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Abstract
Due to the diversity of interpretations and definitions given in Latin America to the terms gobernabilidad and gobernanza, this paper brings together and compares these definitions with the concepts of the Anglo-Saxon terms governance and governability. After an anthropological analysis of these concepts, it proposes a definition of governance which could be applied in international cooperation projects for development in Latin America: the collection of all personal interactions in society which contribute to the creation of a common good, in order to resolve social problems or generate new opportunities.
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Introduction
In view of the current international interest in the concept of governance, it is striking to see the conflicts faced in Latin America in order to define an equivalent term in Spanish. There are diverse interpretations and definitions when one tries to transfer the concepts within the Anglo-Saxon terms governance and governability and apply the terms gobernanza and gobernabilidad.

A revision of the concepts of these Anglo-Saxon terms and an analysis of the anthropological foundations of governance allows for the proposal of a definition of this concept in the Latin American context; and also, a proposal for the application of this concept in international cooperation projects that try to create a positive impact on governance.

There are conflicting definitions of governance in Latin America
Although the interest in Latin America about gobernanza and gobernabilidad has its origin in the Anglo-Saxon literature, with the publication of the terms governance and governability, transferring the concepts of these Anglo-Saxon terms to the Latin American context have been quite diverse, generating both a semantic and conceptual debate.

Part of this conceptual diversity has been amplified by the manner in which international development agencies have used these terms. Both the terms gobernanza and gobernabilidad have been used to translate the concepts of governance to Spanish. European institutions such as the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the European Union (EU) or Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional (AECI), have a greater tendency of using the word gobernanza. While
institutions such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), use more frequently the term 
gobernabilidad.

However, the political context of Latin America has influenced the use of the term 
gobernabilidad; especially the individual political experiences of Latin American authors.
As the institutionalism of government in Latin America has been weak for a long period of 
time; its own political formation; the way of understanding the issue of government and the 
influence of Marxist thinking in Latin American social sciences (Camou, 2001) have created 
a special interest in the issue of governability. As Mayorga showed (2007, citing Norbert 
Lechner) the leftist Latin American school of thought has favored a strategy of power 
without considering a strategy for order.

The following will show the definitions offered by various Latin American authors for the 
term gobernabilidad.

For several authors (Camou, 2001; Calderón, 2001; Prats, 2001; Coppedge, 2001; Campero, 
2002; Mayorga, 2007), gobernabilidad is a quality of society which explains the socio-
political stability of society.

However, for some of these authors, gobernabilidad is an effect of the type of government.
For Camou (2001), Campero (2002) and Mayorga (2007), gobernabilidad is the dynamic 
balance between societal demands and the responses to those demands by the 
state/government. However, these authors also consider that gobernabilidad has 
undergone an evolution through time: if at the beginning was attributed to balance between 
the different authorities, for example the relationship between the executive and the 
legislature; now it has to be understood as the result of the relationship between more 
social actors.

In this way, Camou (2001) explains that the challenge of governing is knowing how to 
articulate the levels of political culture, institutions and actions with the political (state), 
economical (market) and social (civil society) sectors. This articulation must be held in 
several basic agreements between ruling classes and a meaningful majority of the 
population, and these agreements should be institutional in character.

A similar approach is shown by Campero (2002, cited by Mayorga, 2007).

However, for other authors (Prats, 2001; Coppedge, 2001; Calderón, 2001), gobernabilidad 
of the society is a quality which depends not only on the state, but rather it must be 
evaluated in terms of the actions of other strategic social actors as well.

Prats (2001) adds:

A social system is able to be governed when it is structured socio-politically in a 
manner in which all strategic actors interact for making authoritative decisions and 
solving their conflicts according to a system of rules and both formal and informal
procedures, which may involve different levels of institutionalization, within which expectations and strategies are framed (2001, p. 120).

In this sense, Prats defines strategic actors as “every individual, organization or group with sufficient resources to impede or disturb the function of rules and procedures for decision making and solving collective conflicts” (2001, p. 120), in such a way, as Mayorga mentions (2007), for Prats the strategic actors, rules, procedures or formulas and conflicts between these actors play an important role.

Coppedge (2001) is another author for whom gobernabilidad also relies on strategic actors in society and in which the socio-political stability must face issues of conflict. For this author, strategic actors are those which hold power in society, in such a way that gobernabilidad or socio-political stability relies on following stable formulas which are mutually accepted by these actors.

Calderón (2001) proposes that the objective of gobernabilidad is the political order which assures socio-political stability; and in the case of the democracy, the construction of a plural, conflictive and open institutional order. For this author, strategic actors are those who have a national project or a vision of society as a whole, which could be defined by three dimensions: gobernabilidad, competitiveness and social integration. For this author conflicts will be the result of the priority given to these components by the different interpretations or national projects.

For all of these authors, gobernabilidad is a quality which qualifies the level of socio-political stability in the society. For some forementioned authors, is an essential responsibility of the state/government; for others, is the result of conflicts between strategic actors. In both cases, the relationship in the society is observed as a power relationship.

