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**Introduction**

*Ileana Marin, Kettering Foundation,*
*and Esther Velis, Antonio Núñez Jiménez Foundation*

The Antonio Núñez Jiménez Foundation (FANJ) and the Kettering Foundation (KF) are engaged in ongoing exchanges to understand how active citizenship can be strengthened and nurtured to better people's lives throughout the Western Hemisphere. This exchange began more than a decade ago and, to date, has included four conferences: two held in Cartagena, Colombia, in 2008 and 2009, and two held in Havana, Cuba, in 2014 and 2016. This current publication brings together abstracts of the presentations made by participants in the 2016 conference, which was titled Active Citizenship for a Sustainable Economy.

The approach that KF has taken in the exchanges with FANJ is consistent with its longstanding practice of developing learning exchanges with foundations and other non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in other countries that work directly with communities. The relationships develop over extended periods of time—as the case with FANJ illustrates—and they are grounded in a shared commitment to experimentation, learning, and sharing what the different participants are learning from engaging with citizens in communities in their own context. Periodically, the participants meet face-to-face to discuss the problems they are addressing, why they are addressing them, what they are doing about them, and what they are learning from the work. This approach has been pursued by KF in exchanges with groups in the United States and in other countries around the world, including Russia and China.

For KF, there is particular interest in learning how NGOs that work with citizens in communities are able to align their work with that of an active citizenry—especially in addressing the kinds of complex, pernicious problems that require an array of community actors if any progress is to be made in addressing them. There are rich opportunities for learning from the work of FANJ and other organizations it works with in encouraging active citizenship to address domestic issues in Cuba, particularly at the local level of neighborhoods, villages, towns, and regions. We also think that what KF has learned about communities engaging effectively to address complex problems may prove useful to FANJ and Cuban NGOs as they attempt to engage with local communities.

One area of collaboration has included an exploration of the role of communities in addressing environmental protection, conservation, and sustainability, particularly in light of pressures for economic growth. Both foundations want to understand how communities wrestle with these tensions. In this respect, KF has extensive experience collaborating with NGOs in the United States and in other countries that are engaging citizens in addressing similar environmental challenges. Work

In its capacity as a Cuban foundation that does research on the protection of the environment and its relationship to culture and society, FANJ invited KF to Havana for an exchange with practitioners and academics representing eight Cuban organizations, two US organizations, and three organizations from Canada, Panama, and Spain.

The participants in the 2016 Havana exchange were invited to talk about their efforts to encourage active citizenship for a sustainable economy in their particular contexts:

- Liliana Núñez, FANJ president, and Roberto Sánchez, director of the FANJ nature and community program, speak to the role of active citizenship in developing a sustainable economy in their piece, “Cayucas SOS: Active Citizenship for a Sustainable Economy.” So does Rafael Hernández, director of *Temas* magazine, in his article, “Cuba: Spaces for Citizenship in the Political Context of the Transition.” Aurelio Alonso, deputy director of Casa de las Américas, elaborates further on this theme in the regional context in his article, “Means and Obstacles for Democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean”; while Julia Sagebien, associate professor at the School of Business Administration at the Canadian Dalhousie University, writes about the role of what she refers to as the corporate citizen in a newly industrialized Cuba.

- Randall Nielsen, KF program officer, and Ramón Daubón, independent consultant, discuss economic citizenship and the role of citizens in economic change. Emilio Santiago, an expert in the politics of ecology and economy in Spain, writes about the “Movement for Cities in Transition,” which was created by civil society and citizen organizations in his country to address today’s socio-ecological crisis. Judy Braus, president of the US-based North American Association for Environmental Education, offers an overview of how her organization uses education to encourage a heightened level of awareness about our environment.

- The central conflicts that need to be worked through in order to have a sustainable economy (from an environmental, social, economic, and political point of view) are addressed in the piece by John Dedrick, KF vice-president and program director, and in the overview of Cuba’s economic trajectory by Ricardo Torres, professor with the Center for Studies of Cuban Economy CEEC. Marilyn Fernandez,
program officer with the United Nations’ Habitat program in Cuba, makes the case for coaching as an effective tool for community work, while Marta Núñez, a sociologist and professor at the University of Havana, focuses on one of the “unresolved issues,” as she calls female employment in the new Cuban economic model.

- Some of the ways in which institutions and citizens productively work together to contribute to the creation of a sustainable economy are described in the pieces by Betty Knighton, director of the US-based West Virginia Center for Civic Life, Ana Margarita de la Torre, vice-president of the Center Felix Varela in Cuba, and Mírela Rojas, a specialist with the same center.

- The last piece in this collection is based upon the closing remarks delivered by David Mathews, KF president, on the value and role of an active citizenry in reinforcing the work of institutions.

The Havana conference opened up opportunities to continue developing relationships between KF, FANJ, and a number of other Cuban organizations that FANJ works with in exploring the role of NGOs in engaging with people in communities facing challenging problems.

This event also opened up opportunities to further explore the work of active citizens in communities that are facing severe environmental disasters and the effects of climate change. Building on previous collaborative work with Gulf Coast communities facing similar challenges in the United States and Cuba, we decided to delve more deeply into the question of how communities become resilient. Representatives from Havana, Cojimar, and Guanabo (Cuba), and from Mobile and Baldwin counties in Alabama (United States) have been exploring this question. Their work will form the core of our January 2018 exchange, which will also be held in Havana.

We would like to close by expressing our deep gratitude to each of the authors, translators, editors, and layout and design specialists, and especially to our longtime dear colleague, Ramón Daubón, without whom this publication would never have been possible in this format. It has been a privilege to collaborate with each and all of you!

Ileana Marin is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation, U.S.A. She can be reached at imarin@kettering.org.

Esther Velis is the director of international affairs at Antonio Núñez Jiménez Foundation, Cuba. She can be reached at esther@fanj.cult.cu.
WHAT IS ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP?

Cayucas SOS: Active Citizenship for a Sustainable Economy

Cuba: Spaces for Citizenship in the Political Context of the Transition

Means and Obstacles for Democracy in Latin America and the Caribbean

The Role of the Corporate Citizen in a Newly Industrialized Cuba
As part of its promotion of environmental dialogues, the Antonio Núñez Jimenez Foundation (FANJ) created its SOS Ecological Alerts program, which has become one of its most systematic and effective lines of work, coordinating diverse interests for the conservation of ecosystems, management of sheltered environments, and the protection of species, all consonant with development.

During the past 20-plus years, FANJ has issued more than 30 such alerts. The SOS challenge is to generate proposals for sustainable economic activities that promote community stability and quality of life while protecting the natural surroundings.

The Cayucas SOS in the Toa River basin offers a case study of FANJ’s work in promoting dialogue toward economic, social, and environmental sustainability that involves communication between affected communities and local and national authorities.

The general methodology involves:

- Selection and definition of the issue as it relates to specific conflict, territory, etc.;
- Convening of staff resources;
- Consultation and deliberation at technical and policy levels;
- Recommendations for short and medium-term policy; and
- Production of documents and executive reports.


Cayucas are traditional river boats of the Toa basin made with wooden planks, designed with high sides, and structurally reinforced to navigate river rapids aided by poles and oars. Traditionally, the transport system of cayucas connected all the social sectors of the basin: economic, cultural, educational, and health. Nonetheless, the FANJ expeditions and community exchanges in 2014 and 2015 confirmed...
that, while in 1995 there had been 15 _cayucas_ in operation, by 2014 there was only one— _La Viajera_—left.

Discussions further documented the area’s high outmigration, depressed economic activity and loss of traditions, problems with transport of freight and passengers, and local desire to resurrect the _cayucas_ but lack of clarity about how to proceed. There has been a prohibition on building new vessels since the 1990s, and there is a general disconnect between remote actors who make decisions and local stakeholders who live with them.

The multiplicity of actors identified included local communities, boat operators, ports and border authorities, the Ministries of the Interior and Transportation that deal with maritime investments, security, and river transit, the Forest Service, the Comission for the National Heritage, municipal governments and cultural authorities, national parks, and the Communist Party.

In February 2015, a preliminary roundtable at FANJ selected a coordinating committee for a possible _Cayucas_ SOS. The dialogues were, at first, confrontational, but later evolved into productive discussions where options were considered that would guide policy thinking about local realities, responsibilities, and regulatory implications.

A consensus was reached that _cayucas_ are vital for the economic sustainability of the area. They generate income, carry on tradition, and represent a tourism asset. They encourage rootedness and stability in communities. They preclude the illegal and unsafe use of bamboo for rafts, the clearing for which is ecologically damaging to the river. They improve conditions for merchandise transport, particularly agricultural, in terms of volume, quality, and ease of travel. Their use energizes economic, social, and cultural life. The disappearance of the _cayucas_ was not due to a conscious decision. They inadvertently fell within a national process to regulate small vessels—one with little awareness of mountain life. Boatmen in this remote area found it hard to fathom bureaucratic procedures.

A _Cayucas_ SOS roundtable was proposed for Baracoa for October 2015, with a commitment to authorize the construction of at least 7 new _cayucas_ and convene the institutions and local actors to evaluate the regularization of the _cayucas_ system, including the clarity of the regulatory process. Travel difficulties precluded the visit, but the long time delay allowed representatives of two ministries, Transportation and Interior, to meet at length with FANJ to understand their need to reconcile their respective regulations. The _Cayucas_ SOS roundtable was held at FANJ.
by telephone from Havana, with boatmen and forest rangers in Baracoa, near the river. The proposals were approved. The challenge for 2016 was to promote the clarity of steps to follow, including implementation of the accords, and to brief additional entities like the National Forest Service on the importance of the process.

