

EASST *Review*

Volume 28 (1) *European Association for the Study of Science and Technology* February 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 (Brunel University)

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

James Martin Institute for Science and

Civilization, 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: "Smartbombs" found at www.howstuffworks.com. Photo from US Department of Defense.

Relevance

Editorial

by Ann R. Sætnan

I was recently asked to review a book about Norwegian welfare research. A key issue in the book was “relevance” – how the notion of relevance inspired and/or constrained welfare research and whether welfare research managed to make itself relevant, as measured by impact on policy.

Reading the book got me to thinking about relevance issues in our own field, recalling how in 1993 Langdon Winner challenged STS to examine its then latest theoretical and methodological tools in just such terms. That set me to thinking about this issue of the Review, which can at least in part be read as a follow-up on the election issue that preceded it.

Since the Fall 2008 elections, including EASST’s own, much has happened that should increase our chances of relevance. Our sister organization, Society for the Social Study of Science (4S) was admitted to full membership in the International Social Science Council. Barack Obama was elected President of the USA and in his inaugural speech announced, among other commitments, that “[w]e will restore science to its rightful place and wield technology’s wonders to raise health care’s quality and lower its costs. We will harness the sun and the winds and the soil to fuel our cars and run our factories. And we will transform our schools and colleges and universities to meet the demands of a new age.” So STS is being taken seriously as a member of the larger Science community, and Science is again being taken seriously as a policy advisor.

But much has also happened that has, at least in my eyes, increased our need to be relevant. Much has happened that has depressed me about the state of the world; and, in my experience, the way out of depression is to find some modicum of control over the situation, some means of exerting influence. So what does our professional toolbox offer us that can exert some positive influence on the ongoing tragedies of Darfur or of the Congo/Rwanda

borderlands, over the escalating war in Afghanistan, over local tragedies such as school murders, over the deepening and geographically expanding economic recession, and (perhaps most acutely at the moment of writing) over the humanitarian disaster of Israel’s invasion and siege of Gaza? Can STS, from its new position in the world science community or otherwise, make itself relevant to righting these wrongs and/or preventing new ones?

For instance: Wars are fought on multiple fronts, one of them always the front of homeland rhetoric. And that rhetoric seems to consistently involve at least one strand based on techno-scientific optimism – stories about weapons being “modern,” “accurate,” even “surgically precise,” and thus presumably somehow “humane”. In other words, war news is often a particular variety of science news for the public, which is something we in STS should know a great deal about. We saw examples of such “news” in the press releases during “Desert Storm”. Many of you surely remember the animations and training-ground films that were supposed to convince us that the US was using smart, accurate bombs. We saw such films again in Israeli news bytes from the attack on Gaza. Those video bytes and the repeated explanations for strikes on hospitals, schools, homes (“ Hamas was shooting from there.”) put me in a mood of dark humour. I recalled the joke about military recruiters trawling the countryside to find sharpshooters:

The recruiters come to a hay barn riddled with bullet holes, each one smack dab in the middle of a tiny painted bull’s eye. “Who shot all those bull’s eyes?” they ask, and one farm lad comes forward. “You’re recruited!” they say. But already after a few days of basic training, it is clear that this lad can barely see the barn, let alone hit a target. So the recruiting officer asks him how he managed to hit all those bull’s eyes. He answers, “I shoot first. Then I draw the circles.”

Maybe all it takes is a joke like that to debunk wartime propaganda such as video glimpses of bombs falling on anonymous buildings viewed through crosshairs and the claim that each building, even if clearly marked as a hospital, is a military target. Or does our STS tool chest contain tools even more powerful than jokes?

We have also seen new instances of the potential effectiveness of technologies deployed in opposition to the war. International press was barred from Gaza. Two Norwegian doctors who volunteered to staff trauma hospitals inside Gaza were unable to hold interviews with journalists or take journalists through the hospitals. So instead they used their own small videocams and their cell phones. They wrote their own questions, which they “answered” as if being interviewed, and then multi-media-messaged these homemade videos out to television stations. They also wrote a short text message that they IM’ed to friends with the request that it be forwarded to as many as possible. Norway is a small country and a high-tech one, fewer than 5 million inhabitants and about as many cell phones. Within hours the country was flooded with messages from these two doctors in Gaza. My copy was forwarded by a neighbour. It reads (I translate):

“Dear friends, An IM from Mads Gilbert in Gaza: Thanks for all your support. They bombed the central vegetable market in Gaza City 2 hours ago. 80 injured, 20 killed, all sent here to Shifa Hospital. Hades! We are wading in death, blood, amputated limbs. Loads of children. Pregnant women. I have never before experienced anything this awful. Now we hear tanks. Spread the word, shout it onward. Everything. DO SOMETHING! DO MORE! We are living in the history books right now, all of us! Mads G. 3.1.09 13:50. Gaza, Palestina.”

I received my copy 4.1.09 23:03. I must have been many links out on the distributional chain, but nevertheless it reached me before the news was in the mass media. The text was in all the newspapers the next day and by afternoon

politicians were scrambling to respond.

This use of communication technology to get information past a media blockade is at least a phenomenon of theoretical interest from an STS perspective. Is it also a phenomenon to which we can contribute in some way?

I hesitated to write about Gaza in the EASST Review. The Review is a members’ newsletter for an academic association, not a political forum. And yet, our academic focus is not apolitical. I invite any members who feel an urge to discuss this matter – be it to propose ways of getting involved, to argue for academic neutrality, or to critique my decision to take this up in the Review – to do so at the EASST Review Discussion Forums: <http://www1.svt.ntnu.no/forum/easst/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=48>

Meanwhile, I present to you the 2009/1 issue of EASST Review. It is a fairly long issue, catching up on some pieces that were waiting for publication. Consider it a double issue in compensation for only three last year. In this issue you will find the theme of relevance presented in various ways. First, and directly on this issue’s theme, two event reviews: The first is a report by Corinna Jung from a workshop on the role of social sciences in participatory policy making. The second is Katja Majer’s report from the session “Acting with social sciences and humanities” at the 4S/EASST meeting at Rotterdam. Antti Pelkonen presents his recent dissertation on Finnish science policy as a tool for economic competitiveness. And Christine Hine presents to you all your newly elected EASST President and Council.

Reference:

Winner, Langdon (1993) Upon Opening the Black Box and Finding It Empty: Social Constructivism and the Philosophy of Technology. In *Science, Technology, & Human Values*, Vol. 18, No. 3. pp. 362-378.

Ironists, Reformers, Rebels?

A Workshop Report

by Corinna Jung

From June 26th to 27th 2008, the workshop “Ironists, Reformers, or Rebels? The Role of the Social Sciences in Participatory Policy Making” took place at the Collegium Helveticum of the UZH/ETH in Zurich. It was organised by Silke Schicktanz (University Göttingen) and Priska Gisler (ETH Zurich) in collaboration with STS-CH (Swiss Association for Science, Technology and Society) and focused on the position of the social sciences in modern democracies.

By developing and using participatory methods social scientists often initiate public debates but rarely take part in them themselves. When we look at ethics commissions, expert committees or public hearings concerned with science and technology issues, we find natural scientists, physicians, lawyers and the occasional philosopher. Sociologists, anthropologists and other social scientists, on the other hand, are often missing. Because of this imbalance, the conference organisers' aim was to bring together scholars and researchers from different areas of the social sciences to consider the role of their disciplines in public policy making. This happened in three sessions and two introductory lectures given by Andrew Sterling (SPRU, University of Sussex) and Gabriele Abels (Institute for Political Science, University of Tübingen).

The role of the social sciences – general perspectives

The opening session asked general questions about the role of the social sciences and was chaired by Franco Furger (University of Applied Studies Switzerland). It included three talks by Christopher Kullenberg (Department for History of Ideas and Theory of Science, University of Gothenburg), Kevin Burchell (BIOS, London School of Economics) and Sonja van der Arend (Delft University of Technology).

After all three speakers and the preceding introduction lecture by Andrew Stirling who had advocated the use of multiple approaches in

a given setting, a lively debate began. The workshop participants primarily discussed the understanding and meaning of the citizen and the public in the contexts of the lectures and the underlying models of society.

Later the discussion turned to the question how several approaches to resolving the complications of a given setting could be used at the same time. Sterling could give an illustrative example for a setting where this worked well. He mentioned a situation where a policy-maker was very happy about not getting the one advice but several.

A closer look: case studies in public policy making

In session 2 selected case studies were presented by Carlo Caduff (Department of Anthropology, University of Berkeley), Gabriele Werner-Felmayer (Division of Biological Chemistry, Medical University of Innsbruck) and Maud Radstake (Centre for Society and Genomics, Radboud University Nijmegen). This session was chaired by Martin Lengwiler (Department of History, University of Basel).

Again, the panel led to another very lively debate. This time, the subject was the different roles of social scientists within those case study-contexts and beyond. At first, social scientists were identified as ironists, reformers and sometimes as rebels. The ironist would be the social scientist who observes the contingency of several processes without interfering. The reformer would criticise the observed processes and demand stronger public participation, he would act according to a certain normative background. The rebel would question the classical categories. He would not only want to change certain roles within the process but aim at changing the issues on the political agenda.

The workshop participants agreed that those roles may not be enough. In special situations, some discussants suggested, the social sciences may be seen as servant. This

would describe the role of someone who supports political decision-making and tries to smooth political processes but it would be a rather problematic role. Social scientists can, in other situations, also act as advocates who speak for those who can't speak for themselves or they could become a midwife. The midwife stands for the idea of a person who is assisting at a birth but then lets the "child" grow up alone. This could be understood as the scientists' having the power at a certain point of a process and then losing it again. All these roles would contain distinct implications of power.

Methods for participatory policy making

Before the third workshop session Gabriele Abels gave her introductory lecture. In it she developed a typology of participatory technology assessment (pTA). Among others she listed scenario workshops, consensus conferences and public hearings. For each of these she identified various roles for social scientists: the translator between lay man's speech and expert speech or between lay people and policy-makers; the observer of pTA; the 'normal', or participating, expert.

Abels' introductory lecture was commented on by Erik Millstone (also of SPRU). He believes that debates about the utility and limitations of different forms of participatory technology assessment needs to engage with a second major debate about technology assessment: the debate about the relationship between science and policy-making.

Monika Kurath (Collegium Helveticum, Zurich) moderated the third panel which took a closer look at methods for public engagement. Caroline Moor (Centre of Gerontology, University of Zurich) presented results of a Round Table on dementia, Eefje Cuppen (Institute for Environmental Studies, Free University of Amsterdam) presented the Q Methodology and Hans Keune (Faculty of Political and Social Studies, University of Antwerp) talked about a Multi Criteria Analysis.

In this panel discussion, the distinct methodological approaches were compared and

the workshop participants discussed which method could work in which context. The discussants agreed that different settings required specific methods, depending on the researcher's intention. The choice of the right method was considered to be rather difficult without enough background knowledge.

Conclusions: different settings, various roles

In their discussion the workshop participants realised that social scientists are already involved in a variety of participatory policy processes. However, there was agreement that even in those processes the influence of the social scientists should be stronger.

The participants also were of the common opinion that there is no single role that can be ascribed to the social sciences. On the contrary, the discussants agreed that the role of a social scientist would always depend on the (research) project and will vary from situation to situation and from context to context.

A further point of discussion was that not every project carrying the label public engagement is necessarily a project in which the public is really involved. In these later cases it is especially important for participating social scientists to reflect their role. Even apart from these situations researchers of the social sciences should deliberate their assignments and their understanding of modern democracy and of how societies should be governed in any situation they are involved in.

Social scientists do have a responsibility in our societies. Especially in the ongoing debates concerned with science and technology issues, we have to play our part. Depending on the circumstances, it is our job to play our role as translators, advocates, moderators, experts or any other role that may be necessary - we as social scientists should always act as mindful impulse givers to our societies as well as as responsible citizens.

In conclusion, this workshop was a place to reflect and reconsider, and to wonder where the social sciences could and should go from here. To continue these discussions, go to <http://www1.svt.ntnu.no/forum/easst/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=47>

Acting With Social Sciences and Humanities

Acting with science, technology and medicine

4S/EASST Joint Meeting 2008

Session report and comment

by Katja Mayer¹

In collaboration with Tereza Stöckelová² and Veronika Wöhrer³
and with essential help of all participants of the session.

