*****DRAFT*****
(PLEASE DO NOT CITE WITHOUT AUTHOR'S PERMISSION)

Values Discourse and Discursive Democracy in Natural Resource Planning

Daniel R. Williams
USDA Forest Service
Rocky Mountain Research Station
2150A Centre Avenue
Fort Collins, CO 80526-1891
drwilliams@fs.fed.us

Paper presented as part of session on "Social Values in Public Discourse: Analyzing the Deliberative Process of Value Formation in Resource Conflicts"

8th International Symposium on Society and Natural Resource Management, Bellingham, Washington, June, 2000

Introduction

The concept of values is one of the most widely used to characterize the human dimensions of natural resources. Clearly the concept means many different things in different disciplines, so perhaps any attempt to characterize values research is unlikely to resolve any of the longstanding conceptual problems that plague this topic. Still, I think the effort is worthwhile for two reasons. First, I see a gap between recent theorizing about values in social and political science and how the topic is understood and applied in natural resources. Specifically the field tends to take its value concepts from either economics or social psychology and ignores more sociological and political theory formulations. Second, these theoretical developments are particularly pertinent to current issues in natural resource management such as collaborative planning. In this presentation I want to build on Walt Kuentzel's framework for comparing value theories, particularly the social discourse view of values and address its implications for human dimensions in natural resources. Specifically, I want to focus on the problem of how society orders values and the role that value discourse plays in this task. First, I will try to establish the context of this problem. Then I will identify alternative modes by which society orders values. Finally, I will present a framework for contrasting alternative theories of democracy with respect to the role of value discourse.

The central issue, as I see it, is aptly captured by this quote from Challenger:

"We would all do well. . .to quit acting as if the work of science and the work of governing our lives can be done without conversation about values and ideals"

Let me illustrate by relating a little parable:

There once was a large federal agency that coveted the approaches and successes of the private sector in meeting its "customers" needs. In an effort to develop a more business-like, customer-friendly approach, this agency (which shall go nameless) hired a Fortune 500 marketing guru for technical guidance and council. The first few sessions between the highly esteemed consultant, robed in the finest vestments of any on Wall Street, and the assorted agency personnel, modestly adorned in boots and bolo ties, were spent learning the language and ways of each others' worlds. In one early meeting, the marketing guru was stressing the importance of collecting systematic data on customer preferences and values. Several of the government employees pointed out that face-to-face interaction with customers is increasingly valued within the organization and, furthermore, there are laws requiring local managers to use small-group, informal meetings and conversations to get to know and understand their customers. The guru was aghast that such irregular and unstructured dialogue, using statistically unrepresentative samples of customers, was a required and even preferred method of learning about "customers" and their desires and values. To him it was inconceivable that such an approach was actually viewed by some as superior to scientifically assessed public opinion and it further reinforced his disdain for the bureaucratic inefficiency and irrationality of government. At this point, having noted that the guru's resume included a discipleship with the exalted Daniel Yankelovich, high priest of opinion research, one insolent agency employee suggested the guru consult the high priest's book Coming To Public Judgment for an explanation as to why "conversation about values" was necessary and in some ways superior to the kinds of attitude and value assessments typically dispensed by card-carrying consultants indoctrinated in the ways of what Yankelovich called the "cult of technical control" (Yankelovich, 1991).

This parable helps to illustrate an underlying ambivalence natural resource managers have about the role of the public in natural resource decisions. On the one hand they are encouraged to engage in dialogue with the public. On the other hand their scientific training and tendency to engage technical expertise to solve what amount to value conflicts lead them to distrust that same public dialogue. What possible role can conversation play in planning that is not captured by hard-nosed scientific assessments of public opinion? What is the purpose of conversation in policy deliberations if not to measure constituent values and preferences? Why heed Challenger's words about the wisdom of conversation in matters of values and ideals or, for that matter, the sage wisdom of a repentant high priest of market research?

