EASST
Review

Volume 25 (4)   European Association for the Study of Science and Technology   December 2006

Re-viewing the Review?

by Ann Rudinow Sætnan

Happy New Year! Greetings to all from your new editor.

First, I'd like to thank Chunglin Kwa yet again for the job he's done defending and developing EASST Review over the years and through periods of budgetary restraints. Maintaining EASST Review, on paper, and with a recognizable style as more than simply a members' newsletter has at times been no small challenge. Printing and mailing the Review is, after all, the main post on EASST's budget, so when the budget was tight there was always a pressure to cut back. Now that the budget seems secure, Chunglin has decided it's a safe chance to hand over the editorship and free up time for other concerns. Having offered to take over as editor, I see my first task as learning the ropes and maintaining the Review as the quality product it already is. But thereafter, the question is whether it's possible for EASST Review to become even better.

The council has been discussing various options for offering members a fully peer-reviewed journal. Should we start our own? Link up with an existing journal? Build on the EASST Review? And if the latter, should we do it on paper or on line? The council has asked me to start exploring how EASST Review might become a fully peer-reviewed on-line journal. Here are my thoughts on this so far:

First, the idea makes little sense if all we do is turn it into an ordinary journal, only on screen. If we take the Review on-line, we should take advantage of the extra opportunities on-line publishing offers. Three that I see as pertinent are:

- The ability to publish multi-media articles, i.e. articles including images, sound, video.
- The ability to hold on-line discussions of published materials.
- Fewer restrictions on space.

These do, however, raise new challenges. Especially opening a journal to un-edited comments would require both technical and organizational safeguards against spam, flames, theme piracy, etc.

Secondly, council has time and again concluded that most members want to receive the Review on paper. Preferably then, going on-line would supplement rather than supplant a paper version.

So what might this look like? I envision a journal that comes out in three forms simultaneously. The complete journal appears on line. At the same time a paper version is sent to members. The paper version contains, as now, "service pages" (job announcements, conference announcements, calls for papers), an editorial, a review or two (of books, conferences, other events) … and in addition an expanded table of contents including abstracts and URLs to the on-line articles. A shorter version – table of contents with clickable links – can be sent out by email.

Another question is where we want to balance between accessibility and membership privileges. If membership is to be meaningful, then members should receive some privileges that non-members do not – or at least not as freely or automatically or promptly as do the members. On the other hand, when we publish in a journal we want as broad a readership as possible. Thus we do want the journal available also to non-members. One way to handle this might be through a delayed release. The complete, on-line journal would be available "fresh off the presses" only to members and to subscribing institutions. As each issue comes out, however, the previous issue could be made available to the general public. Or … we could make only abstracts available to the general public during this first time period, but require a log-on (i.e. individual or institutional membership) to access full texts. Or … we could make all issues freely available and count on members finding other reasons to maintain their memberships. Any thoughts on what would be preferable?

Next, how might discussion pages function? I envision that each accepted article becomes a "thread" to which comments can be appended. Here we would need some security features. In some discussion forums where I participate, there is a warning button automatically added to each posted item. If a reader sees an offensive item – spam, flaming, inappropriate language, attempts to "pirate" discussions into unwelcome topics – they push the warning button and alert a discussion monitor. Monitors are able to remove items from the forum and, worst case, to ban offenders from participating. Unfortunately, these security features are necessary, and they require personnel time as well as technical solutions. The time requirements go beyond what is now donated for editorship, so we would have to have more volunteers and/or a budget for paid assistance. And while we're on the

subject of volunteers, even without opening for on-line discussions, we would still need volunteers to do peer review! So answer me honestly: Would you be willing and able to offer prompt responses to referee requests from a new journal?

Some other security features would be a bit different from what I've seen on, say, cycling forums. Hobby forums often allow people to post under nicknames. I think that would be inappropriate for an academic discussion. We ought to sign our debate contributions with our own names, much as we are visible and knowable when we participate at a conference session. However, since we are not visible on-line, there is the danger that someone would post under someone else's identity. I envision that there would be a "confirm your post" system, perhaps automatic. Having signed on as a user, your email address would be registered, but invisible to other users. Any posting in your name would generate an alert to your email allowing you to alarm a monitor if someone else is posting in your name. Of course, if you know you've just posted, you know there will be an alert seconds later and you simply delete it.

