

**Chapter 1 : Ingenuity and the Mercantile Muse: Authorship and the History of the Patent - Chicago Scholar**

*This chapter presents a discussion on authorship and the history of the patent. It highlights the charm of Ben Jonson's graceful and shrewdly knowing capitulation to the monopolistic character even of the literary economy, an economy of competing projects.*

Identify and discuss task-related group roles and behaviors. Identify and discuss maintenance group roles and behaviors. Identify and discuss negative group roles and behaviors. Just as leaders have been long studied as a part of group communication research, so too have group member roles. Group roles are more dynamic than leadership roles in that a role can be formal or informal and played by more than one group member. Additionally, one group member may exhibit various role behaviors within a single group meeting or play a few consistent roles over the course of his or her involvement with a group. Group communication scholars have cautioned us to not always think of these roles as neatly bounded all-inclusive categories. After all, we all play multiple roles within a group and must draw on multiple communication behaviors in order to successfully play them. When someone continually exhibits a particular behavior, it may be labeled as a role, but even isolated behaviors can impact group functioning. In this section, we will discuss the three categories of common group roles that were identified by early group communication scholars. These role categories include task-related roles, maintenance roles, and individual roles that are self-centered or unproductive for the group. Task-related roles typically serve leadership, informational, or procedural functions. In this section we will discuss the following roles and behaviors: Cragan and David W. Wright, *Communication in Small Group Discussions: An Integrated Approach*, 3rd ed. West Publishing, . This person may be a designated or emergent leader, but in either case, task leaders tend to talk more during group interactions than other group members and also tend to do more work in the group. Depending on the number of tasks a group has, there may be more than one task leader, especially if the tasks require different sets of skills or knowledge. Because of the added responsibilities of being a task leader, people in these roles may experience higher levels of stress. Task-leader behaviors can be further divided into two types: Frey Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, . The procedural leader is the person who gives the most guidance, perhaps following up on the ideas generated by the substantive leader. A skilled and experienced task leader may be able to perform both of these roles, but when the roles are filled by two different people, the person considered the procedural leader is more likely than the substantive leader to be viewed by members as the overall group leader. Maybe we should switch gears so we can get something concrete done tonight. So the expediter helps make order out of chaos by calling the food out to the kitchen in a particular order that logically works so that all the food will come up at the same time. Expediting in a restaurant and in a small group is like a dance that requires some flexible and creative thinking and an ability to stick to a time frame and assess progress. To avoid the perception that group members are being rushed, a skilled expediter can demonstrate good active-listening skills by paraphrasing what has been discussed and summarizing what has been accomplished in such a way that makes it easier for group members to see the need to move on. Information Provider The role of information provider A role that includes behaviors that are more evenly shared than in other roles, as ideally, all group members present new ideas, initiate discussions of new topics, and contribute their own relevant knowledge and experiences. When group members are brought together because they each have different types of information, early group meetings may consist of group members taking turns briefing each other on their area of expertise. In other situations, only one person in the group may be chosen because of his or her specialized knowledge and this person may be expected to be the primary information provider for all other group members. For example, I was asked to serve on a university committee that is reviewing our undergraduate learning goals. The information sought may include factual information or group member opinions. In general, information seekers ask questions for clarification, but they can also ask questions that help provide an important evaluative function. Most groups could benefit from more critically oriented information-seeking behaviors. As our discussion of groupthink notes, critical questioning helps increase the quality of ideas and group outcomes and helps avoid groupthink. When information seeking or questioning occurs as a result of poor

listening skills, it risks negatively impacting the group. Skilled information providers and seekers are also good active listeners.

**Gatekeeper** The gatekeeper A group member who manages the flow of conversation in a group in order to achieve an appropriate balance so that all group members get to participate in a meaningful way. Instead of scolding someone for not participating, they should be invitational and ask a member to contribute to something specific instead of just asking if they have anything to add. Since gatekeepers make group members feel included, they also service the relational aspects of the group.