Ambivalence about public conversation and values is deeply rooted in the natural resource tradition of scientific management and its technical impulse to separate facts from values. As scientists and science-minded managers, we value the power of analytical tools to reveal not just biophysical truths, but the valuations the public holds toward alternative management regimes. But we also see the public as uninformed about natural resource matters and discount public values as criteria for sound management. Hence, dialogue strikes us as both unnecessary given our technical abilities -- it is an inefficient and unreliable way to collect public opinion information -- and unwise given

the public's lack of understanding of complex natural resource issues. However, as citizens and public servants we also value democratic principles and recognize that the public should have a say in the management of public resources, if for no other reason than there is at least some therapeutic value in allowing citizens to voice there opinions directly. In addition, dialogue is potentially virtuous if it can serve as a vehicle for informing citizens of the scientific realities and ecological constraints on management.

This ambivalence also lurks beneath recent efforts to reform natural resource decision-making as exemplified by the Committee of Scientist's Report (Committee of Scientists, 1999). The two major recommendations of that report are to use "the best available science" and "collaborative dialogue" to guide forest planning efforts. But it is unclear from the report how to combine the best available science with civic dialogue. As worthy as these two directives may be, they also tend to be contradictory (Cortner & Moote, 1999, p. 19, p. 61; Yankelovich, 1991). In calls for sound scientific decisions, "scientists" often complain that science has been ignored in natural resource policy debates, setting up a tension between more or better science and more public participation (Aron, 1979 cited in Webler & Renn, 1995; Alverson et al., 1994; Ebel, 2000; Thomas & Burchfield, 1999). Similarly, calls for expansion of citizen input into environmental decision-making reflect public distrust of agency experts and recognition that technocratic decision-making tends to hide experts' values and biases behind the veil of scientific objectivity (Brown, 1987; Wellman & Tipple, 1990; Williams & Matheny, 1994). This contradiction between science and dialogue is particularly acute when the best available science interprets values in economic terms as pre-given, autonomous preferences of individuals; in other words making values primarily a technical matter and rendering superfluous any conversation about values in public policy. This "fundamental paradox" as Daniels and Walker (forthcoming) describe it, is widely recognized in public administration. Yet, the COS Report offers not a whisper of contradiction between its dual injunctions of using the "best available science" and "collaborative dialogue" in natural resource decisions. All too often those who acknowledge some contradiction think science can or should trump politics, hold naively to a strict separation of facts and values, and betray an abiding distrust of public input (cf Ebel, 2000).

The end result is natural resource managers do a poor job involving the public because they are confused about the nature and purpose of dialogue and how to meld it with expert science. Befitting their technical orientation they liken public involvement to information gathering (Cortner, 1996). Or they dismiss it as political bargaining and positioning disconnected from the "truth" that science provides (Ebel, 2000). For public involvement to be more successful we need broader recognition of the value of conversation, not just among managers and scientists, but also within the public at large.

In sum, there are significant, but under-appreciated professional and social barriers to bridging the tension between the best available science and collaborative decision-making. These include nearly exclusive use of economic/social-psychological conceptions of values as fixed, sovereign preferences and widespread assumptions about the nature of politics and political theory that mirror these economic/management science views of values. Both have the effect of undermining public involvement and

conversation, as public conversation would seem pointless in a world where values, interests, or preferences are sovereign and fixed.

To help alleviate some of this ambivalence I want to present some of the alternatives to what Kuentzel earlier in this session characterized as the social utility theory of values. I will do this in two ways. First, I will present a critique of the economic conception of values and suggest other bases for the valuation of goods that necessitate public discourse. Second, I will present some of alternative theories of democracy that provide normative support for value discourse and public involvement in natural resource decision-making.