Before completing this review of the concept of gobernabilidad in Latin American literature, is appropriate to mention that although several authors (Camou, 2001; Campero, 2002; Mayorga, 2007) recognize that the origin of their reflections was promoted, in part, by the report The Crisis of Democracy: Report on the Gobernabilidad of Democracies to the Trilateral Commission, of 1975; their definition of gobernabilidad has also been influenced by World Bank definition of governance, which was published in 1992: the abilities for managing the public sector; rules and institutions which create a predictable and transparent framework for public and private businesses; and the ability for economic and financial accounting (World Bank, 1992).

In this context, which prioritizes power and the relationship between the state and society, what does gobernanza mean?

For Camou (2001), gobernanza is only the establishment of the government’s agenda, the design of politics, decisions and the evaluation of their impact. For him, gobernanza would be understood as an element of the concept of gobernabilidad.
Campero (2002, cited by Mayorga, 2007) defines gobernanza as a technical ability of the State to respond to social and economic demands with efficacy and transparency. Similarly to Camou, he understands gobernanza as an element of the concept of gobernabilidad.

Mayorga (2007) points out that Latin American political science has elaborated models and paradigms of gobernabilidad which could be used as analytical tools; but on the other hand, “there are not models and paradigms of gobernanza” (p. 9). There are only “normative formulas of good government or punctual studies of interaction between actors, rules, public politics and levels of government” (p. 9).

This author also concludes that “there is not a text in Latin American literature which summarizes and systematizes the use of gobernanza” (p.7) and definitions vary according to the case studies, its focus or approach.

In particular, for this author, gobernanza passed from merely referring to the action of government or the exercise of governing a region; to include, citing Elena Martínez, the Director of PNUD Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean, “the framework of rules, institutions and established practices which develop limits and incentives to the actions of individuals, organizations and enterprises” (Mayorga, 2007, p. 4).

Mayorga’s definition of gobernanza coincides with that of Camou (2001) at the starting point but his final definition is closer to the definition of governance proposed in a policy research working paper of the World Bank: “governance as the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised” (Kaufmann, Kraay & Zoido-Lobaton, 1999).

This analysis, about the concept of gobernanza, leads Mayorga to conclude:

It seems more appropriate to restrict the concept of gobernanza to the analysis of relationships between state and society, on their different jurisdictional levels, when the object refers to public policies, while the concept of gobernabilidad is more pertinent to a broader interpretation of the state relationships, political systems and society, or for an analysis of social systems, but not for referring to their components (2007, p. 9).

Hence, all of these authors give more importance to the term gobernabilidad than to the term gobernanza. For these authors, the level of social stability is determined by the quality of the relationship between the state and society in political decisions (Camou, 2001; Calderón, 2001; Mayorga, 2007).

There are other Latin American and Spanish authors who think that the concept of gobernanza is more relevant than the concept of gobernabilidad. For these authors gobernabilidad is a quality of societies: the ability for governing; but as this ability relies on the order in society to this objective, gobernanza would be to gobernabilidad as the cause to the effect. Thus, they make more emphasis in studying gobernanza or the different ways for governing a society.
Among these authors is Jolly (2003), who after several projects in Colombia, and using the French literature, points out that gobernanza is “a coordination process of actors, social groups and institutions in order to reach goals which have been discussed collectively in fragmented and uncertain environments” (p. 12).

And to develop a definition with a broader application, he includes the territorial variable, and adds:

To conceptualize gobernanza suggests to understand the articulation of different types of regulation into a territory, in both aspects political and social integration and ability for action. To conceptualize it implies to examine again interactions between civil society, state and market and new compositions between these different spheres whose edges was deleted (p. 12).

For Jolly (2003) gobernabilidad is “the capacity of societies and their political sub-systems to make decisions or initiate actions in reaction to demands and needs that occur within them” (p. 11). In this way, for Jolly (2003), governability is the ability to be governed; while gobernanza is the particular manner of governing, or according to Muller and Surel, “a way of governing”; however a mean of government which differs from the concept of local government, for this reason he adds, again cites Muller y Surel:

A coherent public action (...) is not only defined by the action of a relatively homogeneous and centralized political-administrative elite (...), but by putting into action multi-level and multi-actor coordination. The result of which is always uncertain, and depends on the ability of public and private actors to define a common ground, and to utilize competencies of different actors and to implement formulas of responsibility and legitimization of decisions (p. 12).

Balbis (2001) translates the English term governance as gobernanza, and points out “first of all, it is a manner to refer to the issue of politics indirectly” (p. 24). He later adds: “this practice of good governance implies reforms which call for new articulations between the state, society and the market as they relate precisely to the new role assigned in this context to NGOs” (p. 24). And citing Alcantara, he states that good gobernanza means “to create consensus, to obtain the agreement or needed acceptance to carry out a program, in a scenario where several interests are at stake” (p. 24).

From his personal experience in rural development projects, Moyano (2009) points out that the success or the failure of development projects in rural areas with similar human resources and material resources depends on the existence of good interaction between the different institutions and agents involved. This interaction has to offer the necessary infrastructure to generate trust among population, to mobilize to social actors (individuals and the collective) and to make cooperation between them easier.
This author concludes:

Gobernanza is a system of articulation of actors, collective or institutional, public or private, where, by coordination, transforms unavoidable conflicts of zero-sum, where someone wins, but another loses, into conflicts of a non-zero-sum, where everybody wins if they reach a consensus about common interests. For governance to be an articulation of interests, the current actors in territories have to trust each other as a necessary step towards cooperation (Moyano, Julio 19, 2010).

