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ENDNOTES

1 The original excerpt spoke not of government in general but of the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. See chapter 4.

2 In 1997 and 1998 I supported citizens’ groups in a participatory planning project. Since 1998 I also have worked for a consultancy agency, de Stad bv, that organizes these type of experiments at the local, regional and national level.

3 For now I will define reflectivity as: “being empathetic with the plight of others; more considered; more far-reaching in both time and space” (Goodin 2003, p. 7). In chapter 2 I will include in the definition: criticism of dominant discourses and of actors – including oneself - that utter these discourses. Moreover, I will use the concepts reflective rather than reflexivity as reflexivity refers to “reflex” and has a connotation of being something that happens in action. In this dissertation I am interested in the rather cognitive type of reflectivity that can be facilitated or organized.

4 Government discourse is not to be confused with discourse of governmental actors! Government discourse is the ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categories that are produced and reproduced in practice (Hajer 1995, 44) about the hierarchical ways in which governmental actors can make policy decisions and command those. All sorts of actor can utter government discourse.

5 Credibility is introduced as an alternative to the concepts ‘legitimacy and authority’ in policy analysis and builds on the three concepts of ‘credibility, legitimacy, and authority’ that Gieryn applied in his conceptual work on boundary work (Gieryn 1999).


7 The theoretical models of scholars can be considered to be the (re)production of these discourses in the scientific practice and this is intertwined with other type of practices, such as the policy practice, in society.

8 Governance in the literature means many things, sometimes it refers to New Public Management (Rhodes 1996 and 1997, Hodges 2005). I will leave NPM out of the discussion, as that is a shift on the organizational level within governmental organizations. I am interested in governance as experimentation in interactions between government and society.

9 Hajer refers to this as the classical modernist way of governing (2009, p.23-26, 277)

10 Research into “government” models demonstrates a great variety in democratic models, regulatory models, and decision-making styles. Countries vary in the way formal responsibilities, procedures, legislation and so on are arranged. Broadly speaking, the United States has a pluralistic style of decision-making and a liberal model of democracy. The Netherlands has a neo-corporatist style of decision-making, a consensus-oriented and social democratic model of democracy (cf. Halfman, 2005; Held, 1999; F. Hendriks, 2006; Innes and Gruber, 2001; Lijphart, 1999; Renn, 1995; Vogel, 1986).

11 Literature in (urban) planning, environmental studies, and, for example rural sociology, also addresses (a shift to) network governance or decision making in networks. Even though I study cases that can be related to these research traditions — participatory planning in the case of the Bijlmerpark, and environmental studies and rural sociology for the two other cases, I will not give an overview of this literature at this point. However, in the chapters on these cases I will refer to the relevant bodies of literature.

12 Many more meanings of governance have been identified, for example governance as a structure, a process or an analytical framework (Pierre, 2000, p. 23-26). Hajer prefers the term “network governance” to distinguish it from the process of governing (Hajer, 2009, p. 30-31).

13 In STS this plurality, diffusion and the negotiation of knowledge in decision making are demonstrated empirically, for example by Epstein (1993; 1995), Jasanoff (1987; 1994), Shackley and Wynne (1995) and Nowonty (2003).

14 Various reasons are given for this. For example, Hajer speaks of a “triple deficit in the authority of classical modernist institutional politics” and describes the three as a problem of implementation, of the challenge to create learning within policy making, and a legitimacy problem (2009, p. 29-30).

15 Hence, a “shift to governance” does not mean that government completely disappears. Kjaer (2004) for example argued that it is premature to conclude that
Credible decisions have become credible as they are received form formal and legal positions and based on procedural aspects such as transparency, and on the other hand the acceptance of arguments and discourses that is gained in interactions.

19 The difference between dominant and hegemonic discourse is that the latter is even more forceful and less visible in its disciplining of subjects (cf. Grint, 2006, p. 797; Glynos and Howarth, 2007, p. 5 and 106).

20 In STS for example, Funтович and Ravetz preferred to include non-experts in knowledge-making in a process of “extended peer review” (Funтович and Ravetz, 1992) when there is high political salience combined with uncertainty about the knowledge. Other examples: Gibbons, 2000; Funтович, and Liberatori, 2003; Durant, 1999; Caron-Flinterman, 2006. See also on inclusion of lay knowledge in deliberations, for example, Grin and Graaf, (1999a and 1999b) and Hendriks (2006).

21 Although, at least in the Netherlands, it is argued that the organization of these deliberative spaces has become a “common phenomenon in decision-making especially at the local level” (Edeleinboosh and Momnikhof, 2003, p. 9), and fit perfectly in the Dutch consensus tradition (Duyvendak, 2001, p.39; Kickert, 2004). Some even argue that these interactive settings should replace some elements of the formal structures (Edeleinboosh and Momnikhof, 1998b, p.133).

22 Forester also speaks of strategies that can be part of a deliberative design, for example the strategy of indirect or humor (Forester, 2000; 2004; 2009).

23 I would like to stress that I constructed the category “deliberative governance.” Many of the scholars and practitioners that developed these criteria and techniques may not have considered their approach part of this category.

24 A special thanks to Etienne Wenger for introducing this difference between convening and facilitating in a master class about Communities of Practice organized by Habiforum in 2007.

25 I understand practice to consist of several elements. First, action and Knowing. “Practice is a coherent and complex form of socially established cooperative human activity” (MacIntyre, 1981, p.187 cited by Wagenaar and Cook 2003). It is “habitus” (Bourdieu in Wagenaar and Cook 2003). Moreover, practice is constitutive meaning, it cannot be separate from language; and practice is a theory of action or an “activity system” (Wagenaar and Cook, 2003, p. 144-48). Hence, practice and discourse are intertwined.

26 For other examples of the turn to practice in the third face of political science see, for example, Torgerøn, 1985, p. 243. In social studies a similar turn to practice took place to bridge theory and knowing, and action and knowledge. For example, Anselm Strauss (Strauss, 1993), Jean Lave (Lave, 1988) and Etienne Wenger (Lave and Wenger, 1991) pointed out that in social studies the inclination is to focus on the rational aspects of social phenomena, for example “work” (Strauss 1993) or on the cognitive aspects of learning. However, other aspects, for example routines and tacit knowledge and knowing (Polanyi, 1951), are also an important part of these phenomena and the learning process.

27 For other examples of a turn to practice in STS see (Glynos, 1983; Mol, 2002) and for an overview (Hagendijk, 1996).

28 This point is often raised as a critique on discourse analysis. It is argued that discourse analysis is that the latter is even more forceful and less visible in its disciplining of subjects, for example “work” (Strauss 1993) or on the cognitive aspects of learning. However, other aspects, for example routines and tacit knowledge and knowing (Polanyi, 1951), are also an important part of these phenomena and the learning process.

29 The definition of boundary work as given by Halfmann also speaks of “disciplining” in the sense that these demarcations “define proper ways of interaction” and “prescribe proper behaviour” (Halfmann 2003, p. 70).

