and either the humanities or social sciences, such as science studies. Disciplinary specialization is open. Teaching experience and active engagement in scholarship required. Ph.D must be conferred by August 7, 2003 to be appointed as Assistant Professor. Interest in interdisciplinary curriculum development preferred. To apply, send a letter of interest that addresses the interdisciplinary nature of your scholarship and teaching; a Curriculum Vitae; three reference letters; and a sample of scholarship to the address below. Applications must be received no later than January 1, 2003. According to Florida Law, applications and meetings regarding them are open to the public. For ADA accommodations, please contact Selafani Louis-Henee at (813) 974-2519 at least five working days prior to need. USF is an AA/EEO Institution. Dr. William Cummings, Interdisciplinary Studies, 4202 E Fowler Avenue; FOB 270, University of South Florida, Tampa, FL 33620, USA. Phone: (813) 974-1087, Fax: (813) 974-5190, email: wcummin3@ufl.edu

Cornell University's Department of Science & Technology Studies invites applications for Assistant Professor, tenure-tracked, beginning Fall 2003. Area of specialization: history of modern physical sciences. Preference will be given to candidates working on topics in 20th-century science and technology, including aspects of the politics of science. Ph.D. in history of science, science & technology studies, or equivalent field is required by start of appointment. The successful candidate will bring the integrative approaches of science & technology studies (drawing on history, philosophy, sociology, and politics) to her/his work. Full contribution to the department's research and teaching programs, both graduate and undergraduate, in the candidate's area of specialization is central to the position. Applications from women and members of minority groups are strongly encouraged. Candidates should submit: a) a letter of application explaining the relation of their research and teaching interest to the requirements of the position; b) a curriculum vitae; c) a sample of written work; and d) sample course syllabi. Candidates should arrange to have three letters of recommendation sent directly to the Committee chair. Application materials should be submitted to: Professor Peter Dear, Chair, Search Committee, Department of Science & Technology Studies, 622 Clark Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, U.S.A. Telephone: (607) 255-6236; Fax: (607) 255-6044; e-mail: jly5@cornell.edu. Application deadline: January 1, 2003. Cornell University is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer. http://www.sats.cornell.edu/

The Division of Social Science, Hong Kong University, invites applications for an Assistant Professor position in the field of Science and Technology Studies, to begin Fall 2003. The Division is seeking candidates with a demonstrated research excellence in science and technology studies, in particular with a focus on China or Pacific Asia. The position is open to candidates with a background in any social science discipline, but we are particularly keen to recruit a colleague who can contribute with interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching to the division's activities related to Asian innovation systems. Salary is highly competitive with generous benefits. Applicants should send a letter of interest, curriculum vitae, samples of published work and three letters of recommendation; other materials will be requested if needed. Applications will be screened beginning Monday, January 13, 2003. All materials and correspondence should be addressed to: Chair, Search Committee for Position in Science and Technology Studies, Division of Social Science, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Clear Water Bay, Kowloon, Hong Kong [Fax: (852) 2355-0014; Email: sojo@ust.hk]. For more information see http://www.ust.hk/~websoc/.
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Contensive Science - discussing the politics of science

by Paul Wouters, Aant Elzinga and Annemiek Nelsi
Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences, University of Goeteborg, University of Amsterdam

Since the constructivist turn in the sociology of scientific knowledge, it is no longer possible to speak about the relationship between science and politics. Whereas in the older tradition of the sociology of science, one could metaphorically describe the political dimension of research and the political role of scientists as an interface between two different social institutions - each with their specific norms, processes and procedures, this is hardly tenable from a perspective which stresses the constructedness of knowledge. There are several reasons for this. Political considerations have been shown to play a formative role in the production of scientific knowledge which has resulted in the notion that scientific knowledge is always political through and through. The same constructivist turn has not only recreated science as a political phenomenon, but has also redefined the political itself. Both science and politics seem to have been reconstructed as networks of power with humans and artefacts as the nodes and symbolic and material translation processes as the links between the nodes.

This does create a problem, though, it becomes necessary to analyze the co-production of science and social order(s). If everything plays around in a seamless web, how can we sensibly speak about the politics of science except in the thick description of case studies? Or does it not make sense anymore to try to make generalised statements about the politics of science? This would be rather ironic since scientific research seems to have become more controversial than ever.

This was the theme of two workshops organised by the Dutch graduate school Science, Technology and Modern Culture WOTMC. The first, the Summer School, was held in September 2001, the other in May this year. We wished to discuss with the PhD students how one could analyse the political plays carried out by scientific experts and indeed by research itself and also how one could systematically study the influence of political processes in knowledge creation. This is the more pertinent since PhD students are increasingly confronted with situations in which they are asked to advise the public in controversies relating to new technologies and state of the art research. At least this is our experience in the Netherlands: the media and public institutes in general are quite interested in students of science, including PhD students, doing case studies on, for example, new reproductive technologies, the use of scientific expertise in parliamentary debates about drug policies, or the future of cloning humans and their tissues.

The central question around which the Summer School turned out to revolve is one of language: how can one in present-day "social studies of science speak" conceptualise the political without falling back to positions that are either implicitly or explicitly based on models of the political or of science that we have been deconstructing? We do not think that we have found a solution, although several candidates did turn up. The extent of the problem was clearly demonstrated in a role-playing exercise the PhD students did for a whole day. The challenge was to play out a scientific hearing to inform a jury that had to judge the credibility of the science used to back up statements about global warming put forward on the tables of political decision makers. The jury consisted of experts from different fields. They had to write a report to their governments clarifying whether a phenomenon like global warming actually exists and what course of action the government should take in the light of these conclusions. In the course of the hearing, the dispute about whether or not global warming exists, and if so what causes it, raged between the experts from the relevant scientific fields, social movements and interested parties. The PhD students had read the documents from the (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) IPCC climate conference and the statements by the different parties before the exercise. Hence, they were thoroughly familiar with the line of reasoning on which they had to play out. Therefore it was no big surprise that the PhD students did their job very well. It was striking, we think, how all cliché-models of the political dimensions of scientific research dominated the discourse. The rationalist model in which "good science" should underpin and determine the political course of action; the
cynical model in which every political movement or act of a politician can tailor the science to their needs and find the appropriate scientific spokes person; and the legal model in which scientific arguments are one of the many different arguments that should be weighed against other considerations.

