

The Struggle to Govern the Commons

Thomas Dietz, Elinor Ostrom and Paul C. Stern

Abstract Human institutions—ways of organizing activities—affect the resilience of the environment. Locally evolved institutional arrangements governed by stable communities and buffered from outside forces have sustained resources successfully for centuries, although they often fail when rapid change occurs. Ideal conditions for governance are increasingly rare. Critical problems, such as transboundary pollution, tropical deforestation, and climate change, are at larger scales and involve nonlocal influences. Promising strategies for addressing these problems include dialogue among interested parties, officials, and scientists; complex, redundant, and layered institutions; a mix of institutional types; and designs that facilitate experimentation, learning, and change.

Keywords: tragedy of commons · government · human institutions · fisheries · sustainability

In 1968, Hardin [1] drew attention to two human factors that drive environmental change. The first factor is the increasing demand for natural resources and environmental services, stemming from growth in human population and per capita resource consumption. The second factor is the way in which humans organize themselves to extract resources from the environment and eject effluents into it—what social scientists refer to as institutional arrangements. Hardin’s work has been highly influential [2] but has long been aptly criticized as oversimplified [3–6].


Hardin’s oversimplification was twofold: He claimed that only two state-established institutional arrangements—centralized government and private property—could sustain commons over the long run, and he presumed that resource users were trapped in a commons dilemma, unable to create solutions [7–9]. He missed the point that many social groups, including the herders on the commons that provided the metaphor for his analysis, have struggled successfully against threats of resource degradation by developing and maintaining self-governing institutions [3,10–13]. Although these institutions have not always succeeded, neither have Hardin’s preferred alternatives of private or state ownership.

In the absence of effective governance institutions at the appropriate scale, natural resources and the environment are in peril from increasing human population, consumption, and deployment of advanced technologies for resource use, all of which have reached unprecedented levels. For example, it is estimated that “the global ocean has lost more than 90% of large predatory fishes” with an 80% decline typically occurring “within 15 years of industrialized exploitation” [14]. The threat of massive ecosystem degradation results from an interplay among ocean ecologies, fishing technologies, and inadequate governance.

T. Dietz

Environmental Science and Policy Program, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824, USA
e-mail: TdietzVT@aol.com

Fig. 1 Comparison of landings of ground fish (gadoids, solid line) and lobster (dashed line) in Maine from 1980 to 2002. Measured in millions of kilograms of ground fish and lobsters landed per year. International fishing in these waters ended with the extended jurisdiction that occurred in 1977 [155]




Inshore fisheries are similarly degraded where they are open access or governed by top-down national regimes, leaving local and regional officials and users with insufficient autonomy and understanding to design effective institutions [15, 16]. For example, the degraded inshore ground fishery in Maine is governed by top-down rules based on models that were not credible among users. As a result, compliance has been relatively low and there has been strong resistance to strengthening existing restrictions. This is in marked contrast to the Maine lobster fishery, which has been governed by formal and informal user institutions that have strongly influenced state-level rules that restrict fishing. The result has been credible rules with very high levels of compliance [17–19]. A comparison of the landings of ground fish and lobster since 1980 is shown in Fig. 1. The rules and high levels of compliance related to lobster appear to have prevented the destruction of this fishery but probably are not responsible for the sharp rise in abundance and landings after 1986.

Resources at larger scales have also been successfully protected through appropriate international governance regimes such as the Montreal Protocol on stratospheric ozone and the International Commission for the Protection of the Rhine Agreements [20–24]. Figure 2 compares the trajectory of atmospheric concentrations of ozone-depleting substances (ODS) with that of carbon dioxide since 1982. The Montreal Protocol, the centerpiece of the international agreements on ozone depletion, was signed in 1987. Before then, ODS concentrations were increasing faster than those of CO₂; the increases slowed by the early 1990s and the concentration appears to have stabilized in recent years. The international treaty regime to reduce the anthropogenic impact on stratospheric ozone is widely considered an example of a successful effort to protect the global commons. In contrast, international efforts to reduce greenhouse gas concentrations have not yet had an impact.

Knowledge from an emerging science of human-environment interactions, sometimes called human ecology or the “second environmental science” [25, 26], is clarifying the characteristics of

Fig. 2 Atmospheric concentration of CO₂ (solid line, right scale) and three principal ODS (dashed line, left scale). The ODS are chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) 11, 12, and 113 and were weighted based on their ozone-depleting potential [156]. Data are from [157]. ppt, parts per trillion; ppm, parts per million



institutions that facilitate or undermine sustainable use of environmental resources under particular conditions [6, 27]. The knowledge base is strongest with small-scale ecologies and institutions, where long time series exist on many successes and failures. It is now developing for larger-scale systems. In this review, we address what science has learned about governing the commons and why it is always a struggle [28].

Why a Struggle?