30 Glynos applied the concept “cultural repertoires” rather than discourse. In 2003, Kinchy and Kleinman pointed out that the acceptance of a demarcation of a cultural repertoire needed a theoretical notion of discourse to explain the tacit acceptance of specific demarcations of cultural repertoires.

31 This assumption is supported by research that demonstrates that governmental models of governing are better accepted and institutionalized than deliberative and interactive forms of governing, see (for example Klien and Khmeleonjan (1998) and Prâpîr and Stenbeek (1998)).

32 In 2000, the anthropologist Fredrik Barth argued for a similar study of how groups draw boundaries and categorize as opposed to anthropologist that draw these boundaries between groups (Barth, 2000, p. 34).

33 Although Glynos later on explained that they all had been part of a linguistic turn in science studies (1999, p.5 footnote 8), in the 1980s he was strongly opposed to the discourse approach that Gilbert and Mulkay introduced. He claimed that “in the analysis of discourse we learn how scientists do their studies seem ‘objective’ but we can learn little of why such a story becomes the preferred one” (Glynos, 1982: 292).

34 In the Netherlands, examples of these boundary organizations are: Scientific Council for the Government (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regleringsbeleid (WRR)), Advisory council for research on spatial planning, nature and the environment (Raad voor Rijnlandelijk, Milieu en Natuuronderzoek (RMNO)), National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (Rijksinstituut voor volksgezondheid en Milieu (RIVM)), Central Planning Agency (Centraal Planbureau (CPB)), Statistics Netherlands (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS)) (cf. Hoppe and Halfmann, 2005; De Wit, 2005).

35 This was also a central struggle in Foucault’s work: how individuals could be liberated from dominant discourse.

36 Empirical findings of studies of the role of scientific knowledge and expertise in decision making also demonstrate that scientific research and expertise are not always used or applied. Scholars in political science and public administration, most importantly Carol Weiss (Weiss, 1977, 1980a; cf. in the Netherlands also Köbben and Tromp (1999), studied knowledge utilization in policy practice. Weiss demonstrated that there are limitations to the production of knowledge and that there are limitations to the use and production of knowledge in a political context (Weiss 1977). Next to being not used at all, extensive research in STS on the production and use of knowledge on, for example, HIV and AIDS (Epstein 1995) or climate change (Schackley and Wynne, 1995), demonstrated that there is an ideological bias in research, that research has social and political consequences, but also that scientific research can be produced and used strategically by scientists, social movements, politicians etc… Moreover, a recent study of rhetoric in first year writing courses also demonstrates that science remains a miniscule part of rhetoric (Zerbe, 2007).
be separated, according to Habermas they can (cf. Schmidt, 1994; Flyvbjerg, 1998). However, a pragmatic way out of these philosophical disputes, which I do not claim to solve, is to understand ideal speech situations, and reactivity and parhesis in it, as ways to liberate from dominant discourse and to introduce new disciplining powers. Hence, parhesis that can lead to reactivity does not mean that individuals or groups are free from disciplining powers.

Dewey defined reflexive though as: “active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends” (Dewey, 1933, p.9).

Michael Lynch differentiated three levels of reactivity: the macro, meso and micro level (Lynch, 2000). At the macro level of society, Beck and others speak of “reflexive modernization.” This means that modernity has become “a theme and a problem for itself” (Beck, 1994, p.8). Beck uses “reactivity” rather than reactivity to emphasize that this condition emerges as opposed to being created. At the macro level, the experiments with deliberative governance in our case are attempts to be less reflexive and more reflective about this transition toward a reflexive modernity. At the meso level, Lynch argues, theorists of reactivity discuss how science can produce or evoke reactivity in practice. Deliberative policy analysis can be understood to have the objective of enhancing this type of reactivity. For example, Douglas Torgerson argued that “reflexive policy discourse” could be initiated to make “it […] increasingly possible to contest the meaning of policy and draw it closer into association with politics – particularly democratic politics at odds with a technocratic policy discourse” (Torgerson, 2003).

Malcolm Ashmore distinguishes three forms of reactivity: r-awareness (self knowledge), r-circularity (mutual construction), and r-reference (self reference) (Ashmore, 1969, p.32).

In organizational learning, this articulation of routine — or theory in use — that might lead to a change of it, is considered double loop learning (Argyris and Schön 1978; Argyris 1982).

As we will see below, boundary transcending between subdiscourses can be considered to enable a reframing of policy problems (Rein and Schöns, 1993).

The problem is this can only be established with hindsight. Conflict or reflectivity need to follow parhesis in order to have come across indeed a boundary between dominant or alternative discourse. Otherwise, parhesis has not been uttered (but dominant discourse has been enacted).

Another question would be: after the contestation and reflective conversation, how does a boundary around alternative discourse get accepted? It has become dominant discourse, or as Jasanoff in 1994 “repens” is important in negotiations over regulatory science, otherwise closure of debate will fail (Jasanoff, 1994, p. 235). This is where Bourdieu speaks of “closure.”

Gerrym in 1983 also mentioned the possibility of boundaries being “obscured” or “dissolved” as different (“subtle and complex”) forms of boundary work (Gerrym, 1983, p.79).

Unidentified Political Objects (UPO’s) as introduced by Hush Djistelthooome are somewhat similar to boundary objects as they also sit on the boundaries between domains. According to Djistelthooome, UPO’s are policy problems that manifest themselves at the nexus of (policy) domains. There is a difference between boundary objects and UPO’s: in Dijstelthooome’s thesis, UPO’s are “wicked problems” that are always technical, scientific, medical or ecological problems in need of a reaction from public administration or politics ((Dijstelthooome, 2007, p.8). In the field of organizational studies, boundary objects also have been studied, for example, by (Caru, 2002).

Similar notions have been introduced in STS. For example, the boundary organization is considered as an organization that sits on the science-policy nexus and mediates between these two realms (Hellstrom and Jacobs, 2003; Guston, 1999a, 1999b). In public administration public-private partnerships has also been described as “crossover arrangements” (Montfort, 2008, p. 57).

In STS, especially Bruno Latour and Michael Callon stressed that these boundary objects are of influence on subjects and the way they interact (cf. Latour, 1987; Callon, 1986). I understand these objects or concepts indeed to co-determine the way subjects interact. As we will see, these concepts create a sphere of engagement.

Literature on framing stands in yet another argumentative tradition. In this tradition, different forms of framing (frame alignment, frame bridge, frame amplification, frame extension, frame transformation (cf. Snow and Benford, 1992; Klandermans and Golsling, 1996; Dewolf et al. 2004) have been developed mostly as analytical categories to understand the manners in which new social movements can or do mobilize actors. It goes beyond the scope of this study to go into details of the differences between “frames” and “discourses,” but frames are usually considered to be related more to individual beliefs (schema of interpretation) than to discourses. Hence, frame transformations take place at the level of the individual and not of the group. Thus frames have a lesser “political” notion than discourses that discipline (Brink and Mette, 2006; Brink, 2009).

