

EASST *Review*

Volume 28 (4) European Association for the Study of Science and Technology December 2009



Editor: Ann Rudinow Saetnan (NTNU)

Deputy Editor: Richard Rogers

Tel: (+47) 73 59 17 86 (Saetnan)

(+31) 20 525 3352 (Rogers)

email: annrs@svt.ntnu.no

rogers@easst.net

Membership queries:

admin@easst.net

EASST Review on the Web:

http://www.easst.net

Contributing Editors:

Andrew Jamison (University of Aalborg)

Harald Rohracher (Graz)

Paul Wouters (Virtual Knowledge Studio, Royal Academy of Sciences, Netherlands)

Council of the European Association for the Study of Science and Technology:

Marc Audetat (University of Lausanne)

Thomas Sanchez Criado (student representative)

Pierre-Benoit Joly (National Institute of Agronomic Research, Paris)

Erika Mansnerus (London School of Economics and Political Science)

Tiago Moreira (Durham University)

Fred Steward, President (Policy Studies Institute, London 3)

Estrid Sørensen (Humboldt University, Berlin)

Harro van Lente (University of Utrecht)

Claire Waterton (Lancaster University)

Michael Lynch (President of the Society for Social Studies of Science, ex-officio)

EASST's Institutional Members:

Interuniversity Research Center (IFZ), Graz

Science Museum Library, London

Section for Science & Technology Studies, University of Göteborg

RCSS, University of Edinburgh

Faculteit der Cultuurwetenschappen, University of Maastricht

Department of Sociology, University of Surrey

Institute for Science, Innovation and Society, Saïd

Business School, University of Oxford

Dept. Of Technology and Social Change,

Linköping University

Europäische Akademie zur Erforschung von Folgen wissenschaftlich-technischer

Entwicklungen

Department of Sociology/SATSU, University of York

EASST Review (ISSN 1384-5160) is published quarterly, in March, June, September and December. The Association's journal was called the EASST Newsletter through 1994.

Subscription: Individual membership fee: EUR 35 annual. Reduced two- and three-year membership available. Students and citizens of East European countries pay reduced rates on application EUR 25/20. Library rate is EUR 40.

Please note that subscriptions can also be made through the EASST website.

Member benefits: Travel stipends for Ph.D. students, young scholars and researchers from developing countries are available. Reduced registration rates for EASST events apply.

EASST's Past Presidents:

Christine Hine, 2005-2008; Sally Wyatt, 2000-2004; Rob Hagendijk, 1997-2000; Aant Elzinga, 1991-1997; Stuart Blume, 1987-1991; John Ziman, 1983-1986; Peter Weingart, 1982.

EASST Review's Past Editors:

Chunglin Kwa, 1991 – 2006; Arie Rip, 1982-1991; Georg Kamphausen, 1982.

cover illustration: "Welcome to the 4S Banquet" Ann Rudinow Saetnan, October 2009

Think Big!

Editorial by Ann Rudinow Sætnan

It is rather typical, in my experience, for academic conference plenaries to look forward by looking back, and to do so through the eyes of the respective fields' senior grand masters. One might fear that this strategy would result in zombie visions for a science based on stagnantly undead ideas. However, even though this year's 4S conference plenary, held the night before Halloween, followed the traditional strategy of looking forward by looking back, and even though panelist and now-past president Michael Lynch attended the banquet later that evening as a zombie¹, the future views presented were quite fresh and inspiring.

Lynch exhorted us² to raise the spirit of symmetry back amongst the living. It seems to have become something of a mythical house god figure, something we ritually bow to in our methods sections, then turn our backs on as we face the world of our data and analyses. Perhaps it is time to go back and reread Bloor, if no further back than his own reflexive rereading in *ST&HV* (1997).

Judy Wajcman cheered us with stories of STS successes (e.g. Steve Epstein's book award from the American Sociology Association), then sobered us by pointing out that technology determinism remains that "thundering herd of elephants" (Wyatt 2008) we need to continue to confront in area after expanding area.

Somewhere between the celebratory and the sobering, Sheila Jasanoff urged us to be patient. Our words, she said, will find their market if they are worthy; we just need to keep refining them.

Opting for somewhat less extrapolation, Karin Knorr-Cetina chose instead to dream an unlikely dream. What would she do, she speculated out loud, if she were offered a

research fund of \$10 million per year for the next 10 years? Her dream was to build an STS laboratory, preferably in California's Silicon Valley. Not an impossible dream if the money were offered: Property prices have fallen there recently, yet the social and meteorological climates remain inviting -- at least so far. In her dream, the lab would have five core activities. There would be research on explanatory cultures (i.e. studies of epistemologies and ontologies in the natural sciences, social sciences, humanities, and the public sphere), on interdisciplinary fields (e.g. biochemistry, psycho-immunology, neuro-just-about-anything, nano-ditto, and so on), on field mechanisms (such as authorship conventions, integration mechanisms, laboratorizations, and other organizational patterns), and on evaluative cultures (including cultures of evaluative negligence such as we have seen in finance of late). There would also be a science and technology studies media lab where creativity would reign, exhibits and media applications would be produced, policy advice would be developed, and observation studies on science in society would be conducted.

The prospect, however imaginary, of such lavish funding and the rich (double entendre intended) environment it might enable seemed a particularly fruitful image for triggering discussion after the panel presentations. The list of virtual project proposals and job applications grew with each hand raised. Perhaps that is a discussion we can continue in the Review. If you were invited to participate in Knorr-Cetina's imaginary new STS lab, if you were invited to write your own project ticket with no holds barred and no belt-tightening budgets imposed, what would your proposal be? Perhaps from such a discussion new research networks will arise. Perhaps they will even write up their proposals; and perhaps, just perhaps even get them funded :D

1 A zombie banker, that is.

2 All references here to the plenary panel presentations are based on my hand-written and therefore somewhat skeletal notes.

The EASST Review Discussion Forums have been in hibernation of late. Due to constant spamming, I had to close down the sign-up function. Sign-ups can still be carried out, however, by sending me an email: annrs "at" svt.ntnu.no. I will open up a forum for virtual applications to Karin Knorr-Cetina's dream lab. Anyone is welcome to read; registered forum participants are welcome to post. Let's see how productively we can dream together. To participate in the collective dream, request forum membership from: annrs "at" svt.ntnu.no. Then go to: <http://www1.svt.ntnu.no/forum/easst/viewforum.php?f=16>

References:

Bloor, D (1997) "Remember the Strong Program?" *Science, Technology & Human Values*, 22 (3): 373-385. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/689894?seq=1>

Wyatt, S (2008) "Technological Determinism Is Dead; Long Live Technological Determinism" in Hackett, Amsterdamska, Lynch & Wajcman (eds.) *The Handbook of Science and Technology Studies*, 3d edition, Cambridge MA: MIT Press: 165-180.

Urban Laboratories: Towards an STS of the Built Environment

by: Bas van Heur, Ralf Brand, Andrew Karvonen, Simon Guy and Sally Wyatt

On 5-6 November 2009, the workshop 'Urban Laboratories: Towards an STS of the Built Environment' took place at Maastricht University in the Netherlands. Organised by the Manchester Architecture Research Centre (MARC) and the Maastricht Virtual Knowledge Studio (VKS) and financially supported by the European Association for the Study of Science and Technology (EASST) and the Netherlands Graduate Research School of Science, Technology and Modern Culture (WTMC – <http://www.wtmc.net>), the aim of the workshop was to trace the different uses of the urban laboratory concept both within and outside of academia and to analyze the analytical relevance of this notion and related vocabularies for interpreting socio-technical urban change.