The naive self becomes an exemplar of the latter. Given the fact that the majority of the PhD students were Dutch, it may come as no big surprise that social contract was the main motif that drove the actions of the jury and the different parties alike. More surprising was that it proved very difficult for the participants to actually mobilize the insights generated by the last decades of science studies in this dispute. The approach that comes closest seems to be the co-production of knowledge model (Callon, 1999), which enables one to seamlessly include actors other than researchers and to equalize influences no matter what their motive. One pays a price for this, though: the actor-network theoretical perspective effectively represents all movements in one dimension. Therefore it makes by definition invisible analytical distinctions between different types of institutions or social domains. This is the same problem brought up by early critics of Latour that ANT effectively represents all scientists as political actors and science as politics. We take the had on the problem in the Summum school was that of the thought figure. We proposed to see the different models and mid-level theories about recent developments in the scientific system model B (Gibbons et al., 1994; Nowotny, Scott, & Gibbons, 2001); triple helix (Leydesdorff & Etzkowitz, 1996; Etzkowitz & Leydesdorff, 2000), and neo-normal science (Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1995; Funtowicz & Ravetz, 1999; Ravetz, 1999); strategic science (Creswell, Healey, Rip, & Ziman, 1990; Rip, 2002); and coproduction science (Callon, 1999) as thought figures of political science. This means that images of the interplay of science and politics were understood in two-tier fashion, as at one and the same time involving epistemic claims about natural and social realities, and as cultural goods through which institutional and actor-group identities are actively shaped in tandem with reconfigurations of institutions, networks and agency.

Earlier policy models, like the so-called linear model of innovation, Don K. Price's "truth speaks to power", or Robert Merton's CUDOS model, all had clear boundaries between science and society and were predicated on powerful metaphors that assumed clearcut boundaries between science and society. They can be seen as the product of a post-World War II social epistemology, but were once considered to have come to function as social facts despite an amnesic picture of the states of affairs they were supposed to portray. In present discussions regarding the "new production of knowledge" or a "new social contract for science" the earlier images and metaphors are being replaced by new ones, this time predicated on a social epistemology informed by globalisation and fusion of different stakeholders. The new models and metaphors are no less amnesic than their predecessors, but given the new context they serve to reinforce and legitimate new institutional arrangements where the accent is on hybridity and porosity.

The models and metaphors are nevertheless part and parcel of new forms of boundary work, this time in a co-production of "metascience", social organisation and economics of research in society at various levels (micro, meso, macro) that ought to be the units of analysis for a more reflective mode of "new science policy studies" (SPS). Since the learning lies in reflection-in-action it is not unusual to find some of the scholars in this field playing a double role, for example as participant observers and experts in research foresight, social constructive technology assessment, consensus conferencing on new technologies (e.g. nanotechnology), and ethical, legal and social aspects of science (ELSA) pertaining to opportunities and threats in the funding of, for example biotechnology (cloning, GMO-foods). In such processes STS scholars may have an important role in generating critical science policy knowledge in the very process of advising decision-makers. Therewith we come a full circle, as we are confronted with the same types of problems faced by our colleagues in the natural and social sciences that interact with politicians in the domain of global changes where climate is both research and politics. Of course, this creates tensions between the participant/advisory role and the reflective/analyst role, as the role play in our Summer School demonstrated. How do actors including scholars in our field themselves solve these tensions? This is apparently a question quite relevant to understanding the politics of knowledge making, yet one that cannot be answered by the usually rather abstract studies of mode B or triple helix interactions at the systemic level. It asks for case studies, either focused on the actors involved or on the communication between the actors.

This was the theme of the second workshop on the politics of science (Workshop Heterogenous Knowledge Practices) which we organised May this year. The question we put central in the
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How Not to Think About Biotechnology

by Andrew Jamison

A review of *Our Posthuman Future*, by Francis Fukuyama (Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002)

Americans, it is sometimes said, have had a love-affair with science and technology for well over 200 years. Already back in the revolutionary period, the American national identity came to be associated with technical progress: Benjamin Franklin discovered electricity and was an enterprising craftsman as well as a "founding father"; and Thomas Jefferson was an architect and scientist, as well as the author of the Declaration of Independence.

Later on, as the mallees were defeated and the vast open plains were cultivated, it was machinery that paved the way: the mass-produced guns used by the cavalry in the Indian wars, the railroads that made it possible to move the population across the frontier, and then, in the 20th century, it was the automobile, electrification and the computer industry that, more than anything else, have come to define Americanism. In the United States, human development came to be seen in technological terms, and, as Ronald Reagan used to say back in the 1950s when he was a television announcer for the General Electric company, "progress is our most important product."

But, then, of course the sixties happened, and for a brief moment the love-affair with technology turned sour. It became socially acceptable to criticize technology, and, as in Sweden, nuclear power plants and a few other symbols of progress were challenged by the emerging environmental movement, and, in some cases, technological development was actually curtailed. A group of activists even burned a car on the first Earth Day in 1970.

But the technology lovers quickly bounced back, with new toys and new products that they could manufacture and sell. And as in earlier periods of technological development - what economic historians call "long waves" - the radical innovations of the 1970s, in particular, the personal computer and genetic engineering, have simultaneously given rise to huge industries and to enormous amounts of hype. Information technology and biotechnology are seen by many pundits as the driving forces in a new era of economic expansion, and, as in the past, the new technology is glorified throughout the American society, and, for that matter, the increasingly Americanized rest of the world.

The problem, however, is that many people, in the United States and elsewhere, simply don't like genetic engineering, or see any particular reason for its development other than corporate greed and commercial hubris. At least computers can be fun; you can play games on them. But genetic engineering isn't necessarily fun. It is more a matter of solutions looking for problems to solve. Ever since that day in 1972, when scientists managed to transfer some genetic material from one organism to another in a laboratory in California, the genetic manipulators have been looking for ways to make money out of their newly discovered technologies. And almost everywhere they have looked they have run up against opposition - from environmentalists, small farmers, the religious minded, and all those people who would simply not like to have to decide whether or not to check out the genes of their forthcoming babies. Genetic engineering has raised economic problems, environmental problems, and, of course, a range of ethical and moral problems that primarily have to do with power relations, and, more specifically, with who is to have power and control over processes of life.