These are my thoughts so far. As you can see, there are some costs and some risks involved. Over the coming months I'll be exploring what the costs might be. I'll be talking to colleagues who run on-line journals. I'll be checking on availability of software that offers the features we would need. I'll be checking on server space requirements and where we might get these met. All this exploring will take a bit of time …which is just fine, because we also need to know if this is something the council and the members want to do. To that end, we will also be sending out an email survey. Depending on publication and mailing schedules, you may already have received your invitation to participate in the survey. If you've set it aside and forgotten it already, consider yourself hereby reminded. We do want to know what the membership thinks on this before we move forward – or not.

Meanwhile, I will attempt to maintain the style and standards established by Chunglin. Of course, that too depends on contributions from you, the readers. Please continue to support EASST as an academic forum by submitting reviews, announcements, dissertation presentations etc. to EASST Review. Reviews and dissertation presentations may be sent to me at any time, preferably electronically at **annrs@svt.ntnu.no**. Announcements may be sent to Richard Rogers at **rogers@hum.uva.nl**. In addition to appearing in the next quarterly Review, announcements appear on our more frequently updated web pages: **http://www.easst.net**.

And just to get the ball rolling on contributions, I have made one small change starting with this issue:

Were you puzzled by the front cover illustration? Were you frustrated to find only a source cited inside and no explanation of the image offered? I thought I would make the front cover into a puzzle. I have no prizes to offer beyond a few seconds of fame, but I invite readers to "compete" for two honourable mentions – one for being the first with the "correct" answer to the question "What is this?" and one for the most creatively "incorrect" answer (or shall we say the most flexible interpretation?). Winners to be announced in the next issue.

So when is the next issue? This is officially Volume 25 (4). We may do a double issue in 2007 to catch up, but for now I am setting the following deadlines for contributions: Vol 26 (1) March 5; Vol 26 (2) May 7; Vol 26 (3) Sep 10; Vol 26 (4) Dec 3. I will try to get each issue sent on from my desk to the next stage of production within a week or two after each deadline.

Toward a New Agenda for the Study of Science in the Context of Application

by Justus Lentsch

Report of the conference "Science in the Context of Application: Transformation of Academic Research", Center for Interdisciplinarity Studies (ZiF), Bielefeld University, October 26-28, 2006

A great deal of ink has been spilled about the changing „social contract" between science and society: new modes of knowledge production have been spotted at the horizon were the transgressiveness of scientific expertise calls for a novel way to think about science and the public (Gibbons et al. 1994; Nowotny, Scott, and Gibbons 2001; Nowotny 2003, 30; Nowotny et al. 2005); new „triple" tightened links between universities, industry and government have been identified as the driving force to innovation (Etzkovitz 2003); and (non-human) networks have been recognised as the genuine stabilisers of scientific knowledge (Ihde et al. (2003), Latour (1987)). Finally, new conditions under which science is applied have been recognised that are anything but normal (Funtowicz and Ravetz 1990, 1993; Funtowicz 2001). However, it is less understood to what extent the observed changes in the societal, institutional and epistemic conditions of science in the context of application actually affect the knowledge that is being produced.

With this lacuna in mind, the ZiF: Research Group "Science in the Context of Application", Centre for Interdisciplinary Research (ZiF), Bielfeld University's Centre for Advanced Studies, has organised its opening conference on the topic "Transformation of Academic Research", October 26-28, Bielefeld. 1 The idea behind this symposium was not to prove or disprove the above mentioned diagnoses or to add another label for the observed transitions. Instead, this symposium wanted to trace the observed historical breaks in the shifting practices and self-conceptions of science in the context of application itself.

In order to achieve this objective, on a disiplinary level, the symposium assembled perspectives from leading scholars in the history, sociology and philosophy of science like Arie Rip (University of Twente, NL), Terry Shinn (Maison des Sciences de l'Homme, Paris, FR), Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent (Université de Paris X, FR), Davis Baird (University of South Carolina, USA), Uwe Schimank (The FernUniversitaet/University in Hagen, D) and Janet Kourany (University of Notre-Dame, USA).