Despite a few last-minute cancellations due to the flu and a Belgian train strike, the workshop was of a consistently high quality. The original call for papers (available on the workshop weblog:

<http://urbanlaboratories.wordpress.com>) attracted approximately 35 abstracts, reflecting the resonance of the 'urban laboratories' theme amongst the wider STS community. The organizers selected ten papers that best fit the

goals of the workshop and distributed the papers to participants beforehand. The varied academic and geographic backgrounds of the participants, coming from the United Kingdom, the United States, the Netherlands, Switzerland and Germany, made for lively and diverse discussions.

Opening the workshop with a word of welcome, Wiebe Bijker – professor and chair of the Department of Technology and Society Studies at Maastricht University – emphasized the need to distinguish between actors' concepts and analytical concepts used by researchers. This important distinction would return in one way or another in the various discussions throughout the workshop. The metaphorical usage of the notion of laboratory partly overlaps but also differs from the more analytical usage of this notion in STS. Explaining the reasons for organizing this workshop, Bas van Heur summarized the core dimensions of the laboratory according to the STS tradition: 1) the malleability of objects (i.e. the capability of a laboratory to enable manipulation of objects in a controlled environment); 2) the role of researchers as interveners in the object of research through various actions; 3) the importance of an

inside/outside distinction between a controlled laboratory space and an uncontrolled field site; and 4) the achievement of successful experiments through the establishment of a relatively stable context.

This introduction was followed by five sessions in which the relevance of the STS notion of laboratories was unpacked, and alternative or extended conceptualizations were proposed. In the first session, Barbara Allen (Virginia Tech, USA) offered an analysis of the 'green' rebuilding of Holy Cross, an historic neighbourhood in New Orleans, after the flooding from Hurricane Katrina in August 2005 by following Latour's distinction between problematization, interessement, enrolment and mobilisation. Referring to Anique Hommels' argument that cities are comprised of obdurate technologies, Allen argued that the hurricane 'solved' the obduracy problem and opened up the neighbourhood to green NGOs and other groups. She also suggested, however, that Actor-Network Theory (ANT) might be complemented with tools from the New Political Sociology of Science (NPSS) to address more explicitly issues of justice and fairness. This paper was followed by Philipp Dorstewitz (Maastricht University, Netherlands) who presented the case of the Zollverein, an abandoned colliery and coking plant in the German city of Essen. Originally scheduled for demolition, the plant is now a protected cultural heritage site. Understanding the dynamics around this transition process as an urban laboratory, Dorstewitz drew on the pragmatist philosophy of John Dewey to make the claim that the laboratory is above all a place of work involving situated inquiry concerned with identifying the potentials inherent to particular contexts.

The second session commenced with a paper by Michael Liegl and Björn Krey (University of Mainz, Germany) in which they critiqued the *Soziale Stadt* (Social City) program in Germany. Focusing on the website of this program, they argued that this website is a 'centre of calculation' because it is a place to which particular urban neighbourhoods submit their reports and where findings are documented, archived, and redistributed as

templates for new applications to the *Soziale Stadt* program. The tension in this program – which respondent Beth Greenhough described as the "thorn inside the laboratory model" – is that agency is centred in the website and the institutions responsible for this site, but at the same time distributed to citizens under the heading of participation and empowerment. This question of participation also returned in Andrew Karvonen's (University of Manchester, UK) paper on design and practice-based research. Using ANT to conceptualize the city as a relational achievement, Karvonen argued that despite the increasing influence of relational perspectives, most relational researchers still rely on well-established qualitative methods such as interviews and ethnography. To address this, performative research methods that explicitly recognize research as a form of engagement need to be developed. The closing part of his paper addressed the case of design practices that combine participatory action research and community outreach to substantiate this claim.

On the second day, the morning session started with a paper by Beth Greenhough (Queen Mary, University of London; co-written with Tim Brown and Steve Cummins who could not attend the workshop) on experimental aspects of public health. Also drawing on Latour, she argued that laboratorization involves a series of three key moves: from enlisting the interests of those outside the laboratory and isolating phenomena thought to be significant to the development of an intervention in the field. She used this framework to analyze two public health cases: the promotion of 'green space' in nineteenth century London and the contemporary Health Towns programme in England. A paper by Paula J. Davis on urban laboratories and the African city concluded this session. Drawing on empirical data from Kampala in Uganda, she traced the problematic assumptions in the mainstream laboratory studies tradition as well as the discipline of urban studies when approached from the perspective of non-Western cities. Rethinking Thomas Gieryn's 'lab-field shuttle', Davis argued that this model (which Gieryn claims underlies the arguments

of the Chicago School of Sociology on the city of Chicago) cannot easily be translated to African cities, since African cities never attain the status of a laboratory. Instead, these cities are usually seen as “monstrosities” highly specific to the locality or the “Third World”. In effect, the generalizability promised by laboratories disappears.

The next session included papers by James Evans (University of Manchester, UK) and Christian Solberg (University College London, UK). Evans offered a detailed discourse analysis of the Social-Ecological Systems (SES) approach that underlies current debates on urban resilience and sustainability. The SES view of the city as an unpredictable social-ecological system and as a terrain for scientific experiments needs to be criticized, he argued, since it depoliticizes processes that are fundamentally political. Within the SES approach, nothing is outside the laboratory. In contrast, Solberg’s paper investigates the dark side of ecology by focusing on earthquakes and the disaster sciences. Earthquakes are usefully understood as natural experiments that reshape the urban environment. Disaster sciences try to regulate and stabilize these experiments by developing a range of anti-seismic technologies and building styles. He supported this argument with empirical data from colonial Manila and Meiji-era Japan.

In the final session of the workshop, Ignaz Strebel (ETH Zürich, Switzerland) discussed his paper (co-written with Jane M. Jacobs, University of Edinburgh, UK) on the scientification of architectural form through practices of high-rise mass housing. Focusing on 1961 and 1971 reports on mass housing architecture in Britain, Strebel and Jacobs demonstrated how the ‘building facts’ inscribed into such reports are produced and preceded by messy scientific work. In taking this comparative approach, they identified two models of laboratorization although they suspect that other models exist. Their findings are echoed in the closing paper by Michael Guggenheim (University of Zürich, Switzerland) in which he identified a number of conceptual problems with the “laboratorization

of everything”. Criticizing overly metaphorical uses of the laboratory concept to describe urban processes, Guggenheim argued in favour of two new notions: the locatory and the unilatory. Where the laboratory is characterized by placelessness (following Robert Kohler) and inconsequential action, the locatory is tied to a specific location and its actions are consequential and typified. The unilatory, similar to the laboratory, also creates an inside/outside distinction, but the object it aims to manipulate cannot be controlled since it is not in the laboratory. More explicit than Strebel and Jacobs, Guggenheim argued that the identification of these three types points in the direction of a theory of research types.

Although the goal of this workshop was never to reach consensus on the one and only correct definition of urban laboratory, a number of core issues did return and are in need of further development. First, the notion of laboratory has been heavily shaped by the STS laboratory studies tradition, but other theoretical lineages – such as the pragmatism of Dewey, relational sociology and the NPSS – offer the potential to extend and transform this STS tradition in exciting ways. Second, most case studies appropriated the notion of urban laboratory to investigate particular spaces within the city and with good reason. Conceptualizing the city as a whole as a laboratory is questionable since it downplays the inside/outside dynamic of laboratories, ignores the uncontrollable aspects of such a complex phenomenon as the city and tends to depoliticize the notion of laboratory. Third and finally, applying the notion of laboratory to urban processes raises questions concerning the types of intervention developed by researchers. Although this workshop clearly led to a conceptual clarification of the notion of urban laboratory, more research on new interventionist methods is needed. This also raises questions concerning participation and the role played by non-academic researchers and actors in shaping the object of research, which are all issues currently also discussed in other parts of STS.

