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

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 this type of experiments at the local, regional and national level.

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.

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 actors can utter government discourse.

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).

See on discourse contests in deliberations Fraser, 1992, p. 123-4.

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.

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.

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

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. Halliman, 2005; Held, 1999; F. Hendriks, 2006; Innes and Gruber, 2001; Lijphart, 1999; Renn, 1995; Vogel, 1986).

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.

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).

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).

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).

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.

The difference between dominant and hegemonic discourse is that the latter is even more forceful and less visible in its disciplining of subjects (cf. Givna, 2006, p. 79; Glynos and Howarth, 2007, p. 5 and 106).

In STS for example, Funtowicz and Ravetz proposed to include non-experts in knowledge-making in a process of “extended peer review” (Funtowicz and Ravetz, 1992) when there is high political salience combined with uncertainty about the knowledge. Other examples: Gibbons, 2000; Funtowicz, and Liberatore, 2003; Durant, 1999; Caron-Flinterman, 2006. See also on inclusion of lay knowledge in deliberations, for example, Grin and Graaf, (1996a and 1996b) and Hendriks (2006).

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” (Edeleenbosch and Monnikhof, 2003, p. 9), and fit perfectly in the Dutch consensus tradition (Duyvendak, 2003, p.39; Kickett, 2004). Some even argue that these interactive settings should replace some elements of the formal structures (Edeleenbosch and Monnikhof, 1998b, p.133).

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

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.

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 meanings, 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.

For other examples of the turn to practice in the third face of political science see, for example, Toegerson, 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.

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

This point is often raised as a critique on discourse analysis. It is argued that discourse analysis cannot explain how certain discourses have become dominant but can describe only that they have done so. Boundary work is a way through which discourse becomes dominant or remains dominant.

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).

Giryn applied the concept “cultural repertoires” rather than discourse. In 2003, Knechy 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.

This assumption is supported by research that demonstrates that the governmental models of governing are better accepted and institutionalized than deliberative and interactive forms of governing, see for example Klijn and Knechta (1997) and Pröpper and Steenbeek (1998).

In 2000, the anthropologist Fedič Karth 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).

Although Giryn 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 make their stories seem ‘objective’ but we can learn little of why such a story becomes the preferred one” (Giryn, 1982:292).

In the Netherlands, examples of these boundary organizations are: Scientific Council for the Government (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid (WRR)), Advisory council for research on spatial planning, nature and the environment (Raad voor Rijkspland, 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 Halfman, 2005; De Wit, 2005).

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

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 Troop (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 (Shackley 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).

Goverance now takes place without government (2004, p. 49). Hajer also concludes that “it is more appropriate to conceive of it as a recomposition” and that network governance “includes the particular classical-modernist enactments” (Hajer 2009, p. 188). In terms of this thesis this means that government discourse can also be enacted and gain credibility in experiments with deliberative governance.

Scholars in the tradition of Jurgen Habermas, for example James Fishkin and John Elster, emphasize rational reasoning as a way to improve democratic decision making. Scholars in this tradition define deliberations as “ideal speech” situations which Habermas later referred to as discourse ethics, that is, general norms of communication (Habermas, 1980).

Credible decisions have become credible as they are part of a discourse that actors believe in.

“Authority” usually refers to a formal position and “legitimacy” refers to the formal process by which authority is accepted. Legitimacy is the right to govern, the process by which decisions are accepted (representative democracy, law). For example, Weber discriminated between three sources that legitimate authority: charisma, tradition, rational or legal authority(cf. Mommsen, 1992). In more recent work in policy analysis, legitimacy and authority include criteria that can only be met in interaction with other actors. For example, in addition to being lawful, legitimate policies and collective decisions need to be justifiable and need the consent of other actors (Parkinson 2003). “Throughput” legitimacy (Schurp, 1999) is often used in this context. Throughput legitimacy concerns procedural aspects such as integrating or aggregative mechanisms for decision making, transparency of deliberations, quality of the representation of citizens, checks and balances (Bekkers and Edwards, 2007, p. 44-45).

