
Cogent Science in Context

The Science Wars, Argumentation Theory, and Habermas

William Rehg

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

© 2009 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

For information about special quantity discounts, please email special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu.

This book was set in Baskerville by SNP Best-set Typesetter Ltd., Hong Kong, and was printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Rehg, William.

Cogent science in context : the science wars, argumentation theory, and Habermas / William Regh.

p. cm.—(Studies in contemporary German social thought)

Includes bibliographical references (p.) and index.

ISBN 978-0-262-18271-3 (hardcover : alk. paper)

1. Habermas, Jürgen. 2. Science—Philosophy. 3. Debates and debating. 4. Persuasion (Rhetoric). I. Title.

B3258.H324R444 2009

121—dc22

2008029433

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Index

- Accountability, 114, 222–227, 249, 262–263, 283. *See also* Validity claims
ethnomethodology and, 218–221
Habermas on, 114–120, 136
- Achinstein, Peter, 81–98, 146–148, 201
- Action types. *See* Theory of communicative action
- Actor network theory (ANT), 71–74, 244, 255
- Adequacy
dialogical, 154, 185–187, 195
empirical, 80, 104, 146–148, 185–188, 195, 206–208, 249
- Analytic-evaluative perspectives. *See*
Perspectivist framework; Dialectical perspective; Logical perspective; Rhetorical perspective; Social-institutional perspective
- ANT. *See* Actor network theory (ANT)
- Argument, 25, 246, 249, 269–272, 287–291
dialectically robust (responsive), 133–138, 145–146, 172–173, 181–183
evidential, 34, 88–90, 93–96, 176, 247
as product (*see* Product)
- Argumentation
aims of scientific argument-making (representative, justificatory, communicative), 97–98, 146–147, 283
argumentative practices in science, 8, 17, 30, 43, 67, 97–98
and bias (*see* Bias)
and context of discovery (*see* Context, of discovery; Experimental practice)
as cooperative judgment formation, 139–141
as dialectical procedure, 24–29, 30, 133–134
in the laboratory or at the research site, 18–19, 75, 133, 141, 149 (*see also* Experimental practice)
multidimensional nature of, 24, 28–29, 245–246 (*see also* Perspectivist framework; Cogency, as multidimensional)
as process (*see* Perspectivist framework; Process)
as social practice, 9, 24–25, 33, 51, 146–147, 269
substantial, 23, 34, 60–64, 132, 142–143, 267, 272–273
- Argumentation studies. *See* Argumentation theory
- Argumentation theory, 4–9, 22–25, 30–32, 245–246
contextualist (*see* Critical contextualism)
and Habermas, 129–161, 180–193, 270, 303n13, 303n14
informal logic, 20, 23–24, 106
perspectivism, 25, 30, 266 (*see also* Perspectivist framework)
rhetorical turn, 9, 20–23
- Argument-making practices. *See* Argumentation
- Aristotle, 20–21, 65–69, 140–142, 151, 224, 254–255. *See also* Rhetoric, Aristotelian
- Auxiliary assumptions, 35, 37, 134, 201–202
- Barbour, Ian, 290–292
- Barnes, Barry, 51, 196–199
- Beller, Mara, 273

