

# Elusive publics

## Citation for published version (APA):

Mitzschke, A. (2018). *Elusive publics: understanding techno-scientific controversy and democratic governance in the GM crops debate*. Datawyse / Universitaire Pers Maastricht. <https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20181220am>

## Document status and date:

Published: 01/01/2018

## DOI:

[10.26481/dis.20181220am](https://doi.org/10.26481/dis.20181220am)

## Document Version:

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

## 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.umlib.nl/taverne-license](http://www.umlib.nl/taverne-license)

## Take down policy

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

[repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:repository@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

providing details and we will investigate your claim.

## **Stellingen**

behorende bij het proefschrift

### **ELUSIVE PUBLICS**

Understanding Techno-Scientific Controversy and Democratic Governance  
in the GM Crops Debate

Andreas Mitzschke

1. In public controversies about the risks and benefits of genetically modified (GM) crops, different actor groups construct multiple issue-based publics.
2. Issue-based publics are no fixed entity. They are continuously and sometimes strategically constructed according to the changing issues and objects around transgenic crop technology.
3. When trying to understand the democratisation of techno-science, STS scholars benefit greatly from engaging with political science literature on democracy.
4. When studying the relationship between technological and democratic development in a globalising world from a cultural perspective, the nation state is not an adequate unit of analysis. Instead, it is more fruitful to study the flows of technology and publics not contained by national boundaries.
5. For understanding debates about GM crop toxicological risk assessment, questions about the financial, professional, and material attachments of the actors involved in the debate are as important as issues of method, experimental design, and data interpretation (cf. chapter 2).
6. In cases of scientific disagreement and uncertainty, the assessment of the reliability and trustworthiness of scientific knowledge is complicated by varying definitions of how to draw the boundary between science and politics (cf. chapter 2).
7. The imaginaries different actors construct in the debate about GM crops are normative visions of what is 'good' for society. Such visions are based on present interpretations of the past that get projected into the future (cf. chapter 3).
8. European publics can learn from Indian publics about the heterodoxy of democratic discourse and engagement (cf. chapter 4).
9. The knowledge created in public debate about genetically modified crops is caught in a paradox: Despite efforts to democratise policy-making on GM crop technology through public engagement exercises, policy-makers favour scientific expert knowledge to justify their decisions (cf. chapter 4).
10. The path of the researcher resembles the path of the yogi: only continuous engagement with the practice can bring light into darkness.