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COMMUNITY VENTURE IN AGUA DULCE:
THE EVOLUTION OF CIVIC INTO ECONOMIC DEMOCRACY

Abstract

At a time when political democratization and the operations of democracy in Latin America are being called in question, there is to be found at the local level in the Andes a heritage of civic community. This paper discusses one case where that heritage has led to the development of a novel and productive form of community venture I call “community-based enterprise,” clarifying my use of that concept in relation to its use in the literature. The concepts of civil and economic democracy are explicated, and are used to describe the fundamental merging in this case of political community with collective business activity, and the thorough-going democracy of the enterprise’s operation.

Context is provided by a review of some similar developments in other regions. There is a discussion of features that appear relevant to success in these developments, as well as challenges for these enterprises in general and the subject enterprise in particular. I conclude with the question of whether this development provides a model for other communities seeking self-development through entrepreneurship.
In the search for examples of democracy in action, Perú may not be the first place one would be inclined to look. On the contrary, this South American nation with a population of some twenty-two million, eighty percent of whom are either mestizo or indigenous, has only recently emerged from decades of dictatorship, corrupt governance and brutal civil strife. Its orderly future is still not secured as the economy falters and a weak government, beset by a multitude of conflicting demands, attempts to bring stability.

Yet first impressions can sometimes be deceiving. High in the Andes, well beyond the horizons of either domestic or international tourism, lies the small community of Agua Dulce. Communities such as this tend to function largely on their own, out of sight of the national government—providing nothing untoward occurs to attract attention. Agua Dulce, however, is a community with special characteristics. One of the most striking features of Agua Dulce, especially in relation to the purposes of this paper, is the way that it brings together civic democracy with democracy in the workplace.

The purpose of this paper is to show how culture and custom have combined with democratic traditions in this small mountain community to create a viable self-managed enterprise and to improve the quality of life for all. Moreover, the example of Agua Dulce carries a broader message to those who would promote democratization in regions such as this and more broadly in Latin America. On the margins, Agua Dulce may provide useful insights to those wishing to promote sustainable local development in relevantly similar circumstances.

**An Experiment?**

The self-managed enterprise that has emerged in Agua Dulce is indeed an experiment in the sense that the enterprise is breaking new ground for an Andean community in terms of form and results. While cooperatives are not new to the Andes—nor are other forms of communal economic endeavor—Agua Dulce manifests a number of characteristics that distinguish it from other efforts at local community development. It is also experimental in the sense that pressures of the outside world, the market, globalization, etc., are testing the sustainability of Agua Dulce. The longer-term outcomes and replicability of the experiment are still unknown.
The form of venture that has taken shape in *Agua Dulce* is something I call Community-Based Enterprise or CBE. “Community-based enterprise” and variations on that term, such as “community enterprise” and “community entrepreneurship,” have been used in a number of different ways in the literature. For example, Selsky and Smith (1994) use the term “community entrepreneurship” to represent entrepreneurial leadership that arises within not-for-profit organizations aimed at community benefits. The County of Los Angeles in California, on the other hand, uses “CBE” to refer to firms which may be certified “minority, women, disabled veteran or disadvantaged-owned businesses (Los Angeles County Board, 2004).” More generally, these expressions are used to represent efforts on the part of governments, non-governmental organizations and (lately) corporations to use businesses or the techniques of business to support development of various kinds in poor communities and/or disadvantaged sectors of communities.

The way in which I use the term “community-based enterprise” differs from this broad range of usage in one important respect. In my use of the expression I wish to capture those forms of business-based community development which arise from within the community itself and not as a result of outside interventions. I use it to refer to a form of business organization in which a community, acting corporately, takes on the role of both entrepreneur and enterprise (Peredo & Chrisman, 2005). It acts as an entrepreneur in the way that its members act collaboratively to identify and/or create one or more market opportunities, and then organize in order to respond. It acts as an enterprise in the way that its members work together in carrying out the business of producing and exchanging goods and/or services. Community, in this context, refers to an aggregation of people that is defined initially by their geographical location combined with their ethnicity and culture, and not only by sharing the goals or the productive activity of the enterprise. Profit-making is not the primary purpose of the enterprise. While some return is necessary to make the operation sustainable, that return is typically seen as instrumental in achieving some other community purpose(s), and a lower rate of return is accepted in exchange for the achievement of other community goals.
This is a somewhat formal description of the unusual and evolving form of business venture one finds in Agua Dulce. What is essential to recognize is that the distinction between the politically and geographically defined community of Agua Dulce and its collective business enterprise is difficult if not impossible to draw. The same aggregation of people is both a body of citizens and the membership of a self-managed business organization. And the form of decision-making is thoroughly inclusive and participatory, in ways described below. In fact the enterprise is arguably a paradigm case of what may be called “economic democracy,” of which more is said below.

It must be emphasized that the experiment of Agua Dulce has not arisen in a vacuum. The population of the community are the Quechua-speaking descendants of the Incas, whose empire was in full flower at the time of the arrival of the Spanish conquerors in the sixteenth century. Of particular relevance from the perspective of our study is the fact that Inca rule was marked by a highly developed system of discipline and sharing (Collier, Rosaldo, & Wirth, 1982). Land was allocated by the community; each family was expected to contribute to the common good. A portion of all produce was considered property of the state, and the system was expected to maintain a relatively equal food supply throughout the empire. A fundamental component of the Inca regime, but predating it, was the local indigenous community, a bastion of cohesiveness, and social stability (Rostworowski, 1999). Part of the genius of the Inca empire was that rather than obliterating these communities, it built upon them and linked them.

While the Inca empire fell, it left an enduring heritage of local communities with a high degree of what has come to be known as “civic community (Putnam, with Leonardi, & Nanetti, 1993).” Putnam explicates this concept in the following way.

Putnam explicates this concept in the following way.

Citizenship in the civic community entails equal rights and obligations for all. Such a community is bound together by horizontal relations of reciprocity and cooperation, not by vertical relations of authority and dependency. Citizens interact as equals, not as patrons and clients nor as governors and petitioners.... The more that politics approximates the ideal of political equality among citizens following norms of reciprocity and
engaged in self-government, the more civic that community may be said to be (1993: 88).

Civic democracy is therefore community-based, and built on a culture of civic engagement, reciprocal trust and shared decision-making. It is important to acknowledge this heritage in Agua Dulce, since many of these elements are recognizable today and have played a significant role in the success of the enterprise.

