

## Registering difference, encouraging dissent? An analysis of indian biofuel policy as 'Good Environmental Politics'

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Hoop, de, E., Arora, S., & Romijn, H. A. (2013). *Registering difference, encouraging dissent? An analysis of indian biofuel policy as 'Good Environmental Politics'*. 132-132. conference; EUGEO: Europe, what's next? Changing geographies and geographies of change; 2013-09-05; 2013-09-07, .

**Document status and date:**

Published: 01/01/2013

**Document Version:**

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of Record (includes final page, issue and volume numbers)

**Please check the document version of this publication:**

- A submitted manuscript is the version of the article upon submission and before peer-review. There can be important differences between the submitted version and the official published version of record. People interested in the research are advised to contact the author for the final version of the publication, or visit the DOI to the publisher's website.
- The final author version and the galley proof are versions of the publication after peer review.
- The final published version features the final layout of the paper including the volume, issue and page numbers.

[Link to publication](#)

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

If the publication is distributed under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license above, please follow below link for the End User Agreement:

[www.tue.nl/taverne](http://www.tue.nl/taverne)

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at:

[openaccess@tue.nl](mailto:openaccess@tue.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

## Presentation 2

**Author(s):** Evelien de Hoop, Saurabh Arora, Henry Romijn, Technical University of Eindhoven, The Netherlands

**Title:** Registering Difference, Encouraging Dissent? An Analysis of Indian Biofuel Policy as 'Good Environmental Politics'

**Abstract:** Following its 2003 biodiesel mission, the Indian national government released its biofuel policy in December 2009. We evaluate if the making of this policy can be considered 'good environmental politics'. Policy

is viewed as a set of propositions that have been progressively assembled. This assembling process constitutes 'good environmental politics' if the propositions were well-articulated in their making. By well-articulated, following Isabelle Stengers, Vinciane Despret and Bruno Latour, we do not simply mean that a proposition is clear

in its formulation but rather that it has *registered the agency* of many discursive, material and procedural entities.

The process of assembling well-articulated propositions must have, a) invited and accommodated as many different entities as possible without unifying their actions/voices into a repetitive singularity; b) registered the voices of entities that were hitherto mute; c) allowed the registered entities to successively challenge and recompose the propositions; d) maximized the entities' potential to dispute scientific as well as political authority; e) produced a set of propositions that are not easily transferrable between different socio-ecological situations. Attempting to perform 'good science' in this paper by recording widely different perspectives on the

policy-making process, we find that the Indian government's policy was an attempt to do 'good environmental politics', which partially responded to many entities' recalcitrance. However, it still failed to register some crucial

voices, especially those that were hitherto mute. We conclude that our normative evaluation framework needs

to discriminate better between more and less crucial voices to register in specific socio-ecological situations.