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Over the last few decades, governments at all administrative levels have faced socioeconomic and environmental development challenges characterised by increased global-local interdependencies: the international financial crisis, global climate change, and questions of resource security to name just a few. Linked to these trends, the concept of governance has been widely discussed throughout the social sciences and has become a buzzword in media and public debates. As Chhotray and Stoker (2010: 2) point out, the reemergence of the term governance into debates “coincided with a sense that existing models were failing to capture what was happening, and not providing an appropriate framing of key issues for reformers.” The growing literature on governance seeks to capture the responses to these challenges, identifying new actors, changed responsibilities, and new forms of decision-making that themselves are susceptible to risk and failure (Jessop, 1998; Kjær, 2004). Debates on governance have evolved simultaneously in a number of disciplines including political science, international relations, environmental studies, economics, and geography, leading to a wide range of definitions and perspectives. The term governance, originally derived from the Greek and Latin words for (boat) “steering,” describes the process of decision-making and the processes through which decisions are implemented. Despite the interdisciplinarity and different perspectives, governance is predominantly understood to include a plurality of actors (formal and informal ones, not restricted to government actors) involved in decision-making and implementation as well as the institutional structures (both formal and informal) in place that define the range of action.
This introductory chapter consists of two sections. The first section provides a cross-disciplinary snapshot of the governance literature to contextualize the multi-disciplinary contributions in this book. It also highlights a number of challenges to governance that form recurrent themes throughout the book; namely, the issues of democracy and fragility as well as increased global-local interdependencies that illustrate the need to reinforce governance structures from the global to the local scale. The overview is restricted to selected discourses from political science (e.g., Chapter 1 & 3), international relations (e.g., Chapter 2), development studies (e.g., Chapter 5), and a more applied perspective on environmental governance and Aboriginal rights (e.g., Chapter 4) that directly relate to the following chapters. It leaves out equally lively debates occurring in other disciplines, such as economics (e.g., corporate governance) and European studies (e.g., multi-level governance). The second section provides an overview of the book.

Cross-Disciplinary Perspectives on Governance

Widespread societal changes including increased regional and global interdependencies, the rise of new organised interests (whether vested interests or NGOs), but also increased fragmentation, state devolution, and regionalisation have led to a reemergence of the concept of governance throughout the social sciences. Due to these changes, the traditional unit of political organisation, the nation state, has come under increased pressure. The notion of “the hollowing out of the state” is omnipresent in the literature to describe institutional fragmentation, dispersion of state authority, and diminishing policy autonomy, amongst others. Internally, public sector reforms have led to changes of authority and capacity from the core executive to other actors at lower spatial scales (Kjær, 2004). Externally, globalisation, particularly the impact of the global market, is limiting state autonomy while global interdependencies, as in the case of actions related to climate change, extend state power through transnational government initiatives (Rhodes 1997; Benz & Papadopoulos, 2006).

Public policy and public administration

Since the 1980s, widespread public sector reforms in industrialised countries including processes of privatisation, agencification, competition, decentralisation, and citizens’ empowerment have led away from principles of Weberian-influenced hierarchical structures towards new models of governing that have been widely discussed in political sciences. Rhodes (1996: 655) argues that the transformation of the public sector has resulted in “less government” (or what he describes as less rowing) and “more governance” (or more steering). The vast literature
on governance in public administration and public policy addresses these changes by focusing in particular on networks, partnerships, and alternative forms of coordination that – in contrast to government – do not rely on the use of authority and hierarchy. The literature reflects a rethinking and redefinition of institutions and actors that focus on the non-hierarchic relationships between organisations and actors (e.g., expressed through power dependencies, information flows, and resource exchange). Studies on the European Union, particularly the analysis of complex interactions between different spatial scales and territories including state and non-state actors (e.g., Hooghe & Marks, 2003 on multi-level governance), have extended the understanding of institutions (formal and informal) and actors (going beyond government). Chhotray and Stoker (2010: 23) identify four governance mechanisms: regulation at arm’s length, contracting through the market, interest articulation (mainly in the form of policy networks), and bonds of loyalty or trust. Even though governments lose direct control through processes of decentralisation, privatisation, contracting, etc., they gain partners as a result of new relationships, horizontally and vertically at different spatial scales, between government agencies and public and private institutions (Salamon, 2001).

