

The Commons Digest

formerly known as *The Common Property Resource Digest*

NO. 4 QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE STUDY OF THE COMMONS June 2007

Welcome to the June 2007 *Commons Digest*. In this issue we highlight the importance of a historical perspective in commons research. **Tine DeMoor** leads the *Commons Forum* with her commentary outlining her view of the role of long-term historical development of commons as a source of inspiration for research and policy. **Audun Sandberg** responds to the lead essay with his agreement that historian's knowledge about the pre-conditions for commons institutions is important, and goes further to call on social scientists and historians to bridge the gap between the disciplines. **Evelyn Chia** tells us that the lack of historic perspective in commons work is often the result of the mistaken belief that the past was relatively static and insular, but that history can enlighten us on the adaptability of societies and communities. **Brad Walters** focuses on another issue in the historical perspective- that historical analysis is scientific in its own right. The *Commons Forum* closes with an essay by **Sarah Strauss**. Using a perspective informed from her work in Switzerland and Wyoming, Sarah agrees in the importance of the long-term perspective in commons and points out at the chasm between tradition and modernity is but a mirage.

Please also take a look at the Announcements where we extend an invitation to report on commons-related organisations and research through profiles in the *Digest* and web discussions on the IASC homepage. **Enjoy!**

CONTENTS	
COMMONS FORUM: The Historical Commons: Inspiration for Research and Policy	
The Past is not another Country ... <i>Tine De Moor</i>	1
Bridging the Gap between Disciplines <i>Audun Sandberg</i>	4
The Distant Past and Other Pasts as ‘fodder’ for Understanding state-society relations and extra-local influences on Society <i>Evelyn Chia</i>	5
Making History Matter <i>Brad Walters</i>	7
Living on (under?) the Edge: The Commons between Environmental Risk and Economic Development <i>Sarah Strauss</i>	8
Recent Publications	10
Project Profiles	13
Announcements	16

Commons Forum Commentary

The past is not a another country: The long-term historical development of commons as a source of inspiration for research and policy.

Tine DeMoor

**Research Institute for History and Culture
University of Utrecht, the Netherlands**

Managing co-editor, *International Journal of the Commons*

Many negative effects of human use of resources do not become visible until after lengthy periods of time, often even centuries. One could assume it therefore to be obvious to integrate long-term historical developments into case-studies on common pool resources, in particular when we're trying to understand how the regulation of the use of common pool resources worked and what changes of that regulation could bring about. However, whenever a historical perspective is integrated in the commons studies this is mostly restricted to the 19th century. The distant past seems to be - for many commons-researchers- another country. At the same time historians, tending to be rather descriptive and often hardly interested in the theoretical implications of their research, hardly search to benefit from the models and frameworks repetitively tested by sociologists, economists, and others. This is a missed opportunity. After all, in the period we can study because of sufficient inheritance of written documents (from the 10th century onwards), the *homo sapiens* did not

The Commons Digest

Formerly The Common Property Resource Digest

Published with support from
the Ford Foundation

Editor

Alyne E. Delaney



International Association for the Study of the Commons

formerly the International Association for the Study of
Common Property

Current Officers

President: Owen Lynch

President Elect: Ruth Meinzen-Dick

Immediate Past President: Narpat S. Jodha

Council

Doris Capistrano Frank Matose
Leticia Merino Andy White
Dianne Rocheleau Doug Wilson

Executive Director Michelle Curtain
Commons Digest Editor Alyne Delaney
Information Officer Charlotte Hess

Conference Coordinators

2007 Regional Meetings

North Americ Region

Newfoundland Murray Rudd

2008 Biennial Meeting

England Chris Short and John Powell

© 2000 IASCP

WWW.IASCP.ORG

change to such an extent that we couldn't compare his behaviour over long periods of time. Seen from a world history perspective, whether this *homo sapiens* behaved as an *economicus* or *reciprocans* is more a matter of circumstances—ecological, economic, social, cultural—than of human biology or evolution. I believe that part of the limited mutual interest between historians and other social scientists is due to the rather negative and static view of the pre-1800 village common that was created in the 1960s. In this short article I will try to start correcting that image. Europe, being the area of the world with the most extensively studied history of the commons—from common arable to common woodland—will hereby play an exemplary role in this, but other regions could be at least as interesting to test the possibilities of cooperation between disciplines.

Over time, and in particular since the middle of the twentieth century, the term 'commons' has been used in many ways. Previously, in the historical documents 'commons' referred to common land, often in the form of pasture, or meadowland. Commons in the historical sense refer to land that was used and managed by several people or households during a certain period, in distinction to land that was used by only one person or household throughout the whole year. The variety of alternative namings in English (e.g., open field, common meadow, common waste) and in other languages (*markegenootschappen*, *meenten* (Dutch), *Genossenschaften* (German) to give just a few examples) has over time led to considerable confusion and has for a long time prevented scientific comparison of the emergence and functioning of commons. In the middle of the twentieth century, the common as a physical phenomenon started to be used repeatedly by scientists from other disciplines to indicate collective property. Though he was not the first to 'conceptualise' the historical commons, Hardin's 'the tragedy of the commons' can be considered as a bench mark in the evolution of the discourse on the commons.

Hardin caused considerable confusion by giving a false account of the historical functioning of the commons. The "common" Hardin described was land whereupon no property rights rested, thus making it very easy for everyone to overuse it. He asks the reader to 'Picture a pasture open to all'. And then: 'It is to be expected that each herdsman will try to keep as many cattle as possible on the commons.' However, the historical common was not at all open to all. On the contrary: all the commons had clear rules about the conditions to be-

come a legitimate user, and on the do's and don'ts if you had obtained membership. The European villagers started from the early 12th century onwards to formalise their cooperation in land usage and management by writing down regulations. These regulations were often highly sophisticated in their design, showing the awareness of the commoners in the dangers that lured in cooperation. They, for example, often used graduated sanctioning systems, not sparing those who didn't report freeriding either. In trying to prevent the commoners being seduced by the market, it was often prohibited to put cattle on the common summer pasture that had been bought on the early spring cattle market. The common was not a place to fatten up your cattle but it was an essential part of the mixed agricultural system as the manure produced by the cattle was indispensable for the arable land. This connection between the arable land and the common was vital for the pre-industrial agricultural system. As has been shown for several Western European countries the regulations of the European commons matched Lin Ostrom's famous design principles pretty well. When putting these rules into practice, the commoners showed an often remarkable ability to guard the ecological balance on their common and to adjust to changing social and economic circumstances. In plenty of occasions the number of cattle allowed on the common was restricted to the carrying capacity of the pasture, and if this number was not set in advance, the number of cattle could be regulated by using price mechanisms. Plenty of other examples of rules and practice could show that in their strive for a striking a balance between efficiency and utility the commoners autonomously designed an impressive set of rules they put adequately into practice. This allowed them to keep the 'tragedy' well at a distance.

Topics other than natural resources have emerged since the 1990s in the commons debate. Here again, inspiration can be found in a long-term perspective as in the same period of the emergence of commons we also find a sort of knowledge common emerging. Craft and merchant guilds –which Putnam considered to be pivotal in the development of democracy in Northern Italy (Putnam et al. 2003)- were set up to exchange and safeguard knowledge about trade, products and production processes. History here confirms what we find in the experimental anthropological research, that market integration can encourage cooperation, as was also recently shown by amongst others Herbert Gintis and Samuel Bowles. The emergence of commons and guilds happened in a period of increasing market integration: in some regions of

Western Europe as much as 60% of the population had been active on the labour market, already during the late middle ages. At the same time historical analysis also suggests other factors that might have played a role in the population's willingness to cooperate. There are juridical (for example the creation of the concept of *universitas*) and social factors (the particular marriage/family pattern of Western Europe) that also may have played a fundamental role in changing the face of the history of cooperation. The evolution of cooperation over a mere 1000 years in Europe suggests a multitude of new paths of analysis for sociological and anthropological studies of present day commons.