I will call them gate-keepers and a change coalition rather than boundary people to be able to specify that some boundary people enable change through protection of elements of dominant discourse in conversations with a change coalition. The change coalition is the “parrhesiastes”.

I introduce the concept subdiscourse to describe “discursive ordering devices” that can be part of a broader discourse, in our case government or governance discourse and at the same time are uttered and formed by actors. Other research has defined these subdiscourses as “frames” (Hager and Lays, 2006, p. 227; Brink, 2009, p. 43.) to make a distinction between on one hand discourse as structures that construct and discipline agencies, and frames as discursive structures that agencies generate (see also Brink and Mette, 2006). I do not wish to make this distinction and consider discourses both to construct and be constructed by agencies.

Participants in experiments will not refer to these concepts as boundary concepts. It is more likely that they will talk of vision, solutions, opportunity and so on. It is an analytical and interpretative process to indicate what the boundary concepts are and how they are dealt with in experiments with deliberative governance.

This tradition follows in the footsteps of Dewey’s pragmatism (see for example, Dewey, 1939, 1984) and Latours’s democracy theories (Lawwell, 1975b)
As I argued in chapter 1, reflexivity and reflectivity can come in ethnographic studies (see for the elements of interpretation of the case on its own terms as is done from experiences and emotions other than pure research with a reflective quality, and prefer the term interested in the induction of conversations and interactions that were part of the deliberations in order to understand how boundary work takes place, not only in the especially designed and facilitated meetings but also throughout the project. Change of dominant discourse might also have taken place outside the especially designed deliberative venues.

This limited my data; however, I decided to consider the empirical chapter, these were never organized. stakeholders had been planned, but as we will see in the especially designed and facilitated meetings that were not part of the deliberations in order to understand how boundary work takes place, not only in the especially designed and facilitated meetings but also throughout the project. Change of dominant discourse might also have taken place outside the especially designed deliberative venues.

Moreover, I follow deliberative policy analysts that claim that the production of pure scientific knowledge has failed and that, despite good intentions, especially in theoretical thinking on democracy, policy analysis hardly ever escapes from implicit support of “the status quo in political power relations” (Dryzek, 1990, p.116; see also: Torgerson, 1986; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, p.11, 12 and 18).

As pointed out in chapter 1, reflectivity can come from experiences and emotions other than pure rational or cognitive thinking. Moreover, “reflection” is biased by the “power-laden social processes” as “experience and knowledge are mutually determined” (Michelson, 1996).

This is different from starting research with interpretation of the case on its own terms as is done in ethnographic studies (see for the elements of ethnographic research on local governance (Hulst, 2008) or in intrinsic case studies (Stake 2005, p. 445). This type of reflectivity created by theory is quite common in the scientific realm. What is less common is that the results of the empirical analysis feed back into the theory and method, and that I engaged in a dialectic process with practitioners about my interpretations of their projects through the framework of boundary work.

This case was suggested by practitioners from the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Food Quality when I asked them to help me find a case to match the Dairy Gateway project. A special thanks to Jurgen van der Heijden, David Laws, and the people from what now is called Directie Kennis and Directie Handel of the Ministry of Agriculture.

Stake argues that it is difficult to learn from these cases as they shift focus to the comparison rather than to the specificities of the case (Stake, 2005, p. 458). He considers the intrinsic interest in a case and the interests in the results of a comparison to be mutually exclusive but they might be complementary.

This is both “typical case sampling or homogeneous sampling” as well as “criterion sampling” (Patton, 1990, p. 173 and 176).

A synecdoche is a rhetorical figure: “we use part of something to refer the listener or reader to the whole it belongs to” (Becker 1998, p. 67). Synechodoes as rhetorical devices in political life can also be studied in themselves (Stone, 2002, p. 137–8). In this case, I understand the cases to be synecdoches of experiments with deliberative governance.

Chapter 3, 4 and 5 all include a more extensive description of the goals of the projects, the important events, what organizations participated at what moments and in what way.

In the proposal, five more meetings with stakeholders had been planned, but as we will see in the empirical chapter, these were never organized. This limited my data; however, I decided to consider this as a result of this often happens. Personal communication with one of the project leaders at the start of the project in 2004.

The meetings, documents, and other sorts of interactions that were part of these sites did not all have a deliberative design. I did include interactions that were not part of the deliberations in order to understand how boundary work takes place, not only in the especially designed and facilitated meetings but also throughout the project. Change of dominant discourse might also have taken place outside the especially designed deliberative venues.

In later work, Geyer summarizes these three literary devices as a way to expulse or protect autonomy and as styles of demarcation that put “disrepeent claimants outside (or at least at the margins)” (Geyer 1999, p. 16).

The analysis of demarcations seems similar to the analysis of “othering,” see for example Sacks and Schegloff (1980) or “positioning,” see for example Harré and Van Langenhove (1999).

The demarcation can consist of one element of government or governance discourse, a combination of elements of these discourses (what Geyer calls a repertoire), or of government or governance discourse. I constructed these discourses beforehand. To facilitate reading I refrain from referring to “elements” of discourses and will speak of a demarcation of discourses. Moreover, other types of discourses and even subdiscourses can be constructed with help of these devices. I interpreted whether a subdiscourse or other discourse was being demarcated.

This interpretation was not as organized as this section might suggest: some sort of tacit knowledge and intuition is part of the interpretative process.

Thanks to Alan Cienki for this suggestion in the discourse reading club of the Amsterdam Discourse Center.

In all three cases, the role of the researcher is eminent. As Dvora Yanow states in reference to constructing categories: “Interpretative category analysts identify (‘collect’) the set of terms and then seek to explicate the logic according to which these terms order the world” (Yanow, 2003).


What is discourse or subdiscourse, or macro and meso discourse depends on the choice of the focus of the research (Dryzek, 2006; C. Hendriks, 2006). I study government and governance discourse of which entrepreneurship can be a subdiscourse.

This critical moments were interpreted per site of interaction, but also per project.

The function “Episode clips” in Transana Softare 2.21 enabled me to establish patterns of boundary work. This function gives an overview of the order of the “collections” that holds a group of key words per coded document. I coded demarcations, boundary concepts and responses. These came out in a specific order. Moreover, the option in Transana to visualize key words in different colors also helped to establish these patterns.

Parts of this chapter were published as (Metze, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Brink and Metze 2006. I would like to gratefully acknowledge all the editors for their comments and suggestions.

A study in 1989 concluded that this had been caused by an enormous “contradiction between the values of planners and the preferences of citizens” (Mentzel, 1986, p. 248).

Since 1990 Amsterdam has been divided into fifteen districts of which Bijlmermeer, later called Amsterdam Zuidoost is one. From May 2010 onward there are seven districts. Each district has its own district government but is also governed by the city government.