These new forms of governance have raised a number of questions in the political science and public administration literature including the role of government in governance. While different scholars have put different emphasis on the role of government ranging from steering to less structured forms, most authors agree that networks are not completely independent but always guided to a certain extent by government (e.g., Pierre & Peters, 2000). Further, through fragmentation and dispersal of decision-making processes, governance implies higher complexities and uncertainty of outcomes leading to questions of accountability. Chhotray and Stoker (2010: 51) suggest that governance may be stronger than government in so far as it diffuses power and includes learning capacities that allow for adjustment and improvement where problems arise.

International Relations

Globalisation is usually seen as the driving force behind an increased interest in global governance. Giddens (1990: 64) defines globalisation “as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.” Global governance analyses the responses to globalisation and seeks to find better solutions to global problems that go beyond the self-interested nation state to include (the creation of) global institutions that address the changes linked to globalisation (Kjær, 2004; Chhotray & Stoker, 2010). As Keohane and
Nye (2000a: 38) point out, “[g]lobalism is here to stay. How it will be governed is the question.”

Processes of globalisation including global capitalism, new global limits (e.g., the world’s carrying capacity), and the rise of new social movements have led to a weakening of state authority, decreased autonomy, and dispersal of decision-making powers. International relations are characterised by complex interdependencies between countries and economies including a multiplicity of reciprocities across borders (Keohane & Nye, 2000b). As such, global governance is not only restricted to nation states and contracts between them but encompasses a wide range of actors including mercenary groups, ENGOs, political movements, financial markets, religious organisations, as well as quasi-formal and informal platforms of exchange between state and non-state actors. While nation states remain important or even central actors in world politics, they have to operate in complex institutional environments where decision-making powers are dispersed amongst these actors. This environment provides potential for more collaborative forms of decision-making and collective action, whether to regulate or set standards at the global scale or to intervene in situations of crisis. The majority of literature supports the view that global governance involves positive-sum relations between state and other non-state actors (e.g., Evans, 1997). At the same time, increasingly complex global governance structures are more fragile and are more likely to be the cause of unintended consequences.

Global governance structures show a number of limitations and weaknesses in respect to their efficiency and capacity. First, efficiency is limited by the high fragmentation of existing global governance institutions, particularly where institutions hold competing mandates; illustrated for example by the World Bank, the World Health Organization, and others. Second, recent examples of non-compliance with international agreements, such as Canada’s withdrawal from the Kyoto accord in December 2011, highlight a lack of enforcement and capacity to act. Another frequently discussed challenge relates to questions of democracy and accountability of global governance structures. Democracy in global governance is multi-scalar, including the national to the transnational and international scale. On a global level, democracy is suffering under the primacy of industrialised countries that dominate global power relationships or what Chhotray and Stoker (2010: 90) describe as a “complex pattern of structured inequalities.” Transnational NGOs, for example, seek to overcome this bias, representing particular constituencies that otherwise lack resources to participate in decision-making processes.
In development studies, the concept of governance has been widely adopted to overcome the shortcomings and challenges resulting from the neoliberal paradigms of the 1980s. In contrast to formerly dominant free market models, governance offers a broader perspective to understand and respond to development crises. Governance “allows donors to address matters broader than the government, to include various types of institutions from the official state apparatus to market institutions, to institutions from the civil society or voluntary sector, and all without explicitly talking about politics” (Chhotray & Stoker, 2010: 103).

Within the governance literature, the notion of good governance emerged in the late 1980s and early 1990s and quickly dominated the debate reflecting a rift between those advocating the adoption of western standards for developing countries and those emphasizing differences between industrialised countries and the Third World. Driven by the realisation that the use and outcome of development aid is dependent on the political commitment, capacity, and skills of the recipients, good governance has been widely established as a central theme to guide international development interventions, allowing donor institutions to influence the way sovereign states should organise their political systems, ensure policy implementation, and structure their institutions (Doornbos, 2000). As such, good governance provides criteria and defines mechanisms that need to be in place in order for recipient countries to receive aid and loans. While good governance is largely driven by western values and thinking including a strong preference for liberal democratic systems, many different interpretations and definitions abound reflecting principles and missions of the donor organisations. The World Bank and International Monetary Fund continue to rely on neoliberal economic development principles, but other institutions emphasise aspects of participation and present it as a tool to realise human rights. The United Nations (UNESCAP, 2012), for example, lists eight characteristics in its definition of good governance: accountability, transparency, consensus orientation, responsiveness, participation, effectiveness and efficiency, equity and inclusiveness, and rule of law.

