

# AARST 2002 Annual Preconference

N.C.A. New Orleans, LA

## Schedule & Papers

### Time Panel

8:00 am **Welcome**

8:15 - 10:00 am **Rhetorics of Mind and Experience: Case Studies and Conversation**  
Spotlight Panel Session

- ["A Capital and Novel Argument": Charles Darwin's Notebooks and the Origin of Rhetorical Consciousness](#) – Nathan Crick
- [From interpretation to identification: Assessing the status of language in psychological and neuroscientific accounts of affective facial expression](#) – McClain Watson
- [Functional magnetic resonance imaging and the mind-body problem: A rhetorical analysis of Conversations in the Cognitive Neurosciences](#) – Necia Werner
- [Making Room for Newcomers: Is There a Future for Memetics?](#) – Andreea Ritivoi

10:00 - 10:15 am **Break**

10:15 - 11:30 am **From Ghosts to God: Exploring the Relationship between Narrative and Technology**  
Panel Session

- [Rhetorically reading the Computer Game: Realism and Narrative in Icewind Dale](#) – Kevin Schut
- [Ghost-Hunting, Mystery, and the Rhetoric of Technology](#) – Warren Bareiss
- [Conflating God: Equating God and Science in Black & White](#) – Kenneth Rufo

11:30 - 1:00 pm **Lunch (on your own)**

1:00 - 2:15 pm **Studies in the Rhetoric of Science and Health**  
Panel Session

- [Genre Theory, Chaim Perelman, and Bioterrorism Responses: A Rhetorical Analysis](#) – Margaret Hamilton
- [Kairos in the History of Medical Discourse on Breastmilk and Immunity: Moving Beyond the Scientific-Progress Narrative](#) – Amy Koerber

2:30 - 6:15 pm **Case Study and Working Session**  
Beyond the Laboratory: History, Public Participation, and Communication at [Brookhaven National Laboratory](#)

### **Special Guests** **Robert Crease**

Robert Crease serves as historian for Brookhaven National Laboratory and is also on the faculty of the State University of New York at Stonybrook. His work as lab historian has focused on not only the scientific and technological culture of the laboratory, but the social controversies in which it has played a part. Of late, he has become interested in the different narratives that constitute the lab in public discourse, the media, and "official" history. He comes to AARST with questions about how to better account for the rhetorical dimensions of the institution's relationship with its various publics.

### **Mona Rowe**

Mona Rowe is the head of public affairs at Brookhaven National Laboratory. Having worked at BNL for several years, she has seen the evolution of public affairs work in the national laboratory system during her tenure at the lab. In response to numerous public controversies in recent years, the laboratories have attempted to cultivate more "pro-active" relationships with the publics they serve. Ms. Rowe comes to us to share her experience and concerns and looks forward to learning how and what a rhetorical perspective might contribute to BNL's effort to establish and maintain ongoing communication with its many publics.

### **Panel Overview**

The lab faces a number of rhetorical problems as they try to find effective and ethical ways to communicate with varied publics about a wide variety of issues and both panelists hope to address the following issues during the working sessions:

- BNL must address multiple audiences with conflicting interests and needs, including but not limited to the scientific community, the federal government, community groups, regulatory agencies, and corporate managers. Research in science communication traditionally has valorized the “attentive public,” but are there other publics of equal or even more importance to the laboratory? How can the laboratory present the idea of “basic research” (with no guaranteed technological payoff) to its various audiences? What possible justifications can it offer for continued taxpayer support of basic research laboratories?
- Communication at the laboratory has been conditioned by the procedures and restrictions inherited from the AEC and perpetuated by the DOE. Over the years, efforts have been made to mitigate the culture of secrecy established during WW2 and the cold war, but such change can only be brought about through consistent and repeated attempts to adopt of new frameworks through which to understand the nature and ethics of public communication. What are the ethical dimensions of communication within and about a national laboratory? How does the lab respond when asked questions such as “Can you guarantee that this research/technology will not harm humankind?” or “Why should I trust scientists?”

### **Papers**

- "[Fallout: Issues in the Study, Treatment, and Reparations of Exposed Marshall Islanders](#)"--Robert Crease

### **Websites**

- [Brookhaven National Laboratory](#) website
- [Environmental Restoration Division](#), BNL

6:15  
pm - ? Group dinner to follow—please plan to join us!

---

[AARST home](#) | [Symposia](#) | [NCA panels schedule](#)

created by g. coonfield, (c) 2002