ‘always remain positive, as tough as it may seem, because many of these women look up to me as a role model.’ Enacting that ‘role model’ position, she said, she had encountered others whose influence not just modified how she approached her profession but ‘add[ed] value’ to her own life. By being a role model/developer, she was herself changed. Therefore, developers, in part, are the products of beneficiaries’ influence.

As seen in the above examples, the practice of a developer’s ethical subjectivity, and its development, is punctuated by periods of reflection on often subtle aspects of development interactions. It is through such modalities of learning (i.e. reflective techniques) that observed intersubjective experiences become fuel for subject modification, particularly in how subjects embody and perform relations of development.

Recognising this has led me to suggest that, due to the role they play in development narratives, beneficiaries have significant agency to affect developer subjectivities. Thinking back on the song, part of the participants’ ‘own strength’ is their ability to facilitate the process of developer modification. Such a process is evident in the archaeology of WLEP’s creation.

Shortly after implementing WLEP, my CWD informants had already had experiences that suggested to them that the programme was successful. The increased involvement of participants at the CDC was their primary measure of success. As already demonstrated in this section, Natasja used narratives illustrating increased involvement in development programmes as evidence that people had been empowered by CWD’s efforts. In the next section, I explore further how the perception of success leads to the reinforcement of the subjective components that designate relations of development.

**Successful Interventions and the Reproduction of Subjectivity**

The previous section primarily focused on the processes by which subjectivities are modified when development interventions disappoint. I now consider how developer subjectivities are reproduced when development is perceived as effective. In times of success, development
narratives are again used to objectify development encounters for purposes of reflection. In this section I demonstrate, using two examples, how a careful consideration of development narratives can help developers assess the validity of the ideas and approaches that constitute their subjective ideal. I do this to support my argument that it is through moments of reflection on narratives of success that development professionals are bound to the on-going practice of their ethical subjectivities.

During my first meeting with Sandra in Tafelsig, on 28 June 2011, she related a story about a local family which had just lost its matriarch. The family’s history is a profound example of the extremes of life — again, Ross’s (2010) ‘raw life’ — experienced on the Cape Flats. The father had died 15 years before his wife. He had helped raise many of their eleven children despite, after a substance abuse-related stroke, being confined to a wheelchair. After his death, his widow continued to support the family from her meagre earnings as an informal car guard. Sandra reported the woman would spend half her earnings on the family and the other half on alcohol. Of the eleven children she had borne, only seven were still living when Sandra had first come to know them. One son had died in a gang initiation where his own brother had killed him. Drug addiction was a continuing problem for many of the surviving family members.

As recipients of CWD welfare handouts, the family had already had some contact with Sandra before their mother died. When that occurred, they turned to Sandra for assistance. Instead of simply telling the family what to do, however, Sandra reported that she had facilitated several intimate discussions in which the family’s members had identified what they wanted for the funeral and how much money they needed to raise for the wake and burial because no one wanted the body cremated. The first time she had met with the family to discuss the funeral arrangements, she said, she had walked into their small home and found fifteen family members mourning, crowded onto one bed. Sandra described it as a ‘touch[ing]’ experience of familial ‘closeness and unity.’ According to Sandra, despite many of the family’s members being caught up in gang life and drugs, everyone collaborated to find ways to raise the money for a burial rather than the cremation being pushed on them by the local undertakers who were, Sandra said, infamous for trying to ‘take advantage of people’ and ‘focused on getting business.’

Over the course of a couple meetings, Sandra said, she had ‘found out what they wanted for the funeral and helped them plan it themselves.’ Reflecting in my presence on these experiences, Sandra explained that it was from such experiences that she had obtained evidence that ‘people [themselves] have the answers’ to their problems. Further demonstration of this point came when Sandra’s and my conversation was at one point interrupted by two of the departed woman’s
daughters and a granddaughter. Leaving the conference room in which we were talking, we found them sharing a small bench in the CDC’s waiting area. I watched as they showed Sandra that they had already collected R150 (approximately $20 U.S.) for the funeral. Sandra smiled, praised their efforts, and encouraged them to keep pursuing their fundraising. Witnessing this exchange, I began to see what Sandra meant by her mantra ‘people have the answers’ — that they are able to pursue their self-designed goals and to find the answers to life’s contingencies through committed action.

The idea that ‘people have the answers’ was a common narrative theme I encountered during fieldwork. As previous chapters have shown, training programmes provided by CWD to staff members had had the effect of influencing the constitution of developer subjectivities. Chapter 3, for example, demonstrated how the prevalent themes and techniques found in development programmes are linked back to developer training. Similarly, the idea that ‘people have the answers’ can be connected to training programmes for ‘lay counsellors’, programmes of the kind that had trained both Tafelsig’s Sandra and CCN’s Mary.41

When I interviewed Sandra and Mary, it soon became apparent that they shared a discourse. Both spoke of ‘beneficiaries hav[ing] the answers inside of them,’ and that their role in relationships with beneficiaries was to help them gain ‘perspective’ and to develop ‘the voice of the voiceless.’ Sandra’s narrative of the bereaved family’s members, and our shared experience of their actions, demonstrated how such a vision of the developer’s role is performed and, moreover, reinforced by the daily achievements of CWD’s beneficiaries. We witnessed for ourselves that people know what they want and just needed support in order to reach their goals. As a subjective component constituting the relations of development, the premise that ‘people have the answers’ was thus supported by Sandra’s experiences with the mourning family.

While both Sandra and Mary may have been introduced to these ideas in training programmes, it was their interpersonal relationships within development settings that had enabled them to perceive their validity. For example, during an interview, Mary stated:

Watching [beneficiaries’] growth keeps us going. Even if all are not equally successful, we know that it's worth continuing. Even if someone turns their back on the service or goes back to their old ways. It's the people who did benefit... the beneficiary who's had a life changing experience. That's what makes it worthwhile.

