Readers are invited to fill in the title’s blank with whatever they wish, but in my end-of-sabbatical musings I am inclined to think “out loud” as it were about three candidate terms – truth, place, and time – each of which have been proclaimed by some to be obsolete in light of post-modern theory and/or the latest in communications technologies.

**Truth:** Having spent my sabbatical largely in California, and having spent it among politically active and critical friends and family, issues about “truth” and “honesty” have loomed large from time to time, along with their logical opposites such as “lies” and “corruption”. Let me state up front that I see the claim that constructivism(s) render truth obsolete to be a straw figure, a misrepresentation of constructivism designed to make it easier to critique. As a constructivist myself, I agree with Michael Lynch (2004) that there are many reasons “Why Truth Matters”. I will not attempt to summarize that book in a fraction of even a long editorial. Rather, I will stick to my post-sabbatical musings, dodging away from the high stakes political episodes witnessed through the past year and drawing instead on one banal encounter on last Sunday’s hike … or rather (just to remain truthful) a pair of encounters.

Here is how I recall them: On my outward-bound hike Sunday morning, I passed a pair of large eucalyptus trees, from which I heard plaintive cries that sounded to me like a hawk’s – kriiiii, kriiiii! Sure enough, there was a large hawk, perched on one bare branch high in one of the trees. A family of hikers came along and, seeing me photographing the hawk, studied it as well. The father asked if I knew what kind of bird it was. I replied that I’d left my field guide back in the car, but I thought it was a juvenile Red-Tailed Hawk (Buteo jamaicensis), since I thought I recognized the banded, not-yet-red tail and the speckled “vest” of that age and species of bird. If I was right, then it was calling out to its parents “Feeeeed me! Feeeeed me!” The family thanked me, saying this was fun to know, then hurried off to catch up with the youngest child who had spotted a small insect further up the trail. Hiking back on the same trail some hours later, I met another family as we all watched some Forster’s Terns diving for fish. They told of having seen a pair of very large birds rise up from the hillside just above us. Not hawks, they thought, because they were much larger and had yellowish breasts. Well, I’d been told once that there were Golden Eagles nesting somewhere nearby, I thought just the other side of the hill, but didn’t know where and had never seen them. Maybe they were as big as the family recalled, and maybe there is some sort of golden shine off their brown feathers? Around the next bend, however, I knew where some Red-Tailed Hawks were nesting. When we came around the bend, the hawks were still there – now both the juvenile and a parent bird, and very soon the other parent as well. But the family felt sure that these were not hawks. Too big, they thought, and look at that yellowish color of their breasts. These were the birds they’d seen, they thought, and might it be that the yellow tinge was the reference point for the name “Golden Eagle”? I was pretty sure that my field guide showed Golden Eagles as brown all over, but I didn’t have it with me so I kept my council and for a while we all watched the birds as possibly Golden Eagles, enjoying the spectacle when one of the parent birds flew straight towards us – either hunting the ground below or trying to scare us off (see cover photo). When I got to the car, I checked my field guide. Sure enough, Golden Eagles are brown all over and half again as big; these birds were Red-Tailed
Hawks. But did that matter?

The first family were happy to have a name to attach to the birds. Perhaps any name would do, as my “authority” as someone with a large camera and who claimed to own a field guide was apparently enough for them to accept the name I offered, even if I offered it along with disclaimers. The second family, in spite of my still showing those same badges of authority, were clearly happier to think of the birds as eagles. And truth be told, I was thrilled to consider the possibility myself, however unlikely I thought it to be. If the thrill of having seen “eagles” fed our common interest in wildlife, does it matter in retrospect that the second family and I were wrong, or that I was right in the bird-ID I offered the first family?

In the context of families out on a Father’s Day hike, I think not. Even if the second family later checked, as I did, and found we were wrong, I think no harm was done to their interest in wildlife or sense of competence, as they can blame that old lady with her camera and non-present field guide for having encouraged them in the mistaken identification.

But in other contexts, I do think the correct identification of species matters quite a bit. For instance, on the bird watcher forum where I post some of my photos: Folks there are patient with me as a newbie. They tolerate my ID errors and offer corrections. But I think they would soon lose patience with me if I persisted in misidentifying birds, perhaps even feel insulted that I took the hobby so off-handedly. I certainly do not want to insult them! And … uh oh! I said I would leave the high-stakes politics aside. I guess I lied. I think the correct identification of species matters to us all, amongst other reasons because species density, diversity and behaviors are indicators of the existence and consequences of and possible adaptations to global warming, and that is one set of issues where denial of (what I and many with me see as) convincing truths is leading to (what I and many with me see as) political paralysis with (as I and many with me see it) devastating long-term consequences for humanity.

Place: Earlier that same day, driving in my car to the park, I was listening to one of the area’s public radio stations. The program was an interview with a philosopher who had written a book about the concept of community. I thought perhaps this was Bruce B. Janz talking about his new book “Philosophy as if Place Mattered” (forthcoming). Somehow that title rings a mental bell, but I was driving and couldn’t take notes and have since heard back from Janz that it wasn’t he. Whoever it was, at one point the interviewer asked what the interviewee thought of the use of the term “community” to refer to so-called “virtual” or “on-line” social interactions. The interviewee responded that, while he did not want to disparage such communities, which clearly were meaningful and helpful to many (otherwise they would not come into being), he felt they lacked the heterogeneity of geographically defined communities – also known as “places”. Because actual places in bounded space need social diversity to function well, by sharing that place we also come into contact with others who are, aside from their connection to the same place, quite different from ourselves – an important experience for building social virtues such as broad-mindedness, imagination, generosity etc. Furthermore – linking to another interview I heard that weekend, perhaps with Glenn Albrecht since it discussed the concepts solastalgia and soliphilia (Albrecht 2010)1 – through affection for place, we may learn to nurture that place, protecting it from the degradations we come to realize we are inflicting upon the environment. Virtual communities, by contrast, are based on shared interests and focused on activities relating to those interests – World of

1 Or perhaps it was the same interview and perhaps Albrecht cited points from and/or mentioned the forthcoming book by Janz, or perhaps some other person cited both. As I said, I was driving and could not take notes.
Warcraft, or birding, or cycling, or social studies of science and technology. Thus, such “communities” may tend to hide whatever heterogeneity they encompass, since communications may be more narrowly centered on the homogenous aspect(s) of the “community”. And too, those communications take place on screen, divorced from the natural settings outside the office/living room/bedroom window.

I agree with the interviewed author(s) that heterogeneity and affection for place are important features of communities, important to experience in order to build virtues that are vital if societies are to thrive. I’ve made, together with co-authors, a similar point about loss of heterogeneity in public settings through the use of video surveillance for social exclusion (Sætnan, Lomell & Wiecek 2004). But I’m not so sure I agree that social heterogeneity of communities and affection for place are all that much more obvious or more actively experienced in geographically bounded communities than in interest-bounded virtual communities.

