

The Neoliberal reconfiguration of the rural spaces derived from tourism: an advance or a recoil?

Neptalí Monterroso Salvatierra

Autonomous University of the State of Mexico / n.monterrossalvatierra@gmail.com

Lilia Zizumbo Villarreal

Autonomous University of the State of Mexico / lilia.zizumbo@gmail.com

Abstract: This article discusses the rural development strategy called New Rurality (Nueva Ruralidad), through which international agencies insist on the need to reconfigure the rural areas to meet the new roles as signed to them by the neoliberal model of development. It is suggested that the importance of discussing it lies in the fact that, it is currently being implemented in most Latin American countries, including Mexico. In contrast, rural tourism has been promoted from the perspective of the Labor Economics, strategy generated in the communities; it was unveiled as an alternative for rural populations, because it helps to counteract the negative effects of globalization and modernization that characterizes the current neoliberal period. To deepen into how the perspective of Labor Economics projects works in rural areas, this article refers to two experiences. One is developed by the community of San Pedro Atlapulco, located in the municipality of Ocoyoacac, State of Mexico, Mexico. The other has been developed by the community of San Cristobal, located in the town of Cardonal, State of Hidalgo, Mexico. In both cases, the implementation of tourism projects has helped improve rural living conditions.

Key words: new rurality, social economy, rural tourism, rural areas, rural development.

Resumen: En este artículo se discute la estrategia de desarrollo rural denominada nueva ruralidad, a través de la cual los organismos internacionales insisten en que es necesario reconfigurar los ámbitos rurales para que cumplan con las nuevas funciones que les asigna el modelo de desarrollo neoliberal. Se apunta que la importancia de discutirla radica en que, actualmente, está siendo aplicada en la mayor parte de los países latinoamericanos, México incluido. En contraposición, se sostiene que el turismo rural, impulsado desde la perspectiva de la economía del trabajo, estrategia generada en las propias comunidades, se devela como una alternativa para las poblaciones rurales, porque ayuda a contrarrestar los efectos negativos del proceso de globalización y modernización que caracteriza el actual periodo neoliberal. Para abundar sobre la forma en que funciona la economía del trabajo en proyectos de turismo rural, se hace referencia a dos experiencias. Una es la desarrollada por la comunidad de San Pedro Atlapulco, localizada en el municipio de Ocoyoacac, Estado de México. La otra corresponde a la comunidad de San Cristóbal, ubicada en el municipio del Cardonal, estado de Hidalgo. En ambas la instrumentación de proyectos de turismo rural ha permitido mejorar las condiciones de vida.

Palabras clave: nueva ruralidad, economía social, desarrollo rural, turismo rural, espacios rurales.

Introduction

The change in terms of economic model started at the beginning of the 80's included several processes of institutional adjustments and reforms. One of these reforms was in macro-economic terms and has been focused on privileging the market economy and favoring the revision of the State's role in the economic dynamics, above all those which have to do with investments, employment, production of goods and provision of services.

The new model, which is not newfangled anymore since it has been practiced for over 25 years, has been a return to the market as "an almost unique principle of social organization, economic globalized deregulation, unlimited trust in technological progress, reaffirmation of the individual at the expense of society and distrust on the State" (Pipitone, 1996).

With regard to the rural world, this model implies the return to the structural functional vision of the positivist empirical paradigm that, in its neostructuralist perspective, considers the rural as a complex world that covers more than agricultural production, in fact, agricultural production is only one of its components and not the most significant (IICA, 2000; Pérez, 2001).

In order to organize this approach neostructuralists have created a strategy called *new rurality*. It is promoted at international level by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). In the Latin American region it is in charge of the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC), the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). In Mexico, most of the policies, strategies and projects in terms of rural development that are carried out nowadays find their reason of existence in this paradigm.¹

New rurality considers that rural development is achieved when the needs of all of the rural inhabitants are fulfilled; when one takes into account that rural environment helps to solve some of the needs that occur to urban inhabitants, and when, also, deterioration is solved and the conservation

¹ We refer to the rural components of the social governmental policy and to most of the projects developed by non-governmental organizations that receive financial support from other countries.

of the natural and cultural resources in the regions that share the rural environment are promoted. These foundations allow performing broad and varied efforts to reconfigure rural spaces, so that they fulfill the new functions which are assigned to them. One of the ways used for this purpose is the organization of tourist projects by the rural communities themselves.

This essay aims, from the revision of this new paradigm, to provide an answer to the following questions: have rural spaces been reconfigured? and, are we really in a *new rurality*? What has been the role of tourism in said reconfiguration? Has the situation of social rural groups improved or worsened?

A new strategy in terms of productive exclusion of peasants and their inclusion in services

All efforts made at present with regard to the achievement of a globalized world revolve around market economy and liberal democracy. This is the premise from which all programs of international kind derive. The feasibility of the model is not argued anymore. The first assumption is that, willingly or not, everyone shall work and produce within this schema. Economic modernization and globalization represent the new determinisms of international capitalism.

International organizations, above all the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB), have devoted themselves to promote the voluntary or forceful application of actions of economic modernization tending to strengthen market economy and liberal democracy (Saxe-Fernández, 1999; Calva, 1993, 1995; Flores, 2000; Coraggio, 2002).

Based on this, international organizations coordinate and drive governments from underdeveloped countries. They change their objectives and lead their social policies so that programs and projects are set in motion to struggle against poverty, allowing the reproduction of different civil organizations and reducing state budgets.

From the moment when the country is led by this logic, rural environment has seen its wellbeing levels decrease, this occurs both during the period when the neoliberal model was applied radically and in the current one, when the neostructuralist proposals have entered to provide it with a human side, hence poverty and exclusion have increased dramatically in the rural zones.

When the Neoliberal model was taken as a foundation, the schema that had been applied in the country which was centralized on the State was left behind. Nowadays, whichever way one looks from, it is clear that the actions in favor of rural development promoted from the government structures are not supported anymore by the agrarian, agricultural and rural policies that prevailed in the previous period. In that time, the distribution of lands was followed by technical and financial assistance so that both peasant producers who owned profitable conditions of production and those who continued using their traditional ways could continue developing their agricultural productive activities.

Most of the peasants were given assistance in those aspects where they had deficiencies. It is not that way nowadays. Almost all of them have been excluded in the new *agrarian policy*, which, by lying in the principles of economic globalization promoted by developed countries, only provides attention to those producers with capitalist conditions.

The *Agrarian policy* has disappeared; instead, the objective is to make markets of lands more dynamic through actions which have to do with privatization, decollectivization, register and assignment of lands.

The changes in Art. 27 of the Republican Constitution made the marketing of lands more attractive and flexible given the fact that it, almost, obliges peasants to sell their land, partially or totally, so as to reduce the poverty in which they live.