The Science of Values

The main problem with the science of values in matters of public policy is its tendency to extend private market relations or economic logic into the public realm. In fact the pervasive application of economic logic to all aspects of society has been thoroughly documented in the sociological literature on modernity (Wolfe, 1989). As Anderson (1990, p. 179) states it: "A distinctive feature of modern capitalist societies is the tendency of the market to take over the production, maintenance and distribution of goods that were previously produced, maintained and distributed by non-market means." If this statement holds anywhere it surely applies to natural resources where policy debates have long been articulated as an economic versus moral question (cf. Norton, 1991).

The problem isn't with economics per se but determining which goods should be the subject of market transactions (and by implication market valuations) and which should not. Concepts of value and valuation as applied in natural resource management generally fail to distinguish between economic goods from other kind of goods (Sagoff, 1998). Anderson (1990) provides a useful framework for illustrating the differences between market (use) and alternative modes of valuation (See Table 1).

Anderson begins by noting that the market is an institution or procedure for making valuations. And like any institution, it embodies norms for regulating the production, exchange, and enjoyment of goods that are sensitive to some qualitative differences among values and insensitive to others. The task of ordering (producing, maintaining, and distributing) natural resource values would seem to fit squarely within this analysis. It is not just a task of identifying possible goods (values or benefits) that might accrue from natural resource management (e.g., carbon sequestration, recreation, economic goods, or scientific knowledge), but also a question of the appropriate means by which society should order, evaluate, or decide among the production, distribution and maintenance of these various goods.

Table 1. Contrasting Valuation Modes and Norms (from Anderson, 1990)

Modes	**Norms**
Use	Impersonal, taste, advantage, exclusive & rival, exit
Intrinsic	Respect, acceptance
Personal	Intimacy, attachment, gift, commitment
Shared	Fraternity, need, mutual benefit, shared, voice

Anderson describes four modes for the valuation of goods and the corresponding social norms that regulate these different types of exchange. The most familiar mode of exchange is the use mode, which involves subordinating something to one's own ends. Markets render use valuations based on several social norms. These norms include impersonal relations (transactions with strangers), freedom to pursue one's own advantage unrestrained by consideration of others' advantage, equating values to matters of personal taste, where goods exchanged are exclusive in consumption and rival in competition, and where dissatisfaction is expressed by exit from the market. These norms can be contrasted with three other valuation modes or sets of social norms for regulating the production, distribution, and maintenance of goods.

The first alternative is what Anderson calls the intrinsic mode. Intrinsic norms for valuation deal primarily with respect and acceptance of the object as it is, rather than for how it can be used. Here is where we would likely note ecological and aesthetic values. We can, as economists have, develop economic values of such goods using contingent valuation and other pricing techniques. But this nevertheless requires subordinating their intrinsic value to an economic end. To illustrate, most people object to any attempt to measure the economic value of a human life because the question presumes that the value of a human life can be compared to the usefulness of ordinary consumer goods such as toothpaste and automobiles. Similarly, people object to questions about their willingness to pay for clean air on the grounds that they are being asked to pay to restore that which is intrinsically good, but which has been degraded by allowing people to subordinate its value to a mere economic good (Dustin, 1992). That is, it only makes sense to ask the question of willingness to pay from within the use mode of exchange.

Aside from the market, what kinds of institutional mechanisms are or can be invoked to allocate intrinsic goods? Wolfe (1989) argues that early theorists of economics such as Adam Smith expected institutions associated with civil society (e.g., family, social conventions, cultural norms and traditions, law, and religion) to act as constraints on purely private approaches to regulating social transactions. In essence valuing intrinsic goods involves ethical-political considerations rooted in culture. Ironically, the modern age is marked by both a growing societal awareness of the intrinsic values of nature (cf. the expansion of environmental ethics as documented by Nash, 1989) and the dominance of market institutions for valuation of these goods over the institutions of civil society (Sagoff, 1988).

