Going Dutch in Environmental Policy

In many discussions on Environmental Policy the Dutch efforts since 1989 are mentioned as a laudable example for other governments. But after five years of hard work and three National Environmental Policy Plans (nepp), the effectiveness of all these policy plans are still up for debate, most of all in the Netherlands itself. Environmental policy is more than writing plans and as it turns out the implementation of policies is more unruly than expected. OECD’s recent ‘Environmental Performance Review’ of the Dutch policies even wondered if the Dutch planning and agreement approach could backfire and prevent some real solutions.

The Netherlands, once called ‘the dirtiest country in the West’, have good reasons for a strong approach towards environmental policy (EP). It is the most densely populated country in the world and live in a very vulnerable delta. At the same time the Dutch have chosen to base their economy on ‘dirty’ activities: agriculture, chemical production and transportation. Also, the Dutch are known as a very ‘concerned nation’ as regards their involvement in ‘societal’ issues like the needs of the Third World, the poor, the environment, etc. So, there are several good reasons why the second wave of environmentalism made such an impact on the Dutch political scene in 1988.

So, when the first National Environmental Policy Plan (NEPP) was issued (see table 1), there was considerable interest in this effort which was enhanced by the fall of the centre-right government over a disagreement on a minor detail in this plan (tax deduction for commuters). In the Fall of 1989 a new government (centre-left) entered the scene and immediately announced a new NEPP (called NEPP-Plus) and claimed the environment as a third corner-stone of government policy (next to employment, economic growth, and budget shortage).

One should realise that all these Dutch political interests in the environment was in line with the international development in the wake of the Brundtland Commission and on the road to UNCED. In 1990 when the NEPP plan appeared, it was preceded by the ‘Green Summit’ of the world leading needs of government in Paris. So, the Dutch may have had some earlier structures for EP but they did so because on an international wave of environmentalism (e.g., the rise of the ‘greenhouse’- and ‘ozone’ debates notably in the US in 1988/89).

Planning based on consensus and targets

One of the key changes in the planning process of the Dutch environmental policy was the decision to abandon the sectoral approach entirely. It was the ‘management minister’ Winsemius who had developed the ‘twin track’ approach which addresses sources and effects of environmental damage. The next innovation of this planning process was developed by his successor Nijpels who is the originator of the present approach. Based on the very thorough scientific analysis of the first National Environmental Survey (NES) ‘Concern for Tomorrow’ the Dutch society realised the need for drastic changes and political parties followed this trend. The establishment of quality objectives and the decision to attribute them to very recognisable ‘themes’ was quite new and works out well within the Dutch system. Former Minister Winsemius implementation-approach of ‘internalising’ the policies was translated into the approach of the target group, who had to be involved in both the planning and the implementation of the necessary actions. Also the planning period was well-taken, mostly government policies stick to four or five year plans (one election period).

Based on the sound scientific analysis of the first NES most planning horizons chosen were up to 2000 and 2010 with interim targets for 1994 (see table 2).

Interesting was also that the NEPP was developed in cooperation with three ‘polluting’ ministries which supposed a better entrenchment...
The National Environmental Policy Plan (NEPP) was an integral part of the Dutch Environmental Policy since 1993. It was developed by the Ministry for the Environment in cooperation with the Ministries of Transport, Public Works and Water Management, the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature Management and Fisheries, and the Ministry of Economic Affairs, who all endorsed the published document. These ministries have also produced their own sectoral plans setting out environmental policy for transport, agriculture and energy. The new Environmental Management Act (March 1993) includes a legal requirement for national and provincial level environmental plans to be produced every four years. The second NEPP, covering the planning period to 1998, was published in December 1993.

The attraction of this concept is that it brings environmental debate beyond the dichotomy between economy and ecology. Even FoE accepts (in this plan) a certain level of economic growth, although it will be subject to limits as it is aiming at more efficient use of fixed amounts of energy and resources.

### Sustainability as a management challenge

Much has been said in the Dutch debate about the need to move on from environmental policy planning to environmental management and even to a next step. Former minister Winsemius has written a book on the new approach within government to tackle the environment (Winsemius, 1992). But the challenge to industrial management also is considerable (see Tuinging and Groenewegen, 1993), as it is to policy makers at the lower levels in government.