EASST Conference, 2-4 September 2010

University of Trento, Italy

Announcing themes and tracks

PRACTISING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, PERFORMING THE SOCIAL

The following themes and tracks have now been agreed. There will also be an open track. Details of the call for each theme and the convenors involved will be on the conference website. Abstracts need to be submitted through the conference website by **March 15th 2010**. Please check the EASST website (www.easst.net) for further information and the conference website address.

A) ART, DESIGN AND MUNDANE TECHNOLOGIES

1. ARTificial Life? Performativity between Science, Media and Art
2. Design, Performativity, STS
3. Digital Game Play as Socio-technical Practice
4. Everyday Artefacts, Social Practices and Consumption in a STS Perspective

B) CAPITALISM AND/IN TECHNOSCIENCE

5. Techno-scientific Reconstruction of Capitalism
6. Uncertainty as an asset? Neoliberalized technoscience and the manufacture of world and the self

C) CHALLENGING SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY STUDIES: THEORETICAL AND METHODOLOGICAL REFLECTIONS

7. Practicing Semiotics, Performing Science and Technology Studies
8. Probing technoscience
9. Speculation, Design, Public and Participatory Technoscience: Possibilities and Critical Perspectives
10. Video & STS: Methodologies and Methods

D) INFORMATION SYSTEMS AND SOCIOMATERIAL INFRASTRUCTURES

11. Performative Infrastructures, Multiple Mobilities
12. The Social Study of the Information Technology Marketplace

E) KNOWLEDGE ASSEMBLAGES AND INSTITUTIONS

13. From a "social raw matter" to the production of stabilized collectives: Tracking institutions of knowledge
14. Socio-material assemblages in education

F) THE MANUFACTURE OF BIO-OBJECTS

AND LIFE SCIENCES

15. Bio-Objects – Life in the 21st Century
16. From biodigital lives to BioIT worlds: invivo, in-silico and in-vitro embodiments and dissonances
17. The Struggle for Meanings: Representations and Debates in the Nanotechnology Field
18. STS Approaches to Neuroscience Objects and Practices

G) ORGANIZING PRACTICES AND PROFESSIONAL PERFORMANCES

19. Engineering Practice: Performing a Profession, Constructing Society
20. Organization of Science Practices
21. Technologically Dense Environments: A Bridge between STS and Organization Studies

H) RETHINKING INNOVATION

22. Creativity and Innovation
23. Innovation Networks and Real-World Experimentation
24. Rhetoric in Science, Technology and Innovation Policies

I) SCRUTINISING HEALTHCARE AND LIFE SCIENCE: FUTURE TRENDS AND CLINICAL REFLECTIONS

25. Exploring the agencies, technologies and discourses in new healthcare practices
26. How do we collaborate? Scrutinising the relationship between STS and biomedicine
27. The 'meaning' and 'doing' of bodies and gender in medicine and healthcare
28. Technology, Innovation and Images of Health and Aging

L) SOCIAL ENGAGEMENT, CONTROVERSY AND INNOVATION

29. The new politics of risk: the performing of regulation in a comparative perspective
30. Practicing Public Engagement in Controversial Science and Technology
31. Practicing Responsibilities

M) SURVEILLANCE PRACTICES, TECHNOLOGIES AND SOCIETY

32. New Developments in Surveillance Practices and Technologies
33. Surveillance and Society

N) SUSTAINABILITY TRANSITIONS AND PRACTICES

- 34. Energy Use in Everyday Life – Combining Sustainable Technology and Practices
- 35. Practices and the Environment: Performing Sustainability and Doing STS
- 36. System Innovations and Transitions to Sustainability
- 37. Towards Zero Emission Buildings, Settlements and Cities

O) TRAVELLING PRACTICES IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

- 38. Performing Places
- 39. Practices on the move: dynamics, circulation and diffusion
- 40. Science, Technology and the North/South Divide

IMPORTANT DATES AND DEADLINES:

- **March 15 (2010):** deadline for abstracts submission;
- **May 15 (2010):** Communication of acceptance/rejection of abstracts to authors and opening of online registrations;
- **June 15 (2010):** early registrations deadline (required for all presenters);
- **June 20 (2010):** Final draft of the organization of each thematic session (to be sent by the convenors to the Scientific and Local Committee);
- **July 5 (2010):** Publication on the website of the final Conference program.

Books Seeking Reviewers

EASST Review receives from time to time books or messages about books for review. We currently have two books looking for reviewers. We think these books would be of interest to many of our readers and would be glad to publish the reviews in an upcoming issue of the Review. To our early-career members I might add that a published book review is a valuable addition to your cv and the book itself a potentially valuable addition to your library.

If you would like to review either of these books, send a message to the editor – annrs “at” svt.ntnu.no.

Susanne Bauer & Ayo Wahlberg (eds.) *Contested Categories. Life Sciences in Society.* Ashgate, 2009.

Jonathan Finn: *Capturing the Criminal Image: From Mug Shot to Surveillance Society.* University of Minnesota Press, 2009

Conferences and Calls for Papers

Membranes, Surfaces and Boundaries: interstices in the history of science, technology and culture is the title of the workshop at the **Max-Planck-Institute for the History of Science, Berlin, October 7-9, 2010**, <http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/workshops/en/Membranes-Surfaces-Boundaries.html>.

The world, more of than not, is and has been conceived in its compactness, as stuff, things, and objects; far less so, in its interstices. Science, technology and culture, of course, are permeated and traversed by boundary phenomena: From the materialities of life itself, whether cellular membranes, skin, immune-systems or ecological habitats, to surface, separation and purification

processes in chemistry and industry to the making, processing and exhibition of photographs and films, things coalesced at surfaces. They are palpable as well in the history of geography and politics, of urban and private spaces, of literature, art, psychology and the self, and certainly enough, as interfaces, in contemporary media theory. The workshop *Membranes, Surfaces and Boundaries* aims to recover and bring together these interstices. We wish to attract contributions from a wide range of disciplines, including the natural sciences, that cross, straddle and make permeable these specialist divides, and that interrogate the historical being of surfaces. We wish to focus the workshop on the materialities of membranes, surfaces, and boundaries themselves. Possible anchors are surfaces and membranes as biological entities;

chemical and technical phenomena at boundaries such as catalysis, filtration or electrophoresis; or films, photographic and otherwise, as media of projection and material surface processes. We invite contributions engaging with these and other spheres and their manifold intersections. Some illustrative questions include: In the history of science, can we generate cultural histories of the biological cell, a historiographically rather neglected object? Or related, of the similarly neglected but important, huge fields such as electro-chemistry or chemical engineering? Might we re-read through surface-objects disciplinary histories, experimental practices or the ways science is permeable to its social and cultural settings (and vice versa)? In film and media studies, how can attention to the materialities of surfaces incorporate the histories of science, technology or industry? Or again, more philosophically, how can we bring together concepts and materials, the abstract and concrete, metaphors and physical boundaries in re-thinking the histories of interstices? All submitted abstracts showing some relation to our main theme will be given careful consideration. Abstracts of up to 300 words should include your name, institutional affiliation, and email address. These should be submitted by email to Mathias Grote (mgrote@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de) and Max Stadler (mstadler@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de). The deadline for abstract submission is 31 January 2010.

