

# The Common Property Resource Digest

NO. 77 QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMON PROPERTY June 2006

Welcome to another edition of the *CPR Digest*. This issue consists of reports from the **IASCP Europe Regional Meeting**, held in Brescia, Italy in March 2006. Conference organisers, *Giangiaco Bravo* and *Tine De Moor*, open the CPR Forum with their summary report: **Building the European Commons**. This is followed with *Audun Sandberg* providing his perspective of the state of the commons in Europe. *Thomas Sikor* focuses his comments on the meeting from his view from Central and Eastern European Commons. Meanwhile, *Tom Dedeurwaerdere* reports on the discussions that took place during the conference on institutional design for knowledge sharing. Bringing in his perspectives from fisheries management, *Doug Wilson* makes predictions about European commons. The *Forum* concludes with some reflections on the European commons from an American perspective by *Leticia Merino*.

We would like to draw your attention to the 2006 Election Results and suggest you refer to the Announcements section for more details. We offer a warm welcome to new Executive Council members Frank Matose and Doug Wilson. We would also like to welcome President-elect Ruth Meinzen-Dick. **Enjoy!**

CONTENTS	
<b>CPR FORUM: Reports from the IASCP Europe Regional Meeting</b>	
<b>Building the European Commons</b> <i>Giangiaco Bravo &amp; Tine De Moor...1</i>	
<b>The State of the Commons in Europe</b> <i>Audun Sandberg.....4</i>	
<b>Central and East European Commons</b> <i>Thomas Sikor ..... 5</i>	
<b>Cows Grazing on Ever Green Knowledge Meadows?</b> <i>Tom Dedeurwaerdere.....6</i>	
<b>Predictions about European Commons</b> <i>Doug Wilson .....7</i>	
<b>Reflections about European and Non-European Commons</b> <i>Leticia Merino .....8</i>	
<b>Recent Publications ..... 10</b>	
<b>Announcements ..... 14</b>	

## CPR FORUM Europe Regional Report

### **Building the European Commons: Report of the IASCP Europe Regional Meeting Report**

**Giangiaco Bravo and Tine De Moor**  
**IACP Europe Regional Meeting Organisers**

The European Branch meeting of the IASCP in Brescia meeting is behind us, and now it's time to sit down and reflect. It may be easier to start with some figures. About 80 people, coming from most of European countries and a number of extra-European ones, joined us in Brescia and, throughout the two days of the meeting opened by Lin Ostrom's keynote speech on "Multiple methods for studying collective action", over 60 papers were presented. That was much more than initially forecasted on the basis of European participation to the IASCP global meetings over the past few years. The success makes us therefore confident about the healthy status of common-pool resource research in Europe, and that is very good news.

The conference theme and sub-themes were set broad enough to capture not only CPR-scholars and practitioners, but also environmental economists, law scholars and, generally speaking, people interested in natural resources management and ecology. Participant culture and competences were consequently rather mixed and often complementary,

# The Common Property Resource Digest

*Published with support from  
the Ford Foundation*

*Editor*

Alyne E. Delaney



## International Association for the Study of Common Property

### Current Officers

President: Narpat Jodha

President Elect: Owen Lynch

Immediate Past President: Erling Berge

### Council

Doris Capistrano Ruth Meinzen-Dick

Leticia Merino Calvin Nhira

Dianne Rocheleau Andy White

**Executive Director**  
**CPR Digest Editor**  
**Information Officer**

MichelleCurtain  
Alyne Delaney  
Charlotte Hess

### Conference Coordinators

#### 2006 Regional Meetings

**European Region** Giangiacomo Bravo & Martina DeMoor

**Pacific Region** John Sheehan

© 2000 IASCP

**WWW.IASCP.ORG**

a situation not infrequent in IASCP-meetings (it actually represents one of the strengths of the association!). Notwithstanding the heterogeneity of participants, a significant part of the papers presented during the conference were deeply rooted in some of the “good old topics” of CPR-research: forestry, pastures and water management.

The subtitle of the conference “From open fields to open spaces” was intended to attract a wide variety of commons-researchers, including historians, as the commons have a long history in Europe and this would allow us to look more closely at the very-long-term developments of commons. A significant number of historical cases and overviews that has been presented at the conference showed that it is possible though not easy to cover such long stretches of time, by means of detailed case-studies or regional overviews. These papers showed several problems which can be expected when digging into the history of the commons. First of all, the source material is usually a lot scarcer than in contemporary commons studies. Secondly, the type of source material does not always allow us to use the same methods of analysis as those that are being used for the contemporary commons. Thirdly, the integration of theoretical models proves to be difficult, though not impossible. The main reason for this is terminological fuzziness. A term like “the commons” has been used for a variety of forms of resources in different places and periods, and by a large number of scientific disciplines. The term had been used in England for hundreds of years, but what it refers to in that context differs significantly from for example what is usually understood by those researching knowledge as a “commons”. One of the most important conclusions of this interdisciplinary meeting therefore is that there is still a need for more terminological clarity among all social scientists working on the commons.

A relevant number of papers dealt with topics related to the conditions of CPRs in developed countries, which was not surprising considering the focus upon Europe. Within this set, a first group investigated a specific European problem: the transition process in post-socialist countries. What emerged is a widespread mistrust between stakeholders and public officials and a difficult process of local management institution building, after the destruction of the traditional ones during the socialist period. However, the picture is more mixed than imag-

ined. Some studies presented indeed interesting cases where the transition created benefits for the local population and a general process of land restitution to peasants and land user (even if sometimes hardly exploited by local politicians and corrupt officials). A second group of papers dealt with the new uses of traditional natural commons, especially in relation with the provision of ecological services. Natural resources and, more specifically, natural commons are today multifunctional: they provide food and raw materials (like fish or timber), tourism and leisure areas, but also grant a number of ecological services that humans and other living beings need for their physical existence (e.g. the capture of solar energy, the regulation of the atmosphere composition, the control of soil erosion, the regulation of the water cycle, etc.). In addition, they are often a source of biodiversity and they sometimes possess a significant aesthetic and cultural value. The multi-functionality of the commons is a source of difficulty for their management, especially due to the number and the heterogeneity of interests of the stakeholders. However, interesting co-management and multi-level management experiences are on the way, and this topic is certainly a new and exciting one.

A third group of papers converged on the “Knowledge Commons” theme. The interest for knowledge and internet-based commons is rapidly growing and this is turning out to be a crucial issue for researchers (especially the young ones) in developed countries. During the conference two entire sessions plus a couple of other papers discussed the topic. Are knowledge commons public goods or CPRs? It depends on a number of factors, including the specificity of the resource system and of its artificial infrastructure (if present). What is certain is that, however immaterial, knowledge commons need robust and well-developed regulation schemes in order to avoid underprovision, piracy and other harmful behaviors. The interplay between public and private actors is often crucial for the development of those institutions, whose design principles present both similarities and differences with the traditional commons.

Notwithstanding the number of the papers presented and the wide range of the interests they covered, at least two important topics were nearly absent from the conference. The first one is one of the traditional major topics in CPR-research: fisheries. Only two papers dealt with this theme, one studying the changes in Taiwan and one the management of inshore fisheries in a small Southern Italian

community. The low interest of European scholars in fisheries is rather surprising given both the importance that the topic has for CPR-research, its role in the EU common policy and the problems this institution is facing to govern its seas and fisheries. Is it actually the bureaucratization and the centralization of the EU fishery policy that discourages researchers to deal with the topic? It may be. Still the small number of papers covering this theme was one of the weaknesses of the meeting.