STS has a long tradition of research on scientific cultures and practices. Many studies start from the assumption that science is not a secluded part of society but is, on the contrary, closely interlinked with society, and contemporary technosciences are understood and studied by STS scholars as one of the key phenomena of contemporary knowledge societies. However, research has mainly concentrated on engineering, the natural and medical sciences. Social sciences and humanities (SSH) occupy just a marginal part of the STS agenda, even though these scientific fields contribute equally to the co-producing of relevant knowledge about the world and may diffuse into society even faster than “technical” knowledge (see Mesny 2000, Beck et al 1982).

A presentation on “Studying Soft Sciences” (Therese Garstenauer and Katja Mayer) at the 2006 EASST conference in Lausanne generated interesting discussions: We were told, among other things, that many people have tried to embed research on SSH into STS repeatedly, but failed and their efforts soon dried up. With this “encouraging” expectation we started to investigate where such research was done, if not in the STS context, and why it had not been appropriated by STS. Besides numerous (reflexive) studies inside and across SSH fields themselves, we unexpectedly discovered quite a considerable number of publications on SSH within the broad field of STS and its theories and methodologies, which cover research on e.g. finance systems, markets and economies, urban studies, law, development studies, psychology, anthropology, history, sociology, ... See

www.sshstudies.net for bibliography) These scientific fields (as research objects) however seem rather invisible in STS journals and at STS events.

Further investigation brought us in contact with many like-minded researchers and resulted in a series of workshops in Vienna and Prague in 2007, centering on shared experiences and methodological approaches when doing social research on SSH. Discussions revolved around the adequacy of STS approaches, issues of self-reflexivity, problems of field access, proximity and “going native”. To cut the long story short, one result of the workshops was a call for papers for the joint 4S and EASST conference in 2008, to invite researchers, who are investigating SSH with concepts from STS and other dispositives, but who are also reflecting on their own work as social scientists doing STS or related research. This text should allow readers to catch several glimpses on what was going on in the triple session entitled: Acting With Social Sciences and Humanities.

Our section comprised of 3 sessions and a total of 13 presentations. In order not to impose a “grand narrative” on the quite heterogeneous set of lectures, I will follow the order of appearance, to open up the broad range of subjects that were addressed. But let me introduce you to the different sessions beforehand: In the first session “Impact, Co-Shaping and Reflexivity” the presentations analyzed what happens with knowledge developed in the social sciences and humanities when it goes beyond the (core) scientific community: how it is used, translated, and

1 Katja Mayer, PhD Student at Department of Social Studies of Science, University of Vienna, Austria.

2 Tereza Stöckelová, Institute of Sociology of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic.

3 Veronika Wöhrer, Department of Social Studies of Science, University of Vienna, Austria.

made sense of e.g. in the conduct of psychological experiments (Derksen). Some papers focused on the role of social sciences in research projects or institutions they themselves are involved in (Bister, Dunn), or focused on social sciences within multidisciplinary research sites (Dunn) resp. in science communications (Phillips) and in the media and public debates (Plesner).

The second session “(Politics of) Methods and Complicity” was dedicated to methodological issues and their relevance in regard to research politics and research outcomes. The papers focused on performativity and aesthetics of social science methods (Mayer), elaborated on the role and position of a researcher being simultaneously inside and outside his/her field of study (Wöhler, Stegmaier), and/or included further reflections on political implications of different methodological and theoretical approaches (Mager).

The papers of the third session, called “Inter-Disciplines”, dealt with different aspects of disciplinarity and interdisciplinarity. One paper focused on perceptions and enactment of inter/disciplinarity in a sociology department (Červinková/Stöckelová), two concentrated on cross-disciplinary collaborations (Connor, Dormans) and a further paper was on historical developments of interdisciplinary and participatory social research (Lezaun).

Another perspective on our section reveals two main issues: Some of us were reflecting on our own practice as (social) scientists or STS researchers and on the other hand we were researchers studying SSH as a full fledged empirical field.

Our first session was opened by Milena Bister (University of Vienna, Austria) and her reflections on the research setting in a STS project investigating informed consent to tissue donation at a university hospital in Austria. Stepping in this particular space of negotiation between biomedicine and society, her team of STS researchers actually came to parallel some of their methods (acts and movements in the hospital) with those of the biomedical project partners. For instance they as well had to ask for the patients’ consent to the social science

interviews just as the biomedical team did for tissue donation. Bister showed that by exploring the realm of bioethics in acting with the whole procedure – proposing to the ethics committee, designing the IC form, conducting IC with the patients right after the biomedical IC, interviewing the patients - her team actually co-shaped and reinforced the dominant practices of informed consent, despite their overall critical standpoint.

Caroline Dunn (University of Melbourne, Australia) introduced us to the often-conflicting imaginations of the Other in her research about community attitudes towards forestry industry, which is part of a 7-year project at the cooperative research center. In reflecting ethnographically her own status in the complex meshwork of funders, forestry practitioners as participants and other researchers in such an interdisciplinary collaboration, Dunn experienced the potential of negotiating the aims of her social scientific inquiry. By asking collaborators what they expect of her study, she positioned herself as well as her study horizontally within the collective knowledge production process. By letting her own status be questioned by other participants, Dunn could engage in new perspectives and develop otherwise ignored research questions.

Ursula Plesner (University of Roskilde, Denmark) argued in line with Latour (2005) and Lynch (2000) that reflexivity should be given back to actors, rather than being drawn upon as a routine methodological duty and feigned enhancement of validity. Plesner presented empirical materials of interviews with journalists and social scientists from her study on communication of social scientific knowledge via mass media. She marked out the fact that interviewer and interviewees are competent lay audiences for one another. Showing that the concept of “lay sociological imaginations” (Mesny 1998) can be used as a heuristic tool to understand the production of intimacy in interviews with fellow sociologists and journalists. Plesner proposed that we leave the normative concerns related to ‘studying down’, and use active interview techniques (Holstein/Gubrium 1995) when we “study sideways”, conceiving of interviews as bilateral

“meaning-making occasions”.

Louise Phillips (University of Roskilde, Denmark) brought with her transcriptions of meetings in a Danish research and development consultancy. The researcher-consultants in the consultancy under study attempt to operate on the basis of dialogic principles in the sense that they view the communication of knowledge as knowledge-sharing, interaction, dialogue or negotiation rather than the one-way, unilinear transmission of expert knowledge to a less knowledgeable target-group. In analysis of the transcriptions, Phillips applied an integrative approach combining dialogic communication theory and STS – to address the questions: What happens to social scientific knowledge when it is communicated dialogically? How are different knowledges produced, negotiated, challenged and transformed in the meeting between social scientific knowledges and other knowledge forms and the meeting between the researchers and other participating actors?

Maarten Derksen (University of Groningen, The Netherlands) presented a study of 'machinations' (Latour, 1988) in psychology, part of a larger project on social technology conducted together with Anne Beaulieu. Noting that studies of technology usually focus on machines, he argued that it has become urgent to explore the engineering of human behavior. His analysis focused on priming studies and automaticity theory, attempts to construct subjects as machines, not under the control of a free, rational self. Derksen showed that priming research nevertheless produces excess subjectivity, resistance to machination, and proposed this as a general feature of machinations in the social sciences

Our second session started with my presentation (Katja Mayer, University of Vienna, Austria) about the usage of network diagrams in the context of Social Network Analysis. With focusing on their embedding in and capacity of coupling with scientific as well as popular visual cultures, but also on the material and corporeal dimensions of the imaging process, I illustrated what I call the “epistemological desire of being touched by-and touching” objects of research. Traveling fingers on social topographies, rhetoric

precision via metaphors to circumscribe pictorial ambivalences, ergonomic standardizations in color schemes, are enacting and animating social structures, and therefore should be regarded as authentic practices to produce scientific validity. I concluded that in studying scientific practices the body is not to be blinded out as automatism, rather it should be considered as present criterion and constant involvement.

Peter Stegmaier (University of Nijmegen, Netherlands) tackled his role as “embedded” social scientist in the Centre for Society and Genomics in Nijmegen. With its mission to understand and improve the interaction between genomics researchers and various other societal actors, this institution employs Stegmaier to carry out a “meta-project” on what is considered to be the framework approach of the center, namely, ELSA (for ethical, legal, social aspects of) Genomics. He described himself as a “re-informant” who cooperates with and studies the social scientist-managers and -researchers in this facility. “While the informant informs a stranger/outsider about an unknown world of insiders, the re-informant/outsider informs the insiders about their known world. The re-informant shows the unknown or neglected dimensions/aspects, and questions insider perspectives through estrangement.”, as Stegmaier phrased it. He observed the institution’s own condition of doing research and outreach and he pointed to unknown or neglected dimensions/aspects, and questioned self-evident perspectives through professionalized “estrangement” (Hirschauer 1994; Hirschauer/Amann 1997). With a reflexive, ethnographic approach Stegmaier sought to know “something from the inside and outside at the same time” (Hirschauer 1994).

Being a gender researcher herself, Veronika Wöhrer (University of Vienna, Austria) found herself in conflicting attributions towards her own role in her investigation of international co-operations between gender researchers of four different national communities. In her presentation Wöhrer explored the ambivalence/mutuality of proximity and distance to the protagonists as “complicity” (Marcus 1998) and showed how

she was constructed as Other by her “co-researchers” (Kitzinger /Wilkinson 1996;). In the awareness that they were sharing the same scientific field, she was perceived differently in each context, i.e. as “rich Westener”, “experienced gender researcher”, “poor student” or “badly prepared foreigner”, which brought her to re-conceptualize her own assumptions about the respective “others” in the different field sites. She argues for more explicit reflections of one's own entanglements with the field, especially when researching (social) scientists, to contribute to what Bourdieu called a “reflexive sociology” (Bourdieu 1988).

Drawing on recent work in Actor-Network Theory (Law 2004, Mol 2002), Astrid Mager (University of Vienna, Austria) reflected on the different methods employed in her study on online health information and how they differently enacted “the web”. Taking in the standpoint of website providers the web was shaped as a network of clear-cut websites understood as coherent information packages linked to a specific actor. Taking in the standpoint of users the web was performed as assemblage of disconnected pieces of information organized around specific issues primarily by the search engine Google. Mager further asked what the political implications of the various methods chosen are in terms of “ontological politics” (Mol 2002). She elaborated that focusing on website providers tends to enact the web as a de-central actor-network that may strengthen the rhetoric of democracy widely attached to the web especially in its early days. Following users, in contrast, shapes the web as a Google-organized space that may underline the imagination of Google as an information monopolist increasingly spreading in public discourses. Mager concluded by arguing that it is thus central to think about the divergent politics pushed forward when choosing one method or another.

Alice Červinková and Tereza Stöckelová (Academy of Sciences Prague, Czech Republic) gave account of their long-term study in a department of sociology. They described the “inter/disciplinary hybrids” of social

anthropology (SA) and gender studies (GS) that are partially connected to the “mother” discipline of sociology. Following Strathern (2007) they argued that disciplines are always interdisciplinary and identify three logics of this “hidden” interdisciplinarity. The logic of administration keeps SA and GS interlinked with sociology because of the lack of admissible senior professors who have to be formally “borrowed” from sociology; the logic of trajectory is embodied in researchers identities who often have a degree in sociology and are not ready to completely disconnect from it (they are “boundary subjects”); and the logic of discipline allows for disciplinary ordering and cleansing, for keeping certain topics, epistemologies, ontologies and politics (especially in case of gender studies) out/on the margin of “proper” sociology, while guarding a partial control over them and mobilizing them as “sociology” when convenient.

During his presentation, Conor Douglas (University of York, UK and University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada) reframed the question “How to integrate qualitative social scientific results into the development of a new prescribing algorithm for the anticoagulation drug warfarin?” into “How and why does social scientific knowledge matter in a multidisciplinary research project on pharmacogenetics?” He argued that while the project’s social science component implied the collection of “bio-narratives” of patients to effectively develop a way for understanding how patients make sense of their medical treatment⁴ that these findings may not be able to be readily integrated into the overall project organization. It is a challenge for social scientists involved in multidisciplinary research to reflect on what they are effectively doing in the research process, and for investigators to critically examine their own social science knowledge production processes in the same way that we in STS are accustomed to examining conventional technoscientific knowledge production.