This author also highlights, that the key to gobernanza is integration. Gobernanza promotes ideal conditions for integrating all development projects of a particular territory under a common social, economic and environmental strategy.

According to this view, gobernanza helps to understand that the main relationship in society is not that of the state and society, but rather the relationship among all the actors within the society. So it translates the focus toward an area of common responsibility of distinct actors within society; and, hence, it is not part of the sphere of the state/government.

Up until this point, the concepts within the Spanish terms gobernanza and gobernabilidad in the Latin American context have been reviewed. As these terms have their origin in Anglo-Saxon literature, it is important to analyze the concepts of the terms from which they originate: governance and governability.

**Definition of Governance**

According to the World Bank’s concerns for the effectiveness of development efforts, the concept of governance was linked to the “capacities of the public sector management to encouraging the formation of the rules and institutions, which provide a predictable and transparent framework to the conduct of public and private businesses, and to promoting accountability for economic and financial performance” (World Bank, 1992, p. 3).

The World Bank proposed a first definition of governance, namely “the manner in which power is exercised in the management of a country’s economic and social resources for development” (World Bank, 1992, p. 1). This document also points out that good governance is a synonymous for good management for development.

In this way, in the early 1990 and in the context of World Bank, the term governance had the following characteristics:

1. It is associated to the quality of public management.
2. To improve the governance on a society, the decision of the government is essential. The other social actors would only help through acts of pressure.
3. It is also necessary to develop institutions for public administration.
4. NGOs, universities, professional associations, associations of women and young people may help to control government’s decisions and suggest solutions to problems in society. However, their participation is always viewed as reactive.

According to Stoker, for Osborne and Gaebler, in 1992, governance is a vision of the government which is beyond the direct provision of services, that is to say, “the potential for contracting, franchising and new forms of regulation” (p. 18). However, this conceptualization was qualified rather as an appropriate definition of new public administration by Stoker, Hood and other authors.

Reviewing several conceptualizations of governance, Stoker found that there is a baseline agreement “governance refers to the development of governing styles in which boundaries between public and private sector have become blurred” (p. 17).

Jessop (1995) points out that governance refers to every way of coordination of independent activities; more restrictively, it means self-governing.

According to Rhodes, governance is “a change in the meaning of government, referring to a new process of governing; or a changed condition of ordered rules; or the new method by which society is governed” (1996, cited by Stoker, p. 17).

For Stoker (1997), governance is the “interactive relationships between and within government and non-governmental forces” (p. 38). He points out that the essence of governance is the importance that it gives to mechanism of governing which are not based in an authority or penalties, and citing to Kooiman and Van Vliet concludes:

The governance concepts points to the creation of a structure or an order which cannot be externally imposed but is the result of the interaction of a multiplicity of governing and each other influencing actors (1993, cited by Stoker, p. 18).

Therefore, for Stoker, governance is not a quality of the government, but it is rather a quality of the ordered society in which all different social actors make political decisions. Citing to Kooiman, he asserts that “governing from the governance perspective is always an interactive process because no single actor, public or private, has the knowledge and resource capacity to tackle problems unilaterally” (1993, cited by Stocker, p. 22).

In 1999, a World Bank’s work paper of research (Kaufmann, Kraay & Zoido-Lobaton, 1999) proposed a new broad definition of governance “the traditions and institutions by which authority in a country is exercised, and this includes:

1. The process by which governments, are selected, monitored and replaced,
2. The capacity of the government to effectively formulate and implement sound policies, and
3. The respect of citizens and the state for the institutions that govern economic and social interactions among them.” (p. 2).
This definition of governance includes more elements and actors than those included in previous World Bank’s definitions of governance. It does not refer any more only to the quality of government; it refers to an independence of public administration; to activities of agents able to destabilize the government or break the rule of law; and to the role of media.

Later, Kaufmann (2003) states that the corporative sector, international or national, would have a role on the improvement of the governance “the particular corporate responsibility and ethic strategies that powerful enterprises (including foreign investors) choose to carry out can further improve or undermine national governance within the country” (p. 34). In 2005, Kaufmann precisates that governance are “the traditions and institutions by which the authority in a country is exercised for the common good” (p. 82).

A working paper prepared by the Institute on Governance, Plumptre and Graham (2000) presents that there are four main actors: the government, the business sector, the institutions in civil society, and the media. As well, it proposes a outline where the size of the different spheres, which can overlap, because their borders are permeable, represent the relative power that each of these sectors have at each level of decision making in a society: local, regional or national.

In 2003, the Union European Commission put forward a definition of governance in the document Governance and Development:

Goverance concerns the state's ability to serve the citizens. Governance refers to the rules, processes, and behavior by which interests are articulated, resources are managed, and power is exercised in society. The way public functions are carried out, public resources are managed and public regulatory powers are exercised is the major issue to be addressed in that context. Governance is a basic measure of the stability and performance of a society. As the concepts of human rights, democratization and democracy, the rule of law, civil society, decentralized power sharing, and sound public administration gain importance and relevance, a society develops into a more sophisticated political system and governance evolves into good governance (COM 2003, 615, p. 3).

