

CONFLICT AND COOPERATION ON THE SCHELDT RIVER BASIN

ENVIRONMENT & POLICY

VOLUME 17

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

Conflict and Cooperation on the Scheldt River Basin

A Case Study of Decision Making on International Scheldt Issues between 1967 and 1997

by

Sander V. Meijerink

*Delft University of Technology,
Delft, The Netherlands*



SPRINGER-SCIENCE+BUSINESS MEDIA, B.V.

A C.I.P. Catalogue record for this book is available from the Library of Congress.

ISBN 978-90-481-5194-3

ISBN 978-94-015-9200-0 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-94-015-9200-0

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved

© 1999 Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht

Originally published by Kluwer Academic Publishers in 1999

Softcover reprint of the hardcover 1st edition 1999

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

"Cooperation is in a dialectical relationship with discord, and they must be understood together. Thus to understand cooperation, one must also understand the frequent absence of, or failure of, cooperation."

Robert O. Keohane, International Studies Quarterly

To Chantal

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part I:		
Introduction, Theory, and Case Study Design		1
1	INTRODUCTION	3
1.1	Background	3
1.1.1	International river issues	3
1.1.2	Decision making on international river issues	4
1.1.3	International policies and steering concepts	5
1.1.4	International Scheldt issues	6
1.2	Research objective and problem statement	8
1.3	Research characteristics	9
1.4	Relevance	9
1.4.1	Theoretical relevance	9
1.4.2	Practical relevance	10
1.5	Outline of thesis	10
2	DECISION MAKING ON INTERNATIONAL RIVER ISSUES	13
2.1	Introduction	13
2.2	Main theoretical concepts of the network perspective on decision making	13
2.2.1	Positioning of the network perspective on decision making	14
2.2.2	Multi-actor structures of interdependence	15
2.2.3	Strategies and positions	16
2.2.4	Strategic interaction, games, and decision making rounds	19
2.2.5	Perceptions, issues, and issue-areas	21
2.2.6	Games, networks, and context	22
2.2.7	Learning	25
2.2.8	Evaluation of decision making	29
2.3	Characteristics of decision making on international river issues	30
2.3.1	Decision making on international issues	31
2.3.2	Decision making on international river issues	33
2.4	A conceptual framework for the analysis and explanation of decision making on international river issues	41

3	CASE STUDY DESIGN	45
3.1	Introduction	45
3.2	Toward a predictive theory of decision making on international river issues?	45
3.3	A case study of decision making on international Scheldt issues	47
	3.3.1 A case study strategy	47
	3.3.2 A single case study covering a long time span	47
3.4	Elaboration of the problem statement and formulation of research questions	48
	3.4.1 Descriptive research questions	48
	3.4.2 Explanatory research questions	50
	3.4.3 Prescriptive research question	51
3.5	Data collection	52
	3.5.1 Methods of data collection	52
	3.5.2 Data sources	52
3.6	Guide for the reader	53
 Part II:		
The Scheldt Case		55
 4	 CONTEXT OF DECISION MAKING ON INTERNATIONAL SCHELDT ISSUES	 57
4.1	Introduction	57
4.2	The Scheldt basin	57
	4.2.1 Hydrographic description	57
	4.2.2 River functions	58
4.3	International Scheldt issues	60
	4.3.1 The issue-area of the maritime access to the port of Antwerp	61
	4.3.2 The issue-area of water and sediment pollution in the Scheldt basin	62
4.4	Underlying hydrological structure of the issues at stake	63
4.5	International context	64
	4.5.1 Decision making on other international water management issues	64
	4.5.2 Decision making on general water management policies	67
4.6	Cultural context	68
	4.6.1 Introduction	68
	4.6.2 Cultural differences between Scheldt basin states and regions	69
	4.6.3 Dutch decision making culture	72
	4.6.4 Belgian decision making culture	74