For the one-day symposium on **20th century popular science, 'booms' of popular science publishing**, a call for papers has been issued. The morning session is to be devoted to the apparent post-Einstein boom in popular science publishing, the afternoon considering post-Hawking works. We are keen that this event should help foster connections between the wide range of people who study and think about popular science: historians, science communication researchers, professional scientists, science writers and literary critics. The event is to be held at **Imperial College London on 31st March, 2010**. It will comprise of a series of extended 30 minute talks, plus time for discussion. The mention of Einstein and Hawking should not suggest an interest purely in the popularisation of physics, nor should it imply a focus on biographical details of their lives, celebrity-science, or challenges of relaying especially abstract ideas in text. We are merely using these two iconic names in the history of popular science as a starting point for broader discussion in what can be a very diffuse topic of inquiry and a prompt to interrogate the reality of so-

called 'booms' in popular science publishing. Papers might explore the impact of other iconic scientists, popular science audiences, marginal scientists publishing through popular texts, the role of journalists and science-writers and/or the role played by publishers, reviewers and bookselling contexts. We should also note that we welcome papers which reflection on both the background context and long-term consequences of 20th century popular science. Papers on 19th or 21st century popular science publishing are still of interest, as long as they speak to themes raised by a 20th century focus. The broad range of topics potential papers might discuss include (but are not limited to): Relationships between scientists and their publics; Celebrity, public intellectuals and popular science authorship; Marketing and the role of consumer culture; Issues of culture and social class; Writing for children; Implied epistemologies; Publishing processes and cultures; Outsider-scientist writers; Science and Religion; The audiences of popular science; Popular science's impact on and reflection of science policy issues; Humour and comedy in science writing; Wonder and the sublime; Metaphor; Literary renderings of mathematics; and Illustrations, diagrams, graphics and design. **Potential contributors should email a 500 word abstract (including, if necessary, bibliography) along with a 150 word biography to popularsciencebooms@googlemail.com by 11th December, 2009.** We are planning a special issue for a scholarly journal such as the Public Understanding of Science, based on the event. If you would be unable to join us on the 31st of March, but are interested in submitting a paper for such a publication, it is worth dropping us an expression of interest. These, and all other queries to popularsciencebooms@googlemail.com. Dr Hauke Riesch, NearCo2 Project, Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Dr Alice Bell, Lecturer in Science Communication, Imperial College, London.

The Bauman Institute, the School of Sociology and Social Policy, University of Leeds, UK, is holding an **international launch conference, 'Re-thinking Global Society,' Monday 6th – Tuesday 7th September 2010**, and has issued a call for papers. We are delighted to announce that the School of Sociology and Social Policy at the University of Leeds will formally launch the Bauman Institute in September 2010, established in honour of Leeds's Emeritus Professor of Sociology Zygmunt Bauman. In recognition of the launch, we

are holding an International Conference here at the University of Leeds on Monday 6th and Tuesday 7th September 2010. The Conference aims to bring together international expertise amongst scholars, researchers, practitioners, and postgraduate students, working in a variety of fields across the arts, humanities and social sciences. As such, we are delighted to announce amongst our confirmed plenary speakers: George Ritzer - Distinguished University Professor at the University of Maryland, Washington DC; Daniel Libeskind - Architect; and Neal Lawson - Chair of Compass and writer for The Guardian and The New Statesman. The key conference themes are Consumerism and Sustainability; Globalization, Risk and Uncertainty; Renewing Politics and Civil Society; and The Social Thought of Zygmunt Bauman. We invite **abstracts of not more than 150 words and tied to any of the above themes to be submitted not later than 31st January 2010** to the email address below. All abstracts will be subject to peer-review and should be sent to the Director of the Bauman Institute, Dr Mark Davis: m.e.davis@leeds.ac.uk. For further details: <http://sociology.leeds.ac.uk/bauman>.

The Centre for Society & Genomics (the Netherlands), in collaboration with the ESRC Genomics Network (United Kingdom) and Valgen (Canada) will hold its biannual Conference on Society and Genomics on 27-28 May 2010 in Amsterdam. The conference organizers have issued a **call for abstracts, with the deadline set at 8 January 2010.** We invite submission of abstracts for oral and poster presentations addressing the upcoming conference's theme: Ten years after. Mapping the societal landscape of genomics. Please see www.society-genomics.nl/conference.

The **ISEE conference, ICT and sustainability**, has issued a call for papers. You may never have considered attending an ecological economics conference. But now the time has come to try it. We intend to arrange some sessions on ICT and sustainability at the upcoming ISEE conference, **22 - 25 August 2010 in Bremen / Oldenburg.** See <http://www.isee2010.org/>. We plan to submit the session proposal before 30 November. If you would like to join us, either send your **abstract to inro@man.dtu.dk or upload it through the special track on the conference website, on 23 November at the latest, 200-400 words.** Concerning the environment, ICT is part of the

problem as well as the solution. Whether the positive or the negative impacts come to dominate, depends on the socio-economic and political conditions. The core question is: How should the conditions be formed to realize the positive potentials and restrict the negative impacts? It is easy to say that we need a higher energy price, but we may be able to come up with more elaborate suggestions, based on thorough studies on ICT. We would be happy to see contributions on a wide range of topics related to ICT: case studies on environmental impacts; modelling environmental impacts of ICT; the rebound effect of ICT; green ICT business models and innovation strategies for green ICT; greening everyday life; transformation of energy systems, transportation etc. with ICT (Green through ICT); regulation of ICT markets in an environmental perspective; innovative political approaches for promoting Green ICT; and many more. If we succeed in attracting interesting contributions, we plan to edit a special issue of a relevant journal. For more information, write to Inge Røpke <inro@MAN.DTU.DK>.

The **Identity in the Information Society workshop (IDIS10)** is to be held on **May 26-28, 2010, Rome, Italy.** The third IDIS annual workshop provides an opportunity to present leading edge research, exchange ideas, encourage collaboration, and build communities across the various research groups working on contemporary identity topics and in the related fields of privacy and security. The workshop website is now up and running, here: <http://is2.lse.ac.uk/idis/2010>. IDIS10 explores the relationship between "Identity and Organizations", whether public or private sector, local or global, formal or informal, for-profit or not. We welcome contributions ranging across different disciplinary areas, reflecting the broad nature of the study area with its interwoven concerns of law, technology, and information systems alongside other social, political and management issues. Topics might include, but are not limited to, the following: New identity technologies; Emerging practices and behaviours enabled with identification processes; Changing notions of identity: customers, citizens, and audiences; Information and identity risks and how they are managed; Surveillance and privacy issues; and Regulatory and legal issues. **Submission of papers to Workshop (4000-6000 words): 10 December 2009.** Decision and screening feedback to authors: 19 February 2010. Presentation of selected papers at IDIS10 Workshop: 26-28 May 2010. Submission to IDIS Journal of revised

selected papers: 25 June 2010. Feedback from reviewers to authors: 3 September 2010. Submission of final version papers: 5 November 2010. Publication in IDIS Journal from January 2011. Submit papers to IDIS Journal: <http://www.editorialmanager.com/idis/>, selecting "IDIS10 Workshop" article type.

On **30th January 2010** the **School of Historical Studies at the University of Leicester** will host a **one-day post-graduate workshop on 'Transcending the Boundaries: doctoral research across disciplines'**. The workshop aims to attract research students from a variety of academic disciplines, with the intention of building lasting connections between approaches, projects, departments and universities. There will be sessions on themes such as 'Art, material culture and the built environment', 'Conceptual approaches to research' and 'Sources: old and new'. The School would like to hear from PhD students whose work relates to these themes, and whose research engages with material of ideas from outside the obvious confines of their discipline. While the workshop will have a substantial historical focus, speakers should not be hindered by this requirement. Papers will be 20 minutes long and should discuss research conducted by the presenter and be of interest to historians - but beyond that be creative! **Abstracts should be submitted to Matt Neale (mpn1@le.ac.uk) by Friday 4th December 2009**. Funding for travel costs incurred in attending the workshop will be available for speakers.