In 2004, the UNDP, in Strategy Note on Governance and Human Development, proposed the following definition of governance.

Governance is the system of values, policies and institutions by which a society manages its economic, political and social affairs through interactions within and among the state, civil society and private sector. It is the way a society organizes itself to make and implement decisions— achieving mutual understanding, agreement and action. It comprises the mechanisms and processes for citizens and groups to articulate their interests, mediate their differences and exercise their legal rights and obligations. It is the rules, institutions and practices that set limits and provide incentives for individuals, organizations and firms. Governance, including its social,
political and economic dimensions, operates at every level of human enterprise, be it the household, village, municipality, nation, region or globe” (UNDP, 2004, n.p.).

For Brinkerhoff (2005) governance is “the processes through which individuals and state officials interact to express their interests, exercise their rights and obligations, work out their differences, and cooperate to produce public goods and services” (p. 200)

In these last definitions of governance appears more relevant for describing the interactions between social actors. However, these definitions still give more importance to rules and institutions rather than preparing actors for interaction with each other. However, the conceptualization of governance proposed by Kooiman goes beyond this. It emphasizes the interactions between social actors as the main element of governance. Kooiman (2003) understands that the modern society is characterized by an increase of diversity, dynamics and complexity. For this point of view, the socio-political issues imply knowledge, political and technical, which usually is dispersed among several social actors. And finally, the objectives of government are not easy to define and are constantly being reviewed.

This increase of diversity, dynamics and complexity of the social reality requires new ways of governing, where the other social actors: the market and civil society are seen as serious actors; local issues have a distinct role from that of global issues; government agreements can vary from sector to sector, in accordance with their diversity. One actor is not enough to work efficiently, it is necessary to promote interaction, create socio-political structures and processes, stimulating communication and responsibility among actors taking into consideration their differences and integrating their different points of view.

Under this conceptualization, the governing of society is re-defined. It includes from limited actions of governing individuals to large scale effects, public and private, to determine main socio-political development (Kooiman, 2003).

In this way, for Kooiman (2003) the social actor is a dynamic subject who is defined by the relations which it develops with other actors. He emphasizes more the attitudes and competences of actors than the rules or institutions in society. In this sense, Kooiman points out “pragmatic (meta) principles such as openness to difference, a willingness to communicate, and a willingness to learn are important criteria in coping with societal diversity, dynamics and complexity” (p. 7). The focus is on people and on the relations which people can develop with each other.

Another difference between Kooiman’s conceptualization and others is that it is not confined to a determined social sphere. It is applicable to all spheres, from local to global.

Finally, in 2005, Kooiman proposed a more elaborate definition of governance (interactive), taking elements from the definition which he offered on the government in 2003:
The whole of interactions taken to solve societal problems and to create societal opportunities; including the formulation and application of principles guiding those interactions and care for institutions that enable and control them (cited by Kooiman et al., 2008, p. 2)

**Definition of Governability**

The term governability appears in the 1970s, in the context of the cold war, in the Trilateral Commission report, *The Crisis of Democracy*, referring to the capacity of government of the societies that were analyzed in that report (Crozier, Huntington & Watanuki, 1975).

Kooiman (2003) considers that governability is “a quality of a socio-political entity considered as a whole” (p. 224); and which depends on many factors: natural; consequences of the decisions of the government; external or internal factors of that entity, and some of which cannot be managed by the system of government. Therefore, governability is the result of governance.

He would later say that as “Governors, the governed and the nature of interactions among governors and the governed all contribute to governability. Governability can therefore be defined as: the overall capacity for governance of any societal entity or system” (Kooiman et al., 2008, p. 3).

Chuenpagdee et al. (2008), in applying the definition of governance proposed by Kooiman to a system of natural resources, he points out that governability is a quality which can be evaluated according to its determining properties: qualities and functional aspects which make this system would be more or less governable. He thinks that measuring governability could help to identify areas where governance could be improved.

**The Uses and Concepts of Governance and Governability**

A bibliographic revision of the Anglo-Saxon terms governance and governability makes it possible to identify that these terms involve different, however linked concepts.

Governance makes reference to the way in which different actors in a social system interact with each other to make a political decision; and thus, to govern. Governance is a level of action which is above the state; it considers the role of the state as a component of a whole, but governance does not give the state priority over the other social actors.

In this manner, governance emphasizes that public welfare is the responsibility of all members of society; and therefore, it calls for their participation in decision making, offering them a voice and also giving them a more active role in society.

Governance cannot be understood therefore as the improvement of the capacity of the state to meet social demands. As well, it cannot only involve an increase in the skills and abilities for management; it is necessary to aim for an improvement in the interrelation
between the actors, for the improvement of the ability to accept the points of view of other members of society, which implies an openness to dialogue and acting rationally.

