

WTMC SERIES

ON TEACHING &
LEARNING STS

POSTCOLONIAL

Workshop

2019(I)



WTMC

*Netherlands Graduate Research School
of Science, Technology and Modern Culture*

WTMC Series on Teaching and Learning STS

Publication of the Netherlands Graduate Research School
of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC)

Director:

Stefan Kuhlmann

Training co-ordinators:

Bernike Pasveer & Anne Beaulieu

Information on the programme:

j.a.beaulieu@rug.nl

b.pasveer@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Practical information, registration, and hotel arrangements:

Elize Schiweck, e.schiweck@utwente.nl

Last minute emergencies: +31-24-3615999 (Soeterbeeck)

Cover design:

Zahar Koretsky

Information about the series:

j.a.beaulieu@rug.nl

b.pasveer@maastrichtuniversity.nl

Available at: <https://www.wtmc.eu/wtmc-series/>

ISSN: 2666-2892

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3990/4.2666-2892.2019.01>

WTMC Workshop

Post-Colonial

No cartoon this time!

Why not? Because everything we could find was somehow awfully embarrassing and ‘wrong’, from a postcolonial view that is.

Here’s the challenge:

Find or make a cartoon that may withstand postcolonial critique while still addressing the topic (finding/drawing may be done before or during the workshop).

Put your cartoon up on the wall we will reserve for it.

During Friday’s ‘what kept you awake’ session (but most likely also at other points during the workshop) we will reflect on postcolonial humor.

Contents

Introduction to the workshop	5
Programme	7
Detailed overview.....	8
1.1 Opening and introduction.....	8
1.2 Core reading Anderson 2002, Postcolonial Technoscience and Harding 2011, The Postcolonial STS Reader	8
1.3 David Ludwig: Between Action and Critique. What is the Role of STS in International Development?	9
1.4 PhD Presentations (skill).....	9
2.1 Where is your ‘field’ and where are you? On methodological symmetries (method)	9
2.2 PhD Presentations (skill).....	10
2.3 Ester Turnhout Globalising nature? Post-colonial options and challenges for global environmental knowledge making.....	10
2.4 Alana Helberg-Proctor: Doing difference: race and ethnicity in medicine, care, and science	11
2.5 Debating the Anthropocene (skill).....	11
3.1 + 3.2 Nishant Shah: Technologies of Survival: How postcolonial and feminist critique shall save the world (method and lecture)	12
3.3 Maisons Tropicales/Maisons Coloniales: Contesting Technologies of Authenticity and Value in Niamey, Brazzaville, Paris, New York, and Venice.....	13
About the speakers	13
About the co-ordinators	14
Readings for this workshop.....	14
Presentation guidelines	15
Feedback for Presentations	16

Introduction to the workshop

Welcome to the workshop. It starts here. Before the actual workshop begins, read through this programme to make sure you know what you are supposed to do in advance. You need to prepare assignments, as well as read all the literature – best not to leave this until the last minute. Preparing for the workshop will take about one week of full-time work. There are not many gaps in the programme, so it is important that you do the reading before you arrive. Make notes of any questions you may have or anything you do not understand – that will remind you to raise them during the workshop. Read through the detailed programme as well, so you know in good time what you need to prepare, write and think about. Pay special attention to the activities, as these require extra preparation (drawing and team preparation for debate). Discussants have been assigned for the presentations some of you will be giving. The names are listed in the programme – do check to see if you need to be prepared for that. We have tried to include people as discussants who have not done that task recently, and who do not work in the same university as the presenter. Some of you may have to think hard about what you can say – it's good practice.

Each of you will get something different out of this workshop, depending on where you are in your own research and on what exactly you are studying. As a more informal part of the preparation, it is worthwhile to spend time thinking about what it is you want to learn and how you could achieve that. Of course, you should also be prepared to be surprised, to learn something unexpected and then afterwards reflect on how that relates to your own development as a scholar.

