Reading Tips and Study Questions

Session 8: Science and local knowledge in policy disputes

Required reading:

1. **READ** "About us" and "what we do" at the MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative website http://web.mit.edu/dusp/epp/music/
2. **READ** Karl, Susskind, and Wallace, "A dialogue, not a diatribe: Effective integration of science and policy through joint fact finding." Environment 49(1):20-34 (2007).
   At http://web.mit.edu/dusp/epp/music/pdf/ENV_JF07_JFFarticle.pdf
3. **SKIM**. Lenard and Finlayson, "The role of the scientist in collaborative environmental policymaking," at website above (homepage, right column). At http://web.mit.edu/dusp/epp/music/pdf/lenard_finlayson.pdf
4. **READ**. Matthew Amengual, "Incorporating local knowledge into joint fact finding," at: http://web.mit.edu/dusp/epp/music/pdf/amengual.pdf
5. **SKIM**. (case) Cape Wind Farm: Use the game instructions at this webpage to familiarize yourself with the issues in dispute, in particular the "science-intensive" ones.
   At http://web.mit.edu/dusp/epp/music/pdf/Wind-Game.pdf

Tips and questions

Thus far, we have explored a number of ways that research and other forms of knowledge influence the public agenda, frame public problems, tell stories about social programs or other interventions, or otherwise shape action. But this week, we turn our attention to policy disputes in which science itself is often disputed and in which scientific evidence plays a central, if controversial, role.

Our guest will be **Lawrence Susskind**, a faculty member in our department. Larry wears many hats, but the most important ones this week relate to a project he co-founded—MUSIC (MIT-USGS Science Impact Collaborative)—and to his experience mediating and studying "science-intensive" policy disputes, specifically in the environmental policy arena. We will focus on such disputes and on science and scientists in them, using the Cape Wind dispute in our own backyard but making international comparisons as well. Larry will emphasize the joint fact finding process as a tool for incorporating scientific and other forms of useful knowledge for better decision-making.

1. **Karl, Susskind, and Wallace** make a case for joint fact finding not only because of the nature of science and of the policymaking process "in

general" but also because of specific shifts in the kinds of decisions society must make about the environment and health and safety. What are those shifts? And what are the key responsibilities of researchers and others in joint fact finding, according to the authors?

2. **Lenard and Finlayson** call, at once, for more science and more local knowledge in policymaking: What roles do they propose for each, and how do they distinguish "advocacy science" from "collaborative science"?

3. What sort of research does **Amengual** suggest is needed (but missing) on local knowledge and its impact? What does his typology of approaches suggest in the way of important, research-able questions?