In this thesis I define credibility as the actors’ acceptance of – their “belief in” (Hajer 1995, p. 59) — other participants’ arguments in deliberations. When credibility of arguments or even discourse is established in deliberations, this can contribute to the authority and legitimacy of actors, institutions that utter these arguments. In this thesis I introduce the concept “credibility” to make a clear distinction between on hand legitimacy and authority
Often these different interpretations of reflectivity reflect the difference between a good and a bad orator “does not lie primarily in the fact that one gives good while the other gives bad advice. The difference lies in this: the depraved orators who are accepted by the people only say what the people desire to hear (isocrates calls these flatterers)” (Foucault, 2001:81).

As Foucault acknowledged, an escape of disciplining powers does not mean that power disappears. It signifies that power is more dynamic than presumed and that actors can bring about new power-division as “individuals are the vehicles of power, not its supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusion to which it tends” (Dewey, 1933, p.30).

Dewey defined reflective thought 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” (Beck, 1994, p. 8). Beck uses “reflectivity” rather than reflectivity 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 reflectivity discuss how science can produce or evoke reflectivity in practice. Deliberative policy analysis can be understood to have the objective of enhancing this type of reflectivity. For example, Douglas Torgerson argued that “reflective 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 reflectivity: r-warness (self knowledge), r-circularity (mutual construction), and r-reference (self reference) (Ashmore, 1989, 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 Schön, 1993).

The problem is this can only be established with hindsight. Conflict or reflectivity need to follow parrhesia in order to have come across indeed a boundary between dominant or alternative discourse. Otherwise, parrhesia 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, as or as Jasannot in 1994 “epeness” is important in negotiations over regulatory science, otherwise closure of debate will fail (Jasannot, 1994, p. 233). This is where Bourdieu speaks of “closure.”

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

Unidentified Political Objects (UPO’s) as introduced by Hush Djistelbloem are somewhat similar to boundary objects as they also sit on the boundaries between domains. According to Djistelbloem, 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 Djistelbloem’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. (Djistelbloem, 2007, p. 8). In the field of organizational studies, boundary objects also have been studied, for example, by (Buttle, 2006).

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 (Hellström and Jacobs, 2003; Guston, 1999a, 1999b). In public administration public-private partnerships has also been described as “crossover arrangements” (Montfort, 2008, p. 57).

In SNS, 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 to 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, frame bridge, frame amplification, frame extension, frame transformation (cf. Snow and Benford, 1992; Klandermans and Gossling, 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 the details of the differences between “frames” and “discourses,” but frames are usually considered to be related to individual beliefs (the 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, 2008; 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” (Hajer and Law, 2006, p. 232; Brink, 2009, p. 43) to make a distinction between on 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 Laswell’s democracy theories (Laswell, 1951b).
As I argued in chapter 1, reflexivity and reflectivity is biased and constructed in “power-laden social relations” (Dryzek, 1990, p.116; see also: Torgerson, 1986; Hajer and Wagenaar, 2003, p.11, 12 and 18).

As Peregrine Schwartz-Shea argued, Guba and Lincoln remain rather close to positivist evaluative criteria for the quality of research (Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p.94). Guba and Lincoln speak of credibility, transferability, dependability, confirmability. Indeed, in this chapter we provide you with the means to judge if this dissertation meets these criteria and whether, according to Guba and Lincoln (2005), this research fits a post-positivist paradigm and does not move in the direction of critical theory or constructivism (Guba and Lincoln, 2005, p. 166).

This is similar to the relation between parthetia and reflectivity from chapter 1 that together are a condition for practitioners to engage in a conversation of a deliberative quality. A mutual inquiry by a researcher and practitioners also needs to be of a deliberative quality to be able to generate phronesis.

As I argued in chapter 1, reflexivity and reflectivity often are used interchangeably. Reflexivity means to reflect on or to contemplate (Schwartz-Shea, 2006, p.102). As we saw, in social theories ‘reflex’ varies from experiences and emotions other than pure intuition is part of the interpretive process.

