
Enduring Tensions and Lessons Learned

Sandra Braman

2002

However agonizing current dilemmas may be, they are not new. Rather, the same kinds of problems recur over and over again. They fall into two categories: some result from essentially unresolvable issues, while others are resolvable on the basis of lessons learned from past experience. Distinguishing between the two is a first step in addressing several deep contradictions:

- Because the U.S. government has spent massive amounts of funds on the development of information technologies but almost nothing on understanding their uses and effects, policy-makers are crippled when it comes to making policy for the information infrastructure.
- Because universities narrowly define the categories of work to be considered for promotion and tenure—despite the long-standing legal position that the fundamental function of universities is to provide a variety of forms of service to society—researchers interested in providing public service find doing so is often self-destructive in career terms.
- Because the literature on policy-making restricts itself to the formal processes of what is now referred to as legacy law and training in how to think about policy is so thin, communication researchers wishing to engage with the policy world often do so precisely at the moments when they are least likely to be effective.
- For those who study information, communication, and culture the field as a whole faces the dilemma that precisely when its insights are most needed those who know the most are barely in the conversation at all.

All of this matters not because the discipline “must survive,” or because it serves the personal goals of particular individuals, but because it is a matter of national capacity—our ability as a society to make it possible to craft a world in which we would like to live.

Enduring Tensions

Enduring tensions arise when individuals must make choices in circumstances characterized by multiple but often mutually exclusive goals, guiding principles, rights, and responsibilities. They appear in the course of defining relationships between researchers and policy-maker, the design of research questions, and the structuring of decision-making processes.

Relationships

Researchers who seek input into policy-making processes face issues raised by their relationships with policy-makers, with their employing institutions, and with themselves.

Between Researcher and Policy-maker The inevitably political aspect of policy work yields a spectrum of possible relationships between researcher and policy-maker. In the easiest situation, a researcher may be in complete agreement with the goals of a policy-maker. Often, however, researchers are interested in expanding the range of policy alternatives under consideration or in effecting a specific change in policy. When either of these is the case, the researcher will need to protect his or her autonomy in the conduct of research and interpretation of its results—and must be able to separate both from negotiations over creating and implementing specific policies. Keeping the scholarly and political tasks separate will increase the utility and efficacy of each.

To do so does not require taking the position that research is neutral. As within the exclusively scholarly context, research is still strongest when the biases and assumptions of researchers are acknowledged, the weaknesses and limitations of the chosen research method are explained, and the nature of the Hawthorne effect, if any—the impact of the research itself upon the subject studied—is identified. It does, however,

require acknowledging that the translation of research results into policy requires normative and political arguments as well as information. Data may reveal the shape of a policy problem but cannot determine, on its own, which out of what is always a multitude of possible policy responses is best under a given set of empirical and political conditions.

The manner with which work that is critical or urges policy-makers to take alternative choices is presented makes a big difference to the reception of those ideas. Framing critical arguments within the language of the dominant policy-making discourse is likely to be more successful than demanding that policy-makers attend to a discourse framed in language unfamiliar to them and untranslatable into terms that are. Those who argue that communication policy has been unable to deal fully with questions of equity and civil liberties because it relies solely upon quantitative data have a responsibility to act upon the alternatives:

1. find ways of quantifying concepts historically treated as unquantifiable so that they may be incorporated into existing decision-making processes;
2. develop ways of adapting decision-making processes currently in use so that they can identify moments when other types of inputs are required and kick decisions that require this into another decision loop; and/or
3. develop new modes of decision making that can incorporate consideration of both quantitative and qualitative kinds of data, an approach more possible with today's information technologies than it has been historically.

Trust between policy-maker and researcher is clearly important in creating a situation in which even critical arguments or requests for change are being made. As a result, personal relationships with policy-makers are important for researchers who would like to have some impact. Demonstrating a willingness to go to where policy-makers are—to travel to Washington, take part in conversations exploring policy issues, respond to calls for policy input, meet with staffers with communications policy responsibilities, etc.—as well as demanding that those in the policy world “come over” to academia, can also make a big difference.