The end result was a heightened level of understanding of the issue by all involved and of the need to generate solutions consonant with more complex national-level directives. Previously, the dialogue arguments had been made out of ignorance: “not all locals can own a cayuca”; “boatbuilding in the country is restricted”; “vessels must comply with international standards”; or “distances in the area are too short for cayucas.” The arguments posed after the dialogue reflected a higher level of understanding: “cayucas contribute to local development, recover cultural traditions, and improve the quality of life”; “the issue can and must be resolved soon”; “authorization procedures can be simplified”; “these people need support”; “children and seniors must be given priority in the context of priorities.”

Liliana Núñez is the president of the Antonio Núñez Jiménez Foundation, Cuba. She can be reached at liliana@fanj.cult.cu.

Roberto Sánchez is director of the nature and community program at Antonio Núñez Jiménez Foundation. He can be reached at roberto.sanchez@fanj.cult.cu.
The presentation discussed salient issues of the concept of citizenship as presented in draft guidelines and later modified in the VI Party Congress in April 2011 and in the National Conference of 2012, and anticipated Cuban policies after December 2015 in view of the demographic transitions and normalization of US relations, which increased interest in the transition.

**Resolved in the VI Party Congress**

- Improvement of the standard of living of the population complemented with the necessary formation of ethical and political values of our citizens.
- Economic policy embraces the concept that socialism means *equality of rights and opportunities for all citizens but not egalitarianism*, although no one in Cuba’s socialist society shall remain unprotected; that work is a right and a duty, a source of personal growth for each citizen, and should be remunerated according to its quality and quantity.

**The Concept of Citizen in the Guidelines for the VI Congress**

The *Guidelines*, the basic document for consideration by the Congress, had been legitimized by a broad base of citizens through ample popular participation and was drafted from the proposals presented there. Noted by item:

57...higher taxes shall be set for higher incomes to mitigate inequality;

140...key achievements of the revolution shall be preserved, such as access to medical attention, education, culture, sports, recreation, *public tranquility* (added by the Congress) and social protection through social assistance;

143...will continue improving education, health, culture and sports, which will require reducing some social expenditures as well as generating new sources of income and assessing activities that may be transferred from the public budget to private enterprise;

161...reiterated public support for all manifestations in physical culture and sport as a means for quality of life and the integral formation of citizens;

174...committed the Congress to the orderly and gradual elimination of the citizen ration book as a form of egalitarian distribution at subsidized prices.
In the subsequent Party conference on Critical Thinking in the Public Sphere (Objetivos de trabajo del PCC aprobados por la Primera Conferencia Nacional, La Habana, 29 de enero, 2012), it was mandated by Objective:

67 ...to tackle excess formalism, lack of creativity, and obsolete criteria in the work of social communication and propaganda, with particular attention to diversity of audiences;

69 ...directed the Party to convey via audiovisual means, print, and digital press all of Cuba’s diversity of economic, labor, and social situations, as well as of race, religious beliefs, sexual orientation, and regional origin;

70 ...to compel mass media to inform in an opportune, objective, systematic, and transparent fashion the policies of the Party and their evolution, the problems, difficulties, insufficiencies, and adversities that it must face, and suppress information lacunae and secretism, being mindful of the needs and interests of the population;

71 ...demanded that mass media rely on scientific criteria and studies, become an effective platform for the expression of culture and debate, and offer a path for knowledge, analysis, and the exercise of opinion. The press and information sources shall assume the responsibility to develop a journalism that is newsworthy, objective, and investigative.

Citizen Issues Regarding the USA

The report addresses the challenges to Cuba’s political and civic culture by the normalization of relations with the United States, how said normalization interacts with Cuba’s transition issues, and how it impacts on its citizen exercise.

The citizen reaction to seeing the US flag in Cuba was a clear “WELCOME BACK!” Beside fears of an “American tsunami,” the opening brought near-normal migratory relations, a newly circular migratory pattern with eased restrictions from either side, an increased influx of undocumented migrants through third countries, and an increased tendency for dual citizenship. From the US side, the new relations brought about a change in the image of Cuba from dictatorship to governance, from gulag to favored tourist destination, and having People to People programs replaced Track II as preferred contact. The impact was substantial in terms of information, communication, and technology (ICT): after an official conference in February 2015, Cuba was opened to the Internet, sidewalk Wi-Fi became ubiquitous, and open communications with US relatives became common. In all, it brought greater attention on dialogues between Cubans, inside and out.

There were underlying negative challenges, inherited from the Cold War. Normalization drew attention to Cuba’s siege mentality; to a US policy of regime change that encourages Cuban pushback; to reactions to ideologized concepts like human rights, civil society, democracy, pluralism, transition, and loyal opposition; and to suspicions about the intent
of US civil institutions like foundations, academic, cultural, or religious programs.

Other issues made more visible by the transition process included:

- In **governance**, renewed resilience of centralized decision making, of an overly bureaucratized institutional system, and of administrative corruption; an earlier-than-expected generational transition in political leadership; more heterogeneous and contradictory opinions in official circles; and an insufficient weight of the law as instrument of change and civic power.

- In **civic life**, changes in civic and ideological values; insufficient autonomy to civil society actors; decreased citizen participation in institutions and organizations; intergenerational differences in public representation and participation; gender differences in decision making; racial prejudice and disadvantage; insufficient access to information and ICT; and limited extension and practice of free expression.

- In the **economy**, evidence of greater inequality and poverty; fragility of the basic family income and consumer basket; increased out-migration; collateral impact of massive tourism and transformation of economic cultural patterns of *mercantilism* and of idealized visions of the capitalist lifestyle.

**Challenges to the Transition: Interacting with Normalization**

New policies designed from the grassroots and national levels allow Cuba’s political system to take advantage of normalization and its multiple actors, cultivate new interlocutors in the United States and third countries, promote initiatives from the Cuban side instead of from the other, and transit from a defensive mentality to a strategic and creative one.

By 2018, we anticipate a new administration in the United States, the VII Party Congress, the end of Raul Castro’s mandate, new legislation by the National Assembly for re-structuring municipalities and promoting decentralization, and a new electoral law. Governance tasks include:

- improving the People’s Power Assembly’s decision making and legislative roles;
- creating a new public media system;
- continuing the ongoing demographic transition in leadership;
- extending the co-op model to non-agricultural sectors;
- expanding the non-state sector with small and medium businesses;
- passing pending legislation on the Family Code and on the Law of Associations; and
- proposing a constitutional reform to limit the number of terms for elected or appointed officials in top state and party positions.

*Rafael Hernández is the director of the Cuban TEMAS magazine. He can be reached at rafaelmhdez@temas.icaic.cu.*
This presentation refers to two previous presentations on the same topic in Cartagena, and discusses how more recent developments in Cuba and in its Latin American context may have made old concepts obsolete or introduced new ones. In Cuba’s *sui generis* reality, the turn in US policy since 2014 (normalizing diplomatic relations and easing the economic embargo) should not be observed in isolation or in relation only to the United States, but also within the context of the unresolved economic crisis that began in 2008 and was felt strongly throughout Latin America.

There, from 2000 onward, it had seemed possible to achieve through electoral means a network of progressive governments capable of challenging the traditional dependence on the economic, political, social, ideological, and cultural norms of the world’s power centers. Events in Argentina, Venezuela, Brazil, Bolivia, and Ecuador suggested that the common good was being redefined as effective sovereignty and a permanent realignment of center-periphery relations. With degrees of radicalization attuned to conditions in each country, these changes, though unanticipated, were nonetheless tangible.

This organized resistance to the system of control imposed by the United States in its geographic neighborhood was met with a new disruptive strategy aimed especially at Venezuela and Brazil. Venezuela, beyond improving its living standards in collaboration with Cuba, had become a key supporter for changes in the region toward an integration project free from asymmetrical power centers. In Brazil, the largest country and greatest economic force in the region, the Workers Party came to power without the radicalism of Venezuela, but with reforms promising an attractive alternative for a sustainable regional autonomy. Moreover, Brazil came to represent the region’s interests in the world’s middle-tier alliance of powers (BRICS).

But while Venezuela and Brazil are central to the US strategy to recover its traditional ascendancy over Latin America, one must also look at its approach toward Cuba. Notably, the changes occurring elsewhere in the region, including the most profound, arose in market economies even in those designated socialist. But inherent weaknesses in these new alternatives, or in their mechanisms for
implementation, kept them from garnering the needed electoral support, which then became their challenge.

The Cuban case is different. Its revolutionary structure came to power through arms, and through arms it confirmed its legitimacy. It distributed land to producers, universalized literacy, reformed employment and housing, instituted universal education and health, prohibited discrimination, and expropriated enterprise, creating a state economy. It involved turmoil from the beginning; where it worked well and where it didn’t, how it could have been done better, and how it might have worked without the US embargo, are matters for other discussions. What is significant is that, since 1959, Cuba showed a capacity for resistance and a possibility for effective sovereignty that could be exemplary for the region. The material limitations suffered by Cubans in those years did not preclude a pattern of social justice and protection of the helpless, fundamental bases for any sustained action to mitigate poverty and inequality. It also did not inhibit a culture of solidarity, elevated to a central principle of the Cuban socialist project and documented at the UN General Assembly in recognition of the legitimacy of Cuban socialism. The solidarity ethics developed by Cuba have become a main point of the Cuban agenda and a referent with progressive proposals in other countries.

The coincidence of the Cuban experience with other platforms for change in the hemisphere must be highlighted, even if their routes were not identical. While the other economies of the continent must deal with the weight of oligarchies to empower the social interest, the Cuban task is to decentralize, incentivize production, and stimulate output through more participatory structures and more diverse forms of property in which private enterprise assumes a greater contributive role in the functioning of the system, all without losing state control but also without hampering the entrepreneur with the bureaucrat.

And whereas other societies struggle to consolidate social gains within their public institutions, Cuba, committed to its socialist nature, leaves no room for deviations and can address other tasks, one being the economic efficiency of its socialist project. Another is improving its deliberative processes, recognizing its diversity, and enhancing its citizen participation. For while there can be no true democracy without socialism, the latter often has difficulties in fostering a democratic culture and institutionality.