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

And intuition is part of the interpretative process. 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 Giersen 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 Drora 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).

See also: http://www.americanethnologist.com/figures/ categories.htm (accessed on 7th of June 2008)

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.

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

The function “Episode clips” in Transana Software 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 1999 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” (Reijnord, 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% (Hellmann, 2003).


The analysis is based on a study of documents and interviews. See attachment 3.2 for an overview of the interviewees.

This was a project bureau in which the central city, the district and the housing corporation ‘Nieuw Amsterdam’ participated.

This procedure contains seven phases: Phase α = Initiative (initiatief); Phase β = exploration (verkenning); Phase γ = List of Guidelines (Nota van Uitgangspunten); Phase δ = Urban Developmental

Endnotes
In Dutch: Creatieve Concurrentie is een methode die in dit second round of Creative Competition new representatie door politieke partijen, […] er niet
reached out for other citizens. Especially a group of women and a group of mainly white Bijlmerpark participated, for example, a group of Surinam Hofstede, 2003). People from various backgrounds and held in the interest of citizens to participate, as this suggests that the number of participants increased. It was in the interest of citizens to participate, as this gave them a voice. The analysis of boundary work demonstrates how these citizens became convinced that the governance discourse was in their interest. In Dutch: een verzoek tot een voorstel tot het faciliteren voor de verdere ontwikkeling van een visie voor het Bijlmerpark. In Dutch: De kromme tekenen die ik tot nu toe had met de oude bestuurders zijn hopelijk verleden tijd met dit goede initiatief. Een woord van spijt: het is belachelijk dat de overheid niet het geld heeft om een parck van 34 hectare te onderhouden terwijl het Vondelpark voor enkele tonnen mag vertimmeren. In Dutch: Het Bijlmerpark functioneert niet. Het is belachelijk dat de overheid niet het geld heeft om een parck van 34 hectare te onderhouden terwijl het Vondelpark voor enkele tonnen mag vertimmeren. In Dutch: De bijeenkomst wordt afgesloten met de conclusie dat het besluitvormingsproces niet zo anders is dan wat gangbaar is. Het enige verschil is dat de inspanning op een radicaal andere wijze is georganiseerd.