To return to the example of the online birding forum – one member from India sometimes includes jokes in the notes that accompany his photos. The jokes are marked by his calling them jokes and ending them with bouncing, laughing “smiley” faces. I must admit, I rarely get the jokes, but I do find his amusement from them contagious and laugh along with – not at! – him. Perhaps in time I will even gain a sense for Indian humor. Another member is from Jeddah and through her photos shares with us her love of desert colors -shades of grey, brown and gold - and occasionally also her worries about the geo-political situation in the Middle East. So even in a narrowly defined interest forum, we do not entirely leave our other identities and interests behind.

Of course, I am also present in several geographically bounded communities. Walking around Berkeley, where I work this year, I certainly come into contact with – or at least see – people from many circumstances and walks of life. However, my contact with them can be narrow indeed. Though I do keep a pocket budget for handouts, the many buskers and panhandlers I pass are for the most part only part of the urban scenery for me; I know nothing of how they came to be in that role in that place, what their political views are, what tastes they have in food or music, etc. And they know nothing of me aside from whether I gave them a few coins in passing or not (“stingy old lady” either way, I suspect). The same goes for the bank tellers, the library employees, the baristas and so on that I meet. Even if we exchange first name greetings when I buy my first coffee of the day as I get off the BART train, the baristas and I have only fleeting and narrowly conscribed contacts. And the people I interact more extensively with – family and friends – are quite a homogenous bunch culturally and politically, possibly more homogenous than those I meet in the interest-based “communities” where I’m a member on-line.

Nevertheless, yes, I agree that it is important that I also participate in actual places. I have renewed my affection for this place, where I grew up, and at the same time also intensified my affection for greener, wetter, cooler Norway. And participating in an actual place, I inescapably see, acknowledge, and (however briefly or narrowly) interact with a heterogeneous multitude. Some of those I meet do leave a lasting impression, such as the homeless person dancing enthusiastically if clumsily to the music from a highly skilled piano-playing busker and then pulling his wad of meager holdings from deep in his sack and peeling off a dollar to pay the busker for that pleasure. How can one forget such a moment, however brief and indirect the interaction? But now my membership in this community is also notably temporary; my sabbatical year is rapidly coming to an end.

Time: However, it is not so much the finite or limited resource aspect of time that is claimed to be obsolete. That aspect is demonstrably still relevant, as witness the
market prices of time-saving devices and of wage-bought hours. Rather, it is the need for simultaneity that seems increasingly archaic. We need not be in the same time-space to communicate nowadays. Emails, for instance, can be sent instantaneously and received in a very different time-space, or wait patiently for it to be convenient for their recipients to read them. However, as I will argue, both demands for and liberation from simultaneity do impact on time as a limited resource.

Firstly, not all human action has been freed from the need for simultaneity. Although all human action may in some sense be communication, communication does not constitute the whole of human action. Action also goes beyond communication, or at least beyond communication’s abstract content. Action can, for instance, also involve the physical processing of material objects, or the delivery of material services to living beings. So while simultaneity may seem obsolete for some, for others simultaneous co-presence with objects and/or persons is still the rule rather than the exception. Furthermore, as we have come to know, “liberation” from time-bound work has not meant more free time for most, but rather making oneself “agile” and “flexible”, i.e. available 24/7 to cater to the simultaneity needs of others - for instance, taking service calls from around the globe when others need a computer program to run during their local working hours when and where they process materials (see for instance Lelorieux 2010). Then too, how efficient are such non-co-present services? In my sabbatical experience, even the fairly abstract and obviously communicative work of supervising graduate students has proven less liberated from simultaneity requirements than hype might have it. No, I have not been able to meet with my graduate students over a cup of coffee at the campus café, and yes, I have nevertheless been able to offer them supervision, but it has demanded substantially more of my time to do so through emails rather than in person, and I imagine substantially more self-confidence on the part of my students to deal with the drier, harsher language of written comments.

Summing up the year as it nears its end, my year off from the demands of space and time, of co-presence with students and colleagues on my home campus, has been a productive one, but academic years are never productive enough. I managed to pilot a large proposal through to submission, but have not yet heard the outcome. I managed to start on my next book, but not to finish it – not by a long shot! I managed to do my part towards submission of some number of co-authored articles, but none are yet out in print. I managed to keep my graduate students moving forward, but it remains to be seen whether they complete and if so when. And soon now I have to return, fill out reports and account sheets, pick up a stack of theses to grade and a professorship promotion application to evaluate – back to sackcloth and oatcakes, as the saying goes.

Well … I have taken up enough space in this issue and enough time from those who have read this far. I recommend that you read on to other matters discussed below – Renate Brandimarte’s review of discussions on “uncertainty” in track 6 of last summer’s EASST conference, membership news from EASST administration, my call for guest editors for the Review, and the latest listings from the Eurograd site.

I wish you all a good summer, however much time you have to enjoy it and wherever and however you spend that time. Keep it truthful! ☺
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Reconsidering uncertainty, a brief note on track 06: Uncertainty as an asset? Neoliberalized technoscience and the manufacture of world and the self

By: Renata Brandimarte, University of Bari

Here I would like to present some observations on the debate of track 06 at the 2010 EASST conference. The debate took place in a session nurtured by a variety of empirical and theoretical approaches, which significantly enriched the discussion. Numerous empirical works were presented, with subjects covering, for example, the management of genetic risk, the role of convergent technologies (nanotechnologies, biotechnologies, information technologies, and cognitive science - collectively known as NBIC technologies) and also the view on convergent technologies as expressed by new media (an empirical research conducted in Slovenia).

The main focus of the track was the link between the narrative of neoliberalism and NBIC technoscience. This connection pivots around and thereby highlights the role of uncertainty: Uncertainty becomes an instrument of neoliberal governmentality in the management of the self and world. The concept of governmentality was introduced by the work of Michel Foucault in the field of genealogy of biopolitics. Governmentality denotes a composite concept: One of its fundamental traits refers to the all technologies of government of the population and individual (Foucault 2004). The neoliberal perspective can be represented by a hegemonic project of society characterized, in synthesis, by free markets and trades, property rights, new vision of state intervention, flexibility, individual entrepreneurial capacities and responsibilities (Harvey 2005). As O’Malley (2004) has pointed out, in the tradition of liberalism, the notions of risk and uncertainty have been instruments through which liberalism has imagined and governed the future. In this way, neoliberal governmentality (with all its values) goes beyond a merely governmental viewpoint because it also emphasizes the role of the subject as entrepreneurial individual and focuses on strategies of self-governing and self-regulation. Such a neoliberal narrative seems to consider nature as something that could be manipulated. This is a pivot point, or point of tangency, at which it fits with the narrative of NBIC technology because the latter proposes a biophysical world as one completely transformable and available to become goods.
However, many applications of NBIC technologies aren’t enabled to foresee long term consequences or harms. In this way, uncertainty is not the boost to decide to take a risk as in the traditional liberal narrative, but neither is it simply a problem for decisional processes at every level, in the world of everyday life and in political sphere: what we can eat or what kind of agriculture the government has to authorize. So the discourse on uncertainty goes beyond the fact of uncertainty being a problem for the decisional processes and considers new perspectives. One of these could be considered the notion of individual responsibility as an integral part of neoliberal narrative, overall in the management of health. Another theme is also the vision of nature, understanding as something profoundly different from the past: it becomes very similar to a product resulting from human interventions. This sort of plasticity includes also human nature and leads to the notion of responsibility in the construction of perfect life because uncertainty turns in an empowering condition for all social actors. Build scenarios or possible worlds, in which the notion of risk seems to be relegated in the past, are the most important components to govern through uncertainty. In this perspective, the problem of not having forecasts to use in the decision-making process is transformed in such a way as to emphasize the force of neoliberal hegemony in every space of social life. Obviously, there are also many ambiguities and scholarship has interpreted this shift in different ways, as well as there being many subjects of empirical investigations.