- Bias, 69, 112, 125, 149–150, 201, 250, 273–274, 280–284, 288
 at CDF, 172–176, 181–182
 masculine, 149, 228–232, 274
 at NAS, 256, 259–264, 280
- Bloor, David, 51–52, 78, 196–199
- Boffey, Phillip, 261–267, 279–280, 284. *See also* Sunshine rule
- Bohr, Niels, 273
- Boundary concepts, 6–9, 21, 30, 208, 214, 297n3
- Burke, Kenneth, 20–21, 65
- Carnap, Rudolf, 31, 37–38, 41, 82, 86–87, 173
- Cases/examples
 AIDS research, 234–235
 behavioral biology, 203–207, 214, 235
 Bohr's quantum theory, 273
 CDF Evidence paper, 169–186, 190, 272–273 (*see also* CDF collaboration)
 creationist-Darwinist debate, 1–2, 68, 70, 124, 206–207, 214, 290–293
 dinosaur extinction controversy, 281–282
 DNA structure, 273–274
 Galvani-Volta debate, 58–61
 Geiger-Müller counter, 166–168
 global warming (*see* Climate change debate)
 K-T boundary layer, 225
 lone genius, 149–151 (*see also* Cases/examples, Rous, Peyton; Cases/examples, McClintock, Barbara)
 McClintock, Barbara, 149–150
 NAS panels on diet and health, 242–249, 254–268, 273, 279–280, 285, 288–290
 Pasteur, 72–76
 Rous, Peyton, 149–151
 terminally ill comatose patient, 141–145
 Thomson on cathode rays, 82–87, 90–93, 148
 Wittgenstein's counting by twos, 238
 women in science, 228–230, 272
- Case studies, tasks of, 163–165
- CAST. *See* Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST)
- Cathode rays, 82–85, 90–91, 148, 165
- CDF collaboration, 163–193, 266–267, 272
 kinematic analysis, 176–180
 SLT group analysis, 173–176
- CERN, 168–169
- C_H. *See* Habermas's conception of cogency
- Climate change debate, 2–3, 189, 191
- Cloud chamber, 165–166
- Cog(A), 278–281, 293
- Cogency, 2–14, 130. *See also* Perspectivist framework
 and Achinstein's theory of evidence, 87–90, 95–97, 130 (*see also* Cogency, as impersonal merits; Logical perspective)
 as boundary concept, 6–8 (*see also* Boundary concepts)
 and costs of error, 235
 and critical contextualism, 250, 266–267, 277–284 (*see also* Cog(A))
 and ethnomethodology, 49–53, 222–224
 Habermas's theory of, 130–131, 138, 144–151, 154, 197–198
 as impersonal merits, 34, 41, 55, 88, 97, 130
 and Kuhnian paradigms, 42–49, 62
 Latour's rhetorical conception of, 77 (*see also* Rhetorical perspective)
 logical theory of (Hempel), 34, 40–43, 55–56, 130
 as multidimensional, 8, 25, 129, 146–151, 249–254, 258, 266
 Pera's dialectical conception of, 64 (*see also* Dialectical perspective)
 Prelli's rhetorical conception of (RC), 67 (*see also* Rhetorical perspective)
 and process ideals, 136
 and Rorty, 156–157
 and the sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK), 49–56
 usage, 4, 7, 30, 55
- Communicative action, 104–105, 111–112. *See also* Theory of communicative action
- Concrete audience, 79–80, 137. *See also* Ideal universal audience
- Confirmation, 32–41, 55, 81–82, 86, 249, 298n2
- Content merits, 132, 176, 251–253, 271–275, 282–283, 287–288, 291
 and the reception of *DNC*, 258–259, 263
- Context, 13–14, 249, 253, 293–294
 context-transcendence, 106, 115, 214–216, 224–227, 242
 dialogical context, 104, 250
 of discovery, 18, 33, 42, 45, 48–49
 as domain or discipline, 227–230, 241
 further evaluative contexts (C_E), 278, 281 (*see also* Cog(A))
 further relevant contexts (C_R), 278, 281, 293 (*see also* Cog(A))
 of justification, 20, 33, 41–42, 45, 49

- local, 53, 217–219, 224, 236, 242, 246, 264
 as locale, 227–230, 241–242, 251–253, 272, 310n10
 material, 18
 of origin (C_o), 278–281 (*see also* $Cog(A)$)
 public, 246–248, 260–265, 288
 rhetorical, 23, 174, 241, 246, 294
 scientists as functioning in multiple, 238, 242, 282
 social context in argumentative evaluation, 24, 53, 130, 151–156, 237, 271–274
 social-psychological, 140, 145, 151–152, 159, 271
 Contextualism
 critical (*see* Critical contextualism)
 epistemological, 214, 308n7
 ethnomethodological, 53, 214–231
 and Habermas, 139–145, 160, 253, 266, 270–274
 semantic, 302n2, 302n3
 Conventionalism. *See* Relativism
 Council for Agricultural Science and Technology (CAST), 259–260, 267–269, 279
 Creationism, 1, 68, 70, 124, 206–207, 214, 290–293
 Credit, 157–161, 177–179, 184, 191, 217
 Critical contextualism, 8, 124, 214–215, 231–239, 265–268, 284–295
 and CDF, 272–273
 and Habermas's discourse theory, 270–274
 and Kuhn's Gap, 269–278
 prescriptive character of, 277–284
 Critical science studies (CSS), 7, 195–209, 230, 275–287, 295
 Critical (social) theory, 103, 105, 101–127
 and empirical sociology (ESW, SSK), 196–209, 222–223 (*see also* Ethnomethodology of scientific work; Sociology of scientific knowledge)
 and formal pragmatics, 109
 CSS. *See* Critical science studies (CSS)