41 This training was provided over 6 months by an external stakeholder called LifeLine Southern Africa (LLSA). LLSA partners often with CWD; they hold an office on location at CWD’s Khayelitsha CDC.
By witnessing the beneficiary succeed, Mary is able to remain inspired to continue to practice her subjectivity, which has been reinforced through the intersubjective experience of successful interventions.

According to Mary, she had learned about more than just whether her interventions breed success; she had also ‘learned about life’ and faith ‘due to the strength of those [she] help[s].’ The following discussion between Mary (M) and myself (G) further demonstrates the point:

M: I don't treat [development] as 'OK, I'm here to help you, and I'm the big shot.' That's not what it's about. It's about me feeling privileged for them to choose to come to me... because we're a faith-based organisation a lot of the people we see have a strong faith. There was one case in particular where the client came, sat in front of me and said: 'you don't know me but I've been praying about you for a long time.' And I said: 'what do you mean?' They were praying about whether it was the right thing to do: coming to see me or not. And the result was that it was the right thing to do...

G: So you could see the power of faith in that particular example?

M: Yes...and I had never seen this person before; but they had heard of me and had been recommended to come and see me. And before doing that they had prayed about it and prayed about me and for me. And that made me feel pretty special. That someone who doesn't really know me would take the time out to pray for me.

G: Would you say that kind of reinforces what you're doing, strengthens your resolve and your desire to continue to practice?

M: Yes, and it's those small nuggets of gold that come through every now and again that make it all worthwhile. There was a case where it was sexual abuse. This person's now an adult, but they were sexually abused for 12 years while they were a child... More than one member of the family was abusing... it was heavy, really, really heavy... that person... the past was disabling them... they were isolating themselves from everyone. Somehow that person ended up with me, so we counselled... at the end of it they ended up saying: 'it happened and there's nothing I can do about it.' But to be able to say that [and move on] after suffering for so long was pretty amazing.
What is evident in this exchange is how Mary highlighted the power of beneficiaries to ‘amaze’ and inspire her through their strength and faith and thereby to reinforce her commitment to her development practice. The one beneficiary’s intimate disclosure of faith moved Mary reportedly to feel that her work was ‘all worthwhile.’ Faith, in this instance, not only provided the inspiration for Mary’s vocation; it also validated for her the work she does and encouraged her future practice. Furthermore, the strength she perceived in the beneficiaries put her in a state of awe and appeared to compel her to continue her CWD development practice in order to participate in and witness similar successes in the future.

Mary opined, during the WLEP programme, that development experiences — like those narrated above — teach developers such as she how to approach future encounters with beneficiaries and indeed compel them to do so. By witnessing and narratively reflecting upon the success or failure of interventions, and the validity of particular relations of development (such as that ‘people have the answers’), CWD developers garner evidence of what is true and effective and use it to make their future practice conform to their experiential learning. By carefully considering the fruits and faults of development relationships, and by explicitly asserting that beneficiaries truly ‘know what to do,’ my informants have, at least to some extent, approached the development of people as a facilitated partnership in which both beneficiary and developer are developed, even as they also experience what I have called, in the dancing narrative of Chapter 1, ‘leading while being led.’

Just as I took on the gender normative role of dance leader whilst having to be tapped on the appropriate shoulder by my teacher to let me know which foot to lead with, so are CWD’s developers regularly ‘tapped on the shoulder’ by beneficiaries and directed to lead in particular ways. This dialectical performance (re)produces developer subjectivity and thereby modifies or reinforces the subjective components designating the relations of development. At least amongst CWD workers who are committed to the ideal CWD subject, neither the trope of developer as vehicle for epistemic hegemony nor that of beneficiary as picture of powerlessness is viable for their conceptualisation of development encounters.

From such a perspective, a developer’s ever-emergent ethical subjectivity relies on the assessment by developers of intersubjective experiences that stem from subjective practice and the agentive capacity of beneficiaries. To revisit the Cycle of Faith: development professionals act — to
be a subject one must act — in reference to the knowledge that constitutes their subjectivity (i.e. criteria, techniques, and practices obtained through thought, discourse, and experience). Such action in turn produces intersubjective experiences of the development encounter that can be and are then translated into evaluative forms, and analysed as to their success or not. Through the consequent judgment, development experiences are assessed for their efficacy by developers, their peers and their managers. What they learn as a result is then inserted into the componental structure of their subjectivity as new knowledge and possibilities for the relations of development. The cycle in its entirety is dependent upon discursive influences, an individual’s initiative to self-fashion and the subject’s relations to others of varying subject positions.

This chapter, constituting as it does an examination of Phases III and IV of the Cycle of Faith, has sought to unpack and explain the influence of beneficiaries on the subjectivities of development professionals. I have argued that the parties involved in intersubjective events co-emerge as subjects. The reality of intersubjective influence at CWD consequently disrupts any strict explanation of subjectivity as occurring through only self-fashioning or discursive subjection. Based upon the evidence I have presented thus far, I argue in the concluding chapter that development cannot be seen as a polarising event in which the development professional is an unaffected hegemonic spectre and the beneficiary a powerless non-agent; and that the binary opposition between developer and beneficiary is not viable. Throughout the process of development, the developer is constantly being developed and, I unequivocally assert, some of what constitutes that development is clearly attributable to the power and agency of the beneficiary.
I don't agree with the view that development is done unto others, but that development is always happening. It is something that is innate and is always going to be happening, so there is a co-relation between the developers and those we perceive to be developed. So I don't think us at CWD, we perceive ourselves as experts that are going to design programmes and come in with solutions and answers for the communities that we work with, but rather we engage with the issues that the communities are working with and work in collaboration and partnership with those communities. That for me is the essence of working within a much more developmental practice.