Endnotes

100 In Dutch: Er is sprake van meervoudige probleemdefinities en doelvervechting.
101 Feasibility is a concept that all sorts of actors in the (Dutch) planning practice often utter. However, I did not study the coming about of this concept — or perhaps even discourse — in Dutch planning. I constructed this concept as a boundary concept based on the data-analysis of the first and second phase of Creative Competition (see chapter 2). It would be interesting to do a discourse analysis into the coming about and the meaning of this concept in Dutch planning.
102 In Dutch: De opdracht beperkt zich uitdrukkelijk tot en met de ‘startnotitie’. Voor het vervolg (fase 2) wordt gedacht aan normale voorzetting via een projectorganisatie die, met de besluiten over de startnotitie op zak, aan de slag gaat met het fase 2 product.
103 In Dutch: De consortia trachten de oplossingen in fasen zodat mogelijk bij een haalbaar en uitvoerbaar plan te brengen.
104 There were no data generated of interactions between government and businesses. Businesses did participate in public meetings; however, they did not interact with government in bilateral settings.
105 I don’t know how many citizens dropped out. The attendance of participants at all four meetings suggests that the number of participants increased.
106 It was in the interest of citizens to participate, as this gave them a voice. The analysis of boundary work demonstrates how these citizens became convinced that the governance discourse was in their interest.
107 In Dutch: een voorstel tot het voorstellen tot het reserveren van een toegangspunt en de bijeenkomst worden 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.
110 In Dutch: Er is sprake van meervoudige probleemdefinities en doelvervechting.
111 In Dutch: We weten dat het parck voor 1/37 behoud beheugt gaat. Het park moet weer parck worden.
112 In Dutch: Het park moet multifunctioneel worden. De bebouwing kan nul worden.
113 Het belangrijkste probleem, het verkeer op de Goosieweg, moet niet vergeten worden.
114 Kwakoeften is a multi-cultural festival that lasts for six weeks and includes music, foot races and a soccer competition.
115 In Dutch: Meer functies in het parkontwerp betrokk.
116 In 2004 66% of the residents of Amsterdam Southeast were of non-Dutch background (Afdeling, OENs, 2004).
117 Members of Bijlmerpark Naturally were mainly white, middle class residents that lived in the houses at the fringes of the park. Stonfurt members were mostly lower and middle class Surinam women living in the high rise. The competition between these two groups made visible that the conflict about building houses in the park might be considered a class and even race conflict: houses for the “poor black people” and trees for the “rich white people”. Interesting was that this central issue was kept out of the deliberations (see conclusions of chapter 3).
118 In Dutch: sport niet alleen voor teams en clubs maar ook voor individuele recreanten.
119 In Dutch: Alle plannen hebben iets moois. Een combinatie kan het beste zijn.
120 In Dutch: We willen graag de plannen afmaken. Groen Links zal aandacht besteden aan de milieue issues. Het park moet in de vorm van een compromis gehandhaafd blijven.
121 In Dutch: We moeten eerst uitlezen of zoetens {een stichting voor het parkonderhoud} financieel haalbaar is.
122 In Dutch: Vanadvand is duidelijk geworden dat de bewoners goed toegrepen zijn om plannen af te leveren.
123 In Dutch: De voorgestelde oplossen in de plannen, zoals het parckbeheer en een verbinding van investeringen aan onderhoud zijn op zichzelf prima.
124 In Dutch: Ik ben een voorstander van een beheersmaatschappij die de plannen van de consortia combineert en waarin het stadsdeel maar ook successen en doelstellingen deelt.
125 In Dutch: De bijeenkomst 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.
126 In Dutch: De raad neemt niet noodzakelijkerwijs dit voorstel van de extreme adviseur over. De planning moet onderzocht worden en wij [de raad, TM] moeten kiezen wat het beste plan is.
127 In Dutch: Stonfurt’s plan met wat waar moet zijn, samen met Routes (de verbindingen door het park) en sport (is een noodzaak), worden gecombineerd.
128 In Dutch: We moeten professionals werken met hulp van experts, bijvoorbeeld de DRO die goede studies kunnen uitvoeren.
129 In Dutch: We moeten nadenken over een constructie waarin consortia en bewoners kunnen deelnemen naast het stadsdeel en experts.
130 These two actions were hardly visible for citizens. To them decision making about the Bijlmerpark became relatively quiet (Créiman, 2000).
131 In Dutch: Ik ben afgestudeerd aan de Technische Universiteit Delft op een plan na de naam: Bijlmerpark Boulevard of broken dreams. Het Bijlmerpark was onderdeel van dit plan. Het is samen met Stonfurt verder ontwikkeld.
132 The alderwoman Hannah Belliot had asked for a “white” project manager. The project had become too “white” and this was a political concern (Interview – Latchman, 2004).
133 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 managen. Ik beveel planner LH aan.
134 In Dutch: Voor het planologische deel zorg te dragen.
135 In Dutch: Creativiteit and commitment of the experts and stakeholders aan de gekozen thema’s.
136 In Dutch: Voor de transformatie van het park in een stadsparck.
137 In Dutch: Deze naamsverandering betekent een beweging op drie punten […] de ambitie om het park een surplus te geven […] de cultuur en de emancipatie en het perspectief van de bijlmerbewoners. Ten tweede, een versnelling van de hervontwikkeling […] Tot slot zal het plan van aanpak voorstellen bevatten voor een ontwikkelingsstructuur die samenhangt met de wensen en competenties van de verschillende partijen, het stadsdeel en externe partijen.
138 In Dutch: De ontwerp Nota van Uitgangspunten is geen stedelijk plan maar meer een ontwikkelingsstrategie, een document dat de meest
160 The organization of the “third track,” the exploration of Public Private Partnership for the park maintenance had started but never developed fully, as the district council thought it was not useful (Mz–4, 2000; N2–15, 2000). At this point, Luchtmach, the project manager, also was fired (Vz–22, 2000; Vz–26, 2000a), 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 (Fax2_1, 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. Just as you should not put sheep and dogs in one cage” (Vz–22, 2000) to “can a roundabout (kloverbadaanpassing)” be replaced with a “Haarlemmermeer aansluiting” (Vz–23, 2000). The planners translated this information into three drafts for development models.