Post-Colonial

At the turn of the millennium, Science and Technology Studies was seen to have made mixed progress in terms of developing a post-colonial scholarship, in spite of over a decade of post-colonial lines of work in many areas of the humanities and social sciences. For example, in 2002, Anderson wrote:

During the 1990s, [such] efforts to 'provincialize Europe' have gained pace in many disciplines, but they seem to almost have stalled in science studies, with the engine choking perhaps on a lingering residue of the field's obsession with a universalized European rationality (Anderson 2002, 645).

A decade later, Harding remarked that despite longstanding critique of the underdeveloped ability of the modern Western science, namely, their lack of the resources to recognize their own provincially, "it remains puzzling that the issues raised ... are only now beginning to attract the attention of broader audiences in the West" (Harding 2012, 3). In 2018, an elaborate exhibition called "[STS across borders](https://4s2018sydney.org/across-borders/)" (<https://4s2018sydney.org/across-borders/>) was part of the annual meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science, marking yet another milestone in the post-colonial STS discussion. It is interesting to take a look at what has been discussed and proposed there.

Post-colonial STS has assumed many forms and varieties: from appeals to take 'other', 'indigenous', 'local', or 'non-Western' knowledges and practices seriously while leaving untouched and unquestioned the 'self', the 'global', the 'western' - in short the standards from where things could be othered and rendered indigenous. Here we see movements to 'give voice' to others and make them participate to the development of science, but still always according to the standards, the categories, the normativities of the science that would simply claim universality. Other efforts have been much more fundamental appeals and efforts to 'provincialize' science (and STS) i.e. to localize, situate and reflexively engage the very

positions, languages, categories from which we proceed, including how we, as STS scholars, position ourselves vis-a-vis our research subjects and objects. This has meant asking ‘who do we think we are?’ In a sense, postcolonial STS has added a third symmetry: the first was the need to symmetrically explain true and false knowledge/successful and unsuccessful technologies, and the second not to assume an ontological and a priori divide between humans and non-humans. The third would be to symmetrically consider all worlds to be local and situated, and perhaps even to consider all (human as well as non-human animals) as being in need of refuge (Haraway, 2015).

In this workshop we will look at a variety of propositions for what a post-colonial project for STS could be, and which ambitions have been and could be formulated. Where are we, today, as a field? How has STS been implicated in and contributed to working towards rethinking orderings of global and local, concepts of transnationalities and identities, and other “durable binaries” such as modern/traditional, developed/underdeveloped, Western/Indigenous, metropole/post-colony -- to paraphrase Anderson?

We will reflect on the roles of technoscience in the production of 'globality' of the present historical moment, and try to situate them. For such globality is made of declining nation-states, hybrid identities, contested new global markers (for example, a new 'global' geological age, the Anthropocene) among other phenomena. ‘Globalization’ also takes on ever new forms in market, organizations, bodies and epistemologies: flexible hierarchies, complex transactions, displacement and fragmentations abide, also in the terrain of STS.

On day 1, we will start the workshop with a session on core readings that are especially useful to set the stage for discussions of the post-colonial and STS. Next, David Ludwig, from WUR, will talk about different modes of critically engaging ‘others’ into the development of meaningful technological innovation.

On day 2, we will look at human and non-human animals – climate and biodiversity on the one hand (Turnhout, a debate between you), and health on the other (Helberg-Proctor).

On day 3, Nishan Shah, from ArtEZ, will reflect on but also practically engage us with postcolonial computing. We will end the workshop with a contribution from Christoph Rausch on architecture and the post-colonial.

You will be listening to guest lecturers, but also actively engage in ‘doing’ post-colonial critique in different modalities – a debate, a methods session, the core reading, and quite likely some of the PhD Presentations as well.

We are confident that you will find many opportunities to link the workshop to your own research interests and that this workshop will serve you in your future teaching and research activities.