Good governance has been largely criticised due to its western bias, problems associated with methods and implementation, and the roles of democracy and the state in development. There is no evidence as to which reforms work best in different development contexts and countries. As the use of good in good governance indicates, the concept is highly judgemental, reflecting mainly western principles and concepts that do not take into considerations the needs and circumstances of recipients (Leftwich, 1994; Blunt, 1995; Doornbos, 2001). In respect to methods and implementation, the main challenge relates to identifying
and formulating governance criteria that facilitate effective aid policy in each case. Imposition of western standards through political conditionalities has often created difficult and unforeseeable situations threatening stability and development goals. Donors usually are also unable to check compliance of recipients. Processes of democratisation that are seen as central aspect of good governance by the donor community have been questioned as they might not result in the best political process for African and other developing countries where competitive electoral politics have proven to pose a risk to security and prosperity (Doornbos, 2001). Finally, the splitting of the state and break with the dominant neoliberal paradigm of the 1980s has weakened the state in many developing countries and undermined key governance objectives rather than strengthened them, further questioning western models.

**Environmental Governance and Indigenous Rights**

Over the last years the changed role of the state conceptualised as shift from government to governance has turned to be a major issue within the environmental field. The multifaceted character of the socio-environmental problematic, combined with the magnitude of the challenges derived from the accumulated negative effects of human activity on the natural environment, pressed for new forms of regulation and socio-ecological custodianship. As a result, a large amount of literature applying the multiple debates on governance to the variety of environmental themes en vogue has flourished: governance of natural resources, governance of socio-ecological systems, governance of biodiversity and nature, governance of protected areas, and governance of climate change just to name a few (e.g., Adger, 2001; Brondizio et al., 2009; Parra, forthcoming). The work has been accompanied by contributions reflecting on best governance modes to deal with uncertainties given the context of climate change, such as with adaptive governance, transition management, resilience, and sustainable governance (e.g., Berkes and Folke, 2000; Walker et al., 2002, 2004; Stringer et al., 2006; Bosselmann et al., 2008; Loorbach & Kemp, 2008; Ostrom et al., 2009).

Most of this literature considers environmental governance challenges within the ensemble of unknowns inherent to the complexities and multi-scalar dynamics of climate change, modification of ecosystems, and depletion of natural resources. On the one hand, there is the denouncement of how contemporary modes of production and consumption have produced a world state of socio-ecological vulnerability that especially harms the poorest groups of society. On the other hand, it evidences the powerlessness of nation states to act alone in this global environmental crisis scenario. National governments “have come to be seen, and to see themselves, as participants in more complex and multi-layered processes of deliberation and environmental action” (Berkhout
et al., 2003: 8). This is because environmental decision-making processes related to the governance of the commons (Ostrom, 2007) involve and articulate highly complex and changing dynamics across nested spatio-temporal levels (Gibbs et al., 2002; Eckerberg & Joas, 2004; Rauschmayer et al., 2009; Parra, 2010; Affolderbach, 2011). In this multi-layered environmental reality, Paavola et al. (2009: 149) stress the need to distinguish between the role of “governance frameworks” and broader “governance regimes.” Whereas governance frameworks refer to those specific institutional interventions and policies set up by multiple actors to achieve an explicit goal, broader governance regimes include the variety of customs, norms, and rules that structure and affect behaviour of those taking part in environmental negotiations (Paavola et al., 2009).

A core issue in the debate on environmental governance has to do with how and who steers collective action to stop this state of vulnerability and bring sustainability of embedded socio-ecological systems back. From the global to the local, a wide range of mechanisms and instruments has been put forward giving rise to hybrid modes of environmental governance (Lemos & Agrawal, 2006). This hybrid structure includes popular market-based mechanisms such as ecotaxes, carbon tradable permits, and incentives for the corporate sector. Nevertheless, these mechanisms have been criticised for creating socio-environmental inequalities eroding democracy, as well as for reinforcing a process of “commodification of nature” where efficient use of natural resources is erroneously seen as equivalent to higher rates of extraction (Liverman cited in Lemos & Agrawal, 2006:312).