The *rural policy*, which disappeared during the years when Neoliberalism brutally promoted capitalism, assumes nowadays a social content,² and it helps promote the projects that organize the strategy of the *new rurality*.

Rural inhabitants have faced this situation of exclusion from different perspectives. The most common is that represented by those who – by not having the credit and technical support from the past – sold their lands to private entrepreneurs and became part of the new rural poor or took part in the migratory flows toward the large cities of Mexico and the U. S. (Calva, 1995; Monterroso, 1998, 2000, 2002, 2003). Those who managed to keep their lands, who recovered common lands or who are settled in municipal or

² Rural development projects are now part of the social policy of the government, and it is exercised from the Secretariat of Social Development (Sedesol).

state lands, are the ones developing the alternatives that *new rurality* proposes them. Among these, one finds the organization of tourist and recreational services of use for the urban populations.

Basic content of the new strategy of rural development

New rurality considers that rural development is achieved when all the needs of the rural population are met. According to this, it is also achieved when one takes into account that the rural space helps fulfilling some of the needs of the urban population, and also when the deterioration and conservation of the natural and cultural resources existing within the regions are attended.

There are two essential ideas in the *new rurality*. One is related to the management of the natural and cultural resources; the other one is related to the centrality of the actors, who are supposed to be the center of any project of sustainable rural development. Based on them, it is stated that in order for rural population to face poverty, they shall look for alternatives that help solve the problems, and this can only be achieved if one goes beyond the traditional agricultural activities.

Although one of the alternatives proposed to peasants is the development of a strategic agriculture that has an impact on the close urban zones, the strategy which has an essential nature in this approach is the development of non-agricultural activities in the rural sphere in order to promote it as a recreational space. Current efforts to develop the *rural tourism* correspond to this last proposal.

In order to promote these actions, international and state organizations offer peasants what they deny them when support is related to agricultural activities: technical assistance and credit. Furthermore, the use of the existent infrastructure and the development of communications are as well promoted (García, 1996). This way, *rural tourism* starts to be seen as a new kind, broader and diverse, of service that is promoted as economic or social policy or as a project of communitarian development.

The development of these new alternatives is based on several concepts. One of them is that related to the *sustainability* of productive actions. This term helps us to calculate the nature taken by the actions in favor of rural development at present. The adjective *sustainable* can be added to it and it has two main characteristics as concept of development.

On the one hand, it makes poor rural communities forget agricultural issues by owning small fertile lands or not having them at all (changes in the constitution allowed them to sell the ones they had), they do not have capital to produce (the government cancelled credits and technical assistance programs) and have low technologic knowledge (most of them cannot have access to state-of-the-art technology) so their conditions to develop a competitive and sustainable agriculture are null. On the other, based on the premise that it is necessary to maintain the natural and cultural resources that constitute the national patrimony, it encourages communities to take part in the new productive model developing activities of conservation and use of those resources.

Another key concept is *territoriality*. This one makes peasants think of their land as their basic productive unit and see the farming of basic grains as their essential activity. It promotes the use of the land of the community as well as the natural and cultural resources contained in it as essential elements to develop the productive non-agricultural activities. Among these one can highlight the production of handcrafts, forestry,³ the organization and provision of tourist and recreational services to the inhabitants of the neighboring urban centers.

The concepts *natural areas* and *national parks* can also be included in the new rural strategy. Although they are not directly mentioned in the documents that refer to it, they are used to convince peasants of concentrating their efforts on the recovering of communal lands, whose possession has an ancestral precedent and whose limits are nowadays confused with the lands that are registered as property of the state or the municipality. In that respect, a new institutionality has been created and it constitutes a high number of natural protected areas and national parks. It also provides technical assistance and credit to communities that remained inside them.

Based on these statements, institutions have been dismantled, the programs that provided attention to the rural production of basic grains

³ This Anglicism is used to make reference to the set of productive activities that can be performed in forest areas, and that go beyond the use of trees. Among them: collection and cultivation of medicine and decoration plants (agroforestry) and the development of silvopastor activities (forest shepherding)

have been cancelled and almost all of the products in the Mexican field have been disarranged. Policies of stabilization and structural adjustment, promoted during the 80's, and the Earth Summit that took place in 1992 were the instruments of a policy that promoted the establishment of a new rural institutionality which highlighted the importance of the use of natural resources and the development of the local actors as self-managers.

One could be in favor of those ideas and actions if it was not because, after more than 15 years of their application, poverty conditions of peasants, instead of decreasing, have increased discouragingly. This means that the new paradigm of rural development is more a necessity to reproduce capital than a methodological proposal for peasants to increase their living conditions. Behind this, one finds the real purposes of those who promote it: to exclude peasants from the economic activities that have constituted an essential part of their culture throughout centuries. The objective is to put an end to the main way of rural livelihood, to force its population to look for other alternatives of survival and to plunge the country into alimentary dependence, as the infrastructure that allowed it to maintain its sovereignty in this area was dismantled.

Rural tourism in the new development strategy

Rural tourism is one new kind of tourism which provides a wide range of recreational activities, lodging and similar services. These activities are developed in the rural environment and directed mainly to people who want to enjoy some days in the countryside, to be in touch with nature and with the local community. This new kind of tourism aims at promoting the participation of the communities in the economic flow that tourist and/or recreational displacements cause.

Rural tourism projects are promoted in two different ways. One of them is developed by the rural communities themselves as a livelihood alternative. And the other is in charge of private investments and/or international organizations. Among the latter one finds the World Tourism Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). At Latin American level, the support from the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB), the Central American Bank for Economic Integration (CABEI), Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture and the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR).

Rural tourism projects are also promoted, nowadays, thanks to the collaboration between communities. That is the case of the associations: municipalities that join to provide services which due to their own characteristics require the cooperation of several city councils in order to promote them and improve their economic conditions by means of the joint provision of a touristic service. This kind of collaboration comes frequently from sources different to the city councils, i.e., it is *caused* by the international financing organizations.

There are several regions of the country immersed in this dynamic at present. In it, apparently and through the reception of capitals by the already mentioned ways, the possibilities of development of rural populations are extended. Nevertheless, despite the democratic, broad and diverse discourse of the *new rurality* and the attractiveness of starting and developing rural touristic projects, their organization does not always imply benefits for the rural social groups, involving more of a serious damage to their livelihood.

The reception of capitals for the development of *rural tourism* projects is carried out in the country since the beginning of the 90's. Large transnational companies, known through the tourist chains in which national entrepreneurs take part as well, are the ones that promote this kind of projects. Natural and cultural resources, more and more frequently, are opened and available both for foreign and national investments in order for them to perform *rural tourism* projects.