Javier Lezaun (University of Oxford, UK)

4 Douglas and his colleagues call it a “lay pharmacology”; see: Webster et al. in *Science as Culture* forthcoming.

introduced us to MS Balao, a large cargo ship that was partly designed as a platform for experiments in the democratization of work, under the auspices of the Work Research Institute in Oslo from 1968-1978. Lezaun showed how the ship was treated as socio-technical experiment in offshore shipboard democracy. Essential social and spatial requirements for democratic work were built into the technological conditions and physical arrangements of the ship. The experiment included “onboard” social scientists who in the process of conducting their research learned that hierarchical forms of organization and communication were also inherent in their research practice, and concluded that they had to open up their “expertise” to other contributors, hence performing a democratization of research as well.

Stefan Dormans (Virtual Knowledge Studio, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) presented a project on ICT-enabled collaborations, so called collaboratories, in the domain of social history. The various collaborations under study revolve around geographically dispersed groups of experts who aggregate and co-create specific datasets for international comparative research. In his own project, Dormans tries to combine the traditional ethnographic role of the observer with an active role as participant in a more design-oriented approach. Besides writing a critical analysis on the collaboratories, he also actively participates in their development. However, as discussed during the presentation, this double role challenges the ethnographers fear of ‘going native’ and, since the project started fairly recently, it is still difficult to see if this combination of distance and engagement is a feasible one.

For further discussion:

Let me start with a modest conclusion: It appeared to me that the study of SSH indeed already makes extensive use of STS approaches. Questions such as how to deal with artefacts and non-human actors, concepts and boundary works, multiplicities, engenderings and enactments (Bister), but also with the politics (Mager) and performativity (Mayer, Lezaun,...) of certain practices have been dealt

with both in STS of natural or technosciences and of SSH. One major difference is however the degree of “estrangement” (Stegmaier) from the object of research. The obvious, but varied (allotropic) proximity (Wöhrer) of researcher and research object in the study of SSH leads to a necessity of positional re-signification (Butler 1997). The possibilities range from “going native” (Dormans) and “intervening” (Dunn, Mayer, ...) or “studying sideways” (Plesner) to standardized methods of estrangement or objective distancing. It would be interesting to delve into several examples of positionings here, but as space is limited, let me just pick one important “effect” of such a reflexive association with the researcher’s position: estrangement or proximity do not only affect research practice on an epistemic level, but interfere with social organizations and hierarchies (Bister, Philipps, Stöckelová and Červinkova, Wöhrer) in the field. If you study a very familiar field or your own field with the field’s familiar or own methodologies and concepts, it always means to study one’s own practices, hierarchies and orders. This can also lead to problematic attributions by colleagues or seniors or even negative effects in career trajectories⁵. Crawford remarks in 1971 about such a core-periphery bias: “[...] it appears that a significant proportion of writings presenting the social scientific analysis of the social sciences has been contributed by ‘marginals’, that is, by individuals in other universities than the leading ones [...], without a university-affiliation or by young and not yet established scholars [...]” (Crawford 1971: 12).

Self-reflexivity or critical reflexivity (Douglas) takes an important stance in studying SSH. The question of authorship and liability tackles important dimensions of reflexivity: Even ethnographic texts are often written with a “conquering gaze of nowhere” (Haraway 1988: 581) If we in contrast place ourselves as authors into our work, then how do we turn

5 Sabine Eggmann, who did ethnology on European ethnologists in her PhD work, e.g. describes that she often received critical and skeptical remarks. Some called her idea to critically reflect a field in which she tries to qualify her self in as coming close to professional suicide (Eggmann 2004: 133).

“introspection” into “(auto-)ethnographic approaches” (Lezaun), how do we position ourselves between “estrangement” (Hirschauer 1994) and “objective distance” (Bourdieu/Wacquant 1992) In other words: How could one investigate a field while using very similar or its own dispositives (Foucault 1990), while maybe even “distorting, magnifying and refracting” (Williams/Klemmer 1997) its enactments? And what kind of boundary work is happening in such an undertaking?

One aspect of reflexive engagement draws attention to the co-construction of communicative selves in interview situations. While “studying sideways” means to either share expertise (Philips) or even bid expertise farewell (Plesner) we should not forget that with such a perspective we do again impose a certain approach onto our research, maybe even another layer of attempted estrangement. How do we keep track of our methodological interventions, so that we do not end up only with anecdote-like publications, on the contrary, how could we confidently use a certain methodology on itself, a certain discourse on itself? Not all presentations in our section had the same drift and exigency to such meta-reflexive questions, but there was agreement that self-reflexivity should not be regarded as an end in itself. Reflexive challenges ought to lead to methodological and theoretical considerations that can serve as inputs for a) STS in general and b) for the fields under study. “If reflexivity remains merely theoretical, thus serving merely to refetishize ego investments in one’s work and the world, then an anthropology of anthropology easily becomes a specter of and for anxiety, fear and distrust. If reflexivity is politicized, thus providing a means for ego displacement, then meta-anthropology becomes a means for new formations of work, self and community.” (Williams/Klemmer 1997: 187)

Let me address another issue here, that was not only coming up in our SSH workshops before the EASST/4S conference, during the discussions in Rotterdam, but also at the conference of the EU STREP project

KNOWING⁶ in November 2008 which focused on the “politics of knowing: research, institutions and gender in the making” with an east-west perspective and a comparison of bio- and social sciences. While listening to the presentations at the conference, I noted that questions like: “How to follow a social scientist?”, “What can be observed in a social scientific field?” popped up frequently. The comparison of supposedly distinct scientific cultures such as life sciences and social sciences brings about difficulties of deciding which practices to put side by side. Despite the fact that KNOWING researchers had managed to develop a range of (highly relevant) perspectives to be drawn out of the comparison of life-course interviews and observations, such as: modes of ordering and co-operation and temporalities in careers and biographies, the impact of their own methodologies was challenged several times.

Lisa Garforth, eg., questioned the limits of the “observational gaze”⁷ in ethnography. She argued that a good portion of now common STS research methods and especially ethnographies, are influenced by “lab-centric” approaches developed for investigations into technoscientific assemblages. This becomes problematic as soon as investigating scientific knowledge production that is lacking of (technoscientific) laboratories. Turning to practices in SSH allows us – if we can get access to the field, which is not always easy – observations and interpretations of many alternative scientific workplaces, like offices, libraries, classes, digital interfaces, canteens, conferences, institutions, journals, funding agencies and so forth and combining such efforts. Especially since we are very familiar with similar settings and frames through our own research practices. I would go so far as saying, that by the lack of observable laboratories we have to become imaginative as where to find our research subjects/objects.

To come back to the SSH sessions in

6 Knowing Conference Prague 2008:
<http://www.knowing.soc.cas.cz/>

7 Lisa Garforth (2008) presentation at Knowing Conference Prague: In/visible epistemic practices: ethnography and what the researcher can't see.

Rotterdam: throughout the sessions we traveled from forests to ships, from images to interfaces, from countries to hospitals and offices and followed (social) scientists' accounts of encounters with their research objects. We did not identify the typical "lonesome" (social) scientist, neither the typical visibilities or invisibilities, such as reading or writing texts as being the dominant resources for observation in SSH. We did however encounter frequent reluctance of potential research subjects to participate in social scientific enquiries of social science due to several reasons, which we could only speculate about. Lack of time, fear of being exposed, precarious financial or prestigious status, not convinced of researchers and their methodologies, and so forth. Proximity of researcher and research object might lead to latent vulnerabilities and thus be a reason for the lack of enthusiasm to participate. Williams and Klemmer (1997: 182) put it that way: "greater intimacy between the subject and the object intensifies the potential for hurt and increases the risks of misunderstanding". On the other hand, rejections, irritations and unexpected reactions on the side of the researched - and on the side of the researchers - are important field data. (e.g. Garfinkel 1984, Erdheim 1991, Wöhrer 2008) There are sometimes even very positive reactions: "For once it was really nice to be the one, who gets studied. I learned a lot from this situation and started reflecting on my own practices and institutions." (Panel with research participants at Knowing Conference 2008, Prague)

Let me conclude my comment by asking: What realities, or "collateral realities" (Law, abstract⁹) are enacted by our methodologies and inquiries? Following Law in his cogitation of a recent EUROBAROMETER study, reflections of our "acting with social sciences and humanities" should not only help to tackle issues of knowledge production but also knowledge politics.

8 Veronika Wöhrer (2008) presentation at Knowing Conference Prague: Too Close to be Welcomed? Methodological Reflections on Researching Social Scientists.

9 John Law (2008) abstract: Collateral Realities. For abstract, please visit: <http://www.sshstudies.net/>

Announcement:

The next SSH Studies workshop will consist of a hands-on exercise to de-/re-/co-construct EU policy papers relating to conceptualizing and funding of social sciences and humanities and a closer look at its implied representations and possible practical impacts.

If you are interested in participating in our next workshop, scheduled for a weekend in May 2009 either in Prague or Vienna, please visit the website: www.sshstudies.net or send an email to workshop2009@sshstudies.net. At the SSH Studies website you will also find this text with the option to comment on it. In the meantime, to continue these discussions go to

<http://www1.svt.ntnu.no/forum/easst/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=46>

References

- Beck, Ulrich (1982): Folgeprobleme der Modernisierung und die Stellung der Soziologie in der Praxis, in: Soziologie und Praxis - Erfahrungen, Konflikte, Perspektiven, Sonderband Soziale Welt, 1-27.
- Berger, Peter L./Luckmann, Thomas 1966: The Social Construction of Reality. A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge, Garden City, New York.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1988): For Heterodoxy in Social Science, in: Theory and Society, Vol. 17, No. 5, Special Issue on Breaking Boundaries: Social Theory and the Sixties: 773-787.
- Bourdieu, Pierre/Wacquant, Loic J.D. (1992): Reflexive Anthropologie, Frankfurt.
- Butler, Judith (1997): Excitable Speech. A Politics of the Performative, London/New York.
- Crawford, Elizabeth T. (1971): The sociology of the social sciences. A trend report and bibliography, Current Sociology/La sociologie contemporaine, Volume XIX, Nr. 2.
- Eggmann, Sabine (2004): Der Blick auf das Eigene. Ein kulturwissenschaftlicher Zugang zur Kulturwissenschaft, in: Arnold, Markus / Dressel, Gert (Hg.): Wissenschaftskulturen, Experimentalkulturen, Gelehrtenkulturen, Wien: Turia und Kant: 127-136
- Erdheim, Mario (1991): Psychoanalyse und

- Unbewusstheit in der Kultur, Frankfurt/Main.
- Foucault, Michel (1990): *The History of Sexuality, Volume 1: An Introduction*. New York.
- Garfinkel, Harold (1984 [1967]): *Studies in Ethnomethodology*, Malden.
- Haraway, Donna (1988): *Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective*, in: *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No. 3, 575-599.
- Hirschauer, Stefan (1994): *Towards a Methodology of Investigations into the Strangeness of One's Own Culture: A Response to Collins*, in: *Social Studies of Science* 24/2, pp. 335-46.
- Hirschauer, Stefan/Amann, Klaus (Eds.) (1997): *Die Befremdung der eigenen Kultur. Zur ethnographischen Herausforderung soziologischer Empirie*, Frankfurt.
- Holstein, J. A. / Gubrium, J. F. (1995) *The Active Interview*, London.
- Kitzinger, Celia / Wilkinson, Sue (1996): *Theorizing representing the other*, in: Wilkinson, Sue/ Kitzinger, Celia, eds.: *Feminism and Psychology*, London: 14-23.
- Latour, Bruno (2005): *Reassembling the Social - An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*, Oxford.
- Law, John (2004): *After Method. Mess in Social Science Research*. London/ New York.
- Lynch, M. (2000): *Against Reflexivity as an Academic Virtue and Source of Privileged Knowledge*, in: *Theory, Culture and Society*, 17, 27-56.
- Marcus, George E. (1998): *Ethnography Through Thick and Thin*, Princeton.
- Mesny, Anne (1998): *Sociology for Whom? The Role of Sociology in Reflexive Modernity*, in: *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 23, 159-178.
- Mol, Annemarie (2002): *The Body Multiple. Ontology in Medical Practice*, Durham/ London.
- Pfadenhauer, Michaela (2003): *Professionalität. Eine wissenssoziologische Rekonstruktion institutionalisierter Kompetenzdarstellungskompetenz*, Opladen.
- Schütz, Alfred/Luckmann, Thomas (1974): *The Structures of the Life-World*, London.
- Star, Susan Leigh/Griesemer, James R. (1989): *Institutional Ecology, 'Translations' and Boundary Objects: Amateurs and Professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907-39*, in: *Social Studies of Science*, Vol. 19, No. 3, 387-420.
- Strauss, Anselm (1993): *Continual permutations of action*, New York.
- Williamson, Sarah/Frederick Klemmer (1997): *Ethnographic fetishism or cyborg anthropology? Human Scientists, Rebellious Rats and their Mazes at El Delirio and in the Land of the Long White Cloud*, in: Gary Lee Downey/Joseph Dumit (eds.): *Cyborgs & Citadels. Anthropological Interventions in Emerging Sciences and Technologies*. Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Recent Dissertations

The Finnish Competition State and Entrepreneurial Policies in the Helsinki Region.

