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1 INTRODUCTION: CULTURE MATTERS IN PUBLIC POLICY

More than ever before, in our late or postmodern condition of civil societies and polities, governance implies the active creation of shared, or, at least, congruent political and policy frameworks. For policy analysis this means that culture matters. The challenge is to intelligently and creatively cope with pluralism and diversity. One important way of doing this is to develop a kind of policy analysis that pays attention to cultural differences more than current practice, which frequently violates even existing precepts to take culture into account. This is by no means easy, for it takes some counter-intuitive assumptions to see that the proposal makes sense. After all, from a cultural perspective, public policy making appears to invent and impose a unitary, supposedly consensual governance culture on the many different cultures “out there” in society (Van Gunsteren 2002). Yet, taking cultural difference seriously and making it an ally instead of an enemy is the only sensible response for a policy analysis profession in tune with its times. The thesis of this chapter is that we need grid-group cultural theory to do a better policy analytic job. Group-grid cultural theory speeds up and facilitates acting on precepts already in the toolkit of analysts; and it suggests a couple of new ones. In a sentence, applied cultural theory offers the policy analyst an approach to his job, responsive to the needs of modern governance systems.

Given this justification for the need of a culturalist approach, the central question of this chapter is, What, if any, is the contribution of group-grid cultural theory for the analysis of public policy? In section 2, I will first provide a very concise overview of cultural theory, limited to what is minimally necessary for understanding the possibilities for application in policy analysis. Next, in section 3, I show how group-grid cultural theory can be used as a tool to enrich policy analysis as conventionally understood. It is demonstrated (in section 3.1.) how group-grid cultural theory is used in the analysis of basic value orientations and institutional implications of policy discourses and elite policy belief systems; (in section 3.2.) how it may be used in spotting overlooked options and constructing productive hybrid policy alternatives in policy brokerage and policy design; and (in section 3.3.) how it helps in predicting side effects and intelligent policy learning. Yet, its most important contribution (demonstrated in section 3.4.) is in facilitating frame reflection in problem structuring. More particularly, paraphrasing one of Wildavsky’s aphorisms, an inch of grid-group cultural theory gives scholars and practitioners miles of frame-reflective policy analysis.

2 WHAT IS GROUP-GROUP CULTURAL THEORY?

Within a culturalist approach, one may distinguish between the attitudinal and the inclusive approach. The attitudinal approaches, like the civic culture (e.g., in Almond and Verba 1963) and (post)materialist culture traditions in political science (Inglehart and Baker 2000), use a restrictive definition of culture as mental products of individuals, i.e., meanings, values, norms, and symbols.
In research, culture is operationalized as the aggregate of individual attitudes; where individuals are seen as single units of analysis, free from social contexts. In policy analysis, this social-psychological theorizing leads to the assumption of congruence or harmony between policy and political culture; where differences in culture have to be bridged by an “imposed,” unifying governance culture. The inclusive approach defines culture more comprehensively. First, in social-constructivist fashion culture is seen as ways of world making, or ways of creating conceptual order and intelligibility through labels, categories, and other principles of vision and division (Bourdieu). Second, culture is studied as part and parcel of a way of life; individuals are seen in the context of prior social solidarities and institutions. In research and policy analysis the inclusive approach leads to “an institutional theory of multiple equilibria, in which different cultural contexts have opposing effects upon the thought and action of the individual” (Grendstad and Selle 1999, 46).

Within the inclusive approach, there is a further split between the romantic vision of culture, and modernist ones, like in Marxist and technological thinking (Van Gunsteren 2002). In the former version, the study of culture is a life-long undertaking; only “going native” provides the feel for detail and fine-grained distinction necessary for truly grasping the essence of another (sub)culture; and the set of cultures is infinite in complexity and variety. In policy analysis, this would lead to advocacy for one particular culture, or becoming a specialist, like country specialists in the analysis of international politics. In Marxist and modern technological visions, culture is a dependent variable of underlying economic and technological realities. For policy analysis, quick analysis and practical understanding of culture is possible, but at the cost of seeing it as false consciousness in need of a reality correction. Group-grid cultural theory avoids both extremes. Being familiar with its four ideal-typical cultures speeds up analysis and orientation because it is a continuous warning sign against assuming universal culture or applying just one particular cultural lens to analyze a policy problem; and the social-constructivism underlying cultural theory will prevent one from falling in the trap of reducing culture to false consciousness.

Cultural theory originates from Mary Douglas’ effort to remedy the failure of anthropologists to systematically compare cultures (Douglas 1978). Subsequently, Douglas herself developed the theory (esp. Douglas, 1987), but it was also quickly put to use in understanding policy debates on environmental problems and risks (e.g., Douglas and Wildavsky 1982). In the 1980s and 1990s, the cultural theory bandwagon was joined by authors from many different social science disciplines, like Michael Thompson, Steve Rayner, Chris Lockhart, Richard Ellis, and Christopher Hood. In 1990, Thompson, Ellis, and Wildavsky produced what still stands as the most comprehensive statement and justification of cultural theory between the covers of one book (Thompson, Ellis, and Wildavsky 1990). In this way, cultural theory came to political science Thompson, Grendstad, and Selle (1999) and policy analysis. Yet, it remains puzzling that Mary Douglas, as founding mother, and especially Aaron Wildavsky, as intellectual founder of Berkeley’s school of public policy analysis and later lead user and advocate of grid-group cultural theory in political science (Wildavsky 1987), did so little in formally (as opposed to “inspirationally”) linking cultural theory and policy analysis (but see Geva-May 1997, xiii; Swedlow 2002).

Cultural theorists claim that the social world ticks the way it does due to selective affinity and mutual dependency between social relations, cultural biases, and behavioral strategies. Therefore, grid-group cultural theory belongs in the inclusive camp. The group and grid dimensions of human transaction are constructed as the ultimate causal drivers in ordering social relations. These give rise to cultural biases as justifications for particular social orders. As justifications and sets of available orientations to action, the cultural biases influence behavior by making it patterned. The properties of social relations in group-grid cultural theory are about relational patterns, or stable types of transactions between people. The theory distinguishes between internal structures called “grid” and external structures called “group.” Grid refers to the types of rules that relate one person to others on an ego-centered basis. Grid is low when there are few binding rules, and when people negotiate rules among themselves. Therefore, if grid is low, you have symmetrical transactions. Grid is high when
rules are numerous and complex, and when they are imposed without people having much of a say in accepting or rejecting them. Therefore, if grid is high, you get asymmetrical transactions. Group refers to the experience of belonging to a bounded social unit. High group means people identify strongly with those they see as “members.” Thus, if group is high, you get restricted transactions. Low group means people don’t care for membership but for people who are intrinsically interesting for some reason or other. If group is low, you get less exclusive, unrestricted transactions.