**Out of the Political Wilderness**

The emergence of the CBE in Agua Dulce must also be understood in the context of the region’s political history over the past several decades. Central and South America have been marked by dictatorship, repression and violent civil wars. Law was more often than not administered through the barrel of a gun. Governments were controlled by and for the elites. Discrimination was a way of life for the indigenous. Poverty was endemic and there were few social programs to moderate its effects. Perú was one of the countries to suffer a particularly vicious civil insurgency, causing the deaths of tens of thousands. The region of Agua Dulce was one of the most conflictive, with the population suffering excesses at the hands of both the guerrilla and the government.

Electoral democratization in the 80s and 90s, and the application of the neo-liberal economic model were to have laid the basis for gradual political and economic improvement. The International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and various Western donors provided strong impetus for the reforms, regarded almost as theological dogma by its proponents, and seen by many professionals as a “single all-purpose remedy” (Sen, 1999: 76). And, indeed, investment into the region did increase markedly, while growth rates in some countries showed healthy advances. Inflation was largely brought under control (Reinhart & Savastano, 2003).

The contemporary overall picture, however, is unfortunately far from being one of unmitigated optimism. Serious problems of growth, unemployment and poverty persist. For many at the lower end of the economic scale—and this includes virtually all the people in smaller rural communities—neither the electoral nor economic reforms of recent years have made a noticeable positive difference. Trickle-down simply has not worked. Over the past five years, there has been “no overall growth in income per head
in the region” (The Economist, 2003: 34). As national budgets have been tightened, such limited social programs as existed were either reduced or done away with altogether. At the theoretical level, there has been a tendency to speak in terms of economic forces, all the while forgetting “those that are embodied in actual human beings” (MacArthur, 2000: 10). The prospects of any rapid solution to Latin America’s embedded poverty currently seem slim. Recent polls in the region show a high rate of dissatisfaction with the functioning of democracy (The Economist, 2003).

It is against this turbulent background that the birth, growth and current state of the CBE in Agua Dulce must be seen. Partially the product of community history and tradition, partially the result of the community drawing together even more closely in response to political violence, instability and economic insecurity, the CBE was created to provide a buffer and to utilize available resources to provide benefits and proceeds to all its stakeholders.

The process of creation and development of the CBE has been a remarkable exercise in both political and work-place democracy. In this sense, Agua Dulce is a living example of economist and Nobel-laureate Amartya Sen’s insistence on the “…extensive interconnections between political freedoms and the understanding and fulfilment of economic needs” (Sen, 1999: 147).

**Agua Dulce: First Impressions**

The entrance to this community situated at some 11,000 feet above sea level is spectacular, marked by huge rock carvings. The first thing that may strike an experienced Andean visitor is the fact that the roads around the central Plaza in Agua Dulce are paved; a remarkable feature for the region. The Plaza itself is well kept, with well-groomed gardens. The well-maintained buildings in the town center testify to the work devoted to community infrastructure. The visitor may well observe a truck delivering subsidized fresh milk to the local people. Appearances generally reflect a sense of community pride.

In entering Agua Dulce with a view to studying its structure and function, I was entering something which I came to learn was at one and the same time an Andean village community and a complex working enterprise. One and the same organizational structure serves both as the equivalent of the local government and the governing body
of a corporation. I quickly became aware of the extent to which Agua Dulce is, in both respects, thoroughly run by its entire citizenry.

From Silicon to Cola

The fortunes of nature provided Agua Dulce with a number of natural advantages in the form of usable resources. Chief among these were deposits of silicon, gypsum and marble. First exploited by a private family firm in 1947, the silicon deposits were turned over to a community cooperative in 1970, which continued to sell the product to the original private company. As for gypsum and marble, it is only in the last decade that attention is being directed to their exploitation.

The second principal resource bestowed by nature is the community’s agricultural land. This is comprised of both private and communal holdings. Agricultural activity includes the cultivation of crops, a dairy, the breeding and raising of sheep, cattle and alpacas. A number of constraints affect agricultural activity, including contamination of land by nearby commercial mineral processing, the high elevation of the land (11,000 feet above sea level), and more.

Two other elements round out Agua Dulce’s exploitable resources. The first is the area’s natural medicinal water, which has a high degree of purity and reputed medicinal benefits. This led to the production of bottled natural water and soft drinks. Second are the region’s spectacular views, together with medicinal hot springs, which have the potential to attract tourism.

A Brief History

Agua Dulce has been a clearly defined indigenous community throughout its recorded history. As one of its citizens told me, “This is a little democracy where (commoners) freely express their ideas and opinions in a constructive way, with respect, and taking into account the common good…(Peredo, 1998).” Indeed, as I learned, this notion of the “common good” carried down through generations predominates still today, and expresses the complementarity between community and individual interests.

The Agua Dulce Community-Based Enterprise (ADCBE), formed with the specific intention of facilitating the common good, was formally created in 1975 by vote of the community’s General Assembly as the successor to various forms of enterprise organization. How did community members come to this decision? Responses to my
query varied. For many, the co-operative movement which the government of the day had been promoting through its legislation did not fully respond to the community's aspirations. Most importantly for some, the “co-operative” envisioned by the government was not fully inclusive of the population and, in its less than inclusive membership, neglected a vital aspect of the community's heritage. Still others rejected the influence of government bureaucracy that the co-operatives imposed. As one local social worker told me, the government legislation was predicated on a “Western” model presupposing a sharp polarity between communal and individual, whereas Agua Dulce’s requirement was for a reconciliation of both dimensions (Peredo, 1998).

The Agua Dulce model thus differs significantly from a more traditional cooperative movement such as that developed by the national dairy development board (NDDB) in India or the Mondragon cooperative corporation in Spain. Whereas NDDB and Mondragon respond to the mandate accorded by those members with a specific stake in their operations, the ADCBE takes its authority from the community as a whole. There are similarities, however, in that both these organizations reinvest in community infrastructure such as education and healthcare.

The most important building block of the community is the “commoner,” and an understanding of what the term denotes is fundamental. All men and women 18 years and older who were born and subsequently live in the community are considered commoners. Someone who marries a native of the community can apply for commoner status. So also can anyone moving from the outside who resides in the community for at least five years and can provide evidence that he/she has been an up-standing community member during that period. Citizenship rules, both written and unwritten, spell out rights and duties, ranging from the right to vote through the right to use communal resources (lands and buildings) to the obligation to participate in assemblies and communal non-salaried work (faena). Commoners beyond the age of 60 are given some additional leeway in observance of their duties to allow for age and infirmity. Women are fully recognized as commoners in their own right.