Thus, these two routes, the Cuban and the new Latin American ones, vary in appearance and points of departure, but both aim at a social and democratic complementarity within their synergies. In today’s Latin America, an effective strategy requires identifying and addressing specific points of both coincidence and difference. Latin oligarchies and other centers of opposition to progressive governments will get their support from allied multinational interests, largely in the United States, with Europe to a lesser degree. Contrary to Africa and the Middle East, on this side of the Atlantic one needs not involve NATO partners, as it would defy the principal tenet of American geopolitics, the Monroe Doctrine. The US strategy appears to be to use the neoliberal governments to counterbalance
those with sovereign projects by relying on misinformation and cultural deformation about the latter’s reality. In 2010, then archbishop Bergoglio of Buenos Aires—now Pope Francis—denounced this affront to Latin America as a communication problem nurtured by three actions: “disinformation, defamation, and calumny, [with] disinformation [being] the most dangerous.” Such is the case of the manipulation of the discontented by propaganda to subvert electoral results, as has occurred in presidential elections in Argentina and legislative ones in Venezuela.

Given the decline in possibilities to develop and sustain social programs amidst global backsliding and economic crises, it is imperative to locally manage each country’s juncture to minimize social damage.

Yet the visible reversal does not justify accepting that the socializing effort is exhausted. Neo-liberal formulas must reject genuine citizen participation because they offer no alternative to address unemployment, helplessness, inequality, poverty, hunger, and environmental degradation. In the long run, their effort of restoration will end in a blind alley. History works against them. In David Mathews’ observations on citizen participation, the importance of naming a civic problem in relation to things that people hold valuable will encourage them to engage with it in creating new realities, things that only the civic action of the people can create. This self-referred, autochthonous democracy can thus neither be imported nor exported.

Aurelio Alonso is deputy director of the Casa de las Américas in Cuba. He can be reached at aurelius@cubarte.cult.cu.

This self-referred, autochthonous democracy can thus neither be imported nor exported.
The presentation addresses “the central conflicts that need be worked through for a sustainable economy from an environmental, social, economic, and political point of view.” It adds that while corporations are among the most powerful value-creating mechanisms available, globalization has extended corporate rights but has not produced a countervailing corporate responsibility. This raises further questions of what kind of value is created, for whom, and at whose expense. The application of market precepts understood as neoliberalism and the concentration of new wealth generated by corporate efficiency has weakened states’ capacity to address those questions. In response, corporate social responsibility (CSR) and corporate citizenship (CC) concepts address such “governance gaps.” For, while corporations are juridical persons, they are not fully citizens with full rights and responsibilities. Nevertheless, they can become corporate citizens.

It is proposed that CSR and CC may be seen as the application of the 18th century social contract theory to corporate behavior. In Hobbes’ theory, a person’s moral and political obligations rest upon a contract or agreement made with other persons to rule the society in which they live. Collaborative governance (Simon Zadek) is its modern equivalent, whereby multiple stakeholders, including government and private institutions, NGOs, and individual citizens come together to evolve, implement, and oversee rules, proposing ongoing solutions to social challenges as they emerge.

But CSR and CC are opposed by the political right because “the business of business is business”: its social responsibility is to behave ethically and pay its taxes, and its social contribution is the creation of jobs for its workers and wealth for its owners. Meanwhile, CSR and CC are opposed by the political left because they do not alter the capitalist rent dynamic and its unequal concentration of economic power. Yet both capitalists and socialists are exploring CC, following a reasoning akin to the prisoner’s dilemma. In capitalist systems, for-profit corporations must be compelled to issue explicit social and environmental objectives because they are legally bound to shareholder primacy, whereby shareholder interests are assigned first priority before all other stakeholders. To deal with any absence thereof, the state can use its powers of regulation and remedial action, exposing corporate risk. But regulation in a globalized economy is not a predictable...
enough normative or enforcement mechanism. Therefore, corporate self-regulation via CSR and CC arises to internalize the risk externalities. CSR has thus spread to developing countries, closing this governance gap. Meanwhile, in socialist systems, all enterprises serve the interest of society as defined, mediated, and guided by the state. Since state corporations have implicit societal objectives within the aegis of the egalitarian objectives of the system, expressions of multisector social and environmental objectives are implied, vis-à-vis the socialist tutelage.

In Cuba, a history of centralized economic planning created sectoral silos with little motivation to forge cross-linkages. In addition, CSR and CC are seen as threatening to the monopoly of the state and instill fears of protagonismo by the private sector. To invite foreign capitalist corporations to involve themselves directly in local development or in health and education is seen as inviting the fox to manage the chickens, the return of pre-revolutionary rural bateyes, or, ultimately, as the path to create new local bourgeoisies beholden to foreign actors. At worst, it can be seen as an underhanded way to bring back the old Track II bugaboo. Yet it is important to discuss the role of corporate citizens in Cuba, mainly because they are there, and because the sector is presently the main source of hard currency, technology transfer, managerial know-how, and professional employment.

Corporate citizenship can also help Cuba in its transition to a COP 21 low-carbon industrial ecosystem by taking advantage of the Momento Coyuntural’s 10 Key Factors:

- Cuba’s highly qualified stock of professionals;
- Special period limitations have rendered much of the old infrastructure obsolete;
- It also created an “Accidental (and Proactive) Eden”;
- Need to update the Cuban economy gave expanded space for local enterprise;
- “17 December” opening with the United States can be the beginning of the end of the embargo;
- “17 D-Plus” is seen as the lifting of the international “bell jar” isolating Cuba;
- The desired “Big Bang”: possible membership in international financial institutions;
- US Immigration Reform: acceleration of the brain drain and loss of the escape valve;
- Threatened end of Venezuelan cheap oil supplies;
- COP 21: This time, governments, institutions, businesses, and investors are ready.
The evident strategy is to “Follow the Money.” From official sources, developed countries have already pledged US$10.1 billion for the initial resource mobilization of the Green Climate Fund. The World Bank Group has pledged US$16 billion per year in public financing and possibly an additional US$13 billion per year beginning in 2020. The Inter-American Development Bank pledged an increase from 14 percent per year to 25-30 percent per year of its budget by 2020. The European Investment Bank has pledged US$20 billion per year globally for five years.

From private sources, the Gates Foundation has offered to create a Billion-Dollar Fund for Clean Energy. Warren Buffett’s grandson seeks his own investment route based on “Social Change.” Goldman Sachs, Citi, JPMorgan, and the institutional investment industry are moving increasing volumes in the capital market as it matures and sheds risk. Finally, hundreds of leading corporations are involved in some aspect of de-carbonization (leaner supply chains, production technologies, carbon pricing, etc.). Resources are there.

This presents a dual choice strategy for Cuba’s re-industrialization:

A. 19th century industrialization mode of heavy industry, low-wage manufacturing, and tourism service jobs, with high carbon energy sources palliated through social and environmental regulation and provision of universal benefits; and

B. 21st century industrial economy that makes use of the global response to climate change and that leapfrogs into highly paid knowledge workers, science-based research and development (R&D), and low-carbon production and distribution modes, all led through a state-crafted industrial policy, targeted attraction of foreign domestic investment, and assisted by improved universal benefits.

But A and B are not mutually exclusive, especially given Cuba’s development needs and circumstances. This may have been envisioned before, but now the leapfrog is possible as there is a match between Cuba’s national development priorities and assets, post-17D opportunities, Venezuelan oil insecurity, and global resources committed to innovation in de-carbonization strategies in developed and developing countries.

Option B can allow for jump-starting Cuba’s new infrastructure and industrial structure to leapfrog into a 21st century low-carbon world. It provides a desired future vision for an emerging economic model of a sustainable and prosperous socialism. It suggests ways to get there and who can help. And it can return Cuba to the world stage as a leader in scientific and technological innovation and equitable development. What is required is leadership by the Cuban state, adoption by state enterprises, trusted interlocutors, access to IFIs and development banks, R&D centers and universities, a vibrant nonprofit sector, and selected international investors and business partners.

Julia Sagebien is an associate professor at the School of Business Administration at the Dalhousie University, Canada. She can be reached at julia.sagebien@dal.ca.
WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP IN GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY?

Economic Citizenship: Citizens in Economic Change

Cities in Transition: Programmatic Bases and Practical Experiences of the Break-the-Circle Transition Institute in Spain

North American Association for Environmental Education: An Overview
The presentation rests on the premise that *citizenship* cannot exist outside of community, as it can only be manifested by the interactions among citizens. By *community*, we mean a contextual environment—an *ecology*—in which interactions among people occur continuously and across time. It shares the basic characteristics of all ecologies of (a) continuous adaptive movement, (b) interactivity, where every action ripples in direct and indirect reactions, and (c) subsidiarity, where adaptations occur first at the most local levels. Communities differ from non-human ecologies in that people can presumably choose to structure the environment of their community ecology in ways that affect the nature of future interactions and the trajectory of the community. The community ecology, thus, evolves as its members continuously interact and learn to shape future interactions.

A *citizen* of a community is a person able and willing to make choices about how to live in interaction with others regarding (a) how they wish to structure the civic ecology, (b) the *norms* under which such choices are made and which, themselves, evolve over time and through practice, and (c) how to *interact* within a given structure on specific issues that constantly emerge and which compel the structure to adapt and evolve.

Some ecologies—human and otherwise—thrive, while some wither and disappear. The key environmental characteristics of places that prosper across time are resilience, or the ability to respond protectively to pressures generated from outside the ecology, and innovation, the ability to create beneficial changes—conscious or serendipitous—from sources within the ecology. In communities everywhere, people are continually interacting in ways that cause changes—conscious or unforeseen—and elicit adaptations to those changes for their particular circumstances of time and place.

Which raises the following questions:

1. What encourages these interactions to be *conscious acts of citizenship*, so that they can consciously produce more resilient and innovative communities?

