

The Governance of Social Inclusion and Social Sustainability

Outline presentation on Friday 30th October 2009 at the 49th UCEU Conference in Nicosia

dr. Louis Meuleman*

Integrated urban renewal can be a political mine field. The stakes (often financial) are high for political leaders, for project developers, and for many other local stakeholders, last but not least the citizens themselves. The aims may be clear, but often the actual renewal or improvement projects encounter technical, social and political problems. The concept of *social sustainability* adds a new challenge, namely to include not only 'planet' and 'profit' but also the 'people' dimension in future-oriented planning. This social dimension includes for example poverty reduction, improvement of the quality of labour conditions, creating equal rights (e.g. regarding gender), and *social inclusion*. Social inclusion can be a policy objective, close to the term social cohesion, but is also a way to express that citizens should be involved in planning and decision making about their own urban environment. In practice, social sustainability has often been neglected, compared to the economic and environmental dimensions of urban renewal and improvement projects.

This brings us to the term *governance*. From a local government perspective, the main reasons to involve citizens in urban renewal and improvement are usually to create a broad acceptance and to make use of citizens' knowledge. Therefore, it has become 'en vogue' to design interactive forms of planning and policy-making.

However, social inclusion should be more than only involving (selected) citizens in formal decision-making. City governments who have the courage to also give local communities their own responsibility for, for example, designing and managing playgrounds and other green areas, or keeping the streets clean, will observe that ownership increases and new ideas will come up. Neighbourhoods are sometimes very well able to make sensible priorities and achieve progress in a responsible, and sustainable way. In addition, government control (e.g. zero tolerance policing) may also be necessary in certain circumstances.

Each of the three approaches brings forth a typical failure. Hierarchy can lead to bureaucracy and 'red tape'. Network governance can become very time-consuming ('talking clubs'), expensive and inconclusive, and questions can be raised about how representative the participants are. Decentralisation and empowering can lead to ineffectiveness.

Such failures should be prevented or at least mitigated. Therefore, city leaders should also *govern their governance*: they have to become 'metagovernors', by using smart combinations of three styles of governance: *network* governance (participation, building trust), *hierarchical* governance (authority, targets, deadlines, rules and regulations, securing results) and *market* governance (creating ownership, empowerment, and entrepreneurship, but also keeping an eye on efficiency and flexibility).

Successful British urban renewal projects have illustrated that during such projects, a 'natural' evolution from one governance style to another emerges. If one style, like the network style, dominates, the other styles are used to flank and support the key style. But also a national or even local culture plays a role. In the Netherlands, cultural differences between Amsterdam and Rotterdam, have led to quite different ways of dealing with petty crime and other forms of social unrest. Also other examples will be presented.

This leads to the central claim of this presentation: social inclusion and social sustainability both require that city leaders and managers develop the capacity to be reflexive 'metagovernors', who sometimes are in control, sometimes are partners, and sometimes give room to citizens to develop their own, active inclusiveness in their own streets and neighbourhoods. The success lies in the best combination, and it is important to understand that what is 'best' may differ per city and over time. Therefore also for social sustainability and social inclusion applies that learning from each other is smart, but copying is not. The question should always be: what works where and why?

* dr. Louis Meuleman is director of the Advisory Council for Research on Spatial Planning, Nature and the Environment in the Hague, the Netherlands, and Chair of the Netherlands Association for Public Management.

contact: Email: louis.meuleman@publicstrategy.nl Mobile:+31 6 2182702

The Governance of Social Inclusion and Social Sustainability

Keynote speech
49th UCEU Conference
Nicosia, Cyprus
Friday 30th October 2009

Dr Louis Meuleman

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

Central claim/case

I will make the case that:

Social inclusion and social sustainability both require that city leaders and managers develop the capacity to be reflexive 'metagovernors', who

- sometimes are in control,
- sometimes are partners,
- and sometimes give room to citizens to develop their own, active inclusiveness in their own streets and neighbourhoods.

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

Integrated urban renewal and sustainable development

- **Social sustainability** is often neglected: environment & economics dominate
- **Social inclusion** is a dimension of soc.sust. and is also problematic

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

Cities, Democracy and Governance Styles

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

Push & pull factors: there are three basic forces or 'governance styles

Governance = how government, civil society, business, etcetera relate to each other when solving societal problems and creating societal opportunities

Top-down
 Subjects
 Authority
 Imperatives
 Rules

Hierarchy

Together
 Participation
 Partners
 Trust
Network
 Empathy
 Consensus

Self-regulation
 Empowerment
 Clients/customers
Market
 Price
 Competition
 Contracts

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

These are also three ways to stimulate social inclusion

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
 louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

But there are also three problems challenging city managers

Problem 1. Typical failures and dark sides of the styles...

3. TOP DOWN:
Ineffectiveness, red tape
Abuse of power
Hierarchy

1. TOGETHER:
Never-ending talks,
No decisions
Network

2. SELF-REGULATION:
Economic inefficiency,
market failures
Market

Corruption
Manipulation

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

7

But there are also three problems challenging city managers

Problem 2. Each style is a culture/ belief system/ addiction...

East- and South European countries
Hierarchy

Scandinavian countries, Netherlands
Network

Anglo-Saxon countries
Market

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

8

But there are also three problems challenging city managers

Problem 3. The 3 styles can undermine each other (and they do.....)

Govt. rules society (dependency)
Reliability
Hierarchy

Govt. is partner (interdependency)
Trust
Network

PR campaign
Flexibility
Market

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

9

Possible solution: 'metagovernance' of social inclusion

Metagovernance = managing the problems between hierarchical, network and market governance, through:

1. Combining styles
2. Switching between styles
3. Maintenance of successful style mixture

... in a **situational** way: taking into account cultures, for example

Hierarchy
Meta-governance of social inclusion
Network **Market**

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

10

Possible solution: 'metagovernance' of social inclusion

Example of metagovernance as **switching** between styles
Community policing case in Utrecht, Netherlands

1. Decision on target and to give resources
2. Stakeholders convene in steering group; consensus on how to proceed
3. Stakeholders do their 'tasks' as efficient as possible, autonomous
4. Securing results in rules legislation if necessary

Hierarchy
Meta-governance of social inclusion
Network **Market**

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

11

Possible solution: 'metagovernance' of social inclusion

Example of metagovernance as **making situational combinations** of styles: differences between the cities of Amsterdam and Rotterdam

Rotterdam
Workers, collectivists
Logics of hierarchy and cooperation:
Appointment of City marines

Amsterdam
Artists Individualists
Logic of entrepreneurship
Contract with sport school

Hierarchy
Network **Market**

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

12

Conclusions

1. Social inclusion is a requisite of social sustainability.
2. Social inclusion can be stimulated through hierarchical, network and market governance, but probably mostly through the last two.
3. These three approaches (1) have typical failures, (2) can undermine each other, and (3) are also deep belief systems.
4. National and local cultures influence what works; good practices of social inclusion must always be adapted.
5. Social inclusion and social sustainability both require that city leaders and managers have the capacity to be reflexive 'metagovernors'.

Louis Meuleman 30/10/09 Nicosia
louismeuleman@publicstrategy.nl

13