In the future, we –as commons-researchers from various disciplines- should try to close the interdisciplinary gap. Historians have for a long time primarily focussed on the dissolution of the commons, whereby external factors like industrialisation and population growth were considered as the motors of this process. In these stories, the commoners themselves usually play a passive role and are approached as a group, without much attention for the potential influence of the commoners as individuals. Among 19th century commons-historians, there was also a clear interest for the origins of the commons, but here again the individual motivations to own and use land collectively were largely ignored. And moreover, those motivations, whether individual or group-directed, were in the historical debate not linked to the causes for the dissolution of the commons. More attention should go to what lays in between origin (in Europe, mainly 11-13th century) and dissolution (in Europe, mainly 18th-19th century): the functioning of the commons, which has been one of the prime concerns of the other social scientists. Social scientists have used concepts as the prisoner's dilemma, free riding, and reciprocity to identify problematic relationships between individual aspirations and group dynamics, and have put less stress on external factors as causes for the malfunctioning or even dissolution of a common. Sociologists and economists generally put the main responsibility for the dissolution of the commons with the individual. This divergence in research traditions shouldn't be a hindrance for more interdisciplinary commons research in the future. The sociological debate on individual responsibility of the commoners can be enriched by linking it to the influence of external factors, which has been at the fore of historians describing the dissolution of the commons and vice versa. A solution to identify the links between

the different aspects as discussed by commons-researchers, could be the use of an analytical framework that focuses on the main functions of a common, and the interaction between these functions: the common as a resource, as an institution and as a property regime

The longevity of many commons (several centuries) should be recognised as a sign for institutional flexibility. Adapting to change and the passing on of values and norms over hundreds of years is not easily done -but, as seen in many commons- it can be done. Including the commons of the past would add abundant diachronical evidence of what is now primarily based on contemporary case studies. One of the difficulties of experimental research has long been the difficulty to repeat situations –over several generations- and to take into account reputational mechanisms. Notwithstanding the problematic aspects of historical research (e.g., the lack of oral sources), there is often sufficient written material left to analyse the behaviour of generations of commoners. And we can discover the pitfalls: where the self-governance of the commons was threatened, a tragedy could often not be avoided, as in contemporary examples. This information could help us understand and predict what happens on commons in villages in third-world countries that are facing levels of e.g. market integration similar to the villages in the European past. That past is not another country; they didn't do things all that much differently there. On the contrary.

For Further Reading :

Bowles, S. 2004. *Foundations of Human Sociality. Economic experiments and ethnographic evidence from fifteen small-scale societies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

De Moor, Martina, Leigh Shaw-Taylor, and Paul Warde, eds. 2002. *The management of common land in north west Europe, c.1500-1850*. CORN Publication Series, 8. Turnhout : Brepols.

De Moor, Tine. 2007. Avoiding tragedies. A Flemish common and its commoners under the pressure of social and economic change during the eighteenth century. *Economic History Review*.

Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making democracy work. Civic traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vivier, Nadine, and Marie-Danielle Demélas. 2003. *Les propriétés collectives face aux attaques libérales (1750-1914). Europe occidentale et Amérique latine*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

tine.demoor@let.uu.nl

Commons Forum Response

Bridging the Gap between Disciplines

Audun Sandberg

Associate Professor, Bodø University College,
Norway

In her lead essay, Tine DeMoor directs our attention to the obvious, but often forgotten, fact that the past is not an entirely different country from the present and that they who lived in the past did not do things all that much differently there. Not only is the past still with us in the form of institutional layers of customs, laws and doctrines that still shape a path dependent future. But more importantly, the past was not the stable state it is often imagined, a static traditional society that did not change until modernity arrived with its dynamics and turned everything upside down. On the contrary, seen in the long perspective, the past always seems to have changed and thus always contained seeds of the future. Tine argues that at least after the 10th century onwards, we have enough historical evidence to compare the behaviour of homo sapiens over time and that we can show how both their individual and collective behaviour can be explained a matter of circumstances – whether ecological, economic, social and cultural, rather than as a result of some grand evolutionary design. She chooses the European Common – in all its variety - to prove that the study of long lines of institutional development can be most useful in understanding contemporary collective choice dilemmas.

Tine is very right in pointing out that much of the lack of mutual interest in resource governance issues between historians and other social scientists is the rather negative and static view of the pre-1800 village common that was created in the 1960's. And she uses this image to explain how Hardin could make such erroneous assumptions about the historical common and why consequently his analysis could turn out so wrong – and have such grave consequences in terms of privatisation on a world scale through the latter part of the 20th century. What Tine does not point to, however, is the fact that this static view was in many ways created much earlier, more than 100 years earlier when the “enclosure movement” and the enclosure debate raged in the industrializing Europe, with famous combatants like Fustel de Coulange and Henry Sumner Maine. It was also at this time that much

of the social sciences were formed under the pressure of solving the three great questions of the time: “Die Sozialfrage”, “die Arbeiterfrage” and “die Agrarfrage” Still all 1st year students in Sociology are taught the difference between “Gemeinschaft” and “Gesellschaft” as the best way of dichotomizing the “traditional” and the “modern”. Thus the past became even more stereotyped as the static, unchangeable agrarian society where everybody did all tasks themselves and where everyone thought the same way in some sort of mechanical solidarity. Whether deliberately or not, this contrasting with the vibrant, dynamic and specialized modern *gesellschaft*, also stigmatized the empirical models of the “ideal type”, the commons, the *allmend* and the *genossenschaft* as old-fashioned and best suited for the garbage heap of history. While in fact, as Robert Netting has shown us, the *erdgenossenschaft* was a very efficient economic and ecological governance machine, which programmed all economic activity in the alpine communities and secured what today is called “sustainable development”.

But as Tine suggest, we sometimes have to look at really long lines of development to really understand the changes that takes place. Such important lines can be also found in the development of juridical doctrines in Europe, where the legal revolution of pope Gregor VII combined with the extreme individualism of the renaissance gradually produced the “Western Maxime” that “No one should be forced to stay in co-proprietorship against their will!” This combined with the convenience of individual collateral security in the emerging banking system produced what after 1000 years is now known as the victory of Roman Law over Germanic Law and other folk laws. However, as Tine does not mention, juridical factors are very often the result of politics and power struggles. Thus we should also remember that in understanding the long lines of development between the origin of European commons, and their dissolution, it is also necessary to understand the growth of the nation state – especially the nation state that emerged after the Great French Revolution. This state was founded on the obligation to defend the “freedoms” of the individual citizens on its territory, among these, the freedom to own property. But this involved not only protecting citizens from thieves and external enemies, but also defending individuals against oppression by tribes, clans, lineages and other “secondary groups”, which in many cases were the foundation for various kinds of “Commons”. A by-product of this was of course also to keep down such territorially based secondary groups that could be a

challenge to the unity of the nation. The nation-state thus became an important agent in changing the relationships to property at the local level. Therefore land consolidation, registration and individualization was not only about agricultural efficiency and food surplus for the new industrial class, but also about a young nations seeking legitimacy with individual citizens whose individual property rights were guaranteed by the same state. So when “new legal doctrines” are applied by the modern European states, like international treaties on indigenous collective rights to land and water, the reaction among the former loyal citizens should be analysed on the basis of this long “partnership” between the state and the individual.

Today there is no doubt that the Commons, as a form of collective action, monitoring and self disciplining, has a future: Either as locally based governance systems – or in partnership with a partially withdrawn state in some kind of co-management arrangement. With the advance of adaptive ecosystem governance practices in many jurisdictions, the demand for knowledge about “commons-like systems” will only grow. Here both the knowledge of social scientists about the internal dynamics of collectives – and the historians and legal scholars knowledge about the external preconditions for a commons-type institution to function and survive, is of equal importance. So here we should join Tine in her call to bridge the gap between the disciplines.