The second missing theme in the conference was the issue of the global commons: only one single paper dealt with this topic. This was unexpected for at least two reasons. First, global commons, especially those linked with climate change issues, are at present a “hot” topic in international research in a number of different disciplines. Why CPRs students are not prone to participate? Second, Europe is supposed to be a chief actor in fostering the development of global institutions for global change mitigation. It has been one of the leading actors in the actualization of the Kyoto-protocol (and it plays, at present, the same role in the bargaining process for the post-2012 phase) and first developed a continental-scale carbon emission permit trade market.

There may be a good reason indeed for this lack of interest in this topic. Despite some remarkable advancements, global commons are hard to confront with the standard CPR-approach. The actors are too diverse and heterogeneous, the interests are exceedingly diverse, the conceptual status of the “resources” themselves is hard to define. On the other hand, the IASCP-society in general is convinced that global resources are actual commons. The theory, developed mainly on small-scale, traditional resources should be further extended and developed in order to include also ecosystem-scale resources. New research on the global institution building process is not only possible, but may represent a fundamental help for the building itself of both robust and successful institutions. This is a great challenge for CPR-students. Will we be able to confront it?

At a meeting the future of the now established European network was discussed, in the presence of Michelle Curtain. The European branch meeting was attended by 25 people. Several possible initiatives were mentioned, among others the organisation of another European meeting either in 2007 or 2009. One organisation

showed interest in organising the biennial meeting in 2008 in Europe, which was an explicit request of the IASCP-council. No explicit institutional structure was set-up to organise future activities of the European Branch of the IASCP, but clearly a healthy basis for further intensive cooperation among commons-researchers within Europe, and among those working on European commons has been laid by the conference in Brescia.

For the time being, the conference website <http://iascpeurope.eco.unibs.it/> will continue to act as a virtual meeting point for the European scholars and practitioners of the commons. On a non-regular and informal basis messages are sent to the participants of the conference and others by the former conference organisers. If you feel like making use of this possibility, send us your messages and requests.

tine.Demoor@let.uu.nl

gbravo@eco.unibs.it

## CPR FORUM Europe Regional Report

### The State of the Commons in Europe

**Audun Sandberg**

**Bodo University College, Norway**

During the IASCP Europe Regional Meeting in Brescia, Italy 23-25 March, the Commons of Europe received a thorough coverage by scholars from a large number of European countries. Not since the International IASCP Conference in Bodø in 1995, has such a variety of European Commons been discussed by scientists and resource managers. The conference participants could enjoy timely updates on the contemporary governing challenges for the century old grazing commons of England (Adrian Walters, John Goodacre) and for the modernizing alpine pastures (*Agrargesellschaft*) of Austria (Elisabeth Johann). In addition, the conference brought the attention to a number of new aspects of European Commons hitherto not well known to the IASCP network. These included as diverse commons as the reemerging village commons of the Vrancea Mountains of Romania (Liviu Mantescu and Monica Vasile), the deterioration of the collective irrigation systems of Bulgaria (Insa Theesfeld), the revival of the “Collective

Alps” in the alpine region of Germany (Anne Gueydon) and the surviving commons of Navarra (Jose Miguel, Lana Bersain).

The big question in face of this growing complexity in the development of European Commons is whether this many-faceted picture mirrors the reality concerning commons in Europe today, or whether there are distinct directions in the contemporary development of commons. These questions were debated in a round table discussion on “The state of the Commons in Europe” on the last day of the conference. Here various conclusions to this question were presented: One was the view that in contemporary Europe overuse of a commons’ resources is not the only threat to the survival of a commons. Analytically, the underuse – and the human neglect and lack of maintenance should be viewed as an equal threat to most European commons. Another view was the more confident view that as long as the crucial institutions were in place – in the form of laws and codified rules, a commons will tend to survive – no matter what humans users or their livestock does. Nature has its own management mechanisms and thus an underused pasture commons will in most cases revert to forest and become a forest commons. If the rules have foreseen this, it is only the harvesting operation rules that have to be changed from one commons item (forage) to another (wood and timber). However, it was agreed that this is an area where more of the European Commons research should be directed in future years; of particular interest will here be the future development in the mountainous part of former communist European states.

Related to this broader issue of European Commons are two areas which will represent challenges to Commons Property researchers in the years to come. One is the larger “political commons” of Europe, the “Common Fisheries Policy” – with its Common Pond



– “the Common Agricultural Policy” and the “Common Environmental Policy.” These are also basically institutional arrangements – although at a macro-scale, with the same threats survival and legitimacy as the smaller and more local commons. This they can be analyzed with the same tools of institutional analysis. Here there were no contributions at this conference, but the issues ought to be addressed by commons researchers at future IASCP conferences.

The other area that in the future should be seen in connection with development of commons in Europe in general, are the indigenous questions of Europe, and especially those related to the High North of Europe. One paper was presented on this issue, showing how ancient indigenous nomadic pasture rights could be institutionalized in modern times as a collective local and indigenous right anchored in a new constitutional construction, to whom a state transfers its property rights (Audun Sandberg). Theoretically this is also relevant for comparisons with the development of local governing rights in particular regions in post-communist countries in Eastern and Central Europe. But it also remains a challenge for IASCP researchers to follow closely the processes of land and water claims of the Sámi of Sweden, Finland and Russia, as well as the subsequent processes for the other northern peoples of “Russia”, the Samoyeds and the Nenetsian.

Audun.Sandberg@hibo.no

## CPR FORUM Europe Regional Report

### Central and Eastern European Commons

**Thomas Sikor**

**Humboldt University, Berlin**

I want to take the liberty and present a rather polemical commentary on the nature of academic and policy debates about Central and Eastern European (CEE) commons. My comments are informed by my knowledge of the scant literature on the topic. They are restricted to rural resource management, as I cannot claim any knowledge of other fields. Nevertheless, I hope that they will help readers put the presentations at the Brescia conference in perspective and appreciate

their contributions to an understanding of commons in the region.

I want to describe three narratives permeating discussions of commons in CEE. My account of the narratives will be highly stylized for reasons of simplicity. These narratives are commonly found in writings on commons in the region. Yet they are not confined to debates about commons in CEE. I believe that the narratives – and what I derive from them – are more generally found in discussions of commons.

The first narrative deplores a general absence of commons in CEE. In fact, in this narrative, commons have been absent from the region for five decades or so. Communism is the culprit, because the collectivization of agriculture and state management of forests in the 1950s eradicated long-standing traditions of common management. In this view, the challenge is now to recover lost traditions and protect those from further intervention by states in CEE. This is a view that is found not only among common people but also scholars in the region.

The second narrative also observes a lack of commons in CEE. In contrast to the first view, this narrative locates the decline of common management in much more recent times. Capitalism is the one to blame, because it erased all forms of collective management in the region. The advent of capitalism in the 1990s put an end not only to collective forms of cultivation but also to common management of pastures, irrigation systems, and other ‘common-pool resources’. In this view, the solution is now to preserve certain collective elements of socialist agriculture and forestry that, in hindsight, prove superior to their capitalist equivalents. This perspective is widespread among rural people in CEE but not very popular among scholars in the region. Western scholars seem to be more sympathetic to this narrative.

