

Dr Stefan Laser

Ruhr-University Bochum
Universitätsstr. 150
44801 Bochum

✉ stefan.laser@rub.de
🌐 www.sfb1567.ruhr-uni-bochum.de

Bochum, 5. September 2024

**Dissertation Review #2, Barbora Stehlíková:
E-waste between morality and ethics: Waste practices in the Czech Republic**

To whom it may concern,

Barbora Stehlíková's provided a thorough revision of her dissertation draft. I therefore recommend the granting of the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy to the candidate. For publication, minor editors would be helpful.

Based on the initial reviews and critical discussions during the defense, the author has invested considerable energy into rephrasing the guiding research question and methodological frame of the dissertation. I appreciate the edits and think they do a good job in clarifying the contribution of the dissertation. The new question, "How does e-waste recycling become economically efficient, and what kind of relations makes it possible?", is a suitable one. However, considering the publication of the manuscript, the author may think about adding a bit more specificity to the question, attending to the situated, i.e. ethnographic nature of the cases at hand. Put differently: What kind of efficiency are you referring to?; efficient for whom? A brave decision would be to put the "disability" experience centre stage, since you state on p. 7 that this is your principal contribution to the study of waste economies. An alternative would be to revise the "what kind of relations" part of the question. I feel like there is an absent-present "despite" at the end of the question—e.g., efficiency is established, *despite* certain structural issues, *despite* the shortcomings of recycling in general, etc. Either way, you could try driving home a discard study frame of analysis and emphasize the necessary work a system is doing. Efficiency is a precarious state of being, so what is mobilized to keep the economy flowing as promised? This would push the reflection on market economies, Gudeman et al., just one step further. Lastly, in good old ethnographic fashion, more specificity would add partiality to the study of efficiency—appreciating one's particular research experiences and its performativity. But these are optional hints for the publication revision and taking the broader audience into consideration.

Beyond the general perspective and frame of the dissertation, let me briefly address the defendant's reaction to my initial review.

First, the author clarified ambiguities of the term disability (Ch. 1). Thanks for these revisions. I wonder if you could add literature from disability studies to situate your classifications; I can imagine that readers would appreciate explicit connections of the emerging field (considering the edits on p. 55). On p. 66, there is a compelling insight into the relationship between materials and things classified as lacking in abilities. What about making this argument more prominent, working with the “abilities” (thinking through Ingold) of both materials and humans; the uncanny valley of comparing their “lives” and how they meet? It appears to be no coincidence that these two form an alliance. These reflections are again additional thoughts, optional in nature; and they are a testament to an improved manuscript.

Second, the requested edits on the author’s position and freedom to intervene (Ch. 2) are convincing. Similarly, third, the clarification regarding other (large) recycling corporations (Ch. 3) works well and helps situate the contribution of the dissertation. Fourth, I noted an interest in more historical depth, especially considering the communist legacy of waste processing (plus important waste study research on that matter, cf. Gille). In the notes of the resubmission, the defendant is quite critical of her own revisions; I think the new historical reflections on p. 111-112 do exactly what I was thinking about: giving context, connecting key terms to the regulatory developments of the past 30 years. Likewise, five, the critical discussion of *Welcome to Sodom*, an infamous waste documentation, does justice to the rich discussion of the field of waste studies while acknowledging that such movies still help mobilize a public and its issues.

Last, thank you for appreciating the complexities around the question “What is to be done once we have carved out the ideology of modern-day high-tech recycling?” I agree with the conclusion, but since the defendant mentioned the Global E-Waste Monitor in its most recent edition: Consider including the Monitor’s notes on new types of waste material inside the e-waste stream (e.g., mini devices such as e-cigarettes), and how such new flows impact your research site (I think you have something to say on that matter based on your ethnography).

Let me know if you have any questions.

Best wishes,