Now Francis Fukuyama comes along and tells us that the real problem with genetic technology has to do with political philosophy. Like the good established American academic that he is, Fukuyama loves not only technology but he also loves the American constitution - that highly flawed document, which contains a lot of talk about human rights and human nature, but not a word about slavery. What bothers Fukuyama about genetic engineering is that all that "rights" talk simple becomes irrelevant and meaningless now that the genetic manipulators are able to change the meaning of being human. All of the other economic and environmental issues pale by comparison to this fundamental issue of "posthumanity".

Fukuyama has made a name for himself by having big thoughts, and this time, as in his earlier books, he is both inspiring and silly in just about equal doses. The inspiring part is that he provides an interesting and well-written overview of the whole debate about the genetic determinism of human behavior, which has been raging for quite awhile. There is a basic disagreement among scientists about what role the so-called genetic code actually plays in human behavior, and Fukuyama presents the debate in a readable, if overly opinionated manner (he's on the side of the genetic determinists). He also has some thoughtful things to say about the new sorts of personality-affecting drugs - Prozac and Ritalin, in particular - and again covers a wide range of literature about their costs and benefits. Perhaps most inspiring of all is the opaqueness he shows about how to deal with the challenges of biotechnology. He rightly criticizes the fact that in the United States, as opposed to Europe, there are no proper regulatory institutions in place - neither laws, government agencies, technology assessment boards (that was closed down in 1995), ethical commissions, or even ethical rules for companies - all of which exist, in one way or another, in many, but certainly not all European countries. He also challenges what might be called the conventional wisdom in the United States, namely that policy making is best left to the private marketplace, and that consumers are the ultimate decision-makers.

But the words of inspiration tend to get cancelled out by the silliness, and, in particular, the strange idea of a universal human nature that Fukuyama would have us believe hasn't changed in any fundamental way since the time of Aristotle, the guru of all Western political philosophers. The problem with that, of course, is that Aristotle, and Thomas Jefferson, as well, for that matter - another Fukuyama hero - lived in slave societies, and their idea of human nature, among other things, didn't involve working for a living. Slaves by definition were not humans, and, with such a point of departure, their political ideas strike me as somewhat inappropriate for dealing with genetic engineering. Indeed, it seems to me that we need to think about the political aspects of biotechnology in a very different manner than Fukuyama.

The real challenge of genetic engineering is that powerful techniques for manipulating elements of living organisms are almost entirely out of public control and access. In keeping with the dominant neo-liberal belief system of our time, our politicians have given private commercial companies the right to experiment with these powerful techniques without much in the way of public oversight. Making
The Issue Crawler: the Makiings of Live Social Science on the Web

by Richard Rogers

The Issue Crawler project at http://govcom.org/one.world is really three in one - a software, visualisation project and 'live' social science project. Where the first, the software project, is concerned, we have built the Issue Crawler - a remote, server-side machine, operated through a desktop browser, that crawls a set of specified sites, brings back the sites' outgoing links, looks for common outgoing links (the co-links) in up to three iterations, and delivers the co-links by domain name (e.g., greenpeace.org) and by top- and second-level domain suffix (gov, com, org, edu, and their country-specific, subdomain equivalents) to an XML file. The Issue Crawler output, the XML file, is rendered into maps, dubbed 'issue network' maps; they make up an issue network atlas in an archive. These maps capture the state of a network of heterogenous actors, configuring around an issue. Finally, we are able automatically schedule regular queries on the crucial networks to watch them evolve over time.

I first hired two designers, graduates of the Design Academy in Eindhoven, to do not only the look, feel and object design of the piece of software as well as the entire site, but to deal with the myriad problems of navigation and use. But designers' work at this early stage, former students of mine from the University of Vienna, who'd already suffered through 3 of my classes and who understand the theory and method of network location and issue mapping. These folks would be the co-cartographers and the user-testers, and attend a series of four mapping workshops on the Social Life of Issues, where we would push the theory and standardise the practice. (See http://www.govcom.org/workshops.html)

The Narrative Specification defined a 'narrative algorithm' which crawls sites, and returns co-links. It was specified to bring back not co-sites, but co-pages. This was the first conundrum. If you generate a map of relevant pages related to an issue, and more than one of those pages come from a single organisational site, the map may look strange. What's Greenpeace doing on the map three times? On the other hand, we are looking for the most relevant material on the web per issue. If greenpeace or one.world is hosting a set of distinct sites, then we don't want the crawler to bring back 3 greenpeace sites, and 4 one.world sites, if greenpeace and one.world are only hosting others - organizations divided from a mother host by a mere slash. Then you'd have quite the inaccurate picture. So the solution is two-fold. We build a 'switch' that allows the cartographer to 'match pages' or 'match sites', and once the network is returned to you, you may 'edit' it. If you've matched pages, you select the page of a site that appears most frequently, so there's only one site per map, but with the most relevant page. If you match sites, you return the double sites. For the greenpeace case cited above, you can check for a network in two ways (pages the first time, sites the second time, say), compare them, and be reasonably assured that eventually you have the right nodes for the map.

Building in switches - allowing one or another method to be employed by virtue of turning on and off particular settings - has been our solution to many of the other conundrums. For example, the Narrative Specification also called for the starting points to be privileged. Starting points are a set of URL-s one enters initially into the software, to begin building a network of interlinked sites. Starting points are privileged in that you find their external links, and then you crawl the starting points and the links together to find external links anew (which results in a set of actors, the 'pool' or 'population'). The next iteration of the co-link analysis returns your sample, in which you seek a 'network'. This 'biasing' of starting points is one 'brick' to the algorithm, for it ensures that the network you capture has a semblance of the starting points you entered. It meets some expectations of the issue network seeker, whilst also producing a few new unexpected actors in the outcomes. (It also assumes some sophistication in choosing the initial starting points.) The Amsterdam theorist was against this, for she believes in 'brutal co-link' and hard network location analysis (my phrases), whilst the project scientist (yours truly) believes that without privileged starting points you will get 'issue drift'. Given civil society, we both agree, is not really made up of single-issue actors (as old social movement theory has it), but rather of a more free-floating protest network potential (to paraphrase Heiddigger) that moves from issue to issue. If you do brutal co-link analysis, and only match sites, you run the risk of having the same network for every issue. In the event, we've built in a switch to allow both methods. Privileging starting points also allows you to find a classic social network around your starting points, i.e., the starting points plus those actors that have (linking) affiliations with at least two of the starting points.