**Recorder** The recorder A group member who takes notes on the discussion and activities that occur during a group meeting. At less formal meetings there may be no recorder, while at formal meetings there is almost always a person who records meeting minutes, which are an overview of what occurred at the meeting. Each committee will have different rules or norms regarding the level of detail within and availability of the minutes. Because of this, it may be desirable to have the role of recorder rotate among members. All these role behaviors require strong and sensitive interpersonal skills.

The maintenance roles we will discuss in this section include social-emotional leader, supporter, tension releaser, harmonizer, and interpreter. The social-emotional leader may also reassure and support the task leader when he or she becomes stressed. In general, the social-emotional leader is a reflective thinker who has good perception skills that he or she uses to analyze the group dynamics and climate and then initiate the appropriate role behaviors to maintain a positive climate. While all members of the group perform some maintenance role behaviors at various times, the socioemotional leader reliably functions to support group members and maintain a positive relational climate. Social-emotional leadership functions can actually become detrimental to the group and lead to less satisfaction among members when the maintenance behaviors being performed are seen as redundant or as too distracting from the task.

**Supporter** The role of supporter A role characterized by communication behaviors that encourage other group members and provide emotional support as needed. I hope it goes well. Let me know if you need anything. Leaders and other group members can help support the supporter by acknowledging his or her contributions.

**Tension Releaser** The tension releaser A role filled by someone who is naturally funny and sensitive to the personalities of the group and the dynamics of any given situation and who uses these qualities to manage the frustration level of the group. Being funny is not enough to fulfill this role, as jokes or comments could indeed be humorous to other group members but be delivered at an inopportune time, which ultimately creates rather than releases tension. The healthy use of humor by the tension releaser performs the same maintenance function as the empathy employed by the harmonizer or the social-emotional leader, but it is less intimate and is typically directed toward the whole group instead of just one person. The tension releaser may start serving his or her function during the forming stage of group development when primary tensions are present due to the typical uncertainties present during initial interactions. When people make a failed attempt to release tension, they may be viewed as a joker, which is a self-centered role we will learn more about later.

**Harmonizer** The harmonizer A group member who helps manage the various types of group conflict that emerge during group communication. They keep their eyes and ears open for signs of conflict among group members and ideally intervene before it escalates. Harmonizers also deescalate conflict once it has already started—for example, by suggesting that the group take a break and then mediating between group members in a side conversation. These actions can help prevent conflict from spilling over into other group interactions. In cases where the whole group experiences conflict, the harmonizer may help lead the group in perception-checking discussions that help members see an issue from multiple perspectives. A special kind of harmonizer that helps manage cultural differences within the group is the interpreter. An interpreter is a group member who has cultural sensitivity and experience interacting with multiple cultures and can help facilitate intercultural interactions within a group. Just as an interpreter at the United Nations acts as a bridge between two different languages, the interpreter can bridge identity differences between group members. Interpreters can help perform the other maintenance roles discussed with a special awareness of and sensitivity toward cultural differences. While a literal interpreter would serve a task-related function within a group, this type of interpreter may help support a person who feels left out of the group because he or she has a different cultural identity than the majority of the group. The interpreter may help manage conflict that arises as a result of diversity, in this case, acting like an ambassador