Progress in Medicine, the conference, will be held at the **University of Bristol, 13-15 April 2010**. The aims of this conference are: to examine the nature, scope, causes, and grounds of progress in medicine; to provide a forum for developing the unified study of the history and philosophy of medicine, and in particular raising the profile of the philosophy of medicine in the UK and its engagement with the history of medicine; to create interdisciplinary bridges between the medical, philosophical, and historical professions, enabling medical professionals to become more theoretically engaged, while philosophers and philosophically-minded historians of medicine engage with the actual practice of medical professionals, so that their research reflects the realities and needs of modern medicine; to facilitate the wider dissemination of research in the philosophy and history of medicine beyond the boundaries of those disciplines, and

especially in medical practice; and to identify opportunities for public engagement concerning the relation between medical progress and changing attitudes to medical knowledge, the medical profession, and medical authority. Conference homepage:

http://www.bristol.ac.uk/philosophy/department/events/progress_in_medicine/index.html. Call for

papers:

http://www.bristol.ac.uk/philosophy/department/events/progress_in_medicine/call.html.

This conference is generously supported by the Mind Association, the British Society for the Philosophy of Science, and the Aristotelian Society.

Creativity and Leadership in Science, Technology and Innovation, a joint International Society for the Psychology of Science and Technology (ISPST) and the European Sociological Association Sociology of Science and Technology Network (SSTNET) has issued a call for abstracts (200 words) for its **workshop, 9-10 July, 2010, at the School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg**. The **deadline is 1 March 2010**. There is agreement that leadership is vital to creativity and successful innovation in groups and organizations. Despite this agreement in the literature, leadership is seldom studied as a creativity driver. For example, leadership in R&D groups, where creativity is clearly needed, has not been given enough attention. One reason for this situation may be the belief that creativity cannot and should not be managed. Creative individuals and groups are regarded as, and indeed often are, autonomous and self-driving. From this belief the erroneous conclusion is drawn that there is no need for leadership in creative environments and situations. The better conclusion is rather that a creativity-stimulating leadership is necessary. Moreover, such a leadership should possess at least two features: a) expertise in the field/s, and b) an ability to create, support and encourage individuals, groups and creative knowledge environments. The former feature demands deep and extensive scientific knowledge (or other knowledge and skills) which should be communicated and used by followers, while the latter is related to general and specific leadership abilities and skills that promote creativity among followers. How this leadership is performed is still largely unknown. In the literature, it is often concluded that we distinguish between the idea generation and implementation phases in creative processes because they are different and demand different forms of leadership that take this

into account. Leadership seems to vary with the two phases, but our knowledge about this is limited. One hypothesis is that R&D leaders provide feedback on ideas from group members in the idea generation phase to make ideas more creative and possible to realize, while in the implementation phase, where a stronger market orientation is needed, other leadership behaviours are needed. A distinction in creativity, innovation and leadership research, is sometimes made between cognitive and social leadership, where the former denotes instrumental leadership behaviours (e.g. instructions) and the latter relational and emotional ones (e.g. encouraging talk). Although, cognitive and social leaderships are intertwined in real-life situations and not always distinguishable, the two are useful analytically to understand how leadership in creative settings works and can be enhanced. Of course, there are a number of other issues on leading creativity in S&T that deserves attention and research. Some of the research problems - but not restricted to those - that could be addressed in the workshop are: Is leadership aiming at creativity different from other forms of leadership? And if it is, in what ways? Does the creative process put certain demands on leaders? Which kind of leaderships are needed at different levels of S&T organizations for a creative output? What leadership differences in creative knowledge environments can be found (a search for a taxonomy)? For example, we would expect that the wider context (e.g., S&T policies, economies), institutions (e.g., academic, industrial), the technologies involved (e.g., biomed/biotech, environmental, ICT) and disciplinary differences (e.g., physics, anthropology) will influence creative leadership. What social and cognitive abilities and skills are needed for leadership in creative environments? For example, do creative team processes demand certain social and cognitive leadership characteristics? How does leadership vary with different phases of the creative process? How are coworkers involved in creative leadership? For example, to what extent and in what situations are shared or informal forms of leadership advantageous for a creative output? What creative leaderships have evolved over time? For example, is there a shift in creative leadership over time? Have some characteristics in creative leaderships not changed? How should leadership and creativity be approached? What measures of creativity and/or leadership are preferable to understand better how leaders may stimulate creativity? Workshop objective: Besides increasing our knowledge about creativity and leadership by gathering eminent researchers in the psychology and

sociology of science, technology and innovation. The best papers will be selected for an edited book volume on Creativity and Leadership in Science, Technology and Innovation to be published by an international publisher. In addition, certain selected authors who are not workshop participants may be invited to submit papers. Keynote speaker: Professor Michael D. Mumford, Department of Psychology, University of Oklahoma University, USA. Abstract and paper submission: Abstracts of 200 words on the workshop theme should be submitted to sven.hemlin@gri.gu.se. Deadline: 1 March, 2010. Decisions on abstracts will be made about 1 May. To be part of the selection of best papers for the edited volume, full papers of about 8 000-10 000 words (12-point Times Roman) should be submitted to sven.hemlin@gri.gu.se by 31 August, 2010. Local hosts: Sven Hemlin, (sven.hemlin@gri.gu.se), Lisa Olsson (lisa.olsson@gri.gu.se) and Leif Denti (leif.denti@gri.gu.se).

Managing Knowledge in the Techno-sciences, 1850-2000, the international conference at the University of Leeds, 5-8 July 2010, has issued its second call for papers. The international conference by the collaborative research project, 'Owning and Disowning invention: intellectual property, authority, and identity in British science and technology, 1880-1920', (University of Leeds & University of Bristol), supported by the Arts & Humanities Research Council and the White Rose IPBio Project (Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York). The Keynote Speaker is Prof. Mario Biagioli, Harvard University, with a talk entitled, 'What has Happened to 'Discovery' and 'Invention'? Intersecting the discourse of patent law and science studies'. The conference brings together researchers investigating the history of knowledge management since the mid-19th century – a period that saw the rise of the techno-sciences, trans-European controversies over the legitimacy of patenting, and the coining of the term 'intellectual property'. Contributions are welcome from a variety of perspectives concerning 'intellectual property' and the 'intellectual commons' in the techno-sciences e.g. the cultures of monopoly, shared 'open' knowledge and of sponsored invention. Participants are encouraged to examine critically the foundations and methodology of historical research on the techno-sciences, including biomedical and agricultural forms. Papers are invited on the following themes: patent management and inventing cultures; openness vs secrecy; authority and the

construction of inventorship; discourses of 'pure' vs 'applied' science and 'discovery' vs 'invention'; IP laws, and techno-scientific transformations; legal cultures and techno-scientific expertise; academic entrepreneurship and state funding; gender and inventor identity; industrial research and techno-scientific identities, techno-sciences and IP in Asian, Latin American and African cultures. Abstracts for individual papers or panel sessions should be submitted by 30 November 2009. Abstracts for individual papers should not exceed 200 words and should be accompanied by the author's short curriculum vitae (1 page). Proposals for panel sessions should comprise: an outline of the session (200 words), abstracts for the three individual papers (200 words) and CVs (1 page) for each of the contributors. All **submissions should be emailed as an MS Word file attachment to: owninganddisowning@hotmail.co.uk by 30 November 2009.** A registration fee may be charged for presenters at this conference. Please indicate in your email if you would like to be considered for assistance in this regard. For enquiries about the academic content of the conference please contact: Prof. Graeme Gooday, g.j.n.gooday@leeds.ac.uk tel. 0113 343 3274, Centre for History & Philosophy of Science, Department of Philosophy, University of Leeds, UK. For administrative enquiries please contact Dr Stathis Arapostathis, owninganddisowning@hotmail.co.uk tel. 0113 343 8027, Centre for History & Philosophy of Science, Department of Philosophy, University of Leeds. For information on the 'Owning and Disowning Invention' project, please see <http://www.philosophy.leeds.ac.uk/Invention/invention.htm>.