Participatory processes have been encouraged to improve legitimacy and effectiveness of governance solutions and by extent to reinforce democracy (Rauschmayer et al., 2009). The involvement of non-state actors is considered fundamental to enable social learning, stimulate environmental consciousness, and build sustainability from alternative forms of expertise and grounded knowledge (Parra, 2012). This relies on adapted governance frameworks, including adequate politico-institutional structures and policies, which are necessary to welcome and support a societal dialogue in which multiple voices, alternative knowledge, and cultural diversity converge (Parra & Moulaert, 2011). Among the plurality of the existing participatory processes, we draw attention to those modes of community-based governance of natural resources advocating for the inclusion of local and traditional indigenous people (Beltrán, 2000; Jenkins, 2000; Hanna et al., 2008; Neufeld, 2008; Jenkins, 2000). In brief, this communitarian governance paradigm stems from three interrelated matters drawing links between environmental governance and rights of vulnerable social groups. First, effec-
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tive and sustainable environmental governance depends on the entire diversity and cultural forms represented in a certain territory, including indigenous cultures. Second, traditional local people and indigenous communities hold a unique territorial knowledge founded in a strong nature-culture nexus from which the entire governance system, including government institutions, should learn and could benefit from. Third, as expressed in the 169 ILO Indigenous and Tribal Peoples Convention (1989), there is a global institutional call for reverting and mending a historical denial and sabotage of indigenous communities, that has led to abuses, dislocations, and varied forms of social and environmental injustices in different world regions. With the aim of finding solutions to these injustices, community based governance appears as a basis for social inclusion of traditional communities while simultaneously encouraging environmental protection and overcoming historical fragilities (Langton et al., 2005). Of course, indigenous community based governance, as with many other participatory processes, is far from being free of contradictions or a straightforward invitation for plurality in decision-making. Many contradictions and conflicts over natural resources embodied in actors with opposed interests and agendas show a still long way to go in the task of recalibrating power balances and establishing democratic practices at the service of the satisfaction of human needs and justice. We should not forget that building governance is a process or a dialogue, and as such it is slowly built up along time in the different concerned territories (Affolderbach et al., forthcoming; Parra, forthcoming; Parra & Moulaert, 2012).

Recurrent Themes in Governance Studies

The brief reflections on governance debates from different disciplines highlight recurrent themes in respect to democracy and fragility. Fragility, the high risk of governance failure, and unintended consequences form central themes in governance debates. They are frequently related to more complex decision-making structures that involve various actors. Already disadvantaged people, those historically excluded from decision-making processes, and victims of global injustices and disasters are counted among the most fragile and vulnerable groups. Governance systems need to incorporate and serve their interests and needs in order to reduce failure. Democracy is a central and frequently debated concept, giving rise to questions on the role of nation states and governments in delivering and producing good governance, and taking into account new interests and growing social complexity (e.g., hollowing out of the state). At the global level, questions arise to who will be represented by democracy – as it is impossible to include all those affected by a decision – and who will decide on who should be included (Dahl, 1989). The ambiguity of the processes of integration, centralisa-
tion, and globalisation on the one hand and those of disintegration, decentralisation, and localisation on the other require translation of global issues to the local level and vice versa in the form of governance structures that represent multi-scalar interests and coordinate between spatial levels. As reflected in the discourse in international relations and development studies, democracy itself is questioned as appropriate governance form. With increased complexity of governance structures and complex interdependencies between multiple spatial scales, accountability becomes considerably harder to achieve.

Outline of the Book

The book developed out of the 2010 Regional Integration and Social Cohesion (RISC) conference\(^1\) that brought together scholars from different disciplines around the world to discuss governance in respect to development, poverty, and global crises. The contributions in this book tackle a number of challenges and responses to governance highlighting issues of democracy and global interdependencies in respect to crisis. The first three contributions discuss issues of governance in respect to democracy and crises on an international scale with particular focus on developing countries. The following three chapters present specific case studies of governance challenges from Bolivia, Niger, and a number of South African countries.