Combining the group and grid dimensions gives you a social map with four types of relationships. Two of them, markets or networks and hierarchy, are well known and thoroughly analyzed in previous social science literature (e.g., Lindblom 1977; Williamson 1975). But if the known types of social relationships are classified by two discriminators, a full typology should pay attention to the other two possibilities: clans or enclaves, and systems of isolation or zero-networks.

Corresponding to these four types of social relationships, so grid-group cultural theory’s fundamentals claim, are cultural biases. They refer to sets of shared values and beliefs (Thompson et al., 1990, 1), or stable orientations to action (Eckstein 1988, 790) or dispositions/habitus (Bourdieu 1998, 6). They are thought of as judgments of value which function as justifications of specific organizational structures. It is supposed that each develops its own typical set of beliefs, a cognitive and moral bias that contributes to reflexivity in the social organization (Douglas, gridgroup.listserv, March 10, 1998). In the language of complexity theory, the cultural biases function as stable attractors in socio-cultural landscapes. Grid-group cultural theory posits four viable or long-term sustainable cultural biases, called active or competitive individualism (Thompson et al. 1990, 34–35),

![Figure 20.1 Cultural Theory's Grid/Group Typology. Source: Thompson, 1996; symbols taken from front page of Schmutzer, 1994.](image)
pattern-maintaining or conservative hierarchy (Douglas and Wildavsky 1983, 90–92), egalitarian sects or dissident enclaves (Douglas 1986, 38–40; Sivan 1995, 16–18), and backwater isolates or fatalists (Schmutzer 1994; Douglas, 1996, 183–87). Michael Thompson claims the existence of a fifth cultural bias—indifference to and active avoidance of the group and grid dimensions of life results in hermit-like autonomy.

The orientations or dispositions underlying cultural biases guide judgment and action in many ways. Cultural theorists have inquired into the interpretive and more practical correspondences between the cultural biases and strategies in many social fields (Mamadouh 1999, for an overview). Perhaps the theory’s most important claim here is its rigorous demonstration of the poverty of (individualist) homo economicus as dominant model for individual behavior, and thus the existence of “missing persons” in much of contemporary social science (Thompson et al. 1990, 40–47; Douglas and Ney 1998).

To some, the group/grid scheme is basically a descriptive taxonomy or typology. If looked at as a construction of ideal types, to which reality does not correspond in a one-to-one way, cultural theory as group/grid analysis offers considerable conceptual resources for comparative research and theory development. Real life phenomena can be analyzed as dyadic or triadic hybrids (Hood 1998); hybridization can take different time paths and have different critical junctures; and, therefore, some such hybrids may show more stability through time than others. Other theories conceptualize social change as faster or slower movement from one to another pole on a one-dimensional scale (modernism-postmodernism, materialism-postmaterialism). Group-grid analysis obliges you to perform the more demanding task to trace (simultaneous) changes between the four quadrants of its two-dimensional socio-cultural space (Thompson et al. 1990, 75ff).

One more element deserves brief elucidation, i.e., grid-group cultural theory’s explanation of social change. Culturalist approaches generally have often been rejected as too static, better geared to explaining social stability than transformation. Social stability is unlikely as grid-group cultural theory views the mutual engagement of the four cultures/solidarities as continuous social and political struggle. Mary Douglas (1996, 43) stresses the institution-based (Douglas 1986) and constitution-making nature of human choice: “In the social sciences a choice is treated as… arising out of the needs inside the individual psyche… (In t)he theory of culturea choice is an act of allegiance and a protest against the undesired model of society….eac…each type of culture is by its nature hostile to the other three cultures…. (A) all four coexist in a state of mutual antagonism in any society at all times.” The continuous struggles for cultural hegemony in different social fields imply agonistic interactions between people. Therefore, the theory hardly predicts the social harmony characteristic for theories of social stability. Grid-group cultural theory’s model of social change as political and social struggle for cultural hegemony and learning makes the theory eminently suitable as a theoretical building block for a theory of long term policy dynamics (cf. Saba tier and Jenkins-Smith 1993; Baumgartner and Jones 1994; Edberg 1997).

### 3 CULTURAL THEORY AS A TOOL IN POLICY ANALYSIS

In this section I will show how grid-group cultural theory contributes to policy analysis as conventionally understood. I will argue that although existing policy analysis methods admonish analysts to map cultural context, they leave analysts mostly in the dark about how to go about it. All these tools lean on grid-group cultural theory’s vision of the four cultures. Familiarity with this view speeds up a policy analyst’s tasks considerably. From this perspective, although the ideas are not entirely new, applied grid-group cultural theory contributes substantially to the policy analytic toolkit (also Swedlow 2002). More particularly I will argue four points:
• cultural theory helps policy analysts in quick scans of basic value orientations and institutional as well as instrumental implications inherent in different strands of policy discourse and in elite policy belief systems (section 3.1.);
• cultural theory allows policy analysts to quickly spot overlooked options and create culturally hybrid, but productive policy alternatives in policy brokerage and policy design tasks (section 3.2.);
• cultural theory systematically helps policy analysts predict a policy’s side effects and design policy-oriented learning processes (section 3.3.);
• and last but not least, deriving from the prior points, cultural theory is an excellent heuristic in problem-structuring and frame-reflective policy an analysis (section 3.4.).

In illustrating these four points, I will draw on examples from many different policy problems and domains. Compared to using one or two running examples, I have thereby sacrificed background and depth of understanding to the (for my purposes in this chapter) more important goal of demonstrating the surprising versatility and flexibility of cultural theory in policy analytic applications. However, those interested in the former may consult the referenced works.