Just as the first two, the third narrative notes the scarcity of commons in CEE. Yet it does not locate the causes in socialism or capitalism but in the design of the property reforms implemented across the region after 1990. Privatization has dominated the agenda of politicians, government officials, and international advisors in the region. They have enacted, implemented, and support policies that privatize all land and other assets previously under the control of socialist cooperatives, state farms, and – to some extent – state forest enterprises. In this view, regional politicians and government officials need

to promote commons by allowing rural people to acquire land and other assets jointly. Privatization should not only allow individuals to gain new ownership rights but also afford the same possibility to groups. This narrative is seen with some doubt by people and experts in the region. Nevertheless, it finds strong support among international advisors.

These narratives are obviously different from each other. I would even suggest that they are incompatible with each other. They are incompatible because they are grounded in different underlying notions of commons. The first narrative understands commons as a form of resource management undertaken by communities separate from the state. The second narrative holds a diametrically opposed view of commons, recognizing the state as the key forum for collective action. It does not separate between state and communities as the first perspective. The third perspective, finally, defines commons as a form of group ownership. In this narrative, commons are after all not that different from private ownership and management.

The papers presented at the conference deserve credit for discussing concrete cases of commons. Their findings question the general validity of the three narratives commonly found in academic and policy debates. They not only attest to the existence of commons in CEE, but also suggest the value of research being informed by the three perspectives – and engaging them.

Central and Eastern Europe, I believe, provides fertile grounds to examine different notions of commons, which I have barely touched here. As for the region, I hope that scholars will continue to engage and develop all three perspectives by way of empirical research on concrete commons. Beyond the region, I think it is important to recognize the different perspectives and use them for more theoretical inquiries into the nature of commons and their relations with different societal models. This, perhaps, could be a special contribution that research in CEE could make to research on commons.

thomas.sikor@rz.hu-berlin.de

www.agrar.hu-berlin.de/wisola/ipw/plr

## CPR FORUM Europe Regional Report

### **Cows grazing on Ever Green Knowledge Meadows?**

**Tom Dedeurwaerdere**

**Université catholique de Louvain, Belgium**

In the realm of the knowledge commons, one sees cows grazing on ever green knowledge meadows. Upon close inspection, one discovers that the more they are grazing, the faster the wealth of knowledge is growing. For the unacquainted visitor this seems to be the commons paradise ! However, tragedy is looming also. The tragedy of these ever green meadows is not that the cows graze too much, but that they do not graze enough. Why would the cows invest time in grazing “the deep knowledge web” lying under the surface of the grass? What to do with the digital fence that encloses some of the more productive parts? Interlinking the patchwork of knowledge meadows would open an even brighter future for them, but how to decide upon the best way forward?

As this popular story now goes, since Michael Heller and Rebecca Eisenberg’s seminal article, in the case of knowledge, the tragedy of the commons has been turned upside down into a so-called anti-commons. By enclosing bits of knowledge and information through excessive use of intellectual property rights and technological fences, a wealth of knowledge is out there but under-used. Of course, this statement needs some more flesh to be made hard and probably the anti-commons is only a part of the story. However, it raises some important problems that ring a bell in the IASCP community and build ground for fruitful exchange: how to build institutions for open access in cases where neither enclosure, nor pure public domain seems to be the way forward? How to organize rapid diffusion of new research results? And how to deal with problems of congestion and limited resources in the organization of the flow of ideas in the knowledge communities?

In the Brescia meeting, we dug deeper into these questions of institutional design for knowledge sharing. In particular, we explored some specific fields at the forefront of the development of the knowledge commons such as the scholarly information commons, the micro-biological commons and the open software commons.

# CPR FORUM

## Europe Regional Report

### Predictions about European Commons

**Doug Wilson**

**Research Director, Institute for Fisheries Management and Coastal Community Development, Denmark**

Like everyone else, the perspective that I brought to “Building the European Commons: from Open Fields to Open Source” reflects my own experience in commons research. I work in fisheries management. Fishing in Europe is an “old commons” in the sense of having been created around a traditional common pool natural resource. In contrast to other old commons, though, fishing is a very large commons, in both space and the number of commoners, and many of these commoners are powerful business concerns.

The Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) as it is called is an “exclusive competence” of the European Union (EU) meaning that all decisions are taken at the level of the Union. This is one of the few policy areas where such a significant amount of power has been granted to the EU, making fisheries important in the overall formation of the Union. For example, when France was recently ordered to pay a fine for ignoring a court order to comply with fishing rules, and to continue to pay it until it did comply, it was the first time that the court had ever fined a member state for disobeying a past ruling and imposed a periodic penalty payment.

The CFP is not only politically important within the overall effort to build a new kind of polity in Europe; it is also failing to do a very good job of maintaining sustainable fish stocks. Fisheries scientists tell us that, in 2003, 22% of the fish caught from stocks managed by the CFP were taken from stocks that were smaller than they should have been for sustainable fishing. Neither scientists, fishers, government agencies nor marine conservation groups are happy with the CFP and there are myriad attempts to reform it. These reforms include better policing, better data gathering, a reduction in perverse subsidies to the fishing industry and, finally 30 years after most other fisheries management agencies had moved beyond top-down management, some serious attempts at stakeholder involvement.

With this commons management milieu as background, and having listened for the past three days to my col-

What characterizes these initiatives is that knowledge providers commit themselves to building interoperable global digital libraries – with the goal to obtain higher joint benefits and to reduce their joint harm from the enclosure process. For instance, within the field of scholarly information there is an exponential growth of so-called institutional repositories, which are institutional databases of E-prints, with giants such as BioMedCentral with more than 494162 entries or the University of Amsterdam with over 138455 entries. At the workshop, Charlotte Hess illustrated aptly this growth by showing how a simple count of the institutional repositories on the Registry of Open Access Repositories showed that their number had doubled between the 1<sup>st</sup> of March 2006 and the 20<sup>th</sup> of March 2006: from 145 in Europe and 98 in the USA to 282 in Europe and 178 in the USA in 20 days. At this rate of change, it will become difficult for commons scholars to follow and to get a grip on what’s happening!

To conclude, I would like to raise a note of concern. Sometimes, one has the impression that creating a technical means or a legal license format furthering open access is sufficient to qualify and to become a member of the knowledge commons galaxy. However, the organization of the knowledge commons is not just a technical or a legal issue. It depends on the way that the communities take advantage of the legal and technical rules to design their own governance arrangements. Hence for evaluating these different cases, we will have to specify the particular context, the institutional frameworks and the type of collective action that is required to solve provision and use dilemmas. To deal with these different questions, the IASCP legacy of studying governance as a way through which communities organize and govern themselves through the design of operational and collective choice rule will surely be an important source of inspiration.

dedeurwaerdere@cpdr.ucl.ac.be



***Design the logo!***

For the new *International Journal of the Commons*

Details on page 14

leagues talking about other form of commons management in Europe, I would like to make the following predictions about European commons:

1. We are going to see more *multiple-stakeholder cooperative management arrangements*. The driving force for these arrangements will be complexity. On complex commons multiple user groups are carrying out multiple interacting uses. Commons management, at least in the environmental field, is also being heavily influenced by demands for ecosystem-based approaches. The trend towards mimicking private property rights, the so-called market-based solutions, will continue both because of fierce ideological support and because they do solve a number of practical problems, but this overall complexity will make simple privatization arrangements attractive only in the context of wider participatory structures.

