# Article information:

Science as a “fixed point”? Quantification and boundary objects in international climate politics - ScienceDirect  
<https://www-sciencedirect-com.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/science/article/pii/S1462901116307869>

# Article summary:

1. The ruling by the Hague District Court in 2015, ordering the Dutch Government to increase its greenhouse gas emission reduction target, highlights the dominant role of scientific, quantified precision in climate policy discussions.

2. The numbers "25%–40%" emission reductions deemed necessary in climate science, which were cited in the court ruling, originated from a fact box in the IPCC's Fourth Assessment Report and played a prominent role in international climate change negotiations leading up to COP 15 in Copenhagen.

3. The controversy surrounding the numbers in the fact box illustrates the challenges of drawing boundaries between science and policy in climate change discussions and highlights the need for boundary objects that can facilitate cooperation and understanding between different actors.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

The article titled "Science as a 'fixed point'? Quantification and boundary objects in international climate politics" discusses the role of scientific knowledge and quantification in climate policy, using the example of the Dutch court ruling on greenhouse gas emissions. The author argues that there is a dominant reliance on quantified scientific knowledge in climate policy discussions, and that this leads to a separation between science and policy. The article also examines the controversy surrounding the "Bali Box" numbers, which were used in international climate negotiations.

One potential bias in the article is its focus on the dominance of quantified scientific knowledge in climate policy discussions. While it is true that scientific evidence plays an important role in shaping climate policies, the article does not fully explore other factors that influence policy decisions, such as political considerations or economic interests. By focusing solely on the role of science, the article may overlook important nuances and complexities in the policymaking process.

Another potential bias is the suggestion that there is a clear separation between science and policy. The author argues that science should be seen as separate from policymaking, with science providing objective recommendations to policymakers. However, this view neglects the fact that science itself can be influenced by political and social factors. Scientific research is often funded by governments or private entities with specific agendas, which can shape the direction and findings of research. Additionally, scientists themselves may have personal biases or preferences that can influence their work.

The article also makes unsupported claims about the impact of the Dutch court ruling on future legal action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. While it is mentioned that the ruling is being hailed as setting a global precedent, no evidence or examples are provided to support this claim. Without further information, it is unclear how significant or influential this ruling will be in shaping future legal actions.

Furthermore, there are missing points of consideration in the article. For example, it does not discuss potential criticisms or counterarguments to its central thesis about the dominance of quantified scientific knowledge. It also does not explore alternative approaches to climate policy that may prioritize different factors, such as economic growth or social justice.

Overall, the article presents a one-sided view of the role of science in climate policy and overlooks important factors that shape policymaking decisions. It makes unsupported claims and fails to provide a balanced analysis of the topic.

# Topics for further research:

* Criticisms of reliance on quantified scientific knowledge in climate policy
* Influence of political considerations on climate policy decisions
* Economic interests in shaping climate policies
* Social factors influencing scientific research on climate change
* Examples of other approaches to climate policy prioritizing economic growth or social justice
* Analysis of the potential impact of the Dutch court ruling on future legal actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.
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