Audun.Sandberg@hibo.no

Commons Forum *Response*

The distant past and other ‘pasts’ as fodder for understanding state-society relations and extra-local influences on society

Evelyn Chia (Ms)

Dept. Political and Social Change, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, The Australian National University

The neglect of the distant past – i.e. pre-1800 Europe or the equivalent of pre-1800 (pre-industrial revolution and expansion of a market economy) Europe elsewhere in the study of commons is perhaps due to mistaken perceptions

of the past as relatively static and insular as compared to the upheavals of the 19th century. Wars, collapse and alternatively amalgamations of kingdoms, disease – were all substantial upheavals in themselves. The question is to what extent did such phenomena affect the ability of a community to create sustainable rules of governance over a common-pool resource. The answer would be quite obvious, I would suppose - to a significant degree. They were in fact as disruptive of rules of the commons as the expansion of the market, the advent of mercantilism, and the Industrial Revolution in England and subsequently in the rest of Europe in the late 18th to 19th century. In addition, these upheavals often affected the nature of social interactions within people in a community and people between the community and the rest of the kingdom or country, as the case may be. And it is precisely the form and nature of such social interactions, the level of trust, the level of social capital, if you will, and perceptions of a common interest that affects the creation of institutions that govern common-pool resources. As such, I would agree with Tine that we should expand our scope of analysis to beyond the recent past to the more distant past. The question is – how do we do it, without subscribing to a sort of path dependency that leaves no room for theoretical integration.

My first answer would be – to seek how such events affected social interaction of such communities. The tendency to overlook this aspect of analysis is perhaps the misconception that such ‘communities’ were relatively homogeneous and hence interactions between members of a community were also relatively homogeneous. More importantly, the implication of such an assumption also leads to seeing the ‘community’ as a static entity that does not change or adapt to exogenous shocks. Institutional change does indeed happen over a period of time, in response to structural conditions, but they also require human agency to mould those conditions. It is not always the case that humans are subject to conditions of which they have no power over and are reduced to creating rules that are ultimately still contained within the structural conditions of the game. Institutional theory tells us that it is possible to change the rules of the game, indeed, people do that all the time. However, it is also possible to change the nature and objective of the game itself, and by extension the rules of the game. Think outside the box. Shift the focus of the game – that requires agency, and an appeal to more fundamental feelings of human association as well as ideological and moral exhortations beyond the mere homo economicus or even bounded-rationality model. And it is often human

agency that is very much ignored in our focus on institutional arrangements.

I would surmise that the focus on the 1800s onwards is due to the events/phenomena that I listed above – namely the emergence of free-market capitalism and the Industrial Revolution which fundamentally changed social relationships and the way that exchanges of goods and commodities were done. These two phenomena affected the nature of social interactions in very significant ways. Firstly, the mechanisation of production processes rendered the factory/industrial production paramount in people’s lives rather than the agricultural (or other) communities in which people lived in, during which production was aimed at more or less the local consumers or for self-consumption. Secondly, mechanisation enabled the accumulation of surplus premised upon a higher level of extraction of natural resources. The higher demand on natural resources required a change in the way which local communities managed their resources and adapted to the community as well as industrial pressures.

However, the status of the community vis-à-vis the extralocal, and the nature of extraction of natural resources are also factors that are affected by nation-building – a process that is not unique to the period after the 1800s. The rise and fall of kingdoms, and the question of how rulers mobilised natural resources and people for war against other nations, or kingdoms, as the case may be, are the proverbial questions of nation-building that accompany each stage of political transformation. As with my research of China in the early stages of nation-building after the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949, the state sought to control far-flung places that were previously considered the ‘periphery’ and in order to fold these places into the state-led developmental fold, they tried to transform society and rural communities in ways that were unprecedented in China. The measures they employed sought to break the hold of traditional authority in these places, and supplant the Party-State as the eminent authority of all aspects of political and economic life, including the way people managed natural resources. Natural resources no longer belonged to the communities, they belonged to the state. Communities were relegated to custodians of the environment, and had to follow state initiatives that were often very much against the traditional concepts of forests, land, and water. The disasters of the Great Leap Forward, for example, that precipitated rampant exploitation of forests and timber must have ruled against local ideas about timber use. How did people and

Commons Forum *Response*

Making History Matter

Brad Walters

Associate Professor and Coordinator of Environmental Studies, Mount Allison University, Canada

The study of collective action and common property resource management could be deeply enriched by research that adopts a more explicit, analytically historical perspective. However, “the past is another country” presents the study of historical commons as if this remains a distinct disciplinary pursuit from that of contemporary socio-economic approaches. In so doing, it tends to re-enforce a counter-productive and arguably false dualism between the historically “descriptive” and the contemporary social “scientific.” It further argues that the value of historical studies be measured in terms of their contribution to the development of general commons theory. In short, historical information is seen as a kind of untapped pool of empirical information that can be put to the test of contemporary theory.

But some of us would argue that historical analysis is scientific in its own right, at least wherein it involves the intentional search for and rigorous evaluation of causal relationships between changes or events over time. Taking this view, the development and refinement of general commons theory in the social sciences is secondary to the goal of pursuing and establishing robust causal-historical explanations about things that are of interest to us. In short, let us use theory to serve our needs for better understanding, rather than place our investigations at the service of testing or proving some predetermined theory or model.

My own experience is that, where historical information is sought to better understand present day patterns of collective action and commons management, findings are ambiguous, and tend to challenge, if not sharply contradict existing theory and assumptions. Secure land tenure encouraged tree planting in some communities, yet insecure tenure was a primary motive for tree planting in others. The same people who practiced sound resource management at one point in time destroyed those same resources at a later date. Heavy-handed state management of a critical ecological area failed in the 1980s, but then recovered to succeed in the 1990s. And so on. It was not difficult in each of these cases to explain the

local communities justify or come to terms with such exploitation? What is the role of local communities, the role of leaders (widely defined) in shaping the discourse of exploitation and hence successfully challenging externally-imposed rules on their communities? Although these are questions that are frequently-asked these days in the development literature, they are seldom asked of periods often deemed too distant and remote to warrant comparison. As is with the case with globalisation and how that is often recreated and reshaped at local levels, the same logic applies to periods that experienced extralocal influences on conceptions of the common good, the usage of natural resources, concepts of leadership, the role of the individual and the community within which the ‘common good’ is to be defined. What I am suggesting therefore (as perhaps some of the many experts have already started doing) is an examination of central-local and region-local interactions that affect not just the ability of local ‘communities’ to create and enforce their own rules of governance, but also how the discourse of the ‘common good’ that has shaped these rules. As with the Great Leap Forward, and seemingly irrational policies of the Chinese Party-State that runs against ingrained knowledge of certain natural resources, studies suggest that there was substantial resistance to state-hegemonic discourse of the common good and usage of natural resources. However, in people’s adaptability, we also find a certain complicity to state-rhetoric that can range from reasons of political self-interest to something as fundamental as survival.

As such, my agreement with the author’s call to study the distant past stems not from an intrinsic interest in Europe pre-1800s, but rather from the belief that there are certain societal transformations that not just the 1800s onwards are privileged to. From this premise, the past and history provides a rich source of information on which to dwell on the adaptability of societies and communities, the ingenuity of the human race in adjusting to changing conditions, and the role of ideas, ideology and values in shaping what is the common good. The common good, then, I suppose would define then what is considered as the optimal outcome. Ignoring how the common good came to be shaped or defined, and the role of human agency (either in response to endogenous or exogenous changes) in this process of definition would neglect a whole lot of sociopolitical dynamics within and without these local ‘communities’. These sociopolitical dynamics translate into the strength and form of social capital, and contribute or detract from the effective governance of any resource.

evelyn.chia@anu.edu.au

contradictions, but accepted theories and models of collective action and commons management were often not needed to do so (Walters et al., 1999; Walters, 2004).

In short, careful attention to history tends to humble, not empower general theory. But in so doing, it puts theory in its proper place; namely, in the service of (but not the direction of) researchers who seek to explain why collective action and commons management emerge, persist and decline at particular points in times and in particular places.