In these new tourism projects, rural populations are virtually vacated from the lands they have occupied and are deprived of the benefits that would allow them to use the natural and cultural resources contained in them. Many of these populations migrate to cities, but when they remain in the rural areas they become part of the services of these companies and receive miserable salaries that hold them in poverty, thus entrepreneurial development does not become, in this cases, part of rural development.

A similar situation occurs in projects promoted by international organizations, being these promoted by public institutions or from the so called non-governmental organizations. Since the priority is to create profitable companies, the financial availability is increased for the economic sector that already has it; therefore, those subjects of selection are entrepreneurs that take advantage of this new source of financial resources in order to increase the size of their companies. Once more, rural populations experience eviction and deprivation, therefore, in this case one cannot either speak of rural development.

Communities immersed in these dynamics instead of broadening their possibilities of development, are once again limited. This is what occurred in the Mayan World. Several studies demonstrate that the incorporation of ecotourism projects in the areas that are part of it have not achieved the sustainable rural development that was expected. In the end, tourist companies, instead of benefiting the indigenous communities by incorporating them to the development projects have only fulfilled their own interests. This proves, once more, that the only ones who have capacity to perform a profitable capitalist and competitive production in the rural zones are the entrepreneurs (Daltabuit, 2000; Monterroso, 2008).

In very few cases, they do exist, the financial resources the international organizations provide to organize *rural tourism* projects reach farming rural groups. Despite being few, responses have been of different kind and range from successful results in terms of changes in the conditions of life of the rural populations to situations that can be seen rather as a recoil; this not only in economic terms but also and maybe more in sociocultural grounds. To these positive cases one adds touristic services established by the communities themselves and with their own resources; given the precariousness of their situation, in these case we are also speaking of more failures than success stories. In any case, despite the low number of successful cases, what this paper sustains is that *rural tourism*, developed from the perspective of the *labor economy*, having external resources or only its own, is an alternative of development for the rural population, given the fact that it helps them to counteract the negative effects of the capitalist processes of globalization and modernization which are a characteristic of the current Neoliberal period.

Development from the *labor economy* perspective⁴

Huge are the structural obstacles that rural communities shall overcome to undertake any kind of socioeconomic improvement given the fact that they are in extreme poverty conditions, with damaged, divided and very needy natural resources (Paré, 2003).

In the light of this scenario, communities can have success when they take into account their environmental, social and cultural circumstances. It can be said that this watching over themselves substitutes the lack of links with government agencies and with other communities, and provides them with the endogenous nature that is a characteristic of economic self-management when it is achieved.

Generally speaking, in order to attain this objective, communities separate from the policies that try to impose development ways and of the prevailing socioeconomic system that demands the use of telecommunications, infrastructure, specific kinds of access to the production and exchange of expensive long-lasting goods and machines (O'Malley, 2003: 209).

Labor economy is focused on the social economy as a way to create societies that are more integrated, more equitable, socially and politically stable, with a population that has high levels of education and training, and with an equilibrated environment that can promote hand labor that is flexible due to its basic education and cultural background (Coraggio, 1997: 43).

Social economy has the possibility of creating more efficient and effective structures for the reproduction of life based on collective actions which are strong enough and directed by a paradigm of human development. When saying this, Coraggio proposes the promotion of an alternative project of development that can constitute a social economy centered on labor as a main resource, not the only one however. *Labor economy* is called a subsystem whose logic is neither the accumulation of monetary nor political capital, but human capital.

Labor economy is an alternative to improve the poverty and exclusion conditions through the search for new ways to incorporate individuals to work. Since the Neoliberal economic model has demonstrated its incapacity to integrate populations to development, the objective from this perspective

⁴ Furter information on Zizumbo (2007).

is to promote programs aimed at marginalized sectors, and to integrate them into the economic conditions of their context so that they meet their basic needs.

Labor economy takes into account that all popular economy consists of a set of resources that social groups have. It is composed of the activities they perform to meet their needs in short and medium term (activities on their own or those in which there is a dependency, commercial or not), the rules, values and knowledge which lead such activities and the corresponding groupings, networks and relations (of concurrence, regulation or cooperation, internal or external) that are established through the formal organization or through the repetition of those activities and the domestic groups that depend on them for the reproduction of the continuous performance of their work fund⁵ (Coraggio, 2003).

Labor economy, from the communitarian point of view, can give rise to a system that is able to present and provide energy to the projects of quality of life in a more egalitarian, fairer and self-managed society when it looks for other ways to make the capabilities of people more effective. This is essentially made from the association of networks of coalition such as communitarian work, the simple production of goods in individual, familial or cooperative enterprises, (Coraggio, 2003: 154).

The benefits obtained from the self production, as well as the labor force sold in exchange for a salary and the products and services sold in exchange for a commercial income are the result of the development of the capabilities of the domestic units. They represent the source of work constituted by physical energy, abilities, skills, dispositions and knowledge codified and acquired through formal, non-formal and informal education or through tacit knowledge derived from the practice or even transmitted from generation to generation and that the members of the domestic unit have and use in order to take part in the production of goods (Coraggio, 2004: 155).

⁵ Work fund is the set of capacities that can be exercised, under normal conditions, by the competent members of the social group in order to solve their situation in a solidary way. The performance of such fund covers the following areas: a) commercial work (either on their own or paid) and b) reproduction work as such.

Through *labor economy*, associative, cooperative or mutualist options are developed. They are sustained in the organization of the communities themselves. In some cases this has been in charge of the State, which has given rise to the development of a public policy of social nature that has set in motion programs, projects and strategies based on different kinds of organizations and whose objective has been to create jobs that are independent and which connect with the market but are strengthened by communitarian relations.

However, the most successful experiences have been those derived from families, friendships, neighbors, cooperatives and communities, which through the values of solidarity and networks of association tend to create associations, cooperatives or micro-companies to create jobs that are independent from the local sphere. They have the objective of facing labor, commercial or financing problems in a joint way (Coraggio, 2003).

Communities that are left with their own mechanisms and few resources have been forced to adjust their local economies to the requirements of the world economy (Díaz, 1989). Desperation to find alternatives has forced them to take on their ancestral way of life, which has allowed them to recover their traditional organization ways. When they struggle for survival, through participative, equitable and sustainable processes, they have created a kind of endogenous growth which has enabled them to accumulate a surplus on which, ideally, they have absolute control both in the creation and in the distribution of wealth (Molina, 1998).

Communitarian control includes decisions on the ownership of the lands and means of production which can be or not collective, but in any case, they are not decisions made on a collective base with regard to the nature of said property. This separates, in an essential way, communities from the huge pressure exercised by the dominant structures, especially the national structure of classes, in the socioeconomic local dynamic.

Communities working based on their *labor economy* are constantly struggling to be independent from the socioeconomic programs and plans promoted from the State, which are derived from a political and culture vision that is alien to them. Most of the times they are programs that direct opportunities in favor of the great investors, who appropriate the profits and grants through the manipulation of the essential dependencies.

