

Debate Format

- PART I: Introduction, Opening Speeches and Questions**
Moderator's introduction: Dr. Gordon Mitchell (10 Minutes)
Affirmative opening argument (15-20 Minutes)
Questions from the negative (5 minutes)
Negative opening argument (15-20 Minutes)
Questions from the affirmative (5 minutes)
- PART II: Questions from the General Audience (30 minutes)**
- PART III: Closing Arguments**
Affirmative closing argument (5 minutes)
Negative closing argument (5 minutes)
- PART IV: A Rhetorical Perspective on the Debate**
Dr. David Hingstman, respondent (15 minutes)

The co-organizers of the Science Policy Forum would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for helping to make this event possible: AARST, Dr. Alan Gross, the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, and the William Pitt Debating Union.

A PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE SCIENCE OF GLOBAL WARMING

*Is there sufficient scientific evidence which proves we
should limit greenhouse gas emissions
because of climate change?*

Affirmative

Dr. James E. Hansen
NASA Goddard Institute for Space Studies

Negative

Dr. Patrick J. Michaels
University of Virginia

The Inaugural Science Policy Forum of the
American Association for the Rhetoric of
Science and Technology (AARST)

Friday, November 20, 1998
New York Hilton, New York, NY
7:00 - 9:00 p.m. Green Room (Fourth floor)

What is AARST?

The American Association for the Rhetoric of Science and Technology is affiliated with the National Communication Association and composed of scholars concerned with all areas of science and technology analysis of science policy debates, the analysis of scientific texts, the transfer of scientific rhetoric into literary and other contexts, and the rhetorical impact of popular representations of science.

What is the Science Policy Forum?

We would like to welcome you to the inaugural Science Policy Forum of the American Association for the Rhetoric of Science and Technology (AARST). Spurred by last year's AARST preconvention conference call for "generating some measurable outcomes" the science policy forum is designed to create a space in which scientists can voice competing perspectives on a policy issue of pressing concern and enter into a constructive dialogue with members of the Communication discipline and the general public. By maximizing give-and-take between scientist advocates and the audience, the forum's format is designed to enhance public understanding of the scientific dimensions of science policy decisions.

The forum is also designed to facilitate and promote rhetoric of science as an academic enterprise. By providing an opportunity for AARST members to engage a live scientific controversy, the forum can serve as a common reference point for rhetoricians of science to exchange reflective dialogue and feedback regarding specific arguments advanced in the course of the event, as well as other issues which are highlighted by the deliberation. To facilitate this process, a full transcript of the forum proceedings will be published on the internet.

Why Global Warming?

We chose the topic of global warming for the inaugural Science Policy Forum because it involves issues that are central to the research interests of many of AARST's members. The current controversy over global warming includes such issues as disputes over scientific authority and expertise; the role of social, political, economic and rhetorical factors in the manufacture of scientific knowledge; the effect of institutional constraints on the reception and communication of that knowledge; the public face of science in controversy; and the intersection between science and policymaking. This topic is also very timely. With the recent U.S. signing of the Kyoto protocol the controversy over global warming has returned to the headlines. With further efforts to gain Senate ratification pending, these issues are not likely to cool off anytime soon.

What Next?

If sufficient interest exists among AARST members, we would like to make the Science Policy Forum a regular annual event at NCA. Given that the diverse research programs of AARST members provides a rich resource of knowledge on possible forum topics and participants, we would be delighted to hear from you if you have suggestions for future forums. Additionally, feedback regarding the format, timing, and venue for the forum could be instrumental in improving the quality of the event. Do you have ideas for modifying the forum? Would you like to participate in organizing a forum in the future, or do you have ideas that could contribute to the project? Lets start a dialogue! Contact: Gordon Mitchell (gordonm+@pitt.edu) or Tim O'Donnell (tiost+@pitt.edu).

Who are the Participants?

• **Dr. James E. Hansen, Director of NASA's Goddard Institute for Space Studies.** Dr. Hansen received his BA, MS and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Iowa. His research interests include: radiative transfer in planetary atmosphere, development of simplified climate models and 3-D global climate models, analysis of mechanisms of climate change, and study of current climate trends from observational data and projections of human impact on climate. Dr. Hansen has been the head of NASA's Goddard Institute since 1981. He is an adjunct professor of geological sciences at Columbia University, he has published extensively and he has been active in congressional hearings on climate change.

• **Dr. Patrick J. Michaels, Research Professor of Environmental Sciences at the University of Virginia.** Dr. Michaels received his AB and SM degrees from the University of Chicago, and a Ph.D. in Ecological Climatology from the University of Wisconsin-Madison in 1979. Dr. Michaels has been President of the American Association of State Climatologists and Program Chair of the Applied Climatology Committee of the American Meteorological Society. Dr. Michaels has testified at Congressional hearings numerous times and has published extensively both popular and scientific articles on climate change and its impact on society including a book, *Sound and Fury: The Science and Politics of Global Warming*.

• **Dr. David Hingstman, Assistant Professor of Communication, University of Iowa.** Dr. Hingstman holds a J.D. from Harvard and a Ph.D. in Communication from Northwestern. His scholarly interests include argumentation, rhetorical criticism, and freedom of expression as applied to the study of legal and political discourse. His current research program involves the study of social controversies and oppositional argument and the revision of argumentation theory and practice to account for recent criticism and defense of practical reasoning. Dr. Hingstman currently directs the University of Iowa's A. Craig Baird Debate Program.

• **Dr. Gordon R. Mitchell, Assistant Professor of Communication, University of Pittsburgh (co-organizer).** Dr. Mitchell holds a Ph.D. in Communication from Northwestern. His academic work focuses on rhetoric of science, public argument, and argumentation pedagogy, and he has moderated numerous public debates. Dr. Mitchell is currently in the process of completing the final manuscript of a book-length study on the rhetoric of missile defense advocacy, and he has published previously on this topic in prominent journals such as the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*. Dr. Mitchell currently directs the University of Pittsburgh's William Pitt Debating Union.

• **Timothy M. O'Donnell, Ph.D. Candidate, University of Pittsburgh (co-organizer).** Mr. O'Donnell, a former college debater and successful high school and college debate coach, received his BA and MA from Wake Forest University. He is currently completing his dissertation on the rhetoric of American science policy. This project entails placing the legacy of Vannevar Bush's 1945 report to the president, *The Endless Frontier*, in contemporary perspective, as the government attempts to rearticulate national science policy after the Cold War. His scholarly interests include rhetoric of science, public argument, and rhetorical theory.

Debate Format

PART I: Introduction, Opening Speeches and Questions

Moderator's introduction: Dr. Gordon Mitchell (10 Minutes)

Affirmative opening argument (15-20 Minutes)

Questions from the negative (5 minutes)

Negative opening argument (15-20 Minutes)

Questions from the affirmative (5 minutes)

PART II: Questions from the General Audience (30 minutes)

PART III: Closing Arguments

Affirmative closing argument (5 minutes)

Negative closing argument (5 minutes)

PART IV: A Rhetorical Perspective on the Debate

Dr. David Hingstman, respondent (15 minutes)

The co-organizers of the Science Policy Forum would like to thank the following organizations and individuals for helping to make this event possible: AARST, Dr. Alan Gross, the Department of Communication at the University of Pittsburgh, and the William Pitt Debating Union.