Detailed written records of the kind called for in “the past is not another country” are scarce for most of the developing world. Here, oral history remains the most ready source of information about the past and the tools of ethnography the most valuable for retrieving it. While knowledge of the distant past may be unobtainable, critical insights can be gained from oral histories of memorable past events and their causal influence on present-day patterns of behavior, social organization and resource management (Walters *et al.* 1999). Theory and models about collective action can assist in our piecing-together some of the puzzles, but researchers should be willing to set these aside and embrace the unexpected and idiosyncratic as these emerge during the course of study.

For Further Reading:

Walters, B.B., A. Cadelina, A. Cardano, and E. Visitacion. 1999. Community history and rural development: Why some farmers participate more readily than others. *Agricultural Systems* 59:193-214.

Walters, B.B. 2004. Local management of mangrove forests in the Philippines: Successful conservation or efficient resource exploitation? *Human Ecology* 32:177-195.

bwalters@mta.ca



Will you be there?

Commons Forum *Response*

Living on (under?) the Edge: The Commons between Environmental Risk and Economic Development

Sarah Strauss

**Associate Professor, Department of Anthropology,
University of Wyoming, USA**

Sitting in the City Council meeting for hours, waiting patiently as the democratic process played out, I tried to think of what I would say when my turn to speak came around. The concern that had brought me to the meeting was how to get the city of Laramie to take significant steps to reduce its carbon footprint and thus tread more lightly on the planet, reducing the damage done to the global commons. But before that topic could be discussed, we needed to clear the agenda of an earlier question regarding the protection of our local aquifer from the potential negative impacts of another new housing project.

Since this all took place as I was in the middle of writing my response to “The Past is Not Another Country,” our management of the local commons weighed heavily on my mind. The situation that was unfolding in my Wyoming town this week recalled strongly the kinds of issues that I have learned about through my historical and ethnographic research concerning the village of Leukerbad in the Swiss Alps. As Tine suggests, “The evolution of cooperation over a mere 1000 years in Europe suggests a multitude of new paths of analysis for sociological and anthropological studies of present day commons.” Because we are fortunate enough to have access to a roughly 500-year-old historical record for Leukerbad (in comparison to the less than 150-year record for Laramie), it is possible to compare past experiences in managing the commons to avoid collective risks with contemporary situations that pit private gain against public welfare. I could not agree more with the suggestion that historians and social scientists (not to mention natural scientists!) need to spend more time in conversation, uncovering and learning from the experiences of the “longue durée.”

Leukerbad is located at the end of a side valley that extends northward from the main valley of the Rhone River, in the Swiss canton of Valais/Wallis. In the past, Leukerbadners have recognized their extreme vulnerability to avalanche destruction. The recorded history of the

village over the past five hundred years has demonstrated that attention to this particular type of natural hazard was crucial for survival. Representations of such concern appear in a number of ways; the earliest that I have found are in the White Book, the primary village historical document, which contains written records of legal and administrative decisions regarding the village from 1501 til 1909. This leather-bound book, the current iteration of which was transcribed from earlier documents starting in 1697, had been all but forgotten by most local community members when it was first shown to me in 2001. While all communities in the Valais maintained such records at one time, the majority of them have been lost to fire or other natural disasters over the years, or simply forgotten. Few remain intact, and the ability to take digital photographs of this document, page by page, and to have the funds to translate it from its original combination of Latin and early modern German into contemporary high German, has allowed a marvelous resource to be preserved to the benefit of the entire Leukerbad community.

Attention to avalanche danger in the White Book is represented in two primary ways: in terms of environmental regulation through maintenance of the common resource of the Bannwald, or protective forest zone, and of recognition of the threat to human safety that habitation in avalanche-prone areas always entails.

The seventeenth chapter of the White Book, a legal remedy originally written in 1573, discusses two dairy farmers from the Mayen and Supersaxo alps who were forbidden from taking any wood from the Bannwald of that region for a period of twenty years, in order to curb the overuse of forest resources and the resulting weakening of the village's defenses against avalanche damage in this region. The document notes that

“through this excessive tree cutting, the mentioned dairy farm Du Mayen at many, indeed at most locations, slid, slides and is damaged and heavily ruined and its trees are devastated. This has been obvious for a long time and is clearly visible today while visiting the site. [Furthermore, this lumber cutting] [happened] beyond the hitherto customary law; and other [reasons for dispute were brought forward] that are left out here for the reason of brevity. To prevent future damage, it was extremely necessary to find a remedy [and], finally, to [restore] peace, love/friendship and benefit of both parties through the negotiations between righteous men” (The White Book).

Analysis of the White Book has also been facilitated by the existence of a volume of aerial photographs of the region, labelled with place names in the old dialect—a project conceived of and executed by village elders to prevent the

total loss of this important information. Leukerbadners have always lived in a landscape characterized by a high degree of avalanche risk, and despite the rather extreme nature of this uncertain life, they have worked continually to deflect the risks in favour of continued development of their water-based economy.

As Leukerbad's reputation as a Kurort, or spa, grew, the number of guesthouses on the eastern side of the Dala also increased. In this location, which had come to be the village center, the major thermal source, the St. Laurence spring, flowed out of the ground at 50°C and nearly 1000 l/minute. But in each century following the founding of the church in 1501, major avalanches destroyed this highly vulnerable section of town. The worst avalanche catastrophe in terms of human life was that of 1719, in which 52 people lost their lives and all the guesthouses with the exception of the enormous Hotel Maison Blanche were destroyed. The avalanche came just up to the church building, but though slightly damaged, it was for the most part spared. Since then, on the day of St. Antonius—patron saint of avalanche victims—a special mass is said to remember these tragedies. When I attended this ceremony in 2001, the names of the victims, along with marital status, age, maiden name for women, family relationships, and other bits of info available (eg that one person was known as Johannes the Blind) were read aloud, with the effect of making the magnitude of the tragedy for a village of 500 quite clear—10% of the population died in one day.

Additional avalanches in 1720, 1756, and 1767 culminated with the flattening of one of the major bathhouses by another avalanche in 1793. During the 18th century, efforts were made to build small avalanche deflection walls, but it was not until 1829/30 that construction of an 800 foot long and 17 foot high wall began to secure the village center from its repeated cycles of destruction and rebuilding. The latest effort in this regard was completed only two years ago, with sophisticated structures on the top of the western cliffs.

As more effective controls were designed, however, complacency set in. In 1999, a very heavy snow year, a building at the southern edge of town was severely damaged by an avalanche that was the result of a deliberately set explosive charge. The building that was damaged had been built after 1980, in an area known to native Leukerbadners as a dangerous place, a place where no one would walk in winter, nor keep livestock. In fact, a community development plan created by an architectural design class from the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology in the 1960s shows that they recommended the same thing as the old timers—

that no development take place in this region because of its vulnerability to damage from avalanches.

By the 1980s, however, one could argue that Leukerbad had become as much of a late modern Risk Society, in Ulrich Beck's sense, as any other place in the West; the villagers' concern with cooperative distribution of "goods" in the largely communal, subsistence-based society had presumably been replaced with a more individualistic perspective accompanied by greater concern for distribution of "bads"—that is, risks. The local council calculated the degree of risk for building large structures in what should have been an avalanche protection zone against prospect for increased profit through low cost housing development for the surging army of guestworkers who were providing the foundation for an economic boom in the tourism industry—both in terms of the spas and the ski area—that lasted through the early 1990s; the decision at that time came out on the side of development that would profit individual property owners and employers in the region more than it would protect the wider community.

Yet, we moderns are rarely as completely rational in our maximization of profit as we have been portrayed. Following our lead essay, I do see, both in Leukerbad and in Laramie, more recent demonstrations that the "sociological debate on individual responsibility of the commoners can be enriched by linking it to the influence of external factors." As we have moved into the 21st century, more choices have been made in support of the range of commons that benefit our communities—whether material, like water or forest resources, or knowledge-based, or even probabilistic risks to health or hearth. We, the people of Laramie and Leukerbad, have continued to show that the imagined chasm between tradition and modernity blurs into a mirage that reflects back upon the two.