The reconstruction of the Bijlmermeer did not only have consequences for the built environment but aims to increase “the socio-economic status of the residents” and to advance “the position of Bijlmer housing on the housing market and strengthening the Bijlmermeer as a whole” (Reijndorp, 1997).

In October 2001 the draft of the Final Plan of Conduct proposed to demolish another 3.400 houses. The total share of high-rise decreased from 93% to 45% (Helleman, 2001).
In Dutch: “Hoe dat nou te doorbreken? De inschatting was dat dat niet lukte als je traditioneel een ambitie naarmate laan maken en dat er doorheen walst.”

In Dutch: “Trechter visie. Dit means even more short sighted than the more common Dutch and English “tunnel vision”.

Participatory planning can be considered a specific type of network governance that sits in a planning tradition in which participation of citizens is aimed after for better decision making, more efficient, effective and often the aim is also to create more democratic decision making (cf. Healey, 1997a;1997b; Innes and Bouwer, 1999; 2000; Fischer and Fischer and Forester, 1993; Forester, 1996).

In Dutch: Creatieve Concurrentie is een methode die dient om de creativiteit van alle belanghebbenden en besluitvormers maximaal te benutten voor de verrijkking van de oplossingen en de bestuurders in staat te stellen tot selectie uit meerdere mogelijkheden.

The first meeting had 29 participants; the second meeting had 50; the third had 49 participants and the last meeting at the park was attended by approximately 60-80 citizens. At the start of the project, the stad bv made an effort to include not only the “usual suspects” but also residents that normally would not participate (Lintbou, 1999-2001; Az. A. Aankloekingen_Hofsteed, 1997; Interview-Hoofdsteed, 2005). People from various backgrounds participated, for example, a group of Surinam women and a group of mainly white Bijlmerpark “believers” organized in Bijlmerpark Naturally.

In this second round of Creative Competition new groups of residents participated. The consultant reached out for other citizens. Especially a group of Pakistani people became more active.

In Dutch: De kromme tenen die ik tot nu toe had met de oude bestuurders zijn hopelijk verleden tijd. Deze naamsverandering betekent een ander is dan wat gangbaar is. Het enige verschil is dat er een stichting voor het parkonderhoud [een stichting voor het parkonderhoud] financieel haalbaar is. In Dutch: We moeten eerst uitrekenen of zoiets [een stichting voor het parkonderhoud] financieel haalbaar is. In Dutch: “Pavonad is duidelijk geworden dat de bewoners goed toegrijpen om plannen af te leveren. In Dutch: Voor het einde van de werkingsopeiningen in de plannen, zoals het parkbeheer en een verbinding van investeringen aan onderhoud zijn op zichzelf prima.

In Dutch: We moeten nadenken over een constructie waarin consortia en bewoners kunnen deelnemen naast het stadsdeel en experts. De alderwoman Hannah Belliot had asked for a black project manager. The project had become too “white” and this was a political concern (Interview-Latchman, 2004).

In Dutch: In deze geest verder te gaan. […] Ik stel voor om bureau Stad bv te vragen een zwarte project manager aan te stellen die als een werknemer van dit bureau, het proces kan manage. Ik bevel planner LH aan.

In Dutch: Voor het planologische deel zorg te dragen. In Dutch: Creativiteit and commitment of the experts and stakeholders aan de gekozen thema’s. In Dutch: Voor de transformatie van het park in een stads park. In Dutch: De raad neemt niet noodzakelijkerwijs dit voorstel van de extreme adviseur over. De planning moet ondertussen worden en wij [de raad, TM] moeten kiezen wat het beste plan is. In Dutch: Stofnu’s plan met wat waar moet zijn, samen met Routes (de verbindingen door het park) en sport (is een noodzaak), worden gecombineerd. In Dutch: We moeten professionele werken met hulp van experts, bijvoorbeeld de DRO die goede studies kunnen uitvoeren. In Dutch: We moeten nadenken over een constructie waarin consortia en bewoners kunnen deelnemen naast het stadsdeel en experts. These two actions were hardly visible for citizens. To them decision making about the Bijlmerpark became relatively quiet (Crismian, 2005).


In Dutch: Het bijeenvoeren wordt afgesloten met de conclusie dat het besluitvormingsproces niet zo anders is dan wat gangbaar is. Het enige verschil is dat de inspraak op een radicaal andere wijze is georganiseerd.
In Dutch: De raad moet eerst besluiten over de Nota van Uitgangspunten voordat zij kan besluiten over het Plan van Aanpak.

In Dutch: Het publiek hoeft niet zo veel te doen in dit project. Als iemand een brief of een e-mail schrijft, dan is een verzoek gedaan om de mee te delen.

In Dutch: Deelname tot nu toe was erg goed en deelnemers hebben veel lees en commentaar geleverd. Het is belangrijk om deze procedure in de toekomst te gebruiken.


In Dutch: I do not have detailed minutes of these meetings. As far as I can reconstruct from emails, faxes and reports (M3_6, 2000; E3_3, 2000; V2-30, 2000), these thematic workshops investigated possibilities and feasibility of the desires per theme. As a preparation the planning department developed three developmental models and applied New York’s Central Park as a source of inspiration (E3_2, 2000). DRO attempted to gather as much information as possible on each theme. This information varied from “you should not put certain sports clubs in one canteen.” As a result you should not put sheep and dogs in one cage (V2-22, 2000) to “can a roundabout (klaverbladaansluiting) be replaced with a Haarlemmermeer aansluiting?” (V2_23, 2000). The planners translated this information into three drafts for development models.

In Dutch: Deelname tot nu toe was erg goed en vandaag is er een kleine afname. Ik denk dat dit te maken heeft met de hoge participatie in de vorige rondes. Daarop heb ik het laatste woord. De raad beslist.

In Dutch: Dit is een relatief abstract verhaal met enkele aandachtspunten. Daarop heb ik het laatste woord.

In Dutch: Het programma niet past en dat er dus een nieuwe versie is nodig. Juile zou moeten worden doorgemaakt in het bijzijn van de buurtbewoners. Het zouden de mogelijkheden moeten worden beperkt en de waarde moet worden bepaald.
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Several interviewees gave examples of these more severe conflicts (Interview-Niles, 2004; Interview-Skadden, 2004; Interview-Wallander_and_Kreuning, 2004; Interview-Hanson_Andrew, 2004).

An infamous example in the area is the Centreville Centre for Air River and Environmental Solutions (CARES) versus Maple Leaf Dairy (1990 dairy cattle), a conflict that endured for several years and remains unresolved (MEA, 2006).

Command and control is jargon for government top-down steering and inspection.

The State of Wisconsin, compared to the rest of the nation, is considered rather strict in its command and control system: “The state has been regarded as a particularly active defender of the environment prompting conservative attacks on the Department of Natural Resources, DNR, as standing for ‘Damned Near Russia,’ which has raised fears that the state’s strict environmental standards deter investment and slow growth (Wilson,2002).