We hope you will enjoy preparing for this workshop and look forward to meeting you (again) in May!

Bernike and Anne, also on behalf of the speakers

Programme

Wednesday 8 May	
10.30-11.00	Arrival and coffee
11.00-12.00	1.1 Opening and introduction
12.00-13.30	Lunch
13.30-15.00	1.2 Core Readings
15.00-15.30	Break
15.30-17.00	1.3 David Ludwig (WUR): Between Action and Critique (L)
17.30-19.00	Dinner
19.00-20.30	1.5 PhD Presentations (S)
Thursday 9 May	
9.00-9.15	Introduction
9.15-10.45	2.1 Where is your field, and where are you? (E/M)
10.45-11.00	Coffee
11.00-12.30	2.2 PhD Presentations (S)
12.45-14.00	Lunch
14.00-15.30	2.3 Esther Turnhout (WUR): Globalising nature? Post-colonial options and challenges for global environmental knowledge making (L)
15.30-16.00	Tea
16.00-17.30	2.4 Alana Helberg-Proctor (UM/UvA): Doing difference: race and ethnicity in medicine, care, and science (L)
18.00-19.30	Dinner
19.30-21.00	2.5 Debate (S)
Friday 10 May	
Before 9	Check out from Soeterbeeck
9.00-9.15	Introduction
9.15-12.45 (break included)	3.1 + 3.2 Nishant Shah (ArteZ): Technologies of Survival (M + L)
13.00-14.00	Lunch
14.00-15.30	3.3 Christoph Rausch (UM): Maisons Tropicales/Maisons Coloniales (L)
15.30-16.00	Evaluation/closing

Detailed overview

1.1 Opening and introduction

As usual, we will start the workshop with a round of introductions that allows all of you to briefly explain who you are, where you work, what your research is about, and what you expect to get out of this workshop.

Preparation:

Use the drawing (see activity 2.1) or another visual (or auditive or tactile) rendering of you, your field, and what/who is in it, to introduce your project to the group, in no more than 3 minutes per person.

1.2 Core reading Anderson 2002, Postcolonial Technoscience and Harding 2011, The Postcolonial STS Reader

This workshop, we will begin straight away with our Core Reading session – a session in which you read and discuss one or more STS texts that relate to the theme of the workshop. The two texts you will read and discuss this time set the stage for the workshop's theme. In preparation for the session, please read these carefully and make notes of any questions you have of issues you would like to raise. Also think about how these readings relate to your own research.

Anderson, W. (2002), Postcolonial Technoscience. *Social Studies of Science* 32 (5/6), 643–658.

Harding, S. (2011), Beyond Postcolonial Theory: Two Undertheorized Perspectives on Science and Technology. In Harding, S. (ed), *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1-31.

Questions Core reading

- Anderson, W. (2002), Postcolonial Technoscience. *Social Studies of Science* 32 (5/6), 643–658.
- Harding, S. (2011), Beyond Postcolonial Theory: Two Undertheorized Perspectives on Science and Technology. In Harding, S. (ed), *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Durham: Duke University Press, pp. 1-31.

1. Metaphors

Post-colonial critiques often use metaphors such as decentering, symmetry, encounters, moving metropolis, assemblage, fragmentary. Which do you find most helpful and why?

2. Harding puts forth that post-colonial intellectuals have made the case that the Western sciences lack the resources necessary to recognize their own location in social relations and history (page 3). Are these elements of location and relations of concern in STS? Which resources might STS provide to articulate this recognition?
3. Harding notes a number of issues where feminist scholarship and STS disagree.
 - Role of social relations
 - Relative importance of areas of science
 - Who can be an agent of progressive transformation

How could these be addressed? Can you imagine a fruitful encounter? And what form would it take?

For example: Which figures from STS and feminist scholarship need to sit down for a meal and good discussion? Is a new institution necessary? Or a joint conference? How could a course bring these together? Etc.