2. What are the inner attributes of communities that support this capacity of people to deal constructively—*i.e.* as citizens—with change, and can these attributes be encouraged? Four possible attributes present key implications:
WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP IN GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY?

- people who share a sense of ownership over their civic space, the occasions, and opportunities wherein citizens interact;
- people who are constantly creating new forms of association and of interactions among associations;
- people who recognize that tensions are inevitable among things everyone holds dear;
- people who recognize the impossibility of certainty, and from this insight come to recognize learning as a human condition.

To address these issues, Kettering Research has already focused on:

- practices through which people arrive at a shared recognition of important issues;
- naming such issues in ways that people can place them within meaningful local experience, and that implicate the people themselves as resources, individually and in their local associations;
- practices through which people frame alternative approaches in ways that clarify both the tensions among the legitimate things everyone holds valuable and among the opportunities to act within those tensions;
- practices through which people manage those tensions and opportunities and create ways to put their available resources, their assets, to work in complementary ways.

When done constructively, these practices become, in effect, learning exchanges: opportunities to jointly acquire information about particular issues, to realize the legitimate tensions between alternative ways to deal with them, and to devise new ways to interact in the self-governance of these shared challenges.

We call this active citizenship. Only when people interact in the work of doing these things are they acting as citizens. There can be no passive citizenship. Likewise, we refer to economic citizenship as active citizenship in the context of challenges for economic change. It is the awareness that the individual and collective actions of citizens can alter the broad economic environment, including the behavioral norms that impact the economic environment. The key implication is that the act of strengthening the practices of citizenship also strengthens the potential for sustained long-run prosperity of communities. Therefore, development of citizenship,

The key environmental characteristics of places that prosper across time are resilience, or the ability to respond protectively to pressures generated from outside the ecology, and innovation, the ability to create beneficial changes—conscious or serendipitous—from sources within the ecology.
particularly economic citizenship, is a necessary element of economic development.

Which raises a practical question: How can the practices through which people learn and do the work of citizens be built into the design of initiatives that intend to develop economic prosperity? The question is critically important because most so-called development initiatives typically do not do so.

Important learning occurs in the process of dealing with this question. With it we are developing a general learning-based theory of change. Meanwhile, in the daily practices of economic citizenship, people discover and learn:

• about the transformational power in the associational life of community ecologies;

• about the economic impact of everyday issues, especially those that cannot be addressed by unilateral institutional action;

• to recognize the latent power of everyday practices through which people recognize and make sense of shared concerns;

• how to reorient those practices in ways that encourage more productive learning exchanges and, thus, more sound judgments about collective action;

• to deal constructively with legitimate and inevitable tensions among things that all people hold valuable; and

• to recognize and avoid the unfortunate collateral effects of well-meaning institutional efforts to help people and communities.

Randall Nielsen is a program officer at the Kettering Foundation. He can be reached at nielsen@kettering.org.

Ramón Daubón is an independent consultant. He can be reached at kfdaubon@aol.com.
Cities in Transition: Programmatic Bases and Practical Experiences of the Break-the-Circle Transition Institute in Spain

Emilio Santiago, Break-the-Circle Transition Institute

The world’s Movement for Cities in Transition was created to address today’s socio-ecological crisis by using civil society and citizen organizations. The paper presents the movement’s general guidelines and their implementation by a local organization in Móstoles, Spain, near Madrid. They derive from four basic principles:

1. A future with less energy consumption is inevitable;
2. Society has been brought to this crisis by its dependence on fossil fuels;
3. The only effective action is collective and the action must happen now;
4. Proper actions can lead to social change toward habitable and sustainable cities.

The concept, born in Ireland and popularized in 2006 in Totnes, England, is today the world’s referent for cities in transition. It aims to create a grassroots process to endow local governments, neighborhoods, or regions with tools to make them more resilient and less vulnerable to climate change and limitations of petroleum production.

The basis of the movement is creative decline: to manage the decline in energy use and find a mid-point between unsustainable perpetual growth and a catastrophic collapse of industrial society.

- **Resiliency**
  The capacity to adapt and emerge strengthened from destabilizing external traumas. It contravenes the model of prior social movements based on conflictive notions of resistance rather than flexibility.

- **Credible and Appropriate Solutions**, based on five premises:
  - *Doing*, instead of theorizing—to focus on practical steps to increase the autonomy of local communities to manage their basic needs;
WHAT ARE THE CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR ACTIVE CITIZENSHIP IN GROWING A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY?

• Scale, tailored to one in which the initiatives can incide;
• Open code, to disseminate and adapt each initiative’s uniqueness;
• Catalytic reactive processes that ripple and generate further actions;
• Following a thread—build on existing processes and weave them into a story.

Relocalization
Relocalization builds on Schumacher’s premise of “small is beautiful” and adds that “local is inevitable.” It seeks relocalization of production to the local economy as key to the system, where every external business represents a drain of local resiliency.

Visioning and visualizing, divided into:
• The importance of a positive vision of a future in the process of being built;
• A positive vision of the process itself as non-isolated, in constant communication with its surroundings and reaching outside its comfort zone.

Inclusion
Underscores its basic difference with other movements (at the same time, one of its greatest weaknesses):
• Works for, not against; is nonpartisan and non-ideological;
• Inclusive; with room for all because all are needed; no “us versus them”;

Connected to the local institutional and policy context; a facilitator and not a “co-opter”; supporter rather than director.

Consciousness raising by promoting and using neighborhood gatherings.

Psycho-social factors for change:
• Hopeful and constructive; sees the transition as an opportunity, not a curse;
• A community-life experience, focused on the interpersonal as the key link; a learning and growth process for all engaged;
• Importance of personal growth, of learning for behavioral change;
• Celebratory, an opportunity for enjoyment; aware to not obsess or burn-out.

The movement has expanded worldwide to more than 10,000 nuclei, from tiny initiatives to large cities like Bristol, England. Our local Instituto de Transición Rompe el Círculo takes from the success of the movement and hopes to become in Spain what the labor movement was in prior centuries. Its weaknesses, however, are:

• Its strictly nonpartisan nature;
• Its failure to address the capitalist economy’s bias against small scale;
• It does not address the distribution of wealth; rather, it assumes a middle-class perspective where all people are able to save;
• It comes from an Anglo-Saxon relational context. In Spain the relationships of local governance are more complex;

• Approaching only the local can be a limitation for broader transition tasks that tend to be national or international and may yet end up facilitating the local.

The Break-the-Circle Transition Institute adapts these principles to the working-class community of Móstoles. With a population of 200,000, it retains a “small-town” feel with a strong community weave, firm sense of place, working urban small-scale agriculture, and a long tradition of community activism and worker self-management. The Institute began its transition work there in 2011 along three axes: research, outreach, and involvement in projects, which include:

• A widely available locale;

• A garden for agroecology, permaculture, and recovery of traditional skills;

• An experimental community garden;

• Several consumer groups for eco-foods and a fair-trade collaborative;

• A time and skills bank;

• A “guerrilla gardening” collective;

• Catering for gatherings with locally produced foods;

• Discussion groups for a future Móstoles, aimed at 2030.

In addition, the Institute has acted as advocate before local governments, helping with their diagnoses through joint articles, links, social networks, and events. It is also helping to develop a phased plan for the city:

First phase: Shared formation, dissemination and diagnosis, with 17 sessions in 2014, including top experts in sustainability;

Second phase: project design, with 22 projects proposed and broadly discussed in 2015;

Third phase: public presentations of the projects, execution, and grassroots connections. As of April 2016, several of the projects have been initiated. All 22 projects are based on experiences elsewhere brought to Móstoles as a model for other cities in Spain.

The work has followed a two-pronged strategy: down to the grassroots, and up the institutional scale by connecting with the partisan campaign of GANAR Móstoles, which emerged from the PODEMOS national movement. In July 2016, GANAR won the municipal elections and introduced the Institute’s

But the crisis also presents an opportunity to re-imagine an urban-development model led by social movements and an active citizenry, who, with their capillary networks and micro access, will be the fundamental keys to success.
initiative in four program areas: social economy, based on social-solidarity cooperative principles, new models of production, culture and community organizing, and formal and non-formal education.

Over the next decades, cities will have to deal with radical transformations while being constrained by budgetary situations, given the generalized economic stagnation and growing unmet demands. Moreover, local governments will be unable to lead the needed changes, given their limited resources and restricted radius of action. But the crisis also presents an opportunity to re-imagine an urban-development model led by social movements and an active citizenry, who, with their capillary networks and micro access, will be the fundamental keys to success.

Emilio Santiago is an expert in politics of ecology and economy in Spain. He can be reached at emilio.santiago.muino@gmail.com.
The presentation introduces NAAEE and defines environmental education and literacy, discusses the key role of civic engagement in environmental education and the importance of deliberation, and lays out future plans. NAAEE is the professional association for environmental educators throughout North America and around the world. Its mission is to advance environmental literacy and civic engagement through education. It has more than 50 state, regional, and provincial affiliates throughout North America, and more than 30 country members on every continent, who work individually and together to strengthen the field of environmental education. NAAEE and its affiliates serve a broad audience: educators, from early childhood to elementary, secondary, and university teachers, as well as informal educators, foundations, nonprofits, governments, and corporations.

NAAEE supports education for a sustainable future via informed and motivated citizens. Beyond integrating environmental education into school systems at all levels, including with in-service and pre-service educators, NAAEE works through various approaches. These include helping people become more informed citizens and better advocates and building leadership through environmental stewards, as in the Community Climate Change Fellowship involving community educators from across North America.

NAAEE also supports connecting people to nature for all ages, but especially for early childhood learners, to build life-long stewardship values and support curiosity, experiential learning, and healthy habits. Another priority is to help young people develop leadership skills, promote “green” careers, and understand the roles and responsibilities of citizenship. Finally, NAAEE and its partners strive to create a more diverse and inclusive movement, to ensure that everyone has access to high-quality education and to integrate diversity and inclusion into all aspects of its work.

