

2003

The colonisation of scientific uncertainty: liminality & agency in science boundary work

Sandrine A. Thérèse
University of Wollongong

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

This work is copyright. Apart from any use permitted under the Copyright Act 1968, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process, nor may any other exclusive right be exercised, without the permission of the author.

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

Unless otherwise indicated, the views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of the University of Wollongong.

Recommended Citation

Thérèse, Sandrine A., The colonisation of scientific uncertainty: liminality & agency in science boundary work, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication, University of Wollongong, 2003. <https://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/2072>

University of Wollongong Thesis Collections

University of Wollongong Thesis Collection

University of Wollongong

Year 2003

The colonisation of scientific uncertainty:
liminality & agency in science boundary
work

Sandrine A. Thérèse
University of Wollongong

Thérèse, Sandrine A., The colonisation of scientific uncertainty: liminality & agency in science boundary work, Doctor of Philosophy thesis, School of Social Sciences, Media and Communication, University of Wollongong, 2003. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/theses/2072>

This paper is posted at Research Online.

NOTE

This online version of the thesis may have different page formatting and pagination from the paper copy held in the University of Wollongong Library.

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

COPYRIGHT WARNING

You may print or download ONE copy of this document for the purpose of your own research or study. The University does not authorise you to copy, communicate or otherwise make available electronically to any other person any copyright material contained on this site. You are reminded of the following:

Copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may be a copyright infringement. A court may impose penalties and award damages in relation to offences and infringements relating to copyright material. Higher penalties may apply, and higher damages may be awarded, for offences and infringements involving the conversion of material into digital or electronic form.

**THE COLONISATION OF SCIENTIFIC UNCERTAINTY:
LIMINALITY & AGENCY IN SCIENCE BOUNDARY WORK**

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the
requirements for the award of the degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

by

Sandrine A. Thérèse

DEPT. OF SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY & SOCIETY

2003

THESIS CERTIFICATION

I, Sandrine A. Thérèse, declare that this thesis, submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, in the Department of Science, Technology & Society, University of Wollongong, is wholly my own work unless otherwise referenced or acknowledged. The document has not been submitted for qualifications at any other academic institution.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S. Thérèse', written in a cursive style.

Sandrine A. Thérèse

15th December 2003

Abbreviated Table of Contents

Table of Contents	ii
List of Figures	vii
List of Tables	viii
Acknowledgments	ix
Abstract	x
Chapter One – The Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty: Introduction, Ontology, Epistemology, Methodology & Chapter Outline	1
Chapter Two – From Essentialist Demarcation to Scientific Boundary Work & the Cartography of Discursive Tactics: The Colonisation of Uncertainty through Rhetorical Seduction & Collective Representation(s)	61
Chapter Three – The Case of Dr Peter French (Part I): Research into the Health Effects of Mobile Phones & The (Re)Construction of Scientific Deviance	101
Chapter Four – The Case of Dr Peter French (Part II) French <i>et al.</i> & the Heat-Shock Protein Hypothesis: How Scientists Forge a New Research Collective & (Re)Construct ‘Blemished’ Status	219
Chapter Five – The Case of Dr Robert Baker: The Controversy over Sea-Level & Climatic Change	287
Chapter Six – Conclusions: The Strategic Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty: Comparing Denouncers & Dissidents	373
Epilogue – The Case of Dr Peter French & The Problem of Closure	411
References Cited	425
Appendix	439

Table of Contents

Abbreviated Table of Contents.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Figures.....	vii
List of Tables.....	viii
Acknowledgments.....	ix
Abstract.....	x
Chapter One – The Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty: Introduction, Ontology, Epistemology, Methodology & Chapter Outline.....	1
Introduction.....	1
1) Ontology.....	9
i) A Note on Pragmatic Realism & the Study of Science.....	9
ii) The Constructivist Approach to Orthodoxy, Deviance & Suppression: Comparative Studies of Controversy in Science.....	12
iii) The Constructive Perspective on Deviance & Acceptability.....	14
iv) Human Agency & Non-Human Agency in Science.....	17
a) Structuration Theory & Practice Theory: The Dialectic of Human Agency & Social Structures.....	17
b) Towards a Post-Humanist consideration of Human & Non-Human Agency.....	21
v) The Political Ecology & Political Philosophy of Science.....	26
vi) Towards a Reconstructed Durkheimian Programme for the Sociology of Knowledge.....	29
vii) The Powers & Dangers of Uncertainty: The Sociology & Anthropology of Categorical Ambiguity as Resource & Pollution.....	31
2) Epistemology: Singerian Relativist Epistemology Meets Pragmatic Realism.....	43
3) Methodology: The Multi-Sited Ethnography of Boundary Work in Science.....	50
4) Thesis Outline.....	58
Chapter Two – From Essentialist Demarcation to Scientific Boundary Work & the Cartography of Discursive Tactics: The Colonisation of Uncertainty through Rhetorical Seduction & Collective Representation(s).....	61
1) From Essentialism to Constructivism, Boundary Work & Cultural Cartographies of Science.....	62