Relationships between communication researchers and policy-makers can also be structured in multiple ways. Some believe that the researcher who works as an insider—as a staffer—is likely to be most successful. Skeptics suggest that the impact of advocates may be limited because they are seen as non-representative voices from outside the policy process, while enthusiasts claim advocates play an invaluable role because they ensure that a diversity of viewpoints is expressed and because they offer at least some lobbying counterweight to the perspectives based in the corporate world. The role that can be played by training those who will ultimately become policy-makers and can serve as bridges between the worlds of research and decision-making should also not be undervalued; curricular issues within higher education should be considered one of the ways by which research is brought into policy-makers' hands.

Some researchers operate like clinicians, treating policy-makers like clients who need help either because they are deficient or because they are facing pressures with which they cannot cope. Others take the identity of strategist, treating the policy-maker as a client who is simultaneously a colleague with whom the researcher seeks to collaborate in the effort to merge practical knowledge with more systematic modes of analysis. Or the researcher may treat a policy-maker client or sponsor as an "alter," because in the policy world a client individual or institution may at another point in time become a set of resources or the environment within which the researcher must operate. This last notion enriches the concept of the "revolving door" through which individuals move from academia to government and back by emphasizing that researchers are also citizens.

There will of course always be those who believe that to engage at all with policy-makers or policy questions is to be coopted. A researcher's choice to maintain a distance from all governmental concerns, however, provides no guarantee that his or her work once published will not be used by policy-makers. Results of research may even be used to policy ends quite other than those desired by the researcher. Inaction by researchers, whether deliberate or through lack of consensus, has the effect of providing support for the status quo.

Between Researcher and Employer Though job responsibilities for American academics are ritually described as “research, teaching, and service,” it is widely known that research publication has long been considered far more important than the other two for promotion and tenure purposes, and in recent years “receiving outside funds” has become the unspoken item added to the front of the list. While research reports aimed at policy-makers and other types of engagements with policy-making processes can be intensely time-consuming and intellectually rigorous, such activities are usually relegated to the relatively low-ranking category of “service.”

The same kind of research can result in either a policy intervention or publication (or both), but the two types of work products are quite different as genres. This is not only a question of narrative form; publication in the kind of refereed scholarly journals of the type required for promotion and tenure in universities not only in the United States but increasingly around the world require achievement of generalizations, while policy analysis and solutions are always and inevitably particular and unique to the circumstances. There may even be a difference in the types of questions asked.

Thus communication researchers interested in contributing to policy-making processes must often choose between attending to policy-related research questions and audiences and their own professional survival. Those who receive outside funding for policy-related work may find themselves somewhat more protected professionally for economic reasons, but the genuinely critical work so important to healthy policy-making processes is less likely to receive funding than that which directly serves existing corporate or other institutional interests. Those engaged in useful policy analysis that does serve existing institutional needs face an additional complication—when the then-chief economist of the FCC issued a call for researcher input in the mid-1990s he acknowledged that anyone capable of actually addressing the questions to which the agency sought answers was likely already to be in the employ of the industries being regulated for sums of money so substantial that he or she would be unlikely to turn attention to pro bono work.

In a world as driven by personal reputation and interpersonal competition as academia, a response from the policy world to the ideas and

data of researchers can lead to hubris. Remaining in contact with the academic environment may provide a useful grounding when excitement about being close to those in power may tempt individuals into unsound or inappropriate work.

Between the Researcher and the Self A researcher interested in policy-related matters must undergo a series of negotiations not only with the policy institutions of interest but also with him or herself. Those struggles include the need to acknowledge the gap between an ideal world in which one might believe and the political realities of the real world; difficulties encountered with colleagues who may treat policy-related work with scorn or not take it seriously; identity questions raised by the addition of new roles to those of scholar, researcher, and teacher; and the simple pragmatic problem that however theory- and research-rich it is, often policy work does not count in academic promotion and tenure processes. These, too, are political issues—one may find one's work used by decision makers with whose politics you are uncomfortable, have to live with failures of policies promoted by one's work, or be forced to choose between a research program driven by one's theoretical position as opposed to one's political choices.

Research Questions

The horizon against which policy problems are defined, the need for research questions dealing with decision-making processes and the effects of the implementation of policy to be cast in terms that are empirically valid, the degree to which their analysis focuses on generalizable as opposed to unique features, the extent to which research questions are critical in nature, and the desirability of consensus are dimensions of question definition that can affect the utility of communication research to policy-makers.