One of the lesser debated instruments in NEPP are environmental management systems for firms. In 1990 a regulation was published that calls for a 'environmental management system' to be operational in 10,000 Dutch companies by 1995. This really turned out to be a challenge to present management concepts as several other 'management' systems already existed, notably on safety and quality. After a hesitant start most industrial branches took up the challenge and especially the powerful chemical industry took the lead (under the internationally chosen name of 'responsible care systems'). But the 'Greening of Industry' (as an international network of researchers on the issue is called) has developed many other aspects as well. In many management courses environmental management is taken on and especially the concepts of voluntary agreements and the emphasis on the implementation of government policies calls for a new breed of management techniques as the Netherlands has the highest 'consultancy density' in the world, and the lead (under the internationally chosen name of 'responsible care systems').

### Integrated life-cycle management (ILM)

The concept originally mentioned in NEPP 1 was 'closing substance cycles', it is part of source-oriented approach and especially targets for saving raw materials. Since 1989 a host of studies has been done in this field and the results are encouraging.

The Dutch often use the words 'Integrated Life-Cycle Management' (ILM). Integrated life-cycle management was not exactly defined when NEPP appeared. The purpose of the introduction of this concept was in part to stimulate the analysis and management of the industrial, trade and agricultural activities in a way that would stimulate the adjustment between links in the entire chain, thus reducing emissions, saving scarce and using less energy on the basis of the total system in addition to reduction of environmental impacts on individual processes and products.

Initially, ILM primarily seemed to have been intended as a concept useful to communicate the need to impose drastic changes in the economic system. Which would account for the rather vague and generalised descriptions used in the policy papers. It was intended to stimulate people to think about the economical system as chains, flows of material, etc., that at the same time represent flows with ecological impacts. In this way, it should stimulate communication on the environmental aspects between organisations occupying adjoining positions in the economic transformation chains.

ILM has triggered much work in the Netherlands, both on the production processes and on products and packaging. For many target groups studies are being done on both Product Life Cycles Analysis (LCAs) and on production processes (see chemical industry, 1991)

### The concept of environmental space

In 1990 this concept was launched as a monitor for the total amount of pollution, resources, land and forests that we cannot use globally without impinging on the access of future generations to the same amount. This concept has triggered considerable debate in the policy circles in the Netherlands and seems to have overtaken the originally hectic discussions on 'sustainable development'. NEPP 2 has announced further study on the operationability of this concept (which was originally developed to operationalise sustainable development!).

### Special features of Dutch Environmental Policy

Besides an original title ('To Choose of to Loose') the first NEPP had a very original analysis as well (see table 3). Out of this analysis several interesting concepts have been developed, like these:

- **Integrated life-cycle management (ILM)**

The concept originally mentioned in NEPP 1 was 'closing substance cycles', it is part of source-oriented approach and especially targets for saving raw materials. Since 1989 a host of...
Europe, there is a considerable amount of literature on the new management approaches developed for this field.

- **International dimension**

Environmental policies all over the world and especially in the Netherlands are heavily influenced by UNCED 1992. The Dutch government lobbied for a strong Declaration of Rio and played a significant role in the making of Agenda 21. But especially since then, the international aspect foresees more emphasis on the European dimension of national policies, partly due to the Eastern European environmental challenge and partly due to the EU developments.

One of the key discussions on the subject of the Treaty of Maastricht (1992) has been the ‘subsidiary principle’, i.e., how much (environmental) policy can we still influence at the national level once the European Union has been established. The fear of having to accept lower standards, less stringent regulations, etc., dominated the ‘Maastricht’ debate in the Netherlands for several years. The Fifth Environmental Action Programme did not make these fears disappear, even though the Maastricht Treaty accepted the concept of sustainability.

Much of the Dutch discussion in recent years was dominated by the plans to introduce an energy tax in the Netherlands. Although most political parties agreed in the need of such an instrument, the main issue was: can the Netherlands have such a tax without other European and OECD countries following this course?

In every way the Netherlands have an open economy, not only does 80% of our GNP depend on export, also 60% of our air pollution is imported and trade is our main economic activity. So, the Dutch may have farfetched ideas about their own environmental policy needs, but increasingly they have to recognise the limits of the European commitments.