4. Modernization

Anderson discusses various approaches to 'alternative modernities'. Which of these do you prefer, and why? Do any relate to approaches you use in your own work?

1.3 David Ludwig: Between Action and Critique. What is the Role of STS in International Development?

This lecture discusses three international development projects that focus on nature conservation in Brazil, landslide adaptation in Nepal, and sustainable agriculture in Ghana. All three projects aim to incorporate basic insights of postcolonial critique by emphasizing the importance of local knowledge and by avoiding linear development models of economic growth and technological modernization. Instead of exporting scientific and technological solutions into the "Global South", all three projects aim to create meaningful interactions between stakeholders through models of "co-creation", "participation", and "transdisciplinarity". Despite good intentions, participatory and transdisciplinary development projects often leave room for substantial postcolonial critique. The talk will address how to navigate the tension between action and critique through STS research that acknowledges both the need for both practical intervention and theoretical reflexivity.

Literature:

Ludwig, D., El-Hani, C. (forthcoming). Philosophy of ethnobiology: understanding knowledge integration and its limitations. *Journal of Ethnobiology*.

Nadasdy, P. (1999), 'The politics of TEK: power and the "integration" of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 36, 1–18.

1.4 PhD Presentations (skill)

Important: See the PhD Presentation Guidelines at the end of this document.

2.1 Where is your 'field' and where are you? On methodological symmetries (method)

"It happened to me on that trip. I was on the Southern Cross – that's the missions boat – and there was a group of islanders there – recent converts. You can always tell if they're recent, because the women still have bare breasts. And I thought I'd go through my usual routine, so I started asking questions. The first question was, what would you do with it if you earned or found a guinea? Would you share it, and if so who would you share it with? It gets their attention because to them it's a lot of money, and you can uncover all kinds of things about kinship structure and economic arrangements, and so on. Anyway at the end of this – we were all sitting cross-legged on the deck, miles from anywhere – they decided they'd turn the tables on me, and ask me the same questions. Starting with: What would I do with a guinea? Who would I share it with? I explained I was unmarried and that I wouldn't necessarily feel obliged to

share it with anybody. They were incredulous. How could anybody live like that? And so it went on, question after question. And it was one of those situations, you know, where one person starts laughing and everybody joins in and in the end the laughter just feeds off itself. They were rolling round on the deck by the time I'd finished. And suddenly I realized that anything I told them would have got the same response. I could've talked about sex, repression, guilt, fear – the whole sorry caboodle – and it would've got exactly the same response. They wouldn't've felt a twinge of disgust or disapproval or sympathy or anything, because it would all have been too bizarre. And I suddenly saw that their reactions to my society were neither more nor less valid than mine to theirs. And do you know that was a moment of the most amazing freedom. I lay back and I closed my eyes and I felt as if a ton weight had been lifted It was ... the Great White God de-throned, I suppose. Because we did, we quite unselfconsciously assumed we were the measure of all things. That was how we approached them. And suddenly I saw that we weren't the measure of all things, but that there was no measure.'

Will Rivers, social anthropology and neurologist, talking to a colleague in 1916. From: Barker, P., 1996. *The Regeneration trilogy*. Viking, London.

This exercise is partly methodological: it asks you to reflect on how you engage with your 'field' and your research 'subjects/objects'; and partly conceptual: it asks you to reflect upon your positioning from a critical post-colonial point of view.

Preparation:

1. read Law, J. & Lin, W. (2017), Provincializing STS: postcoloniality, symmetry, and method. *East Asian Science and Technology Studies* 11, 211–227.
2. make and bring a drawing (or other representation) of your 'field', its objects/subjects, and your own position regarding these.

During the session:

Make small groups of 3 people and discuss your drawings with the following questions in mind:

- What do the drawings assume?
- What would a post-colonial critique of your drawings look like? Use Law & Lin, but also other workshop readings as you see fit.
- What would you need to do to make your methodologies more 'symmetrical'?
- How would you feel about such critique and revising your engagements with the field?