A second alternative might be called the personal or sentimental mode of exchange. Many goods are not just useful, but also loved and cherished. Whereas commodities are interchangeable, cherished goods are unique, irreplaceable, and given up only under duress. In this case the dominant norms deal with commitment to the relationship and expressions of identity and self. Anderson develops her ideas about this mode by discussing interpersonal relations among friends and family and the role played by goods exchanged in such relationships. Goods such as trust, loyalty, sympathy, affection, admiration, companionship, and devotion cannot be bought and sold (though she notes that people sometimes deceive themselves in the attempt). Rather, the exchange of goods in personal relationships is guided by the spirit of gift rather than the spirit of commercial transaction. To impose market norms of exchange for these goods undermines their authenticity and value. Gifts of love or intimacy for example, "cannot genuinely be procured for oneself by paying others to produce them or by appealing to another's personal advantage to provide them" (Anderson, 1990, p 186).

Extending this idea to cherished places, we can recognize the value of a specific landscape as not a result of consuming its natural qualities, but as a kind of gift one receives from the specific relationship with that landscape. For me the Desolation Wilderness is such a place; no other landscape has the personal meaning of that place. I value the Desolation not as "wilderness" per se but as the memory-filled place called Desolation Wilderness. In this context we might ask not only what are the values that people receive from such a place, but in what ways do people contribute something to its value?

A third alternative mode of valuation deals with value as public symbols and expressions of shared ideals. This is the political mode of evaluation. As Anderson (1990, p. 181) notes some "values cannot be realized in private acts of use, but reside in shared public understanding of the meaning and significance of the good." As an example, Anderson describes sites of historical events as having value as part of national heritage. Preservation of these values requires constraints on use such as zoning ordinances to preserve the architectural integrity of the features and buildings associated with such sites.

The norms for these shared goods contrast sharply with the norms of the market. These norms include fraternity in place of self-interest, mutual benefit in place of exclusive use, need over want, and voice instead of exit as the expression of dissatisfaction. Fraternity is expressed through common provision of services in contrast to the separateness of parties in a commercial transaction or the special relationship between parties in personal gift relationships. Publicly provided goods are provided to all, not just to those who pay. Shared goods are necessarily realized in common activities and rights to these cannot be fully distributed in exclusive increments. When goods being distributed are not public, distribution takes place in accordance with some conception of the relative need of a citizen rather than in accordance with want. Most importantly from a discourse perspective, citizens participate in the allocation of goods based on voice rather than exit. For example, determination of need is based on democratic deliberation. The difference between voice and exit is also related to the way respect for other is demonstrated in market versus political relations. In market transactions one respects the privacy of the consumer by not inquiring into the reasons for wanting something beyond a level necessary to satisfy that want. In public transactions respect for fellow citizens is to take their reasons for advocating a particular position seriously; that is to inquire as to reasons for holding a particular view. Thus, public goods are produced and distributed through institutions and practices that deliberate over the shared concerns of citizens. Market mechanisms of exit do not respond to reasoned ideals any differently than unreflective wants. The realization of shared values requires a forum for working out these understandings together.

Attempting to order these shared goods by market mechanisms tends to detract from their value. In an argument reminiscent of Olmsted's views on public parks, Anderson notes that the goods provided by public spaces are qualitatively different than if they are provided privately. Public space promotes the free and diverse association necessary for fraternity, civility, and democracy (see also Putnam, 2000). Like public spaces, public roads contribute to a similar freedom of association. With a private system of roads one would need to ask permission of each owner to visit the people and places made accessible by such roads.

A critical feature of recognizing these different modes of valuation is that the market or use mode tends to colonize all others (Anderson, 1990; Wolfe, 1989). Intrinsic, personal, and shared modes of evaluation constitute constraints on use. In capitalist societies we tend to value the dismantling of these constraints to "free up the market." Modernization can be understood, in part, as a process in which market norms are increasingly used to regulate more and more social interactions that previously were produced and distributed by non-market means. Anderson's scheme for organizing values and valuations implies that not all values, benefits, goods, or services should be ordered by means of market norms, nor should attempts to weigh and judge them be turned over to technical analysis. Anderson's analysis suggests that an important process for deciding about the production and distribution of these various goods is vigorous, reflective public discourse. This kind of deliberation can create and improve public values and is an essential feature driving the growing movement toward collaborative decision-making in natural resource planning.