A new opportunity might be discovered for policy actions in the directions of Central and Eastern Europe. It is quite clear that environmental investments are on a European scale far more effective in those areas than in the Netherlands. Already the Dutch Electricity Generating Board is compensating the CO₂ effect of a new coal-fired power station by planting a forest in Poland!

- **Environmental efficiency**

An interesting debate has started on the measurement of the success of the many policy actions that started after NEPP in 1989. There is a discussion at different levels going on this aspect.

First, the bi-annual National Environmental Review measures if targets promised, are made or in what direction the policies are working in view of targets ahead (2000, 2010). Several of these evaluative remarks on the targets for the theme (see table 2) have inspired the NEPP-2 preparations.

Secondly, there is a discussion on the efficiency of certain implementation measures at the local level. Specific standards, less stringent regulations, etc., dominate the ‘Maastricht’ debate in the Netherlands for several years.

The Fifth Environmental Action Programme did not make these fears disappear, even though the Maastricht Treaty accepted the concept of sustainability.

Much of the Dutch discussion in recent years was dominated by the plans to introduce an energy tax in the Netherlands. Although most political parties agreed in the need of such an instrument, the main issue was: can the Netherlands have such a tax without other European and OECD countries following this course?

In every way the Netherlands have an open economy, not only does 80% of our GNP depend on export, also 60% of our air pollution is imported and trade is our main economic activity. So, the Dutch may have farfetched ideas about their own environmental policy needs, but increasingly they have to recognise the limits of the European commitments.

A new opportunity might be discovered for policy actions in the directions of Central and Eastern Europe. It is quite clear that environmental investments are on a European scale far more effective in those areas than in the Netherlands. Already the Dutch Electricity Generating Board is compensating the CO₂ effect of a new coal-fired power station by planting a forest in Poland!

### Table 2: Targets by theme in NEPP (Source: Adapted from NEPP, NEPP+)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THEME</th>
<th>OVERALL TARGET</th>
<th>EXAMPLES OF THE CHANGE NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Climate change (incl. ozone layer depletion)</td>
<td>Stabilisation of CO₂ emissions at 1989 levels by 1994-5 (182m tonnes pa); absolute reductions of 3-5% CO₂ emissions to 173-177m Tonnes pa by 2000; reduce world-wide emissions of ozone depleting substances to zero by 2000; NL by 1996</td>
<td>Cut coal burning in power stations and discourage coal use in industry; seek global forestry balance; establish joint programme with industry;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acidification</td>
<td>Reduce emissions of acidifying substances by 70-80% by the year 2000</td>
<td>More FGD and NOx abatement in power sector; promote industrial cogeneration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eutrophication (fertilisers)</td>
<td>70-90% reduction in emissions of eutrophying substances by 2000</td>
<td>Programme for large scale manure processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diffusion</td>
<td>Reduce emissions of certain risky substances by 50-70% by the year 2000</td>
<td>Determine standards for priority substances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste disposal</td>
<td>Reduce risks from waste disposed to acceptable or, where possible, negligible level</td>
<td>Screening of instruments such as labelling and deposit return systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disturbance</td>
<td>Noise problem held to 1985 level; maximum individual risk of 10⁻⁹ per installation</td>
<td>Development of enforcement policy for Noise Nuisance Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dehydration (depletion of water resources)</td>
<td>No (-25% cf. Parliamentary notion) additional dehydration areas in 2000 and water consumption in balance with carrying capacity</td>
<td>Develop instruments for implementation; continue research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3: NEPP basic approach

(Source: Second Chamber, session 1988-89, 21 137, nos 1-2)
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**Explanation:**

1. Effects occur at an increasingly higher level of scale;
2. Sources are to be found all over the world;
3. The effects lead to a decline in the environment’s carrying capacity for human activities;
4. Roll-off mechanism through:
   - opening cycles
   - increasing energy consumption
   - neglecting quality;
5. Feedback through:
   - values to be protected
   - (possible) negative effects
   - unacceptable risks
   - environmental quality standards
   - emission ceilings
   - distribution over sources;
6. Feedback through:
   - closing cycles
   - energy conversation
   - quality improvement.
level. Environmental economists have developed a new approach to correlate the amount of costs and the effect of an action on the percentage of the national environmental load per theme. In other debates the cost effectiveness of several proposed alternative actions are measured: can we better spend our SO2 money here in the Netherlands or in Poland? Or more realistically: what is the CO2-effect of one housing insulation guilder compared to a small eco-tax? The last debate in this field is on the 'pollution prevention pays' ideas which also have triggered many discussions in the Dutch industrial circles. Again, Winsemius, now as a McKinsey director, has been one of the key participants in this debate. He has been instrumental in McKinsey's survey on 'The Corporate Response to the Environmental Challenge' (1991). The environmental challenge can lead to greater long term continuity and even middle term efficiency is the message of this report to the industrial executives.