Devising ways to sustain the earth's ability to support diverse life, including a reasonable quality of life for humans, involves making tough decisions under uncertainty, complexity, and substantial biophysical constraints as well as conflicting human values and interests. Devising effective governance systems is akin to a coevolutionary race. A set of rules crafted to fit one set of socioecological conditions can erode as social, economic, and technological developments increase the potential for human damage to ecosystems and even to the biosphere itself. Furthermore, humans devise ways of evading governance rules. Thus, successful commons governance requires that rules evolve.

Effective commons governance is easier to achieve when (i) the resources and use of the resources by humans can be monitored, and the information can be verified and understood at relatively low cost (e.g., trees are easier to monitor than fish, and lakes are easier to monitor than rivers) [29]; (ii) rates of change in resources, resource-user populations, technology, and economic and social conditions are moderate [30–32]; (iii) communities maintain frequent face-to-face communication and dense social networks—sometimes called social capital—that increase the potential for trust, allow people to express and see emotional reactions to distrust, and lower the cost of monitoring behavior and inducing rule compliance [33–36]; (iv) outsiders can be excluded at relatively low cost from using the resource (new entrants add to the harvesting pressure and typically lack understanding of the rules); and (v) users support effective monitoring and rule enforcement [37–39]. Few settings in the world are characterized by all of these conditions. The challenge is to devise institutional arrangements that help to establish such conditions or, as we discuss below, meet the main challenges of governance in the absence of ideal conditions [6, 40, 41].

Selective Pressures

The characteristics of resources and social interaction in many subsistence societies present favorable conditions for the evolution of effective self-governing resource institutions [13]. Hundreds of documented examples exist of long-term sustainable resource use in such communities as well as in more economically advanced communities with effective, local, self-governing rights, but there are also many failures [6, 11, 42–44]. As human communities have expanded, the selective pressures on environmental governance institutions increasingly have come from broad influences. Commerce has become regional, national, and global, and institutions at all of these levels have been created to enable and regulate trade, transportation, competition, and conflict [45, 46]. These institutions shape environmental impact, even if they are not designed with that intent. They also provide mechanisms for environmental governance (e.g., national laws) and part of the social context for local efforts at environmental governance. Larger scale governance may authorize local control, help it, hinder it, or override it [47–52]. Now, every local place is strongly influenced by global dynamics [48, 53–57].

The most important contemporary environmental challenges involve systems that are intrinsically global (e.g., climate change) or are tightly linked to global pressures (e.g., timber production for the world market) and that require governance at levels from the global all the way down to the local [48, 58, 59]. These situations often feature environmental outcomes spatially displaced from

their causes and hard-to-monitor, larger scale economic incentives that may not be closely aligned with the condition of local ecosystems. Also, differentials in power within user groups or across scales allow some to ignore rules of commons use or to reshape the rules in their own interest, such as when global markets reshape demand for local resources (e.g., forests) in ways that swamp the ability of locally evolved institutions to regulate their use [60–62].

The store of governance tools and ways to modify and combine them is far greater than often is recognized [6, 63–65]. Global and national environmental policy frequently ignores community-based governance and traditional tools, such as informal communication and sanctioning, but these tools can have significant impact [63, 66]. Further, no single broad type of ownership—government, private, or community—uniformly succeeds or fails to halt major resource deterioration, as shown for forests in multiple countries (supporting online material text, figs. S1 to S5, and table S1).

Requirements of Adaptive Governance in Complex Systems

Providing information. Environmental governance depends on good, trustworthy information about stocks, flows, and processes within the resource systems being governed, as well as about the human-environment interactions affecting those systems. This information must be congruent in scale with environmental events and decisions [48, 67]. Highly aggregated information may ignore or average out local information that is important in identifying future problems and developing solutions.

For example, in 2002, a moratorium on all fishing for northern cod was declared by the Canadian government after a collapse of this valuable fishery. An earlier near-collapse had led Canada to declare a 200-mile zone of exclusive fisheries jurisdiction in 1977 [68, 69]. Considerable optimism existed during the 1980s that the stocks, as estimated by fishery scientists, were rebuilding. Consequently, generous total catch limits were established for northern cod and other ground fish, the number of licensed fishers was allowed to increase considerably, and substantial government subsidies were allocated for new vessels [70]. What went wrong? There were a variety of information-related problems including: (i) treating all northern cod as a single stock instead of recognizing distinct populations with different characteristics, (ii) ignoring the variability of year classes of northern cod, (iii) focusing on offshore-fishery landing data rather than inshore data to “tune” the stock assessment, and (iv) ignoring inshore fishers who were catching ever-smaller fish and doubted the validity of stock assessments [70–72]. This experience illustrates the need to collect and model both local and aggregated information about resource conditions and to use it in making policy at the appropriate scales.

Information also must be congruent with decision makers’ needs in terms of timing, content, and form of presentation [73–75]. Informational systems that simultaneously meet high scientific standards and serve ongoing needs of decision makers and users are particularly useful. Information must not overload the capacity of users to assimilate it. Systems that adequately characterize environmental conditions or human activities with summary indicators such as prices for products or emission permits, or certification of good environmental performance can provide valuable signals as long as they are attentive to local as well as aggregate conditions [76–78].