On the systematical level, the programme was divided into five panels: (1.) the relation between scientific theory, experimentation and technological development; (2.) science policy and distributed modes of organising research; (3.) ontologies of technoscience; (4.) institutional differentiation of knowledge production and (5.) governing science democratically. These issues were discussed along the lines of three cross-cutting dimensions:

Firstly, the historical dimension: Do we really observe an epochal break or profound transformation in the very definition and self-understanding of science?

Secondly, the social dimension: What is actually being claimed about the (new) social contract between science and society?

Thirdly, the epistemological dimension: Are there any ramifications of the abovementioned shifts in terms of new or distinctive processes of knowledge validation?

Coming to the historical dimensions of the diagnosed changes, it has been asked whether we actually observe an unprecedented shift in the socio-cognitive history of science and

---

1 More information on the ZiF: Research Group and the named symposium is available at: http://www.uni-bielefeld.de/ZiF/FG/2006Application/ index.html.

technology" rather than a "continuity of discontinuities. Or, as Arie Rip put it: Science has never been SCIENCE, i.e. the unique and homogeneous enterprise as it is in the traditional view of science. Instead, a "composite picture" of science which does justice to the real achievements in knowledge production, would be more accurate. Acknowledging the indeterminacy of knowledge claims and criteria of theory choice by cognitive and material factors, makes us recognise the importance of trajectories of the development of "robust knowledge", i.e. knowledge that is able to travel to other locations without losing its validity (cf. also Rip 2003).

From the received point of view, the history of modern science is proceeding from the "'low' and heterogeneous knowledge production of the 'natural history' type to high science based on 'restricted' circumstances".2 However, as Rip further argued, the 'natural history' tradition has been vitalised in the course of the growing importance of the environmental sciences, the "3-M Sciences", as he called them. In 3-M science Measuring, Mapping and Modelling the world became scientific challenges in their own right. The rebirth of 'natural history' – not as a period but rather as a mode of knowledge production – was further sustained by the discussion triggered by two other presentations: Nicole Karafyllis' talk on "Biofacts or Hybrids?" on the history of the concept of "growth" in biology and Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent's presentation "Materials as Machines" in which she reconstructed the intellectual history leading to Nano-Science – a history that began with the properties of materials and than moved on to functions and systems (around 1900) and from there to "Cartesian" hybrid nano-machines designed to perform a broad variety of different tasks in a messy world. In her case study, Bensaude-Vincent found a perplexing convergence in the languages of molecular biology and materials science in the use of machine metaphors – both cultivating a common paradigm based on an artificialist view of nature as populated with "nanomachines" that technology is to mimic or even to surpass (cf. also Bensaude-Vincent 2004, 10).

In order to develop the final episode of her historical narrative, the transition from functions and systems to machines, Bensaude-Vincent shifted methodologically from historical analysis of scientific practices to the rhetorical analysis of the use of such concepts in science policy documents promoting nanotech initiatives. This methodological shift may call our attention to a general point: Many of the concepts like mode-1/2 were initially invented as powerful rhetorical vehicles to be used strategically in science policy, i.e. as concepts to make politics with. The power of this promotional rhetoric made to circulate around mythical regional high-tech clusters was nicely illustrated by the case of the currently hyped Nano district of Grenoble presented by Dominique Vinck. Therefore, we should be a bit cautious using these concepts, because the way we use them might have an impact on to the social legitimation of certain science policies. Or, to cite Steve Fuller's provocative comparison of contemporary technoscience with those of the cold war era: "Judged simply in terms of normative clarity, Cold War technoscience was preferable to its post-Cold War variants in the STS era: there was at least the virtue of transparency in scientists' defending Mode 1 ideals that blatantly deviated from the Cold War reality they faced. In contrast, Mode 2 knowledge production is marked by scientific ideals much better adapted to expected reality, and hence less likely to provoke criticism or discontent. This transition marks a sea change in the social legitimation of science" (Fuller 2006: 69).