And one of the examples of this sort of industrial foresight may be the Dutch chemical industry's policy agreement (Covenant) with the government to reduce its energy consumption by 20% in a 10-years period.

Target groups and voluntary agreements

The most remarkable innovation in Dutch EP is the target group approach and especially the resulting rise of voluntary agreements between such a target group and government. Target groups established by NEPP include: agriculture, traffic and transport, industry and refineries, gas and electricity supply, constructions, consumers and retail trade, research and education. For each target group the NEPP sets out environmental objectives, targets for the year 2000 and/or interim stages and actions expected from the group. In Table 4, a summary is given for the target group agriculture which is a considerable polluting sector because of the surplus of manure in the Netherlands.

In search for new instruments to negotiate with target groups the first NEPP (1989) already suggested Voluntary Agreements (often called 'Covenants'). Although originally the incoming minister responsible for the NEPP-Plus (1991) did not favour this approach he was converted quite soon. Since then, more than 100 such agreements were signed (see Table 5).

Basically, there are two types of agreements involved: the covenant, agreed by the government and a group of companies or the industry, e.g., packaging industry, basic metal industry or oil transport by barges on the Rhine. Then, there is also the contract between the polluting company or industry and the injured party. In the case of Rhine pollution, the Municipality of Rotterdam has made its fifth environmental contract. Both contract forms give rise by novel legal questions: enforcement, sanctions, third-party liability, the relation to public statutory law, licences, etc.

This instrument is based on the belief that regulation alone is not likely to succeed in motivating 'polluters' beyond mere compliance with the law. Also the financial instruments (like eco taxes) have met great resistance from both industry and even trade unions, so a less contested and motivation policy instrument was looked for. Especially the dynamic environment and the rapidly changing understanding of environmental problems, especially within target groups themselves, have led to the success of this 'internalising' policy-instrument. Table 6 outlines the general approach to the voluntary agreement.

The Packaging agreement (covenant) was signed between the Dutch ministry of Housing, Physical Planning and Environment and representatives of the packaging industry in 1991 and is an example of a voluntary agreement which commits the industry to reduce packaging production, meet recycling and reuse targets and to eliminate the land filling of packaging waste by the year 2000.

As an important tool to reach these goals, the industry accepted to perform life-cycle analysis (LCA) studies on the one of the most common packaged consumer product lines. The aim of these LCA's was to find out if returnable packaging was environmentally attractive (within commercial boundaries) over disposable packaging. The results of this expensive project of 10 sector studies has been published several months ago.

Covenants: some second thoughts

Voluntary agreements are a relatively new policy instrument involving a commitment by a target group to a certain policy measures and target achievements. These agreements are called 'covenants' in the Dutch policy and have recently found some more application outside the Netherlands. (van Dunne, 1993) The recent OECD review of the Dutch Environmental Policy suggested some hesitations about the success of this policy instrument. Although the typical Dutch consensus philosophy is seen positively, the reviewers fear the resulting agreements enhance a conservative stand towards the drastic change that is needed. Especially the lack of real progress in the sectors agriculture and transportation is mentioned as an example of this trend.