By Antti Pelkonen

Antti Pelkonen

Postdoctoral researcher, D.Soc.Sc.
University of Helsinki
Helsinki Institute of Science and Technology Studies
Research Group for Comparative Sociology
Department of Sociology

Email. antti.pelkonen@helsinki.fi

Tel. +358 9 191 23 968

The thesis examines the intensification and characteristics of a policy that emphasises economic competitiveness in Finland during the 1990s and early 2000s. This accentuation of economic objectives is studied at the level of national policy-making as well as at the regional level through the policies and strategies of cities and three universities in the Helsinki region. By combining the analysis of state policies, urban strategies and university activities, the study illustrates the pervasiveness of the objective of economic competitiveness and growth across these levels and sheds light on the features and contradictions of these policies on a broad scale. The thesis is composed of five research articles and a summary article.

At the level of national policies, the central focus of the thesis is on the growing role of science and technology policy as a state means to promote structural economic change and its transformation towards a broader, yet ambivalent concept of innovation policy. This shift brings forward a tension between an increasing emphasis on economic aspects – innovations and competitiveness – as well as the expanding scope of issues across a wide range of policy sectors that are being subsumed under this market- and economy-oriented framework. Related to science and technology policy, attention is paid to adjustments in university policy in which there has been increasing pressure for efficiency, rationalisation and commercialisation of academic activities. Furthermore, political

efforts to build an information society through the application of information and communication technologies are analysed with particular attention to the balance between economic and social objectives. Finally, changes in state regional policy priorities and the tendency towards competitiveness are addressed.

At the regional level, the focus of the thesis is on the policies of the cities in Finland's capital region as well as strategies of three universities operating in the region, namely the University of Helsinki, Helsinki University of Technology and Helsinki School of Economics. As regards the urban level, the main focus is on the changes and characteristics of the urban economic development policy of the City of Helsinki. With respect to the universities, the thesis examines their attempts to commercialise research and thus bring academic research closer to economic interests, and pays particular attention to the contradictions of commercialisation. Related to the universities, the activities of three intermediary organisations that the universities have established in order to increase cooperation with industry are analysed. These organisations are the Helsinki Science Park, Otaniemi International Innovation Centre and LTT Research Ltd.

The summary article provides a synthesis of the material presented in the five original articles and relates the results of the articles to a broader discussion concerning the emergence of competition states and entrepreneurial cities and regions. The main points of reference are Bob Jessop's and Neil Brenner's theses on state and urban-regional restructuring. The empirical results and considerations from Finland and the Helsinki region are used to comment on, specify and criticise specific parts of the two theses.

The thesis research was carried out at the Department of Sociology, University of Helsinki as a part of various Finnish and international research projects funded and initiated by the Finnish Funding Agency for Technology and Innovation Tekes, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the OECD and the

European Commission. The summary article of the thesis is available at the **E-thesis** service of the University of Helsinki (<http://ethesis.helsinki.fi/>). Full text available as Research Reports No. 254, Department of Sociology, University of Helsinki, 2008.

Bowing out By Christine Hine

It was great to see so many people come forward to stand for EASST Council in the recent elections. It's a good sign of the health of our intellectual community that people see EASST Council as a place to invest their time and a way to make an impact on the environment we all work in.

As a result of the elections the EASST council is now as follows:

Fred Steward (President)
Marc Audetat
Tomas Sanchez Criado (student representative)
Pierre-Benoit Joly
Erika Mansnerus
Tiago Moreira
Harro van Lente
Estrid Sørensen
Claire Waterton

On coming to the end of my term as EASST president I feel some regret that I didn't manage to do half of the things that I envisaged might be possible at the outset. I do, though, feel a certain satisfaction at the things that I might be said to have facilitated other people doing! While there has been the odd speech at conferences, a lot of what I've done hasn't felt terribly presidential. I have focused on keeping the infrastructure in place to allow the intellectual life and collegial connections of EASST to flow through and around it. To that end, it has been a great joy to be involved in a small way in the hugely successful conferences in Lausanne and Rotterdam, and I look forward to the next conferences with great enthusiasm. I had hoped in my presidency to see EASST involve more colleagues in southern Europe, so

I am particularly delighted that discussions with STS-Italia have led to an offer from Trento to host the EASST conference in 2010. I am pleased to be handing over EASST to its new council in good health, and I'm anticipating their inputs with interest. On an organizational level it is an advantage that the EASST secretariat will be staying in the UK for the time being, since that enables us to retain various financial and administrative arrangements that took some time to put in place at the beginning of my term of office. Hopefully this will free up the time of our new president for doing more presidential stuff if he feels the need.

I continue to be very grateful to Ann Rudinow Saetnan and Richard Rogers for keeping EASST Review and web site in operation: both outlets are vital ways in which EASST stays feeling live and present for its members between conferences. The council have been a great source of support, ideas and enthusiasm and I have enjoyed their company, both face-to-face and virtual. Through working with the council I have gained a network of people around Europe and beyond that I respect and admire (and nearly got arrested with in Lausanne, but that's another story). I am delighted to hand over the presidency to Fred Steward, who has a great fund of experience to offer and a deeply held commitment to keeping our STS as relevant and as inclusive a community as possible.

Best wishes,
Christine Hine

To thank Christine, go to

<http://www1.svt.ntnu.no/forum/easst/viewtopic.php?f=15&t=44>

EASST News: Members' Benefits

EASST members are now offered reduced rate subscriptions to the following journals:

Science as Culture

www.tandf.co.uk/journals/csac

New Genetics and Society

www.tandf.co.uk/journals/cngs

Please follow the links and select "News and Offers" to sign up for these journals directly with the publisher.

Conferences and Calls for Papers

The Society for the History of Technology (SHOT) will hold its annual meeting in **Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 15-19 October 2009**. The Program Committee invites paper and panel proposals on any topic in the history of technology, broadly defined. Sessions dealing with pre-19th century technologies are particularly welcome. Of special interest for 2009 are proposals that engage the two following themes: Reform(ed) Technologies: While Pittsburgh often brings to historically-prone minds images of coke works and heavy industrial pollution, the city is consistently ranked high in livability surveys of American cities, and smokestacks no longer dominate the skyline. At a moment when decaying infrastructure is a major topic of public discussion and large promised investment, Pittsburgh looks the right place for historians of technology to reconsider linear tales of innovation or destruction. We are interested both in the ways technologies are reformed and on the historical development of technologies for reform. Environmental technologies are an obvious topic, but the theme also welcomes contributions on urban renewal, new uses of old technologies, and issues of maintenance. Circulation of Technology: We encourage proposals dealing with the geographical circulation of technology that discard traditional diffusion models. We are interested in the relevance of local contexts to accounts of how technologies circulate at the global scale. We hope that focused engagement

with such questions will also contribute to SHOT's ongoing efforts to build a more inclusive and diverse cosmopolitan community. The Program Committee's highest priority in evaluating paper and panel proposals is scholarly excellence. The Committee welcomes proposals for individual papers or sessions, as well as works-in-progress from researchers of all stripes (including graduate students, chaired professors, and independent scholars). It welcomes proposals from those new to SHOT, regardless of discipline. Multinational, international, and cross-institutional sessions are also desirable. We especially encourage proposals from non-Western scholars. For the 2009 meeting the Program Committee also encourages unconventional sessions; that is, session formats that vary in useful ways from the typical three/four papers with comment. These might include round-table sessions, workshop-style sessions with papers that are pre-circulated electronically, or "author meets critics" sessions. Panel organizers may choose either to have a commentator or to add one more paper. We also welcome poster proposals for presentation in poster sessions. The **deadline for proposals is March 30, 2009**. For submission information, please see http://www.historyoftechnology.org/annual_meeting.html.

The International Association for the History

of Transport, Traffic and Mobility (T2M) invites proposals for papers to be presented at its Seventh International Conference to be held at the Verkehrshaus der Schweiz (Swiss Museum of Transport), **Lucerne, Switzerland from November 5th - 8th, 2009**. The conference is organised by historians from different universities as well as by the Swiss Museum of Transport. Switzerland's most visited museum celebrates its 50th anniversary in 2009 and is being rebuilt and expanded for this occasion at the time. This year the conference theme is 'Energy and Innovation'. The CfP asks for papers in this thematic field but it is at the same time open to all subjects in the history of transport, traffic, and mobility. The language of the conference is English. Traffic is motion and therefore energy is imperative. It doesn't matter what, how or where to one moves – performance, or the conversion of energy into motion, is always preconditioned. The modernisation of traffic since the 18th century can be seen as a process in the course of which means of transport that relied in the end on solar energy were replaced by means of transport that relied on nonrenewable energy. Thus, the focus was shifted from the likes of walking, rowing, sailing, horseback riding and the usage of animal traction to mechanical means of transport such as the steam engine, the combustion engine and rocket propulsion. Where did the question of energy figure in the acceleration and intensification of traffic? Where in the choice of a means of transport, in the question 'street or ship'? How was energy efficiency for new machines increased? Conversely, how was their environmental pollution reduced? Why did one choose a specific propulsion? How did the price of energy affect the price of transport and mobility? How big was the influence of private traffic and energy business thereby, how great the weight of governmental politics? According to economist Joseph Schumpeter, innovations are elementary improvements that shake the economy and the community which means in this case that they produce new means of transport such as train, car or plane. Which economical, social, cultural and political

conditions leveraged which means of transport? Innovations never were the result of mere business calculations and engineering efforts. Behind those were always sociocultural factors such as the ideology of freedom, the appetite for adventure and discovery or the play instinct and surge for fame. Also, new combinations of existing means of transport could lead to innovation. Proposals which connect the two conference topics (energy and innovation) are eminently favoured: How was the velocity of a means of transport increased without a multiplication of energy consumption? Do new means of transport prevail mainly in times of war and crisis? Could premodern and antiquated means of transport increase their efficiency under the pressure of competition of new modes of drive as for example the fast sailing ships that came up under the pressure of the steam boat around 1850? Is a renaissance of premodern and environmentally sound means of transport imaginable? Participants are encouraged, though not required, to organize panels on these themes. A panel consists of a chair and normally up to three speakers; no commentator is required. We especially encourage transnational, comparative and transmodal approaches, and welcome proposals exploring theoretical or methodological issues as well as those of a more empirical nature. Relevant contributions are welcome from historians as well as from cultural geographers, sociologists, anthropologists, economists, and other scholars who do not define themselves as historians. We especially invite recent entrants to the profession and doctoral students to submit proposals. T2M 2009 wants to invest more energy into communication. Posters of all oral presentations will be exhibited in the public area of Switzerland's most visited museum. This innovation will contribute to better promotion of the history of transport, traffic and mobility as a scientific discipline and as a public service. Submission of a fully completed poster form (1 page A4) is mandatory for all speakers. Posters will be judged. Poster forms will be made available later on the website of the programme committee. **The deadline for abstracts and a short CV (max one page each; Word or rich text format only) is the**

15th of April, 2009. Session proposals should also include a one-page overview of the session. Please send proposals to: t2m_content@verkehrshaus.ch. Submitters will be notified by the programme committee during the first week of May 2009 on the success or status of their submission. The full paper of all accepted submissions and of the posters must be delivered on or before August 15th, 2009. These papers will be copied onto a conference CD-ROM for distribution in advance to all conference participants. Individual presentations at the conference are therefore to be limited to a fifteen-minute summary to allow for debate and discussion within the session. All participants are required to register. For details of T2M and of previous conferences, please visit: www.t2m.org. Further details of the conference (including the poster form) will be posted on a website of the Programme Committee which is currently under construction and will go online later.