NAAEE sponsors an Annual International Conference, bringing educators from more than 30 countries. For 2016, it planned to gather over 1,000 people in Madison, Wisconsin, to learn, network, and share best practices. Two days before its conference, NAAEE holds an International Research Symposium, which gathers more than 150 researchers from around the world to present the latest thinking in the field.

NAAEE looks at environmental education as a tool to create a more sustainable society.
Environmental education is a tool to create a more sustainable society through a process that leads to a more environmentally literate citizenry. For its principles, we refer to its first international conference on environmental education in 1977: awareness, knowledge, skills, attitudes, and informed action. These help people to understand issues and develop skills and the motivation to address them and take action. NAAEE later defined “environmental literacy” as knowledge, competencies, dispositions, and responsible behavior, underscoring that an environmentally literate citizen is one who makes informed decisions, is willing to act to improve the well-being of individuals, societies, and the global environment, and who participates in civic life. But we realize that knowledge alone does not lead to behavior change and that people need disposition and caring to feel that they have power to make a difference, and thus be more likely to act. So NAAEE employs a combination of key concepts to create the best opportunities for people—individually and collectively—to become better advocates and actors, including:

- systems thinking;
- sustainability;
- diversity, equity, and inclusion;
- lifelong learning;
- sense of place;
- civic engagement;
- sustainable communities (formal and informal);
- schools as a formal pipeline;
- non-formal education;
- community education;
- interdisciplinary approaches;
- solution-oriented decision making;
- scientific thinking and research, linked to practice and made accessible to practitioners.

All these are part of experiential learning. Unlike passive learning, experiential learning gives people life experiences; processing these experiences and reflecting on what is observed creates deeper understanding. Environmental education thus teaches people how to think, not what to think. It focuses on both short- and long-term change, on building a sustained environmentally literate citizenry. It moves people beyond awareness to action—to steps like creating consumer activism, giving money, improving habitat directly, or educating others to create a new future. We help people to first engage and then be active in whatever ways make sense to them.

NAAEE has worked with the Kettering Foundation as their environmental education partner to promote deliberation in the United States. Facing many wicked problems like climate change—so complicated that they defy direct solutions—people often don’t do anything, thinking that they can’t make a
difference. As part of our civic-engagement strategies, deliberation is an important first step in helping people understand the complexity of such issues and yet come up with feasible actions that they can take. It is decision making in which people come together to discuss complex issues and think critically. It helps people discuss options from different points of view and encourages enlarged perspectives, new opinions, and deeper understanding—and hopefully results in better decisions and policies. NAAEE is presently working on a series of guides for forums on environmental issues, starting with one titled Climate Choices: How Should We Meet the Challenges of a Warming Planet? Others that deal with community issues will follow. For this, NAAEE is conducting moderator training and helping our network partners moderate discussions in formal and informal settings. Such forums serve to: (a) clarify one’s own thinking, (b) help one hear others’ views, (c) create a safe environment for discussion, (d) discourage sharp, non-nuanced decisions (e.g., environment versus economy), (e) consider a range of value trade-offs, and (f) focus on the key values that people care deeply about.

There has never been greater need for environmental education, as we now face challenges from loss of biodiversity to severe weather, water shortages, and water-quality issues. Communities are also grappling with other issues, including a growing divide between the “haves and the have-nots,” empowering and educating themselves about how environmental quality impacts their health and well-being. Notwithstanding the many wicked challenges, we can tackle them better if we work together. In fact, we cannot tackle them if we don’t.

I encourage you to check out our website at naaee.org. There is a learning hub called eePRO for anyone looking for resources, learning opportunities, research, jobs, news, and discussion groups. There is also a free global online course on Transdisciplinary Approaches to Addressing Wicked Problems. Finally, there is a new global network of countries called the Global Environmental Education Partnership, available at thegeep.org. We would love to have Cuba be a part of it.

Judy Braus is the president of the North American Association for Environmental Education, U.S.A. She can be reached at judybraus@gmail.com.
WHAT ARE THE CENTRAL CONFLICTS THAT NEED TO BE WORKED THROUGH IN ORDER TO HAVE A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY (FROM AN ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND POLITICAL POINT OF VIEW)?

Active Citizenship for a Sustainable Economy

An Overview of Cuba’s Economic Trajectory

Coaching as an Effective Tool for Community Work

Female Employment in the New Cuban Economic Model: Unresolved Issues
Kettering’s research finds that making progress on complex public problems like having a sustainable economy requires an active citizenry that is engaged, makes difficult choices, and works together even when they disagree. It looks at how people make decisions about what is important when there is more than one valuable option. For instance, people may value both good jobs and environmental preservation, but these can be competing imperatives. Tensions rooted in the differences in what people value can hinder sound decisions and collaborative work. Economic sustainability, a universal systemic challenge, is also a public problem in that it requires all sectors to be actively engaged in building the economy they want. Kettering calls this economic citizenship, and as it has no “right” or quick answer, it becomes a classic public problem.

Policy researchers have used the terms complex or wicked—as opposed to simple or tame—to describe problems like economic sustainability. While tame problems have technical solutions, wicked problems are resistant to technical remedies because they are based on people’s values. For example, a technical remedy can set a broken arm, but treating diabetes involves the behavior of both patient and doctor. As noted in Kettering’s book The Ecology of Democracy, the problems that require citizens to make decisions and act together have wicked characteristics:

- The problem is enduring and systemic;
- There is no clear, prior definition for the problem;
- People experience a discrepancy between what “is” and what “ought to be”;
- There are ethical or moral disagreements over what action should be taken;
- Responding to symptoms exposes deeper dimensions of the problem;
- Any effective action requires judgment as well as complementary efforts.
The research finds that progress on wicked public problems, such as maintaining a sustainable economy, requires a citizenry that is engaged, makes difficult choices, and works together even when they disagree. Working through the conflicts inherent in choices is essential to forming a judgment about what a community should do and how it will go about doing it. “They have to work through the feelings aroused when the things they might like to do have a negative impact on other things they hold dear. People don’t have to reach total agreement, but they can reach a point at which they can move forward on solving a problem.” ¹

By values, we mean the underlying human motivations that drives us to be a part of a community ecology. These are basic things, like the desire to be secure, to be treated fairly, or to have a relatively fair distribution of the products of collective work. These are confirmed by everyday experience and documented in social psychological, anthropological, and cognitive research. Some of the basic things that Kettering research has identified as valuable to people include: ²

- personal safety;
- group security;
- being treated fairly;
- care for the vulnerable;
- freedom to act;
- having a secure future;
- not harming others; and
- self-reliance

Through collaborations with other groups, Kettering has observed how people work through conflicts over issues involving values where they live, work, or worship. It found that when people do not work through conflicts, conversations become polar Advocacies for competing solutions. To help identify tensions among things held valuable and encourage people to work them through, Kettering creates issue guides on critical community or national issues. Many of these guides are related to having a sustainable economy, such as:

- **Making Ends Meet: How Should We Spread Prosperity and Improve Opportunity?**
- **The National Debt: How Can We Pay the Bills?**
- **Economic Security: How Should We Take Charge of Our Future?**
- **Jobs: Preparing a Workforce for the 21st Century**
- **Coping with the Cost of Health Care: How Do We Pay for What We Need?**
- **America’s Energy Future: How Can We Take Charge?**

Working through conflicts between what is held valuable is, thus, part of making sound judgments. And progress on complex public
issues like a sustainable economy involves more than understanding the facts about how economic systems work. It also involves judgments about what actions people can live with, knowing that there are some actions they will not like. As an example, the recently released *Making Ends Meet* issue guide relayed a sense that the way of life the United States economy has long supported is at risk. The three framed options (and related values) include:

- Make it easier for people to start new enterprises (freedom to act);
- Expand and secure safeguards so people are not pushed into poverty (collective security);
- Reduce inequality/shrink the income gap between the wealthy and the poor (fair treatment).

Note that the term *working through* often arises in the context of making choices about the kind of community citizens want. It is grounded in social psychology and public opinion research by the Public Agenda organization. They observed that public judgment on most issues goes through a phased process, from initial *awareness*, to *working through* the need for change and confronting it with core values, to a *resolution* that takes into account the pros and cons of addressing the problem. The process takes time and is not unidirectional, but eventually people can work through an issue and come to some considered judgment about it.

*The National Debt*, another example of an issue guide, helps citizens work through the complex public problem of the United States’ enormous debt. Many consider it unsustainable and a threat to the country’s ability to invest in areas like education and infrastructure. The issue is grave enough to motivate people to want to do something, but basic disagreements arise over what course to take and how it will affect both current and future generations. Being *systemic*, any action will ripple through the entire nation. From people’s expressed concerns and research on policy ideas, three distinct options emerged. They (and their related values) are:

- Agree to all make sacrifices now to reduce the future debt (shared sacrifice);
- Strengthen checks and balances so we are forced to control new spending (collective security); and
- Invest in growth first to expand the economy (freedom to act).

Over 1,000 people who took part in *National Debt* forums around the United States gained awareness of the problem and began to work through what is most valuable to them and identify trade-offs that need to be accepted in order to advance. While short of a final judgment, several things have become clear:

- The forums on how to deal with the debt have been focused and civil;
• Older participants were concerned that the debt would affect future generations, while younger participants were concerned about their parents and grandparents;
• Participants have accepted that moving forward may require some changes that they will not like;
• Participants accepted shared sacrifice but wanted assurances that the load would be shared equally;
• The inability of political leadership to work together is fueling citizens’ distrust of government.

Observations of deliberations repeatedly show that people are willing to engage with each other over tough and controversial issues. In so doing, they create an otherwise unavailable knowledge about the issues and the will to make progress together. It is about what is really important to people, what the issues mean to them in their daily lives, and what they can and cannot live with. By deliberating, people also create the will to move forward, as individuals and as communities.