Value Concepts and Models of Democracy

Thus far we have examined discursive concepts of values in relation to economics. A somewhat different angle, one that helps to understand the deliberative process for evaluation, comes from political theory. As developed in this presentation political theory can be conceived as the study of certain processes for how society orders values. Or from Anderson's perspective it is the "shared" mode of valuation (ordering of values) relative to the market or the "use" mode. But what we actually see by comparing political theories of democracy is that the different political theories are somewhat aligned to the different theories of value already identified.

Commonplace notions of democracy often equate it to voting (which renders politics almost indistinguishable from economics). I would like here to outline some of the major competing models of democracy and show how values, conversation, and decision making differ across these views. Two major categories of democracy might be called the Market or Liberal tradition (what most people understand as democracy) and Forum or Discourse views (which recall town hall views of democracy) (see Stanley, 1990). Liberalism refers to interest-based expression of preferences and demands where each person defines her own interests. The function of politics is to aggregate the divergent interests of autonomous civil society. In the pluralist version of liberalism, the goal of democratic decision-making is to decide among polices by maximizing individual welfare assuming individual citizens can best define and judge their own interests. Policy formation is essentially a competition between interests. In the expert or managerial version of liberalism, the search for correct public policies is likened to the search for scientific knowledge, where there is a single correct answer to planning problems. Expert or scientific management presumes that the wants of individuals can be identified and analyzed by technical experts (experts can perfect the market if you will). From the expert/managerial perspective, public participation is a way to increase public support for the delegating authority to experts. Public preferences in the managerial tradition of natural resource management are often registered or ordered using the surrogate tools of economics, allowing managers to evaluate choices through technical procedures that presumably reflect such individual sentiments.

These two models are viewed as liberal because they presume the domain of values to be the province of autonomous individuals that operate in a fixed a priori way in the formation of policy. In contrast forum models presume that values are endogenous to policy deliberations. As Elster (1998, p. 1) notes, forum democracy "revolves around the transformation rather than simply the aggregation of preferences." Forum views of democracy focus on high-level communication processes, which occur within both parliamentary bodies and the informal networks of the public sphere. Alternative formulations of forum models differ in the extent to which they accept a priori the existence of shared values within the polity. In the republican or communitarian view, political discourse seeks the clarification and articulation of a pre-existing common good. The aim of political discourse is the creation of solidarity among citizens. At the other extreme "agnostic" forum models take society to be "composed of diversities that can

nonetheless enjoy moments of communality when, through public deliberations, collective power is used to promote or protect the well-being of a collectivity" (Wolin, cited in Benhabib, 1996; p. 7). Differences are seen as ubiquitous and ineradicable, there is always residual conflict.

Table 2 presents a preliminary attempt to compare these ideas drawing on a number of theorists (Benhabib, 1996; Stanley, 1990; Williams & Matheny, 1994). The table examines the four models of democracy in terms of conceptions of the participants, the processes for ordering of values, the criteria used to judge the outcomes of these processes, the nature of value agreement and consensus, and the form of rationality.

Values as reflected in conceptions of participants suggests the distinction between private values and shared or citizen values. In pluralist and expert models, participants are understood as individual supplicants bearing wants. In communitarian and discursive models participants are social beings embedded in diverse, fluid and overlapping "discursive communities" each with their own system of meaning, forms of knowledge, ways of reasoning, and modes of expression. In the communitarian version, "community member" implies some cohesion with respect to group-defined interests. However, the existence of ingroup-outgoup differences remain problematic -- who shall count as a community member? In the fully discursive or agnostic model, "citizen" implies greater acceptance of social differences but also a duty to a larger polity that might even include non-human nature.