2. We are going to see highly *participatory ways of addressing uncertainty*. Commons management is constantly struggling with limits on knowledge about the true condition of the commons and the real behavior of the commoners. Only cooperation among user groups and other actors concerned with commons management will make effective management institutions possible in the midst of this uncertainty. Stakeholders must learn to share their knowledge in transparent ways if commons management is to succeed.

3. We are going to see *government agencies at multiple levels acting as stakeholders* in commons decision making. The nation-state has traditionally been the important decision making level. But now, while Europe is growing in importance, so also are sub-national and even municipal level governments. Cross-scale institutional linkages reflect the growing complexity and uncertainty and the ways that different agendas and priorities operate on various scales. Commons are often large scale and even global, while the monitoring of behavior happens at the local level, and the enforcement of rules is often a national responsibility. Related economic development agendas are increasingly the concern of sub-national governments. NGOs concerned with Europe-level policies form temporary alliances with community groups and local governments. Public body stakeholders have a special role in providing legitimacy for decisions, participatory balance in decision making, and knowledge services at many levels in response to various values and agendas. The forms that the design

principle of “minimal recognition” can take may need to be rethought as many kinds of recognition emerge.

One of the things that surprised me at this meeting was the degree to which the same issues of complexity, uncertainty and cross-scale linkages are emerging in the in almost all of the “new commons” that my colleagues were describing. Indeed it striking in this meeting how much from a policy perspective the new commons resemble the old ones.

dw@ifm.dk

## CPR FORUM Europe Regional Report

### **Reflections about European and non European commons, from an American perspective**

**Leticia Merino**

**Universidad Nacional Autonoma de Mexico**

I have tried to organize a general comparison of European and non European commons, following four main general themes addressed by many of the papers presented in the conference:

- the understanding of what private property is and the historical weight of private property,
- the historical important of the state in the management of the commons versus their management by local communities,
- the processes of decentralization and or devolution of rights over territories and natural resources.

Different presentations showed that the understanding of private property is far more complex in many places in Europe than it is today in most of the Americas, where private property rights tend to be understood as absolute. In the American ideology of private property, the owner rights tend to be the only visible or considered legitimate, to the point that in some countries private property can be legally defended with arms. In contrast different presentations discussed the presence of commons (defined by their exclusivity and rivalry) and rights of commoners to use the commons within private lands, as show the cases of the Sami's rights to grass their



reindeers in lands owned by others, or the “private commons” of Wales and England.

A second main theme of contrast is that of the role of the State and the sense of the state intervention in the management of the commons. In this sense there are important differences among countries which have a colonial past from does without this historical experience. In the Americas most of the pre-colonial institutions disappear after the conquest and the demographic tragedy that followed the Europeans arrival to the continent and claimed the lives of nearly 90% of the population of those days (due to their lack of immunological response to the crowd diseases brought from Europe). In Spanish America during the XVI, XVII and

XVIII centuries, communities property institutions were, at a large extent a result of colonial policy: indigenous was then a juridical definition based on ethnicity: Indigenous were prohibited to dress as Europeans, to have professions, they could either be ordered as priests, or have private property. Collective property, as community property was the only type of property that the colonial State recognized to indigenous, or “naturals”,

as they were called. Communities had also other meanings for indigenous population, becoming and institution of defense and resistance that allowed the social and political survival of local populations.

The emergence of post-colonial States produced a move, similar to the appearance of the modern State in Western Europe, in the centralization effort and search of social homogenization. Parallel to the imposition of central governments and of ethnic majorities as bearers of nationalities during the XVII and XIX centuries, National post-colonial States in the Americas in the XIX and XX Century, intended to nullify or deny diversity. Institutions that did not fit in the Western pattern of society, such as collective property was seen as anachronistic or retarded. Consequently private and public properties were seen as the only two possible types of property. Local communities both in Europe and the Americas lost vast territories and rights.



*Brescia Farewell Party Photo: Karel Vancura*

The imposition of centralized State management of the Commons (common pool resources) has proved to be mostly a failure in different parts of the industrialized and non industrialized world, of which socialist regimes in Eastern Europe are extreme examples. Various presentations in the European conference 2006, showed the costs of this policies in Transylvania, Vlachia, Bulgaria: the destruction of local institutions and social capital imperative for sustained management of the commons. While documenting losses and difficulties these papers pose a fundamental question: that of the institutional development needed to manage the commons in a “post-centralization” context.

The last theme of reflection and comparison is that of contemporary decentralization and “devolution” processes taking place in the non industrialized work, including Latin America, and in Eastern Europe. Experiences in different Latin American countries, and some exposed in the conference show to main results: the need of local management of

fragile ecological systems. These are systems as the Artic Ocean, the Antarctica, the global climate, the boreal and tropical forests, biological diversity, that provide goods and services key for human societies. They can be thought as common or public *resources*, in terms of difficulties of exclusion. In policy terms the paradox is that they present appropriation problems that need to be addressed globally and locally, and provision needs that are mostly met locally.

The recognition of these needs, have led in some cases to the recognition of the role, need, and value of the local, the need to provide incentives and recognize local rights, not only use rights but also rights of local governance of the commons. These tendencies to strengthen the local have been more evident in forestry and conservation in the non-industrialized world— Bolivia, Central America, Mexico, Kenya, Uganda — but are also present in the United Kingdom and Norway.

Seen from a “non-European” perspective, local democracy and strength of local culture appear to be more vivid in Western Europe than in many places of the World, but devolution is also needed and is also happening in some European settings. However, in the context of weak democracies, devolution and decentralization moves face the risk of becoming “centralized waves of decentralization”. A key element of the agenda of international development agencies imposed on non industrialized countries, regardless local conditions, is decentralized control of natural resources. Given the differences in local conditions, there is a need to see policies as experiments suited for each particular context. Devolution/decentralization need to be based on nested institutions, cooperative management, multi-stakeholders arrangements and cooperation and cross scale schemes. These appear more feasible in Europe than in countries with a colonial past and fractured societies (there are similarities among Eastern European, the European periphery, and Latin America), because of the similar impacts of decades of authoritarian bureaucratic States, poor social capital, and risks of Elite capture.

Importantly, democracy cannot be imposed: when imposed upon others, success does not always follow. Thus, there is a paradox to “imposed” decentralization and devolution.

In conclusion, I found there is a usefulness of comparative studies; not only do the differences become highlighted, but similarities among seemingly unrelated areas (e.g., Eastern Europe and Latin America) can help in strengthening our understanding of the conditions required for successful resource management.