 Dalitz, Richard, 177–179
 Dawkins, Richard, 291–292
 Deliberative democracy, 105, 112, 122–123, 180, 236, 280–281, 286–290, 293
 Demos, 279–281, 288–289
 Dennett, Daniel, 291
 Descriptive-normative approach, 53. *See also* Prescriptive-normative approach

 Dialectic, 59, 76, 134
 Dialectical level (Habermas's), 132–138
 Dialectical perspective, 24, 27, 30, 59–65. *See also* Perspectivist framework
 CDF Evidence paper and, 169–172, 181–184 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper)
 and Habermas, 131–138, 145, 181–184, 304n3
 and NAS, 256–258
 Dialectical rules, 27–28, 59–61, 134, 182
 Dialectical situation, 27, 61–62, 79–80, 144, 169, 182
 Dialectic of inquiry, 19
 Dialogical level. *See also* Dialectical perspective; Rhetorical perspective
 combines rhetorical and dialectical perspectives, 145
 internally related to the logical perspective, 146–148
 internally related to the social-institutional perspective, 151–157, 216–217
 Dialogical merits, 145–148, 151–160, 184–190, 200, 250–251
Diet, Nutrition, and Cancer (DNC), 244–248, 258–268, 285
 Discourse theory (Habermas), 8, 101–102, 126–127, 151–157, 270, 292. *See also* Validity claims
 discourse types, 113, 123–124
 holistic character, 208–209
 as implying a multidimensional conception of cogency, 151
 Discursive dilemma, 306n16
DNC. See Diet, Nutrition and, Cancer (DNC)
 Douglas, Heather, 234–235
 Dramaturgical analysis of self-presentation, 243–249

 Edinburgh School, 51, 196
 Eemeren, Frans H., van, 7
 Emancipation, social, 105, 122–126, 199, 205–206, 223, 234. *See also* Good society
 Error accounts, 115, 118–120, 224
 ES-evidence. *See* Evidence
 ESW. *See* Ethnomethodology of scientific work (ESW)
 Ethnomethodology, 50–53, 71–72, 129, 160, 213–233, 271. *See also* Ethnomethodology of scientific work
 central recommendation of, 221
 Ethnomethodology of scientific work (ESW), 214–215, 217–226, 230, 237, 241