3.1 Analysis of Basic Values and Institutional Implications in Policy Discourse and Policy Belief Systems

A first application of grid-group cultural theory is to perform a discourse analysis and map the belief systems (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993) or policy frames (Scion and Rein 1994) of protagonists and antagonists in a policy issue. In Sabatier’s layered depiction, deep core beliefs involve fundamental normative and ontological beliefs that apply to all policy domains without exception. Grid-group cultural theory’s four core-value systems—conservative hierarchy, active and competitive individualism, egalitarian enclavism, and fatalist isolates—can be used as an analyst’s compass in finding his bearings in the ideals espoused in policy frames and belief systems. Table 20.1 is an illustration of a cultural typology of transport and mobility policy discourses developed by Robert Hoppe and John Grin (2000) in comparative research about technology assessments on transport and mobility issues. To develop the grid-group cultural theory-compass into a typology of discourses that also covers lower-order belief layers like policy core beliefs (fundamental problem definitions, positions, and strategies) and instrumental secondary beliefs (preferred policy instruments and information), considerable substantive familiarity and interactional expertise (Collins and Evans 2002) with the particulars of discourses in a particular policy domain is necessary. In this case, core values, policy cores, and secondary aspects had to be based upon intensive interpretive analyses of the discourse of spatial planning (Hoppe 1992) and car mobility policies in Britain, the Netherlands, and Germany (Hendriks 1999).

The typology was subsequently used to discover and unearth the cultural biases of members in policy issue networks through careful interpretation of document and interview data. The result is a detailed map of cultural biases prevalent in the policy discourses in a particular domain. Table 20.2 gives the results of the comparative study performed on the basis of the cultural typology for the transport and mobility domain (Hoppe and Grin, 2000). The final step, of course, is interpreting and explaining the distributive pattern found. In this particular case, the frequency of hierarchical policy frames is the most striking feature. This was explained by the position of parliamentarian TA institutes as knowledge producers and advisors to national parliaments. Only policy options plausibly available to national parliaments and national governments are taken into account. Being comprehensive and balanced, with a niche for every aspect, is the political strength of the hierarchist position. This also explains why in lower-order layers of the policy belief system individualist and egalitarian elements do occur (Hoppe and Grin 2000,312).
Of course, this research procedure may be formalized and quantified. In her study of so-called NIMBY (Not-In-My-Backyard) type resistance to local waste facility siting decisions in the Netherlands, Van Baren (2001) used Q-methodology (Brown 1980; Durning 1999) to measure which policy frames could be assigned to different policy actors. They were asked to evaluate several statements on waste policy, physical planning and the attributes of decision-making processes in this domain in general, especially about their duration and tendency for deadlocks. For this purpose a set of statements was formulated on the basis of a factorial design reflecting the fundamental variance found in grid-group cultural theory. After performing hierarchical cluster analysis and (inverted)

| TABLE 20.1  
A Cultural Typology of Transport Policy Belief Systems |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TA APPROACH</strong></td>
<td><strong>CRITICAL-SYNOPTIC (C-STA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>USABLE (UTA)</strong></td>
<td><strong>PARTICIPATIVE-INTERACTIVE (P-ITA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred methodological focus</td>
<td>scientific monologue</td>
<td>dialogue between science and policy makers/managers</td>
<td>forum/&quot;multilogue&quot; between science, policy makers, managers, stakeholders, and the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred model of consent in state-market-science triangle</td>
<td>hypothetical consent on natural or other ideal standards, leading to state initiated/imposed policy proposals</td>
<td>implicit, tacit consent on revealed preferences, leading to minimalist policy proposals</td>
<td>tangible, direct consent on expressed preferences, leading to communicative policy planning proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred way of social knowledge production</td>
<td>high expectation of potential of research</td>
<td>moderate expectations of research; high expectations of information</td>
<td>moderate expectations of research; high expectations of informed debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred type of output</td>
<td>study report</td>
<td>study report and discussions</td>
<td>study report, debates, conferences, conference reports, books, folders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred scope of information</td>
<td>almost complete and organized information</td>
<td>sufficient and timely information</td>
<td>imperfect but holistic information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred actor for problem definition</td>
<td>problem definition by TA-experts</td>
<td>problem definition by TA- and administrative/management experts</td>
<td>problem definition by joint stakeholders’ interpretation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred way of organizing TA</td>
<td>one TA-organization (OTA as model)</td>
<td>multiform TA-research capacity: the best TA-analysts get the job</td>
<td>pluriform TA-research capacity: balanced variety of TA-analysts’ views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred type of use of TA study</td>
<td>instrumental use by elite</td>
<td>instrumental/conceptual use; elite “enlightenment”</td>
<td>instrumental/conceptual use; mass “enlightenment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preferred utilization of TA in political context</td>
<td>TA results “automatically” incorporated in decisions</td>
<td>careful tuning of TA and decision-making</td>
<td>using TA (intermedi-ate) results to fuel public debate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideal-typical fit in terms of cultural bias theory</td>
<td>HIERARCHIST/ETATISTE TA</td>
<td>INDIVIDUALIST/ETATISTE AND MARKET-ORIENTED TA</td>
<td>EGALITARIAN/ETATISTE AND PARTICIPATORY TA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reprinted by permission from Parliaments and Technology: The Development of Technology Assessment in Europe edited by Norman J. Vig and Herbert Paschen, the State University of New York Press. ©2000 State University of New York. All Rights Reserved
factor analysis on the data set of the evaluation of all statements by key actors, she identified three policy belief systems. Table 20.3 summarizes her findings.

Datasets and analyses like the ones mentioned in this section provide the policy analyst with what Wildavky called the first step in culturally sensitive policy analysis: the drawing of a sort of cultural baseline, or the (historically dynamic) description of the relative strength of the cultural biases in traceable sources of policy actors’ statements and beliefs. Of course, such readily traceable sources should sometimes be complemented and verified by studies of more invisible sources of power and influence. Studies of the second and third faces of power may correct findings as the ones presented above.

3.2 Finding Overlooked Options And Constructing Productive Culturally Hybrid Policy Alternatives In Policy Brokerage And Design

The claim here is that grid-group cultural theory offers a parsimonious, yet sufficiently variegated system for up-close monitoring of movements in the belief systems and discursive practices of the
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myriad of policy actors populating the policy subsystems. Grid-group cultural theory’s constrained relativism gives you four cultural-institutional focal points or “attractors.” For the analysis of sub-politics in policy issue networks the ascertaining of the relative strength of the four cultural biases obviously, as proposed by Swedlow (2002), gives you more and better information about people’s belief systems than rounding up the usual suspects of left versus right, or materialism versus post-materialism. Cultural theory constructs a society’s political discursive space: how many plausible stories there are to tell, which actors are likely to tell which story, and which audiences are likely to find which story more credible (Ney and Thompson 1999, 215). This discursive space consists of the three meta-narratives of the active biases, i.e., hierarchy, individualism, and enclavism; and a suppressed, at least underarticulated, isolationist bias (Hoppe and Peterse 1993, 36–38). Every policy debate is about the argumentative and rhetorical “grip” these four metanarratives can exert on each other’s manifest and latent adherents. They constrain and enable the types of political rhetoric that can be legitimately and successfully used by politicians and policy actors.