In the US, the permits that protect air and water quality are connected to amounts of emissions. In the European Union the Integrated Pollution Prevention and Control (IPPC) program connects the type of permit to the type of installations (EC, 1996).

A farm that is larger than a 1000 animals units is called a Confined Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO).

Animal units are used to equate the amount of manure produced by different species. An animal unit consists of one mature cow of approximately 1000 pounds and a calf up to weaning, usually 6 months of age, or their equivalent (National Range and Pasture Handbook (NRPB)). CAFO’s have to have a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) permit that is required under the Clean Water Act of 1972.

These numbers are not very accurate. Moreover, the MSWG is a group whose ambition was to improve environmental performance and to introduce new approaches, for example Environmental Management Systems (EMS). These numbers created urgency to introduce new approaches.

In 2003 the secretary of the DNR also acknowledged that adversarial legalism needed to be changed to alter relationships between environmentalists and industry: “Here in the United States, environmental law is grounded in what is called ‘adversarial legalism.’ [...] Phase Two which – at least for now – I will call ‘aspirational legalism’ (Hassett, 2003).

The Green Tier concept not only applied to agrobusinesses but to all other sorts of industry. Moreover, this law, the Dairy Gateway project and concepts in both initiatives, such as dialogue and learning, did not come about in a vacuum. The idea that consensus building and voluntary compliance for sustainable agriculture are connected to debates in, for example rural sociology, about policy networks, network governance, and experiments with participative policy making for sustainable agriculture (cf. Daugbjerg, 1998; Grudens-Schuck, 2000; Beesley and Taillieu 2004; Beesley, 2004; Tatenhove, 2003; Montpetit, 2003; Bulkeley, 2003; Bulkeley and Mol 2003; Lachapelle, 2003; Fish et al., 2006; Goodman, 1999; Marsden, 2004). However, in this thesis I do not try to place this unique case within this debate about network governance within rural sociology, environmental studies or planning. In the introduction, I established that in literature in politics and public administration a shift from government to governance is assumed as a solution: (a) “pollution prevention” (as opposed to ‘end-of-pipe’ pollution control); and (b) “outreach to businesses and collaboration on voluntary and innovative programs” including the development of environmental management systems (Kemal, John Shenot, 2007)).

The DNR CEA was erected in 1996 when the management team of DNR thought that “a home was needed for three types of activities that didn’t fit well within other organizational boundaries”. These activities included (1) “cross-media” issues, for example mercury pollution in air emissions that impact water resources that needed waste management as an instrument; (2) “pollution prevention” (as opposed to ‘end-of-pipe’ pollution control); and (3) “outreach to businesses and collaboration on voluntary and innovative programs” including the development of environmental management systems.

For example, Cook Composites and Polymers (CCP) signed an agreement under Green Tier’s pilot program in which CCP agreed to “cease burning hazardous waste one year before CCP would have been legally required to do so.” (Amengual and Laws, 2004, p. 12).

LNRP had previously been sponsored by DNR as a public/private partnership, the Basin Partnership Team for the Lakeshore Basin. Later on it went completely private.

This change coalition was transformed into an Investors Club in which the aforementioned partners and the River Alliance, a University of Wisconsin Extension Agency in the area, and the Milk Marketing Board participated.

The DNR and others made up this name for the area that consisted of three counties in the lakeshore basin that included two counties (Manitowoc and Kewaunee) with a major dairy industry and the touristic Door County.

As the project manager said: “dairy attracts attention in this state” (Interview-Shenot 2004).

 Financing in the first year, April 2003: $376,625.00 and second year, April 2003: $280,000.00 www.joycefdn.org

In the first round a grant was given to the DNR and in the second round the grant went to the Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship Initiative (WASIS) that is a cooperation of DATCP and DNR. See: Grant List LF 1 Grant list LF 2 (accessed in 2004 and 2005).

Later on these meetings were also referred to farmer-to-neighbour meetings and included several farmer-to-farmer meetings.

The mediator spent three months organizing these meetings. She approached 34 farmers. Only three farmers agreed. Reasons given not to participate: they did not want to “wake sleeping dogs” and “there are no problems in the neighborhood.” The mediator also approached approximately 15 neighbors of each farm that decided to participate. Most of these neighbors participated. Of course, these numbers indicate how successful or difficult this attempt to introduce change was; however, this paper does not evaluate these indicators of change, but rather focuses on the boundaries drawn in deliberations.

Participants in the Statewide Convening were: River Alliance of Wisconsin, Midwest Environmental Advocates, Dairy Business Association, Wisconsin.
Environmental Initiative, Professional Dairy Producers of WI, Manitowoc County, WI Agricultural Stewardship Initiative, University of WI Extension, CROPP/Organic Valley, M & I Bank; Natural Resource Conservation Service, USDA, Fox Paisley, Trout Unlimited, Wisconsin Towns Association, Environmental Defence, University of WI (facilitator) (DNR-CEA, 2004e, DG Report, Jeff Smoller, Wisconsin Department of Natural Environmental Group; Doug Rossberg, Wisconsin Consumer Protection; Sonja Newenhouse, Madison Natural Resources; Linda Merriman Hitchman, Mark McDermid, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection And Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources. DNR.

Unfortunately I did not have access to verbatim transcription of the statewide meetings. The notes that were taken (by WordWorks and the facilitator, Wehbe-Behrman) reflected the results of these meetings, but hardly demonstrate the type of interactions that took place. For this site of interaction we further analyzed several reports: DNR-LNRP, (2004e and 2004f); Wehbe-Behrman (2005a), a mid-term report; WEI-imes (2004), the end-report from the facilitator Wehbe-Behrman, (2005a4); DNR-CEA (2006), a mid-term analysis by MIT (Amegnall and Laws, 2004).

The Investors' Club supported the project and its members included: Howard Bellman, Mediator; Bill Bland, University of Wisconsin – Extension; Denny Canef, River Alliance of Wisconsin; Nura Hernandez-Moria, Madison Environmental Group; Will Hughes, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection; John Ims, Wisconsin Environmental Initiative; Timm Johnson, Wisconsin Agricultural Stewardship Initiative; Matthew J. Joyce, Wisconsin Milk Marketing Board; David Laws, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Mark McDermid, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Linda Merriman Hitechman, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection; Sonja Newenhouse, Madison Environmental Group; Doug Rossberg, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; John Shenton, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Jeff Smoller, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Harry Wehbe-Behrman, Collaborative Initiative (DNR CEA, 2004d, DG Report, Attachment D).

For the analysis of the boundary work in this stage were two proposals of LNRP (LNRP, 2004e, 2004f), one document by Wehbe-Behrman (WEI and Collaborative Initiative) (Wehbe-Behrman, 2004a), two documents of the design team (MIT and mediation experts together with DNR) (Design Team, 2004a, 2004b) and the two proposals of DNR-CEA and the to the United States (cf. Wunderlich, 2004).