The Horizon The difference in the rhythm of the processes with which researchers and policy-makers are engaged creates another enduring tension: Policy-makers generally work on a very short time horizon and need immediate answers to pressing questions, while those involved in research rely upon time-intensive habits of conceptual development and

exhaustive research projects that are often of greatest value when longitudinal. Waiting upon scholarly publication cycles for public presentation of work additionally adds potentially years to the process, though there are multiple ways work can effectively come to the attention of policy-makers before it reaches official publication: manuscripts can be sent to staffers and policy-makers, *amicus curiae* briefs can be filed in court cases, and, today, electronic modes of publication can disseminate findings in the form of working papers and reports long before results reach more formal print forms.

Even such techniques, however, cannot address the problem of taking into account the needs of future generations. Environmental problems have drawn attention to the fact that while it may be possible to get the consent of the governed from those currently living, it is not possible to get policy agreement from those yet unborn. Yet the path dependency of decisions about information infrastructure and its uses means that some method of taking the future into account is necessary. In some policy issue areas there is experimentation with techniques for “discounting the future” and otherwise incorporating long-range impacts into contemporary decision making, and the same needs to be done in the area of policy dealing with information, communication, and culture. This problem is exacerbated by technological change. Policy analysts working in the contemporary environment must deal both with what even the FCC is now referring to as “legacy law”—law and regulation designed for a technological world of media distinguishable for legal treatment that no longer exists—as well as with emergent infrastructural, social, and legal realities.

The Validity of Research Questions The formal policy-making processes to which most communication policy research refers are not the only processes of importance to the real world of how decisions are made and the ways in which they are implemented. Informal negotiations, variables that intervene in the ways in which policies are put into place on the ground, and the intersections among the multiple types of social systems that convene on the policy process should all be subjects of research. Increasingly policy-making is only one among the many structural forces shaping the communications environment. Thus other

factors, such as the structural influence of software and infrastructure system design, need attention as well.

The Global and the Local While policy analysts tend to look for what can be generalized across cases, actual instances of policy-making will always be unique and thus will not be susceptible to a fixed set of analytical rules. Every social process and phenomenon, that is, occurs at a unique conjuncture of numerous causal forces. Policy decisions, too, arise at the intersection of multiple different games, only some of which explicitly involve the policy-making process itself. Neither policy processes nor their solutions are necessarily applicable across environments. Even the elements of the policy world may take on different roles as they move from context to context. In South Africa in the late 1990s, for example, structuring regulatory agencies became a form of discourse, discourse a form of policy tool, policy tools a form of cultural expression, and culture the data upon which regulation was to be based. The implication for communication researchers interested in having an influence on policy processes is that analysis must be responsive to the particularities of specific situations—though an overemphasis on the particular can also be dangerous.

Administrative versus Critical Though many argue that there is an enduring tension between critical research and policy research, others take the position that policy research at its best *is* critical research, applied. Certainly there have been cases when criticism of specific policies or policy-making processes and institutions has been welcomed; indeed, at times those inside decision making organizations try to elicit critical input in order to stimulate or affect specific internal processes. Those who believe that the most valuable role of communication research for policy-makers is putting new ideas on the table are suggesting that critical work is not only inevitable but intrinsic to the process. For this to be successful, however, one must attend to matters of presentation, the nature of the relationship between researcher and policy-maker, and the question of trust. Thus the enduring tension here is not between the types of research but, rather, between the content of

the ideas presented and the mode and manner of presentation. There is always the danger that the messenger may be shot.

Innovation versus Consensus Of the various roles researchers can play in policy-making processes, clearly one of the most effective is expanding the range of potential policy choices by putting new ideas on the table. At the same time, policy-makers are uncomfortable when there is a lack of consensus among researchers—or use such disagreement to turn the results of research to their own political ends. Of course ideas that are new at one point in time can become the subjects of consensus at another, but this enduring tension intersects with that between short and long time horizons to make identification of specific tactics for researchers non-obvious.

Process

The distinction between research and policy is an enduring tension for communication researchers because of the temptation to insert one's personal policy preferences into the presentation of research data or, in some, the belief that the policy implications of one's data are obvious and inevitable. Coping with this tension can include foregrounding the normative assumptions in one's research as well as the ways in which conducting research on a policy problem can constitute an intervention in itself. The Canadian-based nongovernmental organization (ngo) International Development Research Centre (IDRC) provides a model of the latter by incorporating the Hawthorne effect explicitly into the design of its research projects on communication policy-related issues across the developing world. Dolf Zillman's recommendation that the process of bringing research into policy-making processes be carefully broken down into the separate stages of problem definition, synthesis of research, identification of alternative policy responses, and making a policy decision is another way of responding to this problem.