161 In Dutch: Deelname tot nu toe was erg goed en vandaag is er een kleine afname. 

162 In Dutch: Het programma niet past en dat er dus een compromis wat betreft het programma moet worden gekozen. 

173 In Dutch: Het programma niet past en dat er dus een compromis wat betreft het programma moet worden gezocht.


175 I do call this a learning discourse by which I indicate a new discourse that builds on “science discourse” but it includes expertise and experience of all sorts of actors. In other research science or technocracy — policy — discourse is reserved for scientific and other professionals expertise, see for example Fischer, 1995, 2000; Hajer, 1993; Hajer, 1995; Toegerson, 2003.

176 This is an example of what Foucault called “governmentality” which can be summarized as a strong coalition of government and science in a governmentality discourse that disciplines citizens (Dean, 1994; Foucault, 1991).

177 These actors are also considered boundary people (Hallowman, 2003) or boundary workers (Snow and Green, 2003) that contribute to the dynamics of boundary work. The focus of this thesis is not these actors; however, I will pay attention to the role of the change coalition.

178 These discourses appear to resemble the interests of actors. However, I consider them “discourses,” as all sorts of actors can endorse one of these discourses in the deliberations. In other words, it is not necessarily a business person that speaks from a business discourse to protect business interests in a deliberative setting.

179 From Manitowoc to the tip of the peninsula is approximately 117 miles. From Green Bay to Kewaunee is about 28 miles. This area is slightly bigger that the Protein Highway that runs 106 kilometres between Amersfoort and Hengelo and covers an area around this artery about 15 km on both sides.

180 In 2000 the population density in the USA was 79.6 per square mile (= approximately 30.7 per km2) (US_Census_Bureau, 2002, p. 11). The state of Wisconsin had a density of 98,8 persons per sq mile (US_Census_Bureau, 2002, p. 11). That is

Several interviewees gave examples of these more severe conflicts (Interview-Niles, 2004; Interview-Skadden, 2004; Interview-Wallander_and_Keuning, 2004; Interview-Hanson_Andrew, 2004).

An infamous example in the area is the Centreville Centre for Air River and Environmental Solutions (CARIES) versus Maple Leaf Dairy (1400 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). See for example: Rubenstein (2004); Hanley (2003); Amengual and Laws (2004); Ribaudo (2003).

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 (NRPH). 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 MSW 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 agribusinesses 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. Dauberg, 1998; Gruens-Schuck, 2000; Bozeman and Taillieu 2004; Bozeman, 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 in sorts of policy fields. I study if this shift is enacted by participants of experiments with deliberative governance. Again, the body of literature also in rural sociology demonstrates that experimentation is taking place also within rural areas and especially in conflicts between agriculture and the environment, but again the question is if, and if so, how participants enact it in the policy practice.

Usually States government “cost shares” or compensates agribusinesses for measures to prevent pollution. For example, the non-point source rules in 2001 required that farmers only had to prevent polluted runoff if 70% was cost shared by government (NR 151 section on cost sharing). Moreover, “voluntary” in this approach does not mean without government interferences or control. This new approach also implies new ways of being held accountable (Sabel, 1999).