— Lungisa Huna, CWD Director (Interview 25 August 2011)

I have shown above that CWD’s development professionals strive to be autonomous learners, constantly growing and learning: that they are shaped by organisational discourse and individual initiative (Chapter 2), by professional practice (Chapter 3), and by the fecundity of their development relationships as realised via reflection on development narratives (Chapter 4). In general my argument accords with what CWD’s Director expressed in the interview quoted above: that development practice leads to the development of both beneficiary and development professional. Developers are developed through various (internal and external) training programmes intended to forge a specific ethical form within developers’ subjectivities. As developers practice their subjectivities through development interventions, they encounter beneficiaries and are influenced by their relationships with them.

CWD’s development workers cannot be seen (or indeed dismissed) as simply the products of discursive subjection — they consciously practice their ethical subjectivities, seek to improve themselves (and, of course, others) and, in the process, they open themselves up to further change...
through intimate exchanges with beneficiaries. Catholic development discourse, self-effort, and intersubjective experience fashion the developer-as-subject at CWD.

That said, we need to ask: how can analysts and practitioners of development use this knowledge of how beneficiaries affect developers to re-imagine agency and power within development projects? How can the above findings influence the way development scholars and practitioners conceptualise development and the relationships it creates? Can it help development to move beyond paternalistic hegemony and toward reciprocal partnerships?

To explore these questions, I consider the common disconnect between theory and praxis that plagues participatory development interventions (see Parfitt 2004 and Williams 2004). I suggest that, by rejecting the binary oppositions between the ‘first’ and the ‘last’ (Chambers 1983) or the ‘lowers’ and the ‘uppers’ (Chambers 1997), participation can begin being seen — as suggested by Parfitt (2004) — as an end in itself rather than as a means to an objective set from abroad (outside; above). Such an approach might politicise development and prevent it from functioning as Ferguson’s (1994) ‘anti-politics machine.’ In order to realise such goals, however, anthropological theorists must reconsider agency. Any attempt to reject, as I propose, the rigid binarism between developer and beneficiary must be premised upon a more comprehensive vision of agency than that drawn from practice theory (discussed below). In order to do that, I first problematise those kinds of now popular theorisations of agency in social science literature (Ortner 1984, 2005 & 2006; Williams 2004) and I go on to suggest that my research findings politicise the ordinary, recognising agency amongst those commonly denied such influence. I then consider the way forward for participatory development at the intersection between Foucault’s (2010) ethical work on the ‘care of the self’ and that on governmentality. Before concluding the dissertation, I suggest, as do other contemporary studies on faith-based organisations (FBOs) (Hefferan 2010; Occhipinti 2005; Bornstein 2005), that there is need for further research on ‘alternatives to development’ and the possibilities they may generate for development practice in general.

Critiquing and Reconfiguring Agency

As I have attempted to demonstrate throughout this dissertation, power in the development encounter cannot be understood as one-sided. To understand that, anthropologists and other social analysts must draw out the agentive capacities of development actors and elaborate on them by considering the causal roles of beneficiaries in the making of developers. Furthermore, I would argue, it is unethical to portray (or continue to portray) some actors as inconsequential unless they

42 For a good critique see Laidlaw (2010) and Ahearn (2001).
are recreating their own subjection or unless they have the capacity to participate in intentional forms of grand resistance against hegemonic structures (Mahmood 2005; Laidlaw 2010). A vision of agency that sees some actors as consequential only in that way, and agency itself as ‘inherent’, can be linked to practice theory (Laidlaw 2010) which — through Bourdieu (1977), Giddens (1984) and Ortner (1984) — challenged structural determinism and reconciled structure and agency in a dialectical relationship, thus wedding macro and micro levels to one another. However, by conceptualising agency in terms of individuals’ inherent ability only to upset structure or to reproduce their subjection — agents thereby working toward or seemingly opposed to the imagined goals and liberal values of those theorising agency (Mahmood 2005; Laidlaw 2010: 144) — the intersubjective dimension of the self’s encounter with its ‘other’, and the causal position each holds in relation to the other, are overlooked. In Chapter 4, I demonstrated that, through such interpersonal relationships between developers and what might (for heuristic purposes) be called their beneficiaries, developers’ subjectivity can be modified, as can relations of development. Ability to produce such an effect speaks to the need to reconfigure or re-theorise agency.

Deterministic interpretations of Foucauldian power within anthropological models of subjectivity and agency tend to dismiss the power and purposeful action of the ‘marginal’ or ‘subaltern.’ These dismissive models are very much indebted to an early Foucauldian notion of power that is more concerned with ‘matters of economic or political advantage’ than to his later work with ‘techniques of the self’ which approach a more ‘existential sense of empowerment’ (Jackson 1998: 21). As Jackson (ibid.) goes on to assert:

we need to move away from a preoccupation with political control, and control over resources and capital, in order to understand the modus vivendi that is strived for in all contexts of human endeavor… namely, a balance between what is given and what is chosen such that a person comes to experience the world as a subject and not solely as a contingent predicate.

Ortner (2005: 33) echoes Jackson’s argument by asserting that an over-consideration of structural power can hinder our realization of the subject as ‘existentially complex, a being who feels and thinks and reflects, who makes and seeks meaning.’ As studied in the social sciences, the subject all too often seems to disappear into the nebulous void of contemporary power structures. Yet it may be more useful analytically (and indeed politically) not to see particular subject positions (e.g. those of beneficiaries) as being occupied by submissive non-actors crushed under the weight of the elusive and ubiquitous forces of the same power that vexes us all, since to do so further marginalizes beneficiaries. To avoid doing that, one must recognise and work with the understanding that politics
— as the art of governance — and power exists in all interactions (Foucault 1978: 121-122).43 For example, we cannot narrowly conceptualise agency as being one’s ability directly to influence or ‘have a say’ in nation-state governance or the development industry. Political life and power are not confined to the concerns and authority of either governing structure; each is present within even the most ordinary intersubjective encounters that constitute everyday social life. Any effort to explain away ordinary governmentality as subjection, or even as the nefariously covert operations of a nation-state to control its citizenry or an institution (such as CWD) to determine the behaviour of its workers or members, discounts the creativity and freedom of self-fashioning subjects immersed in a dance of co-emergence with a variety of partners.