Another example of the switch solution is the number of iterations one requires in order to find a network. By iterations, I mean the number of times a set of sites are crawled and common external links returned. It's the network location heuristic. The minimum requirement is 2 iterations (with or without starting points privileged), so we have made this the default setting. Also the depth of the crawls of the sites was an issue solved by a setting. So on the crawler interface, there is a number of settings ( privileging starting points [default=off], sampling iterations [default=2], crawl depth [default=2]). There's also a setting called 'one stopper', with the default off. This blacklist is a site/page exclusion list that excludes software download pages and the like. Some cartographers protested that you actually might wish to map this sort of 'issue', so we allow you to turn off the step list. A debate continues currently on whether you should be able to view that list (yes), but also edit it and save it anew (probably not). There you get into another kind of debate, i.e., whether any user or just the administrator or some kind of user in between can save a new blacklist, and then this blacklist becomes the default list, etc.

The moment a specification is changed or added for political or other 'vibe' reasons, it reverberates across the many other pieces of the puzzle.

The original project name is Live Issue Atlas, funded by the Internet Program of the Soros Foundation, New York. In discussions between Jonathan Peiter (of Soros) and myself before the grant was allocated, we debated whether the project was primarily about making a piece of software or making an issue atlas. My response was that we would make the software and the atlas, but the 'live' part would have to wait another day. In my view, an atlas, or a set of maps, becomes 'live' when they know when to refresh themselves. They would know to refresh themselves, I believe, if the network they're based on is hot, i.e., is increasing the frequency of its page modification behaviour, perhaps increasing the link density of its link network. In order to have a network (and a map) learn about itself well enough to refresh itself, it needs to first schedule a series of refreshing crawls, and note the differences in heat over time. The hotter it is in comparison to a set of previous crawls, the more frequently it should refresh itself. If it learns, the atlas is not only live, but it's also webby and self-reliant. It's webby in the sense that it is responding to the Web dynamics, and is responsive to web users, who would be singing for any number of (online and offline media) reasons that an issue is heating up. If the live atlas meets that expectation for those web users, then it's timely. (Perhaps it could be said to be performing live social science, as the first workshop brief put it.) Also, it could alert folks to particular issues heating up. Finally and perhaps most importantly, it's self-reliant - in the sense that it maintains itself, sort of like artificial life.

Some issues emerge if you try to design this, one of the larger of which is the effects of dynamic html. My solution was to exclude those pages from the refresh analysis whose timestamp is about the same time as the crawl was performed. We shall try to make the maps learn in future (here the famous phrase of the 'soil phase' comes to mind). For the time being we have built a scheduler for regularly scheduled refreshes. For operational reasons, that refresh schedule could be made shorter, what have you. Thus the atlas will not be 'live' in the sense above, but it will be able to show 'evolution' of an issue over time through the scheduler feature.

But refresh: One could plug the starting points back in, and determine quite wholesale changes, potentially, or, as our solution has it, especially after a long discussion with the Oneworld programmers (Cambridge University math graduates - this came in handy), we can note the smaller changes in the network (who's now in, who's now out), by taking the inputs of the last iteration and the new starting points. So, we are refreshing the 'network' on its own terms. The starting points become a little less relevant, and thus partially address some cartographers' concerns of bias in starting point selection, i.e., whether the 'network' is ultimately more a product of the starting points then web issue network dynamics.

Above, I mentioned the default number of iterations as well as the default crawl. This brings me to the most frustrating aspect of the software, and that's the speed at which it returns a query (and the planning, and administrator crawl...
Dear Members

As this was a conference year, we have had the opportunity to meet. Indeed, over 500 of us did so in York this summer. The conference was a huge success and again I would like to thank the Local Organising Committee from the Department of Sociology and the Science and Technology Studies Unit at the University of York for their hard work. I hope the hassle of your mother and your four-year effort has now faded and you remember only the good times. Further reports above that a conference can be found elsewhere in this issue of the Review and at the following url: www2.york.ac.uk/itss/astu/conf2002/report.htm

For the first time, we made it pretty well compulsory for conference participants to become members of EASSST. This had the utterly intended consequence of massively increasing our membership and our income. We have been struggling to keep the Review going the past couple of years (which is the main reason why we have had only three issues instead of four in 2001 and 2002). We hope we are now on a more even footing. Both the budget and our overall information strategy (the Review and the website primarily) are under review by the Council and we hope to have more news for you by the time of the next issue. If you have not already received a ballot paper for the Council elections by the time you receive this, you should do so very soon afterwards.

Thanked them during the conference dinner and again in the covering letter accompanying the ballot, but they cannot be thanked enough in my view. Yet again – thanks to Roland Bal, Ann Radinow Sexton, Jane Summerton, Andrew Webster and Steven Yardley – who have served a four year term on Council. Each of them has made a great contribution to the work of EASSST over these past four years. They will be missed, but as you will see, there are more good people willing to fill their places. Please be sure to return the ballots to me by the end of the year.

Finally, some very sad news. On November 20, there was a fire at the University of Twente. Luckily, no one was hurt but our STS colleagues, and others at Twente, lost their offices and everything that was in them. Someone has been arrested on suspicion of arson. A few moments contemplating what your working life would be like if you suddenly lost all your books, notes, computer disks, etc. will give you some idea of how difficult things must be for our Twente colleagues. Please be patient if you were expecting anything from anyone there and consider donating copies of books or hard-to-obtain reports and other grey literature. Up-to-date information can be found on their website (http://www.atwente.nl).

Best wishes

Sally Wyatt
EASSST President
Conference Announcements and Calls for Papers

The International Society for History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology has issued a call for papers and sessions for IHSPPSB 2003, to be held at the University of Vienna, Austria on July 16-20, 2003. See also http://www.vifl.org/ishpspsubmissions/ IHPSSS2003.html. The deadline is February 1, 2003. While participants are strongly encouraged to submit proposals for Panels, Roundtables, Discussion Sessions, or innovative and experimental sessions, individual papers are welcome as well. All Proposals must include an organizer and his or her name, including an e-mail address. There will be some travel funds available to support graduate students presenting papers at the conference. For further information about available funding, please contact Keith Benson, IHSPPSB Treasurer, 13423 Burda Rd. SW, Vashon Island, WA 98070 USA; Phone: (206) 543-6358; email: krenson@uwashington.edu. The International Society for History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology (IHSPPSB) brings together scholars from diverse disciplines, including the life sciences as well as history, philosophy, and social studies of science. IHSPPSB summer meetings are known for innovative, exciting, inclusive, and productive sessions, and for fostering informal, co-operative exchanges and on-going collaborations. For further information consult the IHSPPSB web pages at http://www.vifl.org/ishpsps/ and/or Rob Skipper, IHSPPSB Program Chair 2003, Department of Philosophy, University of Cincinnati, 206 McMicken Hall, Cincinnati, OH 45221-0174 USA; Phone: (513) 556-6340; Fax: (513) 556-2939; email: skipper@email.uc.edu.