The Science Communication Unit at the University of the West of England, Bristol is delighted to announce the **Evolving Science Communication symposium**. This event is being held over **26 and 27 March, 2009 at the Watershed Media Centre, Bristol** and is supported by the Wellcome Trust. The symposium will be a meeting ground for academics and practitioners in the field of Public Engagement with Science and Technology. The symposium will explore key issues facing the sector including: transferability, sustainability, demonstrating impacts, sharing knowledge and collaborative working. The discussions and ideas generated during the day will be collated and distributed after the event in the form of an edited report. Places are very limited and as such applications will be restricted to two participants per institution. The organising committee will be selecting delegates to maximise diversity and experience across the participants, please take this into consideration when completing the form. Please note the **deadline for applications is 9.00am, 27 February**. For further information, see

<http://scu.uwe.ac.uk/index.php?q=node/182>.

The International Conference on Changing Universities: Governance, Relevance, Performance is to be held on **29 September – 2 October 2009 in Istanbul, Turkey**. Over the last couple of decades or so, higher education systems and, in particular, universities have become, notably in Europe as well as elsewhere, targets of attention and debate for change and reform. A host of external factors have been at play in shaping the discourses and actions with regard to changing universities. Within Europe, for example, policy statements such as the Bologna Accord, the Berlin Communiqué and the Lisbon Declaration have called for major reforms and re-orientations in higher education as a part of the broader vision of creating a European knowledge society. This has also been linked with expectations that universities should serve as engines of economic growth and national as well as regional competitiveness in the global marketplace. Concerns have therefore been expressed with regard to the relationships of universities with their external environments and the society at large. Business representatives have been demanding closer university-industry ties and research more relevant to their needs. Likewise, pressures have been mounting on providing education that is more responsive to the needs of the labour market. State authorities have joined in endorsing these demands. Moreover, these kinds of pressures have been coming at a time when public funding has been increasingly constrained and universities have been guided towards obtaining other sources of funds, leading, in some countries at least, to the encouragement of privately funded institutions. Concomitantly, there has been a greater concern with resource allocation to and within universities as well as their efficient use, resulting also in a broader discourse on and ensuing policies with respect to issues about accountability. Altogether these kinds of pressures have resulted in the introduction of new policies and reform initiatives in the last two decades or so, though their timing, scale and pace has been variant across countries.

National and organizational level governance systems have been altered, in some cases a number of times. New evaluation schemes have been introduced for assessing organizational, departmental and individual performance. Funding systems have been revisited, quite often in ways that not only attempt to make them performance-based but also to promote and encourage the acquisition of external funds. That these kinds of changes and the responses to them have and are being played out in institutionalized organizational fields has motivated not only practical but also academic interest in their implementation and outcomes. Likewise, that they have been internationally widespread, quite often with some reference to and justification based on North American models has generated debate around convergence as opposed to divergence sustained in many ways. The above issues have been addressed for the last year or so within a project entitled MEHEM (Mapping European Higher Education Models), funded by the European Union and carried out by scholars from Sabanci University (Turkey), Oxford University (UK), University of Siena (Italy) and Uppsala University (Sweden) together with collaborators from Germany, France and Spain. The Istanbul Conference is organized as a part of this project and aims to bring together researchers from a broader range of institutions and countries with interests in the changes that have been taking place over the last couple of decades at universities, nationally, regionally and internationally. Papers are invited therefore on the following topics, though not exclusively limited to them, as submissions pertaining to related themes will also be considered: Changes in government regulation of higher education fields and universities; Changes in the composition of organizational level governing bodies and the selection of university leaders; Changes in funding, particularly the degree to which market solutions is being introduced; Changes in the selection and promotion of faculty; The changing nature of university-industry relationships and their implications for the structuring and administration of universities; The implications of the increasing use of evaluations and rankings for higher

education and universities; The implications of the changes that have been taking place on the structure of higher education fields and the role of universities with respect to the construction of national and international elites. Both conceptual and empirical papers are invited. Empirical papers could be case studies of individual or a small number of organizations as well as larger scale quantitative investigations. Comparative research would be particularly welcome. One additional aim of the conference is to provide a platform for the production of an edited book. **Abstracts of around 500 words should be submitted through the MEHEM website (www.mehem.org) latest by 31 May 2009.** Authors will be notified about acceptance latest by the end of June. Some funds are available to cover travel and lodging expenses. Please do indicate any needs for funding when submitting your abstract.

The SIMIAN (Simulation Innovation: a Node) project is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council to promote and develop social simulation method in the UK. Social simulation is a new method for the social sciences that combines some of the advantages of statistics and qualitative research. The SIMIAN project aims to develop expertise in simulation within UK social science. The project involves three "demonstrator" simulations chosen to address important social science challenges: (1) Interaction: Where many theories exist across the social sciences, how can simulation be used to integrate and compare them so that social science as a whole can progress? (2) Novelty: How can simulation develop theories in which meanings and capabilities of objects are not "given" but change and develop in use and social interaction? and (3) Norms: Different social sciences understand and measure norms in different ways. How can they be integrated to produce effective theories? These three demonstrators will form the basis for a range of training and capacity building activities: (A) Taster courses to show what simulation can do; (B) Build-a-model courses to show how to

build a first working simulation; and (C) Specialised courses to train advanced users in specific topics. In addition, **there will be presentations at conferences and workshops, user fellowships to encourage collaboration between users and academics, and international exchange visits.** For more information or to register for the courses, please visit <http://www.simian.ac.uk>.

The Institute for Science and Society at the **University of Nottingham** invites you to the **first UK Postgraduate Science and Technology Studies (PSTS) conference** on the **28th and 29th July 2009**. If you are engaged in research in science, technology and society and related fields, then the event will provide a key forum in which to present on-going research and build networks within the UK STS community. The conference is organised by postgraduate students and is intended for postgrads, giving participants unique opportunities to: Present research to a relevant audience; Receive commentary on work-in-progress in a friendly and supportive environment; Practice presentation skills; Meet students with similar research interests; Listen to keynote speakers with established careers in the field; Carry debates across disciplinary boundaries; Reflect on the identities of UK STS; and Build working relationships at an early career stage. The early registration conference fee is £125 which includes en suite accommodation in University halls, all meals and the conference dinner. There are a number of travel bursaries available. If you would like to apply for a travel bursary please indicate so on the abstract submission form, downloadable from the website, fill it in and return it to us before the 1st March 2009. Individual paper proposals for a 15-20 minute presentation on any topic germane to the aims of the conference should be submitted by abstract (no longer than 300 words) using the attached abstract submission form, to psts@nottingham.ac.uk by 1st March 2009. Please include full contact details. Or e-mail Andy Balmer at lbxab@nottingham.ac.uk if you have any other queries. Further information, such as a provisional agenda, travel information, etcetera,

will be available on the conference website: <http://www.psts.org.uk>.

Modes of Governance in Digitally Networked Environments, an informal and interdisciplinary workshop for PhD students and post-docs, will take place at the **Oxford Internet Institute – Oxford University, Thursday, March 26, 2009 – 9am-6pm**. Over the past decades, a variety of technologies have reconfigured the ways in which we initiate and maintain social and economic relations. Today, millions of people around the globe buy goods from people they have never met in person, edit the online encyclopedia Wikipedia without monetary rewards, use e-mail and SMS to organize political protest, stay in contact with friends via social networking sites, or look for a new partner via online dating services. In short, an increasing part of our lives is taking place in digitally networked environments. Powered by information and communication technologies built on cheap and interconnected processors with considerable computing capacity, these environments are characterized by novel forms of interaction. Digitally networked environments are often assumed to magically govern themselves. Especially when traditional modes of governance like law and centralized regulations fail, researchers tend to resort to rather vague ideas like “self-regulation,” “decentralization,” “liberalization,” or “peer production” to describe the complex interactions and mechanisms that take place in large-scale, loose-knit socio-technical networks. Moreover, the network itself is often contrasted with markets or hierarchies as a new mode of governance in its own right. This workshop will adopt a different approach and take a closer look at new and non-obvious modes of governance in digitally networked environments. Specifically, we would like to explore what these modes are, how they work, and who or what controls them. Questions might be, but are not limited to: What is the role of calculation, measurement, classification, trust, accountability, or reputation? How can we understand leadership and authority under these conditions? Which role does the technical infrastructure play? Is there evidence for a new form of network governance? Overall, the goal

of the workshop is to generate a deeper conceptual, empirical, and normative understanding of these new modes of governance through open and creative discussion. The workshop is open to a maximum of 16 postgraduates and post-docs from all departments and universities. If you would like to participate, please **send a brief abstract (300 words) including your name, affiliation, and contact details to malte.ziewitz@oii.ox.ac.uk by Feb. 20, 2009**. Priority will be given to those who commit to introducing a mode of governance of their choice for discussion. Refreshments, lunch, and challenging ideas will be provided. A limited amount of travel funding is available. Workshop PDF:

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~kebl2964/netgov-workshop-cfp.pdf>.

The **Manchester social movements conference** will take place on **15-17 April 2009**, and **abstracts are due by Monday 2nd March 2009**. From 1995 to 2008, Manchester Metropolitan University hosted a series of very successful annual international conferences on 'Alternative Futures and Popular Protests'. We're very happy to announce that the Fourteenth AF&PP Conference will be held, between Wednesday 15th April and Friday 17th April 2009. The Conference rubric remains as in previous years. The aim is to explore the dynamics of popular movements, along with the ideas which animate their activists and supporters and which contribute to shaping their fate. Reflecting the inherent cross-disciplinary nature of the issues, previous participants (from over 50 countries) have come from such specialisms as sociology, politics, cultural studies, social psychology, economics, history and geography. The Manchester conferences have also been notable for discovering a fruitful and friendly meeting ground between activism and academia. We invite offers of papers relevant to the conference themes. Papers should address such matters as: contemporary and historical social movements and popular protests; social movement theory; utopias and experiments; ideologies of collective action;

etc. To offer a paper, please contact either of the conference convenors with a brief abstract: Colin Barker, Dept. of Sociology (c.barker@mmu.ac.uk); or Mike Tyldesley (m.tyldesley@mmu.ac.uk)

The 5th International Conference on e-Social Science will take place in **Cologne, Germany, 24 - 26 June 2009**. The aim of the annual international conference on e-Social Science is to bring together leading representatives of the social science, e-Infrastructure, cyberinfrastructure and e-Research communities in order to improve mutual awareness and promote coordinated activities to accelerate research, development and deployment of powerful, new methods and tools for the social sciences and beyond. This years Keynotes include Ian Foster, a pioneer in developing advanced distributed computer technologies and author of *The Grid: Blueprint for a New Computing Infrastructure*. We invite contributions from members of the social science, e-Infrastructure, cyberinfrastructure and e-Research communities with experience of, or interests in: exploring, developing, and applying new methods, practices, and tools afforded by new infrastructure technologies - such as the Grid and Web 2.0 - in order to further social science research; and studying issues impacting on the wider take-up of e-Research. Contributions from professionals working in and with data services to support research and teaching in the social sciences are especially welcome. Submission categories include: full and short papers, posters, demos, workshops, tutorials and panels. Topics of interest include, but are not restricted to, the following: Case studies of the application of e-Social Science methods to substantive social science research problems; Case studies of e-Research, including benefits and problems in collaboration across organisational, disciplinary and geographical boundaries; Case studies of 'Open Access Science', social networking and 'Science 2.0'; Best practice examples of social research data infrastructure, including virtual distributed databases, open access repositories, self-archiving; Advances in tools and services

for data discovery, harmonization, integration, management, annotation, curation and sharing; Challenges of exploiting new sources of administrative, transactional and observational data, including security, legal and ethical issues in the use of personal and sensitive data; Advances in analytical tools and techniques for quantitative and qualitative social science, including statistical modelling and simulation, data mining, text mining, content analysis, socio-linguistic analysis, social network analysis, data visualisation; Case studies of collaborative research environments, including user engagement, development and use; User experiences of e-Research infrastructure, services and tools; Factors influencing the adoption of e-Research, including technical standards, user engagement and outreach, training, sustainability of digital artefacts, IPR and ethics; New methods, metrics and tools for measuring the adoption and impact of e-Research and for informing policy-making; The evolving research infrastructure technology roadmap, including grids, cloud computing and web 2.0; and National e-Infrastructure development programmes, international cooperation in e-Infrastructure development. Authors are requested to submit an abstract of approximately 1000 words. Workshop, tutorial and panel organisers are requested to submit a one page outline of the topic, format, likely audience, special requirements. **Deadlines and submission instructions - Paper abstracts: 26 January 2009; Workshop, tutorial and panel outlines: 23 February 2009; and Poster and demo abstracts: 23 March 2009.** For full submission details and more information, please visit <http://www.ncess.ac.uk/conference-09/>.