4.6.5	French decision making culture	75
4.6.6	Trends in the development of the decision making cultures in the Scheldt basin states	76
4.7	Intranational context	78
4.7.1	Developments in French water management	78
4.7.2	Developments in Belgian water management	79
4.7.3	Developments in Dutch water management	82
4.7.4	Comparison and analysis of developments in the Scheldt basin states and regions	83
4.8	Historical context	85
4.9	Conclusions	90
5	PREPARATION OF THREE DRAFT CONVENTIONS AND A TOTAL DEADLOCK (1967-1985)	93
5.1	Introduction	93
5.2	Reconstruction of the decision making process (1967-1985)	93
	Selection of crucial decisions, and distinction between decision making rounds	93
	Round I: Dutch linkage of Scheldt and Meuse issues (1967-1968)	95
	Round II: Preparation of three draft conventions (1969-1975)	96
	Round III: Internal Belgian disagreement (1975-1983)	100
	Round IV: Dutch linkage of the 48'/43'/38' deepening programme to Meuse water management issues (1983-1985)	103
5.3	Analysis and explanation of the decision making rounds I to IV	108
	5.3.1 Influence of perceptions of actors involved in the decision making rounds I to IV on their strategies	108
	5.3.2 Strategic interaction and institutionalization processes	112
	5.3.3 Learning processes	114
	5.3.4 Influence of the context on the perceptions and strategies of the Scheldt basin states and regions	114
5.4	Conclusions	116
6	LABORIOUS NEGOTIATIONS AND THE BREAK-THROUGH (1985-1993)	119
6.1	Introduction	119
6.2	Reconstruction of the decision making process (1985-1993)	119
	Selection of crucial decisions, and distinction between decision making rounds	119
	Round V: Modification of the declaration of intent of 1985 (1985-1987)	121
	Round VI: Negotiation commission Biesheuvel-Davignon (1987-1989)	123

	Round VII: Negotiation commission Biesheuvel-Poppe (1989-1991)	126
	Round VIII: Dutch and Belgian draft conventions (1991-1992)	131
	Round IX: The break-through (1992-1993)	140
6.3	Analysis and explanation of the decision making rounds V to IX	150
	6.3.1 Influence of perceptions of actors involved in the decision making rounds V to IX on their strategies	151
	6.3.2 Strategic interactions and institutionalization processes	161
	6.3.3 Learning processes	162
	6.3.4 Influence of the context on the perceptions and strategies of the Scheldt basin states and regions	163
6.4	Conclusions	165
7	CONCLUSION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE WATER CONVENTIONS (1993-1997)	167
7.1	Introduction	167
7.2	Reconstruction of the decision making process (1993-1997)	167
	Selection of crucial decisions, and distinction between decision making rounds	167
	Round Xa: Bilateral negotiations (1993-1994)	169
	Round Xb: Multilateral negotiations and the Flemish decision to re-establish the linkage between bilateral and multilateral issues (1993-1994)	172
	Round XI: A Flemish-Dutch agreement and the conclusion of the water conventions (1994-1995)	180
	Round XIIa: Preparation of the first Scheldt Action Programme (1995-1997)	188
	Round XIIb: Implementation of the Convention on the deepening of the navigation channel in the Western Scheldt (1995-1997)	194
7.3	Analysis and explanation of the decision making rounds Xa to XIIb	206
	7.3.1 Influence of perceptions of actors involved in the decision making rounds Xa to XIIb on their strategies	206
	7.3.2 Strategic interactions and institutionalization processes	215
	7.3.3 Learning processes	217
	7.3.4 Influence of the context on the perceptions and strategies of the Scheldt basin states and regions	218
	7.3.5 Decision making on nature restoration	220
7.4	Conclusions	221