Academics, professionals and other interested parties are invited to submit chapter papers for a forthcoming book tentatively titled, The Social Aspects of Space Projects. This book will collate works from the social sciences devoted to celestial exploration from the myriad of social, political, cultural, philosophical, legal, ethical, and environmental problems and solutions that arise within the projects of all types. Subjects which might be suitable include, but are not limited to, the following: the values and motivations behind space exploration; the impact of space development on non-developed nations; the cultural meaning of the Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence; the political history of the Space Race; nuclear proliferation in space; environmental damage caused by space projects; public understanding of space science; war in space; the social construction of space technology; the use and abuse of international space law; gender, race and ethnic issues associated with space industry; and the impact of science fiction on space travel ideas. The editor will consider both unpublished and previously published papers subject to copyright clearance be prepared. Deadline for first draft (in electronic form) is January 31st, 2003. Authors and potential authors can contact the editor to discuss topics/length etc by writing to: Dr. Alan Marshall, Department of Sociology, Nizhni Novgorod State University, Nizhni Novgorod, Russia, Dr AlanMarshall@yahoo.co.uk.

The Fifth Annual St. Louis Philosophy of Social Science Roundtable is to be held on March 21-23, 2003 at the University of Missouri-St. Louis. Organized by James Bohman (St. Louis University), Paul Roth (University of Missouri-St. Louis) and Alyson Wylie (Washington University in St. Louis), the fifth in the series of annual working conferences on topics in philosophy of the social sciences continues a tradition of meetings that bring together a diverse group of philosophers and social scientists to discuss a wide range of philosophical issues raised in and by social research. Abstracts on any topic in philosophy of the social sciences are welcome. We plan to assemble a program of papers to be presented in workshop format so that intensive discussions can be the focus of the meeting. We choose papers with the aim of ensuring a broad mix of topics and of presenters from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. We particularly welcome contributions from junior colleagues and colleagues new to the area. In this spirit, we have established an alternate year policy for participants; in general, we will give preference to new contributors who presented papers at the previous year's Roundtable. Selected papers from the Roundtable will be published in an annual special issue of Philosophy of the Social Sciences (see any March issue of Philosophy of the Social Sciences from 2000 onward for papers from prior St. Louis Roundtables). Send a ONE-PAGE ABSTRACT to any of the organizers by DECEMBER 14, 2002. If you would like to be on an email distribution list for future meetings, send a note to this effect to Jim Bohman at the email address below. And be sure to check the Roundtable web site for news and updates: http://www.mmslu.edu/~phil8/roundtable.htm.

James Bohman, bohrman@ISL.U.edu; Paul Roth, rothm@umsl.edu, and Alyson Wylie, alysw@arts.wustl.edu.

Articles are invited for a theme issue of Knowledge, Technology & Policy on Terrorism and Technology Policy. The attacks of 11 September 2001 may not have been unimaginable but were certainly unexpected and deeply shocking. The subsequent war on terrorism, lead by the U.S.A. is still unfolding. KT&P would like to explore the technology policy issues inherent in fighting terrorism. We encourage general articles on terrorism and technology, putting recent events in the context of technology throughout time (from early civilization to predicted future threats) and geography (terrorism around the world). Specifically we are looking for papers that describe how technology has influenced terrorism, how terrorism has changed through the ages, the evolutionary role of information technology in terrorism, how information technology can be used to fight terrorism, and analysis of different technology policies to fight terrorism. For the general articles we encourage them to be focused on any area of philosophy of the social sciences are welcome. We plan to assemble a program of papers to be presented in workshop format so that intensive discussions can be the focus of the meeting. We choose papers with the aim of ensuring a broad mix of topics and of presenters from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. We particularly welcome contributions from junior colleagues and colleagues new to the area. In this spirit, we have established an alternate year policy for participants; in general, we will give preference to new contributors who presented papers at the previous year's Roundtable. Selected papers from the Roundtable will be published in an annual special issue of Philosophy of the Social Sciences (see any March issue of Philosophy of the Social Sciences from 2000 onward for papers from prior St. Louis Roundtables). Send a ONE-PAGE ABSTRACT to any of the organizers by DECEMBER 14, 2002. If you would like to be on an email distribution list for future meetings, send a note to this effect to Jim Bohman at the email address below. And be sure to check the Roundtable web site for news and updates: http://www.mmslu.edu/~phil8/roundtable.htm.

James Bohman, bohrman@ISL.U.edu; Paul Roth, rothm@umsl.edu, and Alyson Wylie, alysw@arts.wustl.edu.

objective is to give voice not only to stakeholders but also to other members of society in shaping future relationships between science, technology and society. When highly contentious public issues arise, in what context concrete ways can participation by different groups and individuals be assured - and legitimised? Where and how will issues concerning technological change be debated and negotiated? At which point and how should potentially controversial innovations be brought to the public arena? Will local communities in countries in Europe, learn from each other in handling these issues? And finally, what does this imply for a culturally diverse Europe in terms of appropriate structures and procedures? The conference will take place near the end of the three-year OPUS project in the EC 5th Framework Programme (Raising Public Awareness in Science and Technology in Europe). OPUS is focused on exchanging knowledge and conducting analytical inter-comparisons amongst the different "cultures" of science-society relations in six European countries. It aims at opening up debate and questioning future directions to take in this domain, at all levels of European governance. The conference will be organised around six themes: 1. The Politics of Public Understanding of Science (PUS): Enhancing the Public of Spaces Interaction with Science 3. Publics: Consumers or citizens? 4. Transferability of good practice? European Governance 5. Rethinking models of PUS for a European Research Area 6. PUS, Civil Society and European Governance. For more information visit http://www.univie.ac.at/wissenschaftsthorie/opus. For details contact Ulrike FEIT (ulrike.felty@uniwic.at) or Regina Danek (regina.danek@uniwic.at).