John Dedrick is vice president and program director at the Kettering Foundation, U.S.A. He can be reached at jrdedrick@kettering.org.

Notes
Starting 1959, with massive external help, Cuba put in place a unique social support network. That network was battered after 1990, with the withdrawal of Soviet aid and only partial replacement by other sources, particularly Venezuela. This led to a re-thinking of Cuba’s socio-economic model in an attempt to maintain principles of social equity while adapting to a changing world.

While Cuba’s social achievements were legendary, others, such as infrastructure, housing, and information and communication technology (ICT) availability, lagged. Moreover, in the last 20 years, Cuba has regressed in health and education services, housing stock, and income equality, even relative to other Latin American countries. External trade balances worsened with the collapse of the sugar industry and falls in exportable production, compounded by powerful hurricanes and a severe draught that crippled infrastructure and agriculture. The world financial crisis affected the exchange rate for the convertible Cuban peso, froze Cuba’s trade supply accounts, and forced suspension of its foreign debt payments. Today, its economic sustainability remains exposed and fragile.

An added concern is demographics, as Cuba’s birth rate drops, its life expectancy increases, and its population ages and diminishes in absolute terms, with a related new demand for health, economic, and social-support services. Meanwhile, primary, secondary, and university enrollments have fallen dramatically as the economically active population decreases and the ratio of active-to-inactive population deteriorates.

Pre-emptive new investment is necessary in social and health services, while improvements are needed in education, health, housing, public spaces, and public transportation in order to balance maintaining quality of life with promoting labor productivity. But investment is constrained by limited access to international credit, a discretionary attitude toward foreign capital, low levels of domestic saving, and difficulty servicing Soviet-era high-consumption equipment given unreliable access to energy supplies. Meanwhile, global economic downturns have increased uncertainty, restricted credit markets, and decreased international trade flows, hurting prices for Cuba’s sugar and nickel exports. While Cuba has made new connections with Brazil, Russia, Algeria, Angola, and China, the deficit remains. Cuba continues to exhibit low-performing productive sectors, poor international competitiveness, and a high concentration of its exportable goods in few low value-added sectors. Of further concern is the decline in key industries like capital goods, the high concentration of employment in non-transactional services or services disconnected from value chains, and the slow growth of productive sectors, all diminishing productivity and capital accumulation rates. Cuba’s economic center of gravity has shifted toward services, but employment and value-added sectors are
concentrated in social and government services with low economic impact and which depend on transfers from other sectors, rather than in the commercial, productive, or technological service areas dominant in advanced economies. Agriculture displays similarly stagnant production, low labor productivity, and a minimal contribution to exports, capital accumulation, or industrial inputs. Manufacturing growth has also fallen in historically significant areas like machinery, chemicals, construction materials, and sugar, given their high dependence on imported inputs and the difficulty in sustaining a high-energy, non-competitive industrial base. Exceptions have been pharmaceuticals, nickel metallurgy, beverages, and petroleum refining.

Export-related services—tourism and medical—are relatively non-diversified and are centered in low value-added activities. In tourism, the high-value tasks are dominated by travel agencies, airlines, and tour operators. The dominant attractions are sun and beach, with much of the hotel base focused on autonomous all-inclusive packages that are disconnected from the support infrastructure; as a result, their contribution to incomes and labor absorption is lower than the number of visitors. Some tourism-related production has increased in industries like textiles, foodstuffs, and beverages, but given some recent backsliding, Cuba presents itself as not that different from other Caribbean destinations.

Medical services—half of Cuba’s total exports—rely on direct provision of personnel and services. But new international standards have led to a global structure of knowledge-intensive and ICT procedures that make services transportable across borders, allow coordination of widely dispersed services, and favor investments abroad for enterprises with brand ownership of products and services. Instead, Cuba relies on the most elementary and standardized direct supply of medical personnel (modo cuatro), mostly to Venezuela, which presupposes the absence of a support infrastructure abroad to allow cross-border services like tele-medicine. As this infrastructure is also deficient inside Cuba, this belies a capacity to attract customers to the service’s place of origin (modo dos), as in medical tourism, which could bring spillover benefits in infrastructure plus greater benefits to Cuban patients. Finally, it is yet unproven whether Cuban firms have the capacity to penetrate other markets via direct investments using their own brands and know-how. This has been explored by the government through inter-governmental agreements, but with only minor participation by the firms themselves. This has precluded full utilization of the personnel knowledge base, has limited entrepreneurial development and opportunities for competing in markets with higher requirements, and carries the risk of depending on political support for its continuity. Thus, none of the services now marketed abroad have been linked to domestic productive activity and, except for generic pharmaceuticals directed at Venezuela, there are no other flows in this sense with Cuban personnel stationed elsewhere. This reflects the weakness of Cuban industry as much as the lack of a strategy to assemble interconnected clusters of the health-related services now available piecemeal.
A worse consequence is the underutilization of the labor force, inserting a noxious aspect into the labor market. There is a high concentration of low-wage workers in the public sector while potentially well-paying jobs in the dynamic sectors remain scarce, fomenting alienation, an internal brain drain, and low returns on investments in education. Quality job creation requires elements generally absent in Cuba, especially connections to a high-value chain with specialized backward linkages. But state enterprises face limitations in promoting innovation, new products, or new markets. There are, in fact, mechanisms restricting private and cooperative sectors from more complex activities. Per-worker capital has decreased nationwide as its creation in the non-state sector is penalized through taxation. This leads to degradation of the public sector and its enterprises, where low salary differentiation, overstaffing, and low productivity inhibit rewarding performance, impel labor migration toward more generous sectors or abroad, and heighten the demographic crisis.

Inserting Cuba into international markets thus remains a work in progress, waiting for economic policy reforms. The opening with the United States presents new possibilities, but will not be a solution. Yet there remains an unexplored opportunity for a new policy design more aligned with the times and Cuba’s own characteristics, and dependent on external flows in finance, business, and technology. A new educational system is needed to foster new fundamental skills and coordinate professional formation with technical development, contributing to a more balanced structure with complementary skill levels and a better balance between creators and users of knowledge. Cuba must improve before irreparable damage is done to its productive structure. It must address difficult monetary adjustments, hypertrophy in administrative structures, and low productivity growth. But it has to do it.

Ricardo Torres is a professor at the Center for the Study of the Cuban Economy, Cuba. He can be reached at ricardo@ceec.uh.cu.

A new educational system is needed to foster new fundamental skills and coordinate professional formation with technical development, contributing to a more balanced structure with complementary skill levels and a better balance between creators and users of knowledge.
Coaching as an Effective Tool for Community Work

Marilyn Fernández, UN-Habitat Cuba

Coaching is a working relationship whereby a coach assists his client—the coachee—to achieve his best and obtain desired results for his personal life. It addresses the question: “How can I be better?” Central to coaching is the nature of the coach’s relationship to the clients, who can be individuals, businesses, organizations, or communities. It is based on the assumption that the coach has the knowledge, experience, and desire to help the client achieve his dreams by visualizing them as realizable goals. These goals begin as wishes related to a desired future. Coaching’s maxim is: “Don’t tell a person who asks you what to do, rather, teach him how to think.”

The word coach originated in the 15th century in the Hungarian city of Kocs, a necessary stop on the travel route from Vienna to Budapest. It referred to a comfortable carriage that sometimes incorporated a suspension. Kocsiszékér or Kocs carriage became known as a symbol of excellence. The word kocsi evolved into coach in English, kutsche in German, and coche in Spanish; coach also came to mean the car of a train.

The concept of a coach also came to refer to a tutor, who “conveys” a student through examinations. The coach is thus a trainer who accompanies his coachee to design his dream future, believe in his great potential, establish better objectives, present new alternatives, and find creative ways to help others and society, while being mindful of his own needs.

Social coaching holds a belief that human beings are, by nature, agents of individual and social change. Its mission is to activate human autonomy and freedom, working first from the individual and integrating the person’s understanding of social reality to subsequently extend that change to the collective level.

Coaching can be oriented to vulnerable groups like immigrants, women in situations of gender inequality, minority cultures, and people with serious economic problems. It is useful with social and religious organizations, and among social workers, coordinators of social projects, and government authorities in charge of addressing citizen demands. Coaching can be helpful for those promoting social change on the largest scale, such as mass media or journalists, so that their disseminating role is fulfilled in a clear manner, provokes reflection, and encourages appropriate social action.
Early Phase of the Development of Coaching at the Community Level

• **Prior to the First Coaching Session:**
  
  **First:** The prospective coachee group contacts the coach, requesting services and stating a general objective.
  
  **Second:** The coach explains the rules, mutual responsibilities, and general norms of coaching.
  
  **Third:** The coach makes initial inquiries about the coachee group and what it wishes to achieve.
  
  **Fourth:** The coach reaches a work agreement with the coachee about the coaching sessions and the work to be carried out.

• **First meeting (Initial Approach to the Community by the Initiating Group)**

  After the initial contact, the coach convenes a first meeting with the initiating group, also called brainstorming or an idea workshop, to discuss the initial approach to the community:
  
  **First:** The coach orients the initiating group to walk and observe the community and provides a series of questions to form a first impression of the community.
  
  **Second:** The coach orients the group to interview several people in the community to gauge their self-perceptions guided by a series of questions.
  
  **Third:** The coach asks the group to present the information gathered by observation and from interviews to jointly analyze and discuss it and shape a shared vision.
  
  **Fourth:** The coach directs the group in an exercise so that they begin to create the basis of a group identity and future trust.

• **Second meeting:**

  The coach convenes the group to generate a diagnosis of the community. A circular enneagram of the community, divided into nine sections, is applied, with each section of the graph representing an area of community life to be identified, defined, and rated for its relative importance. The areas are: health, employment, emotive qualities, finance, relationships, education, family life, spirituality, and recreation. Each member of the pilot group then rates each area’s importance on a 1-10 scale, with areas rated 0-4 considered weak and those rated 6-10 considered strong.