In analyzing the dynamics of her cases of local waste facility siting, Van Baren (2001, 202–10, 267–68) observed a pattern that could be exploited more generally by policy analysts applying grid-group cultural theory to their jobs. In cases where the hierarchist policy belief system was the dominant one, its adherents attempted to fix, and put closure on, the agenda of the entire decision making process. They actively worked to exclude or marginalize policy actors that held other policy frames; and thus prevented them from putting their issues on the agenda. Due to their frustration, these other actors initiated antagonistic, but non-dominant advocacy coalitions that could be linked to the strongly egalitarian third policy belief system. Not surprisingly, it is this kind of belief system that is dubbed NIMBY by their hierarchic opponents. In the resulting deadlock, policy talk and negotiations could only be resumed after brokers occurred on the scene. In cases in which planned capacity was eventually realized, such brokers had policy beliefs linked to the first, moderately egalitarian

| TABLE 20.3 | Three Empirically Reconstructed Policy Belief Systems (PBSs) in Local Waste Facility Siting in the Netherlands. |
|-----|-----|-----|
| PBS 2 | PBS 3 | PBS 1 |
| "More waste capacity is necessary! Government intervention is needed*" | "More waste capacity? No, only in consultation with actors involved" | "More waste capacity? Yes, on condition that careful though decisive decisions are made*" |
| Style of thinking and acting | Hierarchical and moderately individualistic | Strongly egalitarian | Moderately egalitarian and individualistic |
| Waste policy | Realizing sufficient waste facility capacity | Impact of waste facility on environment | Waste prevention |
| Physical planning | Speeding up decision-making process is necessary | Carefulness instead of quickness | Careful but decisive |

and individualist belief system. Obviously, this policy frame could function as a discursive bridge to get negotiations between advocates of hierarchist and egalitarian frames going again. Where no such brokers were found, deadlocks continued and planned capacity was not realized.

The generalizable lesson of Van Baren’s comparative case studies is that by zooming in on the four ways of life and their (likely) hybrids, you have a heuristic for systematically constructing compromises, zones of productive engagement and possible convergence, and triangulating for culturally robust solution directions at relevant system levels (Schwarz and Thompson 1990; Roe 1998). Peterse and Hoppe (1998, 252–53), looking for cultural hybrids in their analysis of the controversy over Schiphol Airport’s night flight regime, observed the absence of an enclavist-individualist alternative. From an individualist point of view, one would desire clear regulations and a transparent allocation of decision-making competences over public and private organizations. An individualist would insist on the flexibility of such arrangements, which can be guaranteed by renegotiating them on regular time intervals. From an egalitarian point of view, one would not object in principle, provided the decision making process would be institutionally designed so as to express public accountability and civic responsiveness. Based on this diagnosis of the state of public debate, they identified two groups potentially interested in pursuing such a policy alternative; entrepreneurs interested in sustainable air transport and their ecology-friendly potential clients.

Thus, it is useful and legitimate for a policy analyst to assess the accessibility for and loudness of voices of the four different cultural biases in a particular policy arena. In these kinds of “democracy audits” (Thompson 2002) or “plurality testing” (Peterse and Hoppe 1998, 246ff), the analyst sets out to demonstrate certain prejudices and imbalances between the four cultural biases; some of which may have to do with normal politics, but others may result from in-built institutional practices that need redressing. For example, Hendriks (1999) found that the differences in car mobility policies in Munich and Birmingham were, to a considerable extent, due to institutional differences between the local political and administrative infrastructures of both cities. Such institutions influence the penetration of the cultural biases in the policy process: their relative influence or force, and their inclusion or exclusion from a given policy arena. This, in turn, influences the mutual interaction between the biases, in terms of policy change, policy-oriented learning, and coalition strategies. Hoppe and Peterse (1993) have shown how to conduct such plurality tests in the example of debates on LPG-related external risks and Schiphol Airport’s night flight regime (Peterse and Hoppe, 1998). Subsequently, they engaged in meta-policy design by suggesting ideas for adding temporary informal policy forums to the normal institutional arrangements in the government/business interface to hold risk-imposing firms publicly accountable for the risky externalities of their so-called private business strategies. Similarly, we engaged in some institutional redesign to build more civic responsiveness into large airport management. Thompson (2002) has applied similar methods to assess the democratic quality of development aid projects. The general idea is that zones of productive engagement or compromise are easier detected when all biases, but in the right proportions, have access to a particular policy domain. Apart from observing whether all the cultural policy frames are present in the debate and are taken seriously, the analyst should take care to assess the strength in numbers of the voices of isolationism/fatalism and autonomy that are usually absent in public debate. Too large quantities of these are supposed to undermine democracy and the quality of public debate. Similarly, an analyst should check if in policy domains or political regimes in toto the number of apparently uncontested issues is conspicuously large for a considerable time (Thompson 2002).

### 3.3 Using Cultural Theory in Anticipating Side Effects and Learning

Grid-group cultural theory gives you a more developed heuristic for anticipating normally overlooked, undesirable side effects of program implementation. Even though many frame reflective analysts engage in backward mapping (Elmore 1985) of relevant policy frames held by implementing
agencies and target groups, and in reconstructions of the belief systems of policy stakeholders, the major tacit assumption of policymakers still is that dismantling bureaucracy miraculously transforms bureaucrats and their citizen-clients alike in entrepreneurial individualists (Hood 1998; Hoppe et al. 2004). Smit and Van Gunsteren (1997), on the basis of grid-group cultural theory dynamics, predicted that Schiphol Airport management’s stubborn monocultural, top-down imposed, and standardized implementation of noise-abating programs for nearby housing would lead to more and more egalitarian protest, individualist-induced law suits, and fatalist withdrawal. They recommended experiments in negotiating the meaning and policy implications of noise-abatement with bottom-up, responsive and flexible compensatory programs. Similarly, Van Gunsteren (2002) has criticized Dutch policy initiatives for toll roads and road pricing as means to tackle traffic jams. Policymakers mistakenly construct drivers as individualist choosers. But this overlooks that having chosen a job, a house, and a car, there is not much space left for choice. Given these choices, car drivers become fatalists that resign to chronic traffic jams, and make the best of it by transforming the interiors of their cars in comfortable individual spaces. Treating car drivers as individualist choosers will bring a government only loss of votes and confidence.