In the first chapter of this book, Jill Eriksson provides an overview over critical events from the year 2010 as a starting point to reflect on the global and complex nature of crises and related governance challenges. Examples of crisis from developed and developing countries including economic (e.g., financial crisis), environmental (e.g., earthquakes, volcano eruptions), and socio-political events (e.g., US health reform, political violence) illustrate the multi-scalar character from the local to the global level and the interrelatedness of economic, political, environmental, and social issues. Based on these examples, Eriksson illustrates different forms of governance failure and success focusing on the role of nation states. She introduces the concept of fragility to analyse and classify governance failure highlighting core concepts in governance theory such as legitimacy, efficiency, democracy, and accountability. In a final analytical step, the potential and need of international governance structures is explored taking a closer look at “global economic leadership.” While global economic governance structures have been also relatively prone to governance failures themselves, partly

\(^1\) The RISC Conference entitled “Development, Poverty and Global Crises: Reinforcing Governance” was held in Luxembourg (LU) on November 10-13, 2010 (http://www.risc.lu/content/en/international-conference-2010-luxembourg).
due to competition and breaking into factions, Eriksson emphasises the potential and strength of regional institutions. Taking into account the interconnected nature of crisis any national governance system requires coordination at the supranational level and regional organisations could very well provide support networks and act as saviours.

In Chapter 2, Bruno Boidin examines the concepts of governance and global public good, and discusses the promises and limits of these two popular approaches within the domain of health studies with particular focus on developing countries. He argues that despite the prevailing worldwide consensus regarding the relevance of these two concepts for health studies and related public policies, they persist in being largely disconnected from the increasing challenges of access to health care in developing countries. Boidin claims that approaches to governance as that of the International Bretton Woods system, aiming at imposing a homogenous agenda unified under notions such as good governance, world public goods, democracy, incentives, among others, is not only theoretically unconvincing but also an agenda completely disconnected from the cultural and economic specificities of developing countries. As Boidin’s work shows, approaches of this kind are related to a problematic discrepancy between the “universal right to health care,” proffered by global discourses and official reports, and the existing health care system lacking the adequate structures and institutions required to improve health care, population health, and well-being in developing countries. Without putting into question the debates connecting local governance and human development issues, Boidin makes a plea for a more profound analysis of the conditions of institutional transformation, and especially of power struggles within public local powers and between them and international institutions. Any attempt to impose a pre-established “foreign” programme, without taking into consideration compatibilities between the desired reforms and local interests, have very little chances to succeed in improving efficiency of international cooperation.

It could be argued that the measure of a state’s commitment to democratic principles lies with its ability to ameliorate insecurity risks in the lives of citizens through social programs, redistribution of wealth, and participation in a free electoral process. The fact that many newly democratic states are unable to do so is the subject of the chapter by Sarah Brooks (Chapter 3). A central question in her chapter asks why is it that disenfranchised populations of many states in the developing world do not employ their newfound freedoms to improve their quality of life. Brooks provides a careful examination of how the achievement and practice of democracy does not always lead to the reduction of insecurity in people’s lives. Indeed, even when democratic reforms are
implemented, there is no guarantee that a citizenry will fully utilise and participate in social programs or electoral reform, or even that a nation may be able to establish and sustain such initiatives. Adding to this complication is that most studies seem to overlook that insecurity at the individual level has far greater repercussions than previously supposed, leading many individuals to forego participation in democratic processes due to perceived and actual risks. If combined with a lack of social institutions that can manage risk for their constituent populations, then expectations of economic and social inequality will rise despite any democratic transformations a country may experience. Using global data on 170 countries from the 1970s to the present, Brooks marshals evidence that democracy alone is not the solution to the management of risk. Without adequate and strong institutions to correct for insecurity, citizens may find themselves in situations of violence, poverty, and shut out from meaningful participation in civic processes. Living with high levels of risk will be borne on their shoulders alone. Brooks warns that the resulting malaise and decline in confidence of a newly transitioned state’s regime may be the greatest threat of all to fledgling democracies.

Angela Erazo’s contribution on indigenous peoples and environmental groups (Chapter 4) raises very important questions concerning the multiple tensions that various societal groups experience nowadays: How do we restore friendly relationships between economic development and environmental sustainability aims? How can progressive governments maintain and reproduce the robustness of their social base? How do we reconcile industrialisation, modernisation, and “development” with rights, worldviews, and beliefs of indigenous peoples? Erazo deals with these questions through a research case study on coal mining in the Zulia region of Venezuela, nonetheless the timeliness of her work reflects main governance issues and contemporary challenges faced by social and environmental movements in many other countries. The Bolivia of Evo Morales is one example in this respect, especially the recent fervent opposition of Indians to a new highway construction plan which according to the concerned local community threatens the respect for the ancestral worldview attached to this territory. Erazo’s case is interesting as it brings to light the limits and difficulties of contemporary governance models: in this case, progressive governments in Venezuela, unlike their predecessors, have made steps forward in the distribution of the benefits reaped from the exploitation of energy resources among the local community, however this has regrettably brought corruption.