Table 2 Comparison of Models of Democracy

Model of Democracy	Participants	Process	Outcomes	Values/ Consensus	Rationality
Pluralist	Individual Supplicants	Negotiation/ Bargaining	Welfare Maximization (efficient)	Balance of Interests	Instrumental
Expert	Individual Supplicants	Technical/ Scientific	Welfare Maximization (true)	Scientific Understanding	Instrumental
Communitarian	Community Members	Dialogue	Articulation of shared values	Discover Pre-existing Unity	Communicative
Agnostic/ Discursive	Citizens	Dialogue	Civic Education	Episodic Agreement	Communicative

These various models of democracy also support different conceptions of democratic process for ordering values (Lauber & Knuth, 1998). In the pluralist model democracy amounts to mediation, negotiation, or bargaining among competing interests in which all

interests are presumed to be morally equal. Bargaining and negotiation can take the form of lobbying or formal dispute resolution processes. Within natural resource agencies, the planner's role is to be a neutral arbitrator in these multi-party negotiations (see Yaffee & Wondolleck, 1994; Susskind et al. 1999). The expert model takes a more technocratic approach to policy formation. As variant of the pluralist model, in the expert model policy alternatives can be judged by the degree to which they satisfy aggregate citizen preferences (economic efficiency) or, in a scientific variant, policy alternatives can be judged based on "objective" scientific standards of what is technically sound. In contrast to these liberal conceptions of planning process, the forum models emphasize dialogue. While liberal models might involve the public in some form of dialogue (as a form of data gathering), the forum models essentially equate planning with dialogue. Rather than adjudicating between competing interests, planning is understood as recognizing and confronting competing systems of meaning (Dryzek, 1990; Healey, 1997).

Outcomes describe the result of policy analysis and the criteria of good decisions. In the case of pluralist and expert models, the outcome is to seek welfare maximization, understood, respectively, as economic efficiency and technically sound (true). The communitarian view emphasizes discovery of shared values (solidarity) whereas the discursive view involves creating new values through civic education. In the latter case, policy issues are treated as opportunities to learn about social differences. Recognizing social differences forces participants to transform interests into appeals for wider justice (Young, 1996).

Democratic processes must in some way resolve differences in values. In the pluralist model, differences are ubiquitous and the best one can achieve is some optimal balancing of interests (compromise). In the expert model some level of scientific consensus or understanding is sought which points to an "objective" resolution. The communitarian view seeks out some pre-existing unity or shared identity among community members. Finally, the discursive model presumes only episodic agreement. That is the discursive approach differs from the communitarian approach by not presuming any pre-existence of social unity. It emphasizes that politics is always a struggle among differences and that the best one can hope for is episodic agreement (Benhabib, 1996).

In terms of values, a crucial difference among models is that forum models of democracy embody the ideal that citizens can perfect their preferences whereas market/liberal models take values as fixed. Communicative rationality involves giving reasons for our values and preferences, in contrast to instrumental rationality, which assumes that preferences are given and need only be aggregated. In communicative rationality evaluation of the good is determined by better argument.

Though critical theorists generally agree that a discursive approach to environmental planning more accurately reflects the reality of practice and, normatively speaking a more democratic practice, there is strong disagreement regarding the issue of existence or necessity of consensus or unity. The debate is often framed as whether some form of political unity (shared identity) is a necessary precondition for democratic discussion or merely a possible outcome of such discussion. Some see unity to be a prior condition of

deliberation in the form of some "shared understanding" and this appears quite common in the collaborative models (see Selin and Chavez, 1995). Others talk about the search for consensus and even of discovering public values as an outcome of such processes (Cortner, 1996). In this latter view the task of moving from subjective preferences associated with a pluralist view to more objective views of collective problems is often viewed as a process of discovering or constructing consensus.