Jensen (1999) has criticized Danish legislators for designing regulation for social housing that imposes on tenants an “unworkable (enclavist) monoculture”: “Though just one of the trio of possible destinations—egalitarianism—is the explicit goal of the reforms, these reforms actually operate in a way that ensures that most tenants end up at one or other of the other two destinations, either exiting into privately owned housing or sinking into fatalism” (Jen99). In her view, local-based intercultural institutional designs are to be preferred over nation-wide, uniform legislative reform. Of course, this would imply that hierarchist interpretations of consistency and absolutely equal treatment in legal science and the practice of law would have to give way to thinking among legislators, judges and lawyers in terms of more custom-made, individualist and egalitarian responsive law. As a final example of grid-group cultural theory’s possibilities in anticipating undesirable side effects, I mention Van Asselt and Rotmans’ (1996) method for systematic group support scenario writing in global climate change policymaking. Based on grid-group cultural theory’s typology of surprises through mismatches (dystopias) between politically dominant (individualistic, say) constructions of how the world “out there” appears to work, and how it actually works (egalitarian, say), both quantitative models and qualitative scenarios can be systematically varied so as to tease out various undesirable and desirable future trajectories. These methods may play an important role in identifying “safe landing” scenarios in the way national states and industries deal with this global problem.

Normal or conventional policy analysis uses methods of forward mapping from the ideals and ethical universals of politicians and policy analysts. In doing so, unwittingly, one optimistic assumption about goal-conform behavior is put on top of the next. Small wonder such an accumulation of optimism usually results in positive conclusions about a policy’s feasibility and effectiveness. It is hard to break such habits of thinking in linear causality, simple systems and cybernetics, and goals-means relations, given the rationalist teleology prevalent in many policy analytic heuristics and methods. Not to mention that a policy’s potentially undermining or negative side effects are not getting serious attention for reasons of political opportunism. One of the advantages of grid-group cultural theory is that its roots in institutionalism (Douglas, 1986) and complexity science (Thompson 1996) remind the policy analyst that next to rational teleology there are other teleologies to consider (Stacey 2001). The four ways of life or solidarities each have their own ways of unfolding over time (formative teleology), but may shift from one form to the next due to changes in context (transformative teleology). One of grid-group cultural theory’s gifts to policy analysis therefore is the inclusion of the full range of teleologies involved in policy analysis and design.
3.4 Cultural Theory as Frame-Reflective Policy Analysis in Problem Structuring

The special problem of defining the nature of the problem has been recognized in policy analysis a long time ago quite independent from grid-group cultural theory. Following Dunn (2003) and many others, problem framing and structuring are the heart of good policy analysis. There exist several methods and techniques for problem framing and structuring. How can grid-group cultural theory help a policy analyst do a quicker, better, more systematic job here? Grid-group cultural theory’s contribution in this field is that it teaches analysts which problem definition strategies to expect. It also gives them clues about which types will confront each other in policy arenas. This is potentially usable knowledge for teaching and practicing frame-reflective analysis (based on Hoppe 2002).

3.4.1 What Is a “Problem”?

Standard definitions speak of an unacceptable gap between normative ideals or aspiration levels and present and future conditions. Problems become public or policy problems if governments are supposed to deal with them. It follows that a “problem” is an analytical compound of three elements straddling the fact-value distinction: an ethical standard; a situation (present or future); and the construction of the connection between standard and situation as a gap which should not exist. Policy makers can agree or disagree on any of these elements. Concerning standards, one may distinguish between those with much and little consent. Regarding the situation (and its future development), there are those with highly certain and highly uncertain knowledge. About the relationship between standard and situation, people may disagree about the political sense to construct it as an intolerable gap in need of mending; or about the extent to which this is a government’s responsibility. To simplify, I use only two dimensions—degree of certainty about knowledge, and degree of consent on relevant standards—to distinguish four types of problems (Hoppe 1989, based on Douglas and Wildavsky 1983; also Thompson and Tuden 1959).

Structured problems are characterized by high degrees of certain knowledge and consent. Road maintenance, or (as in The Netherlands) the application of rules for the allocation of social housing facilities, are some obvious examples. Dealing with such problems belongs to daily administrative routine. Moderately structured problems come in two distinct forms. In one variation, (moderately structured problems/ends) consent on relevant standards is high, i.e., relevant values and appropriate ends are not contested. But policy makers cannot agree on the effectiveness and efficiency of means to be used and (financial) resources and risks to be allocated. Many traffic safety problems belong here. Even though everybody sincerely supports the goals, neither experimental research, nor pilot projects, nor negotiations can usher in a definitive solution. The other variation (moderately structured problems/means) features substantial agreement on certain knowledge, but sometime intense disagreements about values at stake and ends to be pursued. Examples here are abortion, euthanasia, or voting rights for foreigners. We can easily do all of these things, but disagreement on the ethical desirability or acceptability of the values and goals continues and, sometimes, intensifies.

Finally, there are those problems where both the knowledge base and ethical support remain hotly contested. The most urgent and virulent political problems, unfortunately, frequently belong to this type. Such problems remain ill-defined, “wicked,” “messy,” or “ill-structured,” or unstructured, a term I prefer. Technical methods for problem solving are inadequate; there is uncertainty as to which disciplines, specializations, experts, and skills to mobilize; conflicts over values abound, and many people get intensely involved, with strong but divisive opinions. Car mobility problems frequently belong to this type of unstructured problems. Fighting traffic jams is a permanent battlefield of value conflicts. Road pricing mechanisms increase costs versus equal access to car mobility, also for lower income groups; or the need for cheap road transport facilities as a basis for regional or national economic competition versus the accompanying rise in transport volume, which may clog
major transport arteries. The knowledge base for choosing among policy instruments is weakly developed. There remains high uncertainty about the effectiveness of policy measures, due to in-separable interaction effects in field experiments, the long maturation time for effects to become visible and measurable, and confounding influences from other policy domains and international developments.