Hence, one of the advantages of studying development from the *labor economy* is that it shows that there are economic alternatives that allow facing Neoliberalism through communitarian efforts. This is especially the case for communities that aim at the economic self-management. It represents an option that is different from the social policies which are of welfare and focused, and which are promoted from the government institutions and represent individual or collective enterprises that tackle commercial or financing problems, it also enables them to defend themselves from the dominant policies and culture.

Rural tourism from the *labor economy* perspective

Although in the rural zones of the country prevails the economic perspective that emphasizes external investments, productive chains and competitiveness, there are rural communities that rely on their capacities to resist the Neoliberal attacks. The use of external financial resources has transformed natural and cultural resources into tourist products either independently or by means of negotiation. Attractions and services have been created from them and they are commercialized with the population of the neighboring urban centers.

This is an alternative of *rural tourism* that is inscribed in what, as exposed in the previous part, Coraggio calls *labor economy*.

Tourist services that are offered have been established from the social, economic, political and cultural conditions that are part of the communities. They are based on their labor fund and have created structures which, at the same time, create resources for the general development of their economy. From this perspective, they have coordinated internally with their possibilities and have highlighted their cultural values of life and, from them, they have ordered their work and resources to consolidate them as kinds of collective organization that enable them to face the poverty in which they fell when they started to apply the policies of structural adjustment of Neoliberal kind.

Their familial economy is organized according to the income derived from the different economic activities that each of the members perform both those carried out as paid people in the capitalist sectors and those they perform as providers of touristic services. As it is known, since long ago, peasants are groups that simultaneously develop a complex set of

productive functions joined by the autonomous farming structure (Wolf, 1975; Warman, 1984; Appendini, 1985; Díaz, 1989).

In order to go further on the way in which *labor economy* functions in projects of *rural tourism*, there is reference now to two experiences in which this kind of projects are developed. The elaboration is on two rural communities from Mexico. One of them, San Pedro Atlapulco; it is located in the municipality of Ocoyoacac, in the State of Mexico. The other one is called San Cristobal; it is located in the municipality of Cardonal in the State of Hidalgo.

Both are indigenous communities which belong to the otomi-pame family. They share a rural situation and have organized their survival for several years based on the provision of touristic services. This has constituted their essential economic activity. The tourist inflow, in both places, is owed to the natural riches they own and to the changes that, in a permanent way, local populations incorporate to their physical, social, economic, cultural and political environments.

By organizing and providing services, they both have managed to reduce the effects of the exclusion they have experienced from the moment in which government institutions decided to eliminate the support to projects of rural development, and which were directed to agricultural productive activities. Both are part, during the whole period in which the previous model was applied,⁶ of these projects. Nevertheless, when the Neoliberal model was applied they remained excluded from the actions the government institutions provide at present.

Their ownership of low-fertility lands, lack of technical assistance and credits did not allow them to depend, in terms of livelihood, on the results obtained from the agricultural activities. They were then forced to look for new options and found one in the organization and provision of tourist service.

Each of them, based on its own potentials, has organized their economic activities around *labor economy*. Virtually, far from the economic benefits from the government, which derive from that which is now pompously

⁶ Reference is made to the Keynesian model or that of the benefactor state that was applied in Mexico from the administration of Manuel Ávila Camacho (1940-1946) to that of José López Portillo (1976-1982).

called *social policy*, they substituted the limitation of the lack of productive lands with the organization of services that complemented conventional tourism. Closeness to government institutions has taken place at the level of the structure of the municipality which they belong to.

Thus, each of them has built the response to the attacks from the Neoliberal policy organized in the country during the last 25 years. Their own socioeconomic policies and cultural dynamics have created the conformation of specific schemata of economic and political organization, whose differences are clear not only in their results, but also and, above all, in their processes. The idea is not to present success stories, but to demonstrate the experiences that seem to be the most recurrent.

1) Atlapulco: old peasants and new entrepreneurs

The population from San Pedro Atlapulco is a social group with a high degree of cohesion. Already in the time of the arrival of Christopher Columbus they did defend their lands, firstly from invasions of Mexicas and Matlazincas. Later on, they defended them from the reports that accused them of being lands without an owner and which were made in the last years of the XVIII century, so that they achieved the formation of ranches or agricultural exploitations.

The struggle for land in Atlapulco is, then, a customary challenge. It is the essential element in the life of their inhabitants. It allows maintaining their own existence; it comprehends life through work, and determines the political, social, economic and cultural structure that rules them.

It was previously a community devoted to agriculture in a rudimentary way, in broad spaces that each determined for its use. Their main crops were corn, beans, chili and squash. Other economic activities they performed were the hunt of small game and the gathering of wood and mushrooms.

Their territory has never been populated by foreign people or by people from a mixed race. All their inhabitants are part of the original social group. This phenomenon has allowed them to base their economy in the kinds of communal exploitation, organizing domestic cells of production to this end.

In the times of the agrarian reform the community continued with the communal property regime. They distributed and legalized the lands that each head of family farmed and they created a new kind of organization

by means of the Assembly of Commoners. Land is not sold; everyone has the right to it, provided they were born there.

Atlapulco was provided 7,110 hectares, most of it under the communal property regime. Each head of family was provided with a plot of land for individual use. 3,800 hectares consist of forests; due to that wooded land, there are abundant sources of water whose liquid has allowed them to meet their own needs and provide lease water to municipalities from Huixquilucan, Lerma and Mexico City (Gutiérrez, 1986).

The deterioration of the rural economy, due to bad harvests and low production, gave rise to migration toward Mexico City. This population looked for better conditions, peasants were separated from their means of production and forced to face a market of salaried work. Families with migrant children started to improve their economy and started trading activities inside and outside the community.

Despite this, Atlapulco was and still is a farming community. Agricultural work and rural environment continue being the main elements on which the life of the inhabitants is founded. Mountains have always been their working lands and the valleys are now their source of employment. Woods are a continuous part of the agrarian landscape; it has not been transformed because it has been considered an essential resource for the rural life.

The community experienced isolation and marginalization from institutional support for many years; their petitions were only accepted if there was a “customer” relationship. The agrarian policy excluded them from being productive subjects because they were located in zones with bad weather and their land had a communal ownership. At their disposal, they only had social welfare policies of financial assistance and those related to healthcare. This experience made them remain, up to date, isolated from government dependencies; time showed them that it was a relationship that, far from helping them, weakened and marginalized their communities.

During the 40's, the community started to relate to La Marquesa National Park. At the beginning, they offered their horses to the visitors, so that they could tour the place. Rural economy started worsening from those years, giving rise to a process of severance from farming activities in which an increasing number of peasants cut from their means of production and was forced to face the paid labor market in Mexico City and to provide tourist

services in the valleys of the community. This way, they started to provide recreational services in the lands neighboring the park, specifically in Valle de las Monjas, which is easy to reach via Mexico-Toluca highway.