**The Community is the Enterprise**

The creation of the ADCBE by the community's General Assembly of commoners in December 1975 marked the convergence of civic and workplace democracy.
Community and Enterprise were merged, legally and operationally, into a single entity. The name of the town—the Agua Dulce Community Based Enterprise—represents the fact that there is no distinction at any level between local political governance and the operation of the corporate enterprise. The governance structure, based on ancient forms of local governance, consists of three bodies: the General Assembly, Executive Body and Control Council.

The General Assembly is the entity where collective decisions are taken on all matters affecting the community/enterprise. Attendance on the part of commoners is obligatory, subject to certain provisions, as is voting. Each Assembly is presided over by a Debate Chair elected when the session convenes and whose duty it is to ensure that all points of view are heard and a respectful atmosphere maintained. The Assembly reviews the economic, administrative and financial management of the community/enterprise, evaluates work plans, mandates audits, approves the admission of new members, and so on. In attending a session, I observed a high level of enthusiasm in the proceedings. There was little shyness on the part of either men or women in speaking up, voicing their views or challenging elected officers.

The Executive Body is responsible for the day-to-day management of the Enterprise, and in that capacity is responsible to the Assembly. The Executive appoints department heads and implements financial and social measures of the community. The President of the ADCBE, who chairs the Executive, is the legal representative of the community/CBE. Members of the executive can be recalled.

Similarly elected and playing a crucial role is the so-called Control Council, which evaluates and audits the actions of the Executive. I witnessed the independence of the auditors when they convened a special session at which the Executive president was accused of hiring someone for a full-time position, in violation of a specific directive. Only some adroit manoeuvring enabled the president to retain his office.

Elections for Executive and Control Council are held every two years, supervised by an independently elected Electoral Committee. Electoral lists are drawn up and public debates organized. In vigorous exercise of their democratic rights, commoners actively participate in the pre-electoral discussions and campaigning.
Producing for the Common Good

Mining, carried out under the authority of the ADCBE is the main source of income and jobs in Agua Dulce. In the 70s, an independent report estimated the community’s high-quality silicon reserves at several million tons. Much of the enterprise’s investment is directed at developing new sites and maintaining the mines’ infrastructure. While the product is sold to an external company for marketing, debate continues over the desirability of developing the Enterprise’s own commercialization capacity.

The agriculture sector encompasses both communal and private activity. The community manages the communal land as part of the Enterprise, dedicated to cultivating grains and vegetables for the benefit of the population as a whole. Grasslands feed communal livestock. Some mining revenue is invested in livestock production, which in turn generates revenue through the sale of wool, mutton, breeding cattle, and dairy products. The commoners hold some 80 percent of the community’s cultivable land privately, although the 20 percent that is most productive is reserved for collective purposes.

The bottling works are also a revenue generator, although this branch of the Enterprise is rather precarious due to increasing external competition, outmoded machinery, the appeal of foreign and new domestic brands, etc. A serious impediment is the fact that under present regulations a community-based enterprise is precluded by its nature from access to credit from commercial banks. Where credit can be obtained, the interest rate is usually insupportably high.

Economic Democracy

One very striking feature of this merger of community and venture is the way in which it has made the thoroughly democratic polity of the community applicable to its enterprise as well. Indeed the ADCBE can be seen as an exemplar of what has come to be called “economic democracy.”

A number of commentators have made use of this concept to identify a form of industrial governance in which those persons and/or bodies which are most affected by an enterprise have an appropriate form of control over its operations (See, e.g., Korten, 1999). Melman’s proposals (2001) concerning “workplace democracy” fall into this
category. Perhaps the most developed account of what this appropriateness standard entails is that given by Archer (1995), and it is worth seeing how his notion applies to the development in *Agua Dulce*.

What makes Archer’s notion of economic democracy *democratic*, is the way that he grounds it in what he calls “the ‘all-affected principle’ (1995: 27).” According to this principle, all those whose ability to make and act upon choices is affected by the operations of an organization should be able to share in affecting the decision-making processes of the organization. This lofty standard is made workable first of all by distinguishing the different sorts of effects that an organization may have on a person, and then by noting that there are importantly differently ways in which affected persons may in turn affect the decisions that bear upon them.

The different sorts of impact an organization might have on an individual are brought out by identifying the different forms of relationship one might have with the organization. Archer uses the more-or-less standard list of “stakeholders” in a conventional capitalist firm to achieve this. So one might be an employee, a consumer, a shareholder or investor, a supplier, a financial institution, and/or a local resident. Each of these is affected in a somewhat different way by the operations of the firm.

Archer then distinguishes two distinct ways in which a person may exercise a degree of control over the decisions of an organization. The first and most obvious way is by participating in some way in its decision-making process; for example by sharing directly in discussions and choices that take place, or by having a responsive representative do the same. This can be called “direct” control. The other form of influence one may have is “indirect,” and consists in placing constraints on the decisions that can be made. This may be done, for instance, by withdrawing from the relationship as employee, customer, investor, etc., that allows the organization to affect you; or by managing to obtain government restrictions on the choices open to an organization.

Now in the standard commercial enterprise of developed capitalism these methods of control are distributed in a way familiar to us all. “Direct” control (a variety of what Hirshman (1970) calls “voice” control) is available only to providers of capital. “Indirect” control (“exit” control in Hirshman’s terminology, plus access to government regulation) is what other affected parties must resort to. In an economic democracy,
according to Archer, the roles are radically different. Direct control is reserved for employees, on the grounds both that they are not as free to exercise control by exit, and their freedom is more limited because they are subject to the authority of the firm in a way other stakeholders are not. Other stakeholders must exercise their control by indirect means, as outlined above.