I am not suggesting that governing institutions — such as NGOs like CWD — do not exercise or attempt to exercise power over subjects. I am suggesting, rather, that the complexity of socio-political life and the ubiquity of agency are lost when the apparatuses of nation-state governance — which, in a contemporary world that desires the presence and activity of civil society, includes NGOs — are conceived of as hegemonic monoliths to which are attributed the most agency (Brigg 2002: 425) while everyone else’s (i.e. ‘Third World’ peoples) only hope for efficacious action is in relation to these institutions. Following Foucault (1980: 139), Brigg (2002: 425) argues that these conceptualisations homogenise experience and represent the ‘marginal’ person as the historically insignificant component of an overly simplistic master/slave narrative.

Both developers and beneficiaries at CWD are indeed constrained by secular and also religious discourses of governance; but through socio-political interactions and the compassionate intersubjective experience of life’s contingencies, as I have shown, they manage to play mutually causal roles in producing each other’s subjectivity. Through an intersubjectivity infused with compassion, developers enter a ‘convivial setting’ in which ‘one is part of a whole imbued with the spirit of togetherness [that]…stresses empowerment for individuals and groups alike, and not the marginalization of the one by or for the other’ (Nyamnjoh 2002: 111).

As the CWD developers who were my informants attempted to confront the conflicts and challenges of contemporary South Africa with compassion, they entered into relationships providing them with new possibilities for being in a development setting. Whatever is capable of causing such an effect must be understood as having agency. Therefore, I would argue, it is beneficial for social theorists to re-theorise agency as the ability to cause an effect44 — a

43 Also see Escobar (1992: 42-43) for his discussion of the ‘subaltern domain’ of politics that is often overlooked due to the hegemony of Western political discourse and colonialism’s legacy.

44 See also Strathern (1988) for a similar discussion of agency as cause and effect.
conceptualisation, following Laidlaw (2010), I borrow from Bruno Latour (2005). By demonstrating that beneficiaries are able to effect change within developers’ subjectivities, I have pointed to the need to retheorise agency beyond the narrow confines of liberal ideological concerns with resistance. By playing an ‘independent causal role in a chain of events’ — as demonstrated and explained through CWD’s development ‘relations and interactions’ — CWD’s beneficiaries fit the Latourian model of agents (Laidlaw 2010: 146). Therefore, I argue, along with Laidlaw (2010:149), that agency is best understood, especially from the perspective of this study, via the ethical pathways by which responsibility for actions and their consequences are assigned. I have shown how change in and reproduction of development techniques can be traced back through the processes of developers’ narrative reflections to beneficiaries’ influence within the initial development encounter. By tracing this ‘chain of events,’ I have determined that beneficiaries played a causal role in the emergence of developers’ subjectivities.

By adopting such a conceptualisation of agency, I have sought to situate agentive power with those deemed marginal and in so doing have demonstrated the effects they have on those who might be described as ‘elite’ (developers). Practice theory’s notion of agency is unable to account for the subtle power relationships that develop between CWD’s developers and beneficiaries, because it asserts that agency is something possessed and then harnessed in resistance to structures, as opposed to something that occurs within the unfolding of everyday relationships. The vision of agency I have used is more humanising in that it recognises that even the most destitute and downtrodden people have a ‘wealth of life’ and that, through their ‘experience of being in control,’ they can and do assert themselves and find balance within the overwhelming power structures of contemporary life (Jackson 1998: 22).

Participatory Development’s Future: Beyond Binarism Toward Ethical Development

By recognising that the developer/beneficiary binary is unproductive — especially if one’s goal is ‘participation’ — I would argue, based upon what I have presented earlier, that the development industry can and probably should now begin to conceptualise development as something experienced by all parties within the development encounter, rather than as something to be done to or for others. As I have demonstrated, not only are all parties ‘developed’ but each has agency, an agency that is often denied as a characteristic of the beneficiary who is seen as an outlier on the ‘margins of civilization.’ I have shown, however, how beneficiaries can affect developers’

---

45 For the purposes of this dissertation, however, I find it unhelpful to delve into the controversial aspects of Latour’s theory — particularly his insistence on attributing agency to non-human actors.
subjectivities even as developers seek to self-fashion themselves in terms of their ethical ideal. If
development practice is to ‘put the last first’ (Chambers 1983), the power of the ‘last’ must be fully
understood; and, to do that, development scholars need to desist from etching precisely those kinds
of dichotomies onto socio-economic relationships. To ‘empower,’ one must not assume; one must rather discover what power is already possessed by those one intends to empower through
development interventions. In this section, I first provide a brief review of discussions of
participatory development before exploring a way forward through what I think of as the
beginnings of an ethics of empowerment.

The Intentions and Critiques of Participatory Development

Participatory development first came into prominence in the 1980s with the work of Robert
Chambers (1983). As the name suggests, participatory development seeks to involve people in their
own development. Chambers’s (1994) vision is characterised by several principles, to name a few:
‘a reversal of learning’ — developers learn from potential beneficiaries — which is both ‘rapid’ and
‘progressive’; facilitation by developers of beneficiary ‘owned’ programmes; change starts within
the development industry (e.g. ‘self-critical awareness’ or reflective practices by developers); and a
focus on practice and experience. Participation is historically linked, like CWD’s development
discourse, to Paulo Freire’s (1970) pedagogy (see Chambers 1983). Previous chapters have shown
the above principles to be in practice at CWD.

Participatory development, at least theoretically, appears to bridge the gap between
development practitioner and beneficiary in order to create a development vision based upon
partnership, empowerment, and the transformation of developers and their industry. In practice,
however, this has not necessarily been the case. Participatory development has been extensively
critiqued within development studies and the anthropology of development (see Ferguson 1994;

First, participatory practices have been shown to depoliticise development and increase the
bureaucratic control of already existing nation-state structures (Ferguson 1994). That
depoliticisation is reinforced by participatory discourse that insists on local ownership of projects
thereby concealing the interests and influence of ‘external actors’ (Mosse 2005: 98) and putting all
the blame for failure on participants (Williams 2004: 564-565).