However, the most significant changes took place after the construction, in 1966, of the highway that links La Marquesa with Tenango del Valle and Chalma. This highway allowed them to start the provision of tourist services in natural areas which are at the side of the road; the limits of the park increased. Atlapulco was one of the rural communities that managed to face the crisis of the 70's when they incorporated into the rural familial structure the income from commercial work and from the provision of touristic services. By 1980, the General Assembly of Commoners had already determined the internal allocation of individual activities and gave freedom to commoners in order to provide tourist services in the valleys.⁷

Communal lands were little by little required in order to broaden the range of tourist services, starting with this the development of small businesses related to trade, tourism, stockbreeding, as well as professional work. Atlapulco's population modified their productive vocation; from farming to tourist-entrepreneurial. Most of the familial units take nowadays part in the communal companies providing tourist services. It is the members of the family who work in them. During high seasons, they hire some external workers for some days. Few families from the neighborhood who have not incorporated to the work in the tourist valleys due to the lack of resources sell their labor force to other rural families for some days a year.

The exceptional location of their land was a determining factor for the promotion of tourism in the community since it allowed the displacement of a tourist flow from two important urban centers of the country, that is,

⁷ Tourist attractions for visitors in Atlapulco are its valleys: Las Monjas, El Silencio, El Conejo, Rancho Viejo, Las Carboneras, El Potrero y Cerrito del Ángel. The adequate location and beauty of its forests encourages the arrival of visitors and the performance of outdoor recreational activities. Thanks to the amount and quality of water coming from the springs, fishing activities with recreational and gastronomic purposes are carried out. Artificial lakes have been created, it is possible to row and fishing in them. The development of motorcycle circuits, the construction of huts, small restaurants, kiosks in which craftworks are sold, shelters to have dinner or eat, playgrounds and slides have broadened the range of services for visitors.

Mexico City and Toluca. Its seven valleys possess great natural attractiveness and, since they are close to Mexico City, they are visited to perform long walks, horse riding, breathing pure air and relax in the company of the family. These communal valleys provide services to visitors who arrive, hire horses, motorcycles or boats; they consume food and/or buy craftworks and crystallized candies.

The crisis experienced by the community, a product of their insertion into the market and its consequences, was the reason to start this new kind of collective organization based on *labor economy*. When the land did not provide a livelihood, as mentioned above, individual strategies of survival are set in motion along with new alternatives of subsistence; the latter are applied in a collective way and this allows inhabitants to keep their culture and territorial identity. Their collective organization allowed the use of the natural richness which was requested by visitors from Mexico City and Toluca; it provided them with a natural environment of unparalleled characteristics in terms of the beauty of their woods, the quality of the air and water, as well as the provision of touristic services in their valleys. Their success was in the way in which they organized their social economy.

Tourism has increased in Atlapulco in an irregular way. The excess in offer of some services in some areas has brought about competence and inequality in income. Thus, the number of people who provide horses for hiring has increased, since it represents the easiest way to obtain benefits from tourism, this increase is in comparison to other activities which given the specialization required for the provision of the service and the investment necessary for their operation require more efforts.

There are families that own plots of land that are still used with agricultural purposes in order to improve their food provision in view of enjoying traditional products: corn, beans, broad beans and fresh herbs. In other cases, they prefer to grow alfalfa to feed the horses or to sell it, since the demand for it is high. They also take part in the tourist valleys in two or more economic areas depending on the number of family members. Other families have also another kind of commercial activity or have an occupation they perform in the town, from which they obtain an income they incorporate to the familial unit. There are families whose members obtain resources through commercial work carried out outside the community,

so they build luxurious establishments that organize feasts for exclusive tourism. This has allowed them to have an income that is higher than that of the majority, bringing about stressed social inequality.

Atlapulco is, hence, a sample of the antagonisms of a rural economy that develops in a capitalist context. The General Assembly of Commoners has carried out the distribution of land in private property, but without damaging the basic structure that is communal.⁸ The key elements in the communal organization are kept: communal property of the whole land, persistence of communitarian relations and an organization of production sustained on familial work, which aims the simple objective of reproduction, but which the lack of land and the pressure from the rural exploitation apparatus have forced to look for other alternatives, such as the provision of touristic services.

This organization based on communal structure for collective work is fragmented at the moment when property and work are individualized into the private business of the commoners. On the one hand, commoners take part equally in the work that has to do with the community: the General Assembly allots them, decides the contributions and the way in which they will be distributed. All those born in Atlapulco are obliged to fulfill their work and to provide the cooperation that is set.

On the other hand, in the places that are private property owned by some commoners, the latter are the only ones who have the right to decide on the use of the resources. Any elder person from the community has the right to obtain benefits from the land and their natural resources; everything here is communal. If anyone wants to provide tourist services they have to write the corresponding request to the community via General Assembly; in contrast, in this case everything is made in private terms. So that, on the one hand, there is participation in communal property and, on the other, one can be a private owner.

⁸ Many Atlapulco's inhabitants have private property. They are provided by the Commoners Assembly only if a person was born in the community. It cannot be sold, but transferred to children. These properties have huts for tourist use, restaurants, function rooms, business related to trout, recreational areas that function as familial units. Most of these private lands are located within common areas, which makes difficult their tourist-recreational organization in the valleys.

2) San Cristobal: building a cooperative alternative

The ejido of San Cristobal belongs to a cooperative of the municipality of Cardonal in the state of Hidalgo. It is part of the Mezquital Valley, in the Mexican central plateau. It was born when La Florida property was expropriated and it was allotted in 1934 in favor of 85 heads of family who worked as laborers in the ranch.

The allotment was 4,365 hectares, provided at different times and they were distributed as follows: 3,862 are communal lands of low quality, 45 correspond to the urban zone and 428 are ejido lands. From the total of hectares that were available, only 30 are irrigation lands and they are located in the hillsides of the Tolantongo River. Each member of the population received an average of four hectares on temporal land and half of irrigation (Rebolledo, former ejido president, August, 2004).

These are temporal lands scarcely productive; however, they are adequate for tourism given their resources. The community remained stuck, without signs of progress. Small houses made out of sticks, huts of adobe and mud. They totally lacked services: electric energy, water, drainage, means of communication and transportation. The poverty of the lands did not guarantee the rural population a livelihood from the production of corn, beans and other basic crops. The small amount of water at their disposal did not allow crops to grow.

It was because of this that the population had to perform other activities to survive. For some time they traded fruits from the region, transporting them in their horses as herdsmen.⁹ Later on, they incorporated the exploitation of the marble mine which is near Mogolito as another source of income. Mogolito is one of the neighborhoods of the urban center of the ejido.