Effective governance requires not only factual information about the state of the environment and human actions but also information about uncertainty and values. Scientific understanding of coupled human-biophysical systems will always be uncertain because of inherent unpredictability in the systems and because the science is never complete [79]. Decision makers need information that characterizes the types and magnitudes of this uncertainty, as well as the nature and extent of scientific ignorance and disagreement [80]. Also, because every environmental decision requires tradeoffs, knowledge is needed about individual and social values and about the effects of decisions on various valued outcomes. For many environmental systems, local and easily captured values (e.g., the market value of lumber) have to be balanced against global, diffuse, and hard-to-capture values (e.g., biodiversity and the capability of humans and ecosystems to adapt to unexpected events).

Finding ways to measure and monitor the outcomes for such varied values in the face of globalization is a major informational challenge for governance.

Dealing with conflict. Sharp differences in power and in values across interested parties make conflict inherent in environmental choices. Indeed, conflict resolution may be as important a motivation for designing resource institutions as is concern with the resources themselves [81]. People bring varying perspectives, interests, and fundamental philosophies to problems of environmental governance [74, 82–84], and their conflicts, if they do not escalate to the point of dysfunction, can spark learning and change [85, 86].

For example, a broadly participatory process was used to examine alternative strategies for regulating the Mississippi River and its tributaries [87]. A dynamic model was constructed with continuous input by the Corps of Engineers, the Fish and Wildlife Service, local landowners, environmental groups, and academics from multiple disciplines. After extensive model development and testing against past historical data, most stakeholders had high confidence in the explanatory power of the model. Consensus was reached over alternative management options, and the resulting policies generated far less conflict than had existed at the outset [88].

Delegating authority to environmental ministries does not always resolve conflicts satisfactorily, so governments are experimenting with various governance approaches to complement managerial ones. They range from ballots and polls, where engagement is passive and participants interact minimally, to adversarial processes that allow parties to redress grievances through formal legal procedures, to various experiments with intense interaction and deliberation aimed at negotiating decisions or allowing parties in potential conflict to provide structured input to them through participatory processes [89–93].

Inducing rule compliance. Effective governance requires that the rules of resource use are generally followed, with reasonable standards for tolerating modest violations. It is generally most effective to impose modest sanctions on first offenders, and gradually increase the severity of sanctions for those who do not learn from their first or second encounter [39, 94]. Community-based institutions often use informal strategies for achieving compliance that rely on participants' commitment to rules and subtle social sanctions. Whether enforcement mechanisms are formal or informal, those who impose them must be seen as effective and legitimate by resource users or resistance and evasion will overwhelm the commons governance strategy.

Much environmental regulation in complex societies has been “command and control.” Governments require or prohibit specific actions or technologies, with fines or jail terms possible for punishing rule breakers. If sufficient resources are made available for monitoring and enforcement, such approaches are effective. But when governments lack the will or resources to protect “protected areas” [95–97], when major environmental damage comes from hard-to-detect “nonpoint sources,” and when the need is to encourage innovation in behaviors or technologies rather than to require or prohibit familiar ones, command and control approaches are less effective. They are also economically inefficient in many circumstances (98–100).

Financial instruments can provide incentives to achieve compliance with environmental rules. In recent years, market-based systems of tradable environmental allowances (TEAs) that define a limit to environmental withdrawals or emissions and permit free trade of allocated allowances under those limits have become popular [76, 101, 102]. TEAs are one of the bases for the Kyoto agreement on climate change.

Economic theory and experience in some settings suggest that these mechanisms have substantial advantages over command and control [103–106]. TEAs have exhibited good environmental performance and economic efficiency in the U.S. Sulfur Dioxide Allowance Market intended to reduce the prevalence of acid rain [107, 108] and the Lead Phasedown Program aimed at reducing the level of lead emissions [109]. Crucial variables that differentiate these highly successful programs from less successful ones, such as chlorofluorocarbon production quota trading and the early EPA emission trading programs, include: (i) the level of predictability of the stocks and flows, (ii) the number of

users or producers who are regulated, (iii) the heterogeneity of the regulated users, and (iv) clearly defined and fully exchangeable permits [110].

TEAs, like all institutional arrangements, have notable limitations. TEA regimes tend to leave unprotected those resources not specifically covered by trading rules (e.g., bycatch of noncovered fish species) [111] and to suffer when monitoring is difficult (e.g., under the Kyoto protocol, the question of whether geologically sequestered carbon will remain sequestered). Problems can also occur with the initial allocation of allowances, especially when historic users, who may be called on to change their behavior most, have disproportionate power over allocation decisions [76, 101]. TEAs and community-based systems appear to have opposite strengths and weaknesses [101], suggesting that institutions that combine aspects of both systems may work better than either approach alone. For example, the fisheries tradable permit system in New Zealand has added comanagement institutions to complement the market institutions [102, 112].

Voluntary approaches and those based on information disclosure have only begun to receive careful scientific attention as supplements to other tools [63, 77, 113–115]. Success appears to depend on the existence of incentives that benefit leaders in volunteering over laggards and on the simultaneous use of other strategies, particularly ones that create incentives for compliance [77, 116–118]. Difficulties of sanctioning pose major problems for international agreements [119–121].