History, Digestion and Society: New Perspectives is the title of the **workshop organised by the Centre for the History of Medicine in Ireland at the University College Dublin, 30 April - 1 May 2010.** Diet and digestion, and associated topics, have been relatively neglected in histories of the body, health and medicine. We have a limited historical context in which to locate the diseases and ailments of the digestive system, such as dyspepsia or peptic ulcer disease, not to mention processes such as vomiting. Meanwhile, historical analysis of issues related to food and eating often reveals a tendency to stress the political elements of historical events at the expense of the biological and medical. Topics such as hunger strikes, and the rise of organised movements such as the Temperance movement and organised vegetarianism have

complex medical and biological aspects which are worthy of serious analytical attention. This workshop aims to act as a platform to discuss and critically engage with these themes. We welcome abstracts from all periods of history, and from all international contexts. Possible topics include, but are not restricted to: Refusal to eat food (e.g. hunger strikes); Dietary movements (e.g. temperance societies, vegetarianism); The development of related technologies such as frozen food and processed food; Historical concepts related to understandings of nutrition; The history of individual digestive organs such as the stomach; Medical issues related to digestion (e.g. gastric ulcer disease, indigestion); Socio-cultural issues related to obesity and anorexia; Surgical and medical intervention in the digestive system; Human and animal digestive habits; and Digestion and Criminal Activity (e.g. poisoning). Please send a **250 word abstract to Ian Miller (ian.miller2@ucd.ie) no later than 30 November 2009.** Workshop organised by the Centre for the History of Medicine in Ireland. For further information contact Mike Liffey (Michael.liffey@ucd.ie).

Biomedical Visualisations and Society is a **workshop series being held at the University of Warwick.** An ESRC funded seminar series for early-career researchers interested in the social and political dimensions of biomedical visualisations. Each two-day workshop will combine a lecture from a leading scholar in the field and time for peer discussion with an opportunity to engage with visualisation in practice and ask questions. Attendance is free but places are limited. Some funding is available towards travel and accommodation costs for researchers who have no alternative funding source. For more information, visit the project website: <http://www.warwick.ac.uk/go/biomedicalvisualisationsandsociety>, or email: visualisations@warwick.ac.uk.

Whither the History of Nineteenth-Century Medicine? is the title of the **one-day symposium held at the Wellcome Unit for the History of Medicine, University of Manchester, 23 April 2010.** During the 1980s and early 1990s, the nineteenth century lay at the very heart of medical historical scholarship. Indeed, many historians chose to focus on this period precisely because they believed that it was in the nineteenth century that modern medicine was born. Historians charted the

'rise' of the profession and of hospital and laboratory medicine. They traced the development of social medicine and public health and reflected on the increasing involvement of medical practitioners in everyday life. Meanwhile, historians of psychiatry, spurred on by the intellectual legacy of Michel Foucault, sought to understand the asylum as a social, cultural and political institution. In the last decade or so, however, things have changed. Historians of medicine continue to work on the nineteenth century but the energy and sense of purpose which used to infuse so much of the earlier work seems to have subsided. By and large, scholars are content to work within their own particular field without addressing the 'big' questions which used to frame the analyses of an earlier generation. Meanwhile, many historians of medicine are now looking to the twentieth century, perhaps under the impression that the major themes of the nineteenth have already been thoroughly researched. This workshop seeks to address this state of affairs and to ask where the history of nineteenth-century medicine goes from here. Exciting and important research is certainly being carried on but what are

the key questions that historians are asking? What are the major themes being examined and what areas remain unexplored? Is it, for example, possible to write 'new' accounts of psychiatry or public health? How are new histories of institutions, such as hospitals and asylums, to be written? Are there new histories of 'big' diseases to be uncovered or histories of neglected diseases and conditions, especially the chronic and non-fatal? Can we elaborate a more effective account of the nineteenth-century medical marketplace? And with all the work that has been done on representation, it is now time to write a history of practice? Applications to present 20-minute papers are invited from anyone working in the field of nineteenth-century medicine. Please submit a title and one page abstract of proposed papers to michael.brown-2@manchester.ac.uk or michael.worboys@manchester.ac.uk. **The deadline for submission of abstracts is 31 January 2010.** There will be no conference fee. Morning coffee, a sandwich lunch and afternoon tea will be provided.

Opportunities available

The School of Languages and Social Sciences at Aston University is offering **two three-year fees-only bursaries to students** who already have, or who will have completed at the latest by October 2009, a Masters degree in a relevant subject area.

The bursaries will enable students to undertake research in any of the School's areas of academic endeavour, of which Sociology is one. The School's vibrant research culture and the rapidly expanding cohort of full-time research students provide a stimulating intellectual environment. The value of each bursary is sufficient to cover for three years the fees of a student who has a European Union passport. In addition there is A THIRD bursary which will not only cover the fees of a European Union student but will also pay up to £5,000 per annum in return for 6 hours weekly of academic support work as requested by their Supervisor and/or Head of the subject area to which s/he is attached. If you wish to apply for one of these bursaries, **please complete and submit by midday on the 30th November 2009 an electronic PhD application form**, which can be downloaded from the School's Research Degree website. <http://www1.aston.ac.uk/lss/research/postgraduate-research/research-degrees-structure/#Entry>

[requirements](#). This will enable us to check that no necessary details are missing. Your application for the bursary should include a CV, a 2-3,000 word research proposal and the names of two academic referees. **Applications for the studentship should be sent by email to m.seresht@aston.ac.uk**, or by post to Ms Margarita Seresht, School of Languages and Social Studies, Aston University, Aston Triangle, Birmingham, B4 7ET. Please mark the email or envelope with the phrase 'PhD Bursary Application'. To speed up the process, please ask your referees to send their references immediately by post or by email to Ms Margarita Seresht, to whom any queries may also be addressed. Not only applications, but also references, **must arrive at the very latest by 30th November 2009**. Candidates may be asked to attend for interview or to take part in a telephone-interview. Decisions will be announced by December 18th and candidates will then be expected to register as soon as possible. If you are not a native speaker of English, proof of English language competence will be necessary, usually in the form of a TOEFL or IELTS test score. The minimum scores are as follows: TOEFL: 610 (paper-based) or 253 (computer-based) or 101/102 (Internet-based) IELTS: 7.0 (minimum 7.0 in

writing, and 6.5 in speaking, listening and reading).

The School of Information Studies (SOIS) at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee (UWM) is accepting **applications for fall of 2010 for its PhD program in Information Studies**. Building on one of the largest and most varied MLIS programs in the United States, the PhD program prepares researchers, educators, and administrators with specializations in three major areas (with other areas also supported): Information Organization, Information Policy and Information Retrieval. The School's international faculty are recognized for their research productivity (<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SOIS/about/research/index.html>), ranking in the top five nationally in per capita publications in a recent study among American schools of library and information science (Adkins & Budd, 2007). The School also has established agreements and collaborations with a number of institutions around the world that offer students international learning and research experiences. SOIS is home to the Center for Information Policy Research (CIPR), which facilitates information policy research through its lecture series and research paper series, outreach activities, and Information Ethics Fellows program. The School also supports an Information Organization Research Group (IOrg), Research Group for Information Retrieval (RGIR), as well as an Information Intelligence & Architecture Research Lab, which serves as a hub for research on information analysis, system design & evaluation, digital libraries, data mining, and usability. Located in a residential neighborhood near Lake Michigan, UWM serves a diverse community of over 30,000 students, faculty and staff. The very livable city of Milwaukee offers the cultural amenities of a large metropolitan area with the conveniences of a smaller city. Financial aid is available in the form of competitive graduate assistantships (full-time students), tuition scholarships, and adjunct teaching opportunities. **Priority consideration for admission will be given to applications received by January 15, 2010.** Detailed information about the program is available on the SOIS website (<http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/SOIS/academics/doctraining.htm>). For additional information, please contact Dietmar Wolfram (dwolfram@uwm.edu).