Irrigation development has been identified as important tool to reduce poverty, secure food production, and foster economic development in developing countries. A large number of international organisations offer support through agricultural irrigation schemes to national and
local governments. Using the example of the Gaya region in Niger, Ronald Jaubert, Lawali Dambo, Nicola Contoreggi, and Joanne Co-chand (Chapter 5) analyse the exclusion of smallholders in irrigation development projects during the 2000s, as well as its national rural development strategy. Even though private irrigation programmes are directed towards individuals with a direct mandate to alleviate poverty, they often fail to respond to the needs of local land users, resulting in project designs that discriminate against them. The analysis of the Gaya region reveals a number of technical and administrative hurdles that exclude smallholders from accessing private irrigation funds, most importantly, the obligation to present a land ownership title and to make a monetary personal contribution. While the project was not accessible to most farmers, it demonstrated the potential and economic interest of small-scale irrigation triggering individual irrigation initiatives outside of funding schemes. Similarly, Niger’s rural development strategy focuses on large-scale hydro-agricultural schemes that reduce the goal of poverty reduction, as the authors point out, to a rhetorical statement. Based on a study of economic performance and investment needs of smallholders, the authors demonstrate the economic profitability of low-cost irrigation used by local farmers and postulate a system of microcredit that would allow to address poverty reduction at the local level supporting the local population including smallholders.

Echoing some of the issues surrounding democratic transitions unravelled by Sarah Brooks, Yolanda Sadie (Chapter 6) presents a comprehensive examination of the views of southern African university students whose nations have undergone democratisation within the last 15 years. The student population is presented as their nations’ budding intellectual and political elite, those that will soon take the reins of control in their respective nations. Moreover, students have been at the forefront in challenging repressive regimes in African states, often becoming the vanguard for incipient democratic transitions. Through their experience on the frontlines of change and the recipients of presumed positive benefits that change would bring, they may serve as a barometer of current conditions on the quality of democracy. What then are their impressions on the current states of democracy and governance in their countries? To answer that question, Sadie presents results from an opinion survey conducted with students from diverse academic departments and disciplines at public universities in the nations of South Africa, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Malawi, and Lesotho. These nations were selected due to their diversity of political histories, populations, and statistical ratings with several international reporting bodies. While the survey is largely concerned with opinions and perceptions of students, Sadie demonstrates that these opinions have a very real impact on the continued success of democratic regimes; if a regime is unable to
assert and maintain it’s legitimacy in the perception of its citizenry, it will directly undermine how a democracy works. To that end, Sadie discusses the survey results in several areas: satisfaction and expectations of democracy, trust in political institutions, the levels of political participation and apathy, and the implications that post-university emigration of students with useful skills, constituting a “brain-drain” of the best and brightest, has on the development of democracy in south African nations. Sadie concludes by discussing the relative similarities between the students’ perceptions, despite the differences between the individual nations. Overall, students felt that their voices were unheard, their trust in political leaders was profoundly low, and that most are considering emigrating after completing university studies. The one bright spot, according to Sadie, is that in light of these negative perceptions, levels of apathy towards politics is not as low as would be expected. Perhaps that is something that can be built upon to encourage students to take up the challenge to lead their nations in pursuit of greater social and economic equality.

Using different starting points and bringing together perspectives from different disciplines, the six chapters illustrate the need to reinforce governance as means to overcome fragility and bring encompassing territorial sustainability. The speed at which our living environment changes requires ongoing learning, adaptation, and development of more adequate forms of coordination, regulation, and steering that take into account the plurality of local interests and human needs. At the same time, reinforced forms of governance must ensure the collective production of more harmonic nature-society relationships. Increased global-local interdependencies and the complexity of global crises require governance systems that span multiple scales from the global to the local level. At the same time, one major challenge relates to the imperative to tailor governance structures to local genuine needs and the specific local culture as emphasized, for example, by Bruno Boidin and Ronald Jaubert and colleagues. We hope this book will inspire creative thinking towards the reinforcement of societal learning and “on the ground” proactive experimentation that will contribute to shift from governance as a reaction or amendment in a context of crisis to a more sustainable and fair anticipation and dialogic imagining of future scenarios.
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