Could this perspective be compatible with other concepts, theories or different narratives? In my opinion, this seems be a sort of basic question to which the papers in the track have tried to give a response. Obviously, the answers are very different because different fields of investigation also have different conceptual apparatuses and languages, but there appears to be a set of common references that have improved understanding across fields.

These are just some of the arguments encountered in the debate, but the track, in my opinion, has achieved its purpose — to push to reconsider uncertainty — and in this sense the transdisciplinary approaches presented have been very useful and interesting: They have further emphasized the complexity of understanding uncertainty and offered new lines of research.

References:
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Membership News

You may have noticed that you haven’t yet been asked for your EASST membership fee for 2011! (Thanks to the small number of you who have paid without prompting).

This is because EASST is in the process of changing its membership administration. As part of this the EASST council has decided to change the membership year (currently January to December) to May to April. Everyone will receive an extra 4 months of membership.

We are also changing our online payment system to one which allows for future renewals.

If you pay online your details will be retained and shortly before your membership runs out you will be notified that a further payment will be taken and your membership renewed unless you tell us that you want to cancel. No payment will be taken before you have had notification and time to cancel. This system will save you having to make the payment each year and will save EASST having to spend a lot of time reminding you to do so! If you do not want to pay in this way then you will still be able to do so by transferring funds
Dear readers:
I hereby extend to any and each of you the opportunity to serve as guest editor for an issue of EASST Review. I especially could use a guest editor for one or both of the Fall and Winter issues coming up later this year.

What’s in it for me is one or two issues that I won’t have to worry about when I’m preparing for and/or recovering from surgery this Fall term. I could conceivably get the September issue done before the surgery. If all goes well, I will be recovered and able to do the December issue by mid-month. But I would worry less about these issues if one or both had a guest editor.

What’s in it for you who offer to serve? Well, on the work side, you would be expected to write an editorial – anything from a half to several pages on some STS-relevant theme you feel strongly about. I generally find that the editorial takes me one or two working days. Then I spend one or two more working days copying in, checking through, and formatting submissions that have come in, ditto the current announcements that have either been sent me or posted on Eurograd, plus finding a cover illustration and updating the issue number on the cover and footers. In all, the work takes me about a week, maybe a little less. You don’t have to worry about distribution; EASST administration handles that, and also offers other support in production of the Review.

And on the benefits side? Well, you get to write an editorial – anything from a half to several pages on some STS-relevant theme you feel strongly about – and actually see it get into print and presumably read. You also get to list on your CV that you have served as guest editor for EASST Review. Since the Review is not a refereed international journal, this will be a minor point on your CV, but a point nevertheless. For a Ph.D. student or post doc., even such a minor point is worthwhile. Even for an established academic, if you do not have such a point on your CV already, it is worthwhile to be able to add it, and I say this with the authority of someone who has served many times now on hiring and promotion committees at all levels. And then there’s the value of contributing to the community in which you participate – attending conferences, getting support to organize international workshops, and so on.

If you are interested and available to do this, just send me an email at annrs <at> svt.ntnu.no. I’d be happy to answer any questions you may have before you make your decision. Should you commit to doing an issue,
I’ll make sure to forward to you any submissions that arrive, sending a note at the same time to each submitter that you will be handling that issue.

I hope there are some readers out there willing to give this a try, and I hope they have fun at it and do it well. Another benefit for both of us if that’s the case, is that I can also worry a bit less about transferring responsibility for the Review on when I decide it’s time to retire. I’ll be 62 next week, so sooner or later, if all goes well, retirement too will happen. ☺

Editorially yours,
Ann R. Saetnan

Conference Announcements and Calls for Papers

Call for Papers - International Conference Making (In)Appropriate Bodies – Between Medical Models of Health, Moral Economies and Everyday Practices.

When: December 1-2, 2011
Venue: Vienna, Albert Schweitzer-Haus
Organised by the Department of Social Studies of Science, University of Vienna

Keynote Speakers:
Steven Epstein (Northwestern University, US)
Ulrike Felt (University of Vienna, AT)
Monica Greco (Goldsmiths, UK)
Flis Henwood (University of Brighton, UK)
Jörg Niewöhner (Humboldt University, DE)
Vololona Rabeharisoa (Ecole des Mines-ParisTech, FR, tbc)

Since the turn of the 18th century regulating, controlling and forming bodies has been a central concern both of medicine and state politics. In recent decades techno-scientific innovations, societal developments and new forms of governance have considerably altered the ways in which bodily conditions are measured, normalised and (bio-)medicalised. While some have proclaimed a new politics of life that has supplanted older forms of regulating and controlling bodies and populations, arguably old and new forms of bio-power coexist and intermingle in multiple ways: Both major state-sponsored campaigns aiming at regulating and disciplining bodies on the population scale, e.g. in the proclaimed ‘war against obesity’, and new forms of understanding bodies that foster novel choices, responsibilities and identities, e.g. personalised genetics, are simultaneously coexisting and coalescing.

In this conference, we aim at exploring the multiple ways in which appropriate – and in the same move, inappropriate – bodies are made and enacted within biomedicine, wider biopolitical interventions and everyday practice. Departing from the assumption that the ways in which bodies are known, lived and acted upon are inseparably intertwined, we call for contributions that investigate the interrelations of (biomedical) knowledge, moral economies and socio-material orders on different levels. Particular focus will be put on:

• the ways in which bodily norms get produced and enacted in diverse biomedical and public health arenas and beyond (e.g. self-help groups, internet forums, …)
• how these arenas are related to each other, and how bodily norms travel and are translated between them
• how bodily norms are tied to the formation of identities
• the kinds of practices and interventions developed to lead to the accomplishment of bodily norms and ideals
• the forms of resistance which emerge against such normalization and biomedicalisation tendencies
• the importance of wider political, cultural and national contexts, i.e. specific techno-political cultures or broader socio-technical imaginaries, for the formation of these norms and related practices

This conference will address the above-mentioned issues and seeks to combine in-depth empirical analyses with broader theoretical reflections. By bringing together research that
addresses different cultural contexts and different efforts of normalising bodies (such as the obesity debate), and that applies different methodological approaches to studying these, the conference’s explicit goal is to open up comparative perspectives and to contribute to a broader understanding of contemporary efforts to govern bodies.

**Deadline for abstract submission:** September 12, 2011.

**Notification of acceptance by:** September 20, 2011.

**Deadline for extended abstracts (3-5 pages):** November 7, 2011

A limited number of travel grants for young researchers will be available upon application.