Summarising, the presentations suggested that we may observe a "continuity of discontinuities" rather than genuine epochal breaks, as Alfred Nordmann noticed.3 Hence, we might be better advised not looking out for the one grand historical narrative (about emerging modes of knowledge production, for instance), but instead to examine local turning points within their specific institutional setting, as was suggested by Carsten Reinhardt, taking up an issue raised by Terry Shinn. Shinn emphasised "transversality" and the importance of strong maintenance of local boundaries: Many 20th century technological innovations are

---

2 Cf. also Rip 2003.

3 With regard to the question whether new institutional settings affect the methodological standards of scientific research, Adam et al. argue in their case studies from corporate and pharmaceutical research that modelling in applied science is informed by theoretical insights from basic science and, conversely, that industrial research surprisingly sometimes produces theoretical understanding (cf. Adam, Carrier, and Wilholt 2006, 33).

dependent on the development of "research technologies", to use Shinn's terminology, that arose in 19th century Germany. Research technologies involve "generic instruments" (developed on the basis of "generic instrumental principles" and suitable to perform multiple purposes). Moreover, they are carried out in "interstitial (organisational) arenas" characterised by intermittent boundary crossings between academia, industry and metrological service. Moreover, studies of "boundary work" have already started to address the emerging issues and analyse the new kinds of objects that arise at the edge of different disciplines and social divisions, e.g. understanding the relationship between organisational and epistemic aspects of scientific culture as they become manifest, for instance, when safety measures are integrated in laboratory practice (cf. e.g. Sims 2005, 35).

But contrary to mode-2 like anti-differentiation, Shinn emphasised coordination and strong maintenance of boundaries: research technologies derive their capacity from reconciling differentiation and integration and thus secure the division of labour while simultaneously promoting transverse communication and interaction between different actors located in heterogeneous environments (cf. Shinn 2005, 44). A similar dual differentiation pattern with the reproduction of established demarcations and the emergence of new heterogeneous environments was displayed by the bibliometrical analysis laid forward by Ulf Sandström. Shinn further illustrates the importance of maintaining boundaries on the example of French scientist-entrepreneurs and the different strategies they pursued in setting up their enterprises: Only those had success who maintained their identity as scientists when going into business (whether for economic or for cognitive reasons such as exploring physical properties of products in unknown environments). Even for those scientists who entirely moved into business in order to become a fully-fledge entrepreneur, it was essential that science remained their major point of reference and that they preserved their identity as scientist-in-business. Those scientist-entrepreneurs, on the contrary, who gave up their identity as scientists and instead turned to the firm as their new major point of reference generally did not perform well – neither with respect to turn-over nor with regard to academic success in terms of publications and patents.

So much, then, for the historical and societal transformations. The presentations and the discussions revealed several lacunae that will have to be dealt with on the way toward an appropriate account of science in the context of application. But where do we go from here? What can we learn from the thick descriptions and the many excellent and detailed historical case studies? Hence, what could be focal points of a new agenda for the study of science in the context of application to develop?

Enlarging the conceptual "tool-box" of science and technology studies:
Many presentations struggled with the limits – in scope and adequacy – of the concepts and methods contained in the tool-box of classical science studies when it comes to the study of science in the context of application. Take for example Mike Boon's comprehensive and well-elaborated survey of the "New Experimentalism" she provided in her talk on "The Construction of Models in the Engineering Sciences" (cf. also Boon 2006, 20). Boon gave an account of "Applying Science" along the lines of the account the "New Experimentalism"[4] gives of basic science. Her very focus was on scientific models.[5] Obviously, in order to account for the epistemology of science in the context of application, we need concepts describing the localised and context-sensitive cognitive strategies of narrow scope employed in application oriented science. Modelling and simulating are perhaps the most important ones. However, the "New Experimentalism" is not very well known for analysing applied science or

4 "New Experimentalism" was put forward by authors like Ian Hacking, Nancy Cartwright, Ronald Giere, Lorraine Daston and Mary Morgan, to name just the most prominent ones. It may not be coincidental that the ZiF at Bielefeld University gave birth to this movement when it hosted a famous forerunner of this research group in the early 1980th, namely that on the "Probabilistic Revolution", members of which authored several of the founding documents of the New Experimentalism.
5 Nice overviews over the discussion on scientific models are given in Bailer-Jones 1999 and in the entry on 'models' in the *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* by Roman Frigg and Stephan Hartmann (http://plato.stanford.edu/). An introduction to "Applying Science" is given in a special issue of the *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science* 20/1 (2006), ed. by Rens Bod, Mike Boon and Marcel Boumans.

technology. Instead the "New Experimentalists" are famous for providing new and surprising answers to old questions in the philosophy of (basic) science – like the question of scientific realism and the meaning of theoretical terms or the relationship between theory and evidence. Therefore, one could wonder whether the new experimentalists' tool-box contains adequate conceptual instruments to account for the recent changes and developments science underwent in the context of application.