We will take the last 30 minutes of the session to reflect on our experiences together.

2.2 PhD Presentations (skill)

Important: See the PhD Presentation guidelines at the end of the programme

2.3 Ester Turnhout Globalising nature? Post-colonial options and challenges for global environmental knowledge making

In this lecture I will use the examples of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and particularly the Intergovernmental Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) to discuss logics and practices of global environmental knowledge making. Particular focus will be on the way in which these global organisations have included diverse disciplines and knowledge systems in their assessment work, including, the IPBES Global Assessment, which will be discussed during the upcoming IPBES plenary, next May in Paris, and of which I have been one of the authors. Drawing on De- and Post Colonial scholarship as well as on current discussions about the democratization of science, I will

juxtapose the notions of diversity and pluralism to assess current limitations and opportunities for these knowledge making practices.

Literature:

- Mignolo, W.D., 2009. Epistemic Disobedience, Independent Thought and Decolonial Freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Montana, J., 2017. Accommodating consensus and diversity in environmental knowledge production: Achieving closure through typologies in IPBES. *Environ. Sci. Policy* 68, 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.011>
- Todd, Z., 2016. An Indigenous Feminist's Take On The Ontological Turn: 'Ontology' Is Just Another Word For Colonialism. *J. Hist. Sociol.* 29, 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124>
- Turnhout, E., Dewulf, A., Hulme, M., 2016. What does policy-relevant global environmental knowledge do? The cases of climate and biodiversity. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain., Sustainability governance and transformation 2016: Informational governance and environmental sustainability* 18, 65–72.

2.4 Alana Helberg-Proctor: Doing difference: race and ethnicity in medicine, care, and science

In health policy, care and research around the world the 'inclusion paradigm' is gaining momentum. This inclusion paradigm is based on the notion that health inequalities are amplified when healthcare and research fail to address the needs of populations and individuals who are physically and culturally different from the 'white-male' standard in medical research and care. In order to combat such inequalities, 'inclusive' policies in the areas of healthcare and research thus call for the greater inclusion of diversity pertaining to ethnicity, race, sex, gender, sexuality, and age in health care and research. As a consequence, the specific research field of *Ethnicity & Health* is developing in Europe, and ethnicity and race are being included in health research and care more frequently. During this lecture I discuss how scientific knowledge and facts about ethnicity and race related to health are produced through present-day research practices in the Netherlands and beyond, and how these modes of scientific knowledge production are deeply intertwined with society and politics.

Literature:

- Duster, T., 2015. A post-genomic surprise. The molecular reinscription of race in science, law and medicine. *British Journal of Sociology* 66 (1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12118>

2.5 Debating the Anthropocene (skill)

In this activity, we will explore what it can mean, in a very practical sense, to take a stand with regards to an issue while also being aware of the assumptions that frame the terms of the debate, the concepts and arguments, as well as the language used. We will debate the following statement:

Geology needs to recognize the fact that humans permanently changed the planet.

There are major categories being evoked in this statement that all have been the subject of post-colonial critique:

- relation of humans to nature
- universalising definitions of 'humanity'
- relations of science and culture
- relation between science and nature

Among these are classic STS themes! Given what we are learning about post-colonial critique in this workshop, how can we engage in this debate? Which (types of) arguments could we use? How could we speak to the issues raised by the Anthropocene?

Preparation

1. Read

Lewis, S.L. & Maslin, M.A. (2015). Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature* 519, 171-180
 Haraway, D. (2015), Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin. *Environmental Humanities* 6(1), 159-165.

2. Prepare arguments

We will debate the statement from three angles or standpoints (see below), each of which will be defended/argued by a specific team.