At the same time the Dutch employers' organisations have published a positive report on the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJECTIVE</th>
<th>PROPOSED SOLUTION</th>
<th>ACTION OR INSTRUMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No more nitrogen and phosphorus will be used than can safely be absorbed by crops</td>
<td>Mineral balance accounting by farmers; Reduce quantities of surplus manure</td>
<td>Regulation to phase in reductions from pilot farms and demonstration projects; Introduction of manure quality certificates to promote acceptance in animal farming; Create conditions for more manure processing installations; Subsidies for covering manure storage basins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% reduction in use of pesticides by year 2000</td>
<td>Reduce and substitute pesticide use</td>
<td>Regulation to phase in reductions from pilot projects and demonstration farms; Public information campaigns; Incentives to encourage farmers to use alternative solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribute to climate change objectives</td>
<td>Raise energy efficiency of horticulture under glass</td>
<td>Pilot projects and demonstration farms; Public information campaigns; Incentives to encourage farmers to use alternative solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% reduction on 1980 levels in emissions of ammonia</td>
<td>Reduce surplus manure</td>
<td>Regulation to phase in reductions from research into substances reducing emissions when added manure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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first 5 years of experience with the Covenants. They distinguish three groups of agreements: emissions-oriented (-related to target groups), energy-saving- and product- 'covenants'. They admit that these agreements do have some disadvantages (particularly legal), but they obviously very much applaud the 'internalising'-aspect (see earlier paragraph). One of the most difficult issues is the way a industry branch can oblige all members to concur with the agreement; often there are some dissenting companies that try to take advantage of loopholes in environmental agreements.

Also there is already much existing policy which has lead to existing permits; this could lead to a tension with new policy emphasising agreements. The Dutch rule making doesn't balance this yet enough, according to the Employers' organisations who prefer a Danish approach where new agreement dominate the former permits.

From the point of view of environmental groups there is no clear standpoint on 'covenants': they emphasize the lack of legal security in the resulting implementation plans. But also, increasingly their experts are involved in the target group discussions.

One has to conclude that the typical Dutch consensus-philosophy to decisionmaking really will be tested by this policy innovation. And the real test will be in the coming years as targets for many agreements have to be met. The real proof of the policy- 'pudding' is in the eating (= implementation and meeting targets).

**How does Dutch society respond to NEPP?**

In the wake of the euphoric year 1989 it seemed as the Dutch definitely had turned green. The second wave of environmentalism had swept the Royal palace, the new government and even was invading boardrooms and schools. It did result in an impressive arsenal of policy plans, State of Environmental reports, many new members to the Royal palace, the new government and even was the Dutch definitely had turned green. The In the wake of the euphoric year 1989 it seemed as the Dutch definitely had turned green. The second wave of environmentalism had swept the Royal palace, the new government and even was invading boardrooms and schools. It did result in an impressive arsenal of policy plans, State of Environmental reports, many new members to the Royal palace, the new government and even was the Dutch definitely had turned green. The In the wake of the euphoric year 1989 it seemed as the Dutch definitely had turned green. The second wave of environmentalism had swept the Royal palace, the new government and even was invading boardrooms and schools. It did result in an impressive arsenal of policy plans, State of Environmental reports, many new members to the Royal palace, the new government and even was the Dutch definitely had turned green. The In the wake of the euphoric year 1989 it seemed as the Dutch definitely had turned green. The second wave of environmentalism had swept the Royal palace, the new government and even was invading boardrooms and schools. It did result in an impressive arsenal of policy plans, State of Environmental reports, many new members to the Royal palace, the new government and even was the Dutch definitely had turned green. The In the wake of the euphoric year 1989 it seemed as the Dutch definitely had turned green. The second wave of environmentalism had swept the Royal palace, the new government and even was invading boardrooms and schools. It did result in an impressive arsenal of policy plans, State of Environmental reports, many new members to the Royal palace, the new government and even was the Dutch definitely had turned green. The