Scholars and artists are invited to apply for travel fellowships and grants, which the **Bakken Library and Museum in Minneapolis** offers to

encourage research in its collection of books, journals, manuscripts, prints, and instruments. The awards are to be used to help defray the expenses of travel, subsistence, and other direct costs of conducting research at the Bakken for researchers who must travel some distance and pay for temporary housing in the Twin Cities in order to conduct research at the Bakken. Visiting Research Fellowships are awarded up to a maximum of \$1,500; the minimum period of residence is two weeks, and preference is given to researchers who are interested in collaborating informally for a day or two with Bakken staff during their research visit. Research Travel Grants are awarded up to a maximum of \$500 (domestic) and \$750 (foreign); the minimum period of residence is one week. The next **application deadline for either type of research assistance is February 19, 2010**. For more details and application guidelines, please contact: Elizabeth Ihrig, Librarian, The Bakken Library and Museum, 3537 Zenith Avenue So., Minneapolis, MN., 55416, tel 612-926-3878 ext. 227, fax (612) 927-7265, e-mail Ihrig@thebakken.org, www.thebakken.org.

The European Neuroscience and Society Network is offering a number of **Short Visits (up to 15 days) and Exchange Grants (from 15 days to 6 months)**. Projects must be related to the scientific objectives of the Programme and start during 2010. For more information about the ENSN please check <http://personal.lse.ac.uk/connorsc> or email ensn@lse.ac.uk. Although we welcome applicants from all countries, priority will be given to applicants coming from and intending to visit laboratories in countries that financially support the programme: Austria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. Preference is given to short visit grant scholars or exchange grant scholars who co-fund or accept partial funding of their exchange stay. Conditions of Eligibility: a) Undertake work of high scientific quality on the ethical, legal and social implications of neuroscience and neurotechnology. Please note that in most cases, general laboratory work in the neurosciences will not be eligible for funding. b) Apply to work in a European country other than the country of origin OR apply with a European country of origin. c) Intend to return to the institute of origin upon termination, so that the applicant's institute may also benefit from the broadened knowledge of the scientist. d) Agree to acknowledge ESF in publications resulting from the grantee's work in

relation to the Short Visit or Exchange Grant. e) Provide a report on the activity within one month of the visit. f) Applications from all scientists are welcome, but priority will be given to those early in their career. Short Visit Grants are reimbursed on a per diem basis of 85 EUR plus actual travel expenses up to a travel expense maximum of 500 EUR. Exchange Grants are reimbursed on the basis of an allowance of 400 EUR per week plus actual travel expenses up to a maximum of 500 EUR. The grants do not cover health insurance, taxes, or retirement scheme contributions. **Submissions must be made online to ensn@lse.ac.uk by January 12th, 2010** with all relevant materials attached. Please read the ESF Guidelines for Grants before submitting your application and ensure that your name and affiliation is present on all materials. Short Visit Grant Applications should include the following information: A cover sheet with your name, affiliation, and all contact information plus a list of materials attached. A short description of the proposed project work (up to 250 words) with the aims of the visit. A curriculum vitae of two A4 pages maximum. Full address details of the prospective host(s). Proposed starting date and duration. Estimated travel costs. Exchange Grant Applications should include the following information: A cover sheet with your name, affiliation, and all contact information plus a list of materials attached. A description of the proposed project work (up to 1000 words) with the aims and justification of the visit. A curriculum vitae of two A4 pages maximum, including a resume of research experience and a list of five most recent publications. A letter of recommendation from someone familiar with the applicant's work. A letter of acceptance from the host at the receiving institute. Full address details of the prospective host(s). Details of the host's research facilities. Proposed starting date and duration. Estimated travel costs. **Applications should be received by 17:00 Central European Time on 12 January 2010.** Late or incomplete applications will not be considered. It is expected that the outcome will be known by mid-February.

The Science, Technology, and Public Policy (STPP) Program in the Ford School of Public Policy at the University of Michigan seeks to fill **one postdoctoral fellow position (for two years in residence), starting Fall 2010.** Fellows are expected to perform research in some aspect of science and technology policy, teach courses in science and technology policy (one course in Year 1

and two courses in Year 2), help to organize a seminar series, and work with faculty to develop the STPP program. In addition to working with colleagues in STPP and the Ford School, fellows will find a wide range of programs at University of Michigan that provide opportunities for enrichment and collaboration, including leading programs in law, business, public health, medicine, engineering, the sciences, and science & technology studies. Applicants can learn more about the STPP Program through our website, <http://stpp.fordschool.umich.edu>. Applicants should be recent recipients of the doctoral degree, with demonstrated interest in science and technology policy. Areas of specialization and disciplinary approaches are open. These fellowships are made possible through a generous gift from The Herbert H. and Grace A. Dow Foundation. Salary is competitive and includes benefits. Modest funds will also be provided for moving, conference travel, and research. Awardees will be expected to be in residence in Ann Arbor, Michigan, for the time of their award and be an active colleague within UM. **Applications received by January 15, 2010, will be given first consideration,** although we will continue to accept applications after that date. Please send application materials electronic form to jbisanz@umich.edu. Applications should include a CV, letter describing research and teaching interests, a statement outlining the proposed research project, teaching evaluations, and three letters of reference. For more information, please contact: STPP Fellow Search, Attn: Jeanne Bisanz, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, University of Michigan, 735 S. State Street, 4204 Weill Hall, Ann Arbor, MI 48109-3091 USA, (734) 615-6942, jbisanz@umich.edu.

The Institute for Advanced Social Studies (IESA), a center of the Spanish Council for Scientific Research (CSIC) located in **Córdoba**, is seeking to appoint a **postdoctoral research fellow for a 12-month position, renewable for two more years, beginning between May and September 2010.** We are looking for a candidate who can contribute to a program in science and innovation policy. The postdoctoral researcher will integrate in a team involved in the design, implementation, analysis and publications plan of a project on "the socio-economic impact of public research organizations", as well as in other projects related to the study of knowledge transfer processes. Ideal candidates will have a Ph.D. in Sociology, Organizational Studies, Industrial Economics, or

related discipline; background in research design, developing surveys and quantitative data analysis; excellent written and oral communications skills in English; and ability to read and communicate fluidly in Spanish. To apply, please include a c.v., writing sample(s), and a description (no longer than two

pages) highlighting how your research experience could be related with the field of science and innovation policy. Please, send your documents to the postal address indicated above, or contact directly Manuel Fernández-Esquinas. Phone: 34-957-760528. E-mail: mfernandez@iesa.csic.es.

News from the field

The Journal of Medical Humanities & Social Studies of Science and Technology has issued a **call for national correspondents**. We are looking for correspondents with residence in: United States, Canada, Brazil, Mexico, Chile, Colombia, United Kingdom, Germany, France, Spain, Italy, Russia, India, China, Japan, Israel and Australia (not exclusive). Profile: we are looking for people 25 years or older, university graduates working on research in Medical Humanities and/or Social Studies of Science and Technology. High English level and good command in the basic tools of Microsoft Office and Internet. Task description: selected candidates are to search for the main distribution lists of information (i.e. listerv) about the different medical humanities and social studies of science and technology that are used by teachers, researchers, students, professionals and scholars of their countries. They should identify the main scientific societies, networks and other associations of researchers of the different medical humanities and social studies of science and technology of their countries, periodically inform about scientific and academic events that take place in their respective countries in the mentioned disciplines so that our journal may contribute with its promotion. They should also contribute promoting Eä in different academic institutions in their area and in social networks (Facebook, blogs, and similar). Selected candidates will be functioning as national correspondents of their countries; their names will be published in our journal as a part of the staff and will receive an accrediting certificate. We estimate that the time for accomplishing this task will not exceed a total of 4 (four) hours a month. The job will be free lance and pro bono, for a period of six months that may be renewed for an extra period by an agreement of both parts. Being national correspondents will not prevent selected candidates from submitting papers for publication in our journal. Applications should be submitted to info@ea-journal.com, attaching abridged CV.