However, the proponents of the New Experimentalism did not remain idle during the last decade: Mary Morgan and Frank den Butter, for instance, analysed the function of empirical modelling at central banks and government departments (Morgan and den Butter 1998, 15), and Mary Morgan expanded the "Models as Mediators" approach developed by her and collaborators in Amsterdam and London to the study of simulation / experiments (Morgan 2004, 57; Morgan 2003)[6], Marcel Bouman, in his recent book, shows that economic models can function as measurement instruments rather than as merely representational devices (Boumans 2005); Nancy Cartwright recently turned to "Evidence for Use" (Cartwright 2006).[7]

A further suggestion was made by Davis Baird. From his presentation on the nanotech start-up "Ometrics" we can conclude that the epistemology of science in the context of application may be better framed in terms of what Baird at another place called "thing knowledge", i.e. "knowledge borne by the things we make, scientific, technological, arts and crafts, or otherwise" (Baird 2003: 40). Baird's "Thing Knowledge" seemed to capture the epistemology of application oriented science much better than Rheinberger's concept of an "epistemic thing" referred to by Roger Strand. The notion of an "epistemic thing" was coined by Hans-Jörg Rheinberger in his book Toward a History of Epistemic Things, meaning the "materials or processes […] that constitute the objects of inquiry" (Rheinberger 1997: 28). Rheinberger introduced this concept in the context of a sophisticated account of scientific reference and method drawing on a detailed case

study of the laboratory synthesis of proteins – to my mind a clear case of basic research![8]

That we need an account of how models are built and actually function in the context of application (rather than of what they are or how they represent), was highlighted by Baird's aforementioned dense story on "Engineering Reality": Drawing on a case study of the development of a new measurement technology that led to the nanotech start-up "Ometric", his philosophical point was that if we want to engineer reality, we will have to measure it. Measurement not only tells us something about a specimen (Baird 2003: 50), but often is essential to its very constitution, because many "specimens" are defined via measurement only. Moreover, often the quanitity we want to measure cannot be defined and characterised independently from the technology to measure it. In his seminal study on the thermometer and the invention of temperature, the historian and philosopher of science, Hasok Chang, identifies this as the measurement problem: Assessing the reliability and accuracy of measurement instruments without a circular reliance on the instruments themselves.[9] In certain areas, scientific or simulation models function as measurement instruments, providing quantitative facts about the world that are not immediately visible or otherwise accessible from the data (cf. for the case of economics Boumans 2005). Pertinent examples are economics and regulatory science, particularly the setting of standards and exposure limits.[10]

The method of conceptual analysis was used in Nicole Karafyllis' aforementioned talk "Biofacts or Hybrids?" on the concept of "growth" in environmental biology, agriculture, "green engineering" and the life sciences, where she introduced the concept of a 'biofact' to describe the influence of technology on biology. It is a bit of a pity that the talk left it to the audience to decide upon the added value of this new term describing the blurring of boundaries between the natural and the artificial exactly brings to science studies scholarship. However, that conceptual and linguistic analysis presents a powerful tool to accommodate scientific and

---

6 For a nice analysis of simulation modelling as "interdisciplinary activity" and models as a kind of "boundary object" facilitating interdisciplinary cooperation cf. Mattila 2005, 13.

7 Not to mention the discussion on models in the regulatory domain; cf. most notably Jasanoff and Wynne 1998.

8 For a critical review of Rheinberger's approach cf. Bloor 2005, 13.

9 Cf. Chang 2004.

10 For a philosophical account and discussions of setting limits in health science and medicine cf. Hansson 1998.

evaluative environmental discourse is demonstrated in Bryan Norton's recent book, in which he traces and analyses the use of concepts (particularly the concept of sustainability) in academic and activist contexts (Norton 2005).