The Annual Meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science will take place on **October 28 – November 1, 2009, in Washington, DC.** 4S conference welcomes contributions on topics from the range of fields found within science and technology studies. This year's conference will not have a predetermined theme. Consequently, proposals for sessions

and papers should emphasize how they will make innovative and timely contributions to any theme relevant to science and technology studies (STS). Our new abstract submission system is now online. All submitters and authors will need to create a new user account in this system. Aside from this small inconvenience, we are confident the new system will enable more efficient conference management and improved communication with participants. Submit abstracts and session proposals here. **Deadline is March 1.** Given the growing size of the 4S conferences and the desire to be as inclusive as possible, the program committee will need to make full use of the available time slots. Therefore, individuals may be listed for a paper presentation and one other role (such as session chair or discussant but not a second paper) for a maximum of two appearances. Paper abstracts may be submitted individually or by a session organizer. Submissions are in the form of abstracts of 500 words or less, and must include a summary of the paper's main arguments and methodology, as well as a brief statement on the contribution to the STS literature. Session proposals should be limited to 500 words total, and should contain a summary and rationale for the session, as well as a brief discussion of its contribution to STS. Session proposals should list names of all session organizers and panelists, including institutional affiliations and (electronic) addresses. Session proposals should be based on the assumption of two-hour time slots with twenty minutes per presentation. A typical session may have five papers, one discussant, and a ten-minute open discussion slot. You must have a minimum of three complete paper abstracts in order to submit a session proposal. The program committee may assign additional papers to proposed sessions. Proposals for double and triple sessions on a single topic may receive a request to consolidate the topic into one panel or to break the multiple sessions into different topics. The meeting welcomes papers, sessions and events that are innovative in their delivery, organization, range of topics, type of public and which bring new resources to the STS community to explore these new relations and

themes. Apart from traditional research papers, the conference will also welcome proposals for sessions and papers using ‘new media’ or other forms of innovative presentation. This year, for the first time, the 4S is including a new “workshop” format. This is an opportunity for informal presentations, with presenters and other attendees seated around tables. This format is ideal for a more interactive presentation of preliminary ideas and work in progress. Authors and session organizers should indicate if they would like to be part of a workshop table. Submissions for “workshop” presentations are included under the one first-authored submission limit, stated above. It is also possible for sessions to be proposed as workshop tables. For more information, visit the 4S website at

<http://www.4sonline.org/meeting.htm>.

Telecommunication and Globalization: Information Flows in the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Century is the title of the event, on **24-25 September 2009, in Heidelberg, Germany** organized by the Junior Research Group “Asymmetries in Cultural Information Flows: Europe and South Asia in the Global Information Network since the Nineteenth Century” (headed by Dr Roland Wenzlhuemer) at the Cluster of Excellence “Asia and Europe in a Global Context”, University of Heidelberg, <http://www.asia-europe.uniheidelberg.de/Plone/research/areas/b/projects/b9-information-flows>. Globalization challenges the established relationship between time and space and detaches human interaction from co-locality or proximity. By bringing geographically distant and socioculturally diverse places in touch, it creates a placeless global sphere. When its constituting transregional connections and transfers become numerous and significant enough, this sphere develops a rationale of its own and starts to interact with the local. Globalization becomes a historically relevant process that has a formative impact on local life and culture. By enabling ever-increasing flows of information and knowledge which connect people over great geographic and cultural distances,

telecommunication technologies have played and continue to play a key role in processes of globalization. The emergence during the nineteenth and early twentieth century of a global telecommunication network significantly altered the nature of human communication and represented a vital phase in the history of global connections. For the first time in history, long-distance communication became “dematerialized”, i.e., it became detached from the physical medium which enabled its transmission. This workshop invites scholars and students in the humanities and social sciences to explore the complex interrelations between telecommunication technologies and globalization in a historical and socio-cultural perspective. The focus of the workshop rests on the emergence of a global network of telegraph and telephone lines during the nineteenth and early twentieth century and its impact on various domains of human activity, such as government, administration, trade, transport, commerce, labour, news, language, and knowledge production. The workshop organizers seek to provide an interdisciplinary forum for debating how this significant historical development impacted on the rationale of the global sphere and translated into economic, political, social and cultural changes at the local level. It is hoped that this forum will allow for new and fascinating perspectives on the interplay of telecommunication technologies and globalization. Potential questions to be explored include: Which socio-economic and cultural factors contributed to the emergence of particular global network patterns? What was the role of telecommunication in linking the global and the local? How did it change the rationale of the global sphere? How did new telecommunication technologies transform existing perceptions of time and space? How were the global and the local negotiated through telecommunication technologies? In what ways did agents in non-information societies adopt and adapt foreign (i.e. European/North American) information technologies to their own ends? How did such developments in the field of technology and colonial enterprise impact upon European societies? Did technologies shape their own networks? And

how did emerging communication patterns impact upon the development of the technology itself? Can we find asymmetries in global network patterns and information flows? Did less-connected regions automatically find themselves at the receiving end of information flows? Can we find evidence for processes of political and cultural centralization? If so, have there been counterstrategies in order to preserve the influence and leeway of agents in the periphery? How did these new technologies impact upon news collection and distribution? How did they change pre-existing ideas and practices of networking? What was the impact of these new communication technologies on language and cultural perceptions of language? How did they contribute to processes of language standardization and language globalization? **Proposals of not more than 500 words may be submitted electronically (Word or PDF) to the organizing committee (Amelia Bonea, bonea@asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de and Paul Fletcher, fletcher@asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de) by 30 April 2009.** See also <http://www.asia-europe.uni-heidelberg.de>.

The 11th Ischia Summer School on the History of the Life Sciences has issued a call for applications. This Summer's theme is From Generation to Reproduction: Knowledge and Techniques from the Renaissance to the Present Day. It takes place at the 'Villa Dohrn', Ischia, Italy, **28 June - 5 July 2009**. Applications are invited for this week-long summer school, which provides advanced training in history of the life sciences through lectures and seminars in a historically rich and naturally beautiful setting. The theme for 2009 is 'From Generation to Reproduction: Knowledge and Techniques from the Renaissance to the Present Day'. The faculty are Helen King, Mary Fissell, Renato Mazzolini, Jürgen Schlumbohm, James Strick, Staffan Müller-Wille, Jean-Paul Gaudillière, Susan Lindee, Christina Brandt and Martin Johnson. **For more information, please visit www.szn.it > events > 2009 > June.**

The tenacity of the nature/nurture divide is the name of the two-day workshop to be held on **March 20-21, 2009 at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Berlin** (Department III). The formula nature/nurture (Na-Nu) has captured a very basic split in the causal structure we assign to the constitution of the human. The divide determines explanatory strategies in scientific and non-scientific arenas. We aim to further our understanding of the tenacity of this binary distinction by contextualizing it within a large time scale, and through different cultures. This workshop will bring together scientists, historians and philosophers, who will tackle the Na-Nu complex from different and complementary angles and will contribute to the collective answering of questions linked to it. Is there for instance something inevitable about such dramatic dichotomous structure? Why does it seem to recur, under ever new shapes, with every new shift in the life and social sciences? Or has it progressively weakened under the strain of criticism and alternative frames? Are we then witnessing its last incarnations? What would a future conceptual field of humanities and the life sciences look like without such a conceptual and ontological divide? Confirmed Speakers: Evelyn Fox Keller, Lisa Gannet, Peter Hammerstein, Tim Ingold, Ursula Klein, Geoffrey Lloyd, Federico Navarrete, Eric Turkheimer, Elizabeth Williams. **For more information, please visit: <http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/de/aktuelles/index.html>. If you would like to attend, please contact: Maria Kronfeldner <maria.kronfeldner@philosophie.uni-bielefeld.de>.**

The 4th Annual International Ethnography Symposium will take place in **Venice, Italy, Sunday August 23rd - Tuesday August 25th 2009**. It is entitled, "Current Developments in Ethnographic Research in the Social and Management Sciences," and the key theme is Practice, Politics and Ethics in Ethnographic Research. **Full details are available at: http://www.liv.ac.uk/managementschool/ethnography_conference/2009_symposium.htm.**

'Have We Ever Been 'Post'? The Critiques of Sociological Knowledge' is the name of the conference of the British Sociological Association Theory Group in collaboration with Sociology at Warwick to be held **17th and 18th September 2009 at the University of Warwick, UK**. The deadline for the submission of abstracts is 3 March 2009. 2009 is an important year for sociology and social theory. It is 50 years after the publication of C. Wright Mills' 'The Sociological Imagination' (1959), 40 years since Michel Foucault's 'The Archaeology of Knowledge' (1969), and 30 years since Jean-Francois Lyotard's 'The Postmodern Condition' (1979). Although coming from distinctive positions, and with different aims, these books share the quality of bringing about strong critiques of knowledge production in the social sciences and, fundamentally, challenging major principles of Western social theory and sociology. These books came to light in a period of increasing self-doubt concerning the sustainability of the project of Western modernity and capitalism. This was translated into substantive epistemological and conceptual reformulations across the social sciences and humanities, often taking the shape of a crisis and provoking the expectation of the coming of a new age. In this context, the pictures drawn by Mills, Foucault and Lyotard generated as much seduction as resistance, but never indifference, within social thought. These critiques of the canonical imagination, knowledge and practice in the social sciences disclosed problems that still occupy us today regarding the ways in which we "understand", "explain" and "represent" the social world: the validity of the categories of knowledge, claims of universalism, meta-narratives and grand-theory, disciplinary boundaries, the link between theory and practice, the public and critical role of knowledge, power discourses, the production of otherness and difference, and the redefinition of the relationship of social theory with modernity, amongst many others. By now much of this debate has been framed under the rubric of a 'post' sociological imagination. Nevertheless,

the times in which we raise these inquiries have become rapidly distant from the times of Mills, Foucault and Lyotard. Wider developments in society, such as a more radical process of technological and economic globalization, the post-ideological consensus, the war on terror, new geopolitical powers and global warming have left their traces in the academic world. The University has become a place of marketisation and assessment, which has challenged the ways in which sociologists and academics more generally practice their disciplines. The university is no longer simply a place of political discourse and contestation. It rather seems that an atmosphere of "post"-orientation has taken over, making the aim to act as a social scientist and as a person – as Mills phrased it – appear anachronistic. Against this background, the coinciding anniversary of Mills', Foucault's, and Lyotard's books provides an opportune moment for revisiting and perhaps updating the legacy of these "critiques of knowledge". Accordingly, the conference welcomes papers from across disciplines and countries, and from different theoretical and empirical backgrounds addressing some of the following issues: The coming of a "post" sociological imagination: When? Where? How? Why?; Becoming canonical: the place, function and implications of Mills, Foucault and Lyotard in the (re)definition of sociology's discourse, identity and practice; Global north and global south, encounters and varieties of the "post" sociological imagination: the reception, contestation and influence of the critique of sociological knowledge; Researching the social world after Mills, Foucault and Lyotard (and others): the challenges and status of the theoretical, empirical and epistemological in social inquiry; and Making things public: possibilities, forms, times and places of sociological knowledge in the age of post-critique. **Abstracts of no more than 250 words will be accepted until 3rd March 2009.** To submit an abstract complete the official form and send it to **theorygroup-conference@warwick.ac.uk**. A decision will be communicated no later than 31st March 2009. Accepted papers will have to be submitted by 17th August 2009 to be

considered for publication in an edited volume after the conference. The conference welcomes traditional paper presentations as well as other formats, including visual and audio materials. The conference fee is £50, which includes conference materials, lunch, coffee and refreshments. Participants giving papers must complete the registration form and send their payment no later than 17th August 2009. We also welcome delegates who want to attend without giving a paper. There will be some places free of charge for postgraduate students. Further details about accommodation and about the conference venue will be available soon on the conference website:

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/bsatheorygroupconference/>. If you have any queries, please feel free to email: Elisabeth Simbuerger, E.A.Simbuerger@warwick.ac.uk, or Rodrigo Cordero Vega, R.A.Cordero-Vega@warwick.ac.uk.