Imerino@servidor.unam.mx



## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

**Charlotte Hess**

hess@indiana.edu

### Books

- Aw, D.**, and G. Diemer. 2005. *Making a Large Irrigation Scheme Work: A Case Study from Mali*. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Biermann, F.**, and S. Bauer. 2005. *A World Environment Organization: Solution or Threat for Effective International Environmental Governance?* Aldershot, England: Ashgate.
- Bousquet, F.**, G. Trebuil, and B. Hardy, eds. 2005. *Companion Modeling and Multi-Agent Systems for Integrated Natural Resource Management in Asia*. Manila, Philippines: International Rice Research Institute.
- Brara, R.** 2006. *Shifting Landscape: The Making and Remaking of Village Commons in India*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bray, D. B.**, L. Merino, and D. Barry, eds. 2005. *The Community Forests of Mexico: Managing for Sustainable Landscapes*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Brouwer, F.**, ed. 2004. *Sustaining Agriculture and the Rural Environment: Governance, Policy and Multi-Functionality*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Demange, G.**, and M. Wooders, eds. 2005. *Group Formation in Economics: Networks, Clubs and Coalitions*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ebbin S. A.**, A. H. Hoel, and A. K. Sydnes, eds. 2005. *A Sea Change: The Exclusive Economic Zone and Governance Institutions for Living Marine Resources*. Norwell, MA: Springer.
- Eggers, J.** 2005. *Dezentralisierung der Agrarumweltmaßnahmen in der Europäischen Agrarpolitik: Hemmnisse eines Institutionellen Wandels*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag.
- Forest Policy and Economics**. Volume 8, Issue 4, Pages 339-498 (June 2006) Special Issue on “Community-based Forestry in the Developing World: Analyses from an Agrarian Perspective.” Ed. T. Sikor
- Gibson, J.** 2005. *Community Resources: Intellectual Property, International Trade and Protection of Traditional Knowledge*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Hidayat, A.** 2005. *Institutional Analysis of Coral Reef Management: A Case Study of Gili Indah Village, West Lombok, Indonesia*. Aachen: Shaker Verlag
- Huber, M. T.** 2005. *The Advancement of Learning: Building the Teaching Commons*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Joyner, C. C.** 2005. *International Law in the 21st Century: Rules for Global Governance*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. .
- Koniodos, S. M.**, ed. 2005. *Networks, Trust, and Social Capital: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations from Europe*. Burlington, VA: Ashgate.
- Luna, M. P.**, O. J. Lynch, and C. Mercado, eds. 2004. *Rural Communities and Philippine Forests: Cases and Insights on Law and Natural Resources*. Quezon City, Philippines: Tanggol Kalikasan.
- Mason, Michael.** 2005. *The New Accountability: Environmental Responsibility across Borders*. Stirling, VA: Earthscan.
- Merino, L.**, and J. Robson, eds. 2005. *Managing the Commons. 4 Volumes*. Mexico: Consejo Civil Mexicano para la Silvicultura Sostenible A.C. et al.
- Mitchell, H. C.** 2005. *The Intellectual Commons: Toward an Ecology of Intellectual Property*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Moran, E. F.** 2006. *People and Nature: An Introduction to Human Ecological Relations*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Rudolph, M.** 2005. *Agrarstrukturpolitik im Vereinten Deutschland: Eine Analyse der Gemeinschaftsaufgabe ‘Verbesserung der Agrarstruktur und des Küstenschutzes’ im Lichte der Neuen Politischen Ökonomie*. Aachen, Germany: Shaker Verlag.

- Ryan, C.**, and M. Aicken, eds. 2005. *Indigenous Tourism: The Commodification and Management of Culture*. San Deigo, CA: Elsevier.
- Summer, J.** 2005. *Sustainability and the Civil Common: Rural Communities in the Age of Globalization*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Thomson, J.**, ed. 2004. *Mali, Botswana, Namibia, and Malawi: Institutional Aspects of Renewable Natural Resources Governance and Management through Special Districts*. Burlington, VT: ARD-BioFor IQC Consortium.
- Tilly, C.** 2005. *Trust and Rule*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Walters, C. J., and S. J. D. Martell. 2004. *Fisheries Ecology and Management*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Wang, N.** 2005. *Making a Market Economy: The Institutional Transformation of a Freshwater Fishery in a Chinese Community*. New York: Routledge.

### Articles

- Agrawal, A.**, and E. Ostrom. 2006. "Political Science and Conservation Biology: A Dialog of the Deaf." *Conservation Biology* 20:681-682.
- Arce M., D. G.**, and L. Beth Gunn 2005. "Working Well with Others: The Evolution of Teamwork and Ethics." *Public Choice* 123:115-131.
- Astle, J.** 2005. "Between the Market and the Commons: Ensuring the Right to Water in Rural Communities." *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* 33:585-608.
- Aswani, S.**, and M. Lauer. 2006. "Incorporating Fishermen's Local Knowledge and Behavior into Geographical Information Systems (GIS) for Designing Marine Protected Areas in Oceania." *Human Organization* 65:81-102.
- Auer, M.** 2006. "Contexts, Multiple Methods, and Values in the Study of Common-Pool Resources." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25:215-228.
- Auer, M.**, C. Karr-Colque, J. McAlpine, and B. Doench. 2005. "Forest Law Enforcement and Governance: Resolve Needed from All Sides." *The Georgetown Public Policy Review* 11:57-67.
- Baird, I.** 2006. "Strength in Diversity: Fish Sanctuaries and Deep-Water Pools in Lao PDR." *Fisheries Management and Ecology*, 2006, 13, 1-8.
- Banerjee, S. G.**, J. M. Oetzel, and R. Ranganathan. 2006. "Private Provision of Infrastructure in Emerging Markets: Do Institutions Matter?" *Development Policy Review* 24:175-202.
- Behan, J.**, K. McQuinn, and M. J. Roche. 2006. "Rural Land Use: Traditional Agriculture or Forestry?" *Land Economics* 82:112-123.
- Berge, E.** 2006. "Protected Areas and Traditional Commons: Values and Institutions." *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift* 60:65-76.
- Bisack, K. D.**, and J. G. Sutinen. 2006. "Harbor Porpoise Bycatch: ITQs or Time/Area Closures in the New England Gillnet Fishery." *Land Economics* 82:85-102.
- Bizer, K.** 2005. "The Institutional Framework of Land-Use Decisions." *Land Degradation and Development* 16:561-568.
- Bray, D. B.**, and P. Klepeis. 2005. "Deforestation, Forest Transitions, and Institutions for Sustainability in Southeastern Mexico, 1900-2000." *Environment and History* 11:195-223.
- Brockington, D.** 2004. "Community Conservation, Inequality and Injustice: Myths of Power in Protected Area Management." *Conservation and Society* 2:411-432.
- Brown, K. M.** 2006. "The Role of Moral Values in Contemporary Common Property Enactment." *Norsk Geografisk Tidsskrift* 60:89-99.
- Calatrava, J.**, and A. Garrido. 2006. "Difficulties in Adopting Formal Water Trading Rules within Users' Associations." *Journal of Economic Issues* 40:27-44.
- Campana, M. E.** 2005. "Transboundary Ground Water: Forward." *Ground Water* 43:646-652.
- Chauhan, M.** 2006. "Contending Water Uses: Biodiversity vs. Irrigation: Case of Keoladeo National Park." *Economic and Political Weekly* 41:575-580.
- Chiarolla, C.** 2006. "Commodifying Agricultural Biodiversity and Development-Related Issues." *The Journal of World Intellectual Property* 9:25-60.
- Close, C. H.**, and G. B. Hall. 2006. "A GIS-Based Protocol for the Collection and Use of Local Knowledge in Fisheries Management Planning." *Journal of Environmental Management* 78:341-352.
- Cookson, R.** 2000. "Framing Effects in Public Goods Experiments." *Experimental Economics* 3:55-79.
- Crawford, T.**, and R. Wilson. 2005. "Multi-scale Analysis of Collaborative National Forest Planning Contexts in the Rural US Mountain West." *Population and Environment* 26:397-426.
- Crenshaw, E. M.**, and K. K. Robison. 2006. "Globalization and the Digital Divide: The Roles of Structural Conduciveness and Global Connection in Internet Diffusion." *Social Science Quarterly* 87:190-205.
- Dal Bó, P.** 2005. "Cooperation Under the Shadow of the Future: Experimental Evidence from Infinitely Repeated Games." *The American Economic Review* 95:1591-1604.
- Danielsen, F.** et al. 2005. "Does Monitoring Matter? A Quantitative Assessment of Management Decisions from Locally- Based Monitoring of Protected Areas." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2633-2652.
- Dasgupta, P.** 2005. "The Economics of Social Capital." *The Economic Record* 81:S2-S21.
- DeSombre, E. R.** 2005. "Fishing under Flags of Convenience: Using Market Power to Increase Participation in International Regulation." *Global Environmental Politics* 5:73-94.
- Dimitrov, R. S.** 2005. "Hostage to Norms: States, Institutions and Global Forest Politics." *Global Environmental Politics* 5:1-24.
- Eccarius-Kelly, V.** 2006. "Guatemalan Women's Cooperatives and State Neglect." *Peace Review* 18:37-43.
- Eckstein, Y.**, and G. E. Eckstein. 2005. "Transboundary Aquifers: Conceptual Models for Development of International Law." *Ground Water* 43:679-690.
- Elkin, S. L.** 2004. "After Madison: Public-Spiritedness and Local Political Life." *Perspectives on Political Science* 33:79- 87.
- Ellis, C. J.**, and A. Van Den Nouweland. 2006. "A Mechanism for Inducing Cooperation in Noncooperative Environments: Theory and Applications." *Journal of Public Economic Theory* 8:23-47.
- Eshuis, J.**, and M. Stuiver. 2005. "Learning in Context through Conflict and Alignment : Farmers and Scientists in Search of Sustainable Agriculture." *Agriculture and Human Values* 2005:137-148.
- Etter, A.** et al. 2006. "Regional Patterns of Agricultural Land Use and Deforestation in Colombia." *Agricultural Ecosystems and Environment* 114:369-386.
- Fay, D.** 2005. "Kinship and Access to Land in the Eastern Cape: Implications for Land Tenure Reform." *Social Dynamics* 31: 182-207.
- Fehr, E.**, and J. Tyran. 2005. "Individual Irrationality and Aggregate Outcomes." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives* 19:43-66.
- Fernando, P.** et al. 2005. "Perceptions and Patterns of Human-Elephant Conflict in Old and New Settlements in Sri Lanka: Insights for Mitigation and Management." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2465-2481.
- Finus, M.**, J. Altamirano-Cabrera, and E. C. Van Ierland. 2005. "The Effect of Membership Rules and Voting Schemes on the Success of International Climate Agreements." *Public Choice* 125:95-127.
- Fisher, M.**, G. E. Shively, and S. Buccola. 2005. "Activity Choice, Labor Allocation, and Forest Use in Malawi." *Land Economics* 81:503-517.
- Fitzpatrick, D.** 2006. "Evolution and Chaos in Property Rights Systems: The Third World Tragedy of Contested Access." *Yale Law Journal* 115:996-1049.
- Francis, M.** 2005. "Trade and the Enforcement of Environmental Property Rights." *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development* 14:281-298.
- Gatzweiler, F. W.** 2005. "Institutionalising Biodiversity Conservation: The Case of Ethiopian Coffee Forests." *Conservation and Society* 3:201-223.