For Further Reading

Beck, Ulrich (1992 [1986]) *Risk Society* (trans. Mark Ritter). London: Sage Publications.

White Book, ch.17, p. 100; tr. Latin-German, T. Schmid and tr. German-English, J. Seifert. See also White Book, ch.8, on the delimitations of woodcutting in other regions, 1508.

strauss@uwyo.edu

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Charlotte Hess

hess@indiana.edu

Books

- Bardhan, P., S. Bowles, and M. Wallerstein, eds.** 2006. *Globalization and Egalitarian Redistribution*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Blackman, A, ed.** 2006. *Small Firms and the Environment in Developing Countries: Collective Impacts, Collective Action*. Washington DC: RFF Press.
- Cairns, M., ed.** 2007. *Voices from the Forest*. Washington DC: RFF Press.
- Guijt, I, ed.** 2007. *Negotiated Learning: Collaborative Monitoring for Forest Resource Management*. Washington DC: RFF Press.
- Haddadin, M. J., ed.** 2006. *Water Resources in Jordan: Evolving Policies for Development, the Environment, and Conflict Resolution*. Washington DC: RFF Press.
- Homer-Dixon, T. F.** 2006. *The Upside of Down: Catastrophe, Creativity, and the Renewal of Civilization*. Washington, DC: Island Press.
- Humphreys, D.** 2006. *Logjam: Deforestation and the Crisis of Global Governance*. Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Johnston, R.J., and S. K. Swallow, eds.** 2006. *Economics and Conservation at the Rural-Urban Fringe*. Washington DC: RFF Press.
- Kariyawasam, R.** 2006. *International Economic Law and the Digital Divide: A New Silk Road?* Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Morganstern, R. D., and W. A. Pizer, eds.** 2007. *Reality Check: The Nature and Performance of Voluntary Environmental Programs in the United States, Europe, and Japan*. Washington, DC: RFF Press.
- Pearce, Fred.** 2006. *When the Rivers Run Dry: Water: The Defining Crisis of the Twenty-First Century*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Pomeroy, R. S., and R. Rivera-Guieb.** 2006. *Fishery Co-Management: A Practical Handbook*. Cambridge, MA: CABI.
- Porsdam, H., ed.** 2006. *Copyright and Other Fairy Tales: Hans Christian Andersen and the Commodification of Creativity*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Rangarajan, M., ed.** 2007. *Environmental Issues in India: A Reader*. New Delhi: Pearson Longman.
- Sabatier, P. A., ed.** 2007. *Theories of the Policy Process*. 2nd. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Tesfatsion, L., and K. L. Judd, eds.** 2006. *Handbook of Computational Economics: Agent-Based Computational Economics*. New York: Elsevier.
- Thai, K. V., D. Rahm, and J. D. Cogburn, eds.** 2007. *Handbook of Globalization and the Environment*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Articles

- Abdulahi, M.** 2007. "The Legal Status of the Communal Land Holding System in Ethiopia: The Case of Pastoral Communities." *International Journal on Minority and Group Rights* 14:85-125.
- Albiac, J., M. Hanemann, J. Calatrava, J. Uche, and J. Tapia.** 2006. "The Rise and Fall of the Ebro Water Transfer." *Natural Resources Journal* 46:727-758.
- Andersson, K.** 2006. "Understanding Decentralized Forest Governance: An Application of the Institutional Analysis and Development Framework." *Sustainability: Science, Practice, and Policy* 2:25-35.
- Apesteguia, J., and F. Maier-Rigaud.** 2006. "The Role of Rivalry: Public Goods Versus Common-Pool Resources." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 50:646-663

- Barrett, C., C. Gibson, B. Hoffman, and M. McCubbins.** 2006. "The Complex Links Between Governance and Biodiversity." *Conservation Biology* 20:1358-1366.
- Becker, M.** 2007. "Indigenous Struggles for Land Rights in Twentieth-Century Ecuador." *Agricultural History* 81:159-181.
- Bischoff, I.** 2007. "Institutional Choice Versus Communication in Social Dilemmas: An Experimental Approach." *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 62:20-36.
- Blomley, N.** 2007. "Making Private Property: Enclosure, Common Right and the Work of Hedges." *Rural History* 18:1-22.
- Bouma, J., D. van Soest, and E. Bulte.** 2007. "How Sustainable is Participatory Watershed Development in India." *Agricultural Economics* 36:13-22.
- Boyer, J. C.** 2006. "Reinventing the Appalachian Commons." *Social Analysis* 50:217-232.
- Brown, K. M.** 2006. "New Challenges for Old Commons: The Role of Historical Common Land in Contemporary Rural Spaces." *Scottish Geographical Journal* 122:109-129.
- Campbell, D., P. Wunungmurra, and H. Nyomba.** 2007. "Starting Where the People Are: Lessons on Community Development from a Remote Aboriginal Australian Setting." *Community Development Journal* 42:151-166.
- Carano, K.** 2007. "Globalization, Cultural Migration and its Impact on the Ndjukan Rain Forest Tribe." *Social Studies Review* 46:43-48.
- Carter, J.L., and G. J.E. Hill.** 2007. "Critiquing Environmental Management in Indigenous Australia: Two Case Studies." *Area* 39:43-54.
- Casari, M.** 2007. "Emergence of Endogenous Legal Institutions: Property Rights and Community Governance in the Italian Alps." *Journal of Economic History* 67:191-226.
- Child, C.D., and K. Gronbjerg.** 2007. "Nonprofit Advocacy Organizations: Their Characteristics and Activities." *Social Science Quarterly* 88:259-288.
- Collet, S.** 2007. "Values at Sea, Value of the Sea: Mapping Issues and Divides." *Social Science Information* 46:35-66.
- Cooper, D.** 2006. "Sometimes a Community and Sometimes a Battlefield": from the Comedic Public Sphere to the Commons of Speakers' Corner." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 24:753-775
- Crook, B.J., and E. Decker.** 2006. "Factors Affecting Community-Based Natural Resource Use Programmes in Southern Africa." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 22:111-133.
- Dasgupta, A., and V.A. Beard.** 2007. "Community Driven Development, Collective Action and Elite Capture in Indonesia." *Development and Change* 38:229-249.
- Davidova, S.** 2007. "A Common Pool Resource in Transition: Determinants of Institutional Change for Bulgaria's Postsocialist Irrigation Sector." *European Review of Agricultural Economics* 34:136-138
- Dionisio, F., and I. Gordo.** 2007. "Controlling Excludability in the Evolution of Cooperation." *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 9:365-373.
- Diwakara, H.** 2006. "Determinants of Trust and Cooperation: Case Study of Self-Managed Tubewell Organizations in North Gujarat, India." *International Journal of Rural Management* 2:19-45.
- Dixon, K.** 2007. "Working with Mixed Commons/Anticommons Property: Mobilizing Customary Land in Papua New Guinea the Melanesian Way." *Harvard Environmental Law Review* 31:219-277.
- Eisenberg, R. S.** 2006. "Patents and Data-Sharing in Public Science." *Industrial and Corporate Change* 15:1013-1031.
- Feldman, M.S., and A.M. Khademian.** 2007. "The Role of the Public Manager in Inclusion: Creating Communities of Participation." *Governance* 20:305-324.
- Flanagin, A.J., C. Stohl, and B. Bimber.** 2006. "Modeling the Structure of Collective Action." *Communication Monographs* 73:29-54.
- Fletcher, K.M.** 2006. "Regional Ocean Governance: The Role of the Public Trust Doctrine." *Duke Environmental Law and Policy Forum* 26:187-204.
- Fujisaki, M., S. Katayama, and H. Ohta.** 2007. "Sustainability or Ruin of a Common Resource Economy with Random Jump." *Review of Development Economics* 11:390-403.
- Gerlak, A. K., and T. Heikkila.** 2007. "Collaboration and Institutional Endurance in U. S. Water Policy." *PS: Political Science and Politics* XL:55-60.
- Gerlak, A. K., and T. Heikkila.** 2006. "Comparing Collaborative Mechanisms in Large-Scale Ecosystem Governance." *Natural Resources Journal* 46:657-708
- Ghosh, S.** 2007. "The Fable of the Commons: Exclusivity and the Construction of Intellectual Property Markets." *University of California Davis Law Review* 40:855-890.
- Goette, L., D. Huffman, and S. Meier.** 2006. "Impact of Group Membership on Cooperation and Norm Enforcement: Evidence Using Random Assignment to Real Social Groups." *The American Economic Review* 96:212-216.
- Gupta, K., and C. Pandit.** 2007. "Importance of Fishermen's Cooperatives." *Economic and Political Weekly* 42:825-827.
- Hauert, C.** 2006. "Cooperation, Collectives Formation and Specialization." *Advances in Complex Systems* 9:315-335.
- Hayes, T.** 2006. "Parks, People, and Forest Protection: An Institutional Assessment of the Effectiveness of Protected Areas." *World Development* 34:2064-2075.
- Hess, C., and E. Ostrom.** 2006. "A Framework for Analysing the Microbiological Commons." *International Social Science Journal* 58:335-349.
- Jumbe, C.B.L., and A. Angelsen.** 2006. "Do the Poor Benefit from Devolution Policies? Evidence from Malawi's Forest Co-Management Program." *Land Economics* 82:562-581.
- Kajisa, K., K. Palanisami, and T. Sakurai.** 2007. "Effects on Poverty and Equity of the Decline in Collective Tank Irrigation Management in Tamil Nadu, India." *Agricultural Economics* 36:347-362.
- Kampragou, E., E. Eleftheriadou, and Y. Mylopoulos.** 2007. "Implementing Equitable Water Allocation in Transboundary Catchments: The Case of River Nestos/Mesta." *Water Resources Management* 21:909-918.
- Kanazawa, Y.** 2007. "The Promotion and Evolution of Cooperation through Projection: Implications for Social Dilemmas and Trust." *Journal of Mathematical Sociology* 31:187-204.
- Kyllonen, S., et al.** 2006. "Conflict Management as a Means to the Sustainable Use of Natural Resources." *Silva Fennica* 40:687-728.
- Landa, D.** 2006. "Rational Choices as Social Norms." *Journal Of Theoretical Politics* 18:434-453.
- Lee, S., and C. Webster.** 2006. "Enclosure of the Urban Commons." *GeoJournal* 66:27-42.
- Lian, G., X. D. Guo, B. J. Fu, J. Wang, and T. He.** 2007. "Farmer's Perception and Response Towards Land Policy and Eco- Environment Based on Participatory Rural Appraisal: A Case Study in the Loess Hilly Area, China." *International Journal of Sustainable Development and World Ecology* 14:182-191.
- Loehman, E., and N. Becker.** 2006. "Cooperation in a Hydro-Geologic Commons: New Institutions and Pricing to Achieve Sustainability and Security." *International Journal of Water Resources Development* 22:603-614.
- Lu, F.** 2006. "The Commons in an Amazonian Context." *Social Analysis* 50:187-194.