For further details about the submission of abstracts, registration fees, etc. please visit: [http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/appropriate-bodies-conference](http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/appropriate-bodies-conference)

This conference is organised as part of the research project „Perceptions and imaginations of obesity as a socio-scientific problem in the Austrian context“.

See: [http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/obesity](http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/obesity)

**Contact:** bodies.sciencestudies(at)univie.ac.at
Tel: +43 1 4277-49609 or -49601
Fax: +43 1 4277-9496

---

**MobilityShifts: An International Future of Learning Summit**

**When:** October 10-16, 2011

**Where:** The New School, New York City

[http://mobilityshifts.org](http://mobilityshifts.org)

**Call for Workshops, Demonstrations, Panel Discussions and Short Talks**

**DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSIONS JULY 1, 2011**

**MOBILITYSHIFTs SUBTHEMES:**

**DIGITAL FLUENCIES FOR A MOBILE WORLD**

- New pedagogical approaches for learning with mobile platforms;
- Mobile media for the creation of rich social contexts around learning activities;
- Revisiting the myth of the digital native;
- Histories of media literacy, the book, reading, and writing;
- Teaching user rights;
- Limitations of the “digital literacies” paradigm;
- Remix and responsibility; the ethics of database culture;

Comprised of a conference, exhibition, workshops, project demos and a theater performance, this summit will add an international layer to the existing debate about digital fluencies for a mobile world and learning outside the bounds of traditional institutions of higher education.

**APPLICATION GUIDELINES:**

MobilityShifts is now accepting applications in the following formats:

1) **Hands-on Workshops and Demonstrations**

(They will take place October 10-13.) Workshops and Demonstrations should provide an opportunity for hands-on exploration. They will be scheduled for **two hours** and should invite audience participation.

2) **Panel Discussions and Short Talks**

(October 13-16) Panel Discussions should bring together **four panelists** to include a mix of individuals working in diverse areas of research, theory and practice. Short Talks of up to ten minutes should focus on presenting work or research on a particular subject relevant to one of the three subthemes of the Summit.
Using locative media to expand learning beyond the classroom;
- Ubiquitous computing inside the traditional classroom;
- Collaborative learning as a fundamental model of pedagogy;
- Texts, tweets, and chats as new modes of writing;
- Smartphone video capture and the art of witnessing;
- Flash-mobbing, spontaneous gathering, and collective learning in a mobile world;
- Nostalgia for pre-mobile learning spaces

DO IT YOURSELF UNIVERSITIES: LEARNING WITHOUT A SCHOOL?
- The future of peer-to-peer learning networks, learning without walls/blended learning, sustainability, methods and social practices;
- Insertions, rearrangements and revamping within existing institutional frameworks: the Twenty-first Century University as global learning network;
- Failure of self-learning projects, barriers to the success of DIY U;
- Technical systems that facilitate relationships between non-monetary or reputation economies and DIY U (OpenBadges project);
- Challenges of selective and non-selective models of admission;
- Producing, locating and using openly accessible resources for learning such as public digital libraries, building educational digital infrastructures;
- Reframing knowledge, the educational turn in art;
- Histories of DIY learning;
- For-profit and non-profit education: certification for self-learning, mass customization of education, open access as business model;
- Models of peer-grading, updated visions of peer review, and peer-produced curriculum;
- Student occupations: Struggle as DIY learning

INNOVATIVE DIGITAL LEARNING PROJECTS WORLDWIDE
- Expand the definition of digital learning informed by projects from outside the United States;
- Examples of practitioners in countries outside of North America and Europe serving as digital innovators;
- Reshape our curricula and pedagogical practices for a transnational digital fluency;
- The Twenty-first Century University as global learning network

PROPOSAL FORMAT.
Proposals for workshops, demonstrations & panel discussions should include:
1) Names of key presenters or panelists
2) Institutional affiliations
3) 150 word biography for Workshop/Panel Chair
4) Identification of conference subtheme to be covered (Digital Fluencies for a Mobile World, DIY U: Learning Without a School?, or Digital Learning Projects Globally)
5) Narrative describing topical orientation, format (e.g., panel discussion, presentation followed by group activity and discussion), as well as how the session addresses the overall conference focus and/or one of the three conference subthemes. Narrative should be 500 words or less.
6) MobilityShifts explores the summit as a site of production. What will be the outcome of your contribution (e.g., mini-manifestos, sprint publications, video interviews and other documents)?
7) Submissions will be accepted in Word document format (.doc or .docx) ONLY.
8) Submit to digitalculture [@] newschool.edu with the chosen subtheme in the subject line

Proposal for short talks should include:
1) Name of key presenter
2) Institutional affiliations
3) 150 word biography for key presenter
4) Identification of conference subtheme to be covered (Digital Fluencies for a Mobile World, DIY U: Learning Without a School?, or Digital Learning Projects Globally)
5) Narrative describing theme, format (e.g., panel discussion, presentation followed by discussion), as well as how the session addresses the overall conference focus and/or
one of the three conference subthemes. The narrative should be 250 words or less.

6) Submissions will be accepted in Word document format ONLY (.doc or .docx).
7) Submit to digitalculture [@] newschool.edu with the chosen subtheme in the subject heading.
(Ex.: Digital Fluencies for a Mobile World Proposal)
8) Each individual will be limited to participation on no more than two panels at the summit. Participants will be expected to fund their own travel and accommodation. The registration fee will not be waived.
APPLICATION DEADLINE IS JULY 1, 2011, 11:59 PM (EST).
AUGUST 15 - PROPOSAL NOTIFICATIONS WILL BE SENT.

Drawing on New York City’s strengths as a global hub for learning, innovation and design, the summit will showcase theories, people and projects making unexpected connections between self-learning, mobile platforms and the Open Web. Learn, discuss, laugh, write mini-manifestos, record videos, conduct interviews and meet future collaborators.

Chair: Trebor Scholz
Co-Chairs: Elizabeth Losh, Edward Keller, David Theo Goldberg, Matthew K. Gold, Sean Dockray
Steering Committee: Arien Mack, Katie Salen, McKenzie Wark

MobilityShifts is part of The New School’s Politics of Digital Culture conference series. The summit builds on two previous events: The Drumbeat Festival in Barcelona (2010) and Digital Media and Learning 2011 in Los Angeles.

1st International Workshop on Values in Design - Building Bridges between RE, HCI & Ethics
To be held in conjunction with INTERACT 2011, 13th IFIP TC13 Conference on Human-Computer Interaction 6th of September, Lisbon, Portugal.
Submissions were due 10 June 2011
Workshop website: http://mmi.tudelft.nl/ValuesInDesign11/

ORGANIZERS
Christian Detweiler - Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
Alina Pommeranz - Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
Jeroen van den Hoven - Delft University of Technology, Delft, The Netherlands
Helen Nissenbaum - New York University, NYC, USA

AIMS AND SCOPE:
In working with stakeholder requirements or user needs in design, various design methods in requirements engineering and human computer interaction, in specific user-centred and value sensitive design, are finding ways to deal with “soft issues”, “social issues”, “people issues” or values. At the same time, applied ethics has begun to pay attention to design. We believe that many of the approaches could complement each other in useful ways. The aim of this workshop is to bring together people from different disciplines to share knowledge and insights about how to account for values in technology design, and to work towards integrating approaches.