Young (1996) identifies several problems with assuming a pre-existing unity or seeking consensus as a planning goal. First, the technological complexity and social pluralism characteristic of modern society cast doubt on the possibility of a common understanding of a given policy question. In fact, in many planning situations and even in collaboration among experts, differences in worldviews and vocabularies are often impediments to collective action (Brown, 1987; Busenberg, 1999). Second, if discussion succeeds primarily when it applies to what the discussants all share then none of the participants need revise their viewpoints in order to take account of perspectives of others. Third, viewing consensus as the central feature of collaborative processes tends to enfranchise those already empowered. This results because appeals to the common good are likely to perpetuate the differentials in social position, power and resources. Benhabib (1996, p. 8) goes even further noting that the challenge is not just a pluralism of values and world views, but "pluralism 'at the axiological level' which recognizes the impossibility of ever adjudicating without contest and without residue among competing visions of the good, of justice, and of the political." At its best democratic consensus is ephemeral and episodic.

Still, some minimal social unity is generally acknowledged as necessary to constitute a polity. Even Young (1996) has proposed that unity within the polity, while not a precondition for or outcome of deliberative processes, may simply be the result of people having to co-exist in a shared space (see also Healey, 1997; Kemmis, 1990). A minimal unity that makes possible and motivates political action is that people find "themselves in geographic proximity and economic interdependence such that the activities and pursuits of some affect the ability of others to conduct their own activities" (Young, 1996, p. 126). Kemmis (1990) for example, characterizes the history of American political institutions as intentionally designed to "keep people apart" politically and spatially, which has undermined the formation of the "civic virtues" necessary for working together in a shared place. Similarly, Healey (1997) describes collaborative planning as shaping shared space despite our differences or "making sense together while living differently." Young sets out three conditions for this kind of minimal unity: Significant interdependence (i.e., geographic proximity), formally equal respect, and agreed-on procedures.

Positions on unity or value consensus generally break down to whether one adopts a consensus theory of society (Durkheim) or a conflict theory (Weber). Communitarians, not surprisingly, tend to take the consensus road, post-modernists the conflict road. In the communitarian approach, society is maintained through shared opinions, norms and values and social order exists to the extent that there is tacit agreement on these. By this account, the purpose of public participation is to reveal the collective conscious that

already exists. In the conflict theory, ruling groups impose their values upon others and there is no collective agreement on values. By this account, the purpose of public participation is to facilitate conflict and redistribute power. By either account, however, participation is superior to its alternative. "Communitarians have shown that despite the intentions of liberal political theory and modern social science to make of politics a primarily technical matter, it remains a moral one. Postmodernists remind us that community must not exclude any members and that the genuine mix of all in the intellectual and political process will be the best guarantee against the tyranny of one or a few groups" (Challenger, 1994, p. 211). The aim is primarily about reaching understanding of others, and only secondarily about reaching consensus on courses of action.

Conclusions

So where has this journey through theories of valuation and democracy taken us? My main argument is that meaningful public involvement presupposes the possibility of value transformation through the exercise of public reason. Economic and social psychological theories of value that maintain the assumption of fixed preferences need to be augmented by discursive theories of value if the field is to adequately embrace public involvement. Further, there exist both theories of valuation and theories of democratic decision making that build on the presumption that conversation is an essential process for the transformation of values. The science of values applied to natural resource decision-making needs to be enlarged to include theories that recognize values (or more accurately valuation) as continuously produced through social interaction. Similarly, the ambivalence in professional understanding of public involvement can be overcome by adopting views of democratic processes (planning and decision-making) that recognize the aim of public involvement is not to take stock of public values, but to transform them. So long as we cling to the view that preferences are immutable, we can't expect citizens to transcend their own subjective valuations and seek a more general understanding of an issue.

Literature Cited

Alverson, W. S., Kuhlmann, W., & Waller, D. (1994). Wild forests: Conservation biology and public policy. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Anderson, E. (1990). The ethical limitations of the market. Economics and Philosophy, 6, 179-205.