or mediator. Interpreters, because of their cultural sensitivity, may also take a proactive role to help address conflict before it emerges—for example, by taking a group member aside and explaining why his or her behavior or comments may be perceived as offensive. Negative Roles and Behaviors Group communication scholars began exploring the negative side of group member roles more than sixty years ago. Studying these negative roles can help us analyze group interactions and potentially better understand why some groups are more successful than others. A person may temporarily monopolize a discussion to bring attention to his or her idea. If that behavior gets the attention of the group members and makes them realize they were misinformed or headed in a negative direction, then that behavior may have been warranted. Negative behaviors can be enacted with varying degrees of intensity and regularity, and their effects may range from mild annoyance to group failure. In general, the effects grow increasingly negative as they increase in intensity and frequency. While a single enactment of a negative role behavior may still harm the group, regular enactment of such behaviors would constitute a role, and playing that role is guaranteed to negatively impact the group. We will divide our discussion of negative roles into self-centered and unproductive roles. Self-Centered Roles The behaviors associated with all the self-centered roles Negative group roles that divert attention from the task to the group member exhibiting the behavior. These roles include the central negative, monopolizer, stage hog, egghead, self-confessor, insecure compliment seeker, and joker. Although all these roles share in their quest to divert attention, they do it in different ways and for different reasons. The self-centered roles we will discuss are the central negative, monopolizer, self-confessor, insecure compliment seeker, and joker. West Publishing, , “Central Negative The central negative argues against most of the ideas and proposals discussed in the group and often emerges as a result of a leadership challenge during group formation. This scenario is unfortunate because the central negative is typically a motivated and intelligent group member who can benefit the group if properly handled by the group leader or other members. Group communication scholars suggest that the group leader or leaders actively incorporate central negatives into group tasks and responsibilities to make them feel valued and to help diminish any residual anger, disappointment, or hurt feelings from the leadership conflict. Bormann and Nancy C. Bormann, *Effective Small Group Communication*, 4th ed. Otherwise the central negative will continue to argue against the proposals and decisions of the group, even when they may be in agreement. In some cases, the central negative may unintentionally serve a beneficial function if his or her criticisms prevent groupthink. Monopolizer The monopolizer is a group member who makes excessive verbal contributions, preventing equal participation by other group members. In short, monopolizers like to hear the sound of their own voice and do not follow typical norms for conversational turn taking. There are some people who are well informed, charismatic, and competent communicators who can get away with impromptu lectures and long stories, but monopolizers do not possess the magnetic qualities of such people. Some monopolizers do not intentionally speak for longer than they should. Instead, they think they are making a genuine contribution to the group. These folks likely lack sensitivity to nonverbal cues, or they would see that other group members are tired of listening or annoyed.

**Chapter 2 : Monopolizing Knowledge, Part 1: Science and Scientism**

*-We learn culture in the process of communicating-Communication is a primary indicator of culture Individualistic cultures - regard each person as distinct from other people, groups, and organizations. Value personal freedom, individual rights, and independence.*

It speeds into town, horns blaring, and steamrolls any resistance it should face. Walmart is the threat we know, but Amazon is the one we should be paying attention to. Instead of total annihilation Amazon takes a more systematic approach. Amazon was founded by Jeff Bezos as a humble online bookstore. But in the years to follow, Amazon quickly evolved into the web version of Walmart, only on a much larger scale. Now you can find nearly half a billion products ranging from grocery items to sneakers. Originally Amazon was deemed an existential threat only to independent bookstores, then huge chains like Borders, which it forced out of business in There was Circuit City, which Amazon played a large part in dismantling after essentially turning it into its own showroom. People would touch and test products in Circuit City, only to make the actual purchase online, and typically at a significant discount on Amazon. All told, Circuit City shuttered stores, and mostly due to pressure from online retailers. No business goes out of business due to one competitor. But the Amazon factor became a major factor in those businesses gradually going out of business, from bookstores to record stores to electronics stores. They are a category killer. Amazon could be the exception to this rule. For anyone that worries about Walmart, they should be losing sleep over Amazon. How bad is it? And worse, according to market intelligence firm Bloomreach , buyers are spending this cash without ever visiting another site. The massive operation could get even bigger in the coming years. Amazon has already expressed interest in selling cars , providing loans , pedaling prescription drugs , and handling your banking. With more than 80 million Prime members in the US alone “ a figure that has doubled in just two years ” Amazon is quietly bringing the entire country into its ecosystem. Take, for example, the average Amazon seller. As time passes, reviewers sing her praises as well as that of her product , and sales skyrocket “ forcing her to double her manufacturing capabilities, move into a bigger building, and hire additional staff. And then Amazon brings down the hammer. The next day she logs on to see her top-ranking product is now buried in on-site search, replaced by the same product brandishing an Amazon Basics logo. Amazon essentially strong-armed the company into an online deal by promising to remove counterfeits from its platform. This, mind you, is something Amazon should have “ if it had any integrity as an online marketplace “ done all along. Nevertheless, Nike relented and Amazon is now pimping branded athletic apparel. But even its stature in the publishing industry was no match for Amazon during a dispute. After failing to secure more favorable purchasing terms, Amazon essentially made thousands of books disappear from its recommendation algorithms. It also dissuaded searchers from buying by displaying messages that warned of two to four week waits for shipping. Two years later it did the same with over 4, titles from the Independent Publisher Group. But is it a monopoly? For all the fusion between the worlds of online and offline commerce, the two are still seen as separate beasts by the regulatory powers that be. Steve Jurvetson The reality is, the move does make Amazon stronger by strengthening its foothold in the offline world “ enabling new ways to track offline users, widening its already impressive distribution network, and facilitating last-mile deliveries “ which makes it stronger in the online world as well. Any continued weakening of the two top shipping companies in the US makes a strong case for Amazon to pick up the slack, at its own terms. According to the FTC: Some courts have required much higher percentages. Obtaining a monopoly by superior products, innovation, or business acumen is legal; however, the same result achieved by exclusionary or predatory acts may raise antitrust concerns. Its monopolistic powers will continue to wreak havoc on commerce, regardless of what we decide to call it. Where does it stop? This is problematic for many reasons, but the power this sort of dominance creates is enough to cripple multiple segments of the US economy, if not the whole thing “ if left unchecked. Take, once again, the Whole Foods deal. Maybe none of this matters. Maybe all that matters is Amazon has built a business that offers unparalleled convenience, pricing, and the biggest leap forward in commerce since the advent of fiat currency. For the consumer, nearly everything else is secondary. Or, maybe