Almost all communication policy research aims at legislation once proposed or put in place—precisely the points at which it is least likely to have impact. While it may be easiest to see the target at this stage, those who want to have effect need to enter the process both much earlier

(when the range of possible policy alternatives is being determined) and much later (when the effects of the implementation of policies are being evaluated).

Lessons Learned

Certain lessons for researchers and policy-makers can be garnered from the experience of others.

Assume That Ideas Matter

Oddly, academics often underestimate the weight of ideas. It is only in the last dozen years that social scientists have begun to incorporate ideas into their analyses of social processes. While the realistic set of policy options may be narrow, the policy process itself is a voracious consumer of ideas. Ideas fulfill multiple roles—they illuminate, they legitimate, and they are critical to keeping debate alive. One of the most important functions for academics is theoretical, for theoretical innovation provides conceptual frameworks that in turn suggest new policy options. This function is particularly important during a period in which the very nature of the information infrastructure is undergoing such radical change.

Of course this can be taken too far. Ideas may be taken up for short-lived political purposes or rhetorical effect. The actual animating logics of policy-makers may be spurious or even counter-indicative. Concepts and belief structures that shape policy-making may not be explicit, so that one of the jobs for researchers should be to bring them into the light.

The “weak Baconian”¹ position acknowledges that knowledge may be power, but it is not a 1:1 relationship. The lesson for communication researchers is that while specific ideas may not always win, they do matter. Generating ideas is thus fundamental to the metabolism of the policy-making process; to do so is to serve as a public intellectual. The greatest benefit from those who choose to play the role of public intellectual may be not in answering questions but in clarifying the questions to be asked.

Policy Analysis Demands Theory Development

While existing theory can usefully be applied in the course of policy analysis, the conceptual task does not stop there. As with any other engagement with the empirical world, policy analysis should serve to refine theory and move it forward. Unlike research data generated in the controlled conditions of laboratories or via a restriction of variables examined in a natural setting, the study of policy problems requires accepting multicausal explanations of events and processes that unfold in complex environments involving a myriad of variables. One of the ways, therefore, that addressing policy problems may create a "happy moment" in the development of the field is that it forces the evolution of theory complex enough to map validly onto the world we experience, demands the development of meso-level theory linking abstractions with the ground, requires linkage of theories that apply to different levels of analysis, insists that longitudinal analyses be undertaken, and must start with fundamental questions involving the nature of society and communication within it.

Treat Policy-making as a Coalition Process

Though researchers are generally accustomed to working alone or only with other researchers, policy-making involves a coalition among social scientists and many other kinds of actors. As a result, success in the world of policy requires negotiating skills additional to those required for scholarship. Responding to critiques of research with anger or withdrawal, for example, may work in the scholarly world but is completely dysfunctional in the policy environment.

The coalition nature of the process is one explanation for the unpredictable or limited impact of research results. Though in the minds of academics data may be determinative, in the political world they are only one among many inputs into decision-making processes that are themselves not linear in nature. The complexity of these processes, then, has research as well as behavioral implications. The notion of the policy world as an ecology of games is one way of responding to this situation conceptually and methodologically. Appreciation of the tacit knowledge of working policy-makers is another. Ongoing relationships between researchers and policy-makers are a third feature of the coalition nature

of the process. Policy research reports are in fact often superfluous in themselves, having been designed into the process as a means of legitimating systematic interactions between researchers and policy-makers. Acknowledging that policy-making is a coalition venture can also open up opportunities for academics, who otherwise find they may have only limited access to pertinent data.

Particularly in issue areas in which circumstances are as rapidly changing as they are in the area of the building, regulation, and use of the global information infrastructure, a great deal of the critical policy thinking and decision making takes place orally during face-to-face meetings at seminars, colloquia, and other venues for public discussion. The slow pace of academic publishing means that even when refereed journal articles or books are on-point for specific problems, they may arrive on the scene long after pertinent decisions have been made. For this reason, too, participating in oral conversation is important. Doing so also contributes to the building of the personal relationships with policy-makers that goes far in developing the kind of trust and credibility required for one's work to be taken into account in the course of policy-making.