I constructed this boundary concept based on the data-analysis (see Chapter 2). Stewardship in this thesis is not further contextualized. I study how this concept is multi-interpretable in the policy practice and as such enables a crossing of discursive boundaries. However, I am aware of its history, for example in the Netherlands it has a Christian Democratic connotation (cf. Metze, 1993; CDA, 1990) and in the United States (cf. Wunderlich, 2004).

Moreover, there is a great body of literature in rural sociology and rural geography about farmers' stewardship (cf. Rickenbach and Scott Reed, 2002), and more specifically on several ways by which farmers try to express their stewardship through for example, Environmental Management System's (cf. Darnall and Carmin, 2005), or “farm-specific environmental action plans” (cf. Smither and Furman 2005). Moreover, there are several studies on conflicts in rural areas, and what challenges are o resolve those (cf. Hall et al., 2004; Grudens-Schuck, 2005; Beiere and Konisky, 2000), or other public voluntary schemes and negotiated agreements (covenants) between state and business that have been applied in the formation of environmental policies (cf. Higley et al., 2001; OECD, 2003).

All meetings were deliberations between government and society, except for the farmer-to-farmer meetings. These were deliberations of government and businesses. I decided not to organize this chapter according to these two sites of interaction as I proposed in chapter 2. These f-t-f meetings made up a small part of the deliberative venues.

This interpretation of an EMS helped to convince a lot of people of its credibility: “But it is a tool, because it’s system- and it runs between Amsterdam, Hengelo in the east of the country, and beyond the Dutch borders to Hannover, south of Berlin and to Strykow in Poland.

This part of the A1 is about 106 kilometres. In 2004, 41,397 operations with cattle were operational in the Netherlands (CBS, 2004). This is called the Veluwe Enkhuizen around Uddel and Elspeet.

Intensive farming and expanding of farms evolved earlier than it did in Wisconsin. For literature on the modernization of agriculture in the Netherlands see, for example, (Brink, 1995; Bielemen, 2000, 2008).

Source: www.orangensmelte.com/maps/europe/ netherlands-b.jpg and googlemaps.com

I consider cluster development in the context of the Reconstruction Law as a combination of “administrative planning” and “developmental planning” which means respectively zoning for specific functions, and cooperation between government and farmers. It’s a tool because it’s system-based and environmentalists are very interested in natural systems and they understand the feedback loop. They are learning and adjusting after you have made something. So, continued improvement is not a foreign concept [laughs]. So, any business that has an environmental management system that is audited by somebody is sort of trapped in a system of continued improvement” (Interview-Terrel 2005).

It is hard to tell if they did so tactically or strategically. I can merely conclude that is what they did as seen from my conceptual framework. DNR is very careful not to attribute these results to the Green Tier program. They argue it is still too early to tell and it is difficult to measure these performances. Moreover, as this figure also demonstrates in 2007 there was a slight increase under green tier companies in their hazardous waste.

Green Tier participants increased their hazardous waste generation in 2005, but have since decreased generation to just 20 percent of their 2004 level. All other reporting sites have slightly reduced their hazardous waste generation since 2004 by about 10 percent” (WDNR 2009, p. 91.). In Dutch: Als de agrosector van Gelderland ook op langere termijn een rol van betekenis wil blijven spelen dan zullen de bakens verzet moeten worden.

This was in this way that consultants and administrators from the Knowledge Centre of the ministry of Agriculture renamed the Protein Corridor as the Protein Highway.

The provinces erected economic development agencies to stimulate that activity. The provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel (the departments of Economic Affairs and Agriculture, respectively) contributed a total of approximately €616,000. The province of Gelderland directly contributed additional financial resources. The province of Overijssel financed the project indirectly through the development agency Oot NV. The national Innovation Network contributed €30,277.50. The resources covered the secretariat work by Oot NV (€9,500) and covered the expenses of the development of the scenarios, the creation of a coordinating body and the support in the area among the businesses, that would sustain the A1 Protein Highway after ‘Make it Happen’ (112,455) (Provincie Gelderland, 2003b).

Cluster development in this thesis is studied as a contested and multi-interpretable concept. Although I do not study it, I am aware that there is a history to this concepts, and a body of scientific literature that defines, studies and evaluates it. For example, in economics cluster development introduced a network type of thinking about relations between government and businesses (cf. Sölvell et al., 2003; Porter, 2000a, 2000b). Moreover, there is literature on cluster development as a way to include the conservation of areas in planning (cf. Arensd, 1996, 1999), and some literature that connects cluster development to rural areas (cf. Barkley and Henrey, 1997).

KLICT was a program funded by the Dutch national government and financed with national income from natural gas extraction and gas production that were earmarked for all sorts of innovations, among which innovation in agriculture. The Dutch government invested 29 million NLG which at the time was 13.2 million EUR (Ministerie_van_Buitenlandse_Zaken, 2001).

Calves (veal) production; valorization of meat animal (slaughter) by-products; knowledge distribution; logistical optimization; and rural park” (WUR, Buck Consultants, Rijiconstruct, 2003).

It was in this way that consultants and administrators from the Knowledge Centre of the ministry of Agriculture renamed the Protein Corridor as the Protein Highway.

The provinces erected economic development agencies to stimulate that activity. The provinces of Gelderland and Overijssel (the departments of Economic Affairs and Agriculture, respectively) contributed a total of approximately €616,000. The province of Gelderland directly contributed additional financial resources. The province of Overijssel financed the project indirectly through the development agency Oot NV. The national Innovation Network contributed €30,277.50. The resources covered the secretariat work by Oot NV (€9,500) and covered the expenses of the development of the scenarios, the creation of a coordinating body and the support in the area among the businesses, that would sustain the A1 Protein Highway after ‘Make it Happen’ (112,455) (Provincie Gelderland, 2003b).
Paying members of the steering committee included two elected officials, deputy Piet Janssen of Agriculture in the Province Overijssel and deputy Henk Aalderink of economic affairs in the province of Gelderland; and Herman de Boon, a member of the board of directors of the Innovation Network De Boon was also involved in a national program, “Transition Sustainable Agriculture.” Non-paying members were Frans Tielrooij, the chair of the Platform Agrologistics and Sjors Kruiper, a member of the board of directors of the Rabobank, a cooperative bank with strong ties in agriculture.

The Shell Oil Company was the first to work with scenarios that describe possible future images that are based on certain and uncertain developments. These scenarios prepared Shell for unknown but thinkable futures, see, for example, Heijden, (2005), Schwartz (1996).

In Dutch: Het is van belang trekkers te vinden die ook van buiten de landbouw.

In Dutch: Het is van belang trekkers te vinden die ook van buiten de landbouw.

Participating businesses: ABCTA; Nutreco Holding NV (Animal nutrition, fish feed, poultry (Europe, Canada, Japan, Chile); Sobel (now part of VION meat production); Dumeeco: [fresh quality] meat-producer, now VION Food Group based in NL and UK); Zwanenberg Food Group (deli meats and meat preservers in NL, USA and UK); Van Drie Group (veal production, 20% of the European market); Rijnvallet (agricultural advice and production of feed, manure, crop-protection, stable).