- McCusker, B.**, and A. Oberhauser. 2006. "An Assessment of Women's Access to Natural Resources through Communal Projects in South Africa." *GeoJournal* 66:325-339.
- Meshack, C. K.**, B. Ahdikari, N. Daggart, and J. C. Lovett. 2006. "Transaction Costs of Community-Based Forest Management: Empirical Evidence from Tanzania." *African Journal of Ecology* 44:468-477.
- Millerd, F.** 2007. "Early Attempts at Establishing Exclusive Rights in British Columbia Salmon Fishery." *Land Economics* 83:23-40.
- Mookerjea, S.** 2007. "Cultural Studies with Multitudes: Immanence and the Multicultural Commons." *Review of Education Pedagogy Cultural Studies* 29:261-305.
- Mwangi, E.** 2007. "Subdividing the Commons: Distributional Conflict in the Transition from Collective to Individual Property Rights in Kenya's Maasailand." *World Development* 35:815-834.
- Nonini, D. M.** 2006. "The Global Idea of 'the Commons'." *Social Analysis* 50:164-177.
- Nonini, D. M.** 2006. "Reflections on Intellectual Commons." *Social Analysis* 50:203-216.
- Ortmann, G. F.**, and R. P. King. 2007. "Agricultural Cooperatives I: History, Theory and Problems." *Agrekon* 46:40-68.
- Ostrom, E.**, and H. Nagendra. 2006. "Insights on Linking Forests, Trees, and People from the Air, on the Ground, and in the Laboratory." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103:19224-19231.
- Palmer, C.** 2007. "The Role of Leadership in the Collective Enforcement of Community Property Rights in Indonesia." *Society and Natural Resources* 20:397-413.
- Pickles, J.** 2006. "Collectivism, Universalism, and Struggles over Common Property Resources in the 'New' Europe." *Social Analysis* 50:178-186.
- Pillai, K. Rajasekharan,** and B. Suchintha. 2006. "Women Empowerment for Biodiversity Conservation through Self Help Groups: A Case from Periyar Tiger Reserve, Kerala, India." *International Journal of Agricultural Resources, Governance and Ecology* 5:338-355.
- Quinn, C. H.**, M. Huby, H. Kiwasila, and J. C. Lovett. 2007. "Design Principles and Common Pool Resource Management: An Institutional Approach to Evaluating Community Management in Semi-Arid Tanzania." *Journal of Environmental Management* 84:100-113.
- Rai, A.**, and J. Boyle. 2007. "Synthetic Biology: Caught between Property Rights, the Public Domain, and the Commons." *PLoS Biology* 5:389-393.
- Rankin, D. J.** 2007. "Resolving the Tragedy of the Commons: The Feedback between Intraspecific Conflict and Population Density." *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 20:173-180.
- Rowat, C.**, and J. Dutta. 2007. "The Commons with Capital Markets." *Economic Theory* 31:225-254.
- Ruijs, A.**, and J. A. Janmaat. 2007. "Chasing the Spillovers: Locating Protected Areas in a Trans-Boundary Fishery." *Land Economics* 83:6-22.
- Ruttan, L.M.** 2006. "Sociocultural Heterogeneity and the Commons." *Current Anthropology* 47:843-853.
- Salemink, O.** 2007. "Changing Rights and Wrongs: The Transnational Construction of Indigenous and Human Rights among Vietnam's Central Highlanders." *Focaal* 47:32-47.
- Sandberg, A.** 2007. "Property Rights and Ecosystem Properties." *Land Use Policy* 24:613-623.
- Scharper, S. B.**, and H. Cunningham. 2006. "The Genetic Commons: Resisting the Neo-liberal Enclosure of Life." *Social Analysis* 50:195-202.
- Schnegg, M.** 2007. "Blurred Edges, Open Boundaries: The Long-Term Development of A Peasant Community in Rural Mexico." *Journal of Anthropological Research* 63:5-32.
- Semchenko, M.**, M. J. Hutchings, and E. A. John. 2007. "Challenging the Tragedy of the Commons in Root Competition: Confounding Effects of Neighbour Presence and Substrate Volume." *Journal of Ecology* 95:252-260.
- Shioda, K.**, and T. Onimaru. 2007. "Successful Factors and Activation Theory/Concept of Water Users Organizations - Based on the MWMS Project in Thailand." *Paddy and Water Environment* 5:15-27.
- Shriar, A.** 2007. "In Search of Sustainable Land Use and Food Security in the Arid Hillside Regions of Central America: Putting the Horse Before the Cart." *Human Ecology* 35:275-287.
- Slaughter, R.A.**, Wiener, J.D. 2007. "Water, Adaptation, and Property Rights on the Snake and Klamath Rivers." *Journal of the American Water Resources Association* 43:308-321.
- Smith-Nonini, S.** 2006. "Conceiving the Health Commons: Operationalizing a 'Right' to Health." *Social Analysis* 50:233-245.
- Smith, K. B.** 2006. "Representation Altruism: The Wary Cooperator as Authoritative Decision Maker." *American Journal of Political Science* 50:1013-1022.
- Smith, M. D.** 2007. "Generating Value in Habitat-Dependent Fisheries: The Importance of Fishery Management Institutions." *Land Economics* 83:59-73.
- Sneddon, C.** 2007. "Nature's Materiality and the Circuitous Paths of Accumulation: Dispossession of Freshwater Fisheries in Cambodia." *Antipode* 39:167-193.
- Southwold-Llewellyn, S.** 2006. "Devolution of Forest Management: A Cautionary Case of Pukhtun Jirgas in Dispute Settlements." *Human Ecology* 34:637-653.
- St. Martin, K.** et al. 2007. "Communities, Knowledge and Fisheries of the Future." *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues* 7:221-239.
- Sullivan, J.**, and R. S. Lloyd. 2006. "The Forum Theatre of Augusto Boal: A Dramatic Model for Dialogue and Community-Based Environmental Science." *Local Environment* 11:627-646.
- Tanner, A.** 2007. "On Understanding Too Quickly: Colonial and Postcolonial Misrepresentation of Indigenous Fijian Land Tenure." *Human Organization* 66:69-77.
- Tarui, N.** 2007. "Inequality and Outside Options in Common-Property Resource Use." *Journal of Development Economics* 83:214-239.
- Thomson, A. M.**, and I. A. Simpson. 2007. "Modeling Historic Rangeland Management and Grazing Pressures in Landscapes of Settlement." *Human Ecology* 35:151-168.
- Tsai, B.**, Chang-Yi C., C. Lin, and Y. Lo. 2006. "Public Participation Geographic Information System and Indigenous Society: New Partnership of Indigenous Peoples in Taiwan." *Geography Research Forum* 26:152-163.
- Tucker, C.**, J. C. Randolph, and E. Castellanos. 2007. "Institutions, Biophysical Factors and History: An Integrative Analysis of Private and Common Property Forests in Guatemala and Honduras." *Human Ecology* 35:259-274.
- Ungar, M.**, S. E. Clark, W. Kwong, A. Makhnach, and C. A. Cameron. 2006. "Studying Resilience Across Cultures." *Journal of Ethnic Cultural Diversity in Social Work* 14:1-19.
- Urama, K. C.**, and I. Hodge. 2006. "Participatory Environmental Education and Willingness to Pay for River Basin Management: Empirical Evidence from Nigeria." *Land Economics* 82:542-561.
- Uzawa, H.** 2007. "Environment, Commons, and Social Common Capital." *Ecological Research* 22:23-24.
- Vaarst, M.**, D. K. Byarugaba, J. Nakavuma, and C. Laker. 2007. "Participatory Livestock Farmer Training for Improvement of Animal Health in Rural and Peri-urban Smallholder Dairy Herds in Jinja, Uganda." *Tropical Animal Health and Production* 39:1-11.