Members of the committee: Wisconsin Paper Council; Wisconsin Manufacturers & Commerce; Alliant Energy; SC Johnson; International Paper; Wisconsin Energy Corporation; Beck Carton; Quad Graphics; Community Health Centre; Sierra Club; Citizens for a Better Environment; Competitive Wisconsin; Mayor John Antaramian (City of Kenosha); Ray Taffora and Linda Bochert (lawyers); Dan Poulson (http://dfr.wi.gov/cear/cm/ environmental/background/advisory/members.html) accessed on 21st July 2008.

An EMS is an environmental management system (EMS) that aims to improve the environmental performance of businesses. In Europe an accredited EMS, an ISO 14001 is often required in business-transactions. An EMS reflects the environmental goals of the specific business and aims at a continuous improvement of environmental performance; for more on EMS see Karapetrovic and Willborn (1998). EMS’s are examined in for example: McLain and Lee (1996); Rondinella (2000); Delmas (2002); Delmas and Keller (2005).

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 answer; (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 (E-mail _John Shenot, 2007)).

Recommendations: Agriculture Sector’s Involvement in Green Tier. From the Agriculture Convening Group to Wisconsin Department of Convening, 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, Webne-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); Webne-Behrman (2005a); a mid-term report; WEI-Imes (2004), the end-report from the facilitator Webne-Behrman, (2005a); DNR-CEA (2006), a mid-term analysis by MIT (Amengual 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; Nuria Hernandez-Moria, Madison Environmental Group; Will Hughes, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection; John Ives, 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 Hitchman, Wisconsin Department of Agriculture and Consumer Protection; Sonja Newenhouse, Madison Environmental Group; Doug Rossberg, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; John Shenot, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Jeff Smoller, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources; Harry Webne-Behrman, Collaborative Initiative (DNR CEA, 2004d; DG Report, Attachment D).

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 very critical environmental organization that at first opposed the Dairy Gateway project and the EMS of its credibility. “But it is 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 had something done. 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 tacitly or strategically. I can merely conclude that this is what they did as seen from my conceptual framework.

http://dnr.wi.gov/org/caer/cea/environmental/ participants/wildairy/photos/photos05.html

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. The A1 is one of main highways in the Netherlands. This part of the A1 is about 106 kilometres. Intensive farming and expanding of farms evolved modernization of agriculture in the Netherlands see, for example, Environmental Management System’s (cf. Darnall and Carmin, 2005), or “farm-specific environmental action plans” (cf. Smithers and Kamphuis, 2001). Moreover, there are several studies on conflicts in rural areas, and what challenges are on resolve those (cf. Hall et al., 2004; Grudensch-Schuck, 2000; Beierle 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. Highley 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 very critical environmental organization that at first opposed the Dairy Gateway project and the EMS of its credibility. “But it is 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 had something done. 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 tacitly or strategically. I can merely conclude that this is what they did as seen from my conceptual framework.

http://dnr.wi.gov/org/caer/cea/environmental/ participants/wildairy/photos/photos05.html

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. The A1 is one of main highways in the Netherlands. This part of the A1 is about 106 kilometres. Intensive farming and expanding of farms evolved modernization of agriculture in the Netherlands see, for example, Environmental Management System’s (cf. Darnall and Carmin, 2005), or “farm-specific environmental action plans” (cf. Smithers and Kamphuis, 2001). Moreover, there are several studies on conflicts in rural areas, and what challenges are on resolve those (cf. Hall et al., 2004; Grudensch-Schuck, 2000; Beierle 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. Highley 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 very critical environmental organization that at first opposed the Dairy Gateway project and the EMS of its credibility. “But it is 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 had something done. So, continued improvement is not a foreign concept [laughs]. So, any business that
In Dutch: Verbreden van het aantal stakeholders, of ook van buiten de landbouw.

In Dutch: Het aantrekkelijke van scenario’s is dat het mogelijk is om te werken aan een “meer dan hetzelfde”-aanpak. Er is echte innovatie nodig in de interdisciplinaire science, maar het is duidelijk dat het niet mogelijk is om zomaar mensen te meenemen in een participatieproces. Er moet worden gewerkt aan een “meer dan hetzelfde”-aanpak.