- Ethos*, 68–69, 131, 140–144, 153, 282, 289
- CDF Evidence paper and, 171, 177–179, 183–185 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper)
- NAS and, 254–258
- Evidence
- Achinstein's theory of, 82–87, 89–92
 - and argument, 249
 - ES-, 89–98, 148
 - potential, 85–96, 148
 - veridical, 85–96, 148
- Evolutionary theory, 1–3, 13, 43, 206, 282, 290–292
- Experimental practice, 18–19, 121–122, 133
- and argumentation, 18, 121–122
- Expertise, 109, 138–144, 235–236, 280, 284, 287–288, 292
- at CDF, 177–178, 183–184
 - at NAS, 244–249, 255, 258
- Falsification, 35–37, 42, 115, 168
- Feminism, 199, 201–202, 205, 228–234, 272, 280
- Fennema, Owen, 259
- Fermilab. *See* CDF collaboration
- Finitism, 51, 236–238
- Formal-logical perspective. *See* Logical perspective
- Formal pragmatics, 103, 109–114, 122, 135–136, 157
- and ESW, 215–216, 222–224
 - as theory of meaning, 111, 129
 - of truth (*see* Truth, Habermas's formal pragmatics of)
- Frankfurt School, 11, 103, 196, 215
- Franklin, Rosalind, 273–274
- Frisch, Henry, 180, 185–186
- Fuller, Steve, 5, 277
- Galison, Peter, 165–167
- Gaonkar, Dilip Parameshwar, 22, 164
- Garfinkel, Harold, 12, 217–222
- Gero, Joan, 228–229
- Goffman, Erving, 243–244. *See also* Dramaturgical analysis of self-presentation
- Goldstein, Gary, 177–179
- Good society, 14, 125, 235, 294–295. *See also* Emancipation, social
- Goodwin, Jean, 245–246
- Gould, Stephen Jay, 291
- Grootendorst, Rob, 7
- Habermas, Jürgen, 11–13, 27–28. *See also* Argumentation theory; Critical (social) theory; Truth
- argumentation theory and compromise, 184–193, 216
 - process idealizations (*see* Process idealizations)
 - sociological analysis of truth (*see* Truth, sociological analysis of)
 - three-dimensional perspectivism, 266
 - on “world” as opposed to “reality,” 303n8
- Habermas's conception of cogency (C_H), 154–155, 187, 197–198
- Hales, Steven, 237
- Haught, John, 290–292
- (HD). *See* Hypothetical-deductive method (HD)
- Hempel, Carl, 23, 33–42, 55, 81–83, 87–88, 130–133
- Hempel-Oppenheim model, 38
- HEP. *See* High-energy physics (HEP)
- Hertz, Heinrich. *See* Cases, Thomson on cathode rays
- High-energy physics, 165–169, 305n1
- Hilgartner, Stephen, 243–249, 254–262
- Holism, 8, 12, 22, 44, 208–209, 214, 253, 270
- Horkheimer, Max, 103
- Hoyningen-Huene, Paul, 46
- Hull, David, 158
- Hypothetical-deductive method (HD), 35–36, 83–84
- Ideal dialogical conditions, 155, 182, 191–192, 227–230
- Idealizations, 27–28, 114, 131. *See also* Ideal speech situation; Ideas (of reason)
- as counterfactual, 114, 136–137, 157, 192–198, 201, 208, 217, 227, 271
 - dialogical, 155–161, 270–272
 - process (Habermas's) (*see* Process idealizations)
- Ideal of an intrinsically reasonable dialogue, 197–198
- Ideal of cogent justification, 160
- Ideal of equal voice, 13, 135, 152–156, 182, 227–230, 260–261, 272
- Ideal of impartiality, 59, 244, 248–250, 256, 258, 260–261
- Ideal of inclusiveness, 152, 156–159, 175–176, 182, 227–230, 257, 260–263, 272
- Ideal of uncoerced discourse, 13, 27–28, 153, 176, 182–186, 191–192, 229, 257, 260–261