Beware of Overgeneralization

Overgeneralization of research findings—whether across time periods, societies, or situations—is one of the greatest weaknesses of communication research as applied to policy problems. Though research results are often presented as if they are independent of their social parameters, it is now understood that any specific social process or phenomenon occurs at an always-unique confluence of multiple different causal forces. To enhance the usefulness of research results for policy-makers, academics must thus:

1. clarify the conditions under which those results obtain;
2. resist ahistorical interpretations of data;
3. distinguish between short-lived phenomena and long-term trends;
4. acknowledge the limitations of findings; and
5. be willing to reexamine policy conclusions when new research appears.

Working in interdisciplinary teams—another form of coalition effort—can help avoid the monocausal explanations of complex situations so tempting to researchers whose research streams are based in single theories.

Theory and concepts, too, can be essentially overgeneralized. Even notions such as secrecy are far from static over time and across cultures, the result of dynamic ongoing negotiations responsive both to social processes and technological change.

Build a Coherent Research Agenda

The fragmented nature of too many scholarly research agendas seriously handicaps the academic community vis-à-vis the systematic and comprehensive efforts of the corporate world. Across researchers this contributes to a perception on the part of policy-makers that communications as a field lacks a consensus and has failed to deal with many of the issues of primary concern. At the individual level, fragmentation of research agendas undermines efforts to build enduring relationships both with policy-makers and with those who fund policy research. Sustained attention to specific problems over time is critical to building credibility and developing a reputation for subject-specific expertise.

A related characteristic of research programs is endurance. The policy-making openness to research changes over time as ideas first seen as radical or irrelevant may move to the center of discussion a few years later. One of the values of publication is that it keeps information and ideas available over long periods. On the personal level, too, researchers should not be discouraged if first attempts to influence decision making fail; rather, the effort should be conceived of as decades-long. Coherence does not mean oversimple—it means focused.

Respond to Actual Policy Problems

Working politicians and policy-makers are not concerned with theory, however sexy—they are concerned with solving problems. This reality has several implications for communication researchers interested in having some impact in the policy world. Communication researchers for much of the twentieth century have pursued questions very different from those addressed by policy-makers. While First Amendment

scholarship focuses on the production of ideas, policy-makers also must address the distribution and use of information as pressing political problems. Audience research has gripped much of the communication research community over the course of the decades during which the pressing policy issue was design of the architecture of the information infrastructure. In both of these exemplar cases there is a relationship between the questions pursued by each but those connections must be explicitly drawn and this is almost never done. While of course any research must be informed by theory and theory will always be the source of any ideas of value to policy-makers, defining a research agenda that is solely driven by theoretical questions may well not yield results of value to policy-makers without additional effort on the part of researchers. Taking an alternative approach need not necessarily require selling out by emptying analyses of a grounding in social theory. Rather, it may be a simple matter of working with presentation modes to ensure that theoretical work and research intersect with the ongoing discourse among policy-makers.

Even when a desired law or regulation is put into place, there is no guarantee that it will be fully or appropriately implemented. On the policy-making side there may be a shortage of funds, lack of nerve, absence of political sponsorship or acceptance by necessary collaborators, or a lack of effective method. The media or other industries to which policies apply may not live up to their commitments. Too, policies once implemented may have effects quite other than those intended. Therefore researchers who are interested in influencing the structure of society and the nature of social processes through the avenue of policy should include evaluation of the effects of the implementation of policies in their research agendas. Without this additional step all other efforts may be for nought.

It is often difficult for policy-makers to link the results of research or ideas with which they are presented to specific decisions they need to make. Researchers can address this problem by making explicit the relationship between their research results and legislation or regulatory decisions facing policy-makers. Linking research to specific pieces of legislation makes it much easier for policy-makers to locate the information and understand its pertinence. When there are no specific pieces of legislation on the table to which research results or theoretical

developments apply, it is still valuable for researchers to detail the policy implications of their work. Often policy-makers otherwise simply cannot see the utility of the information that is offered to them.