Secondly, as Mosse (2005: 35-36) argues, participation is an ambiguous ‘master metaphor’
that enables the rhetorical (but not real) reconciliation of conflicting ideas between interest groups.
Through the ‘master metaphor,’ economic and technological development ‘blueprints’ can be
interpreted as participation (Mosse 2005) and the pursuit of local knowledge and institutional learning thereby stifled (Rahnema 1992). Clearly, participation can be mobilised in ways that are disempowering, exclusionary, and supportive of external interests.

Considering the above criticisms, participation (and development in general) has been argued to be a discursive and political modality for perpetuating poor people’s subjection (Escobar 1995; Ferguson 1994; Cooke & Kothari 2001). However, as Williams (2004) argues, participation as subjection is not absolute, and it can be a modality for ‘repoliticisation’ and processual empowerment over the *longue durée*. This sentiment is echoed by Escobar (1992; 1995) in his work on ‘new social movements’ and ‘radical democracy’ as alternatives to development. His somewhat anarchic views point to a vision of development, that is not Western-driven technological or economic progress — what Matthews (2004) helpfully distinguishes as post-WWII (P-WWII) development — but as an experience of change guided by the autonomous self-organisation of people as the architects of their own betterment.

Williams (2004) and Escobar (1992; 1995) are correct to assert that there is a future beyond P-WWII development and current representations of participation (both theoretically and practically). There is certainly enough evidence to suggest that development’s definition is and should continue to be contested, and that participation cannot be represented monolithically as the subjection of poor people.

My goal in this study has been to demonstrate that subjection is not as clear cut as portrayed by the critics of participation, and that both beneficiaries and developers exert their influence on each other’s subjectivities. Development relationships can and do lead to complex forms of self-fashioning and co-emergence. Beneficiaries are not simply acted upon by static discursive structures of Western hegemony, especially once the definition of development is contested and a new conceptualisation is institutionally implemented, as in CWD’s case which is delineated in Lungisa Huna’s statement quoted at the start of this chapter.

By problematising the assumption that there is a clear distinction between developers and beneficiaries, and questioning who it is that experiences ‘subjection’ during development encounters, it is possible to challenge the power wielded by the development industry, not with aggressive critiques but with simple observations of human relationships. By continuing uncritically to separate beneficiaries and developers into rigid subject positions, each possessing extreme
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46 Escobar, however, avoids the term ‘participation’.

disparities in power and agency, theorists and practitioners perpetuate the disempowerment of those who may potentially benefit from development initiatives. The most egregious example of this disempowering duality is found in Chambers’s (1983: 131) use of the label ‘the powerless poor.’ Hopefully, if nothing else, this dissertation has completely discounted any representation of allegedly poor people as powerless. Perpetuating the developer/beneficiary binary and its variations as found in (post-)development literature — the first/the last; the West/the Third World; developed/underdeveloped; the poor/the elite (see Chambers 1983 and 1994; Ferguson 1994; Escobar 1995; Sachs 1992; Rahnema 1992) — can effectively misrepresent actual development relationships.

To be clear, I am in no way suggesting that the experience of power in human relationships and in the development encounter is balanced. Ettinger (2006) argues — and in development contexts I concur — that as subjects co-emerge, the influence each can have turns out to be asymmetrical. Once developers come to recognize the extent to which they might be, or are, developed by beneficiaries, they might begin to reconsider how substantial the extent of their development efforts really are, and also (up to now far less obvious to them) the extent to which beneficiaries’ efforts contribute to development processes. I would argue that this analysis provides a step toward the reconciliation of development’s asymmetrical binaries.

I have shown that development relationships — at least as experienced in some programmes at CWD — are neither as paternalistic nor as hegemonic as often portrayed in many post-development studies. By using those and related studies as examples to problematise the developer/beneficiary binary — including synonymous configurations of that binary — and by seeking to understand what asymmetry remains, it might be possible to mould the practice of participatory development by striving towards eliminating evident asymmetries and creating or discovering equal partnerships of mutual benefit and aid in the emergence of ethical subjects.

**Ethics of Empowerment: the ‘Care of the Self’ and the Necessity of Others**

To move beyond the dualistic misrepresentation of development relationships and participatory development’s potentially disempowering effects, I again turn to Foucault’s (2010) work on ethics to suggest — in light of the ethnographic evidence presented earlier — that an understanding of the emergence of ethical subjectivities can be mobilised to empower those invested in that emergence. Here I am identifying a type of empowerment that is neither
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48 Sahlins (1974) and Escobar (1995) have effectively shown that both what constitutes and who represents ‘poverty’ is culturally variable.
technological nor economic, and that is rather ethical in that it comprises a pedagogy that problematises the power inequalities of development binaries. Moreover, it occurs within a Foucauldian vision of subjectivity that is paradoxically characterised by aesthetic freedom and subjection (Faubian 2001: 85-86). To use Foucault’s terminology, empowerment could occur at the consciously considered intersection between the ‘care of the self’ and governmentality. Throughout this dissertation, I have referred to these concepts through the related terms ‘self-fashioning’ and ‘co-emergence.’ As shown and as identified by Foucault (2010), and as implicit in Ettinger (2005; 2006), ‘care of the self’ is not something achieved solely through self-initiative; it is entangled with the ordinary influences (i.e. governmentality) of others.

‘Governance’ of and by others is necessary, according to Foucault (2010), if ‘care of the self’ is to be possible. Foucault argues that facilitators are needed to guide people toward ideal modes of relating to their respective selves and to others, and that the existence of a self-fashioning ethical subject is contingent on ‘the judgment given by others’ (2010: 44). He thus argues that we are subjected by others to particular techniques of the self. Relationships in which learning and free-spokenness (parresia) are idealised are, in a sense, needed to ‘complete’ the individual. While such an individual could represent the building block of society, that same individual is incomplete without others or, as Strathern (1988) has argued, the individual is better represented as a ‘dividual’ that exists through relationships with others. From such a perspective, the self is fashioned through its reciprocal dealings with others. In development contexts such as that I have considered above, both the beneficiary and the developer play cyclical roles as ‘facilitators’ in which each calls the other to a virtuous ideal.