**Image of the Enneagram of Life**

The enneagram provides the coach with a visual image in real time of the relationships among various areas, and identifies which are strong and which are weak. It is feasible to apply this in different moments in the coaching process—at the beginning, middle, and near the end, thus serving as a guide to the coach and the *coachee* to gauge advances or declines on the road to the objectives.

The enneagram is also a prelude to other coaching instruments needed to achieve the
What are the central conflicts that need to be worked through in order to have a sustainable economy?

**Active Citizenship for a Sustainable Economy**

desired results, such as a SWOT matrix, a Dreams Map, and a Plan of Action.

It is important to recognize that these tools are all part of an integral social intervention process, each linked to the others by responding to a dialectical, systemic cycle.

Marilyn Fernández is program officer with the UN-Habitat in Cuba. She can be reached at marilyn.fernandez@undp.org.
Female employment in Cuba faces three principal problems in the context of its recent economic model of transition toward socialism. After half a century of state ownership of all sectors, the new model has broadened the space for small-scale private property while maintaining state control over essential sectors of the economy. This has introduced relationships in the economy and way of life not seen since 1959. Citizens face new rules and ideas, such as paying taxes, incomes that vary depending on business results, competition, doing accounting, and raising business capital.

Female workers continue to exhibit higher university and secondary school completion rates than employed males, underscoring the importance of female labor in a sustainable economy, for its economic importance as much as for the ethical issue of gender equity.

Meanwhile, female participation retains characteristics of the last 25 years: 39 percent of total employment, 59 percent of professional and technical personnel, and 34 percent of managerial jobs. Notably, female workers continue to exhibit higher university and secondary school completion rates than employed males, underscoring the importance of female labor in a sustainable economy, for its economic importance as much as for the ethical issue of gender equity.

The first problem is that for 2013, after 3 years, private businesses by self-employed workers (cuentapropistas), saw a female participation rate of only 17 percent. One explanation is that the 206 approved self-employment categories are typically male occupations, such as laborers and service work in areas like transportation. Women workers, 46 percent of whom are professionals and technicians, are thus more restricted to the public sectors. This introduces salary differences since incomes in private businesses are between 6 and 10 times higher than for public employees. While data for 2014 and 2015 show the female self-employed share increased to 30 percent, it is yet unclear which lines of activity absorbed the increase, whether as owners or employees, to ascertain if the increase will also reflect a rise in incomes.

The evident long-term solution would be to broaden the occupational categories to include professions more accessible to women, such as accountants and notaries. Likewise, if more state enterprises were to be converted to private nonagricultural cooperatives, it is anticipated that female employees would
benefit from increased incomes. This would, in turn, increase tax receipts, benefitting not only general social services but also allowing room for higher salaries for public employees.

The second issue affecting female workers, in both the public and private sectors, is the double workload. Women disproportionately bear the burdens of domestic chores, the lack of home appliances, and the housing scarcity, which results in several generations living under one roof. In these family units, women continue to assume household chores, as wages are insufficient to hire household services. Moreover, women are more likely to care for elderly relatives in a country where 19 percent of the population is over 60. Many working women are thus compelled to leave work to attend to ill or aging relatives, sometimes for years.

Long-term solutions to achieve gender parity in household duties will surely require more resources. Care for aging relatives will require more “grandparent homes” where they could spend workdays while still living with relatives who could go to work. There is also need for home-care personnel and for equipment and supplies like beds, wheelchairs, canes, and disposable diapers.

But addressing today’s conflicts should not have to wait for such improvements. Programs to incorporate women under equal conditions—some from 57 years ago—have shown ways to confront patriarchal attitudes of men and women while pursuing material improvements. Policymakers could thus bring a gender focus into policy designs, beyond language about concepts and addressing specific attitudinal conflicts that hinder equitable participation. Such solutions, aimed at all age groups, should be integrated into policies in all sectors. Examples could be the sex-education programs for male and female students required at all educational levels since 2011, which are aimed at changing sexist behaviors. Mass media should also incorporate a gender perspective in their content and language. Marilyn Fernandez of UN Habitat can tell of her experience with solutions for equitably shared spaces with limited resources, supported by local governments and civil society.

The third conflict hampering economic sustainability is low female participation in senior levels of employment, despite the fact that women are the majority of professionals and should be a natural source for managerial talent. Possible reasons include a lingering male managerial culture, the fact that salary increases for management in the public sector—where women are more represented—tend to be small, the established preference to assign managerial tasks to men, that women professionals already see themselves as decision makers at work and, most of all, women’s belief that accepting a managerial job would imply a third work load.

Since the 1990s, studies by Cuban social scientists have compared the management styles of men and women and evidenced the innovative energy that managerial women would bring if they had a larger presence. They show female managers as being more proactive than men and more able to clearly define their objectives and the ways to achieve
Women tend to multi-task and explore avenues of participatory work and communication with subordinates more often than men, encouraging their educational advancement and taking more of an interest in their personal problems. Yet women can still be competitive and assume commanding attitudes toward subordinates to achieve needed goals, as befits a managerial culture conceived by men.

Therefore, to have more women enter management positions in the public and private sectors and thus contribute more to a sustainable economy, we need first to redistribute the double workday burden between men and women before other economic goals are reached. This requires educational efforts in schools, the media, civil-society organizations, and in the design of policies for housing, transportation, salaries, access to health services, and elder care. Second, the managerial culture must be transformed with the participation of both men and women. An important step would be to offer management training with a gender focus. Cuba already has the knowledge to design such programs and apply them.

In sum, to insure the participation of all Cubans in pursuing sustainable solutions in the short, medium, and long terms, changes being introduced in the new economic model must incorporate a realistic gender approach and not just an exhortation.

Marta Núñez is a professor of sociology at the University of Havana. She can be reached at mmspascual@gmail.com.
HOW CAN INSTITUTIONS AND CITIZENS PRODUCTIVELY WORK TOGETHER TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE CREATION OF A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY?

Developing Economic Citizenship in West Virginia

Opening a Path: Active Citizen Participation for Environmental Rehabilitation
In West Virginia, as in many places around the world, community members are developing practices that help them talk with one another, set direction, and take actions that develop positive economic futures for their regions. The West Virginia Center for Civic Life (WVCCL) is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization that partners with local and statewide organizations to help communities do just that.

Our work in West Virginia—as well as ongoing learning exchanges with the Kettering Foundation over the past twenty years—has allowed us to glean insights into the transformative practices of citizens, communities, and institutions that support such economic citizenship, with particular focus on the role of regional centers or networks that intentionally develop relationships, build connections, and create coalitions to support these local and statewide civic interactions.

For the past two years, such a coalition has been working together to create What’s Next, West Virginia?, an initiative in which residents are talking and acting together to build stronger local economies. This nonpartisan statewide initiative has been designed by a broad and growing coalition of state and local partners from nonprofit, philanthropic, governmental, educational, and faith-based organizations.

West Virginia currently faces myriad economic and social challenges that impact its capacity to create a supportive and sustainable economic future. With the downturn in a mining and manufacturing base that has traditionally provided living-wage jobs, it is immersed in the challenging process of considering what economic opportunities can be created or enhanced.

While a number of organizations and foundations were working in West Virginia to address specific problems that impact economic well-being, there had been little opportunity for West Virginians to connect with one another in deep discussions of local needs in ways that allow residents from all walks of life to take actions to address them.
The coalition of organizations supporting this initiative believes that a compelling need exists for open conversations about our state’s future that encompass the diversity of West Virginians, that bring together sectors of the community that don’t normally talk and work together, and that encourage fresh, innovative thinking to emerge.

*What’s Next, West Virginia?* is intended to be localized to the needs and opportunities of each community—whether a neighborhood, a town, a county, or a region. Whether the geographic focus of the discussion is small or large, participants will consider common questions: Where are we now? Where do we want to go? How will we get there?

Over the past two years, we have witnessed deliberative community discussions that tap the wisdom and experience of our residents, encourage participants to see possibilities in a new light, break through stagnant polarizations, and create community-based patterns of acting—and interacting—that address some of the most pressing issues that our communities are facing.

While the initiatives are all locally organized, statewide partners help in several ways:

- WVCCCL itself offers regional workshops and ongoing assistance for those who want to convene and facilitate local initiatives. For this, we have created discussion guides for community members and provide support materials for local planning teams;
- As communities come together to hold conversations and set directions, the West Virginia Community Development Hub is providing coaching and other assistance to help communities develop complementary actions that address public needs;
- Along the way, West Virginia Public Broadcasting is sharing community stories so that West Virginians can find out what their neighbors are doing for a more prosperous future.

As an organization that promotes and practices ongoing learning relationships, WVCCCL is also capturing and sharing insights from West Virginia communities with others in the state and beyond who are facing similar economic challenges and want to encourage the active citizenship required to address them together. We are learning together with others throughout the United States and other nations who are developing inclusive ways for people to engage in productive dialogue about issues that affect their communities.

Our work in West Virginia and our learning exchanges about economic change with the Kettering Foundation have yielded key insights:
HOW CAN INSTITUTIONS AND CITIZENS PRODUCTIVELY WORK TOGETHER TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE CREATION OF A SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY?

- A wide range of interconnected issues have impact on economic well-being;
- The opportunity for residents to see themselves as actors to improve economic conditions is critical to their capacity and willingness to work together;
- Developing practices of sharing learning across geographic and institutional borders is fundamental to continued practices that support economic well-being.

We have confirmed that if people in a community take responsibility for their economic future, the result will be an increased quality of life and a stronger local economy. There are multiple parts to this civic transformation—individuals, organizations, collaborative partnerships—that are all a necessary part of engaged and thriving communities. Diverse, deliberative community forums can then create a framework to generate and thoughtfully consider multiple options for community action.