What value can be gained from bringing grid-group cultural theory to bear on this well-known problem typology? Could we say anything about how policy makers or analysts belonging to one of the four ways of life would cope with different problem types? Can we predict the primary orientation of an adherent of a particular solidarity to frame a problematic situation as a particular type of problem? I will proceed by presenting the starkest contrasts first. I start with the hierarchist policy maker or analyst who is an expert in framing and then solving structured problems. Then, I will contrast him with the frequently overlooked one, the isolate policy maker or analyst who sees unstructured problems everywhere, and identifies solving them with personal and organizational survival. Finally, I will come to enclavists who see value conflicts as the root cause of every problem and their overcoming as precondition to any solution; and individualist types, who want to move away from problems, if only a few inches.

3.4.2 Hierarchists: “Structure It!”

Policy makers and analysts working in complex bureaucracies are exposed to strong hierarchical social relationships and interaction patterns. These organizational structures express a cultural bias or disposition to world making characterized as paradigm protection (Thompson and Wildavsky 1986, 280–81) or belief in strong theories or methods—certified by science, or more traditionally, founded in religion. Although these two are often believed to be mutually exclusive, in a modern handbook on socio-cybernetic policy analysis (Rastogi 1992, 12), we find them both, side by side. Rastogi professes that any effort at problem solving begins with an ordered knowledge base, generated by a scientific methodology and an interdisciplinary theoretical language fit for complexity (Rastogi 1992, 12). Turning to the topic of long-term, lasting solutions, Rastogi (1992, 16) opines that the root causes of social problems are “the abnormal or disturbed emotions/motives of the social actors participating or involved in the problem situations.” To “nullify” these, we need a belief system of religious, or religiously inspired, “super-rational values.” Given these world-making orientations, the hierarchist’s rationality is functional and analytic. It is functional, in the sense of starting from a supposedly agreed objective, as a function of which the most effective and efficient means is worked out. It is analytic, in the sense that problem solving is considered an intellectual effort, best left to experts. In his Administrative Behavior, Simon (1947) has shown how this type of rationality, exactly because it does not deny, but actively uses the inevitable boundaries on our intellectual capacity as a building block in organizational design, can be systematically applied to create complex bureaucratic structures in which everyone expertly solves his partial problem within the decision premises of the organization’s leadership. The whole idea presupposes that problems come neatly packaged; and if they don’t, they can be made to come that way. “Structure it!” is the hierarchist’s primary orientation to the definition of problems.

3.4.3 Isolates: “Surviving Without Resistance”

Isolates experience themselves as outcasts, subjected to a fate determined by dark forces or far-away ruling circles. “God is high, and the King is far” is a good expression of the isolates’ state of mind. We may think of the isolate as belonging to the contemporary underclass, those who, at the margins of modern society, live a life of exclusion. It is a way of life not seen and heard in policy-
making circles. This is why in many policy studies applying grid-group cultural theory only the three “active” voices—hierarchy, enclavism, individualism—are heard, and the “passive” isolate is absent. Isolates perceive the institutional settings in which they find themselves in one of two different ways. It is inherent in their world-making disposition to see the world as a lottery, and risk absorption as the only way of coping with this “fact of life” (Thompson and Wildavsky 1986, 280). Transferred to social, organizational, and political relations, their life worlds are constructed as unstable casinos. If they believe the unstable casino is ruled by mere randomness, they may define the institutional environment as anarchy. Alternatively, in a fatalist variation, he could define the institutional situation as a barracks, if he believes the unstable casino is actually run by an all-powerful but unpredictable human despot or tyrant. The “rationality” of the isolate and fatalist is a gaming or gambling one. According to Dror (1986, 168–69), under conditions of adversity, policymakers resort to “fuzzy gambling.” In its extreme, fatalist form, any decision making is senseless. Surprise dominates life, better intelligence cannot improve ignorance, having goals and values is a luxury, and decisions make no sense because experience and past performance have lost their anchoring functions in a highly volatile environment. In an effort to make the best of it, fatalist policymakers or analysts could gamble to maximize their chances for maximum gain, or a maxmax strategy; or, alternatively, try the policy principle of minimin-avoidance, i.e., choose a strategy which prevents the worst outcome, or at least minimizes the damage (Dror 1986, 10). The isolate, fatalistically inclined or more optimistic, will be predisposed to define any problem as unstructured. Believing that the world is a lottery and the social world an unstable casino, he will be extremely reluctant to impose any definitive framing on a problematic situation. “Survival” and “resilience” are the isolate’s watchwords (Schwarz and Thompson 1990; Hood 1998), and they proscribe him to have any fixed ideas, let alone theories and methods, about the nature of the problem and how to solve it. Instead, he must be totally flexible, keep options open in order to be maximally resourceful and alert at every opportunity to escape fate and grab the lucky number.

3.4.4 Enclavists: “It’s Not fair!”

When one prefers a way of life permitting only relations with like-minded people and as little interference as possible from outsiders, one joins a clan, club, or commune. In grid CT such people are called enclavists. They choose to inhabit an enclave encircled by a ‘hostile’ world. The world-making disposition of enclaves is best described as enlarged groupthink (Janis 1982). The enclavist way of life institutionalizes itself by systematically instilling the groupthink cultural bias in most of its adherents. Guarding the group boundaries by picturing the outside world as evil and mean is the principal way of keeping a society of enclavists together. This is exactly what the enlarged groupthink symptoms achieve. If they fail, expulsion, always disgraceful and sometimes violent, is the enclavist’s means of last resort. The world-making disposition of enlarged groupthink is imbued with a communicative form of value rationality. It is communicative, because verbal means of persuasion, from public debate to speeches to propaganda campaigns, are the only allowed means of creating consent among equals. It is value rational, in the sense of normative standards and goal-finding being the major issue of problem-solving efforts, because the mix of inside moralism and outside criticism makes enclavists never miss an opportunity to point out the value conflicts between “us” and “them.” The major route to a solution is that “they” give up their “wrong” values and change their ways accordingly. Enclavists proselytize, and outsiders should convert to the enclavist’s values and life style. This assumption of ubiquitous value conflicts leads enclavist policymakers and analysts to structure problems as moderately structured/means. The valuative problem dimension is stressed. This does not mean that enclavist policy makers and analysts scrupulously survey all relevant values. Opposing “our” values to “theirs”—frequently attributed on the basis of stereotypes—is sufficient. The same logic breeds close monitoring of differences between groups.
in society; particularly differences in treatment by government. Thus, frequently, the value conflict is shaped as an issue of distributive justice, equality, or (broadly understood) fairness. The fairness problem frame spills over into a problem of trust in the sphere of interaction and institutions.