In Dutch: Dit krimpscenario [...] dat kan ertoe leiden dat de (intensieve) veehouderij binnen enkele decennia uit het gebied is verdwenen. Daarmee een belangrijk deel van de verwerkkende- en voedingsmiddelenindustrie meesleurd in de economische neergang.

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

In Dutch: Schaalgrootte en ruimte voor vernieuwing zijn cruciaal. Verplaatsing en clusteren is niet heilig. Ondernemers moeten ruimte krijgen op de plek waar het nu al kan.

In Dutch: Maar er verandert wel wat. In Gelderland denken men over een ontwikkelingsmaatschappij voor het landelijk gebied. En we willen ondernemerschap stimuleren.


In Dutch: In VianDrieparticipatie levels staan los van de reconstructie? OOM: 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 eruit te jagen. Wat gebeurt er dan? En wij houden dus heel erg uit elkaar, in die scenario’s het policy making stuk, en het, ehm... zeg maar het zo-aan: scenario’s zijn niet normatief.

In Dutch: Van veel belang zijn deze uitwerkingen is ook dat de visie en voorgestelde activiteiten een hoge innovatieve gehalte hebben. Onze andere criteria zijn ú, technologische en institutionele aspecten. Voorkomen moet worden dat alleen gesneden wordt dat er een ‘meer van hetzelfde’ aanzien wordt gekozen. Er is echte vernieuwing nodig met duurzame oplossingen zodat de huidige problemensituatie kan worden omgebroken in een strategische voorzorg met internationale uitstraling.

In Dutch: Het aantrekkelijke van scenario’s is dat het erover gaat of men er mee eens is of niet. Het zijn dingen die zouden kunnen gebeuren.

In Dutch: Want zoals wij daarmee werken, wij gaan nooit belangendiscussies daar houden. Dus wij zeggen als dit en dit nu gebeurt, hoe ziet dat dan volgens jou de wereld eruit. Wat begeert er dan? En wij houden dus heel erg uit elkaar, in die scenario’s het policy making stuk, en het, ehm... zeg maar het zo-aan: scenario’s zijn niet normatief.

In Dutch: Van veel belang zijn deze uitwerkingen is ook dat de visie en voorgestelde activiteiten een hoge innovatieve gehalte hebben. Onze andere criteria zijn ú, technologische en institutionele aspecten. Voorkomen moet worden dat alleen gesneden wordt dat er een ‘meer van hetzelfde’ aanzien wordt gekozen. Er is echte vernieuwing nodig met duurzame oplossingen zodat de huidige problemensituatie kan worden omgebroken in een strategische voorzorg met internationale uitstraling.

In Dutch: De complete steering committee was. De Food and Agro CEO van het Rabobank was ook deels ondertussen door de twaalf maanden van de zaak, na de eerste fase, en daarna, en deels door de pers te zien.
In Dutch: Het is een zaak van dat jullie samen zeggen: dit kan gebeuren. Wij willen jullie niet overtuigen.

In Dutch: We gaan nu vanuit de gedachte dat alles is uitgaande dat dat een eendimensionale technisch-economische oriëntatie. Dus geen imagovraagstukken, geen perfectionisme, geen kwaad. We hebben een plek gevonden en hoe het eruit komt. Want dat lijkt me wel erg ambitieus. Wel is het een probleem dat de bankiers denken in geld, de boeren in varkens, uh uh, onderzoekers in projecten, die geen geld hebben. En dan binnen die clusters krijgen we dwarsverbindingen.

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

In Dutch: Het is een beetje opzettend op voedselproductie en de consument en de andere meer op groen / burger.

In Dutch: Omdat je maatschappelijke [wil] niet geaccepteerd krijgt op het moment dat je die clusters een plek geeft. Dan zal je ook het andere verhaal in beschouwing moeten nemen.