We have seen that the deliberative nature of the What’s Next discussions and the questions they examine—Where are we now? Where do we want to go? How are we going to get there?—are accessible, relevant, and productive means to consider costs, benefits, and trade-offs of particular actions. And when this practice of diverse community-based conversations becomes embedded in the life of the community, more citizens take responsibility for the vitality of their communities and become engaged in community improvement.

A strong future for West Virginia will require new economic opportunities, but also new ways of talking and working together, new relationships, and new connections. It will require economic entrepreneurs, but it will also require civic entrepreneurs. We have had many opportunities to learn from the work of these civic entrepreneurs in West Virginia, such as the residents of this small community in the central part of the state. Several months after a local What’s Next initiative began, I ran into a community member at a conference. I asked her if she was aware of the local What’s Next discussions taking place there. Not only did she know, she was heavily involved and she enthusiastically recounted the way in which the community was coming together to discuss local issues. She said that they had originally planned to convene cross-sector public discussions three times, then expanded it to five, then decided to meet on an ongoing basis. She said, “We decided that this is the way we want to be from now on.”

A strong future for West Virginia will require new economic opportunities, but also new ways of talking and working together, new relationships, and new connections. It will require economic entrepreneurs, but it will also require civic entrepreneurs.
Although we have witnessed many examples of local work emerging from What’s Next initiatives, it is this example of a systemic change in community dynamics that is one of the most powerful we have heard. It illuminates the goal of What’s Next: to help communities develop the capacity to talk and work together on public issues on an ongoing basis and to develop habits and practices that support the deepening of individual, social, and political capital as assets to be applied to future community work.

Betty Knighton is the Director of the West Virginia Center for Civic Life, U.S.A. She can be reached at knighton@wvciviclife.org.
The Félix Varela Center (CFV) is a Cuban volunteer civic organization formally registered in 1993 with the Ministry of Justice as an “independent civil association, autonomous, nonprofit and nongovernmental, with the capacity to own patrimony and be subject to all the rights and obligations under its enabling legislation.” In 1997, CFV obtained a special consultative status from the United Nations Economic and Social Council.

CFV espouses a holistic concept of sustainable development with institutional, social, political, economic, and environmental dimensions. As part of a larger humanistic project in Cuba based on civic ethics and participation, CFV engages in a web of connected activities dedicated to the continued betterment of the country. CFV collaborates with a variety of institutions that all share a vision of sustainable development and see humanistic principles and active citizen participation as fundamental to society’s improvement. For this presentation, CFV talked about its general operation and gave examples of its work with vulnerable communities, where it promotes personal and collective empowerment and an overarching commitment to protecting the environment.

The following timeline shows the general evolution of the various lines of CFV’s work, which is further described below. The seminal question posed in each instance was: How can institutions and citizens collaborate productively in the creation of a sustainable economy? Presented initially as the challenge of promoting an ethics of sustainability, it evolved over time as follows:

1993—A focus on sustainable development as an issue of citizenship and a culture of peace.

1996—Development of CFV’s green map initiative, an interactive exercise focusing on social responsibility for all actors in a community.

2000—Fostering the construction of a network of facilitators, focusing on developing a culture of peace and referencing green maps of communities.

2002—Development of diagnostic methodologies for mediation and concertation and for trans-sectoral, multidimensional gender equity.

Present—Focus on participation and active citizenship, with operational concepts defined as follows:

- **Mediation for sustainability** based on a notion of education for peace. It is a heuristic approach based on techniques for conflict prevention and resolution, managing tension in interactions, and forging agreements toward consensus.
• **Conflict management.** A nonviolence approach focusing on communication, reciprocal understanding, and empowering all people to assume ownership of their problems within their conflicting interests.

• **Concertation** based on deliberation between people or institutions. Starts from initial formulations of problems and possible solutions and works to discover new judgments and reflexive shared decisions leading to agreements between the parties. Operates within a *public space*: a universally accessible circumstance where all citizens may interact.

• **Green map.** A methodological visual instrument used for identifying a community’s strengths and potentials. Managed by the participating social actors themselves, it seeks to design and implement actions that foment a broad and diverse culture of engagement in the public space.

• **Active citizenship** assumes that citizens are endowed as actors with the capacity and *agency* to promote their own development by exercising responsible citizenship. Its precepts are applicable to the routine management of daily life, both individual and collective.

• **Citizen participation.** A collective engagement expressly aimed at influencing *power* and the capacity to make things happen. The tangible expression of *active citizenship*, it implies the development of capacities for initiative and decision making. It requires conscious and active involvement of people in socio-political processes and should always be directed toward the concerted wishes of participants, working from their particular interests and needs as deliberated in their shared public space.

Sustainable development is thus a CFV final goal, emerging from the *interaction* of its *green map*, a culture of *active citizenship*, and *citizen participation* initiatives. CFV explains sustainable development as:

- multi-dimensional and holistic, encompassing the institutional, social political, economic, and environmental dimensions of communities;

- focused on satisfying present needs without injuring the potential of future generations to satisfy theirs;

- fostering a development model that is careful not to harm the environment;

- aimed at guaranteeing the welfare of both present and future generations while paying special attention to the most vulnerable persons and communities.
Interactions occur when the green map network—with its own icons, participatory environmental diagnosis, and culture of participation—connects with the peace culture network—with its basis in methods for mediation and concertation, dialogues, gender equity, and education for peace and nonviolence. Both networks overlap conceptually and operationally in communities committed to equitable sustainable development. CFV links these local communities throughout Cuba with joint trainings on mediation and concertation, workshops on indicators of equity for vulnerable communities, courses on green mapping and climate change, skills development for vulnerable communities, training of facilitators, and acompañamiento, or “walking along,” with local community initiatives. Several community examples illustrated this interaction in the presentation.

Ana Margarita de la Torre is the vice president of the Félix Varela Center. She can be reached at anynauta@cfv.org.cu.

Mirlena Rojas is a specialist with the Félix Varela Center. She can be reached at mirlenacips@centai.inf.cu.
Closing Remarks:
The Value of an Active Citizenry
David Mathews, Kettering Foundation

David Mathews reflected on conference themes throughout his closing remarks about the role of active citizens in reinforcing the work of institutions. The tendency, he said, is to think in terms of everything that large institutions do for citizens, but it is really the other way around. Elinor Ostrom won the Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences in 2009 for demonstrating that the coproduction of public goods by citizens is critical to the functioning of large institutions.

The Kettering Foundation explores how institutions can align their work with a productive citizenry—people who are more than clients, consumers, or voters alone. The work of this active or productive citizenry complements the efforts of schools, governments, and other institutions, which is why Kettering has come to use the term *complementary production*.

Kettering also uses the term to emphasize that the work that citizens do is different from the work of institutional actors. The work of citizens involves doing things professionals don’t—and can’t—do. Health care is a case in point. Institutions can care for people but they cannot care about them; only people can do this. Strong “networks of nurture” organized by communities can be a powerful force in combating the behavioral and social problems that contribute to many illnesses. This has been demonstrated in research done for the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, which shows that community care can reduce the incidence of heart disease, strokes, and lung cancer.

Another example has to do with education. The work of schools is teaching, which is part, but not all, of educating. Schools can benefit enormously from what citizens do with citizens to prepare the next generation of young people for the future. While most formal instruction is best left to professionals, what children learn in educating institutions other than schools can reinforce what happens in classrooms. These institutions, which are in and of the community, provide a valuable real-world context for learning. Take, for example, the case of a fishery and aquaculture program that was developed by a lakeside community not far from the US Gulf Coast. Students were able to come to the fishery and work alongside area fish farmers, an experience that offered a rich context for the science they were learning in the classroom and so much more.

There are two primary obstacles to this kind of complementary production. Professionals often don’t see a meaningful role for citizens to play, and citizens often don’t see a role for themselves either. One of the reasons citizens are so often overlooked is that the resources they bring to bear are themselves not recognized.
Kettering has learned a lot about how people can come to see the assets and resources that they have to offer from the work of John McKnight and Jody Kretzmann, who developed an asset-based approach to working in communities. They took issue with the conventional organizational strategy that begins with a survey of people’s needs and instead created asset surveys. They walked around neighborhoods and asked people what they could do. The answers were often as simple as cooking, sewing, or fixing a car. They would write down all the things that people could do and then explore what might happen if people combined their efforts. This was the start of asset organizing. It has led to a global network of people who use what they call Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD).

Another example of complementary production is the work of Mothers Against Drunk Driving (MADD). Their efforts began with mothers trying to protect their children and loved ones from drunk drivers. They didn’t have legal authority or money. They just did it. Their efforts have brought national attention to the issue and have helped to shape legislation and other policy responses.

Perhaps the most significant example of a movement created by citizens working with other citizens is the civil rights movement in the United States. People often think of the civil rights movement as beginning in the 1950s and 1960s. There were certainly dramatic events at that time—the march on Selma and Birmingham, and lots of media attention—but this was not the beginning of the civil rights movement.

Some communities in Alabama have been involved in the civil right movement since 1870. As one person described the early efforts that led to the desegregation of schools: it was thousands of unnamed people doing thousands of unnamed acts that created a community whose children knew they belonged in the same schools as other children. And they knew those schools should be built. Nobody had to teach them that. They knew it. They taught each other, over a long period of time. The power these people created among themselves not only changed those communities, it also changed the state, the country, and perhaps the world. In fact, one of the Cuban organizations represented in this very conference carries the name of one of the more visible leaders of that movement: Martin Luther King, Jr.

The work of complementary production is exactly what an active citizenry contributes. It is the power of people working together. Mathews ended his remarks by noting how productive the conference has been and that Kettering is looking forward to continuing the exchange between the United States and Cuba.

David Mathews is the president of the Kettering Foundation, U.S.A. He can be reached at dmathews@kettering.org.