The Comparative Relativism colloquium at the IT University of Copenhagen on 3-4 September 2009 features presentations and a roundtable discussion by Professor Eduardo Viveiros de Castro (Museo Nacional, Rio de Janeiro), Professor Barbara Herrnstein Smith (Brown University & Duke University), Professor Isabelle Stengers (The Free University of Brussels) and Professor Marilyn Strathern (Cambridge University) and discussants. Please note that we accept a **maximum of 100 participants, on a first come, first served basis. For further information, please see <http://www.itu.dk/comprel/>.**

The **2009 Annual Medical Sociology Conference** will take place at **The University of Manchester**. In 2008, the MedSoc Annual Conference attracted over 250 delegates from around the world. The event was hailed a great success and very much enjoyed by all. Past delegates have referred to the event as a 'must' for anyone within medical sociology arena and cognate fields such as science and technology studies. For 2009 our plenary speakers are Joan

Busfield, University of Essex and Evan Willis, Latrobe University, Australia. The annual conference provides delegates with the opportunity to discuss the discipline's 'hot topics' within a real community of medical sociologists. Papers, posters and other forms of presentation will be structured around streams that include: Cancer, Lay/professional interface, Complementary & Alternative Medicine, Lifecourse, Ethics, Mental Health, Ethnicity, Methods, Experiences of Health & Illness, Primary care, Gender, Risk, Genetics, Reproductive & Sexual Health, Health service delivery & organization, Teaching Health Professionals, Health policy, Theory, Health technologies, Open stream, Inequalities, and International. **Abstract deadline is 24 April 2009.** For more information see: **<http://www.britisoc.co.uk/events/medsoc.htm>**

Infrastructures for Health Care: Connecting practices across institutional and professional boundaries, the Second International Workshop, will be held on **June 18-19, 2009 at University of Copenhagen, Denmark**. The first international workshop: Infrastructures for Health Care was held at the Technical University of Denmark in June 2006. It attracted researchers, health care professionals, IT professionals, administrators, and others engaged in the development of infrastructures and new, integrated applications and services for improving the quality of health care services. The purpose of this second international workshop is to continue this forum for discussing current issues and trends related to the integration and coordination of health care practices across institutional, organizational, and professional boundaries. The health care sector is characterized by a worsening shortage of personnel and endlessly growing costs caused by the development of new treatments in combination with rising demands for treatment, which are associated with an aging population and an increase in chronic diseases. Against this backdrop, policy makers, health care professionals and researchers show an increased interest in innovative systems of care, which improve

communication, coordination and collaboration among patients/citizens, care providers in primary care and specialty services (clinics, hospitals, emergency departments, old people's homes etc.). Concepts like shared care, integrated care and continuity of care are indicative of ambitions of creating coherent and effective health care services for patients that require complex – and often long-term – care. Although these concepts are often used in relation to projects that seek to enhance communication, coordination, and collaboration around particular patient groups, they also have bearing on more general visions of reorganizing health care. Infrastructural arrangements – such as electronic patient records, classification schemes, accounting systems, communication standards, and quality systems – play a crucial role in these new models of care, and it is increasingly hard to imagine integrative initiatives that do not have a strong IT component. This raises a multitude of questions about the – actual and imagined – role and impact of IT and other infrastructure components in the development of patient-oriented, integrated healthcare services. We wish to highlight how new infrastructures – socio-technical assemblages – simultaneously connect existing practices, influence and change these practices, and create entirely new practices in health care work (e.g. related to the maintenance of the infrastructure itself). What characterizes infrastructures in health care? What role do they play in transforming and reorganizing health care and in creating new actors in health care? How are infrastructures established and maintained? What is the impact on work practices, organizational structures, cost effectiveness, quality of care, etc.? We encourage potential participants to submit an **abstract (3-500 words) describing the contribution before March 1, 2009**. Abstracts must be submitted by email to infrastructures2009@sundhedsITnet.dk. After the conference, a selection of the

contributors will be invited to submit a full paper to an edited - and fully reviewed - book or special issue (to be decided). Submission of abstracts 2nd of March 2009; Notification of acceptance 1st of April 2009; Deadline for registration 15th of May 2009; and Conference 18th – 19th of June 2009. For abstract submission and further information, contact infrastructures2009@sundhedsITnet.dk.

The **European University Heritage Network UNIVERSEUM** announces its **10th annual meeting**, to place from **11 to 13 June 2009 at the Université Paul Sabatier in Toulouse, France**. UNIVERSEUM invites submissions of papers devoted to university heritage in its broad sense, tangible and intangible, namely the preservation, study, access and promotion of university collections, museums, archives, libraries, and buildings of historical and scientific significance. Abstracts and more info: Catherine Gadon, Université Paul Sabatier, universeum09@adm.ups-tlse.fr. See also Universeum - the European University Heritage Network, <http://www.universeum.it>.

The **5th European Spring School of History of Science and Popularization: International workshop "Radioactivity in the Public Sphere"** takes place in **Maó (Menorca), 21-23 May 2009**. The fifth edition of the European Spring School will focus on two major issues: the historical evolution of public perception of radioactivity, and the role of media in shaping public perception of radioactivity's benefits and dangers. A variety of actors would be considered in this discussion, including scientists, the state and the media. Registration forms can be downloaded from the of the 5th European Spring School webpage at the SCHCT website: <http://schct.iec.cat/school/spring09.htm>.

Opportunities Available

The Department of the History of Science at Harvard University invites applications for a **full-time Lecturer in the history of science** for a term of **one semester, beginning January 1, 2010**. The successful applicant will teach two courses in the area of the life sciences (including biotechnology) and/or environmental sciences, broadly defined. Some student advising may also be requested. All candidates should expect to have their Ph.D. by the start date of the appointment. Harvard University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer, and actively encourages applications from minority and women scholars. Please send a brief cover letter (including statement of teaching experience), a curriculum vitae and the names of two referees whom we may contact, to: Judith Lajoie, Director of Administration, Department of the History of Science, Science Center 371, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA. Applications may also be submitted by email to jlajoie@fas.harvard.edu. **Application deadline is March 15, 2009.**

Two One-Year Masters Studentships in the History of Medicine are offered at **Durham University, UK, for the academic year 2009-10**. The closing date for applications is 2 March 2009. The studentships are part of the Taught Masters Programme in History and Philosophy of Science and Medicine (HPSM) of Durham University's Department of Philosophy, the CHMD, and the School of Medicine & Health. It is placed within the framework of the Northern Centre for the History of Medicine (<http://www.nchm.ac.uk/>), a partnership between the universities of Durham and Newcastle, and funded from a Wellcome Trust Strategic Award which has been awarded to the Northern Centre. The studentships will be available as of October 2009. The Masters studentships cover fees at home/EU level (£4,200) and maintenance (at £10,800). The successful applicants will register for the HPSM programme offered by the Department of Philosophy and the School of Medicine and

Health as of October 2009. This one-year (two years part-time) programme combines historical and philosophical approaches to medicine and science. In particular, it provides students with a deeper understanding of historical, cultural and philosophical issues in science and medicine from Antiquity up to the present day. One of its primary aims is to show students how the humanities are relevant to a deeper understanding of past and present medical and scientific issues. The breadth of the course's methods ranges from socio-cultural models to analytical approaches. The programme provides the necessary research training that will either link into further PhD study or act as a stand alone MA; and candidates who have successfully completed the programme will be eligible to take part in the annual Wellcome Trust PhD studentship competition. Further information on the HPSM Masters Programme and the teaching staff can be found on the website at

<http://www.dur.ac.uk/hpsm.ma/index.html>. For general questions regarding the application procedure please contact the Postgraduate Secretary, Mr Jonathon Gilderoy, Department of Philosophy, University of Durham, 50 Old Elvet, Durham DH1 3HN, United Kingdom, Email: jonathon.gilderoy@durham.ac.uk. For specific inquiries about the HPSM Masters Programme contact Prof. Holger Maehle (Department of Philosophy), e-mail: a.h.maehle@durham.ac.uk; or Dr Lutz Sauerteig, (School of Medicine and Health), e-mail: l.d.sauerteig@durham.ac.uk. For the online application for postgraduate studies at Durham please see the University website at **<http://www.dur.ac.uk/postgraduate/apply/>**.

The **University of Manchester** is advertising **four fellowships in the humanities and social sciences**, which historians of science, technology and medicine can apply for, and have been successful in the past. For full details, see

<http://www.manchester.ac.uk/aboutus/jobs/research/vacancy/index.htm?ref=150648>. If

you are thinking of applying, please contact Mick Worboys or any other member of staff at CHSTM to discuss your application. With the Hallsworth Fellowships, political economy can be widely interpreted. The closing date is 20 February 2008. The Simon Research Fellowships (Ref: HUM/90043) are two posts in any of the Social Sciences, broadly conceived, tenable for up to 3 years from 1 September 2009. These fellowships are intended for outstanding early career researchers who have completed a doctoral degree. A record of research and publications or demonstrated potential for research in relevant subject areas is essential. You will receive research expenses of up to £1000 pa. Salary Grade 6 £28,839 - £35,469; Grade 7 £36,533 - £ 44,931 p.a. according to qualifications and experience. The Hallsworth Research Fellowships (Ref HUM/90042) are two posts in Political Economy, including Commerce and Public Administration, tenable for up to three years from 1 September 2009 and open to excellent early career scholars who have completed a doctoral degree and have already demonstrated a potential for research in relevant subject areas. You will receive a generous allowance for research expenses. Salary Grade 6 £28,839 - £35,469; Grade 7 £36,533 - £ 44,931 p.a. according to qualifications and experience.

The **University of Twente (Netherlands)** has an opening for **Assistant Professor in the Dynamics and Assessment of emerging technologies**, in particular for the medical/health sector. Current developments in emerging science and technology have serious consequences for society in general, and particularly for health care and the way society deals with health and illness. Due to these developments, there is a need for systematic research of and reflection on these consequences. Your major task will consist of research and education on the dynamics and assessment of these new and emerging technologies. We expect that you will deliver contributions to the development of this research field and that you build bridges

between social science research and (medical) engineering research. In addition, you are expected to acquire external research funding and to conduct related projects. With respect to education, we expect that you will contribute to courses in bachelor and master programmes such as Philosophy of Science, Technology and Society; Health Sciences; and programmes in the technical faculties. You have completed a PhD thesis in Science and Technology Studies or a related social science field that investigates the interactions between science, technology and society. You have proven experience and a strong affinity with teaching (in Dutch and English language) and research. In addition, you have experience with the acquisition, supervision and conduct of externally-funded research projects. We offer a challenging position in an inspiring environment. The vacancy concerns a tenured position as an Assistant Professor. You will be appointed in a part-time position, 32 hours a week. The salary scale, depending on your experience, extends from €3195 to a maximum of €4374 gross per month (on full-time basis), based upon the job profile of Assistant Professor, level 2 (in accordance with the Collective Labour Agreement for Dutch Universities). In due course growth to Assistant Professor, level 1 is possible. In addition, the University of Twente offers attractive fringe benefits. For more information please contact Prof. Dr. Stefan Kuhlmann (chair department STaPS; tel. +31 53 4893353; s.kuhlmann@utwente.nl) and/or Dr. Ellen van Oost (tel. +31 53 489 4315, e.c.j.vanoost@utwente.nl). **Please send your written application including a full resume (including a list of your education, publications, research, industry and teaching experience), possibly with references, before February 21, 2009** to the University of Twente, School of Management and Governance, Attn: Prof. Dr. P.J.J.M. van Loon, Dean, P.O. Box 217, 7500 AE Enschede, the Netherlands, stating application number 09/009. It is also possible to send your application by email to mbsollicitaties@mb.utwente.nl. For further details relating to this position, see www.mb.utwente.nl/vacatures or <http://www.mb.utwente.nl/stehps/about/>.