The only respect in which Archer’s ideal departs from the reality in Agua Dulce is the position of community members in the control structure. In Archer’s scheme, local residents must exercise their control indirectly, through exit or government regulation. In Agua Dulce, community members are the direct decision-makers. The distinctive setting of the Agua Dulce experiment make it easy to defend the amendment to Archer’s proposal. The community in these cases is not merely the environment in which a business operation is situated; it constitutes the business. Community members in these circumstances are therefore not like the “local residents” listed among Archer’s stakeholders. The impact of these enterprises on community members is both more potentially significant and less avoidable than the impact of enterprises on community members in more typical cases. Appropriate government control may be difficult or impossible to achieve, and exit prohibitively costly. Accordingly, it makes sense to include them among the “direct” governors in an economically democratic enterprise, along with the employees (who will typically be members of the community anyway in a community-based enterprise). In fact the democracy of Agua Dulce’s venture extends beyond control of decision-making on policy and overall governance. As outlined below, workers take an active part in the organization of their own work patterns and responsibilities.

It is fascinating to consider the extent to which the democracy of this economic engine in a community contributes to what it has already accomplished and to its potential. It may also be a feature that creates some of the challenges that now face the ADCBE. It is beyond the scope of this paper to attempt this sort of theoretical evaluation. But it is not possible to describe the Agua Dulce undertaking without noting its implementation of the economic democracy model, and at least raising the question of what role this may play in the successes and the trials of Agua Dulce’s venture.
A Private Sector?

Individual and family businesses flourish under this political and economic umbrella. This sector of business consists mainly of small shops and service providers. In areas of overlap—for example, a private and communal pharmacy exists virtually side by side—the relationship tends to be more complementary than competitive. Similarly, as noted above, eighty percent of the cultivable land is held privately by the commoners who use their produce mainly for personal consumption, but also on occasion for sale to others.

And the Benefits?

Proceeds from the various operations of the CBE, apart from those plowed back into the enterprise, are distributed in a variety of ways. In this respect, ADCBE does not operate like a cooperative. Commoners, while they are shareholders, do not receive a standard per capita dividend at some regular interval. They do have preferential access to jobs in the community enterprise, so many commoners are employed by one of the industrial or agricultural undertakings of the community (e.g. mining, bottling, livestock management or farming), and receive a salary for their efforts. Commoners unable to find this kind of employment are expected, like others in the community, to contribute to regular faena, the communal, non-salaried work parties which support agricultural production as well as community projects such as the erection of schools. These efforts entitle contributors to share in the agricultural harvests, as well as access to community social services, which are also supported by income from the ADCBE.

The same assembly that sets policy for the enterprise’s conduct of business also determines the allocation of funds for community social services and infrastructure. Unlike most inhabitants of the Peruvian Andes, Agua Dulce’s commoners have access not only to jobs in their own community, but also to services either funded directly by the Enterprise or provided by civic organizations (such as the Mothers’ Club, cultural organizations, Parents’ groups, Youth Clubs and more) which are in turn supported by the ADCBE. These include an education system at the elementary, secondary and post-secondary levels; a health center, community pharmacy, day-care for children, milk delivery and dining center, as well as other services often unavailable in other peasant communities such as electricity, potable water, community TV antenna, and a system of
public security. The access of a commoner in good standing to these resources is a form of distribution from the earnings of the community enterprise.

In addition to this general access to community resources, commoners with special needs due to problems of ill health or unemployment may look to the Assembly for help with their specific cases. Assembly considers such special circumstances, and another form of the community’s distribution of resources is the activity of Assembly in aiding particular individuals or families it feels need and deserve assistance.

The community’s educational institutions are supported not only by financial investment from the ADCBE but also by the tradition of *faenas*. Where once only a few students could afford to travel to the city to attend high school, today some 220 young people are enrolled in *Agua Dulce*. A reflection of the level of socio-political consciousness that has emerged is the fact that the town is well known regionally for the schoolteachers it now produces. In addition, local graduates working in the Enterprise include sociologists, lawyers and an anthropologist. Also impressive is the number of young people who have gone on to study business administration. Fellowships are provided to post-secondary students.

The health center was built by means of *faenas*. While the national health ministry supplies a doctor, the ADCBE pays for two nurses and for utilities. For serious emergencies, community transport is used to move patients to the city. A communal pharmacy supplies basic medicines at subsidized prices, with indigent commoners receiving their drugs free.

Local workers can obtain meals at cost in a community dining center, while people in need are fed without payment. Fresh milk is also available at a subsidized price every day. Similarly, at harvest time each family receives a share based on the number of workdays contributed, while the Assembly may decide to allocate a share to those unable to contribute with their work.

The highly flexible form of distribution of income from the enterprise outlined above also addresses the potential for free-riders. On the one hand, distribution is not tied not in any strict way to contributions made by members to the community’s efforts. Special circumstances and hardship are recognized and there is a well-developed “safety net” in the form of health care, food supplies and similar social support. On the
other hand, however, there is no doubt that participation in these benefits is contingent on maintaining status as a commoner in good standing. This means participating actively in the communal life such as the *faena*, attending assemblies, and collaborating in other collective activities and committee work, as well as complying with the rules and agreements of the general assembly, paying fees and penalties as appropriate, defending the collective property and cultural patrimony, and registering livestock in order to plan the rational use of grassland, as well as generally respecting the individual and collective agricultural areas and defending the good name of the community. Compliance with this extensive list of requirements is not taken for granted. Every commoner must be registered in a special ledger called the “communal list,” which is revised and updated every two years. The closeness of the community ensures that anyone failing to discharge the duties of a commoner, or offending by such things as abuse of authority or theft of community property, can expect at least to be sanctioned by Assembly. In extreme circumstances, one may be deprived of standing in the community or be challenged when attempting to re-register. One of the great successes of this community enterprise has been its ability to produce resources and share them, in an environment where many other communities have remained mired in poverty. But these benefits are not distributed without regard for the efforts as well as the need of their beneficiaries.

A further direct benefit attributable to the democratic governance system in *Agua Dulce* is the avoidance of the corruption and instability so rife throughout the Peruvian political and corporate scene. To begin with, commoners share an interest in minimizing financial leakage from the enterprise and maximizing funds available for reinvestment into the community. Further, though, the extent to which business and administrative activities are embedded in the relationships of neighbor-to-neighbor make corruption a prohibitively expensive undertaking. Further still, as Melman (2001) shrewdly observes, in business as in politics, no one should hold absolute economic power. This is a principle to which the commoners of *Agua Dulce* rigorously adhere.

**On the Job**

For obvious reasons, the Enterprise is the main source of jobs in the community. It employs some 150 persons in relatively permanent positions, while indirectly creating
an appreciable number of other work opportunities. While *Agua Dulce* has its share of unemployment, the situation is much better than that of most other Andean communities, in addition to the fact that facilities exist to deflect the most serious consequences of unemployment.