Providing infrastructure. The importance of physical and technological infrastructure is often ignored. Infrastructure, including technology, determines the degree to which a commons can be exploited (e.g., water works and fishing technology), the extent to which waste can be reduced in resource use, and the degree to which resource conditions and the behavior of humans users can be effectively monitored. Indeed, the ability to choose institutional arrangements depends in part on infrastructure. In the absence of barbed-wire fences, for example, enforcing private property rights on grazing lands is expensive, but with barbed wire fences, it is relatively cheap [122]. Effective communication and transportation technologies are also of immense importance. Fishers who observe an unauthorized boat or harvesting technology can use a radio or cellular phone to alert others to illegal actions [123]. Infrastructure also affects the links between local commons and regional and global systems. Good roads can provide food in bad times but can also open local resources to global markets, creating demand for resources that cannot be used locally [124]. Institutional infrastructure is also important, including research, social capital, and multilevel rules, to coordinate between local and larger levels of governance [48, 125, 126].

Be prepared for change. Institutions must be designed to allow for adaptation because some current understanding is likely to be wrong, the required scale of organization can shift, and biophysical and social systems change. Fixed rules are likely to fail because they place too much confidence in the current state of knowledge, whereas systems that guard against the low probability, high consequence possibilities and allow for change may be suboptimal in the short run but prove wiser in the long run. This is a principal lesson of adaptive management research [31, 127].

Strategies for Meeting the Requirements of Adaptive Governance

The general principles for robust governance institutions for localized resources (Fig. 3) are well established as a result of multiple empirical studies [13, 39, 128–137]. Many of these also appear to be applicable to regional and global resources [138], although they are less well tested at those scales. Three of them seem to be particularly relevant for problems at larger scales.

Analytic deliberation. Well-structured dialogue involving scientists, resource users, and interested publics, and informed by analysis of key information about environmental and human-environment systems, appears critical. Such analytic deliberation [74, 139, 140] provides improved information and the trust in it that is essential for information to be used effectively, builds social capital, and can




Fig. 3 General principles for robust governance of environmental resources (left and right columns) and the governance requirements they help meet (center column) [13, 158]. Each principle is relevant for meeting several requirements. Arrows indicate some of the most likely connections between principles and requirements. Principles in the right column may be particularly relevant for global and regional problems

allow for change and deal with inevitable conflicts well enough to produce consensus on governance rules. The negotiated 1994 U.S. regulation on disinfectant by-products in water that reached an interim consensus, including a decision to collect new information and reconsider the rule on that basis [74], is an excellent example of this approach.

Nesting. Institutional arrangements must be complex, redundant, and nested in many layers [32, 141, 142]. Simple strategies for governing the world’s resources that rely exclusively on imposed markets or one-level, centralized command and control and that eliminate apparent redundancies in the name of efficiency have been tried and have failed. Catastrophic failures often have resulted when central governments have exerted sole authority over resources. Examples include the massive environmental degradation and impoverishment of local people in Indonesian Borneo [95], the increased rate of loss and fragmentation of high-quality habitat that occurred after creating the Wolong Nature Reserve in China [143], and the closing of the northern cod fishery along the eastern coast of Canada partly attributable to the excessive quotas granted by the Canadian government [70].

Institutional variety. Governance should employ mixtures of institutional types (e.g., hierarchies, markets, and community self-governance) that employ a variety of decision rules to change incentives, increase information, monitor use, and induce compliance [6, 63, 117]. Innovative rule evaders can have more trouble with a multiplicity of rules than with a single type of rule.

Conclusion

Is it possible to govern such critical commons as the oceans and the climate? We remain guardedly optimistic. Thirty-five years ago it seemed that the “tragedy of the commons” was inevitable everywhere not owned privately or by a government. Systematic multidisciplinary research has, however, shown that a wide diversity of adaptive governance systems have been effective stewards

of many resources. Sustained research coupled to an explicit view of national and international policies as experiments can yield the scientific knowledge necessary to design appropriate adaptive institutions.

Sound science is necessary for commons governance, but not sufficient. Too many strategies for governance of local commons are designed in capital cities or by donor agencies in ignorance of the state of the science and local conditions. The results are often tragic, but at least these tragedies are local. As the human footprint on the Earth enlarges [144], humanity is challenged to develop and deploy understanding of large-scale commons governance quickly enough to avoid the large-scale tragedies that will otherwise ensue.