The main theme is the interdisciplinary exchange of knowledge, experiences and new ideas on values in technology design. The following list reflects (but is not limited to these) possible topics:
- Designing for specific values (e.g. privacy, sustainability, trust, responsibility, ...)
- Experiences from value-oriented projects
- Value Sensitive Design (VSD)
- Value considerations in industry projects or product development
- Understanding and relating different notions of values
- Integrating value-oriented methods with software engineering/ design methods
- Accounting for values in experience-oriented designs, e.g. “fun” as a value
- Values used in evaluations of User Experience (UX)
- Dealing with soft issues, social issues, and people issues in requirements engineering
- Value-based requirements engineering
- Value elicitation & value tensions: dealing with a variety of stakeholder values
- Value elicitation: methods from different research fields
- (Digital) Tools for value elicitation
- Personal Informatics and values
- Capturing and reusing value knowledge (scenarios, design patterns, etc.)
- Values in Persuasive Technology and/or Ambient Intelligence
- Values in specific domains (health care, military, crisis management)
- Values in Intelligent Systems (e.g. for decision support or automated systems)

**FORMAT**

This is a one-day workshop divided into two parts. In the first half we will have four consecutive panel sessions: the values turn in design - “soft issues” in RE and UCD; the design turn in applied ethics; values across disciplines; and values in industry. Panels will be led by representatives in the respective field. Each panel will be initiated by short presentations by authors of accepted papers followed by a discussion with all workshop participants. In the second part, we will create groups of 4-5 participants with different backgrounds (RE, HCI and Ethics). Each group will be given a design case to work on using tools and methods proposed by the participants. The aim will be to create an overview of people issues, values, soft issues and (long term) social aspects emerging from each design case. In a debriefing session we will share experiences (regarding the cases and tools used) from the group work with all participants. Participants who wish to present their work as posters or demos will be given the opportunity to do so during the breaks.

**PAPER SUBMISSION & PUBLICATION**

We invite technologists, designers, and ethicists working on topics related to values in technology design to submit original papers of the following kinds:
- research papers describing recent results, user studies, study methods or ongoing work
- statements of interests or position papers describing novel ideas or perspectives
- papers describing novel systems, design cases or case studies from industry or academia

All papers should represent original and previously unpublished work currently not under review in any conference or journal. Papers will be peer-reviewed and will be selected by relevance and likelihood of stimulating and contributing to a discussion related to the workshop theme. All submissions must follow the Springer Lecture Notes template for Microsoft Word (.doc files only) ([http://interact2011.org/assets/files/SpringerLNCS-word%20format.zip](http://interact2011.org/assets/files/SpringerLNCS-word%20format.zip)). The maximum paper length is 8 pages, but shorter position papers are also welcome. Submit your paper electronically in PDF format to: [https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=vind11](https://www.easychair.org/conferences/?conf=vind11).

Authors of accepted papers must guarantee that their paper will be presented at the workshop. In agreement with the authors papers can be presented as short presentations during panel sessions, or as posters or demos whichever suits the content of the paper most.

Papers will be published in the workshop proceedings. A selection of accepted papers will be considered for publication in the Ethics and Information Technology Journal ([http://www.springer.com/computer/swe/journal/10676](http://www.springer.com/computer/swe/journal/10676)).

**PROGRAM COMMITTEE**

Catholijn Jonker, Man-Machine Interaction, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
David Keyson, Industrial Design, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands
Cees Midden, Human Technology Interaction, Eindhoven University of Technology, The Netherlands
Mark Neerincx, TNO, The Netherlands
Barbara Paech, Software Engineering, University of Heidelberg, Germany
Jens Riegelsberger, User Experience Team, Google, UK
As a result of an exceptionally strong response to our call for papers, the organising committee is pleased to announce the extension of the conference program by an additional half-day. This change will allow us to showcase better the many high-quality presentations proposed in the conference abstract submission process.

The new dates for the conference will be: Monday 3 to Wednesday 5, October 2011. A draft program will be available on the conference website soon.

Early bird registration rate closes Friday 10 June 2011.

Hosted by Contemporary Drug Problems, the School of Political and Social Inquiry at Monash University, the National Drug Research Institute at Curtin University, and the Centre for Population Health at the Burnet Institute, this conference will bring together leading international researchers in drug use and addiction studies from a range of research disciplines and methods - both qualitative and quantitative.


Conference Theme:
Over the past decades, emerging technosciences became inextricably entangled with both visions of specific societal futures and the ways these are, and can be, imagined. Analysts point towards the growing use of a rhetoric of promises, expectations and hopes when narrating, assessing and legitimising technoscientific change. The omnipresent vocabulary of emergence and novelty, which has become characteristic for technoscientific domains particularly to attract large scale funding and the shift from knowledge to innovation as objects to be governed (e.g. the EU's "Innovation Union 2020"), are but two indicators for wider sociotechnical changes.

At the same time we can also observe a change in practices how science, society and policy makers try to imagine, anticipate, colonize and tame futures. This becomes visible in a proliferation of contexts and modes of anticipatory work, such as scenario development, foresight exercises, or ethical assessments. Thus, we have to ask both how technoscientific futures govern contemporary societies and how the latter try to govern these futures.

There has been a flourishing of academic work participating in and analysing the
processes and practises of doing and undoing futures. So far, however, efforts have remained often fragmented. It thus seems promising to draw together work on different aspects and investigate them from a comparative perspective. Particular focus will be put on...

(1) the concrete discursive and material practices through which technoscientific futures are produced, distributed, assessed, negotiated, enforced or discarded;

(2) the conditions of access that define who participates in what ways in these processes and especially the governance of technoscientific futures;

(3) the importance of cultural differences and the 'travelling' of practices and futures across different 'boundaries' (disciplinary, between science, policy and society, or national/cultural);

(4) the role of social sciences and humanities in participating in, pushing or simply commenting on these future-related activities; and finally ...

(5) what does all this mean for the development of technosciences and societies as well as their relations?

This conference will address these issues above and seeks to combine advanced empirical analyses with broader theoretical reflection. By gathering research that addresses different regional-historical/cultural contexts, different methodological approaches and different technoscientific fields ranging from current emerging technologies such as nanotechnology, synthetic biology to the futures that emerged around past technologies (e.g. nuclear energy), the conference's explicit goal is to open up comparative perspectives and to contribute to a broader understanding of contemporary efforts to govern futures.

Main Conference Themes:
* Practices of creating, negotiating and managing technoscientific futures
* Participation in the imagination and creation of technoscientific futures (e.g. through public engagement)
* Impact of economies of promises/futures on knowledge production and innovation processes
* Role of social sciences and humanities in co-producing technoscientific futures (incl. debates concerning diverse methods of anticipating and assessing futures)
* Comparative dimensions in the production and distribution of socio-technical imaginaries and futures (especially tensions between the global and the local)

Follow the conference on twitter: http://twitter.com/governingfuture. The twitter feed will be updated with news on the conference. Also follow and participate in the online conference communication via twitter with the #govf11 hashtag.