2) The Essentialist Crusade for Scientific Purity: Popper & the Vision of Science as Professional Scepticism.....	63
3) Merton’s Norms & the Utopian Vision of Individual & Collective Agency.....	69
4) Kuhn’s Paradigmatic Consensus as Essentialist Demarcation of Science: The Scientist as Professional Believer.....	75
5) Boundary Work & the Cultural Cartography of Science.....	85
6) Forming Cooperative Ties in Science: Boundary Objects & Standardized Packages in Science.....	89
7) The Politicised Colonisation of Uncertainty as Rhetorical Weapon: The Sociological Critique of Science as Resource.....	95
8) The De-Politicised Colonisation of Uncertainty as Rhetorical Tool: The Seductiveness of Collective Representation(s).....	96

Chapter Three – The Case of Dr Peter French (Part I):

Research into the Health Effects of Mobile Phones

& The (Re)Construction of Scientific Deviance.....	101
Chapter Outline.....	104
1) A Media Introduction to the Controversy: Representations of Dissent & Suppression in Science.....	105
2) Professional Background: Legitimate Credentials & Maverick Socialisation.....	113
3) The Eruption of Scientific Anomaly: Scientific “Surprise” & the Foundation of a Controversial Research Programme.....	117
4) First Results: Initial Publications & the Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty Regarding Natural Agency.....	121
5) Subtle Forms of Suppression: Co-option & Surveillance as “Discipline”.....	129
6) Undermining Dissident Research: Destabilising Certainty over Experimental Equipment & Data.....	134
7) Other Forms of Suppression: Blockages to Career Advancements & Collaboration.....	139
8) Orthodox Scientific Boundary Work: Constructions of Convention & Deviance in the Study of MPHEs.....	142
i) Reinforcement of the Orthodox Position: The Discursive Exaggeration of Consensus & Neutrality.....	145
ii) “Camouflaging” or Degrading the Work of Dissidents: Rendering Unorthodox Science Invisible &/or Deviant.....	155
iii) Indirect & Direct Attacks on a Field of Research.....	159
(a) Essentialist and Machinic Visions of Embodied Agency.....	159

(b) The No-Known Mechanism Equals No Mechanism Non-Sequitur: Attributions of Mystical Thinking.....	166
(c) Building up Orthodox Certainty Through Metaphorical Redescriptions of EMR: Homogenising & Dichotomising the EM Spectrum.....	179
(d) Insulting the Methods of Biological Science: Rendering Science Impotent	186
(e) Undermining the Precautionary Principle: The Humiliation of Public Health Imperatives.....	202
(f) Media Coverage of Controversial Science & the Trivialisation of Suppression: Public Performance(s) & the Contradictions for Scientific Status.....	207
(g) Orthodox Counterstrike: Explicit Degradation Ceremony.....	211

Chapter Four – The Case of Dr Peter French (Part II)

French *et al.* & the Heat-Shock Protein Hypothesis:

How Scientists Forge a New Research Collective & (Re)Construct ‘Blemished’ Status.....219

1) Controversial Scientists as Creators of Liminal “Objects” of Nature via Bricolage.....	221
2) Strategic Publishing: The Popularisation & Politicisation of a Controversial Field of Research.....	225
3) Presentation & Performance: Reinforcing Legitimacy of the Scientific Self & Theory through Public Speaking.....	235
4) Creating a Novel Standardized Package of Research: “Heat Shock” Proteins as Boundary Objects with Complex Agency.....	241
5) First Publication of the HSP Hypothesis of RFR Effects.....	247
6) Molecular Heating & the Complexity of Heat Shock Protein Agency.....	248
7) Reinforcing a Novel “Standardized Package” of Research: Cellular Studies, Experimental Rigour & the Discovery of Mechanism.....	256
9) Interdisciplinary Collaboration & Social Reproduction of a Novel Scientific Collective.....	259
10) The Fostering (& Discouragement) of Interdisciplinary & Extra-Scientific Communication & Debate.....	260
11) The Senate Submission as “Bricolage”: Where Popularisation & Politicisation Meet.....	261
12) The Denouncement of a Denouncement: Legal Definitions of Scientific Boundary Work & Remediation versus Scientific Exoneration.....	266
13) Peer Reviewed Publication as Coup: Establishing Priority in a Controversial Field of Research.....	267
13) A Crucial Public Performance: The “Seduction” of the Senate.....	271
14) Strategic Public Performances: The Presentation of Scientific Self in the Media & its Rewards.....	275