Unknown which and how many businesses attended this meeting. Moreover, deliberative governance remained limited to a one day workshop scenario.

In Dutch: Wat kenmerkt de A1 Corridor, wat is het heilig. Ondernemers moeten ruimte krijgen op de plek waar het nu al kan.

In Dutch: Het initiatief moet van de industrie komen. Politiek is de grootste bedreiging van de landbouw in Nederland.


In Dutch: Maar er verandert wel wat. In Gelderland denken men over een ontwikkelingsmaatschappij voor het landelijk gebied en een politiek dat de ondernemen en daarmee enkel de makelaars stimuleren.


In Dutch Van Drie Group: Het staat los van de reconstructie? GOM: De reconstructie is geen aanleiding geweest, dat staat er feitelijk los van. Wij richten ons primair op de industrie.

In Dutch: Bij visieontwikkeling, in onze beleving begin je dus zo breed mogelijk. Je probeert de omgeving erbij te halen, je probeert andere partijen erbij te halen, probeert echt een beweging te creëren. Je gaat niet vanuit de agrosector proberen de rest van de wereld over te Unterbrechen die zo goed bezig bent. Dan wordt het een soort promotieverhaal en je moet er echt op in durven te gaan. Daar kan ook best de conclusie uitkomen dat het helemaal niet zo handig is om te clusteren, maar laat de mensen dat gewoon zelf met elkaar maar bedenken.

In Dutch: En dat die ambachts zeeg of not, maar wel met beide benen op de grond. Want die gedurende moeten ermer kunnen scoren.
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In Dutch: Het is een zaak van dat jullie samen zeggen: dit kan gebeuren. Wij willen jullie niet overtuigen.

266 In Dutch: Dus ja, het spreekt mij in ieder geval wel aan, dit kwadrant. Nu nonnens eigenlijk: de ondernemer ondernemer, de overheid faciliteert en bepaalt de speelregels, en de maatschappij en het publiek, die onmogelijk het gevolg ernaast.

267 In Dutch: De functie van scenario’s is, zoals ik, wat ik van de meeste mensen terug hoor die met scenario’s werken is dat de bankiers denken in geld, boeren in varkens, uh uh, onderzoekers in projecten, wegensbouwers in asfalt, en de hele rest van de wereld. Ik badineer het, blijft een beetje buiten beeld. Wat je in die scenario’s probeert te doen is een wat bredere beeld te scheppen waardoor je dingen in beeld krijgt die van buiten komen. Okay?

268 Participants were Casper Koermander (financier), Fons Goselink (of the province of Gelderland), Ruit Pardoon (H N+S Landschapsarchitecten), Jos Roesmaat (LTO), Herman de Boon (Innovation Network and steering committee member), Jeroen Verver Rabobank. I observed, recorded, transcribed and analyzed this session.

269 In Dutch: De vraag is of die beweging uit de sector zelf kan komen, ook in ruimtelijke zin. Of dat daar toch anderen, zoals recreatie, zou nu bij de natuur, andere functies, of die daar bij betrokken moeten worden om die beweging te krijgen.

270 In Dutch: Maar als je dus die andere doelgroepen bekijkt: landbouw, recreatie, water, natuur, die je gewoon nodig hebt om een andere doelstelling, namelijk de ruimtelijke kwaliteit te realiseren, en dat is ook iets wat je wilt, dat komt ook weer ten goede, denken we, aan de agrarische sector. [...] Als je dat ook als doelstelling hebt, dan is er de eiwitcorridor, ja toch, erg smal, qua begrip en invalshoek.

271 In Dutch: Het begin is, er is ooit, er is een reconstructie die in beide provincies heeft plaatsgevonden. Daar waren alle partijen bij betrokken. Daar hebben alle partijen zich aan gecommuniceerd, ook de partijen die in natuur en milieu zaten. [...] Het idee is dat de A1 nou niet moet proberen om in die volle breedte dit project neer te zetten, om in die volle breedte alle aspecten door te kopen. Want dat lijkt me wel erg ambitieus. Wel heel goed weten wat de natuur en de milieugroepen, wat die willen. Maar, richt dat maar voorop op de primaire sector en de verwerkende industrie. Daar ligt de grootste opgave en dan past die naam ook heel goed.

272 In Dutch: Het domein van voedselvoorziening in grotere clusters en andere voorzieningen en die kwaliteit van leven. Daar kunnen een soort combinaties zijn, zorgboerderijen [...]. onderneming te maken maar weel dat je voorziet in een functie die er in de maatschappij bestaat.

273 Verandering en de mobiliteit moeten er in de maatschappij bestaan. Het begins is, er is ooit, er is een reconstructie die in beide provincies heeft plaatsgevonden. Daar waren alle partijen bij betrokken. Daar hebben alle partijen zich aan gecommuniceerd, ook de partijen die in natuur en milieu zaten. [...] Het idee is dat de A1 nou niet moet proberen om in die volle breedte dit project neer te zetten, om in die volle breedte alle aspecten door te kopen. Want dat lijkt me wel erg ambitieus. Wel heel goed weten wat de natuur en de milieugroepen, wat die willen. Maar, richt dat maar voorop op de primaire sector en de verwerkende industrie. Daar ligt de grootste opgave en dan past die naam ook heel goed.

In Dutch: In het domein van voedselvoorziening in grotere clusters en andere voorzieningen en die kwaliteit van leven. Daar kunnen een soort combinaties zijn, zorgboerderijen [...]. onderneming te maken maar weel dat je voorziet in een functie die er in de maatschappij bestaat.

274 In Dutch: We gaan nu vanuit de gedachte dat alles is waarom die toekomst kent, wordt schattijk. Maar ook, er zijn een heel aantal sectoren in Nederland, de scheepbouw, de textielindustrie, waar een hele hoop buitengewoon verstandige mensen in zaten [...]. toch als het ware, al lopend met elkaar de fulk ingestort en zij zijn verhoven in of heel andere vormen teruggekomen. Het nadenken over wat er in dit gebied zou kunnen gebeuren [...] daarom van belang.

275 In Dutch: Drie varianten voor groene en blauwe diensten: a. via vorm van labelen [...]; b. lidmaatschappen ‘vrienden van’ [...]; c. meer institutioneel: handelbare ontwikkelingsrechten [...]. De vraag is of die beweging uit de sector zelf kan komen, ook in ruimtelijke zin. Of dat daar toch anderen, zoals recreatie, zou nu bij de natuur, andere functies, of die daar bij betrokken moeten worden om die beweging te krijgen.

In Dutch: Three parallel sessions and three people facilitated these sessions. 

