

## CALL FOR PAPERS

### TURNING RHETORIC OF SCIENCE INTO PEDAGOGICAL MATERIALS

The Organizing Committee for the 2004 AARST Preconference Workshop invites you to submit a **two-page treatment of keywords, lines of argument, and applications to various fields and controversies** in rhetoric of science/technology, as it has developed in the last quarter of a century and is being developed today.

The purpose of these texts is to stimulate and organize three sessions on undergraduate and graduate pedagogical materials for the rhetoric of science/technology. These sessions will be held at the preconference workshop in Chicago on November 10, 2004. (A final afternoon session will be devoted to concrete issues about production and publication of textbook material.)

Contributions might include two-page treatments of keywords, lines of argument and applications of rhetoric of science. In this treatment, authors might:

- Identify keywords and outline the history of these in the field,
- Identify lines of argument used by rhetoricians of science and how they have played out in the literature.
- Compare the application of key concepts across fields and controversies.

Keywords might include, for example, priestly voice, spheres of argument, credibility (and related ethos notions), demarcation, polysemy, and so forth; lines of argument might include realism versus social construction, the public understanding of science, deficit models of communication, and so forth; fields or controversies to which rhetoric of science has been, or might profitably be, applied are, for example, creationism, evolutionary biology, nuclear rhetorics, genetics, psychology/parapsychology, anthropology, ecology/environmental science, geology, and a host of others. Both historical and contemporary studies are appropriate, and we anticipate participants going far beyond the examples given; creativity is encouraged.

To participate, please send a short statement containing:

1. Your experience or interest in teaching Rhetoric of Science and Technology
2. A list or outline of the topics you normally teach, or would like to see included in a textbook you would use, and the kind of approach you prefer. (theory, case study, policy, historical, etc.) Putting this in the form of a syllabus or a Table of Content would be helpful.
3. A two page intervention on one or more keywords, lines of argument, or field of application/controversy that you wish to contribute to the discussion.

Send your texts (by e mail attachment) by **JULY 30** to

David Depew (david-depew@uiowa.edu)  
Joan Leach (j.leach@uq.edu.au)  
Bill Keith (wmkeith@uwm.edu)

**Background:**

At last year's preconference in Miami Beach, it was noted that the Rhetoric of Science/Technology/Inquiry project has now entered the stage where dedicated courses are being routinely taught around the county. However, especially at the undergraduate level, teaching materials that are not primary sources or difficult secondary literature are scarce. Participants at the 2003 AARST pre-conference indicated an interest in correcting this problem. At the 2004 Preconference we are entering into the process of writing a collective "course book" which could be used in rhetoric of science courses. The mode of organization and publication remains entirely open at this point, and will be discussed thoroughly at the preconference on November 10.

Schedule. A full schedule will become available by early Fall.

The rough arrangement will be:

Morning session I: Keywords in the Rhetoric of Science and Technology

Morning II: Lines of argument in the field, their distinctiveness from other approaches to science studies, and their fecundity.

Lunch

Afternoon I: Application of Rhetoric of Science and Technology to fields and controversies

Afternoon II: Discussion of publication issues and deadlines.