we can start treating these businesses like we would their brick-and-mortar counterparts:

### Chapter 3 : Amazon is monopolizing commerce “ and we don't seem to care

*the idea that any culture includes a number of social groups with distinct perceptions, identities, and ways of interacting is associated with ethnocentrism the tendency to regard our culture and our way of life as normal and superior to other people and other ways of life.*

Further, a scientific study requested by the court found that while the plant had "aggravated the water scarcity situation," the "most significant factor" was a lack of rainfall. The case has been appealed and a decision is pending. The government gave all the required permissions but did not publicize the Rs. It became a serious issue and Chief Minister Shivraj Singh Chouhan distanced himself from the project. In order to stop the project, residents started a signature campaign to garner support for the cause and passed a resolution against the company. They also attacked state government that on one hand, it was talking about taking measures to save the river and on the other hand, gave permission to set up the plant. Greenpeace also claims that Coca-Cola has actively lobbied against recycling and deposit return schemes in several European countries, while at the same time maintaining a green marketing facade with vague promises and false-solutions such as sizable donations to schemes that put the emphasis of anti-littering on the consumer, instead of the producer of the litter itself. In Tamil Nadu is In the midst of a severe drought which continues to fuel the animosity. TNVSP consists of over local trade associations and boasts about 1. The boycott came into effect from March 1, and the majority of the small and medium-sized vendors were reported to have stopped stocking the products. The move continues to receive strong support while continuing to gain momentum during the Jallikattu protests. Coca-Cola is appealing the case. Coca-Cola was charged in a U. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia , with "forcing some bottlers to purchase hundreds of millions of dollars of unnecessary beverage concentrate to make its sales seem higher. Coke employed 4, workers, operating under the racially segregated housing, workplace, and wages, and was one of the largest employers in the country. However, the movement in the U. In fact, "Coke never truly left the country, leading to overwhelming dominance through the rest of the 20th century. Pepsi adhered to different social imperatives and suffered exceptionally low market shares as a result. In , the Sinaltrainal trade union filed a suit against Coca-Cola in a Miami district court. The union alleged that Coca-Cola bottling partners, Bebidas y Alimentos and Panamco , assisted paramilitaries in murdering several union members. The court decided charges would be considered against the partners but not Coca-Cola itself. On September 4, , Judge Martinez dismissed the remaining claims against the two bottlers. Retrieved 8 May Retrieved 19 August Retrieved 31 May Center for Science in the Public Interest. Retrieved July 29,

**Chapter 4 : Project MUSE - Public Diplomacy A Case Study of the US Digital Outreach Team**

*Two questions about the politicization of the flag arise. First, national symbols carry enormous political capital; they are powerful cultural references for winning hearts and minds.*