In Chapter 1, I chose to represent the above process through my Cycle of Faith diagram. The Cycle and the data presented above have been structured to illustrate, a four-phase process in which, Phase I, developers act on predetermined discursive forms; Phase II, through that practice, they experience intersubjective moments of development that are then translated into narratives (Phase III) — which contain reference of beneficiaries’ power — to be reflected on through techniques of the self and determined to demonstrate either success or failure. Moreover, through practice, the developer calls the beneficiary to a particular ethical subjectivity and, in return, the beneficiary calls the developer to reinforce or modify the components comprising their subjectivity (Phase IV) which contain their internalised relations of development. Seen as a whole, the process involves the developer leading while being led. Consequently, ‘care of the self,’ or the self-fashioning of the

49 In ancient Greek philosophy, parresia is ‘true discourse in the political realm’ (Foucault 2010: 6) and the individual who practices it possesses the ability courageously to speak truth to power. Parresia could be understood as the telos of Foucault’s ethics.
subject, is only fully realised through events of co-emergence. Empowerment occurs as self-fashioning actors become mutually entangled and begin to push one another toward a virtuous ideal. For an ethics of empowerment to work, all parties must recognise and respect the power of others.

Spiegel (2005: 138) — following Tronto’s (1993) work on the ethics of care — acknowledges that ‘the care-receiver has agency and thus the ability and the moral responsibility to be responsive to what is proffered as care and to the manner and context in which it occurs.’ Spiegel highlights both the necessity of a broad conception of agency when dealing with relationships of care (or development) and that the recipient is expected to be ‘responsive.’ Such a reciprocal caring relationship is enabled through egalitarian (and participatory) relationships in which the recipient’s influence is acknowledged and respected; and, as a result, the recipient becomes an important part of the negotiation of power relations in the care/development encounter (Spiegel 2005: 138). An ethics of empowerment would seek to institutionalise knowledge of recipients’ ability to play an important causal role in the trajectory of development interventions. To realise such an ideal within the development industry, I suggest, such knowledge must start with development professionals in the development industry recognising who and what they are (subjects) and that they are able to do what they do through and because of their relationships with beneficiaries.

Development can be an empowering process, but to make it so we must move beyond narrow conceptions of power and agency, recognise what power and agency people have, and strive to develop such power as a resource for achieving virtuous beings and for challenging the ‘raw life’ identified by Ross (2010). Although only implicitly, the WLEP programme discussed in Chapter 4 sought to reveal this type of power and, with the assistance of this analysis, I believe development programmes like WLEP could begin to improve their efforts to empower beneficiaries and increase beneficiary participation in local and personal development. Sometimes simply knowing that one is not helpless is a first step towards change. Add to that an understanding of beneficiaries’ capacity to transform others (particularly developers) and we can begin to imagine the creation of politically aware and motivated citizens pursuing their own betterment. Political awareness and motivation to participate in constructing local wellbeing in turn can allow beneficiaries confidence and socio-political investment which could enable them consciously to negotiate the power relations between themselves and developers and effectively to call developers to manifest more virtuous subjectivities that are courageous and willing to speak truth to power.50

---

50 By supporting this movement beyond economic and technological development and focusing on ‘issues of equity and participation,’ I am attempting to move forward in a fashion similar to what has been suggested by Gardener and Lewis (2005: 354).
I am not saying that development should abandon the pursuit of economic well-being; rather, such pursuits must be fundamentally ethical. In other words, values such as respect, learning, collaboration, and harmony must guide whatever development activity is deemed — outside of external influence — to be necessary. Critical reflection, furthermore, must be implemented to keep one’s actions in conformity with one’s ethical expectations.

The Importance of Studying FBOs

From the perspective of the present study at least, it appears that further investigation of FBOs might be a good starting point for inquiry into a new vision of ethics in development. The past six years has seen various scholars publish significantly on FBOs like CWD (e.g. Hefferan and Fogarty 2010: 1). Despite its being a rather recent focus of inquiry, scholars such as those cited below have offered great insights into FBOs, insights into:

- the challenges and benefits of a discourse that approaches development holistically (Bornstein 2005; Occhipinti 2005; Greenfield 2010);
- the ability of religious development discourse (with special mention of Liberation Theology) to address and engage with beneficiaries regarding injustice (Occhipinti 2005; Bornstein 2005; Novo 2009; Greenfield 2010);
- the possibility of a critique of neoliberalism, capitalism, and hegemonic epistemologies (Occhipinti 2005; Novo 2009; Freidus 2010);
- and the importance of the phenomenology of intersubjectivity between religious developer and beneficiary (Watson 2009).

Similar to Watson’s (2009) thesis, this dissertation has sought to explore the interpersonal dimension of the development encounter. In addition, as my study has demonstrated, the development of particular ethical subjectivities and reflective techniques amongst development professionals at CWD has made the power and agency of beneficiaries in the development encounter much more evident than in past analyses of development and has challenged the assumed binary opposition between developers and beneficiaries (e.g. Ferguson 1994; Escobar 1995; Sachs 1992; Rahnema 1992; Chambers 1983).

FBOs appear to offer fertile ground to study issues like ethics and social justice. That is because FBOs have the potential not only to nurture the production of reflective ethical subjects — as in CWD’s case — but also to provide an ethical alternative to rigid visions of development as technological and economic progress. That is the case if one accepts Bornstein’s (2005: 170) argument — which I do — that a religious approach to development ‘provides a space in which to
negotiate and contest realms not evident in strictly economic discourse, such as good, evil, morality, and witchcraft.’