Democratic practice extends beyond governance structures into the workplace. While experienced individuals from the community manage the various departments of the Enterprise, a sense of equality pervades the workplace. The scenario, of course, is much less formal, but the list of work-unit functions described by Melman (2001) as reflective of work-place democracy at the automobile manufacturer, Saturn, near Nashville, Tennessee is not dissimilar in content to a list that might emerge from an analysis of the operations of the ADCBE. In both places consensus is targeted in decision-making; job design and assignments are made by workers themselves; they perform incidental equipment maintenance, and so on. In *Agua Dulce*, the employees, who are also commoners with voting rights, feel unconstrained in posing questions and offering advice. Indeed, managers often take the initiative in consulting their fellow-workers on various issues affecting production and workers’ welfare.

A vital element in developing leadership potential in the community is the expectation that from the time of assuming standing as a commoner, community members will occupy in their turn a variety of diverse public positions. Leaders such as Executive members are then chosen by the community largely on the basis of their track record of community service and inherent management skills. One result of this process, in keeping with the Andean tradition, is that no “personality cult” has emerged. One respect in which the cultural patterns of authority have adapted to contemporary outlooks is that senior positions, such as President, which were formerly occupied by elders are increasingly held by younger, more highly-educated members of the community.

At the same time, the role of democracy in the Enterprise’s workplace does not go unchallenged. As the community becomes ever more subject to the stresses and strains of the outside world, management expertise and financial resources are increasingly challenged. Because of the nature of the Enterprise, it is difficult, for example, to downsize the workforce and the issue has generated ongoing discussion
and some tension in the General Assembly. At the time of my visit, the agreement was, not to cut jobs for the time being, but nonetheless to freeze salaries and re-evaluate each position. There are those in the community who argue, at least by implication, that a democratic approach to governance of the Enterprise stands in the way of effectively managing these problems.

**Incorporating Newcomers**

The ADCBE’s elaborate system of rights and responsibilities, and the commitment to mutuality and democracy in which it is embedded, raise the question of how new members to the community are led into its culture. How is the regard for the common patrimony and respect for the blend of communal responsibility and personal accountability communicated to newcomers to the community? Newcomers enter by “assimilation,” which means either that they have married someone who already qualifies as a commoner, or they have lived for five years in the community and resigned their membership in their community of origin. Most of those entering the community in either of these ways will from neighboring communities and familiar with Quechua traditions. Maintaining commoner status for anyone who qualifies in this way requires, of course, that a person discharges the other responsibilities of a commoner (attendance at Assembly meeting, contribution to community effort, etc.) as set out above, which will have the effect of reinforcing these traditions and explicating their expression in the ways of Agua Dulce life.

As noted below, there are strains in the community over matters ranging from the concept of community resources as patrimony through to demands for more professional management. These strains appear to run largely along inter-generational lines, but it is possible that the arrival of newcomers to the community contributes to the tensions.

This subject raises the question of the role of inherited culture in forming and maintaining the distinctive structure of the ADCBE. It seems clear that long-standing traditions of civic democracy and collective action have played a decisive role in shaping the conjunction of community and enterprise that constitutes Agua Dulce. One question is whether the ADCBE can survive in its highly democratic and collective form
if that heritage attenuates. Will the *Agua Dulce* undertaking continue in something like its present form even if it members become less connected with the traditions that helped give rise to it? Another question is whether something like this model can replicated where the cultural roots are shallower or absent. Could something like the *Agua Dulce* community/enterprise be assembled in other rural communities lacking the centuries of a culture of civic democracy, or in a setting such as a refugee settlement? Answers to those questions are beyond the scope of this paper, but are recognised elsewhere (Peredo & Chrisman, 2005), as crucial issues deserving further research.

**A Clash Of Generations?**

*Agua Dulce* in spite of its relative remoteness cannot exist in isolation, and tensions between the present and the past, the new and the old, are beginning to surface, posing issues with which the community must grapple. For example, some of those young professionals educated at the Enterprise’s expense take issue with the cultural ideology including the notions of a “common patrimony” and the common good. In their view, such notions are an obstacle to progress. Their solution would be privatisation or leasing of some of the community resources, to individuals or to outside groups. Opposed to this are the traditionalists who point to the inability of other communities to involve private investors in a manner beneficial to the community. (Some of the older commoners worked previously in a nearby major mining complex developed by a multi-national corporation. The mine functioned for a number of years, providing jobs until the resources were exhausted, after which the community was left as an island of poverty and with few means of subsistence). Indeed they argue that the harsh struggle of the past several decades has been precisely to protect against external, corporate exploitation. They hold that the community acting collectively is capable of responding to the demands of modernization.

The same debate exists with respect to management. The younger generation emerging from business administration programs are pushing for a shift to a corps of professional managers in contrast to the current situation where few of the Enterprise’s senior officers have much acquaintance with higher education. As one young business graduate told me, “We are a bunch of peasants managing our Enterprise badly. We need to develop private enterprise” (Peredo, 1998).
Even more fundamentally, some young members urge a separation of the business functions of the organization from the social operations. In their view, the efficiency and productivity of the business undertaking is seriously compromised by being harnessed to community and social goals. Another sarcastic quote: “We need to stop improvising and spending on fiestas!” (Peredo, 1998) Not all of the younger graduates share in this criticism. As one education specialist stated, “This is our own model managed by our own people. We manage with our own resources” (Peredo, 1998). The outcome of this debate is very much undetermined. Its very existence, however, attests to the fact the Agua Dulce experiment is not simply a cultural dinosaur but an evolving and adaptive undertaking.

The harsh reality of increasing global competition has intensified constraints on the Enterprise. The ready market the Enterprise once enjoyed for its mining output has shrunk significantly, as competitive product has become available from abroad. Similar pressures now affect the sale of meat, cattle, soft drinks, etc. The ADCBE can call upon the resources of its traditional ways of operating, for example faena as unpaid work for the common good, in responding to these forces. Whether the historical sense of mutual responsibility embedded in the psyche of the commoners of Agua Dulce will be sufficient to ensure the survival of the Enterprise as a community undertaking remains to be seen.