Far from dividing them, water scarcity made them work together on the land. They combined their half hectares in a common work: an irrigation area used for cultivation. They grew fruits (mainly avocados, bananas, walnuts, oranges). Once a week all men took part in the compulsory work;

⁹ This information is derived from a conversation with Mr. Odilón Rebolledo, 78, former president of the cooperative from 1961 to 1964. He was interviewed in San Cristobal, Hidalgo in 2004.

the resulting product of the sell was equally divided. This is the way in which they learned how to work and live as a community.

Life is focused on the ejido where the population is settled. It is a center with few houses. The participation of the inhabitants is important and has a great power on the decisions that are made with regard to community life; they know how transcendent it is for them to live together and the importance of fulfilling the norms and obligations which were established.

Very recently, from the visit of some tourists, establishments started to be set. They were later organized in order to provide services to the visitors. Tourists were attracted by the natural richness that creates a complex system. We are making reference to Tolantongo caves, a place which has a natural dynamic reflected in the elements that create a composition and distribution of geological creations, which in addition to the weather, hydrology and vegetation, make the place unique.

Due to the conditions of the place, Tolantongo caves have their own weather. The region is a dry steppe. Tolantongo, on its side, due to humidity from the caves and the waterfalls has a fresh weather. The basin of the river is crossed by profound ravines that generally cross from west to east, giving shape to broad plain lands of great extension where extensive camping areas are available.

The geological landscape consists of sedimentary stones of different ages, limestone rock strata interstratified with lutites located in the hillsides that are close to the caves. It is also constituted by blocks of limestone that can reach three meters in diameter, partially rounded, attached and covered with calcium carbonate which demonstrates hydrothermal activity. An activity that continues up to present and can be proved by the flow of hot water that comes from the caves (Colín, 2005: 30).

Tourism appeared in the 60's, but it was not until the 80's that a significant flow was seen. This growth in the tourist inflow gave rise to the organization of the community in order to provide the services, which started in an empirical and rudimentary way. The hired horses, mules and donkeys to go down the ravine were one the first services that the inhabitants provided. Their later offer of food and camping sites encouraged the arrival of more people.

Ejido owners set a small amount of money on the tourist from the beginning and it allowed them to visit the place and remain in it. This starting income allowed setting services, among which one finds toilets and dressing rooms, corridors, walking paths, temporary ladders in order to give access to the touring route (caves, waterfalls and tunnel). By the time in which the amount of people increased, there was the need to have more personnel to meet the needs of the activity itself, and it was then that they decided to become a cooperative.

They started their formal organization in 1972. The construction of a rough dirt track in 1975 enabled the arrival of more tourists, increasing with it the resources and the possibilities of better conditions for the members of the community. It was then that tourism started to be divided in different areas; not only did people from other countries visit them, but also national visitors from the states of Hidalgo, Guanajuato, Queretaro, Mexico and Mexico City abounded, so that local tourism was strengthened.

It was not until 1976 that the Cooperative Society of Tolantongo Caves (*Sociedad Cooperativa Ejidal Grutas de Tolantongo*) was established. This society is not formally acknowledged by the Secretariat of the Treasury and Public Credit until 1998, in that year they start paying taxes, water supply and other services. This came as a result of the will of 113 members of the cooperative, without official influence or private interests (Zizumbo *et al.*, 2006).

The Assembly of Members of the Cooperative, from which the cooperative is derived, established from the very beginning the definition of the recreational area, providing it with 22 hectares. It also established that, in order to be part of the organization, it is necessary that the members of it fulfill all the obligations imposed by the General Assembly, with responsibility, honesty, respect, trust and good behavior.

The cooperative has a president or manager, a secretary and a treasurer. They are elected in a general assembly and are appointed for year. The work of the direction and organization is performed jointly by the Communal Commissioner and the treasurer, who authorizes the activities which are performed, provides a monthly report on the situation of the cooperative, its income and expenses so that there is transparency in the administration of the resources.

The election of the representatives of the cooperative is carried out in the General Assembly of the Members of the Cooperative, consisting of the Communal Commissioner and the Surveillance Council. The general assembly consists of all members of the cooperative who have not been deprived of their rights and it is held openly. There are neither conflicts nor arguments among them at the moment of selecting their representatives.

The work at the interior of the cooperative is organized each year, it distributes the tasks to different groups and aims to be equitable because there are not job posts that last a whole week, instead, there is employment throughout the year in the days of tourism arrival. In low season journeys are only paid for the weekend and have the chance of being employed in other activities the cooperative requires, either as construction workers or to help in conservation or maintenance.

The logic behind the cooperative is sustained on the property of land and on work. That means they can achieve lots of things based on what they have and make. This occurs without them expecting the private will or the government institutions to make it so that they avoid becoming workers at the service of foreigners. The fact that an initiative was born at the bosom of the community as an equitable, democratic and egalitarian proposal for the organization of work has guaranteed a higher level of economic, social and cultural wellbeing for their members. But in order to achieve it, it was necessary to set strict norms, rules and obligations that guaranteed the well functioning of the cooperative society.

Participation is a right and an obligation of any legal-aged person or head of family from the community. The participation occurs above all in the General Assembly of Members of the Cooperative, in the Surveillance Council, in the Municipal Office and in the Council for Civil Participation.

The person in charge of the finances is the cooperative treasurer; that is why he is given the amount obtained in the monthly assembly. When there is need of making arrangements the decision of the president is taken into account, given the fact that he is the one who knows the needs of the cooperative.

The numbers are clear; there is absolute transparency in the administration. Income and expenses are presented with much clarity in order for everyone to have clear data. There is absolute trust on the people chosen for the board of directors. Familial ties are strong. A topic that is dealt with in every assembly is that of maintaining their lifestyle; their dressing and behavior provides tourists confidence, youth are encouraged to follow the customs so that the tranquility of tourism is guaranteed.

Assemblies are a very important forum to promote social, environmental and communitarian awareness so that a better management of their social company and the communitarian life are improved by means of democracy and equity. With regard to the equity variable, there is a great responsibility on the assembly to establish strategies of organization in favor of the cooperative so that the population exercises its right to the benefits from the land and the natural resources. They also set strategies for them to take part in formal and informal activities of the cooperative performing specific work or providing a specific service.

Thus, one can say that the cooperative from Tolantongo Caves is one social company sustained on the work of its members. All the activities performed are significant for the continuity of the company, no post is better or worse, everyone has the same possibilities of being part of the activities that they consider adequate and they are evaluated in the general assembly, where skills and attitudes are taken into account when they are allotted. All members will have to perform any given activity at one point in time; even though it may be regarded as inferior it is as dignifying as any other.