Governance looks toward the good of the whole. It means an approach which listens to different perspectives of the members of a society. It is a tool for dealing with the complexity and diversity of modern societies, while the perspective of one actor would be insufficient to diagnose causes of problems or propose solutions to them.

Governance is a quality which develops in the process of interaction between social actors; at the same time, it creates channels of understanding, and reduces prejudices among actors. This process affects people in society, who learn to trust each other, and take on roles working towards common goals. It is not the sum of individual efforts, but the sum of individual or group collaboration which together look for a satisfactory solution. Therefore, it is social learning, and as such it is an important element in local development.

Governance has as its goal the common good. This means that all members in society should be involve in managing the public domain; instead of the traditional approach, where public concerns are the sole responsibility of the state. The public concerns are the responsibility of the whole, because they are a component of the common good; the material manifestation of this good, but the common good can only be achieved by the improvement of people.

From all of the above, one can deduce that the concepts involved in governance differ substantially from those of governability.

Governability is a quality which aims for the socio-political stability of society, and that, as Kooiman points out (2003), it depends on many factors: natural; consequences of the decisions of those in power, external or internal factors; for this reason, some of them, cannot be managed by the system of government of a society.

From this perspective, governance is one of its components. It is a quality of the social actors which contributes to socio-political stability, but as socio-political stability exists in diverse and dynamic scenarios, each one of them puts this ability of interaction between the social actors to the test, showing in this way, that they are dependent qualities, but not similar ones.

Seen in this way, governability is also the result of a particular type of governance, in such a way, as Kooiman affirms (2003), starting from a level of governability another function of the quality of governance is reached.

Finally, the use of the term gobernanza in order to translate the term governance; and gobernabilidad to translate the term governability seem more adequate. As well, this use has been implemented by official international organisms which have Spanish as one of their official languages.
An Anthropological Examination of Governance

As previously mentioned, governance isn’t simply a structure of political decisions. It has been defined by some authors as norms, values or institutions, but rather governance is interactions between people in society. This is an essential characteristic which places the emphasis in relationships between people, and not on political structures. For this reason is important to examine how the concept of governance relates to a vision of society as a manifestation of a much more profound reality; every social actors is essentially a person.

In this sense, the anthropological foundations of the concept of governance can be found in personalist phenomenology: a concept of man which describes it as a unrepeatable subject capable of intimacy, with an internal openness which allows for self-determination; who at the same time has a capacity to give in such a way that he cannot be described as an isolated being, but rather, necessarily, and openness towards his fellow men. This point of view considers the dialogic character as an essential characteristic of a human being, as is also proposed by Taylor, Levinas and Buber (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998).

Social Life is Essential for Human Beings

The concept of governance highlights the value of personal interrelationships in political decisions (Kooiman, 2003). In this manner, governance helps to realize that social life is a demand of the human being which is not recognized by individualism. Individualism is the conception of society conceptualized in the XVII and XVIII centuries, where society was viewed as the whole of independent individuals who are united by a social contract in order to escape from the savagery, and looking for, an easier way to get all they need for a better way of life (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998).

This vision of a social life – individualism – has the following key characteristics:

1. The freedom of each person is a choice which extends until where the freedom of another person begins.
2. What a person looks for is, above all, their own interest: they are incapable of acting against their own interests.

Under this conception, society is the collective of autonomous individuals, for whom in order to exist, they do not have any other choice than to co-exist. Thus, co-existence could not be something natural, but rather a loss of individual freedom in order to gain security which, in any other manner, could not be possible.

At individualism not fit a conduct to share, to dialogue. Neither to accept a help or to make common tasks, because it considers that human being is self-sufficient and it does not need anything from other people (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998).

As Individualism is a partial vision of social life, it brought the creation of collectivism as a consequence; an entirely opposite stance. In this other vision of social life, everything is shared, and even the person is subordinated to collective objectives.
Neither of these ideologies understands, however, the meaning of the personal being. To be human is to co-exist (Polo, 1993). Therefore, the human being is naturally social; is not the result of an agreement, but it is in their nature “To be is to be with others, with the world” (Yepes & Aranguren 1998, p. 181). A consequence of this reality is that interpersonal relationships are essential to a person, something that could not be eliminated without negatively affecting their personality.

Due to this, for Sellés (2006), the approaches of Hobbes and Rousseau, which proposed that society is an invention, a device; and the approaches of Hegel and Marx, and the political collectivisms and totalitarianisms or the general will of Rousseau, which subordinates people to society, are erroneous.

Therefore, the necessity for dialogue between people is essential “it is not only to hold a dialogue with others, but it means that human person is dialogical” (Sellés, 2006, p. 391). Human organizations must provide these spaces for dialogue if they wish to be anthropologically coherent.

**Governance Demands a Rational Dialogue**

The concept of governance calls for this quality of the human person, when it is defined as interactions between social actors. Jessop (1998) states “the key to its success is continual commitment to dialogue” (p. 35), and Kooiman (2003) also recognizes the relevance of this dialogical character “Interactions shape actors and actors shape interactions” (p. 8).

For Jessop (1998), governance means a constant commitment to dialogue in order to find and exchange the necessary information for reducing opportunism. This reduction of opportunism is also supported by the union of the social actors in different timelines, short-term, medium-term and long-term. As well, governance promotes an attitude of solidarity between social actors, which avoids the use of public resources in arbitrary investments.