Talk to the student outside of class Clarify your expectations. Explain to students at the beginning of the semester in class and on your syllabus how you expect them to participate: Should they raise their hands or just speak up? What should they think through e. Students may have had little exposure to the type of discussion you expect in your course. In addition to stating your expectations, model the behavior you want students to engage in, e. You might also invite a colleague or graduate student to class to model a challenging and vigorous, yet also civil and productive, exchange of ideas. Modeling can provide students who are unused to academic discussions with an opportunity to think about and adjust to your expectations. Provide sufficient time for thoughtful participation. If students feel rushed, they may say the first thing that comes to mind, rather than taking the time to reflect on the material and formulate reasoned perspectives. Thus, slowing down “ and avoiding the temptation to race through too much material “ can help create a more productive atmosphere for high-quality participation. One particularly good way to encourage meaningful participation is to pose a meaty question, give students a minute or two to think and write, then cold call. This allows students to organize their thoughts and craft a response. It also creates space for quieter students to contribute, while providing you with an opportunity to see what the more talkative students can do with time to think through their comments! Draw attention to the kinds of participation you value. Point out particularly meaningful or productive contributions to class discussion when you see them, e. Insist on the kind of participation you value. When a student offers a comment or question that is poorly reasoned or badly articulated, politely ask him to clarify, provide evidence, or explain the relevance of the comment in relation to the larger discussion, for example: What evidence can you find in the readings to back it up? Reward the kind of participation you value. If you grade students on class participation, make sure to distinguish high-quality participation from high-quantity participation. Then give students a mid-semester participation score using the rubric. This kind of feedback can help them evaluate their own contributions to discussion in time to adjust their approach if necessary. Some instructors use physical objects to guide conversational turn taking and discourage any one person from dominating the discussion. One technique is to give students a small pile of poker chips. This encourages students to think before they speak and use their turns judiciously. Other instructors use an object such as a stick or a ball, which a student must be holding in order to speak. Still others use a timer to limit the amount of time any one student can hold the floor. These sorts of techniques are generally only appropriate if over-participation is a significant problem. Talk to the student outside of class If, after some explanation, gentle redirection, and modeling, the student continues to monopolize discussion, pull him aside after class to talk. Thank him for contributing to discussion so regularly, while firmly asking him to make room for others to contribute. Provide some questions the student can ask himself before speaking up, e. How can I best articulate it? What is the single most important point I want to make? This site supplements our 1-on-1 teaching consultations.

**Chapter 5 : Examples - CICB Center of Intercultural Competence AG - Interkulturelle Kompetenz**

*This chapter reports a meditation on the problem of authorship as it was provoked at the turn of the last century, of how historical scholarship intervened in a technological and legal turmoil.*

Monopolizing Knowledge, Part 1: What is more, most people in our society regard science as providing us with knowledge about the natural world that has an unsurpassed claim to reality and truth. That is one reason why I am proud to be a physicist, a part of the scientific enterprise. But increasingly I am dismayed that science is being twisted into something other than what it truly is. Scientism says, or at least implicitly assumes, that rational knowledge is scientific, and everything else that claims that status of knowledge is just superstition, irrationality, emotion, or nonsense. We begin the series with a brief look at the origins of scientism. Because religious knowledge differs from scientific knowledge, scientism claims or at least assumes that it must therefore be inferior. However, there are many other important beliefs, secular as well as religious, which are justified and rational, but not scientific, and therefore marginalized by scientism. And if that is so, then scientism is a ghastly intellectual mistake. But how could it have come about that this mistake is so widespread, if it is a mistake? The underlying reason is that scientism is confused with science. It is natural for readers without inside knowledge of science to assume that science and scientism are one and the same when many leading scientists and science popularizers often speak and act as if they and thus directly promote this confusion. What is more, several major strands within religion also promote this confusion. On the conservative theological wing, science is often rejected because it is confused with scientism, and on the theologically liberal wing scientism is often adopted for the same reason. Whether rejecting or assimilating, religious believers often confuse science and scientism. Scientism is, first of all, a philosophy of knowledge. It is an opinion about the way that knowledge can be obtained and justified. However, scientism rapidly becomes much more. It becomes an all-encompassing world-view; a perspective from which all of the questions of life are examined: In other words, it is essentially a religious position. The Origins of Scientism