**Some context: other community initiatives**

Entrepreneurial initiatives have been tried in many places as an approach to community development. Most of these have accepted the conventional assumption that entrepreneurship is an activity of individuals or small groups, and have incorporated this assumption in various forms of interventions from outside agencies into the communities concerned. While there have been success stories in this genre, there have been many disappointments (Crewe & Harrison, 1998). Much less visible have been a number of entrepreneurially-based initiatives in which entrepreneurship did not conform to the conventional assumption and did not consist in interventions from without. These can be seen as communities drawing upon their own material and social resources to act corporately in an entrepreneurial way. Few of these have been extensively documented. In what follows, I will draw attention to some instructive
examples of this sort of enterprise. It will useful to consider as well some relevantly similar cases which are not perfectly corporate or confined to their own resources, but the collective action of communities is central.

Perhaps the best-known case of these is The Mondragon Corporation Cooperative (MCC). This community cooperative arose in the Basque region of Spain during the 1940s under conditions of unemployment, recession and civil war. It began as a small apprentice school, opened by a parish priest using contributions from 600 local inhabitants. Later, the students began buying up small, bankrupt factories using the capital of community members. Today, the system, which includes 166 cooperatives with more than 2100 workers, has become the world's most significant cooperative system in an industrialized market economy (Greenwood, 1991; Morrison, 1991; Suzuki, 1995).

Other less documented community enterprises are found in relatively poor countries such as Mexico (e.g. the Forest Co-operative of New San Juan (Tenenbaum, 1996)) and India (e.g. The Village of Ralegan Siddhi (Hazare, 1997)). Still others are located in struggling areas in rich countries, such as Retirement Living in Elliot Lake, in Ontario, Canada (OECD, 1995b). And there are examples found in former communist countries, such as the Town and Village Enterprises (TVE) in China (Perotti, Sun, & Zou, 1999),

Many of these cases emerged in conditions of some form of crisis. For example, The Forest Co-operative of New San Juan was a response of the Purepecha Indians to endemic poverty but also to the threat of losing their forest land to outside developers. Likewise, the Town and Village Enterprises (TVE) in China arose in the face of a significant labor surplus and lack of income in rural areas. By the 1980s, the Chinese government openly began to encourage the enterprises as villages became increasingly responsible for the provision of basic services (education, infrastructure and social welfare). And even in rich countries such as Canada, where areas have become ghost towns after the closure of mining companies, communities have organized to revitalize themselves. When the uranium mine closed in Elk Lake, Ontario, people began to emigrate, leaving the town with an excess of affordable housing and a lack of business. Using the example of retirement communities in Florida, community leaders developed the concept of Retirement Living. Caravans of seniors began travelling
across North America to spread the word and a new community flourished on the site of a former ghost town.

What appears significant in successful cases is that communities build upon a culture of solidarity that emphasizes the promotion of both entrepreneurship and democracy. Most of them involve not only individuals but families and the society of which they are part. Most of them combine a variety of goals, such as economic, social, cultural and environmental. Respected Mondragon scholars, Whyte and Whyte (1991), wrote that in interviewing people in Mondragon one of the things that most impressed them was the sense of social vision of the future for the community. Even though people in Mondragon have diverse opinions on controversial issues, MCC has created an organizational culture supported by major policies, structures and instruments of governance that enables it to resolve conflicts in the context of social, economic and political development (Bradley & Gelb, 1985; Whyte & Whyte, 1991).

The case of the forest Co-operative of New San Juan, Mexico, was similarly based on the preservation of village structures and traditions (Tenenbaum, 1996). There are two bodies, the community and the cooperative. The community assembly sets community goals, and the forest co-op designs and implements plans based on business principles and sustainable forestry.

Before 1976, the village of Ralegan Siddhi in India with a population of 2000 inhabitants was a very poor area, with a serious problem of food security. 15-20% of the population were underfed (1 meal a day); 55%-60% borrowed grain from other villages, and there was general deterioration in the health of the community and with problems of alcoholism. Only 70-80 acres of land could be irrigated due to a general lack of water. Droughts were common and the 15-16 inches of annual rainfall was not conserved. A local group started a few watershed development works and increased the interest and participation of the rest of inhabitants. Basic community decisions are taken in the village assembly, whose members (recently, both men and women) are nominated annually by the community.

While there are features of community-based enterprises unique to their particular context, Peredo and Chrisman (2005) identify a number of typical characteristics, including:
1. Typically, they are local level initiatives aimed at self-sufficiency, each emerging out of cohesive communities that had economic and social needs not being met by outside organizations.

2. Communities are generally poor, small and isolated; the latter features often generating strong funds of social capital (Coleman, 1988).

3. Enterprises are characteristically guided by multiple goals. Economics is not the objective in and of itself. Rather sustainability, through job creation, income generation, and retention of local business, is the end, which in turn prevents community members from having to leave due to economic circumstances. CBE is the mechanism which finances and sustains other “quality of life” initiatives such as health, education, employment, infrastructure and services.

Many studies of community entrepreneurship (e.g. Mondragon and Ralejan Siddi) focus on the leaders; on the “the man with the vision.” Although strong individuals lead many of the initiatives documented, this is not always the case. Even where this happens, the decisions and plans are often made collectively by the community (Selsky & Smith, 1994). The leader provides an organizational framework and brings people together, but it is the latter who then develop a collective consciousness as a community. Moreover, the entrepreneurial risk-taker becomes the community itself, not the leader. Thus, as Selsky and Smith (1994) point out, community contexts for exercising leadership are substantially different from those traditionally found in other organizational business settings, where participants are diverse, inclusive visions do not exist, decision-making processes are not agreed (Selsky & Smith, 1994). Often leaders emerge with the initial idea for community entrepreneurship, although the precise role these leaders play differs from community to community.

The role of Government in supplying funding, training or other kind of support appears more common in the instance of communities in relatively well-off nations such as Canada (e.g. the Elliot Retirement Living in (OECD, 1995b)), and Japan (e.g. the village of Amagase (OECD, 1995a)). Government intervention appears less common in the poorer areas such as India (e.g. in Ralegan Siddhi (Hazare, 1997)). In some cases (e.g. the Town Enterprises in China (Perotti et al., 1999)) government simply tolerates
community enterprise. In other instances (e.g. Mexico, (Tenenbaum, 1996)) government appears cool to these local initiatives, and they persist as a form of resistance.