The contestation of pure economic discourse through morality and ethics could, I suggest, be of benefit too to other development organisations. Through becoming increasingly engaged in ethical and moral (and possibly supernatural) issues, an organisation could and probably would open itself up to the possibility of engaging in serious dialogue with recipient groups, especially as regards concern with matters of good and evil, ethics and morality. Ideally, with a strong emphasis on ethics, development workers could and would remain conscious of their ethical subjectivity through techniques of the self; and development itself could then possibly transcend its fetishisation of technological and economic progress. With ethics and reflective techniques of the self as a focal point, development could become more human and could foster healthy psychological connections between beneficiary and practitioner. Were that to occur, development would become ethical work performed not just in relation to others but in relation to self.

To speak truth to power in development, we must recognize the influence of beneficiaries over those that seek to develop them. Critiquing development is not merely about challenging hegemonic epistemologies and foregrounding the monolithic power saturating neoliberal capital’s stranglehold on the development industry; it is also about recognising the overlooked agency of beneficiaries of development interventions. The state of the ‘marginalised’ is not improved by limiting their agency and perpetuating their helplessness. It is admirable to criticise injustice, but not if in doing so one commits further (albeit different) injustices.

As we come to understand the processes by which our selves are constituted, we are able to identify the roles played by others and the extent of our own efforts in that emergence. Being fully aware and conscious that we lead while being led has the potential to cause us to acknowledge and respect the causal roles played by others. Development can be an empowering process; but we must move beyond narrow conceptions of power and agency, recognise what power and agency people have, and strive to develop such power as a resource for achieving virtuous being and for challenging the ‘raw life’ (Ross 2010). A movement in this direction, I argue, is similar to what Escobar (1992: 31) has called ‘new social movements’ that: ‘search not for grand structural transformations but rather for the construction of identities and greater autonomy through modifications in everyday practices and beliefs.’ Such ‘new social movements’ are key alternatives to development, and I argue that CWD represents one these alternatives.
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Appendix 1

CWD’s Mission Statement:

Driven by the gospel values of the Catholic Church and our passion and love for humanity, CWD strives to eradicate poverty through service, caring and accountability. We walk alongside people and communities to learn and understand their needs and empower them to build self-sustainable communities.

CWD’s Vision Statement:

A leading, dynamic organisation, professionally enhancing self-reliant communities.
Appendix 2

Biblical Passages (King James Version) from the CWD Retreat:

I Corinthians 13:1-13

(1) Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. (2) And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. (3) And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing. (4) Charity suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up, (5) Doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; (6) Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; (7) Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. (8) Charity never faileth: but whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease; whether there be knowledge, it shall vanish away. (9) For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. (10) But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. (11) When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things. (12) For now we see through a glass, darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known. (13) And now abideth faith, hope, charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity.


(23) And he said to them all, If any man will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow me. (24) For whosoever will save his life shall lose it: but whosoever will lose his life for my sake, the same shall save it. (25) For what is a man advantaged, if he gain the whole world, and lose himself, or be cast away?
Appendix 3

Selected Marketing Articles Written in Fulfillment of My Duties as Research Intern:

Feature on Zodwa Sonkqayi (Gugulethu CDC Manager)

As the new manager for the 13 year old Masizakhe CDC in Gugulethu, Zodwa Sonkqayi is passionately addressing the troubles facing the community. Zodwa, who has been with CWD since 1996, held a training position as a professional social auxiliary worker at the Masizakhe CDC. Before last April, she trained, counseled, and increased awareness of gender violence in Gugulethu. Now, as CDC manager, she is being faced with new challenges that demand her knowledgeable and loving approach to service.

According to Zodwa, the primary challenge facing her is the increased responsibility of her new position. She stated that she is now in charge of juggling multiple programmes, people, and interests. She must be an attentive supervisor for her staff, a just patron to the tenants renting rooms from CWD, and a nurturing guide for the current and developing programmes at the CDC. Her managerial tasks have economic, political, and organisational dimensions that must be delicately negotiated.

Zodwa asserts that her new position has helped her grow. She is now ‘looking at the bigger picture.’ This new perspective has allowed her to reflect upon her new role. She said, ‘As a manager, you are a window for the community into CWD. I have to portray CWD to the community. I’m not there as Zodwa, but I’m representing CWD to the community of Gugulethu.’

When she first came to CWD, Zodwa was very interested in women and gender issues and helping people. This initial interest has informed her activism in social development at CWD through the years. She quickly moved from an administrator position to a fieldworker position and eventually on to a trainer position. Through her experience in the Emerging Leaders Process, Zodwa said she was prepared for her new role as CDC manager. ‘It makes you look at yourself. I’m learning my strengths and weaknesses and trying to be a better leader.’ Throughout her time with CWD, her training and flexibility have made her into a leader with great potential.

She identified that the good she has done for the Gugulethu community has been done through CWD and the Catholic Social Teachings. She said, ‘As a Catholic, I always believed that each and every person has purpose.’ Her devotion to human dignity and social justice has inspired her efforts to protect people’s rights and provide education and training to the community. She stated that with any other organisation it would be difficult to fully realize the values inherent in the Catholic Social Teachings and CWD. She stated, ‘CWD provides the platform to fulfill all of these things.’

Feature on Noluthando (Khayelitsha CDC Manager)

After nearly 18 years of service with CWD, Noluthando Fuku is no stranger to change. She began her career with CWD as a fieldworker for Health and Nutrition in 1993. At the time, she worked in Community Kitchens, which later evolved into the WARMTH programme. Her initial position was that of cooking demonstrator, and her first supervisor was our current director, Lungisa Huna. Through the years, Noluthando has worked her way up from cooking demonstrator to her new position as manager of the Khayelitsha CDC.

As a new CDC manager, Noluthando has had to face many new challenges. Foremost among these challenges is the increased responsibility that comes with managing a CDC. Noluthando now has to be responsible for her staff members, tenants in the CWD-owned complex, the building
itself, the daily functioning of the CDC, and the community programs. She said, ‘I don’t have a manager to hide behind anymore. I must face the music now.’