Ahead of the workshop:

- *the teams should get in touch* to develop the arguments to bring up and how to formulate them (remember that language is an important element in post-colonial critique)
- *the debate leaders should get in touch* to discuss how they will order & moderate the debate
- *the observers should get in touch* to define specific aspects of the debate they will attend to

Team 1 Standpoint 1 Humans are not a significant factor in climate variations.
Team 2 Standpoint 2 Science (geology) can provide the insights needed to establish the Anthropocene as a distinct period.
Team 3 Standpoint 3 The concept of the Anthropocene in relation to the climate debate is based on faulty assumptions.
Debate leaders
Observers who will help us reflect on the debate

3. The debate itself:

Groups may use 10 minutes to actually set the stage

The debate will take 30 minutes

We will use the remaining time to reflect on the debate

3.1 + 3.2 Nishant Shah: Technologies of Survival: How postcolonial and feminist critique shall save the world (method and lecture)

In past decades there have been numerous attempts to design technological policies for “the developing world”. Such social and political initiatives have, more often than not, presented the computer as an

emancipation device, a provider of solutions to endemic socio-cultural problems. Others within the postcolonial discourse perceive computation as an infrastructure of control, one that asserts existing hegemonies. There is also a third perspective, one that identifies a need for integration between the culture of technology and social conditions, as if the two were somehow separated and in need of integration.

These three, oft critiqued, tropes of the digital are deviously persistent, even in postcolonial arguments that attempt to deconstruct them. And while there is a strategic need for these tropes, they are also marked in promoting an 'extinction impulse' that perpetuates colonial and patriarchal structures. With 'Technologies of Survival', this extended session, beginning with an impulse lecture and following with a workshop, seeks to build a grab-bag of postcolonial perspectives on computation, and to think through these ideas to better understand the computer, computation and the lives of those who are computed.

Literature and sources:

Lisa Nakamura, *transmediale 2018* | *Call Out, Protest, Speak Back*.

Philip, K. (2019). Postcolonial technopolitics: reflections on the Indian experience. Johannesburg. Salon JWTC - Johannesburg. Workshop Theory Crit. 3.

3.3 Maisons Tropicales/Maisons Coloniales: Contesting Technologies of Authenticity and Value in Niamey, Brazzaville, Paris, New York, and Venice

In this session, we watched part of a documentary on Maisons Tropicales/Maison Coloniales and discussed how it related to the workshop themes and contributions.

Literature:

Rausch, C. (2013). *Rescuing Modernity: Global Heritage Assemblages & Modern Architecture in Africa*. Universitaire Pers Maastricht. pp. 27-82.

About the speakers

Alana Helberg-Proctor is a postdoctoral researcher and visiting lecturer at the University of Amsterdam, and an Assistant Professor in the department of Health, Ethics, and Society at Maastricht University. Alana obtained her PhD degree from the Department of Health, Ethics, and Society at Maastricht University's Faculty of Health, Medicine, and Life Sciences in 2017. Her thesis is entitled *(Un)Doing Ethnicity: Analyses of the socio-scientific production of 'ethnicity' in health research in the Netherlands*. Alana's research examines the production of ethnicity and race within health research, policy, and care practices. Specifically, she is interested in understanding how objects of race and ethnicity are enacted in research, policy and care, and what the consequences of those particular enactments are. As a postdoctoral researcher in the RaceFaceID project (ERC, Prof. dr. Amade M'charek) Alana is currently examining the ways in which race is done in social psychology research on facial recognition and processing.

David Ludwig is an assistant professor in the "Knowledge, Technology, and Innovation" (KTI) Group of Wageningen University. His research integrates epistemological and ontological debates in philosophy with applied issues in development studies and research policy. His recent work has been published in journals such as *Philosophy of Science*, *Public Understanding of Science*, and *Current Anthropology*.

