

Dipartimento di Scienze Politiche

Cattedra di Sociologia Economica

**AUTO-ORGANIZZAZIONE E
GESTIONE DEI BENI PUBBLICI**

RELATORE:

Simona Fallocco

CANDIDATO:

Martina De Matteis

Matr. 068372

ANNO ACCADEMICO 2013/2014

INDICE

INTRODUZIONE	3
CAPITOLO PRIMO: IL PROBLEMA DEI BENI PUBBLICI	
1.1 La definizione di beni pubblici	6
1.2 Garret Hardin: la Tragedia dei Beni Comuni	10
1.3 Mancur Olson: la logica dell'azione collettiva	14
1.3.1 La dimensione dei gruppi	17
1.3.2 Gli incentivi selettivi	21
CAPITOLO SECONDO: GOVERNARE I BENI COLLETTIVI	
2.1 Privatizzazione e Centralizzazione	25
2.2 La terza via di Elinor Ostrom	30
CONCLUSIONI	39
BIBLIOGRAFIA	41

ABSTRACT

During the last seventy years the organization and management problem of the common goods has been remarkably important in the field of economic studies. This is a subtle issue and it has been object of analyses of many theorists who have tried to solve one of the most pressing problems in the economic and sociological fields.

My personal concern that I matured on the subject derives from my natural interest on the human organization and from my awareness of the importance of the common goods that represented some difficult resources to classify.

During my study I tried to define the main characteristics of the common goods; at the beginning of my work there is the analysis of the characteristics, definitions limits and implications of the common goods as I focused my attention on the non-rivalry and non-excludability. Regarding the non-rivalry one over a lot of people can consume the same good without reducing its value; while in the second one everyone cannot be blocked from consuming the good. In the second paragraph I examine the studies of Garret Hardin who has wrote an article in 1968 , “ *The Tragedy of Commons*” in which he asserts that is impossible to conduct self-management policies because otherwise they would lead to their disruption; in fact people are inclined to perform an extra consumption of common goods. He wrote an example about the pasture in which he compare individual costs and individual benefits with common costs and common benefits, at the end he said that the final result could be the destruction of publics resources. The important question is that Hardin did not

consider that a little community could organize itself and could avoid the so-called “ the tragedy of commons ”.

At the end of the first chapter there is the analysis of Mancur Olson theory, who wrote in 1985 “*The Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*”. He has elaborated Hardin studies and he focused his attention on the organization and cooperation between every person of the community. His contribution are based on the issue of the different size of groups and selective incentive. Olson distinguished three different types of groups : privileged groups that are groups with few members (everyone would obtain more from a public resource), latent groups that are groups with several members (anyone would not contribute to the production of the public goods without reducing his supply), and intermediate groups (if any member of this group withholds his contribution, it will cause a noticeable decrease in supply of the good, or a noticeable rise in cost to other contributors).

The best solution is represented by privileged groups because here they have an higher expectation and they are most likely to satisfy common needs. On the contrary in the latent group everyone follow his personal interests.

The second argument analyzed by Olson are the selective incentives; he explains how important is the presence of some form of coercions or incentives given in order to avoid opportunistic behaviour and to ensure better management of public affairs.

The second chapter is focused on the singular studies an important American economist, Elinor Ostrom who wrote “*Governing the Commons*” in which she mixes empirical research and theories in order to give more integrity to her analysis. She puts in contrast with the two main policy applied to the commons an innovative type of management. The first one is the centralization of the public goods; this solution must have some essential peculiarities: accuracy of the information, surveillance capabilities and reliability of the penalty. The second one is the privatization and this policy considers the property right on the public goods. This situation has some complication because not every resources can be subdivided in a community.

After have discussed all these attempts that may be seen as remedies to the initial problems of the *public thing* I am going to describe the purpose of Ostrom which solutions are based on the observation of those experiences in which there has been a successful type of cooperation and there is the attempt of establish the dichotomy of a third way.

The author, thanks to her empirical researches and her studies on the societies, defines eight planning principles that may represent the necessary conditions for the self-government of the of the resources could be productive and for the consistency of the institutions. One distinctive and important element is that the endogenous factors create a system of rules, in a way that there would not be violations or *free-rider* type of behaviours that could give the perception that everyone is respecting the rules and then a sense of general trust. The innovative approach of the American author has been recognized with the 2009 Nobel prize as a proof of the importance of her contribute that should be interpreted as a stimulus for the pursuing of the research in such field.

Elinor Ostrom underlines the importance of heterogeneity of aspect during the analysis of this issue. The man described by Ostrom is opened to the cooperation and he has a rationality restricted to a specific contest; on the contrary the nature of the *homo oeconomicus* is based on the high wealth research. It would be necessary to overcome the borderline put by traditional theories that put fixed parameters for situation that are different from the geographical, cultural and social point of view.

The intent of the Nobel Prize is that these studies will continue and they will increase during the time because, if there is a solid theoretical support it could be possible to understand the self –government and to find places where the self-management of common goods is possible.