Despite the stress of such changes, Noluthando has faced these obstacles with optimism, passion, and a desire to grow. These challenges have made her stronger. She stated, ‘It’s a new challenge that is going to equip me to be a good manager. It will make me assertive enough to put my foot down and say ‘no’ or ‘yes’ at the right time. It is giving me strength to be assertive in life.’

Noluthando attributes much of her growth and learning throughout the years to the values of CWD and the Catholic Social Teachings. ‘I only started being the person I am now when I joined this organisation. I have grown tremendously through their ethos and through all the good things this organisation has done. I am who I am due to the Catholic Social Teachings, due to the developmental and welfare way of doing things.’

Working with CWD has given Noluthando the opportunity to be ‘a voice for the voiceless,’ which — along with the history of Catholic service in South Africa — produced her initial desire to join CWD in their mission. Since beginning her career with CWD, she has been recognized with several awards, such as the ‘Woman of Worth Award’ in 2004 and as a winner of the ‘Ma Africa’ award sponsored by the Department of Social Development. She takes great pride in her accomplishments and all the good she has been able to do through CWD. She stated, ‘When I think about the contributions I have made, I am proud to work with this organisation. We have helped so many people. I am proud of that. Our programs are seen as fountains of peace.’

**Feature on Dikeledi Xorile (Weltevreden CDC Manager)**

Starting a new position can be a challenge fraught with difficulties and hardships. Patience and steadfastness are necessary if one is to successfully transition into a new environment. As the new manager of the Weltevreden CDC, Dikeledi Xorile has displayed the dynamism needed to both adjust and flourish when faced with new challenges. Having previously been the manager of the Gugulethu CDC, Dikeledi brings an experienced perspective and work ethic to the needs of the Samora Machel community.

The Gugulethu CDC flourished under Dikeledi’s leadership offering a variety of programs that empowered the community to be more self-reliant. She looks upon her new position as manager of the Weltevreden CDC as both a joy and a challenge. She stated that the move has made her ‘more energetic.’ She said, ‘I look forward to coming to Samora Michel...the need is very genuine here. It’s given me a new energy and new challenges.’

In Samora Machel, Dikeledi is expanding upon the already established programs and striving to develop the services needed in the community. She identified that there are few service organisations in the area. This allows CWD to fill a niche and play a truly integral role in community development. Dikeledi said that there are several programs currently being offered, such as a women’s program on Mondays and both an elderly (a priority group at this CDC) and an HIV program occurring on Wednesdays. She also identified that community members seem to genuinely desire to be involved in CWD’s programs.

Being that Samora Machel is a highly politicized area due to housing and refugees, services to the community must be implemented with great care. Dikeledi identified that faith plays a significant role in maintaining a fruitful spirit in development activities. She said, ‘without the spirit in the center there would be more frictions in the community. The political forces would take over.’ She asserted that Christian-centered development work plays a unifying role in the community. This approach is effective since many residents are themselves Christians. Being a faith-based organisation, CWD strives to provide a way for beneficiaries to express themselves holistically and to nurture the unifying potential present in the spiritual dimension of life.
Dikeledi reflected upon her history of professionally serving communities by discussing another unique aspect of CWD’s service work. According to her, CWD gives employees the autonomy to address the needs of their respective communities. She said, ‘All of my working life I’ve worked for different organisations. At CWD it is different. There is more room to develop what you need to do.’

Newsletter Article on the All-In

Passion, harmony, learning, organisational pride – what do all of these values have to do with our everyday activities at CWD? The answer to this question was explored at CWD’s last ‘All-In’ on 3 June 2011. Many employees were in attendance and excited by the promise of the day’s events. Those in attendance sought to expand upon what it means to be a part of a Catholic value-based organisation.

In the past, the actions of CWD were focused on responding to the immediate problems presented by an unjust society with little time for reflection on the core values that motivate our practice. Through DEVCOM’s guidance, the important Catholic Social Teachings and CWD’s Core Values were identified and discussed by all present. Powerful insights resulted from group discussion, presentations, and recreational activity.

Michail Rassool acted as facilitator for the programme. Michail offered a detailed introductory presentation that outlined three conceptual tools: the “Two Great Commandments of Jesus,” pertinent Catholic Social Teachings, and CWD’s Core Values. These three conceptual tools were demonstrated to be dynamically interlinked and evident in the daily practices of CWD staff.

The Core Values are professionalism, integrity, harmony, passion, accountability, creativity, respect, collaboration, learning, and organisational pride. ‘All-In’ participants divided up into groups and were each assigned a value to discuss. The values of learning and organisational pride were both greatly expounded upon. Learning was seen as an ongoing process in which we accumulate information to be applied, evaluate our experiences, and improve our services. Organisational Pride was identified as the responsibility of each staff member to uphold the organisational values and to be a conscientious representative of CWD. Everyone present agreed that all of the Core Values are connected and essential for the success of the agency.

As exemplars of these values, the Excellence Awards were given out to several employees. First, Derek Alexander received the award for his dedication to the relief effort following the Masiphumelele fire. Next, the Zanokhanyo Programme staff assisted the family of a former student of the training programme, who had passed away due to spousal violence. They went beyond the call of duty to assist the family with the bereavement process and the funeral arrangements. Finally, Zukile Tom, Chance Chagunda, and George Rose received the award for their tireless efforts in the renovation process at 37a and the relocation of Jobstart.

To conclude the day, CWD Director Lungisa Huna spoke about her thoughts and feelings about the content and experience of this ‘All-In.’ She said that by asserting our Core Values, we are ‘proclaiming a stance to humanity.’ It is hoped that these values will be put in a charter in the near future ‘to bind us to what we have said today.’ We all must ‘own up’ to these values, which is a tremendous challenge to each and every worker. We must ‘walk the talk.’ These values have always been a part of CWD, but ‘today we have pronounced them much more.’ This ‘All-In’ was ‘a way to remind ourselves of why we’re here.’
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