Innovation in Europe: Dynamics, Institutions and Values is the title of a conference at Roskilde University, Denmark, on 8th-9th May, 2003. A call for papers has been issued. With the ambition "to become the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world", the European Union has recently engaged in a series of policy initiatives towards fostering innovation and technological development. This is taking place at a time when some fundamental social dynamics related to the innovation process are in a process of rapid transformation, like for example, new regimes for knowledge production and appropriation, changing social values on science, the emerging information society, rapid development of private risk capital markets/industry. These parallel...
transformations, of policy and of social dynamics, are having a direct impact on the contemporary patterns of European innovation. The driving idea of this conference is to analyze the scientific, institutional, and values that characterize the innovation process and technological development in Europe, with special focus on the EU. The conference is particularly interested on papers that have a perspective on European/EU dynamics, multiple-country/comparative studies, or exceptionally national experiences that have a European relevance, in the following topics: 1. Systems of innovation, institutions and values in Europe; 2. Knowledge dynamics and co-operation; 3. Intellectual property rights; 4. Private financing and public-private partnership for innovation; 5. Risk society and the governance of science; 6. Innovation for competitiveness and cohesion; and 7. Information society. Extended abstracts of 1-2 pages should be submitted no later than December 1st, 2003 to Kenny Larsen at: kenny@nu.dk. Further information can be found at the conference website: http://www.segera.nu.dk/. The abstracts will be selected on the basis of their scientific excellence and relevance for the Conference, by a panel of experts made of the SEGERA-project partners. The decision will be communicated in January 2004. Registration to the conference will start on January 15th, 2003. Final paper submission is March 1st, 2003. The conference has the possibility of providing financial support for travel and accommodation to a maximum of 3 selected papers. A special session will be given to young researchers from the EU, and to Eastern European participants. Please, contact Kenny Larsen for further information about procedures.

The first Nordic post-graduate workshop in History of Science and Technology is to be held on May 3 to 5, 2003 in Bjerringbro, Denmark. In recent years, studies of the history of science and technology have been conducted in an increasing number of institutional settings and from a variety of different perspectives. In the Nordic countries, young historians of science and technology often find themselves in relative academic isolation - working on individual projects and located at decentralized academic milieus of limited size. To help extend the network and interchange recent ideas and results among Nordic post-graduates we are pleased to invite our young colleagues to participate in a Nordic post-graduate workshop in History of Science and Technology to be held in Bjerringbro, Denmark May 1 to 4, 2003. The workshop is open to all post-graduate colleagues (doktorander og doktorand-studerende, ph.d.- studerende, assistant professors, and other non- permanently employed researchers) working within the field of history of science and technology. Financial support for accommodation and travel expenses for the workshop programme has been secured from a number of generous sponsors. However, participants must pay their own transportation costs to Aarhus and a limited conference fee (DKK 300). The workshop takes the form of a residential workshop hosted by Norsgaard Hegspolke in Bjerringbro, Jutland. The Hegspolke presents rich academic and recreational facilities hopefully helping to further the networking of participants. To promote interactions and networking between the participants, the workshop has largely been modelled over the annual postgrad workshops of the British Society for the History of Science (BSHS). The workshop includes two invited lectures (Graeme J. N. Gooday, University of Leeds and Hanna Óstholm, Uppsala University) providing a historiographical and a Nordic perspective for the discussions. Each participant should prepare brief presentations of their current research project. Participants can also contribute a poster - in addition to or instead of the oral presentation. Additionally, the workshop program contains excursions to the Steno Museum (The Danish National Museum for the History of Science and Medicine), in Aarhus and to the Danish Museum of Electricity near Bjerringbro. For further information, send your submission to the congress website: http://www.ihv.au.dk/nordicworkshop. Deadline for registration: February 5, 2003.

The Cultural Politics of Human Experimentation is a one-day conference held at the Royal Institute for Advanced Science and Technology, The University of Tokyo, Japan, Building 13, Room 215, December 7, 2002, 9:45-17:30. See http://www.rcsat.a.u-tokyo.ac.jp/index.html. The workshop aims to look precisely back on some historical living-body texts as something never separated from normal medical treatments, to analyze scientific, political and ethical aspects of the tests, and criticize the medical ethics often reduced to personal morality such as the doctor-patient relationship, and to try to find a way to control runaway medical technologies.

The 8th European Congress of Psychology will hold its next meeting on 6 - 11 July 2003, Vienna, Austria. Organised by the Austrian Professional Association of Psychologists (BÖP, the body of the European Federation of Psychologists' Associations (EFP), the congress has as its them Networking. The conference is designed to constitute an international review of how psychology acts in dialogue with related disciplines. The Congress will provide a unique opportunity to bring together experts in the field of psychology and related fields to exchange ideas, information and the latest research findings. Keynote speakers will introduce a selection of important topics followed by symposia, parallel sessions and posters. Also we want to highlight the teaching seminars "Tools for Practitioners", which will offer an excellent opportunity to increase the level of familiarity with different areas of psychology. The Call for Papers posted in this list is to encourage submissions of abstracts especially to the topic Media/New Media. Other topics are: Organisational Psychology, Disaster Psychology, Health Psychology/Wellness, Life Span, Clinical Psychology, Psychotherapy and Political Psychology. The official language of the Congress is English. Presentations in the German language are possible but should not exceed one third of the programme. There will be no simultaneous translations. For further information see the congress website: www.psycopress.at or contact: info@psycopress.at.

Science, Its Advocates and Advocacies is the theme of the 2003 Summer Conference of the Institute of Contemporary British History at the IHR, University of London, 7-9 July 2003. From early science to science and technology and Medicine have profoundly affected all aspects of British life over the past century, from the kitchen to the battlefield, at work, at leisure, in town and country. The capacity to kill and the capacity to cure and to extend life have never grown faster. For much of the twentieth century these changes were generally greeted with enthusiasm and awe as unquestionable improvements and the experts responsible for them were held in respect, though there was always a strand of opposition, in particular to armaments. In the later twentieth century the previously dominant deference to scientific expertise was replaced by widespread scepticism of scientific and medical authority. The conference seeks to explore how this change came about within the wider context of discussing the production and application of scientific knowledge and its impact on British society. Topics to be considered might include:


Who are the scientists? Specific innovations and their impacts e.g. penicillin, silicon, pill, motor-cycle, the washing machine, the mobile phone; Household technology and women's lives; Communication and technological mediation; The environment; Popular attitudes to science, scientists and scientific expertise; R & D and the fortunes of the British Electric and Electronic Industries; Cultural Representations of science, technology and medicine. It should be stressed that we shall only accept papers which present original research. The conference will include a mixture of plenary speakers, panels and parallel seminars. Young researchers and postgraduates are particularly encouraged to apply. The deadline is 31 December 2002. Please send short proposals (no more than 300 words) for individual papers or panels to Dr Harriet Jones, ICBI, Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HU. Email: bjones@icbi.ac.uk. Electronic submission is preferred.