Nishant Shah is a feminist, humanist, technologist working in digital cultures. He is the Vice-President Research at the ArtEZ University of the Arts, The Netherlands, where he is invested in thinking through infrastructure of art, culture, and design for building resilient and equitable futures. He is a Senior Research Fellow in Media Cultures of Computer Simulation at Leuphana University, Germany, working through questions of simulation and the new technosocial subjectivities that emerge thereof. He was the co-founder of the Centre for Internet & Society India, where the work on technological ordering he initiated continues to inform his current preoccupations. He is a knowledge partner with the development agency Hivos, The Netherlands, analyzing new practices of collective action. His work remains at the interlocked edges of the body, identity, digital technologies, policy, and activism. His current interest is in thinking through questions of ethics and inclusion within Artificial Intelligence systems. You can find more of his work at <https://nishantshah.online>

Esther Turnhout is Full Professor at the Forest and Nature Conservation Policy Group of Wageningen University, the Netherlands. Her research program **The Politics of Environmental Knowledge** includes research into the different roles experts play at the science policy interface, the political implications of policy relevant knowledge, and the participation of citizens in environmental knowledge making, also known as citizen science. Current research focuses on the UN Intergovernmental Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), human-wildlife conflict and auditing practices in forest management. She has published articles on these and other topics in journals such as *Nature*, *Conservation Letters*, *Nature Sustainability*, *Science and Public Policy* and *Environment and Planning*. She is (associate) editor of *Environmental science & Policy*, *Restoration Ecology*, and *Conservation and Society*. She has been selected as an expert for IPBES and is currently a lead author of the IPBES Global Assessment

About the co-ordinators

Anne Beaulieu is associate professor of Science and Technology Studies at Campus Fryslan and the Faculty of Science and Engineering, University of Groningen. At Campus Fryslan, she works on creating knowledge infrastructures for sustainability and is responsible for the major Responsible Planet in the programme Global Responsibility and Leadership. She also writes and teaches about the societal aspects of energy and Big Data at the Johan Bernoulli Institute of Mathematics and Computer Science. She is the co-founder of the Groningen Energy Summer School for PhDs and acted as one of its scientific directors for 6 years. She is a member of the Board of Studium General Groningen and of the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board.

Bernike Pasveer is an assistant professor at the department of STS of the Faculty of Arts & Social Sciences (FASoS) at Maastricht University. She has worked on medical (imaging) technologies; on how (medical) technologies are constitutive of the human body's 'natural' achievements such as childbirth, reproduction, sports, and - her current research - dying; on how such 'natural' achievements and arrangements are culturally situated; and on how they might 'travel' to and from other places notably the so-called global South. She has a PhD in STS from the University of Amsterdam. She is member of the NIAS-Lorentz Advisory Board, and programme director of debating centre Sphinx in Maastricht.