In Dutch: Het is een beetje vragen om te beginnen met wat de eenvoudige stap is en hoe het eruit komt. Want dat lijkt me wel erg ambitieus. Wel is het een probleem dat de bankiers denken in geld, de boeren in varkens, uh uh, onderzoekers in projecten, die geen geld hebben. En dan binnen die clusters krijgen we dwarsverbindingen.

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

Participantes were Casper Koenderman (financier), Fons Gouslink (of the Province of Gelderland, rural region), Jeroen Verver (of the Rabobank), and Jos Roemaat (GLTO). Roemaat had to leave early and didn’t participate. Ge Backus from WUR facilitated this session. I observed, recorded and transcribed this session. In all, 10 people participated in the three parallel sessions and three people facilitated these sessions.

In Dutch: Een van de elementen is, de financiering van een aantal gewenste ontwikkelingen. Wat dat dan ook mogen zijn.

In Dutch: In tien jaar tijd staan er zoveel woningen in de planning om gebouwd te worden. Per provincie. Je kunt schatten hoeveel daarvan, en dat is ook bekend, van die nieuwe woningen, luxe kavels zijn. Je kunt ook schatten hoeveel vrijstaande woningen er in het buitengebied zijn en wat daar de volumebeperking is. En dan praal je per provincie al gauw een jaar of een half jaar gerekend, over meer dan honderd miljoen aan te kapitaliseren ruimte.

In Dutch: Nee, extra willingness to pay: je legt additionele planologische beperkingen op en daardoor creëer je in wezen in de burger toe een soort schaarste.

In Dutch: Het is een andere systeem, het is een bestaand systeem dat in Amerika al een jaar of dertig draait. Het heeft transferable development rights, dat is in Amerika in meer dan 140 gebieden operationeel.

In Dutch: Gemeenten zijn gewend, en zeker gemeenten die de afgelopen jaren flink gebouwd hebben, die deken af en toe tekorten mee op de eigen begroting, laat ik het maar heel simpel zeggen. Nu om tegenaan die mensen te zeggen: dat geldstroompje gaan we even een andere kant opsturen, het optimisme even ietsjes lager.

In Dutch: In die bedrijven zitten al zo’n 10% op de verkeerde plek zitten. Dat met reconstruiterie er niks is nieuwige onders de zon. Is generiek wet- en regelgeving. Die boeren hebben pech, maar meer partijen moeten willingness to pay hebben. De hele keten moet weten dat een stukje primaire tak en productie is ook in het belang van de veevoeder bedrijven, van kortom de hele keten. Zij hebben daar allemaal belang bij.


In Dutch: De naam is nu A1 eiwitcorridor en wij denken we, aan de agrarische sector. Daar hebben we, aan de agrarische sector. Daar hebben we het met namen vormen om gehouden, via verbreding van functies enzovoorts.

In Dutch: De reconstructie was over de volle breedte en het traject A1 richt zich echt op de primaire sector en de verwerkende industrie. Daar moet een aantal opgelegd gerekend worden, die uiteindelijk wel zullen helpen om dan in die extensievebebouwingen natuur en milieu te helpen.

In Dutch: De verandering en de mobiliteit moeten bewerkstelligd worden primair vooral in de primaire sector en de verwerkende industrie. Daar moet je op richten en het in het achterhoofd houden wat dan die andere sectoren, wat intersectorialiteit van voor kom. Die hoeven zich er dus niet voortdurend in te herkennen en er voortdurend bij zijn. Heel benaderend: over een jaar zouden zij terug kunnen vragen en kunnen vragen: dit hebben we gedaan en wat vind je ervan? En dan kennen we hen goed genoeg om te weten dat
In Dutch: Coalities daar zijn 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 actors! 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.

This 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 is 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 indirect, 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 agreement or 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 pluralization 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 (drugsabol) 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 Bijlmerpark 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. (1993); 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.

This in 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 of strategies of indirect 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 Liberia, 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 Nellesen 2001; Tønnessen, 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. 293). 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.

ABCTA was a cooperative feed processor and is since 2003 part of ForFarmers U.A.

In Dutch: Nederlandse organisatie voor pluimveehouders.