Adapt Presentation to Audience

Very few policy-makers will have the skills necessary to understand either ideas or data presented in academic terms. The fact that decisions already in place may have been based on intensive empirical investigations is often unknown to contemporary policy-makers. Researchers who seek policy use of their findings, therefore, must repackage their information in forms accessible and usable to policy-makers. Synthesizing complex findings into easily grasped conclusive statements is critical for success, as is contextualizing findings in terms familiar to the policy-making world. Researchers who are able—and willing—to be explicit about the values informing their work and the assumptions embedded within it are also likely to increase their effectiveness with policy-makers.

The arguments built upon research results, too, must be comprehensible to the layperson. Policy-makers will not be attuned to subtleties of theoretical position or to arguments internal to the social sciences over the relative value of various research methods. Rather, the quality of the argument presented will be determinative of their responses. It is worth taking into account during design of presentations that the results of research are often of more interest to those in mid-level decision-making positions than to those at the top. Another danger that attention to the manner of presentation can help avoid is what Wartella describes as “ghettoization” of findings, the application of ideas and research results to single issues when they have more general applicability. Higher education curricula intended to train communication researchers for involvement in the world of policy should incorporate courses that train students in a range of policy research genres that go beyond scholarly journal articles to include executive summaries, reports, press releases, media briefings, and other techniques designed to reach the wide variety of audiences of importance.

The fora for presentation of research results are also important. Contributing to oral debate has already been mentioned. Editorial pieces in newspapers and magazines, letters to the editor, articles for elite but non-academic intellectual magazines, and books written for a trade rather

than academic audience are all ways of bringing scholarly ideas and the results of research in front of working policy-makers. For all of these venues, academics must be clear about just which public is being addressed, and adapt language, syntax, and modes of argument as appropriate. The public at large needs a different type of presentation than do working policy-makers, technical specialists, or the cultural and socio-economic elites who influence policy-makers.

Clarify the Researcher's Role

There are a number of different roles a researcher can play in the policy-making process, from advocate to staffer to expert witness. Not all of what an academic will do in a policy process is necessarily research itself. One may also be called upon to summarize positions of parties, propose alternative policies, assess potential impacts of policies, or simply educate decision makers. Being clear about just what the role is what function is to be filled will enhance a researcher's chances of success in the policy world. A number of the pieces included in this collection identify cases in which researchers were less effective than they might have been because of confusion regarding roles.

Research brokers—insiders in government open to new ideas and willing to bring them into policy-making processes—are one of the most important but least understood and often nonexistent links of the chain of connections needed if research is to effectively influence policy. Brokers may be politicians who are unusually forward-looking or staffers with advanced academic training (often under those whose ideas they subsequently bring into government). Brokers are key to success because they have daily access to decision-making processes, like the industries being regulated but unlike academics brought in upon occasion for expert advice. What it takes to successfully establish such a function will differ, of course, from society to society; it is easier where the population is smaller and the number of hierarchical layers between elites and the general population is lower. The lesson here, though, is the formation of task-specific institutions designed to bring the research and policy communities together can be valuable.

It would be useful were policy-makers to become better equipped to understand and use the results of research. Legal realists early in the

twentieth century began to argue that those involved in making, interpreting, and implementing the law ought to pay more attention to the results of empirical research and the thinking of social scientists. As early as the 1940s the suggestion was made that traditional legal education should either be replaced by or be enriched with training in social science research techniques, and the suggestion of enriching law school curricula this way remains on the table today. Many policy-makers work their way into political activity from other educational backgrounds as well, so all teaching in the area of information, communication, and culture may serve as inputs into later policy-making processes via its impact on students.

Become Involved in Institutional Design

This book has not attended to issues raised by policy-making processes as organizational forms or by their communicative aspects, but tinkering with the design of policy-making processes and institutions themselves is among the techniques available for bringing the research and policy communities closer together. The study of policy-making as organizational and communicative forms is likely to yield additional useful insights as to how to do this most successfully. To further this end, researchers ought to be involved in processes of design and review of policy institutions.

One way in which the use of new information technologies can make it easier for communication researchers to influence policy is through establishment of widely available and easily accessible databases of existing research and the formation of national and international research networks. Computerized databases and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) that include the liaison function in their mission statements have begun to perform some of these functions over the past couple of decades. Recent breakthroughs in the design of knowledge management software should increase capabilities of this kind in future.

Notes

1. Thanks to Andrew Blau for articulating the "weak Baconian" position.