- Ideal speech situation, 27–28, 135
 Ideal universal audience, 62, 116, 124,
 135–137, 229. *See also* Concrete audience
 Ideal universal consensus, 116–118,
 123–126
 Ideas (of reason), 27–28, 114, 223–227, 231,
 274
 objectivity, 114–117, 224–227, 290–292
 truth (*see* Truth, Habermas's formal
 pragmatics of)
 Incommensurability, 44, 57, 66–67, 79, 224,
 237
 Indexicality, 219–225, 230–232, 271, 274,
 283, 291–292
 Indifference, ethnomethodological, 13, 53,
 215, 222, 230, 275
 Induction, 34–43, 84. *See also* Inductive risk
 Inductive risk, 234–235, 284–286
 Inquiry. *See* Dialect of inquiry
 Institutionalization, 68, 124–126, 134, 160,
 182, 134, 154
 credit as an institutional convention, 158
 Intelligent design, 1, 124, 206, 234, 291
 Interdisciplinarity, 4–14, 30–31 (*see also*
 Boundary concepts)
 in argumentation studies, 4–5, 297n5
 between critical theory and SSK, 196–209
 and cogency, 54
 and critical contextualism, 213–214, 243,
 269–278, 281–284
 and Habermas, 101–103, 184–190
 and perspectivism, 30–31
 and the rhetorical turn, 21
 between different scientific disciplines,
 281–282, 284–289
 and tension between critical and social
 approaches, 50, 192
 International Panel on Climate Change, 2,
 189
 Intersubjectivity, 40–42, 144, 195, 225
 and Achinstein, 90, 94
 and Habermas, 105, 115–117, 134–135
 Jasanoff, Sheila, 279–281, 284–289
 Johnson, Ralph, 26
 Journalism, science, 187–190, 231, 263, 272,
 282
 JTC, 117–119, 136
 Judgment, 139–146
 and Habermas, 139–146
 among Kuhnian paradigms, 45–49
 responsible, 140–146, 152–154, 183–186,
 250
 Justification. *See also* Ideal universal consensus
 and evidence, 88–90, 92–97
 and truth, 95, 116–118, 147
 and warrant, 88, 155–156
 Justificational atheism, 196–200
 Kitcher, Philip, 141, 143, 158
 Klein, Julie Thompson, 6, 8, 21, 208–209,
 270
 Klein, Wolfgang, 109–110
 Kuhn, Thomas, 33, 42–56, 139. *See also*
 Kuhn's Gap
 Kuhn's Gap, 33, 42–49, 53–54, 79–80
 and critical contextualism, 269–277
 and Habermas, 129–131, 145, 151–156
 and Latour, 76–78
 and Pera, 62–64
 Kusch, Martin, 236–238
 Latour, Bruno, 71–80, 130, 137, 169, 186,
 255. *See also* Actor network theory
 on allies, 72–77
 antinormative approach to cogency, 72,
 77
 Linguistic turn, 103, 127
 Liss, Tony, 171–172
 Livingston, Eric, 12, 220–221
 Logic, 20–29, 34, 146, 166, 249
 and the evaluation of products, 132
 formal and informal, 23–24
 of justification, 18, 41
 of relativism, 237
 Logical empiricism, 10, 29, 33–42, 45–46, 94,
 190
 Logical perspective, 24–26, 30, 33–42, 49, 55,
 93. *See also* Perspectivist framework
 and Achinstein, 81–82, 92–93
 CDF Evidence paper and, 170–171, 175,
 182 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF
 Evidence paper)
 and content merits, 33–34, 131–133
 and dialectical level, 133
 Kuhn and, 49
 limits of, 98
 Pera and, 64
 Longino, Helen, 150–152, 203–206,
 232–235, 304n3
 Lynch, Michael, 12, 222–226, 231–233
 MacIntyre, Alasdair, 237
 Mayo, Deborah, 133, 172–173
 McCarthy, Thomas, 114–116, 118, 217,
 224–225