The ESRC Centre for Genomics in Society offers **PhD studentship**. Studentships are available to start in the academic year 2009/10 at the ESRC Centre for Genomics and Society (Egenis), University of Exeter, UK. These include two ESRC linked studentships (3 or 1+3) and 3-year full fee and maintenance School of Humanities and Social Science studentships for home and international students. We are looking to recruit students with strong undergraduate degrees (for ESRC 1+3 only) or Master's degrees (for 3 year PhDs) in disciplines including sociology, philosophy, psychology, history, economics, politics, and biology to be part of our interdisciplinary research community. Egenis has a unique research profile in the social study of science and medicine and philosophy of biology with a particular focus on emerging areas of genetic, genomic and post-genomic science. Prospective students should contact a member of staff by the end of February to explore potential research topics (www.genomicsnetwork.ac.uk/egenis/people/). For details of our current research see www.genomicsnetwork.ec.uk/egenis/research. To be put in touch with a member of academic staff to discuss project ideas or if you have any questions please **contact Cheryl Sutton at c.a.sutton@exeter.ac.uk**. For more information about us visit www.genomicsnetwork.ac.uk/egenis. For full details of the School of Humanities and Social Science studentships visit <http://admin.exeter.ac.uk/academic/scholarships/search/scholarship.php?id=109>. To apply for ESRC +3/1+3 studentships: (1) Register your interest and intention to apply to Cheryl Sutton at c.a.sutton@exeter.ac.uk; (2) Applications should be made via the University of Exeter's online application portal (www.exeter.ac.uk/postgraduate/admissions/applyonline.shtml) and should include: University application, transcripts of all academic work, 2 letters of recommendation from referees familiar with your academic work and research proposal. To apply for School of Humanities and Social Science studentships: (1) Applications should be made via the University of Exeter's online application portal

(www.exeter.ac.uk/postgraduate/admissions/applyonline.shtml) and should include: University application, transcripts of all academic work, 2 letters of recommendation from referees familiar with your academic work and research proposal. (2) You must also complete the online Humanities and Social Sciences PhD studentships and bursaries application form http://huss.exeter.ac.uk/postgrad/studentships_application.php.

Egenis, the ESRC Centre for Genomics in Society based at the University of Exeter, is seeking a student for a **PhD project on the environmental and social implications of biofuels, to start in October 2009**. Funding for this position is not confirmed at present, but will be sought in a joint NERC/ESRC application once the right student is found. We have a strong and very timely project, involving collaboration between biofuel researchers and Egenis ([website: http://www.genomicsnetwork.ac.uk/egenis/](http://www.genomicsnetwork.ac.uk/egenis/)). The prospective student will study comparative biofuel technologies (plant-based and microbial) with an aim to explore their environmental and social implications. We are looking for a student with a Masters in Science & Technology Studies, or possibly with Masters-level training in environmental sciences. We will also consider funding an extra year of training for an appropriate student without these qualifications. Information about the funding scheme is here: <http://www.nerc.ac.uk/funding/available/postgrad/schemes/jointesrc.asp>. If this application is unsuccessful, we expect to be able to provide alternative funding for the studentship. Please **contact Sabina Leonelli (S.Leonelli@ex.ac.uk) and Maureen O'Malley (M.A.O'Malley@ex.ac.uk) by the end of February** at the very latest to discuss the project and your potential application for it.

The **IT University of Copenhagen** invites applicants for **positions as assistant and associate professors within the areas: Technology studies informed by the social**

sciences and the humanities, and IT in business and organizations. The IT University has research groups that work with identifying and developing appropriate technologies, innovative communication, computer games, improving IT-design and software development. At this point the IT University is in the process of strengthening research and education in the areas of technology studies and IT in business and organizations. Much of this work is based on activities directed towards contributing to a better understanding of work practices and their organizational context, locally as well as globally. Relevant topics in technology studies are: Philosophy, history and anthropology of science and technology; Organizational processes and technology; Globalization, interaction and technology; and Design and use of IT. Candidates with particular interest in IT will be preferred. Relevant topics in IT in business and organizations are: Process value management; Business to IT alignment; IT based innovation; Design and use of IT. In both areas candidates with competences in ethnographic and other qualitative methodologies will be preferred. For further information, see www.itu.dk, ref. no. 2009-223-0006. **Application deadline: 24 February 2009.**

The Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin, Independent Research Group III (Veronika Lipphardt), announces a **Postdoctoral Fellowship for up to two years, starting date September 1, 2009** (negotiable). Outstanding junior scholars are invited to apply. The research group will focus on the history of knowledge about (and research into) human biodiversity in the 20th century (<http://www.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de/PDF/biodiversity.pdf>). Projects investigating the history of anthropology, human genetics, and population genetics are particularly welcome. Candidates with research interests and experience in challenging disciplinary boundaries, such as Cultural History, History of Science, or Colonial / Postcolonial History, are welcome. Candidates should be able to read and communicate in

English; they should have basic knowledge of biology/genetics or be ready to acquire it. Fellowships are endowed with a monthly stipend between eur 1.900 and eur 2.300 (fellows from abroad) or between 1.468 and 1.621 (fellows from Germany). Candidates of all nationalities are welcome to apply; applications from women are especially welcomed. The Max Planck Society is committed to employing more handicapped individuals and encourages them to apply. Postdoctoral fellows are expected to participate in the research activities at the Institute. Candidates are requested to **send a curriculum vitae, publication list, copies of certificates (PhD), research prospectus (maximum 750 words), a sample text, and names and addresses of two referees no later than March 2, 2009 to: Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Administration, Postdoc NWG III, Boltzmannstraße 22, 14195 Berlin, Germany.** Electronic submission is also possible: paass@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de.

A vacancy for a **researcher (2-year position, tenable September 2009)** has been posted by the **Cellule Interfacultaire de Technology Assessment, University of Namur, Belgium**, specialized in the philosophical, ethical and social evaluation of communication and information technologies. Research lies within the scope of two European projects. Those projects investigate ethical governance in EU research projects with the goal of providing a framework for improved governance mechanisms that will address potential ethical issues arising from new and emerging technologies. Studying current governance arrangements in actual ICT projects (and in particular in Ambient Intelligence project) will help to produce a better understanding of the efficiency and limits of current ethics governance. This will be applied to the relevant ethical issues identified which will lead to a recommendation of successful governance arrangements that will address ethical issues in emerging ICTs before or as they arise. The recommendations for individual issues will be

used to develop general policy recommendations. For the research environment, see <http://www.fundp.ac.be/en/> and the Computer sciences department, <http://www.fundp.ac.be/en/inf/>. **To apply send CV and accompanying letter of motivation before 1st June, 2009 by post or fax to Professor Philippe Goujon, rue Grandgagnage, 21, 5000 - Namur – Belgium, E-mail: pgo@info.fundp.ac.be.**

The New Transparency: Surveillance and Social Sorting research project, at The University of Toronto, Faculty of Information seeks to fill **one post-doctoral fellow** position (two years in residence), starting Summer 2009 based in the Faculty of Information at the University of Toronto. The fellow will be expected to perform research in collaboration with the New Transparency's Integrated Research Sub-Project on Digitally Mediated Surveillance (IRSP 2), lead by Prof. Andrew Clement (University of Toronto) and Prof. Colin Bennett (University of Victoria). In particular, this will involve embarking on a program of productive research on some aspect of digitally mediated surveillance, taking a lead role in organizing an international research workshop on digitally mediated surveillance planned for May 2011, grant application writing and contributing to the New Transparency and related projects more generally. The successful applicant will have the opportunity to work with a number of scholars and students associated with the New Transparency project at Queens University, the University of Victoria, the University of Alberta and the Open University in the UK, as well as those at the University of Toronto affiliated with the Information Policy Research Program (IPRP).

In addition, the post-doctoral fellow will find a wide range of programs at U of T and other Toronto region universities that provide opportunities for enrichment and collaboration. Applicants can learn more about the New Transparency project and IPRP through our websites:

http://www.surveillanceproject.org/about/IRSP_2

and <http://www3.fis.utoronto.ca/research/iprp/>

Applicants should be recent or imminent recipients of the doctoral degree, with demonstrated interest and expertise in surveillance studies and digital media. Areas of specialization and disciplinary approaches are open. This fellowship is made possible through a Major Collaborative Research Initiative (MCRI) grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. Salary is competitive and includes benefits. It may be supplemented by an adjunct teaching appointment arranged with the Faculty of Information. Modest funds will also be provided for conference travel, equipment and other research expenses. The awardee will be expected to be in residence in Toronto, Canada, for the time of the award and be an active colleague within U of T as well as the New Transparency project. **Application Deadline is March 31, 2009.** Please send application materials in electronic form to Andrew.Clement@utoronto.ca. Applications should include a CV, letter describing suitability for the fellowship, a statement outlining the proposed research project(s), three writing samples and three letters of reference. For more information, please contact: **andrew.clement@utoronto.ca**, skype: [andrewclement2](https://www.skype.com/user/andrewclement2), www.fis.utoronto.ca/faculty/clement.

News from the Field

The Sage Encyclopedia of Nanoscience and Society is a new reference for undergraduate students and the general public addressing all

aspects of nanoscience research, including definitions of terms, biographies of major researchers and their work, profiles of research

institutions, organizations, and corporations, descriptions of nano techniques and potential, and thematic topics on ethics, religion and government regulation. We are starting the **assignment process for articles that will be due May 1, 2009**. This comprehensive project is a two-volume encyclopedia for college, public, and science libraries to be published by Sage Reference in 2010. The work is made up of some 450 articles. Each article, ranging from 900 to 3500 words, is signed by the contributor. The General Editor for the encyclopedia is David Guston, Ph.D., Arizona State University, who will review all the articles for academic consistency. If you are interested in contributing to the encyclopedia, it can be a notable publication addition to your CV/resume and broaden your publishing credits. Sage Publications offers an honorarium ranging from Sage book credits for smaller articles up to a free set of the encyclopedia (approximately a \$300 value) for contributions totaling 10,000 words or more. The list of available articles is already prepared, and as a next step we will e-mail you the Article List (Excel file) from which you can select topics that best fit your expertise and interests. Additionally, Style and Submission Guidelines will be provided that detail article specifications. If you would like to contribute to building a truly outstanding reference with the Encyclopedia of Nanoscience and Society, please contact me by the e-mail information below. Please provide a brief summary of your academic/publishing credentials. Please remember this is a non-technical resource that can be understood by the layman. **david.guston@asu.edu**

The Social History of Medicine seeks a **new co-editor** to join Bill Luckin (co-editor), Anna Crozier (book reviews editor), and Ruth Biddiss (assistant editor) **from 1 September 2009**. Social History of Medicine is the leading international journal in its field and covers all aspects of the social, cultural and economic history of medicine. It is published by Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for the Social History of Medicine. Informal enquiries about the nature of the post can be made by e-

mail to Bill Luckin (email: billluckin@googlemail.com) or Brian Dolan (email: DolanB@dahsm.ucsf.edu). **Applicants are asked to send a C.V. and statement of interest to the chair of the Society, Dr Lutz Sauerteig, Centre for the History of Medicine and Disease, Wolfson Research Institute, Durham University, Queen's Campus, Stockton-on-Tees TS17 6BH, UK (email: l.d.sauerteig@durham.ac.uk)**. The application should provide a brief account of why the candidate is attracted to the post and a synopsis of relevant experience. Expertise in all areas and/or time-periods will be considered. The Society also wishes strongly to encourage applications from outside the United Kingdom. The deadline is 31 March 2009. Further details about the journal and the Society for the Social History of Medicine can be found at <http://www.sshm.org/>. Membership benefits of the Society include subscription to the journal Subscription to the journal Social History of Medicine, with three issues per year, and full online archive of Social History of Medicine; "The Gazette" which contains information about professional events, reduced registration fees at Society conferences, 30 per cent off titles in the Society's Routledge series, 20 per cent discount on selected Oxford University Press books, 25 per cent off titles in Ashgate's series "History of Medicine in Context", as well as discounts on selected books from Manchester University Press. Bursaries are available for student members for travel and conferences. Details of how to join the Society, and information about membership benefits are available at <http://www.sshm.org> or from Dr Lutz Sauerteig, Centre for the History of Medicine and Disease, Durham University, Queen's Campus, Wolfson Research Institute, University Boulevard, Stockton on Tees TS17 6BH, UK, Email: competition@sshm.org.

Contents of this issue

- 3 Relevance. Editorial by Ann R. Sætnan
- 5 Ironists, Reformers, Rebels? Workshop report by Corinna Jung.
- 7 Acting with Social Sciences and Humanities. Session report by Katja Majer
- 15 Recent Dissertation: The Finnish Competition State and Entrepreneurial Policies in the Helsinki Region. By Antti Pelkonen
- 16 Bowing Out ... by Christine Hine
- 17 EASST News: Members' Benefits
- 17 Conferences and Calls for Papers
- 29 Opportunities Available
- 33 News from the Field