To sum up, the symposium provided much evidence that the conceptual tool-box of science studies has to be enlarged in order to be able to account for the recent changes science has undergone in the context of application. But it also made noteworthy contributions and, if we think of the discussion on the actual functioning of models or the potential of linguistic and conceptual analysis, opened up new ways to reflect upon the character, the prospects and the perils of science in the context of application. To take up this strand will be a major task, not only for the ZiF Research Group.

Accounting for knowledge quality and validation:

This discussion brings us to a further point: Many of the presentations implicitly addressed the question of how to account for the shift in the quality of knowledge and expertise under conditions of uncertainty and complexity: Particularly, the recent developments in the relationship between science and politics are also affecting the system of quality control, as 'fitness of function' is increasingly becoming the norm (cf. Funtowicz 2001). An issue that was addressed by Arie Rip under the label of "robustness" as a mode of validating knowledge in local contexts as well as under conditions of uncertainty and complexity (cf. for the concept of 'robustness' also Lentsch 2005). Given the context-specificity of application oriented research, how can results be generalised and validated, if universal theories are not available?11 Moreover, in many areas like environmental or social systems – where uncertainty and indeterminacy prevail and the target systems are complex and not closed – models cannot be validated, but only evaluated.12 Hence, the reliability of science in the context of application is dependent on new modes of validation (or, rather: evaluation).

The issue of the quality of scientific information is a pressing one, not only for epistemic reasons but also for political ones: Profound institutional changes as well as the heavy involvement of private interests increasingly affect the quality and accountability of scientific research. Due to politicisation and commercialisation, one of the most serious and challenging problems of conflicts of interests pertains to the role of (academic) science in assessing e.g. the environmental and health impacts of chemicals or the toxicity and approval of new drugs (cf. Krimsky 2003: 228f). Science in the private interest not only provides knowledge input into regulation, but also participates in the evaluation of the very quality of knowledge and scientific information itself. It became quite obvious from the presentations that we lack, firstly, concepts for effectively communicating and assessing the impact of uncertainty and value choices in scientific knowledge production and information on regulation and policy making and, secondly, appropriate institutional structures for dealing with the aforementioned adverse impacts that are due to the heavy involvement of organised partial and commercial interests in the evaluation of the quality of scientific information.

Reflecting upon institutional design for socially and politically responsible science:

The significance of institutions was addressed in four quite different talks: Firstly, in David Baird's aforementioned presentation on the nanotech start-up Ometric, secondly, in Uwe Schimank's presentation on "Governance Changes and Effects on Research", thirdly, in Gabriele Abel's talk on the status of scientific expertise in participatory technology assessment and, finally, in Janet Kourany's well-argued plea for a more political philosophy of science13 that was grounded in a profound analysis of different codes of ethics in science.

Schimank examined the impact of "New Public Management" as a mode of governing universities: Turning the university as a whole into an organisational actor by strengthening external guidance and competitive pressure constrains academic self-regulation and the individual autonomy of the researcher. Whether accepting the adverse impacts to be expected (e.g. on the research agenda) pays off in terms of a more efficient allocation of scarce resources

---

11 For a nice and critical discussion of Latour cf. Guala 2003, 70.

12 Cf. most notably Shrader-Frechette, Oreskes, and Belitz 1994, 263; for questions of model selection having policy consequences cf. also Shrader-Frechette 1997, 64.

13 Cf. her Philosophy of Science for the Twenty-First Century (Kourany 2003, 70).

(money etc.) as well as a more efficient organisation of collective epistemic efforts enhancing "excellence" remains an open question to this date. Gabriele Abels took up quite another stance on the role and significance of institutions: In her talk she analysed various organisational forms of participative technology assessment exercises as socio-epistemic institutions (like citizens' juries or consensus conferences). The shared assumption behind the idea of enhancing public participation in scientific or technological decision making is that enhanced participation improves the quality and public value of science and technology. However, while the scholarly discussion and evaluation exercises of participatory procedures focus very much on participation and social inclusion, the role of scientific expertise and experts in these procedures as well as potential repercussions on the experts themselves is less understood.