References

1. G. Hardin, *Science* **162**, 1243 (1968).
2. See [6, 145]. It was the paper most frequently cited as having the greatest career impact in a recent survey of biologists [146]. A search performed by L. Wisen on 22 and 23 October 2003 on the Workshop Library Common-Pool Resources database [147] revealed that, before Hardin's paper, only 19 articles had been written in English-language academic literature with a specific reference to "commons," "common-pool resources," or "common property" in the title. Since then, attention to the commons has grown rapidly. Since 1968, a total of over 2300 articles in that database contain a specific reference to one of these three terms in the title.
3. B. J. McCay, J. M. Acheson, *The Question of the Commons: The Culture and Ecology of Communal Resources* (Univ. of Arizona Press, Tucson, 1987).
4. P. Dasgupta, *Proc. Br. Acad.* **90**, 165 (1996).
5. D. Feeny, F. Berkes, B. McCay, J. Acheson, *Hum. Ecol.* **18**, 1 (1990).
6. Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, *The Drama of the Commons*, E. Ostrom et al., Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002).
7. J. Platt, *Am. Psychol.* **28**, 642 (1973).
8. J. G. Cross, M. J. Guyer, *Social Traps* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1980).
9. R. Costanza, *Bioscience* **37**, 407 (1987).
10. R. McC. Netting, *Balancing on an Alp: Ecological Change and Continuity in a Swiss Mountain Community* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1981).
11. National Research Council, *Proceedings of the Conference on Common Property Resource Management* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1986).
12. J.-M. Baland, J.-P. Platteau, *Halting Degradation of Natural Resources: Is There a Role for Rural Communities?* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1996).
13. E. Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1990).
14. R. A. Myers, B. Worm, *Nature* **423**, 280 (2003).
15. A. C. Finlayson, *Fishing for Truth: A Sociological Analysis of Northern Cod Stock Assessments from 1987 to 1990* (Institute of Social and Economic Research, Memorial Univ. of Newfoundland, St. Johns, Newfoundland, 1994).
16. S. Hanna, in *Northern Waters: Management Issues and Practice*, D. Symes, Ed. (Blackwell, London, 1998), pp. 25–35.
17. J. Acheson, *Capturing the Commons: Devising Institutions to Manage the Maine Lobster Industry* (Univ. Press of New England, Hanover, NH, 2003).
18. J. A. Wilson, P. Kleban, J. Acheson, M. Metcalfe, *Mar. Policy* **18**, 291 (1994).
19. J. Wilson, personal communication.
20. S. Weiner, J. Maxwell, in *Dimensions of Managing Chlorine in the Environment*, report of the MIT/Norwegian Chlorine Policy Study (MIT, Cambridge, MA, 1993).
21. U. Weber, *UNESCO Courier*, June 2000, p. 9.
22. M. Verweij, *Transboundary Environmental Problems and Cultural Theory: The Protection of the Rhine and the Great Lakes* (Palgrave, New York, 2000).
23. C. Dieperink, *Water Int.* **25**, 347 (2000).
24. E. Parson, *Protecting the Ozone Layer: Science and Strategy* (Oxford Univ. Press, New York, 2003).
25. E. Ostrom, C. D. Becker, *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **26**, 113 (1995).
26. P. C. Stern, *Science* **260**, 1897 (1993).
27. E. Ostrom, J. Burger, C. B. Field, R. B. Norgaard, D. Policansky, *Science* **284**, 278 (1999).

