

The Good Governance Mix

- [Comments \(3\)](#)
- [PDF](#)
- [Send to a friend](#)

The Good Governance Mix

Essay by [Charlie Leadbeater](#), June 17, 2008 in response to [Tacit Governance](#)

[Tacit Governance](#)

One of the outstanding features of David Weinberger's writing about the web is his unwillingness to fall into the trap of making all or nothing, simple dichotomies. More than anyone writing about the web he understands and enjoys its miscellaneous messiness.

So I was slightly surprised when I read his apparently cut and dried [argument](#) in favor of tacit norms over explicit rules. (Thanks to [James Cherkoff](#) for alerting me to the debate.)

David's argument, if I have it straight, is:

Norms organise us without being imposed top down.

Rules are usually imposed because norms fail.

Tacit governance is usually healthy, whereas rules are a social scar.

The net is self-governing, like a good public space, because no one is in control and so people take responsibility for it themselves rather than relying on an external authority to police it for them. (Some Dutch cities have got rid of traffic lights at junctions for just this reason: it encourages people to self-moderate their driving.)

David's argument (rules are failed norms) seems rather one sided. It's reminiscent of the debate about [Michael Polyani's](#) distinction between tacit and explicit knowledge, a distinction widely used in the knowledge management industry.

Polyani did not say there were two different kinds of knowledge but that all knowledge has a tacit and an explicit component. In [The Knowledge Creating Company](#) Hirotaka Takeuchi and Ijuro Nonaka explained how Japanese companies innovated by turning tacit knowledge (how a great pastry chef made croissant) into explicit knowledge (the design for a bread making machine) which in turn required would be chefs to develop their own tacit knowledge to use the machine in their kitchens. What counts is the way that tacit and explicit knowledge are combined.

Much the same interaction is at play in most efforts at governance in cities, groups and especially in governing an open, liberal, individualistic society (like the Internet) where people cannot be instructed by a higher authority.

Are rules always failed norms? Norms can survive even if they breed rules. In the UK the law is that you drive on the left. But it's also a norm that people follow even when there is little prospect of enforcement.

Rules can provide the framework in which norms develop. This is the familiar story in many projects, often involving multiple partners. Initially there is a lot of haggling about contracts. Once that is all done and dusted, the contracts are put away and the project runs according to the norms the participants establish. The success of the project (a film, play, research venture) depends on the norms; but the contracts provide a baseline which allows the project to get going in the first place. In the days when I was employable, I never started a job without a contract. But I never once looked at the contract after it had been signed. In the organizations I worked for (newspapers mainly) work was governed by norms rather than rules.

The norm-based net is not a closed world; it might need protecting by rules. A recent poll found a large majority of UK internet users wanted rules to control how television and newspapers could use information on social networking sites.

Rules can also help groups (online and offline) to collaborate.

The development of the 19th century postal system in the US and UK depended on new rules linking people to addresses. Streets had to be named and houses numbered. All of this involved a massive formalisation of previously tacit organised private life: where you lived was your business. Yet these rules then allowed a flowering of a peer-to-peer communications culture in which hundreds of thousands of Americans and Britons taught one another how to write and reply to letters. No central authority set down rules for writing letters: that was a norm-governed activity. But it depended on a postal system that was rule-governed.

David's argument suggests that living by norms is better than living by rules. Living by norms means you are freer, less prey to external authority and more likely to be part of a collaborative society. Norm based governance is an end in itself.

A different point of view is that both rules and norms are just means. They should be judged by how they help us to reach goals we value. Let me suggest two goals that we might agree upon: equality of opportunity and advances in science that benefit mankind.

On equality, norms are often just as scarring as rules, not least because they are less explicit and so difficult to challenge. (Women should give up their jobs when they have their first child) is not made good by being a norm. Decades of legislation were needed to challenge norms that entrenched gender inequality. Rules are sometimes needed because norms are too powerful and entrenched, not because they have failed.

What of science and knowledge? The Human Genome Project, probably the most impressive example of global scientific collaboration for the public good, depended on strong norms of sharing information. But after a while those norms were sustained only by a simple set of rules: the Bermuda Principles - codified with the help of the Wellcome Trust. Those rules for sharing data then underpinned the rest of the project.

I think the question is: what sort of rules are needed to sustain norm based governance that promotes equality, openness and democracy? Explicit rules may particularly matter to make sure norms give people equal chances and serve a larger purpose than sustaining the power of the insiders who established them. Explicit governance through simple rules is often essential to create a framework of tacit self governance.

Charles Leadbeater is a London based writer, author of We Think and a visiting fellow at the UK National Endowment of Science Technology and the Arts.

Comments (3)

- geir stene wrote:

Well, Norms have rules too. If you look at it from another perspective you will see this. In sociology, or zoology its a very obvious "fact" It's interesting, animals doesn't have rules, but humans does. For both goes the threat that braking them leads to consequences. If you break a rule, you might get a fine, or go to jail. For braking a group norm, you will get excluded from the group, very directly or very subtle, all depending.

In this discussion this created an interessting thought, braking a norm in the virtual, digital world of the web, you risk to be left alone, without an audience, outside the "discussion", outside the collaborative collective? But you might find a new place to "belong" where your way of acting and interacting IS the norm, and you yet again are a part of a group. But for your ideas and actions to be accepted you need acceptance from someone, and if you want to make a difference you still hvae this risk of becoming excluded, and need to moderate yourself. I can't see why or how this shouldn't be a "fact" also in a virtual, digital environment. My statment is that we can discuss rules and norms, but is seems to me that it might not be the most relevant subject in order to understand, nor prefeere the one above the other, and make use of it to understand behaviors and partisipations on the web.

- Anthony Zacharzewski wrote:

I think norms and rules can have a more symbiotic relationship. Norms are social scaffolding - temporary, easy to plan and easy to construct. Rules are the building that grows up under the scaffolding - permanent, the product of compromise, harder to build without erecting the scaffolding first.

In particular, rules remove the risk that personnel or social group changes will change the norms without a process of discussion.

Norms, like partnerships or other personality-based relationships, can shift markedly when a few key people change. Rules can't - and changes have to put in place more slowly and cautiously. It's the difference between the US Constitution and the first twenty years of US Presidential Elections.

- There is an important view in R. Buckminsterfuller, over the horizons of science.

Since science is a cultural practice, we must see the paths of inventions and knowledge acquisitions. There are senses beneath sciences, and sometimes senses are meaning war commitments, in other cases we can find more humanistic goals.

Buckminsterfuller said that there are two main models to produce science, the weaponry model and the livingry model.

I believe that we can find more models. A democratic model should be one of the prospects. I also suggest to all about a welfare-model for science.

Thank you

Gerardo

Madrid- Spain

Post new comment

Your name: *

E-mail: *

The content of this field is kept private and will not be shown publicly.

Homepage:

Subject:

Comment: *

– [▶ Input format](#)

CAPTCHA

This question is for testing whether you are a human visitor and to prevent automated spam submissions.



What code is in the image?: *

Enter the characters shown in the image.

Save

Preview

All Considering Rules and Governance Essays

Tacit vs. Explicit Governance

- [The Good Governance Mix](#)
by [Charlie Leadbeater](#)
- [Learning to Love the Rules](#)
by [Wendy Seltzer](#)
- [Why Tacit Governance of the Net is an Imperative](#)
by [JP Rangaswami](#)

[View all thematic areas »](#)

[Charlie Leadbeater](#) [Tacit vs. Explicit Governance](#)

Source URL: http://publius.cc/good_governance_mix