The change from members of a cooperative to providers of tourist services and construction workers has not changed their life. That is, they continue being rural groups whose economy is directed towards their subsistence and they are not, structurally speaking, part of a heterogeneous and complex society. They are not either great entrepreneurs, and despite receiving a salary, it is derived from the part of the property that they share of the land; they have control over it, given the fact that they now have a source of work and their life conditions have improved.

The evolution of tourism has been slow. This fact has enabled the community to organize according to the growth. Until 2002, tourism had remained the same in numbers during the Holy week and holidays, but in the last two years it has increased considerably so now it is experienced throughout the year; this is due to the fact that there is more promotion of the locality by means of their webpage, the Secretariat of Tourism, the Government of the State of Hidalgo and also as a result of the improvement in communication means.

The population from San Cristobal lives nowadays at a 90% from tourism. Members of the cooperative provide several services through it; this allows them to have a safe source of employment. The success of the cooperative is due to the structural capacity of the group, and it is potentially derived from the cultural identity shown in their solidarity, cooperativism and trust networks.

Tourist activities are carried out taking water as a center. Among these activities one can mention the use of the caves, waterfalls or curtains of water, potholes that allow enjoying thermal waters, the river to play with the current, the digging of potholes or the simple fact of being in the water while one enjoys the landscape.

Some find their group joy in pools and slides. Interesting is that despite the range of social classes, ideologies, likes and preferences, time together among tourist is in harmony and respect terms, and it is possible due to the effort made by the cooperative so that the atmosphere of the place remains adequate.

The main attraction, following the natural resources, is the safety environment the location provides, as well as the economic cost for a whole family to remain there for some days. Four hotel rooms and huts have been built in the last five years. Shower facilities have been improved as well. Tourism is familial, one can find elder people, adults, youth and children; they belong to all social classes with a prevalence of medium and low income population. There are facilities to cook using improvised bonfire or portable stoves; this allows safeguarding the familial economy.

As a conclusion

In this globalized era, in which capitalism has assumed new ways to infiltrate, essential is the development of markets. Important is to open them and to develop them, so that there is work and bets to create the conditions to carry out a highly profitable and competitive production. That is the reason why policies that are mentioned only propose the incorporation of regions, towns and productive units that fulfill the requirements of the capital in order to give rise to their production. This category, sustained in the Neoliberal paradigm, is nowadays basic; it is the most important and constitutes the economic policy of the government.

There is a second category consisting in the social policy developed by the government nowadays. In this case language is related to local development, environment, nature, gender approach, cultural recovery, amelioration of poverty. But it is still directed by the market. Social policy emphasizes the search and training of new entrepreneurs. The idea is to find producers or service providers that can become successful entrepreneurs. To find new clients for the economic policy and to support those who by not having the adequate conditions for the reproduction of capital have remained excluded from the economic policy, provided that they can gather those conditions in the short term. It is of no importance if they start with a tiny business location, what is important in this case is to assume the market economy and the productive philosophy.

These two categories have several things in common. They have the objective of developing the market economy and are based on the formation of social capital and on the participation of the society. They are concerned about the environment and the adequate use of the natural resources (renewable and non-renewable). They preach the struggle against poverty and bet for the development of productive tourist projects.

Local development of tourism in Mexico responds to these two approaches. They are part of the social and economic policies, which aim, above all, to create the conditions to broaden the markets. However, there is a third category in order to achieve local development, which has arisen from the community themselves and whose central objective is not the development of the market, but the improvement of the quality of life.

As poverty and exclusion levels do not diminish, together with the current economic and social politics, rural communities have developed their own survival strategies in order to face the attacks from Neoliberal capitalism. The development of productive tourist projects and the provision of services, based on communitarian structures, are the parts of this third strategy. Its base is the formation and conservation of *labor economy* by the communities themselves.

This third strategy of development based on the community has different variations. It is nowadays used to promote development, both from the economic and the social perspective. It is a strategy arising from the bottom, from the communities themselves, so that the emphasis is set on the development of local populations.

The main difference with the social policy promoted from above is that this one prioritizes the development of markets, whereas *labor economy* consists of a base of communities and looks for a common benefit. Since it is not incorporated to the national, state and local development, it is the populations who look for their own way of organization.

The organization of *rural tourism* projects from *labor economy* is an alternative to improve the conditions of poverty and exclusion in rural zones. It is an alternative to find new ways to incorporate individuals into work given the fact that the liberal economic model has demonstrated not to have the capacity to do so.

Labor economy is then a strategy consisting of organizational forms of work, which aims at creating collective goods among those who share values, ideals and ways of life. As such it is supported on the cultural values that enable struggling for a better and higher quality of life.

Labor economy consists of the capacity to create political and social movements. From them, demands and struggles for the cultural control of development are set. It also enables the creation of independent civil organizations which join their efforts to achieve local development.

Labor economy in rural communities operates, with regard to the use of natural resources with touristic purposes, by creating spaces of political negotiation within the members of the social groups themselves. It acts, hence, as an endogenous element of development. So that tourism can be considered as an instrument of development both, from the economic and

social perspectives, provided that its objective is to help communities to improve their living conditions.

Nonetheless, from the three mentioned approaches, which link rural development with the tourism of the country at present, the two former are the ones that prevail, leaving aside the third modality with a minimal existence given the fact that it does not adapt to the capitalist accumulation. Hence, from the analytical framework that the third approach provides, we can say that *rural tourism* projects are not yet a development option for the rural populations, communities and towns from Mexico.

Despite the fact that the new development policy recognizes touristic and recreational displacements as a phenomenon with possibilities to promote development of local communities, governmental support is minimal and the conditions of the communities are limited, that is why they have to face the difficulties of the application of a model that is brutally excluding.

Policies of touristic development which have been applied have not achieved the improvement of the living conditions of rural populations. On the contrary, rural poverty has increased; this is a result of the scarcity of important adjustments and reforms to solve the challenges of the population which has been abandoned (Díaz, 1989).

Despite that much is said about the fact that civil society is managing its own demands, that there is attachment only to the most immediate needs, that it has experienced from the 70's, an intense growth process, an increasing number of groups and organizations, and the new and more complex action fronts, it can be asserted that peasants are not yet recognized as significant social actors so that they achieve an economic, political and social development in the country.

The construction of the modern State requires taking into account approaches from the rural organizations. Not only does their participation guarantee the social coexistence that is a quality of democratic life, but it also demonstrates the levels of governance required to advance towards development. These organizations are drawn to fulfill a role of special significance, in such manner that said construction shall not be carried out or understood without their participation.