Vakoufaris, H., et al. 2007. "Women's Cooperatives and their Contribution to the Local Development of the North Aegean Region, Greece." *Journal of Rural Cooperation* 35:19-42.

Valderrama, D., and J. L. Anderson. 2007. "Improving Utilization of the Atlantic Sea Scallop Resource: An Analysis of Rotational Management of Fishing Grounds." *Land Economics* 83:86-103.

Wagner, J., and M. Talakai. 2007. "Customs, Commons, Property, and Ecology: Case Studies From Oceania." *Human Organization* 66:1-10.

Watts, S. 2006. "Strategic Developments in Natural Forest Conservation in South Africa." *Journal of Sustainable Forestry* 22:77-109.

Weare, C., W.E. Loges, and N. Oztas. 2007. "Email Effects on the Structure of Local Associations: A Social Network Analysis." *Social Science Quarterly* 88:222-243.

Weber, M., G. Garcia-Marmolejo, and R. Reyna-Hurtado. 2006. "The Tragedy of the Commons: Wildlife Management Units in Southeastern Mexico." *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34:1480-1488.

Webster, C. 2007. "Property Rights, Public Space and Urban Design." *Town Planning Review* 78:81-102.

Westerland, K. 2007. "Nepal's Community Forestry Program: Another Example of the Tragedy of the Commons or a Realistic Means of Balancing Indigenous Needs with Forestry Conservation?" *Colorado Journal of International Environmental Law and Policy* 18:189-216.

Zeuli, K., and S. Deller. 2007. "Measuring the Local Economic Impact of Cooperatives." *Journal of Rural Cooperation* 35:1-18.

Zhonghao, Q., X. Yi, and Q. Futian. 2007. "Farmers' Recognition of Land Property Rights, Their Willingness to Land Acquisition and Reform in Land Acquisition System - A Positive Study Based on a Survey in Yingtan Prefecture, Jiangxi Province." *Chinese Rural Economy* 1:28-35.

Project Profile

Contested Common Land: environmental governance, law and sustainable land management c.1600-2006

A three-year project funded as part of the Landscape and Environment Programme of the Arts and Humanities Research Council (<http://www.landscape.ac.uk/index.htm>)

Principal Investigator

Professor Chris Rodgers, Newcastle Law School, Newcastle University

Co-Investigators

Dr Angus Winchester, History Department, Lancaster University

Dr. Patrick Olivier, Institute for Informatics, Newcastle University.

Start Date: 1 February 2007, Duration: 36 months

The Common land of England and Wales is an important common resource with multiple (and often conflicting) land uses. It provides some of our most ecologically sensitive environments and landscapes; it is an important

agricultural resource (especially in the uplands); and a recreational resource that provides public access to the countryside for walking and other recreational uses. This collaborative project brings together historians from Lancaster University with expertise in manorial court archival research, and environmental lawyers in Newcastle Law School, to examine the environmental governance of common land from an interdisciplinary, historical and contemporary perspective. Virtual reality imaging software is being developed by the Institute for Informatics at Newcastle University.

The project has two interdisciplinary foci; (i) an examination of the management of common land since the 17th century using historical methods of enquiry. This will examine the legal mechanisms for regulating land use and the principles applied to the governance of common land e.g. through the former manorial court system. And (ii) an examination of modern governance mechanisms and the emergence of sustainable land management as a discrete objective for the future of our Commons.

Modern farming methods, intense recreational use and other land use pressures have resulted in the degradation of much common land. This has important policy implications for the delivery of nature conservation, recreational access and other land use priorities for our commons. The Commons Act 2006 will introduce a new legal framework for the governance of common land, aimed at improving the environmental governance of common land and improving the protection of both the biodiversity and landscape values of our commons. The Commons Act 2006 is based on a self-regulatory model. It introduces measures enabling commoners to establish statutory commons councils with legal powers to pass binding regulations to regulate agricultural activities, the management of vegetation and the exercise of common rights on each common. They will also have power to enter into binding agreements on behalf of their members with governmental agencies to promote sustainable management. The research project will place the sustainable management of Commons in historical perspective by using four case studies to illustrate the changing patterns of land use, differing management principles and regulatory mechanisms applied to common land from c.1600 to the modern day. These will be drawn from Commons in Cumbria, North Yorkshire, Norfolk and Powys. The research will marry archival evidence with qualitative data generated by semi-structured interviews with stakeholders in the four case study areas. Commoners, land managers, voluntary groups and the public

agencies responsible for the governance of common land in each case study area, will be involved in the project through the process of qualitative data collection and through participation in seminars for stakeholders to be held in each case study area in the concluding phase of the research project. The project will conclude with an assessment of the impact of different models of self-regulation on the biodiversity and landscape values of the commons in each of the four case study areas, and for the effective implementation of the wider objectives of the Commons Act 2006. Virtual Reality imaging software will be used to illustrate the impacts on the biodiversity and landscape of each case study of different land management options for delivering sustainable management. The stakeholder meetings will, therefore, not only provide a forum for the dissemination of the research to key stakeholders and policy makers: they will also inform decision making by stakeholders seeking to improve the management of the commons in the case study areas, within the new self regulatory framework of the Commons Act 2006.