Part III:		
Conclusions, Recommendations, and Final Discussion		225
8	CONCLUSIONS	227
8.1	Introduction	227
8.2	Answers to descriptive research questions	227
8.3	Answers to explanatory research questions	228
	8.3.1 Influence of perceptions of the actors involved in decision making on international Scheldt issues on their strategies	229
	8.3.2 Strategic interaction and institutionalization processes	233
	8.3.3 Learning processes	236
	8.3.4 Influence of the context on the perceptions and strategies of the Scheldt basin states and regions	238
8.4	Additional conclusions	243
	8.4.1 The effectiveness of international river commissions	243
	8.4.2 Different geographical scales for dealing with international river issues	244
	8.4.3 The role of individual persons in decision making	245
	8.4.4 The relation between international and intranational decision making	245
9	SOLVING UPSTREAM-DOWNSTREAM PROBLEMS	247
9.1	Introduction	247
9.2	Possibilities of prescription	247
9.3	Lessons learned	248
9.4	A typology of strategies that may contribute to the solution of upstream-downstream problems in international river basins	249
	9.4.1 Individual basin states	250
	9.4.2 The European Union	257
	9.4.3 Intermediaries	259
10	FINAL DISCUSSION	261
10.1	Introduction	261
10.2	Evaluation of methodological choices	261
10.3	Evaluation of theoretical choices	262
10.4	Experience with doing international research	263
10.5	Evaluation of research results	264
10.6	Recommendations for further research	265

References	267
A. Literature	269
B. Official documents	281
C. Files	283
D. Newspaper articles	288
E. Respondents/Informants	290
Appendices	295
1. List of Figures	297
2. List of Tables	299
3. Glossary	301
4. Abbreviations	307
5. Hydrographic description of the Scheldt basin	311
6. Administrative organization of water management in the Scheldt basin	317
7. Map Rhine, Meuse, and Scheldt river basins	327
8. Map Scheldt basin	329
9. Map Scheldt estuary	331
10. Alignment of Baalhoek Canal	333
11. Alignment of Bath Canal	335
12. Series of decisions in decision making rounds I to XIIIb (1967-1997)	337
13. Commissions and working groups where international Scheldt issues were discussed	345
Summary	347
About the author	359

Acknowledgements

Working on one research project for four years is an ambivalent undertaking. On the one hand as a Ph.D. student you sometimes realize the luxury of being able to concentrate on one research topic, and to plan your own work. On the other hand, because of the solitary work, the mostly slow progress, and the permanent uncertainties involved you sometimes wonder why you have ever taken up this academic challenge. I have not yet found the definite answer, but intellectual interest and ambition certainly have been important drives. Although writing a Ph.D. thesis in the nature of things is a solitary task, it is impossible to complete a thesis without the help of many others contributing to the results in as many different ways.

First of all, I would like to thank my supervisor, prof.mr. J. Wessel, professor of water law and administration at the Faculty of Civil Engineering, who has always put trust in me and my work. His catching enthusiasm for everything related to water and rivers formed an important stimulus for writing the book at hand, and his extensive international network enabled me to orientate myself internationally. During my studies I was given the opportunity to visit France, Germany, and Hungary twice, Canada, and our southern neighbours countless times. Even after his retirement prof. Wessel was prepared to continue our frequent and intensive interactions on my Scheldt research.

Furthermore, I am much indebted to the Directorate-General for Public Works, and Water Management of the Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works, and Water Management (Rijkswaterstaat). This organization enabled me to participate in a long term research project on the integrated management of the river Scheldt basin, and generously supplied the normally poor Ph.D. payment. The intensive contacts with Rijkswaterstaat made it possible to address the practise of international water management, and preserved me from becoming an armchair scholar. An organization, however, always is represented by persons. During the past years I have contacted many civil servants of the Ministry who all have one thing in common: their fascination for the river Scheldt. I have not forgotten the persons from the very beginning: Eelke Turkstra of the Regional Directorate Zeeland, and Roel Zijlmans at that time employed at the General Directorate, who introduced me to the technical and political problems in the Scheldt basin. In a later stage of the research, they were succeeded by Frans de Bruijckere and Leo Santbergen of the Regional Directorate Zeeland, and Carel de Villeneuve of the General Directorate. I would like to thank Leo for being helpful with the establishment of cross-border contacts, and Carel for the careful reading of my manuscripts and the many interesting conversations giving me a glimpse behind the scenes of international diplomacy. Henk Smit and Albert Holland of the Research Institute for Coastal and Marine Management arranged a temporary working place for me in Middelburg, and with that largely facilitated the data collection. Finally, I would like to thank Wim van Leussen, at that time employed at the same institute, who has always shown interest in me and my research.