It may be instructive at this point to consider the examples of similar developments which have relied more on external stimulation and a reduced for “voice” on the part of worker-citizens. There appear to be certain pitfalls linked to the degree of involvement of NGOs and other outside organizations in community development. Where the community relies solely or in large part on outside organizations for project-funding or implementation, the project may fail as the community has little stake in ensuring sustainability. For example, the Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka was locally self-funded for 22 years. However, when civil war broke out in 1983, the movement began to accept overseas aid for their initiatives, as the movement had by that time established some 7000 outreach points. Today, it is largely financed by overseas aid, and appears not as successful as it was previously (Lean, 1995). Lean (1995) conjectures that villagers began to feel that their good will was being exploited, and the outside organizations replaced accountability to the villages with a new accountability to various external NGOs who measure success in terms of economic, political and social objectives, while ignoring the cultural, moral and spiritual needs of the villagers.

Outside organizations are not involved in the New San Juan Forest Cooperative in Mexico. However, it has been so successful that international development organizations have funded similar initiatives based on this model elsewhere in Mexico, Bolivia, Peru, and Thailand. Despite this funding, some of the initiatives are struggling. Others are shutting down, with failure attributed to mismanagement and disorganization (Tenenbaum, 1996). One other possible interpretation is that the mismanagement and disorganization derive from the lack of direct participation of the entire community in the initiative, and consequently a lack of social pressure and monitoring by the community aimed at ensuring individual accountability.

These cases underline a suggestion that community involvement is crucial to the success of entrepreneurially-based efforts at community rejuvenation. Harrison, Hogget and Jeffers point out that:
…Where targets are imposed from above rather than negotiated at the project level, workers/volunteers may have no sense of ownership and may quickly learn to play the game of meeting targets rather than developing a coherent equality strategy (1995: 153).

A similar pattern appears in the Michoacan Highlands, Mexico, where a medium-sized dairy processor attempted to organize small dairy farmers in the area in order to gain better quality of milk for expanding exports from the local to the national scale. This was done in the hope that:

…Like-minded farmers will create both horizontal integration amongst themselves (thus reducing their costs of production through centralized purchasing of farm inputs) and better vertical integration with the market through the sale of larger volumes of, in this case, higher-quality milk (McDonald, 1999: 276).

Farmers themselves were not involved in the implementation of the plan and knew little about the details. Eventually, the program began to fail because, given the lack of consultation, neither the processor nor the government truly understood what problems the individual farmers faced (McDonald, 1999).

It is difficult to avoid the impression, based on this informal survey, that economic democracy, in the form of significant voice from worker-citizens, is positively correlated with success in entrepreneurial ventures aimed at sustainable local development.

**What appears to make Agua Dulce (among others) successful?**

From the literature and personal observations, it seems that the “bottom-up” approach to development, which begins with the initiatives and input of those whose development is intended, is a positive factor in many cases of relatively successful community entrepreneurship, both because it enlists the commitment of the local population and because it takes advantage of community collective experience. The Agua Dulce example powerfully reinforces this view, as do others in the list given above.

Agua Dulce’s example also supports the suggestion arising from other instances that an existing sense of community identity provides a foundation for cooperation
based on shared characteristics and problems. As in Mondragon, where the Basques were drawn together by political persecution and marginalization, the inhabitants of Agua Dulce drew on a sense of social, political and economic exclusion as well as geographical isolation to form a strong sense of corporate identity.

Many scholars (e.g. (Korten, 1980)) point out that accountability poses a major challenge and can be a key element in success or failure. The strong sense of accountability built into the Agua Dulce arrangements of authority and responsibility arguably give it a clear advantage in dealing with the dangers of indolence and corruption. Similarly, the Mondragon Corporation Co-operative has evolved a complex system, based on small-group units, to ensure accountability at the various levels of its highly participatory organization (Morrison, 1991; Suzuki, 1995; Whyte & Whyte, 1991).

The Agua Dulce enterprise is the result of a process grounded in collective experience and learning, and in this respect mirrors the history of other successful community enterprises (Helmsing, 2002). Frequently, the communities in which community forms of entrepreneurship emerge have previously been involved in collective political action, e.g. demanding access to basic services from the government, contesting government reforms, or protesting against such conditions as counterinsurgency or large-scale landownership. These previous activities may result in the development of tacit knowledge with regard to organizing to achieve goals that is embedded within the community (Spender, 1996). Following Spender (1996) and Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998) I suggest that such knowledge provides a strong advantage to communities who seek to embark on CBE or similar initiatives.

It seems clear that the resort to self-help or voluntary labor is an invaluable asset to community development efforts based on entrepreneurship. Because individuals in small communities (especially in poorer areas) generally lack the capital necessary to finance their initiatives, they contribute instead through their labor. The Agua Dulce enterprise is built around the tradition of faena, or voluntary, unpaid labor. This approach is echoed in The Sarvodaya Shramadana Movement in Sri Lanka, which is built on the concept that working together for the common good builds community spirit and solidarity (Lean, 1995). Similar experiences are seen in Ralegan Siddhi (Hazare, 1997), and a community-based enterprise in Walkerswood, Jamaica (Lean,
Thus, voluntary labor appears as a key factor in the establishment of community entrepreneurship, since individuals do not receive income until the project becomes successful, much like the typical entrepreneur who ‘volunteers’ his/her time in setting up a business, and only recuperates the unpaid time when the business makes a profit.

**Challenges Faced by Community Enterprises**

One serious challenge reported by these movements is associated with size. The concern to keep these organizations democratic and accountable is obviously threatened as they grow larger. In China, as TVE gets bigger, it tends to become corrupt and excessively bureaucratic (Perotti et al., 1999). Elliot Lake is facing a similar predicament of size, for if the town grows too big, the small-town feeling will be lost and house prices will rise, thus destroying its competitive advantage. In the 1970s, Mondragon faced problems with one co-op which had become too large. Since then, the number of members for any one co-op in the group has been limited to 500 (Morrison, 1991).

While isolation may contribute such things as the accumulation of social capital, it also leads to difficulty in creating outside networks (Korten, 1980). Rural communities often face difficulties creating the networks/transportation/communication they require with the outside world both to sell their products and to connect with government and other agencies whose policies affect them. *Agua Dulce* has had to address this challenge partly by entering into a program of road construction, but the problems go far beyond this. ADCBE has organized an association of commoners who live in major cities such as Lima to open doors to commercial opportunities and lobby government as needed. Examples of others facing this challenge can be found in the New San Juan Co-op (Tenenbaum, 1996), Amagase (OECD, 1995a), and TVEs in China (Perotti et al., 1999). A related challenge is that of communicating and collaborating with other similar community entrepreneurial ventures.