The Local and the Global: Contexts in Science and Technology, the Graduate Student Conference, is to be held in April 2003 at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Headquarters in Washington, DC. Abstracts are due by January 15, 2003. This conference is an opportunity for graduate students to present their research in areas concerning science, technology, and globalization, particularly as they relate to the concerns raised in the post-9/11 world. It will take place in conjunction with the annual NSF/SSAT colloquium. Abstracts (up to 250 words) for a 10-15 minute presentation should be submitted by January 30, 2003 to stg@aaas.org. Submission abstracts will receive a response by March 1, 2003. Final papers will be included on the conference website. Travel funding may become available for a limited number of presenters. Students in need of travel funds should indicate so when submitting their abstract. There may be a small ($25 or less) conference fee. The organizers welcome submissions from graduate students whose research focuses on challenges in the global science and technology arena. We are particularly interested in research that concerns science, technology and globalization in relation to (but not limited to): Science and Technology issues in the post-9/11 world; Technology transfer, international investment, and intellectual property rights; Terrorism, public safety, public health and
The International Conference on Women scholars and institutions will be held in Prague, June 8-11, 2003. It is organized by the Commission Women in Science of the International Union of History and Philosophy of Science/Division of History of Science (IUHP/DBHS) and the Research Centre for the History of Sciences and Humanities founded by the Academy of Sciences and Charles University, Prague.

The conference will focus mainly on historical themes, however, recent and sociological topics will be included, as well. By women scholars we mean researchers involved not only in sciences, medicine, technology, but also humanities. The term "institution" is understood in a broad context. It includes: universities, scientific, technical and learned societies and academies, research and educational institutions and organisations, scientific communities and scientific schools, means of communication (e.g. journals, scientific meetings), prize committees, boards of funds, formal and informal networks and associations (supportive networks, communication networks). Analytical and interpretative approaches (local, national, international and multicultural) will be preferred to pure biographies. Topics focusing on cultural diversity or multicultural perspectives will be encouraged. All historical periods will be included, however, papers drawing on 19th and 20th centuries would be welcome.

If you wish to attend the conference, please send a short note with your name, postal and e-mail address and feel free to forward this announcement to anybody who might like to participate. Persons who will express their interest in participation before October 1, will receive the First Circular after October 15. Organizing Committee: Ida Stirnari, President of the Commission and Head of the Program, Vrije University, Amsterdam; Sofia Savvidou, Ph.D., Head of the Organizing Committee, Research Centre of History of Science and Humanities, Prague; Antonin Kovalev, Ph.D., Head of the Research Centre of History of Science and Humanities, Prague.

Contact Person: Mgr. Katefia Majezovak Research Centre for History of Sciences and Humanities, Legerova 61, 120 00 Praha 2, Czech Republic. Phone: (+420) 221990617; fax: (+420) 221990307; e-mail: majezova@tvrdv.cs.cas.cz or katefia@mvk.cs.cas.cz

The Department of Science & Technology Studies, Cornell University, is hosting a conference, Connecting S&Ts: The Academy, the Policy and the World, to be held September 26-28, 2003. This meeting will be the first of a triennial Cardfit, Cornell, and Harvard conference series superceding the old Bath triennial group. In the past decade and a half, S&Ts has evolved into a complex field with broad institutional strength, and forged links with other disciplines. New communities, and policy relevant areas have been created within its fold. S&Ts has begun to make its mark in economic theory, anthropology, music, environmental governance, legal discourse, science education, and science policy. A broad range of public institutions—from funding agencies to science museums to transnational NGOs—are beginning to incorporate S&Ts insights into their thinking. This international conference will take stock of the widening relevance of S&Ts, reflecting on the novel problems and opportunities. There are thus two topics, the new links and the very process of creating, sustaining, and cutting links. The conference organizing committee invites submission of one-page abstracts on topics related to these themes by January 15, 2003. Some funding may be available to help support travel expenses for participants.

The new edition of the HOPOS Newsletter is now online. This edition features an article on history and philosophy resources in Quebec, and reviews of the following books: (1) Richard Secord, Science et Philosophie de la Nature: un Nouveau Dialogue (2000); (2) Hobsbawm, Karl Popper, The Formative Years, 1902-1945: Politics and Philosophy in Interwar Vienna (2000); (3) Hacking, The Social Construction of What (1999); (4) Jackson, T.R., Baron de Holbach, The System of Nature, vol I (1999); (5) Wilson, The Logic and Methodology of Science in Early Modern Thought: Seventy Years of Interests. Please visit the webpages of HOPOS, the History of Philosophy of Science Working Group, at: http://www.steindeur.cgl.ucян. On the NewsLetter page, you will find the current edition (Volume VII, Number 1) on the right-hand side. You will need Adobe Reader to read and print the Newsletter. The History Of Philosophy Of Science (HOPOS) Working Group is dedicated to the study of historical topics in philosophy of science, from Aristotle to the very recent past. Our most recent scholarly meeting took place in Montréal, Canada in June, 2002. The HOPOS Newsletter is published electronically two to three times a year and features reviews of books on topics related to the history of the philosophy of science. For further information, contact the editor, Saul Fisher, stix@mailion.org.

The Human Nature Review, http://www.human-nature.com, is a comprehensive and up-to-date web site for information, coverage of the literature, and links to and lists of other resources concerning the understanding of human nature. It hosts News the Brain and Behavior, a monthly newsletter on the state of research in the human sciences, broadly conceived, reviews of recent books and groups on Psychiatry-Research, Evolutionary-Psychology, and Human-Nature-Information, an ongoing archive of links to matters of interest to mental health workers, as well as a large archive of papers and entire books in these and related areas.