Apart from the representatives of the Dutch Ministry of Transport, Public Works, and Water Management, I am grateful to mister J.-M. Wauthier of the Ministry of the Walloon Region, and mister M. Grandmougin of the Water Agency Artois-Picardie (France). They were willing to welcome me to their organizations, and with that enabled me to study the water management in the upstream parts of the Scheldt basin.

The research was carried out at the Department of Water, Environmental, and Sanitary Engineering of the Faculty of Civil Engineering, and the Centre for Research on River Basin Administration, Analysis and Management (RBA Centre). Although I am not

a civil engineer by education, and not even an engineer, the colleagues at the department and the RBA Centre made me feel home in Delft. I would like to mention three persons in particular: Pieter Huisman, Herbert Berger and prof. dr. M. Donze. Pieter made an important contribution to my research by pointing out to the work of Hofstede on cultural differences between nation states. Herbert, who was involved in the project during the first years, introduced me to the peculiarities of working in an academic environment, and gave a short course on managing relationships with professors. I will never forget the statements made by prof. Donze who, among other things, taught me that a Ph.D. thesis consists of porridge and the best bits ('pap en krenten'), and that a Ph.D. student should write one page of his thesis a day at least.

Prof.dr.ir. W. Thissen of the Faculty of Systems Engineering, Policy Analysis, and Management, and prof. dr. J. Soeters of the Royal Military Academy (KMA) were my main academic contacts out of the Faculty of Civil Engineering. I am much indebted to professor Thissen for faithfully attending the meetings of my supervising team, and for always putting his finger on the problems. Several discussions in Breda with professor Soeters on the 'cultural factor' and the methodological aspects of social science were really inspiring, and have contributed much to the final results. The other members of the steering group I did not mention above did all one way or another make a contribution to this research. I am grateful to prof. dr. J. de Jong of the Faculty of Civil Engineering, prof.dr. P. Glasbergen of the University of Utrecht, and prof.dr. E. Somers of the University of Ghent (Belgium) for their willingness to become a member of the defence commission.

Besides the experts involved in the supervision, I am grateful to the forty respondents who were willing to spend their valuable time to inform me on the latest developments in the international arenas. In the references their names are included.

My direct colleagues in the Scheldt project were Jeroen Maartense, Paul Verlaan and Jos Timmermans. With Jeroen I spent many hours discussing possibilities of interdisciplinary research and formulating joint research proposals. Although our efforts did not bear much fruit, they belonged to the most enjoyable parts of my Ph.D. study. Paul, always good-humoured, a great sense of perspective, and the expert in administrative ranks. Unfortunately, most research topics he addressed were too difficult for me. Jos joined the project in a later stage. Our discussions on decision making and policy analysis helped me a lot to better understand my own research.

In addition to the many professional contacts, my family contributed to the completion of my studies. Jeroen, thank you for stimulating me to cross the river IJssel, and to move to the western part of the Netherlands. For more than one reason you were right! Although I have never regretted the choice to start a Ph.D. study in Delft, born in the 'Achterhoek' I can hardly suppress a feeling of relief now I am able to leave the ant hill called 'Randstad'. My parents have always stimulated me to continue my studies simply because they observed that I really enjoy learning. Finally, I mention Chantal, to whom I dedicate this book, for her invaluable practical and moral support. I am fortunate to have a partner who knows what it means to be a Ph.D. student.

Sander Meijerink

Zwolle, December 1998