Readings for this workshop

- Anderson, W. (2002), Postcolonial Technoscience. *Social Studies of Science* 32, 643–658.
- Duster, T. (2015), A post-genomic surprise. The molecular reinscription of race in science, law and medicine. *British Journal of Sociology* 66, 1–27.
- Haraway, D. (2015), Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: making kin. *Environmental Humanities* 6(1), 159-165.
- Harding, S. (2011), Beyond Postcolonial Theory: Two Undertheorized Perspectives on Science and Technology. *The Postcolonial Science and Technology Studies Reader*. Edited by Sandra Harding. Durham: Duke University Press, 1-31.
- Haraway, D., 2015. Anthropocene, Capitalocene, Plantationocene, Chthulucene: Making Kin. *Environ. Humanit.* 6, 159–165. <https://doi.org/10.1215/22011919-3615934>
- Law, J. & Lin, W. (2017), Provincializing STS: postcoloniality, symmetry, and method. *East Asian Science, Technology & Society*. 11, 211–227.
- Lewis, S.L. & Maslin, M.A. (2015), Defining the Anthropocene. *Nature* 519, 171-180.
- Ludwig, D. & El-Hani, C. (forthcoming), Philosophy of ethnobiology: understanding knowledge integration and its limitations. *Journal of Ethnobiology*.
- Mignolo, W.D. (2009), Epistemic disobedience, independent thought and decolonial freedom. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26, 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276409349275>
- Montana, J. (2017), Accommodating consensus and diversity in environmental knowledge production: Achieving closure through typologies in IPBES. *Environmental Science Policy* 68, 20–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2016.11.011>
- Nadasdy, P. (1999), The politics of TEK: power and the “integration” of knowledge. *Arctic Anthropology* 36, 1–18.
- Philip, K. (2019), Postcolonial technopolitics: reflections on the Indian experience. Johannesburg. Salon JWTC - Johannesburg. Workshop Theory Crit. 3.
- Rausch, C.,(2013). *Rescuing Modernity: Global Heritage Assemblages & Modern Architecture in Africa*. Universitaire Pers Maastricht, 27-82.
- Todd, Z. (2016), An indigenous feminist’s take on the ontological turn: ‘ontology’ is just another word for colonialism. *Journal for the History of Sociology* 29, 4–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/johs.12124>
- Turnhout, E., Dewulf, A. & Hulme, M. (2016.), What does policy-relevant global environmental knowledge do? The cases of climate and biodiversity. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.*, Sustainability governance and transformation 2016: Informational governance and environmental sustainability 18, 65–72. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2015.09.004>

Presentation guidelines

For presenters

- A projector and PC are available. Copy your presentation onto the PC in advance. You may want to use your own laptop, which usually works fine, but mind that it poses an extra risk of technical issues. Also, if you have video material, make sure you have it downloaded locally. There is internet, but relying on YouTube etc. is risky.
- The duration of your presentation should be **15 minutes**. Then there is another 15 minutes for the discussant and plenary discussion. We keep time very strictly.
- Try to make a sophisticated choice on what you want to present. One typical pitfall is wanting to give an overview of your whole PhD project, which leads to an unfocused and overloaded presentation. Rather select an interesting aspect of your research and discuss it in-depth.

For discussants

- Join the presenter in the front of the room after their presentation
- Present your comments in no more than **5 minutes**.

- Mind that being a discussant is not about pointing out all the flaws in the presenter's argument, but about setting the stage for a constructive discussion. Offering critique is good, but also try to bring out what the potentials of the argument are for improvement, and to identify some questions for the speaker or the group as a whole.
- You may want to get in touch with the presenter to prepare some comments. Feedback should address the quality of the presentation itself (slides, clarity, focus) as well as its content.

All others

- Before the presentations, make sure you have read the summary in this reader. It helps you sensitize your listening.
- Please fill in a **feedback form** for each presentation. They can be found at the end of the reader. They will be collected and given to the presenter. We will bring spare copies for people who don't print out the reader.
- Join the discussion after the discussant has given their feedback.

Feedback for Presentations

Note: copies of forms will be available at workshop

The form is to help you give feedback to your fellow participants, some of whom will be presenting their research during the summer school. Using a separate sheet for each presentation, put your name and that of the presenter at the top of a piece of paper. That way, if something isn't clear, the presenter knows whom to ask. Write your comments during or immediately after the presentation and give them to the presenter during the next break.

Points to consider when preparing feedback (you don't need to cover everything):

- Attractiveness of title and opening
- Usefulness of summary provided in the reader
- Clarity and significance of problem definition, research questions and aims (refinement of, addition to, clarification or rejection of an existing thesis)
- Use of theory and/or historiography (concepts, interpretations, etc.)
- Embeddedness in fields relevant to WTMC
- Clarity of structure
- Presentation of the method(s) employed
- Validity and reliability of the method(s) employed
- Accessibility of the research data to the audience
- Use of (intriguing and relevant) details and examples
- Clarity of argument
- Relation to the nature and level of expertise of audience
- Use of PowerPoint and other audio-visual resources
- Contact with audience and audibility of speech
- Clarity and significance of conclusions
- Response to questions and comments
-