28. We refer to adaptive governance rather than adaptive management [31, 127] because the idea of governance conveys the difficulty of control, the need to proceed in the face of substantial uncertainty, and the importance of dealing with diversity and reconciling conflict among people and groups who differ in values, interests, perspectives, power, and the kinds of information they bring to situations (139, 148–151). Effective environmental governance requires an understanding of both environmental systems and human-environment interactions [26, 82, 152, 153].
29. E. Schlager, W. Blomquist, S. Y. Tang, *Land Econ.* **70**, 294 (1994).
30. J. H. Brander, M. S. Taylor, *Am. Econ. Rev.* **88**, 119 (1998).
31. L. H. Gunderson, C. S. Holling, *Panarchy: Understanding Transformations in Human and Natural Systems* (Island Press, Washington, DC, 2001).
32. M. Janssen, *Complexity and Ecosystem Management* (Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2002).
33. R. Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 2001).
34. A. Bebbington, *Geogr. J.* **163**, 189 (1997).
35. R. Frank, *Passions Within Reason: The Strategic Role of the Emotions* (Norton, New York, 1988).
36. J. Pretty, *Science* **302**, 1912 (2003).
37. J. Burger, E. Ostrom, R. B. Norgaard, D. Policansky, B. D. Goldstein, Eds., *Protecting the Commons: A Framework for Resource Management in the Americas* (Island Press, Washington, DC, 2001).
38. C. Gibson, J. Williams, E. Ostrom, in preparation.
39. M. S. Weinstein, *Georgetown Int. Environ. Law Rev.* **12**, 375 (2000).
40. R. Meinzen-Dick, K. V. Raju, A. Gulati, *World Dev.* **30**, 649 (2002).
41. E. L. Miles *et al.*, Eds., *Environmental Regime Effectiveness: Confronting Theory with Evidence* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2001).
42. C. Gibson, M. McKean, E. Ostrom, Eds., *People and Forests* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000).
43. S. Krech III, *The Ecological Indian: Myth and History* (Norton, New York, 1999).
44. For relevant bibliographies, see [147, 154].
45. D. C. North, *Structure and Change in Economic History* (North, New York, 1981).
46. R. Robertson, *Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture* (Sage, London, 1992).
47. O. R. Young, Ed., *The Effectiveness of International Environmental Regimes* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1999).
48. O. R. Young, *The Institutional Dimensions of Environmental Change: Fit, Interplay, and Scale* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002).
49. R. Keohane, E. Ostrom, Eds., *Local Commons and Global Interdependence* (Sage, London, 1995).
50. J. S. Lansing, *Priests and Programmers: Technologies of Power in the Engineered Landscape of Bali* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1991).
51. J. Wunsch, D. Olowu, Eds., *The Failure of the Centralized State* (Institute for Contemporary Studies Press, San Francisco, CA, 1995).
52. N. Dolšák, E. Ostrom, Eds., *The Commons in the New Millennium: Challenges and Adaptation* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003).
53. Association of American Geographers Global Change and Local Places Research Group, *Global Change and Local Places: Estimating, Understanding, and Reducing Greenhouse Gases* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003).
54. S. Karlsson, thesis, Linköping University, Sweden (2000).
55. R. Keohane, M. A. Levy, Eds., *Institutions for Environmental Aid* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996).
56. O. S. Stokke, *Governing High Seas Fisheries: The Interplay of Global and Regional Regimes* (Oxford Univ. Press, London, 2001).
57. A. Underdal, K. Hanf, Eds., *International Environmental Agreements and Domestic Politics: The Case of Acid Rain* (Ashgate, Aldershot, England, 1998).
58. W. Clark, R. Munn, Eds., *Sustainable Development of the Biosphere* (Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 1986).
59. B. L. Turner II *et al.*, *Global Environ. Change* **1**, 14 (1991).
60. T. Dietz, T. R. Burns, *Acta Sociol.* **35**, 187 (1992).
61. T. Dietz, E. A. Rosa, in *Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, R. E. Dunlap, W. Michelson, Eds. (Greenwood Press, Westport, CT, 2002), pp. 370–406.
62. A. P. Vayda, in *Ecology in Practice*, F. di Castri *et al.*, Eds. (Tycooly, Dublin, 1984).
63. Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information, and Voluntary Measures*, T. Dietz, P. C. Stern, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002).
64. M. Auer, *Policy Sci.* **33**, 155 (2000).
65. D. H. Cole, *Pollution and Property: Comparing Ownership Institutions for Environmental Protection* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2002).

66. F. Berkes, J. Colding, C. Folke, Eds., *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2003).
67. K. J. Willis, R. J. Whittaker, *Science* **295**, 1245 (2002).
68. Kirby Task Force on Atlantic Fisheries, *Navigating Troubled Waters: A New Policy for the Atlantic Fisheries* (Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Ottawa, 1982).
69. G. Barrett, A. Davis, *J. Can. Stud.* **19**, 125 (1984).
70. A. C. Finlayson, B. McCay, in *Linking Social and Ecological Systems*, F. Berkes, C. Folke, Eds. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998), pp. 311–338.
71. J. A. Wilson, R. Townsend, P. Kleban, S. McKay, J. French, *Ocean Shoreline Manage.* **13**, 179 (1990).
72. C. Martin, *Fisheries* **20**, 6 (1995).
73. Committee on Risk Perception and Communication, National Research Council, *Improving Risk Communication* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1989).
74. Committee on Risk Characterization and Commission on Behavioral and Social Sciences and Education, National Research Council, *Understanding Risk: Informing Decisions in a Democratic Society*, P. C. Stern, H. V. Fineberg, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1996).
75. Panel on Human Dimensions of Seasonal-to-Interannual Climate Variability, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, *Making Climate Forecasts Matter*, P. C. Stern, W. E. Easterling, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999).
76. T. Tietenberg, in *The Drama of the Commons*, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, E. Ostrom *et al.*, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 233–257.
77. T. Tietenberg, D. Wheeler, in *Frontiers of Environmental Economics*, H. Folmer, H. Landis Gabel, S. Gerking, A. Rose, Eds. (Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, 2001), pp. 85–120.
78. J. Thøgerson, in *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information, and Voluntary Measures*, T. Dietz, P. C. Stern, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 83–104.
79. J. A. Wilson, in *The Drama of the Commons*, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, E. Ostrom *et al.*, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 327–360.
80. R. Moss, S. H. Schneider, in *Guidance Papers on the Cross-Cutting Issues of the Third Assessment Report of the IPCC*, R. Pachauri, T. Taniguchi, K. Tanaka, Eds. (World Meteorological Organization, Geneva, Switzerland, 2000), pp. 33–51.
81. B. J. McCay, in *The Drama of the Commons*, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, E. Ostrom *et al.*, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 361–402.
82. Board on Sustainable Development, National Research Council, *Our Common Journey: A Transition Toward Sustainability* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999).
83. Committee on Noneconomic and Economic Value of Biodiversity, National Research Council, *Perspectives on Biodiversity: Valuing Its Role in an Everchanging World* (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1999).
84. W. M. Adams, D. Brockington, J. Dyson, B. Vira, *Science* **302**, 1915 (2003).
85. P. C. Stern, *Policy Sci.* **24**, 99 (1991).
86. V. Ostrom, *Public Choice* **77**, 163 (1993).
87. R. Costanza, M. Ruth, in *Institutions, Ecosystems, and Sustainability*, R. Costanza, B. S. Low, E. Ostrom, J. Wilson, Eds. (Lewis Publishers, Boca Raton, FL, 2001), pp. 169–178.
88. F. H. Sklar, M. L. White, R. Costanza, *The Coastal Ecological Landscape Spatial Simulation (CELSS) Model* (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC, 1989).
89. O. Renn, T. Webler, P. Wiedemann, Eds., *Fairness and Competence in Citizen Participation: Evaluating Models for Environmental Discourse* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1995).
90. R. Gregory, T. McDaniels, D. Fields, *J. Policy Anal. Manage.* **20**, 415 (2001).
91. T. C. Beierle, J. Cayford, *Democracy in Practice: Public Participation in Environmental Decisions* (Resources for the Future, Washington, DC, 2002).
92. W. Leach, N. Pelkey, P. Sabatier, *J. Policy Anal. Manage.* **21**, 645 (2002).
93. R. O’Leary, L. B. Bingham, Eds., *The Promise and Performance of Environmental Conflict Resolution* (Resources for the Future, Washington, DC, 2003).
94. E. Ostrom, R. Gardner, J. Walker, Eds., *Rules, Games, and Common-Pool Resources* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1994).
95. L. M. Curran *et al.*, in preparation.
96. J. Liu *et al.*, *Science* **300**, 1240 (2003).
97. R. W. Sussman, G. M. Green, L. K. Sussman, *Hum. Ecol.* **22**, 333 (1994).
98. F. Berkes, C. Folke, Eds., *Linking Social and Ecological Systems: Management Practices and Social Mechanisms* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1998).
99. G. M. Heal, *Valuing the Future: Economic Theory and Sustainability* (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1998).
100. B. G. Colby, in *The Handbook of Environmental Economics*, D. Bromley, Ed. (Blackwell Publishers, Oxford, 1995), pp. 475–502.