3.4.5 Individualists: “Let’s Make Things Better!”

In the low group/low grid cell, we find the individualist way of life. In terms of interaction patterns, adherents prefer freely chosen exchange relations to other people. Except in the institutional domains of markets, they find and (re)create them in social networks. In networks, individuals “socialize” with partners, which results in a flurry of networking activity, with persons continuously moving in and out and between networks as they see fit. In networking, they live out their world-making disposition of seizing opportunities for individual benefit. The individualist type of rationality is functional and strategic. It is functional, in the sense that he searches for usable knowledge, i.e., data and information which help him maximize his utility, or at least “satisfice” at the self-selected aspiration levels (Simon 1947). It is strategic, in the sense that individualists are adept in getting usable knowledge by exploiting their personal networks. It is about “shifting the really vital discussions away from the formalized information-handling system and on to the informal old boy net. We characterize this strategy as individualist manipulative” (Thompson and Wildavsky, 1986, 280–81). The individualist’s basic orientation to problems and problem solving is: “Let’s make things better; let’s get usable knowledge.” What is a policy problem, so that it may be properly defined for an individualist policy maker or analyst? Essentially, “problems” are opportunities for improvement. Defining a problem is framing it as a choice between two or more alternative means to seize that opportunity (Dery 1984, 27). Individualists don’t care much for explicit value search and goal formulation. Always taking present conditions as evaluative baseline, individualists limit their preferences to comparisons of incremental change (Braybrooke and Lindblom 1963, 85). This largely implicit, meliorative way of treating values and goals fits the individualist networking style of political interactions hand-in-glove. Being casual about political ideology and explicit policy values allows individualist policy makers to identify shared interests, concerns and threats easily—even with potential opponents (cf. Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith 1993, 223–25). Likewise, preference aggregation among many individualist policy makers comes about as an epiphenomenon of the ongoing partisan mutual adjustment in policy networks (Braybrooke and Lindblom 1963, 15; Lindblom. 1965). On the cognitive side of problems, the individualist policy makers’ and analysts’ instrumental outlook logically values know-how over know-that. They need usable knowledge (Lindblom and Cohen 1979), irrespective of its source. Sometimes the source is scientific or professional inquiry. But they rely as much or more on common sense and practical knowledge. Here again, their interaction style helps them mobilize the usable knowledge or “intelligence of democracy” (Lindblom 1965) implicitly stored in their networks. It follows that the individualist policymaker clearly prefers defining a problem as moderately structured/ends.

3.4.6 A Typology Of Cultures Of Problems

Figure 20.2 summarizes the results achieved by bringing grid-group cultural theory to bear on one particular problem definition. It shows that there is a straightforward match between the four cultures and policy problem types. Each way of life corresponds to one primary problem-framing strategy.

Thus, grid-group cultural theory’s most important contribution is in the crucial, but very difficult task of problem structuring. Elsewhere I have argued why deliberate cognitive problem structuring
by analysts and reasoned problem choice by democratically accountable politicians is indispensable in avoiding policy controversies and breaking deadlocks (Hisschemöller and Hoppe 1996; reprinted in Hisschemöller et al. 2001). It involves the confrontation, evaluation, and integration of as much contradictory information as possible. Apart from many social and political conditions, problem structuring requires forensic policy analysts endowed with skills of problem reframing or “the capacity to keep alive, in the midst of action, a multiplicity of views of the situation” (Schön 1983, 281). The forensic policy analyst considers it his task to use the differences between problem frames to forge an innovative policy design from a combination of plausible and robust arguments (frame-reflective analysis), or to test and bolster some frames (frame-critical analysis). Knowledge about different types of problem frames, and different repertoires of problem definition strategies, is a basic element in building a best practice or craft of doing forensic analysis (Anderson 1987; Jennings 1987). Precisely at this point grid-group cultural theory offers a valuable contribution.

Thompson et al. (1990) have defended the thesis that at the intersection of grid and group on the socio-cultural map sits a fifth ideal-type—the “hermit”—named for this type’s self-conscious withdrawal from commitment to and involvement in the other four ways of life. Schmutzer (1994) stresses another aspect of aloofness from the four ways of life, i.e., free access and movement between them. He therefore interprets the fifth ideal-type as a Hermes, the fast running messenger and clever translator, the god of commerce and traffic of the Greeks. Policy analysis needs Hermes-like problem structuring to become an accepted and feasible, teachable tool of the trade.

Grid-group cultural theory gives the policy analyst a conceptual basis and clues for more productive problem structuring. Consider the way Mamadouh (2002) decides to reframe the entire issue of dealing with multilingualism in the European Union. At present the EU has 11 official and working languages; after expansion of its membership this number will even go up. Although dissatisfied about the practical problems and costs of institutional multilingualism and the factual linguistic homogenization through informal use of English, politicians avoid the issue; obviously there is no compromise between preserving national linguistic identities and improving EU communication. Academics and professionals—mostly language teachers—frame the problem as how many and which language(s) are going to survive? Which language(s) should dominate curriculums?
Rational choice theory, reflecting the individualist culture, predicts that English will be the new lingua franca; it supposedly contributes most to your within-Europe communication potential. From a cultural theory perspective, Mamadouh argues, the professional and rational choice ways of framing the problem are one sided. She shows that the four cultural logics all have their own, sometimes contextually influenced, preferred repertoires for dealing with the plurality of languages as a barrier to social interactions: “...the pertinent question is not so much ‘how many languages’ or ‘which language(s)?’, but ‘how is the mediation between speakers of different languages organized?’” (Mamadouh 2002, 341). In this perspective, the present situation can be analyzed as not so irrational, and many more strategies by stakeholders and policymakers alike appear likely and defensible. Thereby, CT contributes to opening up the solution space for the problem of multilingualism.