15) The Formation of Strategic Industry Alliances.....	276
16) The Remediation of a Blemished Scientific Status: Institutional Performances of Science via the Media.....	279
Chapter Five – The Case of Dr Robert Baker: The Controversy over Sea-Level & Climatic Change.....	287
1) A Media Introduction to the Robert Baker Case: How Scientists Deploy a Sociological Critique of Science.....	290
2) The Importance of Life History for Early Interest in Science.....	294
3) Scientific Education: Structural Blockages to a Scientific Career Path & Early Experiences of Suppression.....	295
4) Vignette: The Fairbridge Oscillating Sea Level Controversy.....	299
5) Intellectual Suppression at Honours: Mathematic Innovation as Pollution to Geography.....	303
6) Master's Debacle: Denouncement & Redemption of Mathematical Modelling in Human Geography.....	309
7) The Sea Level Controversy Revisited.....	311
i) Oscillating Oceans & Complex Climate Change as a Revolutionary Paradigm.....	311
ii) Institutional Resistance to Holocene Sea Level Oscillations: Subtle Patterns of Suppression.....	313
iii) Working to Deflect Deviance and Build a Novel Research Collective: The Formation of Strategic Alliances.....	319
8) Forming a Novel Standardized Package of Research: Strategic Publications.....	327
i) Baker & Haworth 1997: “Further evidence from relic shellcrust sequences for a late Holocene higher sea level for eastern Australia.”.....	328
ii) Statistical versus Biological Knowledge: Baker & Haworth (2000a; 2000b) in <i>Marine Geology</i>	338
iii) From the Statistical to the Biological: The FBI Method & Indirect International Alliances.....	344
iv) Davis, Aitchison, Flood, Morton, Baker and Haworth (Davis <i>et al.</i> 2000): International Collaboration and Collective Call to Arms.....	347
v) Baker, Haworth and Flood (2001a) “Inter-tidal fixed indicators of former Holocene sea levels in Australia: A summary of sites and a review of methods and models.” <i>Quaternary International</i> 83-85: 257-273.....	351
vi) Baker, Haworth and Flood (2001) ‘Warmer or cooler late Holocene marine palaeoenvironments?: Interpreting southeast Australian and Brazilian sea-level changes using fixed biological indicators and their δO^{18} composition.’ <i>Palaeogeography, Palaeoecology, Palaeoclimatology</i> , 168: 249-272.....	355

9) International Publication as Empowerment.....	358
10) Media Exposure: The Seductiveness of Climate Change & Solar Agency.....	359
11) Solar Systemic Patterns of Climate Change: Ecology & Earth Science Writ Large & Large Scale Forms of Agency.....	362
12) Complex Natural Agency as Pollution?.....	368
Chapter Six – Conclusions: The Strategic Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty: Comparing Denouncers & Dissidents.....	373
1) The Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty by Orthodox Denouncers.....	373
2) Essentialist Demarcation Criteria of Science as “Undead”?.....	383
3) The Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty by Dissident Scientists.....	388
4) Comparing Cases of Controversy in Science.....	401
5) Divergence & Similarity in Visions of Agency & Opportunities for Future Research.....	404
Epilogue – The Case of Dr Peter French & The Problem of Closure.....	411
Localisation of Theoretical Closure.....	413
Problems of Closure in Scientific Status.....	416
The Problem of Theoretical Closure: Microwave Bio-effects Research as “Undead” Science?.....	419
References Cited.....	425
Appendix.....	439
Alphabetical List of Interviews	
Questionnaire Guides	
A “Degradation Document”: ARPANSA unpublished report	
Senate Submission by Dr Peter French	