101. C. Rose, in *The Drama of the Commons*, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, E. Ostrom *et al.*, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 233–257.
102. T. Yandle, C. M. Dewees, in *The Commons in the New Millennium: Challenges and Adaptation*, N. Dolšák, E. Ostrom, Eds. (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2003), pp. 101–128.
103. G. Libecap, *Contracting for Property Rights* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1990).
104. R. D. Lile, D. R. Bohi, D. Burtraw, *An Assessment of the EPA's SO₂ Emission Allowance Tracking System* (Resources for the Future, Washington, DC, 1996).
105. R. N. Stavins, *J. Econ. Perspect.* **12**, 133 (1998).
106. J. E. Wilen, *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.* **39**, 309 (2000).
107. A. D. Ellerman, R. Schmalensee, P. L. Joskow, J. P. Montero, E. M. Bailey, *Emissions Trading Under the U.S. Acid Rain Program* (MIT Center for Energy and Environmental Policy Research, Cambridge, MA, 1997).
108. E. M. Bailey, "Allowance trading activity and state regulatory rulings" (Working Paper 98–005, MIT Emissions Trading, Cambridge, MA, 1998).
109. B. D. Nussbaum, in *Climate Change: Designing a Tradeable Permit System* (OECD, Paris, 1992), pp. 22–34.
110. N. Dolšák, thesis, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN (2000).
111. S. L. Hsu, J. E. Wilen, *Ecol. Law Q.* **24**, 799 (1997).
112. E. Pinkerton, *Co-operative Management of Local Fisheries* (Univ. of British Columbia Press, Vancouver, 1989).
113. A. Prakash, *Bus. Strategy Environ.* **10**, 286 (2001).
114. J. Nash, in *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information and Voluntary Measures*, T. Dietz, P. C. Stern, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 235–252.
115. J. A. Aragón-Correa, S. Sharma, *Acad. Manage. Rev.* **28**, 71 (2003).
116. A. Randall, in *New Tools for Environmental Protection: Education, Information and Voluntary Measures*, T. Dietz, P. C. Stern, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 311–318.
117. G. T. Gardner, P. C. Stern, *Environmental Problems and Human Behavior* (Allyn and Bacon, Needham Heights, MA, 1996).
118. P. C. Stern, *J. Consum. Policy* **22**, 461 (1999).
119. S. Hanna, C. Folke, K.-G. Mäler, *Rights to Nature* (Island Press, Washington, DC, 1996).
120. E. Weiss, H. Jacobson, Eds., *Engaging Countries: Strengthening Compliance with International Environmental Agreements* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1998).
121. A. Underdal, *The Politics of International Environmental Management* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands, 1998).
122. A. Krell, *The Devil's Rope: A Cultural History of Barbed Wire* (Reaktion, London, 2002).
123. S. Singleton, *Constructing Cooperation: The Evolution of Institutions of Comanagement* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1998).
124. E. Moran, Ed., *The Ecosystem Approach in Anthropology: From Concept to Practice* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1990).
125. M. Janssen, J. M. Anderies, E. Ostrom, paper presented at the Workshop on Resiliency and Change in Ecological Systems, Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM, 25 to 27 October 2003.
126. T. Princen, *Global Environ. Polit.* **3**, 33 (2003).
127. K. Lee, *Compass and Gyroscope* (Island Press, Washington, DC, 1993).
128. C. L. Abernathy, H. Sally, *J. Appl. Irrig. Stud.* **35**, 177 (2000).
129. A. Agrawal, in *The Drama of the Commons*, Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, E. Ostrom *et al.*, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 2002), pp. 41–85.
130. P. Coop, D. Brunckhorst, *Aust. J. Environ. Manage.* **6**, 48 (1999).
131. D. S. Crook, A. M. Jones, *Mt. Res. Dev.* **19**, 79 (1999).
132. D. J. Merrey, in *Irrigation Management Transfer*, S. H. Johnson, D. L. Vermillion, J. A. Sagardoy, Eds. (International Irrigation Management Institute, Colombo, Sri Lanka and the Food and Agriculture Organisation, Rome, 1995).
133. C. E. Morrow, R. W. Hull, *World Dev.* **24**, 1641 (1996).
134. T. Nilsson, thesis, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden (2001).
135. N. Polman, L. Slangen, in *Environmental Co-operation and Institutional Change*, K. Hagedorn, Ed. (Elgar, Northampton, MA, 2002).
136. A. Sarker, T. Itoh, *Agric. Water Manage.* **48**, 89 (2001).
137. C. Tucker, *Praxis* **15**, 47 (1999).
138. R. Costanza *et al.*, *Science* **281**, 198 (1998).
139. T. Dietz, P. C. Stern, *Bioscience* **48**, 441 (1998).
140. E. Rosa, A. M. McWright, O. Renn, "The risk society: Theoretical frames and state management challenges" (Dept. of Sociology, Washington State Univ., Pullman, WA, 2003).
141. S. Levin, *Fragile Dominion: Complexity and the Commons* (Perseus Books, Reading, MA, 1999).