This conference is organized within the research project "Making Futures Present". See: http://sciencestudies.univie.ac.at/en/research/making-futures-present-nano-and-society/

Contact:

futures.sciencestudies (at) univie.ac.at
Tel: +43 1 4277-49616 or -49601
Fax: +43 1 4277-9496

Ulrike Felt, Head of the Department of Social Studies of Science

---------------------------------------------------------------

Critical Studies in Peer Production. Call for articles for a special issue on Expanding the frontiers of hacking. Bio-punks, open hardware, and hackerspaces

Edited by: Johan Söderberg and Alessandro Delfanti
Call: abstract 500 words
Both theoretical and empirical contributions accepted.

During the past two decades, hacking has chiefly been associated with software development. This is now changing as new walks of life are being explored with a hacker mindset, thus bringing back to memory the origin of hacking in hardware development. Now as then, the hacker is characterised by an active approach to technology, undaunted by hierarchies and established knowledge, and finally a commitment to sharing information freely. In this special issue of Critical Studies in Peer Production, we will investigate how these ideas and practices are spreading. Two cases which have caught much attention in recent years are open hardware development and garage biology. The creation of hacker/maker-spaces in many cities around the world has
provided an infrastructure facilitating this development.

We are looking for both empirical and theoretical contributions which critically engage with this new phenomenon. Every kind of activity which relates to hacking is potentially of interest. Some theoretical questions which might be discussed in the light of this development include, but are not restricted to, the politics of hacking, the role of lay expertise, how the line between the community and markets is negotiated, how development projects are managed, and the legal implications of these practices. We welcome contributions from all the social sciences, including science & technology studies, design and art-practices, anthropology, legal studies, etc.

Interested authors should submit an abstract of 500 words by July 10, 2011. Authors of accepted papers will be notified by July 31. All papers will be subject to peer review before being published.

Abstracts should be sent to delfanti at sissa.it

Critical Studies in Peer Production (CSPP) is a new open access, online journal that focuses on the implications of peer production for social change. http://cspp.oekonux.org

------------------------

CALL FOR PAPERS: Cultures of Anatomical Collections, Leiden University, 15-18 February 2012
Deadline for proposals: 16 September 2011

The conference 'Cultures of Anatomical Collections' will explore anatomical preparations and collections (preparations of human material as well as wax- and other models) as important parts of our cultural heritage. This means that we treat them in a similar way as we would examine other historical artifacts stored in today's museum. Although the history of anatomy and anatomical illustrations has been a popular topic in the history of medicine during the last decade, the history of its material remains has been somewhat neglected. And yet, in particular when taking into account recent historiographies of materiality and medical practices, it offers challenging interdisciplinary questions on the history of anatomy as a whole. Possible topics include: How do the technical details of anatomical preparations tell us about the ideas of their maker? How do ideas on beauty and perfection shape preparations? How were preparations handled and used for teaching purposes? How does the interest of non-medical audiences shape anatomical preparations? On collections as a whole we can ask: How are particular collections built up? How do decisions of curators affect the build-up of collections? How does the housing of a collection affect its outlook and popularity?

For more information see: http://www.hum.leiden.edu/research/culturesofcollecting/news-events/events.html or contact Rina Knoeff on r.knoeff at hum.leidenuniv.nl

The fourteenth international four-day training on R&D Evaluation will be held on the campus of the University of Twente, the Netherlands on 3-6 October 2011.

The course has a long standing reputation as one of the few truly international courses on R&D evaluation, which brings together experts from leading institutes on R&D Evaluation and participants from European and non-European countries. The course offers lectures by experts, study of case material in small groups and international exchange of experiences. It is an excellent opportunity to learn about international best practices and the development in methods and applications of R&D Evaluation. Over 250 staff members from R&D organizations, young professional evaluators and researchers involved in evaluation from more than 20 countries have successfully participated in previous editions of the course.

This four-day course is organized by the Department of Science, Technology, and Policy Studies (STePS), of the University of Twente. Course directors are Stefan Kuhlmann and Gonzalo Ordóñez Matamoros. The team further includes lecturers from the Manchester Institute of Innovation Studies of the University of
Manchester, UK; Technopolis, a leading European consultancy for S&T policy; the School of Public Policy at Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta and the Rathenau Institute, The Hague.

Please find further details on:
http://www.mb.utwente.nl/steps/education/postgraduateprofessional/

For registration, the online registration form can be used!

May we ask you to mention this course also to your colleagues and others who might be interested.

Yours sincerely
Science Technology, and Policy Studies
Prof. Dr. Stefan Kuhlmann
Dr. Gonzalo Ordoñez Matamoros

If you are interested in synaesthetic curating and engagement with objects (by means of all senses), please note 'The Sensuous Object' workshop in Copenhagen 29-30 September.

‘The Sensuous Object’ is an interdisciplinary, participatory workshop concerned with ways we actually engage with objects and aimed at researchers in all disciplines interested in the materiality of actual artefacts and ways of understanding objects through all the senses.

Read more here:

Best wishes,
Thomas Soderqvist
Director, Medical Museion
Professor in History of Medicine, Department of Public Health
Director of Science Communication, Novo Nordisk Center for Basic Metabolic Research, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Copenhagen

ths at sund.ku.dk
http://www.corporeality.net/museion
http://www.mm.ku.dk/ommuseion/media/berjderesoderqvist.aspx
http://www.mm.ku.dk/
+45 2875 3801

Opportunities available

The Institute for Science, Innovation and Society (InSIS, Oxford) is looking for two full-time Postdoctoral Research Fellows to join the Oxford Programme for the Future of Cities. The posts are fixed-term for two years from the date of appointment.

Details: https://www.recruit.ox.ac.uk/pls/hrisliverecruit/erq_jobspec_version_4.display_form

Closing date for applications: **12.00 noon on Friday 8 July 2011**. We are keen for, sociologists, anthropologists, human geographers to apply.

Lecturer in Ecosystem Services

We wish to appoint an ambitious early career academic, with an enthusiasm for developing innovative research, as part of a wider initiative across the Lancaster Environment Centre (LEC) to develop interdisciplinary collaboration in the area of ecosystem services. We are open to a broad spectrum of research perspectives from across the natural and social sciences, and encourage candidates to propose how their distinctive expertise might contribute to this agenda.

**Closing date: Sunday 31st July 2011**

For more details see: https://hr-jobs.lancs.ac.uk/Vacancy.aspx?ref=A253
Professor Gordon Walker
Chair in Organisation Studies/Organisation Theory. Another job at Lancaster - I am sure there are suitable candidates on this list...

Organisation Work & Technology
Salary from £58,928 (Professorial Scale)
Closing Date: Friday 05 August 2011
Interview Date: To be confirmed
Reference: A254

Lancaster University Management School would like to appoint a Chair within the Department of Organisation, Work & Technology to develop research and teaching in the area of organisation studies, organization theory, and/or organisational behaviour. This post arises following the retirement of Professor Frank Blackler, and we seek a scholar of standing to join our collegial department.