The word science is used with two completely different meanings; confusing the two has a natural tendency to lead to scientism. This is scientism in its youth. Enlightenment writings helped to insinuate scientism as an unacknowledged presupposition into much of the intellectual climate of the succeeding two centuries. The supposed distinction between scientific and unscientific history bears no discernible relationship to the methods of the natural sciences. The continued robustness of scientism is surely partly attributable to this terminological confusion. If science means simply knowledge, then scientism is merely tautologically true. But if science means a particular type of knowledge, as it does today, then it is essential to recognize that meaning and stick to it. In short what we mean by science today is the inheritance of the Scientific Revolution. In later parts of this series, I shall identify two key defining characteristics of science that encapsulate the two emphases crucial to its development: Before I move on to this task, though, let me pause to address some objections to the whole of my explanatory enterprise. A Few Possible Objections One objection that might be raised at this stage is to ask why one should restrict the designation science to the inheritors of the Scientific Revolution. After all, the argument goes, surely we should use whatever strategy is available to discover knowledge. My first answer is immediately to point out that this objection is an example of scientism. It confuses knowledge with science and implies that they are one and the same. I simply want to be clear that, as a matter of historical fact, science as we commonly conceive it had, and has, a distinctive characteristic approach to methods of discovering and knowing. But why insist on this terminology? Here, my second answer is that science has a well-earned prestige and authority precisely because of its success. This prestige is, of course, one driving force behind the desire of many disciplines to be considered sciences. To use the metaphor of the market today, it is a question of "branding". A second kind of objection is this: And if it is, why should one limit the scope of science by an identification of its methods? Surely one should use whatever methods are available to study nature. My answer is this: Prior to the Scientific Revolution, nature was populated with gods and teleological imperatives, with intention and purpose. Moreover, even after the Enlightenment, the romantics such as the poets William Wordsworth and Samuel Taylor Coleridge said that

what they were about was the study of nature. Yet no one today would for a moment think to call the poetic understanding of the natural world science. It simply is not adequate to assume that what is meant by nature is obvious. Instead, I believe, we must use a functional definition of science. Once we have a clear view of what science is, we will have a definition of what we here mean by nature. Nature is what we are studying in natural science.

**Chapter 6 : Explore Strategies - Eberly Center - Carnegie Mellon University**

*This article presents a case study in which a group of artisan families were able to monopolize, maintain, and, more importantly, transmit their skills and the socio-economic position bound up with those skills.*

In search of the impossible community 2. Critique of the Gotham Program: From libertarian socialism to communitarian anarchism 3. The third concept of liberty: Theorizing the free community 4. Against principalities and powers: Critique of domination versus liberalization of domination 5. Anarchy and the dialectic of utopia: The place of no place 6. The microecology of community: Toward a theory of grassroots organization 7. Bridging the unbridgeable chasm: Personal transformation and social action in anarchist practice 8. Hurricane Katrina and the shock of recognition 9. Sarvodaya and the Gandhian legacy Beyond the limits of the city: This book is valuable for several important reasons Clark adeptly deploys Marx, Hegel, Aristotle, Enlightenment Philosophers, Zizek and a host of other modern and ancient thinkers, making this work erudite and rich. John Clark is able to bring to bear his immense erudition and experience with alternative modes of social organization, both historical and geographical, and thus can lead us, like Ariane with her thread, out of the labyrinth of our present-day paralysis. He writes very vividly and persuasively, whether it be general theory or particular case studies. The Impossible Community should be widely discussed and realized since it shows brilliantly a way out of our present predicament. Rethinking our Life on Earth, and Riding the Wind: I know of no other work that so successfully integrates rigorous philosophical inquiry with on-the ground struggle. Generous and compassionate in spirit, fierce in critique, prodigious in learning, and universal in scope, this celebration of the anarchist way is a beacon of hope for our afflicted times. It fuses passion, will, and reason. It combines deep theory with practical examples of social transformation. The intricate arguments are well illustrated by the latter, more descriptive and reflective chapter on the Katrina tragedy, and the sections on contemporary communal movements in the Indian sub-continent. As such, The Impossible Community makes a valuable contribution to those interested in the growing anarchistic social movements and how they link the local to the global.