- Ghate, R.,** and H. Nagendra. 2005. "Role of Monitoring in Institutional Performance: Forest Management in Maharashtra, India." *Conservation & Society* 3:509-532.
- Godoy, R.** et al. 2005. "The Effect of Market Economies on the Well-Being of Indigenous Peoples and on Their Use of Renewable Natural Resources." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:121-138.
- Grafton, R. Q.** 2005. "Comment on What Restoration Schemes Can Do: Or, Getting It Right Without Fisheries Transferable Quotas." *Ocean Development and International Law* 36:375-379.
- Hafer, C.** 2006. "On the Origins of Property Rights: Conflict and Production in the State of Nature." *The Review of Economic Studies* 73:119-143.
- Hagos, F.,** and S. Holden 2006. "Tenure Security, Resource Poverty, Public Programs, and Household Plot-Level Conservation Investments in the Highlands of Northern Ethiopia." *Agricultural Economics* 34:183-196.
- Hannesson, R.,** and J. Kennedy. 2005. "Landing Fees Versus Fishing Quotas." *Land Economics* 81:518-529.
- Hart, G.,** and N. L. Peluso. 2005. "Revisiting 'Rural' Java: Agrarian Research in the Wake of Reformasi: A Review Essay Jan Breman and Gunawan Wiradi, Good Times and Bad Times in Rural Java." *Indonesia* 80:177-196.
- Hasan, A.** 2005. "The Political and Institutional Blockages to Good Governance: The Case of the Lyari Expressway in Karachi." *Environment and Urbanization* 17:127-142.
- Hausken, K.** 2005. "Production and Conflict Models Versus Rent-Seeking Models." *Public Choice* 123:59-93.
- Herrmann, T.** 2006. "Indigenous Knowledge and Management of Araucaria Araucana Forest in the Chilean Andes: Implications for Native Forest Conservation." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 15:647-662.
- Hjortso, C. N.,** S. M. Christensen, and P. Tarp. 2005. "Rapid Stakeholder and Conflict Assessment for Natural Resource Management Using Cognitive Mapping: The Case of Damdoi Forest Enterprise, Vietnam." *Agriculture and Human Values* 22:149-167.
- Hockley, N. J.** et al. 2005. "When Should Communities and Conservationists Monitor Exploited Resources?" *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2795-2806.
- Holman, J.,** and M. A. McGregor. 2005. "The Internet as Commons: The Issue of Access." *Communication Law and Policy* 10:267-288.
- Imeson, R.J.,** and J.C.J.M. van den Bergh. 2006. "Policy Failure and Stakeholder Dissatisfaction in Complex Ecosystem Management: The Case of the Dutch Wadden Sea Shellfishery." *Ecological Economics* 56:488-507.
- Jackson, J. E.,** and K. B. Warren. 2005. "Indigenous Movements in Latin America, 1992-2004: Controversies, Ironies, New Directions." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:549-573.
- Janssen, M. A.,** H. Goosen, and N. Omtzigt. 2005. "A Simple Mediation and Negotiation Support Tool for Water Management in the Netherlands." *Landscape and Urban Planning*
- Janssen, M.,** and E. Ostrom. 2006. "Resilience, Vulnerability and Adaptation." *IHDP Update* 1:10-11.
- Jonsson, A.** 2005. "Public Participation in Water Resources Management: Stakeholder Voices on Degree, Scale, Potential, and Methods in Future Water Management." *Ambio* 37:495-500.
- Kemp, T.** 2006. "Of Transactions and Transaction Costs: Uncertainty, Policy, and the Process of Law in the Thought of Commons and Williamson." *Journal of Economic Issues* 40:45-58.
- Kidane, H.,** Z. G. Alemu, and G. Kundhlande 2005. "Causes of household food insecurity in Koredegaga Peasant Association, Oromiya Zone, Ethiopia." *Agrekon* 44:543-560.
- Kurian, M.,** T. Dietz, and K.S. Murali. 2005. "Rule Compliance in Participatory Watershed Management: Is it a Sufficient Guarantee of Sustainable Rural Livelihoods?" *Conservation and Society* 3:43-71.
- Layzer, J.** 2006. "Fish Stories: Science, Advocacy, and Public Change in New England Fishery Management." *Policy Studies Journal* 34:59-80.
- Leach, W. D.,** and P. A. Sabatier. 2005. "To Trust an Adversary: Integrating Rational and Psychological Models of Collaborative Policymaking." *American Political Science Review* 99:491-503.
- Lenka-Bula, P.** 2005. "The Social and Ethical Implications of Article 27 of the Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) on African Communities, Biodiversity and Indigenous Knowledge." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa* 122:36-58.
- lópez-Ridaura, S.,** H. Van. Keulen, M. K. van Ittersum, and P. A. Leffelaar. 2005. "Multiscale Methodological Framework to Derive Criteria and Indicators for Sustainability Evaluation of Peasant Natural Resource Management Systems." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:51-69.
- Luoga, E. J.,** E. T. F. Witkowski, and K. Balkwill. 2005. "Land Cover and Use Changes in Relation to the Institutional Framework and Tenure of Land and Resources in Eastern Tanzania Miombo Woodlands." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:71-93.
- Mackendrick, N. A.** 2005. "The Role of the State in Voluntary Environmental Reform: A Case Study of Public Land." *Journal of Society for the Policy Sciences* 38:21-44.
- Marsland, R.** 2006. "Community Participation the Tanzanian Way: Conceptual Contiguity or Power Struggle." *Oxford Development Studies* 34:65-79.
- Matthews, O. P.** 2005. "Ground Water Rights, Spatial Variation, and Transboundary Conflicts." *Ground Water* 43:691-699.
- Mburu, J.,** and E. Wale. 2006. "Local Organizations Involved in the Conservation of Crop Genetic Resources: Conditions for their Emergence and Success in Ethiopia and Kenya." *Genetic Resources and Crop Evolution* 53:613-629.
- McAllister, R. R. J.,** I. J. Gordon, M. A. Janssen, and N. Abel. 2006. "Pastoralists' Responses to Variation of Rangeland Resources in Time and Space." *Ecological Applications* 16:572-583.
- McCarthy, J.** 2006. "Neoliberalism and the Politics of Alternatives: Community Forestry in British Columbia and the United States." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 96:84-104.
- McConnell, W. J.,** and S. P. Sweeney. 2005. "Challenges of Forest Governance in Madagascar." *Geographical Journal* 171:223-238.
- Menzies, N. K.** 2004. "Communities and Their Partners: Governance and Community-Based Forest Management." *Conservation and Society* 2:449-456.
- Messina, J. P.,** S. J. Walsh, C. F. Mena, and P. L. Delamater. 2006. "Land Tenure and Deforestation Patterns in the Ecuadorian Amazon: Conflicts in Land Conservation in Frontier Settings." *Applied Geography* 26:113-128.
- Michalski, F.,** R. L. P. Boulhosa, and C. A. Peres. 2006. "Human-Wildlife Conflicts in a Fragmented Amazonian Forest Landscape: Determinants of Large Felid Depredation on Livestock." *Animal Conservation* 9:179-188.
- Miller, R. P.,** and P. K. R. Nair. 2006. "Indigenous Agroforestry Systems in Amazonia: From Prehistory to Today." *Agroforestry Systems* 66:151-164.
- Mohan R.,** K. Raja, M. S. Manikandan, and W. L. Filho. 2005. "An Overview of the Impacts of Changes in Common Property Resources Management in the Context of Globalisation: A Case Study of India." *International Journal for Sustainable Development & World Ecology* 12:471-478.