Many CBEs face the challenge of global competition affecting market stability. *Agua Dulce* is typical of CBEs in its relatively small size. Like many other communities acting entrepreneurially, *Agua Dulce* must compete in the world-market against much larger enterprises. The ADCBE, for example, faces growing pressure from
large foreign competitors who can sell silicone to processors at a price uneconomical for
the small, local producer. In China, the TVEs are disadvantaged compared to the State-
Owned Enterprises (SOEs), because the SOEs have greater access to “technology,
labor skills, education levels of staff, access to bank loans and government supports”
(Perotti et al., 1999: 2). The effects of global competition are not always as
straightforwardly economic as the case of Agua Dulce’s silicon. Globalized markets
often bring a sense of what is standard or “modern” or desirable in some other way that
is sometimes at odds with the character of products marketed by local community
ventures. “TNCs [trans-national corporations] with their advertising exert an enormous
influence on what is produced and consumed…. The products of TNCs are regarded in
poor countries as modern, fashionable and consequently highly desirable and as status
symbols” (Peredo, 2001). One of challenges faced by Agua Dulce, for instance, in
marketing its locally-produced soft drink is the widely shared sense that Coca Cola is
the “in” soft drink.

Agua Dulce, with its Andean tradition of blending individual and collective
interests, faces another challenge which will shared by any community where these
interests are both in play. In producing and distributing benefits, but also in calculating
the impacts of its operations, such communities must find an acceptable balance
between these interests. Failure to produce such a balance can be expected to
undermine the democracy on which the enterprise develops, as members see
inadequate connections between the practices and outcomes of the enterprise’s
operation and the interests that motivate them, and consequently exit. In a neighboring
community which attempted a modest, community-based enterprise based on livestock,
a crisis arose when the stock held in common grew to the point where individual grazers
found their access to grazing land seriously impaired. It was necessary to adjust the
balance to allow increased individual access in order to maintain the collective venture.
Similar problems are faced by many communities working collectively to develop
themselves in a way that takes account of the needs of individuals and families within
them (Peredo, 2001).

There is another form of balance which needs to be considered by organizations
of the kind I am discussing. Community-based entrepreneurial ventures face tensions
among the various sorts of goals typically driving a community enterprise. Any standard, for-profit organization finds it necessary to balance its interest in economic outcomes with at least minimal regard for ethical and social goals that its membership in society enjoin upon it. The community initiatives under discussion face this balancing challenge even more urgently, given that their agents are acting collectively as citizens, with a variety of social goals primary in their sights. The balancing of social goals with economic objectives remains a challenge—e.g. should the community settle for decreased profitability in exchange for increased employment?—but so will the balancing of the variety of social goals among themselves—e.g. should increased regard for environmental effects be allowed to reduce employment prospects?

**Agua Dulce’s Uncertain Future**

I have discussed above the challenges which *Agua Dulce* shares with its CBE counterparts in other regions. There are other factors which *Agua Dulce* may also have in common with others, but are especially evident in creating uncertainties for the ADCBE. One central uncertainty concerns the very democracy which is a hallmark of the *Agua Dulce* enterprise.

The democracy of the community and the workplace, of which the commoners of *Agua Dulce* are so proud, has reached the point where it is a two-edged sword. On the one hand, most commoners are deeply convinced that the strength of their community-based enterprise and its ability to provide a significant level of economic and social benefits to its members is directly due to the right of all to participate in the decision-making process. On the other, with the fresh winds of change and the maturation of a new generation of educated young people sensitive to the transformation of the national and global economies and steeped in traditional business school paradigms, the possibility becomes ever more real that some core Andean values that have been revered to date may be voted out.

The ADCBE thus, in looking to the future, is caught between something of a rock and a hard place. Interestingly, the democratic precepts, both political and civic, that are so much a part of the psyche of commoners in *Agua Dulce* are the product of a long and painful struggle. They have evolved over time from history and tradition. Indeed, one of the important lessons of *Agua Dulce* is that democracy survives and thrives best
in a situation where people have a determining role in their own development, and in a situation of reasonable economic stability.

**Towards a Sustainable Future**

The community of *Agua Dulce* has been well served to date by its integration of democratic practice within the community and the workplace. A standard of living and quality of life above those of surrounding communities has been achieved. The extent to which the ADCBE can serve as a model for other communities in the Andes, however, is still not clear. As Stokely points out, when it comes to community economic development, “there are no cookie-cutter solutions…” (1995: 17).

The formidable challenge facing the commoners of *Agua Dulce* will be to devise a means for reconciling the traditions from the past and strengths of the present with the threat and opportunity posed by globalization, competition and reform. It seems clear that this cannot be achieved in isolation and that, if the issues represented by *Agua Dulce* are to be addressed effectively, creative new approaches by the national government, international economic institutions and corporations will be required.

Government and the more fortunate countries, including corporations, have an essential role to play. Reform programs, legislative provisions and corporate investment should create conditions for the expansion and strengthening of those community entrepreneurial and cooperative initiatives that contribute to local development. Corporate investment should be accompanied by a strong sense of social responsibility to the communities where the investment is made, with account being taken of history, tradition, social and material needs.

Far from being a matter of philanthropy, the nurture of sustainable economic improvement at the grass roots is a long-term matter of enlightened self-interest. At the local level in the Andes, culture and tradition have provided a platform for political, social and economic development. As *Agua Dulce* demonstrates, a community whose citizens enjoy the necessities of life, have access to a reasonable system of social amenities, a sense of empowerment and are intimately involved in setting their own destiny, is a community that is open to new ideas, a community where new enterprise can take root, and where stability and democratic forms of governance can flourish.
In the context of increased economic globalization, communities around the world, in the north and in the south, are claiming on behalf of their citizens control over local social and environmental factors that affect them. There are many examples of these movements, including local sustainability movements in such cities such as Seattle and Boston in the U.S. and Calgary in Canada, and the revival of a co-operative movement responding to massive lay-offs, declining natural resources and the volatility of business on the west coast of Canada. Prominent among these movements are indigenous societies anxious to achieve meaningful self-governance and looking to entrepreneurial initiatives as a potent force in achieving this end. Against this backdrop, Agua Dulce may provide a suggestive model of the way in which traditions of civic and economic democracy may combine to bring genuine and lasting local development.
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1 The community’s name is fictional out of respect for community privacy.