**Chapter 7 : Confronting a Monopolizing Coworker - Crucial Skills by VitalSmarts**

*The word science is used with two completely different meanings; confusing the two has a natural tendency to lead to scientism. The historical meaning comes from the word's Latin root, scientia, which means simply knowledge, and indeed the word science was once used to describe any systematic orderly study of a field of knowledge.*

In parts two and three, Hutchinson described two key characteristics of science that underlie its immense power but limit its scope: Is there a clear enough definition or understanding of what natural science is to justify distinguishing it from non-science? In , Nobel-prize-winning economist F. During the first half of the nineteenth century Hayek attributes the start of this fruitless trend in sociology to the "Positivists" Henri Saint-Simon and Auguste Comte. Their ambition was to show that "there were laws governing the development of the human race as definite as those determining the fall of a stone". Their aim was to turn social history into a new science modeled on the natural sciences. Secularist advocates object to calling scientism a religion because they say scientism lacks the clerical hierarchic authority and public rituals that characterize most theistic religions. His followers set out to found the organized religion of this new belief. It ended in a move to a monastic community complete with menial labor and vows of celibacy. Auguste Comte quickly disassociated himself in the s with the Saint-Simonian religion. For much of the twentieth century philosophers of science sought mightily for methodological descriptions or definitions of science: The current opinion in philosophical circles is that both of these programs have failed, and in particular that demarcation between science and non-science has no clear solution. This failure gives rise to a paradox. Despite having concluded that there is no satisfactory working definition of what science is, the History and Philosophy of Science has not collapsed and vanished as an academic field. I conclude that, despite what HPS says, there actually are some intuitive ways by which science is identified, as evidenced by the pretty clear boundaries of the topics that HPS does actually study. These matters of demarcation have been brought very much into the American public eye in recent years by the role they play in battles about high-school biology. Text-books worked cautiously around these laws until in the Arkansas Supreme Court struck down its anti-evolution statute, and was followed in this action by Mississippi two years later. Thereafter, repeated attempts to introduce creationism into the curriculum have repeatedly been overturned by the courts. A statute worded along these lines in Arkansas was struck down in , after testimony from a host of expert witnesses. Its defenders argued that it was not religious but scientific. Seven of the nine justices were unconvinced. Thereafter, the Intelligent Design ID movement went to even further efforts to ensure that their ideas were free from religious taint. These high-profile legal decisions hinge on the question of whether certain opinions and teachings are or are not science. That this has become the deciding question is a remarkable sign of the dominance of scientism in our culture. Scientism leads to acrimonious arguments about whether opinions are or are not science because the scientific ethos gives special status to science that it does not give to non-scientific disciplines. The result is that the demarcation of what is or is not science becomes not merely an academic philosophical discussion, but a vital legal matter that decides practical questions of deep importance and emotional significance in the minds of most of the American public. Since the attempt to define science by uncovering its logical methods or even to establish what is or is not science is judged to have failed, and since this question has become a high-profile legal matter I am in dangerous waters. I am asserting that there are two identifiable characteristics of science, reproducibility and Clarity. Am I therefore claiming to have solved the demarcation problem? I am not setting out to provide a comprehensive solution of demarcation, but I am claiming to be able to identify some characteristics of what any solution must look like. Modest answers to parts of problems are sometimes what one must settle for. Another plea in mitigation of my apparent hubris is that the difficulty of demarcation is substantially amplified by scientism. First, philosophically, demarcation between science and non-science in the context of scientism is equivalent to the demarcation between sense and nonsense, rationality and irrationality, knowledge and superstition. One should not discount the identifiable characteristics of natural science just because of failures of this wider program. Second, politically, since scientism has embroiled the problem of demarcation in high-profile legal questions that raise