**Table 6: Voluntary Agreements as a policy instruments in the Netherlands**

(Source: ERL, 1991)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy context</td>
<td>Identify harmful substances e.g. cadmium or chlorine or product e.g. packaging and negotiate with industry on the elimination or amelioration of the substance/product at every stage of the production cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional mechanism</td>
<td>Since the beginning of the 1970s, the government, scientists and industry have worked together in the Committee for Environment and Industry, formalised in 1979, Establishing the basis of a voluntary agreement takes long and detailed negotiation; a total of some two years for the Packaging Covenant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept of Voluntary Agreements</td>
<td>Long terms objectives realisable through interim stage targets, which government will help industry to achieve. Legislation is the recognised option if targets are not met. - Pilot projects and technologies may be subsidised (up to 60% and 35% respectively) but resulting production processes, if successful, must then be made available to other industries in the sector so they too can meet the long term objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examples of success</td>
<td>Collaborative development of a cadmium free phosphate fertiliser Packaging Covenant. Potential for voluntary agreements to grow in influence and importance in European implementation strategies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The parliament is in general reasonable satisfied with the general message of NEPP 2: no new targets and intensifying the implementation. There was little new policy announced and hardly any new target in this new NEPP and this concurred with the ongoing processes at all levels of implementation. The plan admitted there still is a lack of integration of the existing implementation plans, both at the national and the regional level. A special government commission had earlier last year noted the resistance of the ‘polluting’ ministries in internalising the environment in their policy. Notable exceptions were agriculture, water and energy. Especially the ministers for traffic and industry/technology were heavily criticised. But many policy watchers also were amazed by the emphasis of the present environmental minister: many interesting activities at management levels, but los- ing out at the large political decisions at cabinet level. E.g., the same government that considered environment as the third ‘corner-stone’ of policy, had decided to make huge investments in infrastructural plans like expanding Rotterdam Harbour, Amsterdam Airport, gas drilling in the vulnerable Waddensea and refused to implement on energy tax and stimulate public trans- portation. Especially the environmental move- ment is disappointed by the results as many am- bition targets that were set seemed to fade away under the pressure of the economic recession. And industrial views were quite mixed, at the one side the many voluntary agreements did bring considerable results, but also many other sectors felt embarrassed by the burden of elaborate government action plans in their sector. After five years of environmental planning at the national level, the burden now lies on the regions and the municipalities (including the police) to implement those actions and to enforce- ment of the already existing complex set of rules. Although a far more integrated set of instruments is available (e.g., a new environmental management act), the daily operation of this new policy field does bring along considerable problems.

**Conclusion**

The success of an environmental strategy or plan is not judged by the good intentions or the elaborateness of the planning process. The suc- cess is ultimately judged by its implementation and the outcomes targeted. The Dutch government has undertaken a Hercules task when they decided «that they wanted a sustainable country within one generation.» (Policy statement in 1989). It was a bold step when the environmental minister then decided to start with integrated forecasting study to provide the decision makers with a sound scientific basis for debating and establishing quantified environmental objectives for this ultimate goal.

Then the report concluded that the existing environ- mental policies would only reduce by approximately 30% by the year 2010. But overall emission reductions of between 70 and 90% would be required to reach the sustainability as defined. We now have seen five years of the 20-year planning period pass and on widespread planning process has been set up, all across lev- els and sectors in the country. It has resulted in a
Über Mittel und Ziele der Umweltpolitik

Zehn Thesen wider den ökologischen Instrumentalismus


These 2 Instrumente müssen als Teil von Strategien begriffen werden. Darunter ist eine Zweck-Mittel-Kombination plannmäßigen Handelns zu verstehen, die als flexibles Langzeitkonzept Lernprozesse initiert und für deren Wirkungen offen ist. Strategie ist auch nötig, um die positionale Schwäche umweltpolitischer Akteure zu kompensieren. Dagegen muß heute kaum noch be- vont werden, daß Instrumente sinnvoll nur als Instrumentenmix diskutiert werden können (nur wenige Fälle erfolgreicher Umweltpolitik wurden mit einem einzigen Instrument erzielt).

These 3 Die Instrumentendebatte läßt leicht vergessen, daß unsere bisherigen Defizite im Umweltschutz kaum damit erklärt werden können, daß Staatenlenker die falschen Hebel betätigt haben. Wenn wir uns etwas mehr mit den Restriktionen von Umweltpolitik befassen, wird das schnell deutlich. Es ist aber zugegebenenermaßen elegant, über Instrumente als über so banale Themen wie die Macht der Mineralölkonzerne (in ihrem Bündnis mit der Autoindustrie) zu sprechen.

These 4 Fragwürdig ist das in der Instrumentendebatte vorherrschende mechanistische (top down) Staatsverständnis nach dem Muster: staatliche Akteure erkennen Probleme, definieren Ziele, wählen Instrumente und hoffen auf Wirkungen. Wir wissen inzwischen, daß das politisch-administrative System seine Wirkungen in aller Regel anders, in komplizierten, hochdyna- mischen Interaktionsprozessen realisiert, die Sabatier mit dem Begriff des »policy learning« umschreibt. Es empfahl sich daher zwei Er-