- Mertonian model of science, 49, 68, 70, 73, 198
- Method of avoidance, 199–200, 270
- Narrative, 244
- NAS. *See* National Academy of Sciences (NAS)
- National Academy of Sciences (NAS), 13, 242–249, 254–268, 273, 279–280
- No-peeking rule, 173–176
- Normal science, 43–44
- Objective world (objectivity). *See* Ideas (of reason), objectivity
- Observation statement, 26, 36–42, 84, 172–173
- Olbrechts-Tyteca, Lucie, 23, 43, 58–59, 137
- Oppenheim, Paul, 38–39
- Paradigms, 43–49, 54, 62–69, 228, 236, 250, 266
- Paradox of the ravens, 36–38, 298n2, 299n7
- Parsonian sociology, 217–218
- Particularism, 12, 50–54, 79, 215, 224. *See also* Ethnomethodology
- Pathos*, 68–69, 141–144, 153, 171, 178, 183–185
- Pera, Marcello, 44, 58–65, 69–71, 78–81, 134, 137
- duck-rabbit interpretation of Kuhn, 44–45, 58
- on science as a tradition of actual debate, 60–63
- Perelman, Chaim, 23, 43, 58, 137
- Perspectivist framework, 10–12, 24–25, 30–31, 105, 266
- alignment of triads, 24–29, 105, 266
- internal relations, 132–138, 144–146, 208
- Plantinga, Alvin, 155
- Policymaking and science, 5, 13, 165, 246, 269, 278–280, 293–295
- and civic epistemologies, 286
- and Habermas, 122, 138–139
- political aspects of, 285–286
- and risk, 189, 232–236, 284–290
- Popper, Karl, 42, 54, 59–60
- Practical engagement, 120, 144
- Practice turn (in science studies), 9, 48
- Pragmatic context, 40–41
- Pragmatic merits, 42
- Pragmatic turn, 9–10, 103, 105, 127
- Predesignation rule. *See* No-peeking rule
- Prediction criterion, 35, 298n1
- Presuppositions
- dialectical, 134–135
- epistemological, 9
- level of, 132, 152, 158, 164
- normative, 131–132
- pragmatic, 13, 27–28, 109, 113–117, 136, 159, 214, 223, 230, 266
- social-institutional, 152
- Prelli, Lawrence, 65–71, 78–81, 140–141, 274
- rhetorical standard of cogency (RC), 67–70
- understanding of reasonable, 67
- Prescriptive-normative approach, 53. *See also* Descriptive-normative approach
- Problem of induction, 34. *See also* Induction
- Procedure, 10, 24–30, 231, 236
- as associated with dialectical level by Habermas, 137
- credit as an institutional, 159
- in critical contextualism, 248–249
- as dimension of argumentation, 133–134, 249
- and ESW, 218–222
- at Fermilab, 169–176, 180–187 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper; CDF collaboration)
- and Habermas, 105–108, 125, 133–138, 159–160
- at NAS, 242–249, 254–268, 279
- procedural factors (Pera), 60–63, 137
- statistical arguments as inherently procedural, 174–176 (*see also* CDF collaboration)
- Process, 9–13, 81–82, 98
- Achinstein and, 87–88, 92–98
- and cogency, 270–271
- and critical contextualism, 270–271, 279–284
- at Fermilab, 169–191 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper; CDF collaboration)
- Habermas on, 105–108, 121–122, 130–131, 135–142, 145–161, 180–191
- Kuhn on, 43–49
- Latour and, 71–77
- at NAS, 245–246, 254–265, 279–281
- Pera and, 60–63
- and the perspectivist alignment, 24–30
- Prelli and, 69–71
- as rhetorical, 24–29, 30, 69
- as social, 5, 10–12, 19–20, 49, 135–138, 150–154, 245
- Toulmin on, 106–107