We are keen to consider applicants working from the range of theoretical perspectives associated with contemporary organisation studies and organisational theory. We are interested in candidates with empirical interests in work and the workplace, widely defined; but also those who feel they can complement the existing research strengths of the department more broadly. You would be expected to contribute to the academic leadership of the department, including the development of junior colleagues, have an excellent publication record and external profile, and to attract research funding.

Informal inquiries can be made to Professor Bill Cooke: Tel. +44 (0) 1524 510957; b.cooke at lancaster.ac.uk; skype: billcooke

Department details can be found at: http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk/Departments/owt/

Faculty details can be found at: http://www.lums.lancs.ac.uk

AHRC Collaborative Doctoral Award at Goldsmiths and the Science Museum http://www.gold.ac.uk/computing/news/eventtitle,26663,en.php

Oramics – Electronic Music Precedents, Technology and Influence

This PhD project is focused on an iconic object within the history of British electronic music, Daphne Oram’s ‘Oramics Machine’, a unique music synthesizer developed during the 1960s by this founder of the BBC Radiophonic Workshop. The project is conceived to work out from a close reading of the surviving object, which is now in the Science Museum’s collections, to a full understanding of the origins and influence of Daphne Oram’s musical practice. At the moment, Oram’s relations to existing artistic and musical practice is only understood at the most general level; equally the extent and pathways of her influence on subsequent electronic and digital music practices require extensive study to be able to make a fair evaluation. The project will use the Daphne Oram archive of recordings and papers held at Goldsmiths to build on existing technical and musical studies to locate Oram and the machine within a variety of societal, technological and musical contexts.

The PhD student will be an enrolled student in the Department of Computing at Goldsmiths, University of London, and will also have staff status at the Science Museum. The studentship will be co-supervised by Dr Mick Grierson, from the Dept. of Computing and Dr John Drever, from the Dept. of Music at Goldsmiths, University of London, and by Dr Tim Boon, Chief Curator at the Science Museum.

For eligible candidates the award covers Home/EU tuition fees for three years and provides a maintenance award of at least £15,590 per year for three years (with an additional contribution of £3000 over three years from the Science Museum). The terms and conditions of the award will be those of the AHRC’s postgraduate studentships. Applicants
must therefore have a relevant connection with the United Kingdom, usually through residence. In addition to these amounts, the AHRC will pay an additional £500 per annum in April to students in receipt of a full award.

Applications are invited from suitably qualified and/or experienced candidates. A minimum of a 2.1 degree at undergraduate level is normally required in an appropriate subject area, plus a recognised postgraduate research degree or its equivalent in a relevant specialist area (e.g. music, electronics, modern history, cultural studies, history of science or technology, museum studies etc). In this case, a familiarity with electronics would be an advantage, though not necessarily essential, to the successful candidate. An ability to work both independently and as part of a team will be important to the success of the project.

Interested candidates are strongly recommended to contact either Dr Grierson or Dr Boon before making an application: m.grierson at gold.ac.uk and tim.boon at sciencemuseum.org.uk

Closing date: 1 July

This studentship has been funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council. You can read more about the scheme here: http://www.ahrc.ac.uk/FundingOpportunities/Pages/CollaborativeDoctoralAwards.aspx

All candidates must make a formal application for a PhD place at Goldsmiths. You can apply online<http://www.gold.ac.uk/apply/apply-online/>; go here for more information http://www.gold.ac.uk/pg/apply/

Candidates should indicate clearly that they are applying for the AHRC Collaborative PhD Studentship with the Science Museum, and should attach a full CV and short statement (max 1000 words) indicating their suitability for the project.

Short-listed candidates will be interviewed at the Science Museum in the second half of July.

The studentship commences on 26 September 2011.

Dr Tim Boon,
Chief Curator,
study, will write a grant application to fund a PhD-position. Possible research questions are: How do European policymakers, equality bodies, advocacy groups and other stakeholders make non-discrimination in insurance an official concern and which effects does this generate? What kind of 'logics' of justifications do the stakeholders involved use in advocating for or against non-discrimination legislation in insurance? How does this debate challenge notions of equality and solidarity in insurance? Specifically the area of interest is open with a preference for candidates interested in sociology of (non-)discrimination, debates over the politics of difference, sociology of law, politics of knowledge, bio-citizenship and the right to health care.

**Job description**

* Writing a grant application on the above mentioned topics;
* Participating in theoretical and empirical scientific research on the above mentioned topics;
* Publishing results in international scientific journals;
* Presenting findings at (international) conferences and seminars;
* Participating actively in the "Insurance in the age of non-discrimination" study, including contributions to field work and data collection.

**Candidate profile:**

* Completed or nearly completed master degree (MSc level or equivalent) in a relevant discipline (e.g. sociology, anthropology, science and technology studies or general social sciences);
* Demonstrable ambition to start a scientific career (e.g. by earlier publications, internships, international experience, extra-curricular activities);
* Interest in and feeling for qualitative empirical research;
* Excellent analytical skills, and commitment to conduct innovative research at the intersection of social sciences, law and insurance market practices;
* Good writing qualities;
* Excellent mastery of English in speech and writing, sufficient mastery of Dutch

**Conditions of Employment**

The candidate will be offered a fixed term contract for a period of 18 months for 0.8 fte starting as soon as possible. You will be employed by Maastricht University, CAPHRI. Conditional on the grant application written during this period being successful, a 36 month PhD contract might follow. The terms of employment are in accordance with the Dutch Collective Labour Agreement for Research Institutes ("CAO-onderzoeksinshellingen").

**Organisation**

[http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/](http://www.maastrichtuniversity.nl/)

Maastricht University is renowned for its unique, innovative, problem-based learning system, which is characterized by a small-scale and student-oriented approach. Research at UM is characterized by a multidisciplinary and thematic approach, and is concentrated in research institutes and schools. Maastricht University has around 14,500 students and 3,800 employees. Reflecting the university's strong international profile, a fair amount of both students and staff are from abroad. The university hosts 6 faculties: Faculty of Health, Medicine and Life Sciences, Faculty of Law, School of Business and Economics, Faculty of Humanities and Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Faculty of Psychology and Neuroscience.

**Department:**

Department of Health, Ethics & Society (HES)

The candidate will be a member of the Department of Health, Ethics & Society (HES), in the research school CAPHRI. The Department has a strong multidisciplinary character, with members working in the field of law, sociology, ethics, philosophy and history of medicine. The Department's research focuses on the societal and normative dimensions of health care and public health. The interaction between scientific knowledge and technological innovation on the one hand and societal trends on the other is studied, as well as the implications of these interactions for the distribution of responsibilities and rights between professionals, citizens and patients, society and politics. The candidate will be offered a professional context for his/her research by CAPHRI's Center of Excellence.
Application:
Applications, including an application letter, detailed curriculum vitae and mentioning the vacancy number, should be sent to pzfdgvcatures at facburfdg.unimaas.nl, before July 4 2011. For more information, please contact: Dr. Ine Van Hoyweghen (i.vanhoyweghen at maastrichtuniversity.nl) (project leader).