Please write in the subject "Call for correspondents". For more information, please contact us to info@ea-journal.com. Eä - Journal of Medical Humanities & Social Studies of Science and Technology, www.ea-journal.com.

The 18th Sociology of Health and Illness Monograph, 'Sociology of Screening,' has issued a **call for abstracts**. For the 18th monograph in the series, the Sociology of Health and Illness invites submissions of proposals for papers on the sociology of medical screening. The reach of medical screening is ever-growing, and screening programmes are social interventions as much as they are medical interventions and as such they pose challenging ethical, legal and social dilemmas. This monograph will bring together papers which identify and refine the salient sociological questions around screening, reflect on and integrate the existing literature, and identify the key areas for future sociological work in this area. We seek submissions that focus on large scale population-based screening programmes, and welcome abstracts covering a range of conditions and contexts (including different countries), and from a range of theoretical and methodological perspectives. Possible questions papers might address include: What are the social and ethical implications of screening, and what might these mean? Are current theories of surveillance, subjecthood and citizenship still relevant? How might a sociology of screening refine these? What are the debates between different groups and social movements - for example: patient advocates; lobbyists; proponents of evidence-based medicine? How are these shaped and mobilised? How has screening been represented in the media? What are the implications? What impact does screening have on relationships between patients and professionals, and what might this mean? What are/have been the implications of the development and

implementation of new medical technologies for screening in relation to risk and uncertainty? Can the medicalisation thesis, and its counter-critiques, help us conceptualise screening? The monograph will appear both as a regular issue of the journal and in book form. The planned publication date is February 2012. **Potential contributors should send an abstract of 800-1,000 words by 31st Jan 2010 to shimonograph@le.ac.uk.** Informal email enquiries to this address prior to submission are also welcome. Name and institutional affiliation of author(s) should also be supplied, including full contact details of the main author. Proposals will be reviewed by the editors and authors will be notified by 31 March 2010. Authors whose abstracts are short-listed will be invited to submit an article of 6,500-7,000 words by 31 July 2010. All submissions will be refereed in the usual way for Sociology of Health and Illness submissions and should follow the journal's style guidelines (http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/shil_enhanced/submit.asp). The editors are Natalie Armstrong & Helen Eborall (University of Leicester), hce3@le.ac.uk.

There is a **call for papers for Issue 16 of Philament: Borders, Regions, Worlds**. The **submission deadline is 31st January 2010**. Philament, the peer-reviewed online journal of the arts and culture affiliated with the University of Sydney, invites scholars to contribute articles to our latest issue upon the theme of Borders, Regions, Worlds. Possible topics include, but are not limited to: Mappings, Identity, Migration, Difference, Connections, Complexity, Systems, Community, Totality, Postcolonialism, Regionalism, Domesticity, Liminality, Nature, Landscape, Security, Capital(s), World-Building, Transgression, and Alienation. Philament accepts submissions from current postgraduate students and early-career scholars (less than five years post-qualification). Submissions may include: Academic papers up to 8,000 words. Opinion pieces: reviews (book, stage, screen, etc.), conference reports, short essays, responses to papers previously published in Philament, up to 1,000 words. Creative works: writing, images, sounds or mixed media. Submissions should be limited to three pieces. All submissions may be sent as an email attachment in a PC-readable format to philament@arts.usyd.edu.au together with a submission form available from <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/publications/philament/submissions.htm>. Academic papers must

include endnotes and conform to Philament house style of referencing as detailed at the URL above. Philament will only accept submissions not previously published and not under consideration elsewhere. For further information visit <http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/publications/Philament>.

Spontaneous Generations is an **open, online, peer-reviewed academic journal** published by graduate students at the **Institute for the History and Philosophy of Science and Technology at the University of Toronto**. It has issued a **call for papers for Volume 4: Scientific Instruments: Knowledge, Practice, and Culture**. In addition to articles for peer review, opinion essays, and book reviews, Spontaneous Generations is seeking contributions to its focused discussion section. This section consists of short peer-reviewed and invited articles devoted to a particular theme. This year, the theme is "Scientific Instruments: Knowledge, Practice, and Culture." See below for submission guidelines. We welcome submissions from scholars in all disciplines, including but not limited to HPS, STS, History, Philosophy, Women's Studies, Sociology, Anthropology, and Religious Studies. Papers from all periods are welcome. The journal consists of four sections: A focused discussion section devoted to Scientific Instruments (see below). (1000-3000 words recommended.) A peer-reviewed section of research papers on various topics in the field of HPS. (5000-8000 words recommended.) A book review section for books published in the last 5 years. (Up to 1000 words.) An opinions section that may include a commentary on or a response to current concerns, trends, and issues in HPS. (Up to 500 words.) With the "practical turn" in history and philosophy of science came a renewed interest in scientific instruments. Although they have become a nexus for worries about empiricism and standards of evidence, instruments only rarely feature as primary sources for scholars in the history and philosophy of science. Even historians of technology have been accused of underutilizing the evidence embodied in material objects (Corn 1996). The fundamental questions are not settled. First, there is no general agreement as to what counts as a scientific instrument: Are simulations instruments? Can people function as instruments? Do economic or sociological instruments operate in the same way as material instruments? There is a second, related debate about how scientific instruments work: Is there a unified account? Do instruments produce knowledge or produce effects? Do they extend our

senses (Humphreys 2006) or embody knowledge (Baird 2006)? Third, HPS has seen a variety of approaches to fitting instruments into broader historical and philosophical questions about scientific communities and practices: Shapin and Schaffer (1985) relate instruments to the scientific life, Galison (1997) gives instrument makers equal footing with theorists and experimentalists within the trading zone of scientific discourse, and Hacking (1983) elevates instruments to central importance in the realism-antirealism debate. Finally, it seems plausible that there are methodological concerns

specific to scientific instruments: What lessons can we draw from anthropology, material culture, and other allied fields? We welcome short papers exploring the history and philosophy of scientific instruments for inclusion in Spontaneous Generations Volume 4. **Submissions should be sent no later than 26 February 2010 in order to be considered for the 2010 issue.** For more details, and a preview of Volume 3 (2009): Epistemic Boundaries, please visit the journal homepage at <http://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/SpontaneousGenerations/>.

EASST REVIEW 2010

Publication plan and submission deadlines

Look for your next four issues of EASST Review in March, June, August and December. Submission deadlines Feb. 15, May 18, July 19

and Nov 15 respectively. Meanwhile, I wish all readers a Happy Holiday Season and a Productive New Year!

Contents of this issue

- 3 Think Big! By Ann R. Sætnan
- 4 Urban Laboratories: Towards an STS of the Built Environment
By Bas van Heur, Ralf Brand, Andrew Karvonen, Simon Guy and Sally Wyatt
- 7 EASST Conference 2010 – Announcing themes and tracks
- 8 Books Seeking Reviewers
- 8 Conferences and Calls for Papers
- 14 Opportunities Available
- 17 News from the Field
- 19 EASST Review 2010 – Publication plan and submission deadlines.