Bibliography

- Appendini, Kirsten *et al.* (1985), *El campesinado en México. Dos perspectivas de análisis*, Mexico: El Colegio de México.
- Calva, José (1993), *El Modelo Neoliberal Mexicano*, Mexico: Fontamara.
- Calva, José (1995), “Costos sociales de la reforma neoliberal del Estado y principio de una estrategia alternativa en México”, in Vilas, Carlos [coord.], *Estado y políticas sociales después del ajuste. Debate y alternativas*, Mexico: Nueva Sociedad, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Colín, Sara (2005), *Zonificación del paisaje en el Ejido de San Cristóbal, Tlantolongo, Hidalgo*, graduate thesis, Toluca: Faculty of Geography of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico.
- Coraggio, José (1997), “La agenda del desarrollo local”, in *Descentralización: el día después*, Cuadernos de posgrado, series of courses and conferences, Buenos Aires University.
- Coraggio, José (2002), “La economía social como vía para el otro desarrollo social”. Available at: <[http:// www.ubared.ungs.edu.ar](http://www.ubared.ungs.edu.ar)>.
- Coraggio, José (2003), *La política social y economía del trabajo*, Mexico: Miño and Dávila, Colegio Mexiquense A.C.
- Coraggio, José (2004), “Economía del trabajo”, in Cattani, Antonio [comp.], *La otra economía*, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Altamira, General Sarmiento National University (UNGS), Foundation Organization of Direct Entrepreneur Services (OSDE).
- Flores, Víctor (2000), *Crítica de la globalidad. Dominación y liberación en nuestro tiempo*, Mexico: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Daltabuit, Magalí *et al.* (2000), *Ecoturismo y desarrollo sustentable*, Mexico: National Autonomous University, Regional Center of Multi-disciplinary Research (CRIM).
- Díaz, Miguel (1989), *La condición campesina*, Mexico: Metropolitan Autonomous University, Iztapalapa.
- García, Benjamín (1996), *La sociedad rural ante el siglo XXI*, Madrid, Spain: Agriculture, Fishing and Food Ministry (MAPA).
- Gutiérrez, Pedro (1986), *Ocoyoacac, paraíso turístico*, Mexico: 6^a Cultural Bulletin of the municipality of Ocoyoacac.

- Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) (2000), *Nueva Ruralidad*, San José, Costa Rica: IICA, Rural Development Directorships, Conceptual Documents Series number 1.
- Molina, Iván (1998), “La polarización del desarrollo global”, in *Sociedad Civil: Análisis y Debates*, vol. II, num. 2, Mexico: Foro de Apoyo Mutuo, Demos.
- Monterroso, Neptalí (1998), *Curso de Metodología para profesores de Desarrollo Rural*, Guatemala: San Carlos University, Faculty of Agronomy.
- Monterroso, Neptalí (2000), “La participación de la sociedad civil en el manejo de los recursos forestales”, in *Memoria del Seminario-taller internacional sobre metodologías participativas para el desarrollo forestal sostenible*, Peten, Guatemala, April 2000, Codersa, Holland Embassy
- Monterroso, Neptalí (2002), “Posibilidades para el desarrollo rural de Guatemala”, in *Espacios Públicos*, August, year 5, num. 10, Toluca, Mexico: Faculty of Political Sciences and Public Administration, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico.
- Monterroso, Neptalí and Sergio Zamorano (2003), “Exclusión o participación: estrategias para el desarrollo rural en América Latina”, in *Memoria del Seminario Nacional sobre Desarrollo Rural*, Quetzaltenango, Guatemala: Tulan Indigenous Institute.
- O'Malley, Anthony (2003), “Las perspectivas del desarrollo basado en la comunidad”, in *Contra del neoliberalismo: El desarrollo basado en la comunidad en América Latina*, Mexico: National Autonomous University of Mexico, Porrúa.
- Paré, Luisa and Elena Lazos (2003), *Escuela rural y organización comunitaria: Instituciones locales para el desarrollo y el manejo ambiental*, Mexico: Social Research Institute of the National Autonomous University of Mexico, Plaza y Valdés.
- Pérez, Edelmira (2001), “Hacia una nueva visión de lo rural”, in *¿Una nueva ruralidad en América Latina?*, Buenos Aires, Argentina: Latin-American Council of Social Sciences (CLACSO), Rural Development Work Group.
- Pipitone, Ugo (1996), “El retorno al mercado”, in *La Jornada*, April 9th, Mexico.
- Saxe-Fernández, John (1999), *Globalización: crítica de un paradigma*, Mexico: Plaza y Janés, National Autonomous University of Mexico, General Directorship of Academic Personnel (DGAPA).

Warman, Arturo (1984), *Ensayos sobre el campesinado mexicano*, Mexico: Nueva Imagen.

Warman, Arturo (1989), “Presencia de la pobreza”, in *Cuadernos de Nexos*, March, num. 8.

Wolf, Eric (1975), *Los campesinos*, Barcelona, Spain: Labor.

Zizumbo, Lilia *et al.* (2006), “Tolantongo: Hacia la producción autogestionaria y democrática”, in *V Congreso Internacional sobre turismo rural y desarrollo sustentable “Ordenamiento, segmentación y regionalización del turismo en áreas rurales”*, Brazil: Santa María.

Zizumbo, Lilia (2007), *Turismo en comunidades rurales. Práctica social y Estrategia Económica*, doctoral thesis, Mexico: Faculty of Political and Social Sciences of the National Autonomous University of Mexico.

Neptalí Monterroso Salvatierra. He is an agricultural engineer and sociologist specialized in Rural Development. Full-time professor at the Faculty of Political and Social Sciences of the Autonomous University of the State of Mexico. Since 1998 he is a visiting professor at the Latin-American Faculty of Political Sciences (FLACSO, Guatemala seat). His line of research is rural development. Among his recent published works one finds: coauthor in *Espoleando la esperanza. Evaluación social de la sustentabilidad en dos comunidades rurales del Estado de México*, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (2009); coauthor of “Turismo e identidad de resistencia; la oposición local a proyectos turísticos en el Parque Nacional Nevado de Toluca, México”, in *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 18, Buenos Aires, Argentina (2009); coauthor, in cooperation with Lilia Zizumbo, of *Turismo rural y desarrollo sustentable*, Mexico (2008).

Lilia Zizumbo Villarreal. She holds a Ph. D. in Sociology, full-time profesor and researcher at the Tourism Faculty of the Autnomous University of the State of Mexico. Research line: environmental studies on tourism. Among her recent published works one finds: coauthor of *Espoleando la esperanza. Evaluación social de la sustentabilidad en dos comunidades rurales del Estado de México*, Autonomous University of the State of Mexico (2009); coautor of “Turismo e identidad de resistencia; la oposición local a proyectos turísticos en el Parque Nacional Nevado de Toluca, México”, in *Estudios y Perspectivas en Turismo*, vol. 18, Buenos Aires, Argentina (2009); coauthor, with Neptalí Monterroso, of *Turismo rural y desarrollo sustentable*, Mexico (2008).

Sent to dictum: October 22nd, 2008

Aprobación: December 9th, 2008