- Munda, G.** 2005. "Measuring Sustainability": A Multi-Criterion Framework." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:117-134.
- Nagendra, H., B. Karna, and M. Karmacharya.** 2005. "Examining Institutional Change: Social Conflict in Nepal's Leasehold Forestry Programme." *Conservation and Society* 3:72-91.
- Noss, A. J., I. Oetting, and R. Cuéllar.** 2005. "Hunter Self-Monitoring by the Isoseno-Guarani in the Bolivian Chaco." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2679-2693.
- Olivera, M.** 2005. "Subordination and Rebellion: Indigenous Peasant Women in Chiapas Ten Years after the Zapatista Uprising." *Journal of Peasant Studies* 32:608-628.
- Perez, S. G., C. Aramburu, and J. Bremner.** 2005. "Population, Land Use and Deforestation in the Pan Amazon Basin: A Comparison of Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru and Venezuela." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:23-49.
- Raymond, L.** 2006. "Cooperation without Trust: Overcoming Collective Action Barriers to Endangered Species Protection." *Policy Studies Journal* 34:37-57.
- Reed, E. D.** 2006. "Property Rights, Genes, and the Common Good." *Journal of Religious Ethics* 34:41-67.
- Richards, P.** 2006. "The Politics of Difference and Women's Rights; Lessons from Pobladoras and Mapuche Women in Chile." *Social Politics* 13:1-29.
- Richardson, C. J.** 2005. "The Loss of Property Rights and the Collapse of Zimbabwe." *Cato Journal* 25:541-566.
- Rijsoort, J., and Z. Jinfeng.** 2005. "Participatory Resource Monitoring as a Means for Promoting Social Change in Yunnan, China." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2543-2573.
- Rohde, R. F. et al.** 2006. "Dynamics of Grazing Policy and Practice: Environmental and Social Impacts in Three Communal Areas of Southern Africa." *Environmental Science & Policy* 9:302-316.
- Roy Chowdhury, R.** 2006. "Landscape Change in the Calakmul Biosphere Reserve, Mexico: Modeling the Driving Forces of Smallholder Deforestation in Land Parcels." *Applied Geography* 26:129-152.
- Sanders, W.** 2005. "Dispersal, Autonomy and Scale in Indigenous Community Governance: Some Reflections on Recent Northern Territory Experience." *Australian Journal of Public Administration* 64:53-62.
- Schmitz, P. W.** 2006. "Information Gathering, Transaction Costs, and the Property Rights Approach." *The American Economic Review* 96:422-434.
- Schneiderman, D.** 2006. "Property Rights and Regulatory Innovation: Comparing Constitutional Cultures." *International Journal of Constitutional Law* 4:371-391.
- Sehlke, G., and J. Jacobson.** 2005. "System Dynamics Modeling of Transboundary Systems: The Bear River Basin Model." *Ground Water* 43:722-730.
- Shubert, A., and I. Lang.** 2005. "The Literature Aftermath of the Brundtland Report 'Our Common Future': A Scientometric Study Based on Citations in Science and Social Science Journals." *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 7:1-8.
- Singa Roy, D. K.** 2005. "Peasant Movements in Contemporary India: Emerging Forms of Domination and Resistance." *Economic and Political Weekly* 40:5505-5513.
- Sobel, J.** 2005. "Interdependent Preferences and Reciprocity." *Journal of Economic Literature* 43:392-436.
- Stocks, A.** 2005. "Too Much for Too Few: Problems of Indigenous Land Rights in Latin America." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 34:85-104.
- StrFöde, S., and T. Treue.** 2006. "Beyond Buffer Zone Protection: A Comparative Study of Park and Buffer Zone Products' Importance to Villagers Living Inside Royal Chitwan National Park and to Villagers Living in its Buffer Zone." *Journal of Environmental Management* 78:251-267.
- Stuart-Hill, G., et al.** 2005. "The Event Book System: A Community-based Natural Resource Monitoring System from Namibia." *Biodiversity and Conservation* 14:2611-2631.
- Summerfield, T.** 2005. "Australian Rules: The Rise of Rights and the Demise of the Right." *International Journal for the Semiotics of Law* 18:141-158.
- Susilowait, I. et al.** 2005. "Productive Efficiency, Property Rights, and Sustainable Renewable Resource Development in the Mini-Purse Seine Fishery of the Java Sea." *Environment and Development Economics* 10:837-859.
- Swatuk, L. A.** 2005. "From 'Project' to 'Context': Community Based Natural Resource Management in Botswana." *Global Environmental Politics* 5:95-124.
- Takarada, Y.** 2005. "Transboundary Pollution and the Welfare Effects of Technology Transfer." *Journal of Economics* 85:251-275.
- Tucker, C. M., D. K. Munroe, H. Nagendra, and J. Southworth.** 2005. "Comparative Spatial Analyses of Forest Conservation and Change in Honduras and Guatemala." *Conservation and Society* 3:174-200.
- Turner, N. S.** 2005. "Strategies for Expressing Social Conflict within Communal African Societies in Southern Africa." *Studies in the History of Religion* 109:67-76.
- Vives, X.** 2005. "Complementarities and Games: New Developments." *Journal of Economic Literature* 43:437-479.
- Vos, H. De, R. Boelens, and R. Bustamante.** 2006. "Formal Law and Local Water Control in the Andean Region: A Fiercely Contested Field." *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 22:37-48.
- Weible, C. M., and P. A. Sabatier.** 2005. "Comparing Policy Networks: Marine Protected Areas in California." *Policy Studies Journal* 33:181-201.
- Westermann, O., J. Ashby, and J. Pretty.** 2005. "Gender and Social Capital: the Importance of Gender Differences for the Maturity and Effectiveness of Natural Resource Management Groups." *World Development* 33:1783-1799.
- White, D., and T. Hall.** 2006. "Public Understanding of Science in Pacific Northwest Salmon Recovery Policy." *Society and Natural Resources* 19:305-320.
- Wiersma, L. L.** 2005. "Indigenous Lands as Cultural Property: A New Approach to Indigenous Land Claims." *Duke Law Journal* 54:1061-1088.
- Xue, G.** 2005. "Bilateral Fisheries Agreements for the Cooperative Management of the Shared Resources of the China Seas: A Note." *Ocean Development and International Law* 36:363-374.



# ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Send Letters and Announcements** to Alyne Delaney, Editor, CPR Digest, The Institute for Fisheries Management, North Sea Center, PO Box 104, DK-9850, Hirtshals, Denmark. ad@ifm.dk Tel: 45 98 94 28 55 Fax:: 45 98 94 42 68

**For membership, dues, back issues, and missing copies** Michelle Curtain, P.O. Box 2355 Gary, IN 46409 USA Tel: 01-219-980-1433 Fax:: 01-219-980-2801 iascp@indiana.edu

---

## *Member Services*

### **1. IASCP Online Membership Registration**

Would you like to update or renew your membership? Are you interested in becoming a member of IASCP? You may renew your membership or join by using our new online membership services at: [www.iascp.org/member.html](http://www.iascp.org/member.html).

### **2. IASCP Online Membership Directory**

Would you like to find out which members are currently working on research related to marine turtles or domestic regulatory policy in the Amazon? This information and more is available by searching the new online membership directory at: <http://www.iascp.org/member.html>.

The directory is accessible to IASCP members only and is searchable by name, country of residence, and research area.

---

## *Design the*

### **“International Journal of the Commons” logo!**

The preparations to launch the IASCP’s new “International Journal of the Commons” are moving ahead. In order to make the journal look as attractive as possible, we invite proposals from our members for a special journal logo. Although a professional design is welcomed, good ideas can also serve as a basis. A graphical designer will then continue working on it. Logos and ideas that will be used for the journal’s official lay-out will be appropriately rewarded.

*Proposals should be sent to Martina de Moor*  
Tine.deMoor@let.uu.nl

The managing editors

*Martina de Moor, Charlotte Hess, Erling Berge*

## **2006 IASCP Election Results**

The results of the 2006 IASCP election are in. We would like to extend a warm *welcome* to the newest members of the IASCP leadership:

Executive Council Members

**Frank Matose**

and

**Doug Wilson**

Also, welcome to President-elect,  
**Ruth Meinzen-Dick,**

with thanks to  
President Narpal S. Jodha

and out-going Executive Council Member  
Andy White

In the same election, the IASCP membership also voted to change the name of the IASCP to the

### **International Association for the Study of the Commons**

The proposal to change the by-laws reflecting this name change, the mission of the IASCP and Executive Council duties were also accepted.

**Full details can be seen at: <http://www.iascp.org/about/2006results.html>**



CALL FOR PAPERS
THIRD PACIFIC REGIONAL MEETING
September 3 – 6 2006
AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND

Traditional and Indigenous Land uses and Economies

The Regional Meeting will focus on the transformation of traditional and indigenous sustainable uses and economies into untenable positions in the face of unsustainable "modern" uses and economies.

Abstracts should include a discussion of the objective of the proposed paper, the research design and methodology (where applicable) and some discussion of the nature and implications of the findings for CPR's in the Pacific region. Abstracts must be received by June 30, 2006 and must include the following information on the cover page:

- Title of Paper,
two or three key words indicating topic,
corresponding author,
institutional affiliation,
complete address,
telephone,
facsimile and
email address.

All of the above information is also requested for each additional author.

Persons interested in organizing a special session/ panel discussion, or volunteering to serve as a session chair or discussant is encouraged to indicate interest by June 30, 2006.

Submit abstracts or completed papers via email to api@nsw.api.org.au

or as a 3.5" diskette via mail as shown below, as a Microsoft Word file as one document; length not to exceed 30 pages, including all tables, figures, notes, appendices, and references; margins, 2.54 cm. (1") on all dimensions; font 12pt. Please direct questions to:

John Sheehan
Pacific Regional Chair
International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP)
C/- NSW Division
Australian Property Institute
60 York Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Email: margaret@nsw.api.org.au

JULY 1, 2006 - JUNE 30, 2007 IASCP MEMBERSHIP CARD

Renew your membership now and you will not miss any of your membership benefits; including: subscriptions to The CPR Digest; discount registration at our nearly annual meetings; conference abstracts, and the opportunity to contribute to the growth of the IASCP. Contact the IASCP office for additional information or visit our web site.

MEMBERSHIP INFORMATION: Renewal\_\_\_\_ New\_\_\_\_ (Please check one)
Last Name First Name Middle

Address:

City State/Province: Postal Code/Zip: Country:

Email Address:

INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIP\* CHECK MEMBERSHIP YEAR(S):
\$50,000 or more.....US \$60.00 July 1, 2006- June 30, 2007
\$20,000 - 49,999.....US \$40.00 July 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008
\$19,000 and less.....US\$10.00 July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009
Total dues payment @US \$60.00.....\$
Total dues payment @ US \$ 40.00.....\$
Total dues payment @ US \$ 10.00.....\$

\*Institutional membership fees are a suggested flat rate of US \$120.00.

PAYMENT INFORMATION:

You can return this card to IASCP with:

- A check payable to IASCP
MasterCard Visa Discover | Card Number

For either individuals or institutions, if your financial situation prevents you from making a full payment at this time please indicate that and we will contact you.

Signature | Exp. Date: OR Email, phone or fax the information to:

THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF COMMON PROPERTY

P.O. Box 2355 Gary IN 46409 USA Phone: 219-980-1433 Fax: 219-980-2801 e-mail: iascp@indiana.edu http://www.iascp.org

**Common Property Resource Digest  
International Association for the  
Study of Common Property  
P.O. Box 2355  
Gary IN 46409 USA**