Yepes and Aranguren (1998) point out that the rational attitude is the main good of the common good. They assert that social life is the exchange of rational ideas, in such a way the idea which is approved is not that which is imposed by force, but rather by using rational persuasion to convince the rest of the people. In this sense, a rational attitude connects people.

A free society is governed by a rational speech, which identifies wills and purposes between those who govern and those who obey, in such a way that both of them share rational ideas, objectives and motivations for common goals.

**It Demands a Responsibility for Other People in the Society.**

The awareness that all people are equal causes solidarity (Llano, 1988), thus, “to get the necessary goods for a good life for everybody within society is the responsibility of the
whole society, and not the responsibility of one individual” (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998, p. 183).

This approach leads to the responsibility; not only for oneself, as individualism proposes; but also for everyone within society. This is another characteristic of governance. The responsibility for solving social problems or achieving opportunities does not only belong to an actor, public or private, but rather it belongs to the collective.

In this manner, Kooiman (2003) points out:

“Responses to diverse, dynamic and complex societal issues require approaches involving previously uninvolved partners looking not only at the market (…) but also looking at civil society actors, as serious governing actors” (p. 3)

He later adds:

“Socio-political governance means using an analytical and normative perspective on any societal governance that is collective. Collective not in the sense that the care and development of these activities is looked upon as a public task (the state), a responsibility of the private sector (the market), or of the third sector (civil society) in isolation, but as a shared set of responsibilities” (p. 5).

Governance makes reference to the responsibility for common goods of society, and this responsibility is incumbent on the collective.

**Governance is a Decision Making Process where all Members in Society Participate**

Kooiman, in 2008, commented:

“Interactive governance affirms that within governance, many actors in different positions and at different levels of society are involved. However, there is also a normative aspect of the equation, an understanding that the social participation in governance is an expression of democracy and as such, something desirable. Thus, we defend an ample participation in governance, from the normative perspective as well as from a practical point of view” (p. 3).

This practical point of view is what Kooiman (2008) refers to when he affirms that participation is a demand that stems from the diversity of current society, and at the same time, it is a consequence of the multiple personal interactions which occur within society:

“In a modern society, diversity is the first issue to take into account: only the diversity of interactions of a government can help manage social diversity. The social actors are a construct of these interactions: interactions with others define their identities. For this reason, the only way to manage the diversity of the actors in a social system is to permit those actors to participate in the decisions of government” (p. 18).
In this way, governance emphasizes the reality that the construction of a society must involve the participation of everyone in that society; which Yepes y Aranguren (1998), from the anthropological perspective express in the following way:

“But all imply that what an abstract entity does is not enough—the state—or that each person does their share—individualism—but rather that it is only possible to reach social excellence if everyone takes part in the effort to reach a common goal, a synergy of forces brings forth progress” (p. 197).

From this practical point of view, this participation should involve integration in communities: groups of people who aim to achieve a common good and participate in it. Thus, the public environment is part of this common good, it is a place for working together towards a common goal, in this way achieving more than the sum of individual actions, each of them with their own goals and objectives.

As Yepes and Aranguren comment (1998), living in communities is most appropriate to human nature (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998). As such, communities should be promoted in a society, although the complete development of the necessary elements for these institutions can take a long time “uniting intelligences and wills is a slow process which can be ruined by minute disagreements and lack of dialogue” (Yepes & Aranguren, 1998, p. 187).

But, as these authors point out, this participation must be the result of a personal decision. Participation should arise from a personal choice: not from an external obligation, nor as a consequence of voluntarism; it should come from one’s deepest personal convictions: the recognition of the social character of a human being. To be human is to co-exist, to cooperate, thus, it is to act according to solidarity, it is to participate in working towards a common goal.

This integration would be incomplete if it remained in the structural level. Those who become a group of people in the community are individual people, with their relationships on a personal level, with their smile, with their personal attitude, which cannot be imposed upon by regulations, but rather, it should come from their own personality. This is the dimension that Pérez-López (1998) calls the informal system of organizations: the everyday relationships, not the functional relationships of the organizational structure. They are the relationships that are founded in personal friendship: “human relationships, without friendship degrade the person, and the person is the motor behind all effective work” (Llano, 2000, p. 75).

Friendship, in this manner, is relevant in the integration of communities. This is one aspect that the literature on governance has not been able to fully catch sight of yet. Moyano (2009) highlights the importance of trust for the creation of an effective system of governance, but he does not manage to discover the role which friendship can play.
Governance as Based in Ethic Values Could Lead to a more Profound Common Good

Kooiman (2003) signals that ethical and moral questions are the essence of the sphere of governance: they are the foundation of socio-political interactions. However, for this author, there is not a fundamental objective, but rather the necessity to reflect upon and reach an agreement upon how society wants to be governed. He adds that in the academic environment of governance, there is a growing interest in the question of morality.

Sellés (2006), points out that an ethic to unite society can only be valid if it is supported by values which are in accordance with human nature.