4 APPLIED CULTURAL THEORY FACILITATES FRAME-REFLECTIVE ANALYSIS

In this chapter I have highlighted four contributions of cultural theory to policy analysis. Of course, this is not to say that applying cultural theory to questions of policy is easy and unproblematic. More particularly, some problems with the theory’s structure and validation itself (Mamadouh, 1999) spill over into its application to policy analysis. An important issue is level of analysis. It is not always easy to carefully specify whether one’s analysis applies to policy preferences (bias), institutional ensembles (policy making relations), or policy behavior (implementation strategies, say). The theory itself is about coherent configurations of these three levels of analysis, but inconsistent combinations do occur in policy practice, and they should not be overlooked. Another level of analysis problem is the relationship between individuals, groups and larger human ensembles. Some consider it an advantage that the theory applies to all levels. Indeed, from a political and policy perspective it is familiar to distinguish egalitarian “wings” in political parties or government departments that, overall, are hierarchic or individualist. But this also leads to problems of interpreting an individual’s position or behavior as carrier of cultural bias. Are individual policy actors coherent in the sense of consistent over time as carriers of one specific bias/relation/behavior set? Or are they sequential, in the sense of supporting one set but being open or vulnerable to other ones? Or are they even synthetic, in the sense of supporting different sets at different times for different audiences? (Olli 1999) Are only policy and political elites coherent; and the masses sequential or synthetic? Or does the plurality of present day political systems force leading politicians to be synthetic too? If the latter would be true, cultural theory interpretation runs headway into the problem of stolen rhetoric and stolen strategy in politics, i.e. using one type of policy discourse to achieve one’s true goals in another, more true discourse. Especially in multiparty systems with compromise governments this would be a serious problem for applying cultural theory to policy analysis (Stenvoll 2002). A problem compounded by the fact that cultural theory itself predicts adherents of different bias/relations/behavior sets to have inherently different preferences for political and policy analysis at different levels of analysis and scale. Another problem to do with the level of analysis issue is that it is very difficult to use ordinary survey or poll data to infer cultural baselines. Although especially Norwegian political scientists Grendstad and Selle have developed this art to some extent (Grendstad and Selle 1997; Grenstad 1999; Grendstad and Selle 2000; Grenstad 2003), more qualitative and interpretive approaches to establishing the relative strength and weakness of cultural bias on higher-than-the-individual level look more convincing. In spite of many applications to many different policy fields, it remains the task of the individual policy analyst to devise a culturalist compass by himself for his own policy field. At best, the methodological guidelines given in section 3.1 provide him with some suggestions of how to proceed.

This brief list of problems serves to warn the reader that using applied cultural theory as a tool in policy analysis is not without its problems; and certainly does not absolve the analyst from proceeding cautiously and prudently. Nevertheless, as shown mainly by Christopher Hood (1998),
being alert to cultural hybrids and different levels of analysis should steer the analyst clear of circular arguments and invalid conclusions. But in summary of all of the above, it bears repeating and stressing that grid-group cultural theory, if used with discretion and good judgment, contributes a fast-working and systematic heuristic for doing frame-reflective and frame-critical policy analysis. This mode of doing policy analysis fits the new pluralism hand in glove. It focuses on the cultural-institutional origins of people’s preferences and multiple and pluriform frames of thinking and acting—the stuff of frame reflective analysis. But what stops the forensic analyst from becoming overwhelmed? Which people and which frames to include in her analysis? What is the meaning of a robust policy alternative if an analyst has no clue about the substantive and participatory closure of an issue? How does she distinguish between a merely accidental, local consensus and the political acceptability of policy proposals for nation-wide, perhaps transnational audiences? How does a forensic, frame reflective analyst not become a contemporary Sophist? This is where grid-group cultural theory’s constrained relativism contributes most to good policy analysis. Without grid-group cultural theory, forensic analysis is easily overwhelmed by variety and complexity; it would fail to see the cultural wood for the symbolic trees, become a prey of cultural, interpretive and rhetorical stamp collection (Hood 1998), and postmodern epistemological and moral relativism. One remedy for the new pluralism would be to retrain policy analysts as applied political philosophers, as recommended by Hodgkinson (1983) and the policy philosophers (see Bobrow and Dryzek 1987). But a more efficient way of achieving the same is to use grid-group cultural theory as a simple but effective tool for frame reflective, argumentative policy analysis. If modern democracy and citizenship are indeed about the constructive organization of dealing with otherness and plurality (Van Gunsteren, 1998), policy analysis needs grid-group cultural theory to do a better job. This is because, to paraphrase Wildavsky, an inch of group-grid cultural theory gives an analyst miles of frame reflective analysis.

NOTES

1. See Thompson et al., 1990 for the best full exposition of the theory; for a more complete introduction and overview, see Mamadouh, 1999.

2. The acronyms on the left vertical axis stand for parliamentarian Technology Assessment institutes in several countries involved in the study: p&q stands for problem definitions and questions asked; c&r for conclusions and recommendations.

3. Needless to say that in this article he/him everywhere can also be read as she/her.

4. Of course, Rastogi is eccentric, but honest, in founding his normative position on religion. Policy analysts usually take either a cognitivist or a non-cognitivist meta-ethical stance. Cognitivism in policy analysis is frequently identified with Brecht’s Scientific Value Relativism (or Alternativism). Scientists cannot scientifically determine whether or not something is valuable; but ‘given’ an ultimate value, they can use their scientific methods to clarify the implications and consequences of adhering to this ‘given’ value. Most policy analysts, e.g. cost-benefit analysts and pragmatic incrementalists, adhere to some form of emotive non-cognitivism, i.e. they deny ethical statements any cognitive status beyond emotional expressions of ephemeral and temporary preferences. The only thing scientists may do is observe people’s preferences as manifested in their behavior, and adopt these ‘observed’ preferences as normative lodestars. Paradoxically, these more frequent meta-ethical positions, in practice, amount to the same hierarchical bias as Rastogi’s in favor of experts who claim the right to force-feed their ‘scientific’ interpretations and ‘empirical’ indicators for values to politicians, policymaking officials, and citizens (Van de Graaf and Hoppe, 1989: 141–157; Fischer, 1990).

5. So strong is this tendency that in many versions of grid-group cultural theory enclavists are called ‘egalitarians’.

6. Any similarity with an advertisement slogan of a multi-national company is wholly intentional.

7. The Pareto optimum in cost benefit analysis – choose the alternative(s) which make at least one person better off, and nobody else worse off—is the algorithmic form of the individualist position.
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