Contact details

Professor Christopher Rodgers (Principal Investigator)
Newcastle Law School, Newcastle University, 21-24 Windsor Terrace, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, NE1 7RU
Tel: 0191 222 7612 (direct)
c.p.rodgers@ncl.ac.uk

Dr Angus J L Winchester (Co-Investigator)
Department of History, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK, LA1 4YG
Tel: 01524 592559
a.winchester@lancaster.ac.uk

Dr Eleanor Straughton (Research Associate)
Department of History, Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK, LA1 4YG
Tel: 01524 593392
e.straughton@lancaster.ac.uk

Margherita Pieraccini (Project Doctoral Student)
Newcastle Law School, Newcastle University, 21-24 Windsor Terrace, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK, NE1 7RU
margherita.pieraccini@ncl.ac.uk

Dr Patrick Olivier & Dr D G Jackson (Virtual reality imaging)
Institute for Informatics, Devonshire Building, Newcastle University NE1 7RU
Tel: 0191 246 4630/4920
P.L.Olivier@ncl.ac.uk; D.G.Jackson@ncl.ac.uk

Project Profile

ENIGMA OF COMMONS: SURVIVING AND MANAGEMENT OF COMMON POOL RESOURCES IN EUROPEAN RURAL COMMUNITIES

Research carried out over the last few decades has confirmed the historical and current importance of communal goods and rights. This is not merely the remnant of an archaic past.

The fact of the survival of these institutions over long periods of time, from Mediaeval times up to the 19th Century, and the wide variety of communal typologies (in regard to definitions of users, access rules, limitations and prohibitions, ...) express the efficiency of the community system in adapting to different social and ecological environments. This record of permanence in success leads one to think that communal models of resource management must have offered advantages to users for the production and reproduction of food items, raw materials and other goods and services.

In order to study this issue, we in Spain have initiated the research project "Enigma of Commons: Surviving and Management of Common Pool Resources in European Rural Communities" (MEC-HUM2006-01277), with the support of the Ministry of Education and Science through the call to tenders for the I+D+i projects. Management responsibility for the project has been given to the Public University of Navarre, which provides the bulk of the researchers (J.M.Lana, J.M. Aizpurua, J.De la Torre, A. Arizkun, G.Sanz-Lafuente, J.Benito, P.Galilea, L.Llorente, A.Zamora, J.Madariaga, E.Majuelo), but researchers from other universities are also participating, such as I.Iriarte-Goñi, J.R.Moreno and G.Gómez-Urdañez (Zaragoza), A.M.Linares (Extremadura), A.Ortega (Granada), J.A.Serrano (Barcelona), Tine de Moor (Utrecht) and Erling Berge (Trondheim).

Our hypothesis is that over time, and despite its configuration as a space for conflict among social groups and classes, this type of institution has shown an ability to adapt to changing contexts and under certain conditions has contributed to driving balanced development in both environmental and social terms. This being so, we might

be in the presence of an institution able to generate social cohesiveness through the redistribution of opportunities and the shared restating of community operating rules and norms, thus contributing to the identification of individual subjects with the communities in which they act.

Consequently, the concrete objectives of the project address the analysis of communal institutions from a comparative historical perspective, as from the selection of a number of in-depth case studies, contrasting them with the information provided by specialist literature. The following aspects will be addressed:

1. The establishing of a classification of goods and resources that are susceptible to communal appropriation and management: woods, grasslands, pastures, farmland, watercourses for irrigation or energy production, buildings, devices, mills, stores, parks and recreational space, landscapes, etc. The question is asked: Are there some resources that are more appropriate for community management?

2. The establishing of a classification of communal regimes, through user identification, permitted use, banned behaviors, exclusion rules and community access points,... by means of a systematic study of local documentation (byelaws, sentences, accounts books and municipal minutes) between the 15th and 20th Centuries.

3. The establishing of a classification of communal institutions (town councils, neighborhood committees, districts, commonwealths, cattle breeder guilds and irrigation associations) and their relationships with other external agents (feudal lords, the Church, the religious orders, cities, Crown or State).

4. The designing of a simple economic model in which several products or services are simultaneously provided by the land; a) identifying the essential features distinguishing communal property from private and public property; b) analyzing in the model the relationship between the degree of complementariness or of compatibility between the goods and services derived from the land and the forms of property and use of the same; and c) presenting the communal system as a collection of behaviors that may be interpreted as strategies of equilibrium.

5. A comparative analysis of decision-making mechanisms within the framework of the rural community and their efficiency to guarantee the sustainability of resources and social cohesion, from a historical and theoretical perspective.

6. Identification of the real benefits obtained by individual subjects from the communal institution, as well as its contribution to the living standards of the rural population. Through comparing the long-term history of municipal accounts in those areas that conserved or lost their communal facilities. From a theoretical perspective, the idea is to study the strong and weak points of the thesis associating increased economic value of a resource with the definition of exclusive property rights.

These objectives necessitate a considerable empiric research effort in compiling and exploiting archive sources. The documentation offering the best results includes local laws, administrative licenses and files, lawsuits and judges' sentences, government reports and findings, organization and repopulation plans, State administration and city hall consortia, agrarian reform files, population surveys and tax assessments and real estate surveys, plus municipal budgets and accounts.

With this project it is expected to obtain better knowledge of the commons regime: its effective functioning in differential contexts; the identity of its users and its effect on their standards of living; its rule systems and the modification processes of the same; its role in food and raw materials production systems; its implications for environmental preservation and the social cohesion of rural communities; the exogenous or endogenous tensions that condition its development, as well as the nature of its transformations.

Likewise, it is hoped to isolate the variables possibly explaining the poor functioning of institutions in the cases of depletion or deterioration of resources, or contrarily the success obtained in maintaining sustainable use modes that are compatible with economic development and rising standards of living.

It is also sought to advance in the knowledge of different public policies of tutelage and management of common goods and their effects on the social and ecological context.

This will enable us to propose new modes of management of communal resources in the future that are more in accordance with the post-industrial society of the 21st Century.

CONTACTS: José Miguel Lana Berasain, Dept. of Economy, Public University of Navarre, E-31006, Pamplona-Iruña, Spain. E-mail: josem.lana@unavarra.es. Phone: 0034948169667

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Send Letters and Announcements to Alyne Delaney, Editor, Commons 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

IASC Announcements

Practitioner's Profiles

The *Digest* will soon begin running a column profiling commons-related networks, organisations, and/or individuals. Please submit submissions, questions, and thoughts to the editor at ad@ifm.dk.

Commons Collaboration

The Digest will also run a column, Project Profiles, highlighting projects which emphasize collaboration in commons research. If you would like your project profiled, or if you seek collaborating partners, please contact the editor: ad@ifm.dk

The IASC 's On-line Discussion Board

Members are reminded our newly updated webpage has a discussion board—perfect for connecting to the IASC commons community, whether for discussing Commons issues, finding project partners, or forming panels and finding roommates for the 2008 biennial meeting.

The 2008 Biennial IASC conference in Cheltenham, England is only one year away so now is the time to start planning!



Coming Soon!

The 12th Biennial IASC Conference
Announcement

Check out the **IASC Webpage**
as well as
The Commons Digest
for further details.

Hope to see you there!

JULY 1, 2007 - JUNE 30, 2008 IASC MEMBERSHIP CARD

Renew your membership now and you will not miss any of your membership benefits; including: subscriptions to The Commons Digest; discount registration at our nearly annual meetings; conference abstracts, and the opportunity to contribute to the growth of the IASC. Contact the IASC 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 \$100.00	_____ July 1, 2007- June 30, 2008
\$20,000 - 49,999.....US \$ 50.00	_____ July 1, 2008 - June 30, 2009
\$19,000 and less.....US\$ 10.00	_____ July 1, 2009 - June 30, 2010
Total dues payment @US \$100.00.....\$ _____	
Total dues payment @ US \$ 50.00.....\$ _____	
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 IASC with:

___ A check payable to IASC
___ 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 THE COMMONS
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>