142. B. Low, E. Ostrom, C. Simon, J. Wilson, in *Navigating Social-Ecological Systems: Building Resilience for Complexity and Change*, F. Berkes, J. Colding, C. Folke, Eds. (Cambridge Univ. Press, New York, 2003), pp. 83–114.
143. J. Liu et al., *Science* **292**, 98 (2001).
144. R. York, E. A. Rosa, T. Dietz, *Am. Sociol. Rev.* **68**, 279 (2003).
145. G. Hardin, *Science* **280**, 682 (1998).
146. G. W. Barrett, K. E. Mabry, *Bioscience* **52**, 282 (2002).
147. C. Hess, *The Comprehensive Bibliography of the Commons*, database available online at www.indiana.edu/~iascp/lforms/searchcpr.html.
148. V. Ostrom, *The Meaning of Democracy and the Vulnerability of Democracies* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1997).
149. M. McGinnis, Ed., *Polycentric Governance and Development: Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1999).
150. M. McGinnis, Ed., *Polycentric Games and Institutions: Readings from the Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis* (Univ. of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 2000).
151. T. Dietz, *Hum. Ecol. Rev.* **10**, 60 (2003).
152. R. Costanza, B. S. Low, E. Ostrom, J. Wilson, Eds., *Institutions, Ecosystems, and Sustainability* (Lewis Publishers, New York, 2001).
153. Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council, *Global Environmental Change: Understanding the Human Dimensions*, P. C. Stern, O. R. Young, D. Druckman, Eds. (National Academy Press, Washington, DC, 1992).
154. C. Hess, *A Comprehensive Bibliography of Common-Pool Resources* (CD-Rom, Workshop in Political Theory and Policy Analysis, Indiana Univ., Bloomington, 1999).
155. Ground fish data were compiled by D. Gilbert (Maine Department of Marine Resources) with data from the National Marine Fisheries Service. Lobster data were compiled by C. Wilson (Maine Department of Marine Resources). J. Wilson (University of Maine) worked with the authors in the preparation of this figure.
156. United Nations Environment Programme, *Production and Consumption of Ozone Depleting Substances, 1986–1998* (United Nations Environment Programme Ozone Secretariat, Nairobi, Kenya, 1999).
157. World Resources Institute, *World Resources 2002–2004: Earth Trends Data CD* (World Resources Institute, Washington, DC, 2003).
158. P. C. Stern, T. Dietz, E. Ostrom, *Environ. Pract.* **4**, 61 (2002).
159. We thank R. Andrews, G. Daily, J. Hoehn, K. Lee, S. Levin, G. Libecap, V. Ruttan, T. Tietenberg, J. Wilson, and O. Young for their comments on earlier drafts; and G. Laasby, P. Lezotte, C. Liang, and L. Wisen for providing assistance. Supported in part by NSF grants BCS-9906253 and SBR-9521918, NASA grant NASW-01008, the Ford Foundation, and the MacArthur Foundation.