276 In Dutch: We gaan nu vanuit de gedachte dat alles is waarom die toekomst kent, wordt schattijk. Maar ook, er zijn een heel aantal sectoren in Nederland, de scheepbouw, de textielindustrie, waar een hele hoop buitengewoon verstandige mensen in zaten [...]. toch als het ware, al lopend met elkaar de fulk ingestort en zij zijn verhoven in of heel andere vormen teruggekomen. Het nadenken over wat er in dit gebied zou kunnen gebeuren [...] daarom van belang.

277 In Dutch: In het domein van voedselvoorziening in grotere clusters en andere voorzieningen en die kwaliteit van leven. Daar kunnen een soort combinaties zijn, zorgboerderijen [...]. onderneming te maken maar weel dat je voorziet in een functie die er in de maatschappij bestaat.
These EMS’s are rather conventional instruments; in Dutch: Coalities daaren een aantal voorwaarden voor en een hele belangrijk is in ieder geval als je coalities in de primaire sector tot stand wilt brengen, dat er verderop in de keten, bijvoorbeeld bij de slachterij, of vooraan in de keten, bijvoorbeeld bij de toeleverancier, iemand is die dat afdwingt, tussen aanhalingstekens.

Government discourse is not to be confused with discourse of governmental agents! Government discourse is the ensemble of ideas, concepts, and categories about the hierarchical way in which governmental actors from a top down position can make policy decisions, command and control and regulate. Other actors can also utter government discourse.

These EMS’s are rather conventional instruments; however, the way they were a boundary concept and created a sphere of engagement for farmers, citizens, environmental organizations fits a discourse of deliberative governance.

That includes me: I interpreted the proposals as proposals for experiments with deliberative governance.

Even though there is not one concept to address the experiments, except for the concept I used: deliberative governance. In STS these experiments and their proposals might be considered to be "objects" (see below).

Hence, boundary concepts or even objects and actors interpreting and using those are mutually constructive: they influence each other. For example, in all the projects participants were “disciplined”, in Creative Competition to design a park, in the Dairy Gateway project to explore farmers’ stewardship, and in the Protein Highway Project to develop instruments for cluster development. This confirms the ideas in Actor Network Theory in STS that objects (or in our case concepts) and actors are mutually constructive (cf. Latour, 1987; 2005; Callon, 1986).

This also means that facilitators are part of this coalition and as such are subjected to dominant discourse. In all three cases they were not “independent” or “neutral” as often claimed is necessary in mediation, consensus building or joint fact finding (cf. Fuller, 1971; Fischer and Ury, 1981; Ozawa and Suskind, 1985; Healey, 1988; Innis and Booker, 1999; Suskind et al., 1999; Karl and Turner, 2003). From a discursive perspective, I demonstrated that all three change coalitions were “disciplined” by a discourse. As we saw, the facilitators interpreted the proposals from the perspective of that discourse and implemented those accordingly.

Not only a change coalition or consultants can induce reflective conversations. Participants in deliberations can also apply strategies of indirectness, for example humor, to redirect conflict and facilitate a reflective conversation. Participants can also create conflict if they do not want to get involved in reflective conversations.

This can be considered a neo-consensual style of Dutch decision making in which struggles about possible conflicting interpretations are avoided and agreementor support of societal actors for instruments is aimed after. It builds on Arend Lijphart’s famous argument from 1968 in which he claimed that the success of Dutch decision-making is a pilarization of society in which struggles about objectives can be avoided and an elitists’ agreement on instruments is sufficient for decision making (Lijphart, 1968, 1988). This thesis demonstrates that in the Netherlands, perhaps due to its history of a pilarized society, a consensual style in the conversations rather common. In the Dutch tradition, support (draagvlak) of other network partners, for example elite members of other societal groups, is necessary to make decisions. This tradition already resembles network governance. This makes it more difficult to engage in deliberative governance. The Dutch tradition of keeping struggles of the table and trying to reach agreement on instruments is continued in the experiments with deliberative governance. For example, in the Blijmerpark the conflict of interests to build in the park versus keeping the park green was kept of the table, but also a reflection on different interpretations of what makes a feasible plan.

This is also what is advised in consensus building, conflict resolution and mediation the advice (cf. Fischer and Ury (1981); Suskind, and Cruikshank (1987); Suskind and Field (1996); Suskind et al. (1999); Podziba (1999). Or, as Rein and Schön argued: from a cooperative view, an analysis of (conflicting) frames makes it possible to reframe and thus to find new solutions. Whereas in a conflict of interests (from a political view), the interests cannot be reframed (Rein and Schön 1993).

It might be that in a more adversarial context and style of decision making the change coalition and facilitators had to think of ways how to redirect and deal with this conflict.

In this case discourse means debate or speech. This is also what scholars in deliberative democracy theory argue should be aimed after (cf. Benhabib, 1988, 1996; Forester, 1996; Young 1990).

Governmental actors do not necessarily have to take the initiative to form a change coalition. Moreover, a deliberative design or strategies or strategies of indirectness can also be developed by participants in experiments that feel the need to, for example, gain credibility for an interpretation of the experiment from a deliberative governance perspective.

These results can be used as a set of criteria to evaluate experiments with deliberative governance to establish whether a credible shift to deliberative governance discourse was established or not.

Or scholars in STS that argue that participatory knowledge production leads to better knowledge through the inclusion of lay or local knowledge (Fischer, 1990; Funtowicz and Liberatore, 2003; Gibbons et al., 1994; Nowotny, 2003; Shackley and Wynne, 1995; Kip et al., 1995).

This is how scholars in STS but also political science refer to an ambition in participatory problem solving. They argue that science and scientific knowledge is not free from political judgments, especially when it is applied in a policy context. Knowledge is always contested and negotiated. Therefore, these scholars argue that other types of knowledge such as lay expertise and local expertise should be taken into account (cf. Woodhouse and Nersesian 2001; Torgerson, 2003; Jasanoff, 2004).

In research on rhetoric and argumentation “experience” is a well-known rhetorical device: to draw on “example, or story that might be real cases or invented fables” (Hood, 1998, p. 175). This device is also referred to as ‘argument by example’ that can include both factual facts but can also be made up “fables” (Gottweis, 2006). Further research on this rhetorical dimension of boundary work that includes argumentation by example needs to be further explored, see also (Holmqvist, 1990, p. 239). Further research to connect boundary work to linguistics is necessary.

Studies of authority also include other aspects, such as charisma or media performance, to explain for authority (cf. Hajer 2009). However, in studies of democratic legitimacy, the legal and procedural aspects of what legitimatizes, for example governmental authority, are often emphasized.

You can consider me part of deliberative governance discourse that facilitates pragmatic but democratic problem solving.

Some scholars in deliberative democracy theory have also pointed out this danger, for example Dryzek (2006), Parkinson (2003) and Dodge (2009).

This is a slogan of the Wisconsin Environmental Initiative that promotes sustainable businesses. ARCTA was a cooperative feed processor and is since 2003 part of ForFarmers U.A.

In Dutch: Nederlandse organisatie voor pluimveehouders.
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