emotions on both sides, the difficulty of demarcation is made significantly greater. But my whole aim here is to repudiate the scientism that leads to the enhancement of these difficulties. If, as I am saying, science is not all the knowledge there is, then the weight that demarcation has to bear is reduced to a scope that is both more manageable and less sensitive. Any perception of chauvinism in this position arises from the self-same scientific viewpoint I am at pains to deny. I have no intention to discount or disparage academic disciplines that I regard as not being science. That political science, for example, is not a science in the way I mean it does not change its scholarly or practical value. I do not subscribe to scientism. I believe there is deep meaning, truth, relevance, and insight in non-scientific studies pursued with intelligence and rigor. But their merits have to be really their own, not the reflected glow of a terminological anachronism. The discipline of History and Philosophy of Science does not have simple answers to the questions, what is or is not science? Or what methods does science use? But HPS, like science itself, nevertheless appears to have intuition about what science is. Natural science is what HPS studies. Attempts to turn other disciplines, especially social disciplines, into explicit positive science, after the manner of the natural sciences, have a long history - of failure.

### Chapter 8 : Monopolizing Knowledge, Part 4: Demarcation

*time events. Reasons for this include the common desire for quick fixes, funder interest and capacity, and widespread misinformation about what successful nonprofit fundraising looks like.*

Dear Crucial Skills, I work with an individual who does not appear to realize she monopolizes every conversation and meeting she is in by giving excessively long and repetitive explanations and background information when discussing an issue. Several of us have discussed this and simply do not know how to approach her without hurting feelings and potentially destroying good working relationships. We think this is a crucial conversation we need to have with an expert on crucial conversations. Since Kerry, Ron, and Joseph are unavailable, I hope you will settle for me. Your question actually has a fairly straightforward answer. But first, let me start by backtracking a bit. The first time a problem comes up, talk about the content, or what just happened. The next time the problem occurs, talk pattern—what has happened over time. If the problem continues, talk about the relationship—what effect the problem has on your relationship. We ask people to focus on what kind of crucial conversation or crucial confrontation they need to have based on the finding that people often talk about the wrong issue. Unfortunately, people often choose easy conversations over hard ones, simple issues over complex problems, or one instance over a pattern of bad habits. So with that introduction, let me suggest that you have a content discussion. Note that your colleague seems to be unaware of the problem and that neither you nor anyone else has previously brought it up. A content discussion is one of the most straightforward conversations you can have. The process we teach in Crucial Confrontations offers step-by-step suggestions. Choose what and if. You have several indicators that you need to hold this discussion. The main indicator is that you have been concerned about the situation for a while but your conversations have been about her instead of with her. As I suggested, have a conversation with her about content and maybe include a small discussion about the pattern. You need to get your head right before you open your mouth. You need to have a private conversation with your colleague. You need to show in your face and in your tone of voice that you are bringing this up to help—that you have not pre-judged her or oversimplified the concern. Begin by explaining what you observe versus what you expect. Your conversation might begin this way: I noticed in our last meeting that only ten minutes were allotted to several of the agenda items. I also noted that we took about twenty minutes on two of the issues. This made the meeting run over by half an hour. From my perspective, you either gave background information we already knew or went into more detail than we needed—pushing us way over time. My goal is to make sure we all spend our time well. Your colleague might thank you for your honesty and ask for your advice. Or, she might get upset and be forthright about her feelings. If she gets upset, reaffirm your purpose and the fact that you value your relationship and want to continue to work well with her. She might get upset and go to silence. If she goes to silence, restore safety by reassuring her of your intent to strengthen your relationship. In conclusion, when faced with this kind of crucial confrontation, focus on the issue using CPR, make it safe for your colleague to speak up, and step up to the conversation honestly and respectfully.

### Chapter 9 : Criticism of Coca-Cola - Wikipedia

*In his new book Monopolizing Knowledge (available for purchase now), physicist Ian Hutchinson engages with the world-view he calls "scientism": "the belief that science, modeled on the natural sciences, is the only source of real knowledge" (page vii).*