“Pay attention to the term natural, which prescribes the personal donations and personal acceptances which take place in accordance with human nature. In this way, if you replace this natural order, its offering and acceptance are not personal, because the person should not detach themselves from or go against their own human nature – this would denaturalize them to the extent of depriving natural manifestations of their personal meaning. (p. 396).

From this anthropological point of view, the ethical demands of governance should rely on the demands of human nature itself. For this reason, Sellés (2006) indicates:

“If the only link for social cohesion is ethics, the biggest enemy of society is not a lack of money, of administration, of culture, of information, or of raw materials, etc., but rather ethical relativism, unfortunately widespread.” (Sellés, 2006, p. 401).

However, Sellés (2006) also comments that:

“Human interdependence is necessary, not only when looking at the contribution of products that make human subsistence possible: food, clothing, medicines, etc, but rather and most importantly, in order to improve people according to virtue. This improvement is ethic.” (p. 401).

An ethic which defends the demands of human nature leads to the consideration of behavior according to the virtues of the individual. If one understands, by common good, behavior according to the virtues of the individual and the collective, and the objective of policies are not only the accumulation of material wealth, but rather another kind of wealth: the development of the abilities and skills of the individual within the collective (Cardona, 1966). One can conclude that the concept of governance allows individuals to approach a social reality which is much more enriching: a virtuous order of virtuous individuals. The common good of a society depends on the personal qualities and their components of individuals, which will be reflected and built upon, specifically in relationships with others. As well, in the exercise of these qualities in order to solve problems and create opportunities; in a proactive and responsible manner; in this way, putting in practice the principle of subsidiarity.
Creating a Definition of Governance in Latin America

A Brief Description of the Current Context of Societies in Latin America
Yepes y Aranguren (1998) present a brief description of modern society which applies perfectly to the current situation in Latin America.
1. Society is profoundly impersonal, anonymous. There is a lack of public spheres where each person can act under their own name and be recognized as such.
2. It has a high level of complexity which makes it necessary to find formulas to simplify the system and make it personal: see faces and not papers.
3. As a consequence of this, individual people are very distant from power centers: they participate very little in decision making; the exercise of authority is despotic, not dialogued; those who feel injustice are forced to protest as their voice heard; and democracy becomes a power struggle between smaller despotic authorities, trying to gain a greater share of power in order to impose their decisions.
4. An absence of responsibility for public problems is created: individual citizens believe that individual liberty only functions in a private environment. The distance between public and private is accentuated.
5. Pluralism of values quite often means the absence of values and ideals, which are instead substituted by consumerism and goods of a purely material nature; personal convictions and efforts are left behind.

A Proposed Definition of Governance in Latin America
In a context with these characteristics, a definition of governance should highlight the value of personal relationships, which calls for the responsibility of all members of society in public matters; to demand their participation, based on rational dialogue; to have as an objective the improvement of the material wealth which makes life more comfortable; but, above all, to promote personal development of the members of society.

For this reason, in the context of Latin America, governance is the collection of all personal interactions in society which contribute to the creation of a common good, to resolve a social problem or create new opportunities.

Proposed Applications of this Definition of Governance. It Could Help to Design Appropriate Projects for Development
Projects of international cooperation are an appropriate application of this definition of governance in the context of Latin America. On one hand, development assistance represents funding that by its nature is public, but it is not from the state, and as such, it is not subject to the restrictions of state order. Also, this funding represents significant amounts in various Latin American countries. See figure 1.
As well, in many Latin American countries, processes of decentralization and the creation of intermediate levels of government have begun, which grant local governments degrees of freedom or ability to act with their own resources, in public initiatives, which are not strictly state-run.

It must be added as well, that projects of international cooperation have to meet demands in relation to greater participation of the beneficiaries; the criteria of having to assure its sustainability over time, and the necessity of generating their own resources; as well as the possibility of counting on the contributions of specialists in diverse areas and experts in planning, as much for the training of local actors as for the formulation of the activities.

Due to the nature of governance itself, applications which are suggested for its improvement must have a bearing on two independent, although linked levels. The first corresponds to the structural level: ways of organization which make it possible to classify interactions between social actors, in such a way that they have an impact on the improvement of governance (Cazorla, De Los Ríos & Díaz, 2005). This level of activity has been perceived by various actors (Moyano, 2009). However this is not enough, the initiatives need to have a bearing on the personal level as well, which is where the interactions between the social actors are finally founded. For this reason, the initiatives that are aimed at an improvement of governance must be oriented, as well, at eliminating obstacles which impede the development of trust between actors. Even, further on, the generation of ties of friendship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Argentina</th>
<th>Bolivia</th>
<th>Brazil</th>
<th>Chile</th>
<th>Colombia</th>
<th>Ecuador</th>
<th>Peru</th>
<th>Uruguay</th>
<th>Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>115.64</td>
<td>757.58</td>
<td>292.18</td>
<td>201.94</td>
<td>701.04</td>
<td>269.05</td>
<td>56.24</td>
<td>524.25</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>136.89</td>
<td>954.65</td>
<td>144.77</td>
<td>120.52</td>
<td>1298.51</td>
<td>215.9</td>
<td>62.38</td>
<td>521.31</td>
<td>24.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>108.55</td>
<td>520.31</td>
<td>344.11</td>
<td>113.69</td>
<td>735.15</td>
<td>231.64</td>
<td>115.06</td>
<td>370.06</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>130.5</td>
<td>627.87</td>
<td>460.36</td>
<td>107.83</td>
<td>972.01</td>
<td>220.61</td>
<td>133.54</td>
<td>663.02</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>120.46</td>
<td>742.40</td>
<td>564.48</td>
<td>82.31</td>
<td>1070.41</td>
<td>214.59</td>
<td>147.56</td>
<td>455.03</td>
<td>51.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Friendship between the different actors is an important component for adequate governance. An organization of individuals amongst themselves is only possible to achieve through a union of fraternity; and this union is always founded in what the individuals communicate to one another “Political friendship has its foundation in the communication of honest acts” (Saint Thomas of Aquinas, cited by Cardona, 1966, p. 83). For which Cardona adds “this friendship is of absolute necessity for cooperation, (the) dynamic element of the common good” (p. 84).