List of Figures

- Figure 1.** Schematic representation of a boundary object at the intersection of diverse social worlds.....follows p. 92
- Figure 2.** Schematic representation of competing boundary objects in a scientific controversy between intersecting social worlds.....follows p. 92
- Figure 3.** Diagrammatic representation of research suggesting a mobile-phone-cancer link.....follows p. 272
- Figure 4.** Geological time scale.....follows p. 290
- Figure 5.** The “Fairbridge Curve” of oscillating sea-levels.....follows p. 298
- Figure 6.** Sea level curve for the Northern Spencer Gulf region.....follows p. 316
- Figure 7.** Transformation of a sea-level curve.....follows p. 316
- Figure 8.** Comparison of sea-level curves in the Spencer Gulf Region.....follows p. 318
- Figure 9.** Location map of Australian sites using the fixed biological indicator method.....follows p. 324
- Figure 10.** Intertidal zonation of sessile (fixed) and other organisms.....follows p.332
- Figure 11.** Juxtaposition of quartic and quintic linear regressions showing variable sea-level curves for data from Southern Brazil.....follows p.342
- Figure 12.** Newspaper article on the link between solar cycles and global climate change.....follows p.362
- Figure 13.** Transformations in the scientific boundary work of dissident scientists.....follows p. 392

List of Tables

Table 1. Comparing Cases of Controversy: French case, Baker case, cold fusion (Simon 2002) and gravity waves (Collins 1975, 1981b, 1999, 2000).....	405
--	------------

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like firstly to thank Dr Peter French and Dr Robert Baker for their generosity in terms of time and reference materials given to me. Without their candid testimonials I would not have a thesis. I would also like to thank French's colleague, Professor David McKenzie, and PhD student, Jocelyn Laurence for sparing the time to be interviewed. I am also grateful to the more than 40 Fellows of the Australian Academy of Science who agreed to be interviewed as part of the pilot stage of my research. As promised, those interviews will be archived at the Academy's Adolph Basser Library where consent has been given.

I must also thank Dr Edward Steele, and his colleague, Professor Robert Blanden, who generously agreed to be interviewed as part of my research into scientific controversies. For reasons of length alone I decided not to include the Steele case in this thesis precisely because it merits an entire thesis of its own. In the near future, however, I intend to produce an account of the controversy over neo-Lamarckian visions of the mammalian immune system, based on the data collected during the course of my PhD research.

Appreciation and love go to my partner, Daniel, who has been patient and encouraging throughout the whole gruelling process. I no longer have this thesis as an excuse for my bad behaviour! And to my friends and family I say thank you for feigning interest when I complained *ad nauseum* about the damn thing.

Dr David Mercer provided helpful pointers for the theoretical orientation of the thesis and encouraged my fortuitous decision to complete a PhD at the University of Wollongong.

I am perhaps most indebted to Dr Brian Martin, who has been an exceptional academic mentor and role model. His continual encouragement, astute and timely feedback and unflappable patience have ensured the successful completion of this thesis.

ABSTRACT

The Colonisation of Scientific Uncertainty: Liminality & Agency in Science Boundary Work

The thesis focusses on the traditional problem of demarcation in science through the study of the politics of scientific “boundary work”{ and cultural cartography amidst scientific controversies where claims about the constitution of science and its “other” are asserted, contested and renegotiated. Human and non-human agents and agency are characterised via recourse to a critical practice theory and performative idiom approach where dialectical interactions between social structures and between collective, individual and natural agents are axiomatic. The study aims to provide a multi-sited ethnography of how notions of scientific convention and deviance are (re)defined in the course of scientific practice.

Scientific texts and qualitative data yielded from ethnographic interviews and participant observation are analysed to provide insights into how the demarcation of science is achieved, contested and renegotiated by various science boundary workers. The symmetrical analysis of two case-studies of recent controversy in (Australian) science will show the ways in which both orthodox and controversial scientists and other scientific boundary workers deploy similar discursive tactics in order to “seduce” and “colonise” the minds (and therefore the bodies and resources) of their audience(s). The colonisation of uncertainty in scientific controversies involves the discursive upgrading of certainty in one’s own methods, claims and motives while undermining those of opponents. Hegemonic visions of ideal scientific agency as value-free, acultural and apolitical are reproduced in both dissident and orthodox discourses, despite the strategic deployment by dissidents of a quasi-sociological critique of their denouncers. Both controversial workers and their denouncers engage in justificatory discursive work that “domesticates” or “colonises” uncertainty in descriptions of natural agents and in the general trustworthiness of scientific claims. The strategic presentation through various public ‘performances’ of scientific work as the product of a scientific collective is seen to provide a highly seductive means by which scientific boundary workers galvanise confidence and support.

However, an asymmetry in the scientific boundary work sampled can be seen in dissident workers’ definitions of the non-human or natural agents they study as complex, dynamic and non-linear. Linear, machine-like or “machinic” visions of “natural” agency provide an ontological ground from which new scientific work may be denounced as liminal or ambiguous and thus suspect or controversial, or as clearly “polluted” and thus “deviant” and stigmatised.