IFRIS Call for Applications for Post Doctoral Grants under its Strategic Research Orientations (SROs) Programme
Deadline: July 15 2011

4 post-doctoral positions are available at the French Institute “Research, Innovation, Society” (Institut Francilien Recherche, Innovation, Société - www.ifris.org). The post-doc fellows selected will undertake an original research project in one of the IFRIS Strategic Research Orientations (SROs):
- New explorations on innovation processes ("Responsible" innovation, “Social” innovation, Transitions, ...)
- Regimes and institutions of knowledge
- Science and governance, Scales of government, Earthly Politics
- Construction of futures.

For more information on IFRIS Strategic Research Orientations (SROs), please visit http://www.ifris.org/spip.php?article221

Post-doc fellows will be hosted by one of the IFRIS Research Groups:
- CAK (Centre Alexandre Koyré) http://www.koyre.cnrs.fr/, contact: Dominique Pestre (pestre at eheiss.fr), Amy Dahan (Amy.Dahan-Dalmedico at damesme.cnrs.fr)
- CERMES (Centre de recherche Médecine, Sciences, Santé et Société) http://www.vjf.cnrs.fr/kermes/, Contact: Jean-Paul Gaudillère (gaudilli at vjf.cnrs.fr)
- CSO (Centre de Sociologie des Organisations) http://www.cso.edu/home.asp

Requirements:
Researchers must hold a doctoral degree or have fulfilled all the obligations of a PhD (certified by their supervisor) in a field relevant to the IFRIS SROs.

Applications:
Formal applications will include:
- A one page resume/CV
- A list of publications
- A statement of proposed research (in English, up to 1500 words) including a (preliminary/provisional) budget for travel expenses
- A letter by a member of the hosting research group.

Candidates will also name two referees and make sure that their referees send their letters in due time.

Applications will be sent to Valérie Duband, IFRIS (Valerie.Duband at univ-mlv.fr).
Deadline for applications is 15 July 2011.
Technology and Society. As yet the position has not been announced but this notification is posted as it will be, in February 2011, before this website is updated again.

For information about the Department of Technology and Social Change, please see: http://www.tema.liu.se/tema-t?l=en&sc=true. This is also where the position will be advertised in February 2011. For further information, please contact Jenny Palm (jenny.palm@liu.se).

The Innovation Studies Group at Utrecht University would like to draw your attention to these upcoming positions and invite interested candidates to contact Dr. Alexander Peine (e-mail: a.peine@geo.uu.nl; Tel: +31 30 2532782) or Prof. Dr. Harro van Lente (e-mail: h.vanlente@geo.uu.nl); Tel: +31 30 2537807).

Post-doctoral position: Socio-technical scenarios and strategy articulation in the fields of Nanomedicine and energy (full-time for the duration of 18 months). While the shape of nanotechnology applications and their eventual embedding in society and economy are uncertain, controlled speculation about applications and impact is possible with the help of socio-technical scenarios (see the results of the TA NanoNed program, www.nanoned.nl). Socio-technical scenarios as a constructive technology assessment approach build on insights from science, technology and innovation studies and on stakeholder knowledge. The postdoc will develop scenarios and organize stakeholder workshops aimed at articulation of strategic implications and potential impacts in the areas of Nanomedicine and energy. The project will be conducted in cooperation with a parallel project at the University of Twente. PhD-positions: Articulation of sustainability in Nanomedicine and energy (full-time for the duration of 4 years). The PhD project will explore the co-evolution of nanotechnology and articulations of sustainability in the fields of Nanomedicine and energy. While it is common knowledge that technology co-evolves with societal and individual needs, little is known about the early dynamics of this co-evolution. This project strives to illuminate these early dynamics by zooming in on the articulation of sustainability in the two complementary fields of Nanomedicine, where sustainability is related to the increasing pressure on health care systems in aging societies, and energy, where sustainability is defined by the quest to alter current regimes of energy production and use. To this end, the project will address how these broad ideas of sustainability are articulated and translated into more concrete ideas of “needs” as they are aligned with forms and definitions of nanotechnology in the ongoing streams of R&D activities and projects in the field.

The Leo Apostel Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies (Brussels University) offers Post Doc positions and PhD scholarships in a broad range of research fields including science and technology studies. See http://www.vub.ac.be/CLEA/news/joboffers.

News from the field

Dear colleagues

We are pleased to share some brief updates on our work which we hope will be of interest to you.

Behaviour and Practice Research Group launched

The Behaviour and Practice Research Group is based in the Business School at Kingston University. The group has two key objectives: the development of interdisciplinary
theoretical and conceptual insights that emphasise the social dimensions of the shaping of behaviour and practice, and the development, implementation and evaluation of new interventions that employ these insights. The group brings together the Smart Communities and CHARM projects, and other work.

More about the BPRG
http://business.kingston.ac.uk/research/research-groups/behaviour-and-practice-research-group

Smart Communities launched
Smart Communities, funded by the RCUK/ESRC Energy and Communities Collaborative Venture, is a community action project that applies practice theory with the objective of reducing household energy consumption. The project was launched by local MP Zac Goldsmith at a celebration event on 27 May 2011.

More about Smart Communities
http://www.smartcommunities.org.uk/

More about the launch

All three CHARM studies underway
CHARM, funded by the EPSRC/RCUK Digital Economy Programme, examines the ways in which sophisticated digital technologies can be employed as tools within the social norm approach. CHARM conference papers and working papers can now be downloaded from the CHARM website.

More about CHARM:
http://www.projectcharm.info/

Practices and the environment: performing sustainability and doing STS
We are pleased to share some of the presentations from the Practices and the environment: performing sustainability and doing STS track that was organised by the research group at the European Association for the Study of Science and Technology (EASST) conference in Trento, in September, 2010.

More about the track:
http://business.kingston.ac.uk/easst-track

PhD study in BPRG
The BPRG invites high quality applications for PhD study in relevant areas. We would be grateful if you could forward this message to any appropriate Masters students or cohorts. For discussions of PhD study, please contact
Ruth Rettie: r.rettie at kingston.ac.uk or
Kevin Burchell: k.burchell at kingston.ac.uk

With best wishes,
Professor Ruth Rettie, Director
Dr Kevin Burchell, Deputy Director
bprg at kingston.ac.uk

The British Society for the History of Mathematics is pleased to announce the biennial Neumann Prize for 2011. The prize is awarded for a book in English (including books in translation) dealing with the history of mathematics, aimed at a broad audience and published in 2009 or later. The prize is named in honour of Peter M. Neumann O.B.E., a former President and longstanding contributor to the Society. The winner of the prize of £600 will be announced in autumn 2011. Nominations for the prize are invited from individuals and publishers. Nominations should be sent to the chair of the judging panel, Martin Campbell-Kelly at m.campbell-kelly@warwick.ac.uk. Publishers should send three copies of their nominated book(s) to Professor Martin Campbell-Kelly, Chair: BSHM Neumann Prize, Department of Computer Science, Warwick University, Coventry CV4 7AL, United Kingdom.
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