**Limitations of this approach**

Firstly, one of the most important limitations in the process of improving governance is the time necessary to see results. Governance is a quality which is acquired through its own process, and as it is a process of social learning (Friedmann, 1981), so the speed at which it advances is limited by the abilities of the weakest actors.

Processes of improvement of relationships between actors from different cultures who do not have the custom of interacting with each other require the assistance of external agents, who would help unite efforts, polish possible rough areas or misunderstandings, and eradicate prejudices between actors. In some cases, it is also necessary to count on the support of third parties with both technical and organizational abilities who help make more adequate decisions (Cazorla, 2007; Friedmann, 1993). However, this group of experts should be careful not to impose their own speed in decision making or make unilateral decisions without the integral involvement of the local social actors: their function is only as a support or catalyst, they are not the decision makers (Cazorla, 2007).

Secondly, in order for the action to have a direct impact on governance, the sphere of action must be local, because it is there which the interactions between the distinct members of society, in greater number and in a very close way, occur.

At the same time, various authors (Kooiman, 2003; Moyano, 2009; Stocker, 1997) propose that the interactions between three roles: the state, the market, and civil society, be considered. Of course, in some development programs, there has been success in the creation of some bodies consisting of representatives of the state, the business sector, and of families. This is the case of Grupo de Acción Local, typical of the European initiative LEADER (Cazorla, De Los Ríos & Díaz, 2002, 2005), which Moyano (2009) highlights as a body with a serious contribution to local governance.

A concrete way to generate governance would be the promotion of communities conformed of social actors which act in representation of these three roles in society: the state, the business sector, and families. However, as the actors may include every member of society, and since governance must confront certain specific social problems or take advantage of certain specific opportunities, the participation of the members of society would be defined by the same proportion of the resources and means that they can contribute to the solution to the problem, or for to take full advantage of the opportunity.
In each case, the resources need not be only material goods; they would also be knowledge, experiences, as well as skills and abilities.

Thirdly, it is necessary to act on the personal level, in such a way that the initiatives favor the personal relationships of the actors: personal circumstances, ways of being; relationships which will facilitate dialogue, due to a better understanding of the circumstances and reasons behind each other's decisions and actions. As well, in order to generate higher levels of trust, the initiatives should also promote friendship between the actors involved.

Finally, as governance has the common good of society as its objective, every action of the initiative should be proportional to this objective. Each of the actions must be ethical. It would be incoherent to try to reach an ethical end, if the means were not ethical.

**Conclusions**

The ample character of governance and the diverse dimensions in which it may be applied make it difficult to transfer its elements from one cultural context to another. This has been the case, particularly in Latin America, where the concepts of governance, created in an Anglo-Saxon cultural environment, have been transferred to the Latin American cultural environment, generating diverse definitions and interpretations.

A revision of the concepts of governance, an anthropological analysis of the fundamentals of this concept and of the current state of society in Latin America have made it possible to elaborate a definition of governance, applicable to this cultural context.

In this way, it is possible to affirm that governance is the collection of all personal interactions in society which contribute to the creation of a common good, in order to resolve social problems or generate new opportunities.

Keeping in mind the characteristics of governance, in the initiatives taken for its improvement, its limitations, its requirements and the spheres where action should be taken, must be taken into account. In this document, an analysis which may be used to orient initiatives for international cooperation for development in Latin America is presented.

As governance is a concept which gives principle importance to the interactions between social actors, the initiatives to improve governance have to work on two main levels of action. Most importantly, on the structural level, through the generation of new structures which make interaction between different social actors viable. Secondly, on a personal level, in such a way that the initiatives also consider taking actions which help develop personal abilities of the social actors to relate with one another: abilities involving communication, respecting the opinions of the others, an understanding of each other's cultural environments, and a better understanding in general of the other social actors on a personal level.
Finally, both dimensions, structural and personal, are associated with the generation of relational capital. Therefore, there is a close relationship between the generation of relational capital and its impact on governance. The initiatives which influence relational capital in a positive way create a climate conducive to the improvement of governance; and the initiatives which have an impact on governance, will be a vehicle for the growth of relational capital.
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