- Process idealizations, 135–137, 140, 153, 159–160, 181–182, 186
 in tension with contextualization, 215
 and ethnomethodology, 227–230
- Product, 24–30, 246, 245–251
 Achinstein and, 81–82, 88–92, 97–98
 conditions for dialectically testing, 135–138
 at Fermilab, 170–175, 179–185, 187 (*see also*
 Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper;
 CDF collaboration)
- Habermas and, 105–106, 130, 133–135, 145, 147–148
- Hempel and, 40–41
- Latour and, 72
- at NAS, 245–251, 262, 266
- Public merits, 13, 251–254, 258–268, 277–278, 287–288, 293–294
 and CDF, 272–273
- Public sphere (networks and arenas), 246–251
- Rational agency. *See* Accountability
- Rationality debates, 2, 200, 269, 297n1.
See also Science wars
- Rawls, John, 199–200, 270
- RC. *See* Cogency, Prelli's rhetorical conception of
- Realism, 11, 31
 in Achinstein, 82, 86, 148
 in Habermas, 119, 148
- Recommended daily allowances (RDAs), 244, 248
- Reflexivity (in ESW), 220–221, 225
- Relativism, 12–13, 80
 and contextualism, 126–127, 224, 275
 critical social theory and, 236–238
 and ESW, 50, 213–215, 224
 and Habermas, 106–109, 126–130, 160
 Kusch's, 236–238
 and Latour, 78–79
 across paradigms, 44
 and Pera, 59–63
 in Prelli's rhetorical perspective, 70–71
 in SSK, 50, 102, 106–109, 129, 160
 196–199, 270, 274–275
 Toulmin's, 106–108, 126–127
- Relevance, 3–6, 201–205. *See also* Context
 and Achinstein, 83–84, 87, 91–92
 broad material, 291–292
 and confirmation, 35–39
 and contextualism, 231–237, 257–258, 271–294
 cross-contextual, 268, 281–283
 as a dialectical obligation, 134
 and ESW, 224–230
 and Habermas, 133–136, 139–145
 as an intrinsic formal merit of arguments, 41–42
 and NAS, 258–268
 and process idealizations, 136
 and SSK, 201–203
- Research proposal, 19, 125, 139
- Revolutionary science, 43–46, 54, 283
- Rhetoric, 20–25
 Aristotelian, 20, 65–68, 141, 151, 254–255
 (*see also* Aristotle)
 communitarian, 10, 65, 70, 80, 130
 epistemic conception of, 141
 and ESW, 227–230
ethos (*see* *Ethos*)
 at Fermilab, 169–171, 174, 177–180, 183–186 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper)
 in Habermas, 130–132, 135–145, 151–154
 in Klein (Wolfgang), 109–110
 and Kuhn, 54–57
 in Latour, 71–79, 169
logos, 137, 141–143
 at NAS, 241–250, 257–258, 262–264, 271–272
pathos (*see* *Pathos*)
 in Pera, 58–65
 and perspectivist alignment, 26–31
 in Prelli, 65–71
 proof from character, 142
- Rhetorical criticism, 21, 70–72, 136
- Rhetorical perspective, 22–26, 30, 59. *See also*
 Perspectivist framework; *Pathos*; *Ethos*
 CDF Evidence paper and, 170–172, 177–179, 184 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper)
 and critical contextualism, 241
 of Habermas, 105, 132, 137–138, 141, 145
 of Latour, 71–80
 of Prelli, 65–71
- Rhetorical situation, 174, 241, 246, 294
- Rhetoric of science, 5, 20–22, 29, 57–58, 70–72, 79, 138–145, 164
- Rorty, Richard, 59–62, 156, 199, 215
- Rouse, Joseph, 44
- Satisfaction criterion (Hempel's), 35–38, 299n7
- Science and technology studies (STS), 4–5, 262, 264, 276–277, 281