Benhabib, S. (1996). The democratic moment and the problem of difference. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political (pp. 3-18). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Brown, D. A. (1987). Ethics, science, and environmental regulation. Environmental Ethics, 9, 331-349.

Busenberg, G. J. (1999). Collaborative and adversarial analysis in environmental policy. Policy Sciences, 32(1), 1-11.

Challenger, D. F. (1994). Durkheim through the lens of Aristotle: Durkheim, postmodernist, and communitarian responses to the Enlightenment. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Committee of Scientists (1999). Sustaining the people's land: Recommendations for stewardship of the national forests and grasslands into the next century. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Cortner, H. (1996). Public involvement and interaction. In A. Ewert (Ed.), Natural resource management: The human dimension (pp. 167-179). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Cortner, H. J., & Moote, M. A. (1999). The politics of ecosystem management. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Daniels, S. E., & Walker, G. B. (forthcoming). Working through environmental conflict: The collaborative learning approach. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (1990). Discursive democracy: Politics, policy, and political science. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dustin, D. L. (1992). The dance of the dispossessed: On patriarchy, feminism and the practice of leisure science. Journal of Leisure Research, 24, 324-332.

Ebel, F. W. (2000). Science should come before politics. The Forestry Source, 5(6), 1.

Elster, J. (1998). Deliberative democracy. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Healey, P. (1997). Collaborative planning: Shaping places in fragmented societies. Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press.

Kemmis, D. (1990). Community and the politics of place. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Lauber, T. B., & Knuth, B. A. (1998). Refining our vision of citizen participation: Lessons from a moose reintroduction proposal. Society and Natural Resources, 11, 411-424.

Norton, B. G. (1991). Toward unity among environmentalists. New York: Oxford University Press.

Putnam, R. (2000). Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Sagoff, M. (1998). Aggregation and deliberation in valuing environmental public goods: A look beyond contingent pricing. Ecological Economics, 24, 213-230.

Sagoff, M. (1988). Some problems with environmental economics. Environmental Ethics, 10(Spring), 55-74.

Selin, S., & Chavez, D. (1995). Developing a collaborative model for environmental planning and management. Environmental Management, 19(2), 189-195.

Stanley, M. (1990). The rhetoric of the commons: Forum discourse in politics and society. In H. W. Simons (Ed.), The rhetorical turn: Invention and persuasion in the conduct of inquiry (pp. 238-257). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Susskind, L. E., Levy, P. F., & Thomas-Larmer, J. (1999). Negotiating environmental agreements: How to avoid escalating confrontations, needless costs, and unnecessary litigation. Washington, DC: Island Press.

Thomas, J. W., & Burchfield, J. (1999). Comments on "the religion of forestry: scientific management. Journal of Forestry, 97(11), 10-13.

Wellman, J. D., & Tipple, T. J. (1990). Public forestry and direct democracy. The Environmental Professional, 12, 77-86.

Williams, B. A., & Metheny, A. R. (1995). Democracy, dialogue, and environmental disputes: The contested languages of social regulation. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Webler, T., & Renn, O. (1995). A brief primer on participation: Philosophy and practices. In Renn, O., Webler, T., & Wiedemann, P. (Eds.), Fairness and competence in citizen participation: Evaluating models for environmental discourse (pp. 17-33). Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Wolfe, A. (1989). Whose keepers? Social science and moral obligation. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Yaffee, S. L., & Wondolleck, J. M. (1994). Negotiating survival: An assessment of the potential use of alternative dispute resolution techniques for resolving conflict between endangered species and development (Report to the Administrative Conference of the United States). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan, School of Natural Resources and Environment.

Yankelovich, D. (1991). Coming to public judgment: Making democracy work in a complex world. Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.

Young, I. M. (1996). Communication and the other: Beyond deliberative democracy. In S. Benhabib (Ed.), Democracy and difference: Contesting the boundaries of the political (pp. 121-135). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.