A new website has been launched which provides most of the writings of Charles Darwin in citable form. Most are also fully illustrated with hundreds of images from the original works. The site is now searchable on the internet. Despite this impressive proliferation of Darwin texts on the internet, almost all exclude essential bibliographical information such as edition, publisher, place of publication, etc. Page numbers are nowhere to be seen. These factors vastly reduce the usefulness of those texts as they cannot be easily cited. It is impossible to know if one is reading a first or sixth edition. An example are the many online "first editions" of Darwin's Origin of Species. Often these cannot...
opportunities available

museum practitioners and scholars are invited to submit proposals to the 11th annual smithsonian fellowships in museum practice awards competition for grants to research and write about museological topics. program guidelines and application information are available on web site http://museumstudies.si.edu/fnp.htm

the department of telecommunications at indiana university, bloomington seeks three tenure-track faculty. candidates will hold the ph.d., m.f.a. or other appropriate terminal degree, and present a promising program of (1) scholarly research using social scientific, legal, or historical methods related to electronic media/communications, or (2) creative activity in interactive new media. they also must be able to teach effectively in one or more of the department's undergraduate or graduate areas of concentration. on the undergraduate level, these are media and society, design and production, and industry and management. on the graduate level, these are processes and effects, law and policy, management, and interactive new media design. the department's overriding objective is to attract the best applicants in the field. we encourage qualified applicants whose research, creative activities, or teaching is in any of the graduate or undergraduate areas of concentration indicated above. in light of our current needs, however, we especially seek individuals, with teaching and research or creative interests in the following areas: management of media enterprises, with background in management, organizational communication, economics or any other appropriate discipline; the ideal candidate would strengthen our media management curriculum, especially at the master's level, and intellectually complement our technology, economics, and policy faculty; interactive entertainment design, with demonstrated competence in non-linear script-writing for interactive storytelling and game design; interactive sound and music for character animation; or networked game programming; programming and content strategies; advertising in and promotion and marketing of new electronic media and technologies; and/or public communication campaigns, especially those focusing on health or political messages. the department offers a b.a. in telecommunications as well as m.a., m.s. and ph.d. degrees. it features a special program on the graduate level in new media (mime) and features a joint m.s./j.d. degree with the iod school of law. it also offers an undergraduate certificate in new media and interactive storytelling. applicants should submit 1) a cover letter summarizing their qualifications for the position, 2) a current vita, 3) selected publications or a portfolio documenting recent creative work, including recent student work if applicable and 4) evidence of effective teaching. three letters of recommendation should be submitted directly by recommenders. direct questions and application materials to professor walter gantz, chair, department of telecommunications, radio-tv center, 1229 east seventh street, bloomington, indiana 47405-5501. professor gantz can be reached by phone at (812) 855-1621, fax at (812) 855-7995, or via e-mail at gantz@indiana.edu. those interested in the position and invited to learn more about our faculty and programs by visiting the department's web site at http://www.indiana.edu/~telecom/. openings begin august 15, 2003. review of applications will begin november 1, 2002 and will continue until the positions are filled.

the science, medicine, and technology in culture initiative (smtc) at penn state university is offering six fellowships for graduate study fall of 2003. students will receive tuition plus approximately $14,000 per year (plus health insurance). multi-year packages are available on a competitive basis. the smtc initiative is co-directed by londa schiabinger, edwin e. sparks professor of the history of science, and robert n. fecto, feere professor of the history of science. smtc spans the departments of history, english, philosophy, anthropology, women's studies, and several of psu's leading departments of life, social, and physical sciences. core faculty include: londa schiabinger (colonial science, gender and science, voyages of discovery, race and natural history), robert n. fecto (human origins, darwin, agates, health history, nazis, the social construction of ignorance), richard doyle (rhetoric, virtuality, extraterrestrials, cryotronics, sol-f), guido ruggiero (renaissance science, sex and gender, italy), susan m. squier (literature, reproductive technology, aging, science fiction), and nancy tuana (feminist philosophy, sexuality, science ethics). associated faculty include: gary s. cross (technology, toys, junk food), alan dertckon (u.s. public health), greg ehhigian (medicine and psychiatry, medieval germany), david mcbride (health and medicine of african-american and non-western populations), adam romke (u.s. environmental history), jake selzer (science and technology), jodi wakimkine (women in science, global energy policy), and kenneth m. weiss (biological anthropology, bioethics, genetics). please visit our smtc web site for more information at http://faculty.la.psu.edu/psu/smtc.html.

interested students should apply directly to a department for admission. for the department of history, please contact prof. carol reardon (crn@psu.edu). for the department of english, please contact prof. jeffrey nelson (jxnl@psu.edu). application can also be made to philosophy and anthropology. applications are due january 15, 2003.

the department of communication at the university of illinois at chicago invites applications for assistant professor of communication. the successful candidate will have an earned doctorate in communication or a related field, strong promise of scholarly accomplishments and teaching success (at the undergraduate and graduate levels), appropriate teaching experience, and demonstrated commitment to interdisciplinary scholarship. a candidate must also have some combination of interests in the study of health communication, intercultural communication, and new media, the internet, and/or communication technology. located in the heart of chicago, uic is a research i university with 16,000 undergraduate, 6,500 graduate, and 3,000 professional students. the department of communication has 10 full-time faculty, approximately 200 undergraduate majors, and 20 m.a. students. the department is developing a doctoral program focused on the relationship between technology, intercultural communication, and media studies. the desired appointment date for the position is august 21, 2003. interested parties should send a full curriculum vitae, samples of relevant scholarly publications, evidence of teaching effectiveness, and four letters of reference to professor james j. soneson, chair, communication search committee, department of communication (mc-132), the university of illinois at chicago, 1007 west harrison street, chicago, illinois 60607-7137, usa. applications should be received by december 15, 2002, to receive full consideration, although the search will proceed until the position is filled. applications from women and minorities are particularly encouraged. the university of illinois is an affirmative action, equal opportunity employer.

the institute for science & technology studies (iwt) at bielefeld university announces within its graduate program one post- and several doctoral fellowships. further information at: http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/iwt/igk/ws02-03/ausschreibung.htm.

the department of interdisciplinarity studies at the university of south florida invites applications for a tenure-earning assistant professor position. applicants must have demonstrated commitment to innovative, interdisciplinary scholarship and teaching that crosses the border between the natural sciences