- Science-as-knowledge, 18
- Science-as-practice, 18
- Science studies, 6–11, 28–32, 50, 54, 234–236, 269–270, 274–276. *See also* Critical science studies
- ANT as a method of, 73
- and ESW, 213, 215, 230, 234–236
- Habermas and, 101, 129, 151
- Science wars, 1–3, 7, 41, 269–270, 297n1
- Scientific community
- according to SSK and ESW, 49–53
- and Achinstein, 90
- and critical science studies, 202, 258–260
- and Habermas, 112–114
- and Kuhn, 41, 46–50
- and Pera, 59, 62–65
- and Prelli, 67, 70
- Scientific discourse, 22, 98, 187, 216
- and Habermas, 112, 121, 124–125, 155, 157, 164
- and Pera, 61–63, 70
- and Prelli, 67, 70
- Scientific inquiry, 17–20, 30–31, 78–79, 95–96, 199–201, 214, 269
- and credit, 157
- and Habermas, 113, 129, 148, 154–155
- Scientific method, the, 3, 9, 50, 218, 232–233, 275
- Skepticism
- Latour and, 72, 75
- Pera and, 63
- and the perspectivist framework, 30–31
- Prelli and, 68, 70
- of rational justification, 196–200 (*see also* Justificational atheism)
- rule skepticism, 51–53
- and the sociological response to Kuhn's Gap, 50–53
- SSK and, 196–199, 275
- Sliwa, Krys, 177–179
- Snoeck Henkemans, Francisca, 7
- Social-institutional perspective, 29–30, 33, 191, 213, 216
- as distinct from the dialectical and rhetorical levels, 152–153
- at Fermilab, 170–172, 182–183, 191 (*see also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper)
- Habermas and, 131–134, 151–157, 159
- Latour and, 80
- as replacing the logical perspective for Kuhn, 49, 55
- NAS and, 252
- and SSK, 53–57
- Sociology of error, 118, 156, 192, 203. *See also* Sociology of scientific knowledge
- Sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK), 49–56, 153
- and behavioral biology, 203–207
- and CSS, 275–276
- as including ethnographic approaches and ESW, 300n15
- and Habermas, 102, 129, 153–156, 195–209, 270, 274–276, 307n3
- Latour and, 73–74, 78–79
- as analyzing social-institutional dimension, 200–201
- as rejecting the sociology of error, 118, 156, 192
- Solomon, Miriam, 138–139, 203, 282
- SSK. *See* Sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK)
- Staley, Kent, 165, 169, 174, 176
- Standard model (particle physics), 166, 169, 173, 178, 305n1
- Stases, 65–70, 138, 140
- Strategic action, 104, 108, 125–126, 130–131, 158–159. *See also* Theory of Communication action
- Strong Program in the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge, 50–53, 79, 196, 236–237
- STS. *See* Science and technology studies
- Sunshine rule, 261–265
- Symmetry postulate. *See* Symmetry principle
- Symmetry principle, 50, 73–74, 192–193, 198. *See also* Sociology of scientific knowledge (SSK)
- TCA. *See* Theory of communicative action (TCA)
- Teilhard de Chardin, Pierre, 292
- Theoretical articulation, 7–8
- Theory choice and social influences, 49, 51, 59, 203
- Theory of communicative action (TCA), 104–111, 122–127
- and the meaning of speech acts, 111–113
- Thomism, 291
- Thomson, J. J. *See* Cases/examples, Thomson on cathode rays
- Tipton, Paul, 170–172. *See also* Cases/examples, CDF Evidence paper
- Tollestrup, Alvin, 177–179
- Toulmin, Stephen, 23, 43, 71, 126, 132, 157, 215, 236
- model of argument, 106–108
- Toward Healthful Diets*, 244–248, 259–263, 284

- Transactional merits, 251–253, 258–261,
 265–268, 273, 282–283
 Transactions, 246–254, 257–268, 271–274,
 277–278, 282–288, 293
 Transcendence
 context (*see* Context, context-transcendence)
 locality, 225–226
 Truth, 119–120, 303n11
 and Achinstein, 82, 88–98
 and contextualism, 283–285, 287–288,
 292
 and ESW, 224–227
 in Habermas's argumentation theory,
 133–136, 146–151
 Habermas's formal pragmatics of, 111–122,
 147, 225
 Habermas's philosophical account of,
 119–122, 303n11
 Habermas's sociological analysis of,
 114–119
 Hempel and, 298n3
 as an idea of reason, 114
 as impersonal, 87–90, 97–98, 147, 151
 as justification-transcendent, 116, 118, 126,
 147–148, 242
 Kusch's truth finitism, 236–238
 and the idea of a common objective world,
 115
 Pera and, 63–64, 300n6
 and universal consensus, 116–118
 as a validity claim, 108, 111–113, 136

 Universal pragmatics. *See* Formal pragmatics

 Validity claims, 104–116, 122–126, 132–134,
 136, 215, 241. *See also* Discourse theory
 (Habermas)
 in relation to accountability, 114
 as multidimensional, 129
 morality, 126
 rightness, 111–113
 sincerity, 111–112
 truth (*see* Truth)
 validity basis of speech acts, 111–113
 Values, 201–207. *See also* Inductive risk
 epistemic, 46–49, 60, 66, 141–142, 202,
 232–235, 284–285
 and Kuhnian incommensurability, 42–49
 as defined by Pera, 62
 as employed by Prelli, 66–67

 Watson, James, 274
 Wenzel, Joseph, 24–27, 30, 132, 266, 298

 Whitehead, Alfred North, 292
 Wilkins, Maurice, 274
 Wilson, C. T. R., 165
 Wittgenstein, Ludwig, 50–52, 237–238
 Woolgar, Steve, 58, 71–72
 Wylie, Alison, 228–229

 Zammito, John, 44