In the last talk, Janet Kourany pointed out that much more is at stake than "just losing the truth" when science enters the context of application (as it is the major concern of traditional philosophers of science). Instead, Kourany made a strong point for thinking politically about science. This was argued by referring to the fact that the epistemic, the social and the political are intrinsically intertwined: Science not only incorporates epistemic values like simplicity or predictive power, but also political values that, when applied to methodological considerations, might be harmful to society. As methodological choices in science are underdetermined by facts and evidence, value choices are inevitable (we may think about questions like how to find an appropriate balance between false positive and false negatives or how to include gender aspects in the design of experimental protocols in drug testing).14 Moreover, often it is not "scientific proof" that is really at stake in debates on contested environmental or health issues, but questions of life quality, i.e. ethical and political choices (cf. Oreskes 2004, 7: 381). Kourany's paper is a fine example of the new direction in philosophy, called "social epistemology". Social epistemology examines normative conceptions of knowledge with regard to the critical role social institutions and organisations play in the knowledge-formation process. According to

Kourany, science should consider the needs of the society that funds the scientific enterprise. In her thought-provoking examination of the prospects of ethical codes of conduct issued by many scientific associations in the recent years, she convincingly argues that such ethical or professional codes – in conjunction with effective mechanisms and institutions for policing by the scientific community – may provide a valuable instrument not only for policing science by scientists in cases of fraud and scientific misconduct, but also for encouraging scientists to reflect upon how to conduct research in an ethically and politically responsible way.

Taking stock, the symposium provided an extraordinarily rich panopticon on the world of science in the context of application. However, much work remains to be done. The first steps may entail enlarging the conceptual tool-box of science and technology studies, accounting for changes in information quality and validation, and, finally, reflecting upon appropriate institutional designs for socially and politically responsible conduct of science in the context of application.

References:

1. Adam, Matthias, Martin Carrier, and Torsten Wilholt. 2006. How to Serve the Customer and Still be Truthful: Methodological Characteristics of Applied Research. In: Science & Public Policy 33/6: S. 435-444.

2. Bailer-Jones, Daniela. 1999. Tracing the Development of Models in the Philosophy of Science. In: Model-Based Reasoning in Scientific Discovery, eds. Magnani, Lorenzo, Nersessian, Nancy J., und Thagard, Paul (Hg.) (New York: Kluwer Academic Publishers), S. 23-40.

3. Baird, Davis. 2003. Thing Knowledge: Outline of a Materialist Theory of Knowledge. In: The Philosophy of Scientific Experimentation, ed. Radder, Hans (Hg.) (Pittsburgh, Pa: University of Pittsburgh Press), S. 39-67.

4. Bensaude-Vincent, Bernadette. 2004. Two

---

14 Cf. Rudner 1953, 20 and, most notably, Douglas 2000, 67.

Cultures of Nanotechnology? In: HYLE - International Journal for Philosophy of Chemistry 10/2: S. 65-82.

5. Bloor, David. 2005. Toward a Sociology of Epistemic Things. In: Perspectives on Science 13/3: S. 285-312.

6. Boon, Mike. 2006. How Science is Applied. In: International Studies in the Philosophy of Science 20/1: S. 27-47.

7. Boumans, Marcel. 2005. How Economists Model the World Into Numbers. London: Routledge.

8. Cartwright, Nancy. 2006. "Well-ordered Science: Evidence for Use." Available from **http://personal.lse.ac.uk/cartwrig/Papers/WellorderedScienceEvidenceforUse.pdf** (last accessed 2006.

9. Chang, Hasok. 2004. Inventing Temperature: Measurement and Scientific Progress. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

10. Douglas, Heather. 2000. Inductive Risk and Values in Science. In: Philosophy of Science 67/4: S. 559-579.

11. Fuller, Steve. 2006. The Philosophy of Science and Technology Studies. New York, NY u.a.: Routledge.

12. Funtowicz, S. O. 2001. Peer Review and Quality Control. eds. Smelser, Neil J. / Baltes, Paul B. (Hg.) (Amsterdam u.a.: Elsevier), S. 11179-11183.

13. Funtowicz, Silvio / Jerome Ravetz. 1993. Science for the Post-Normal Age. In: Futures 25/7: S. 739-755.

14. Funtowicz, Silvio O. / Ravetz, Jerome R. 1990. Uncertainty and quality in science for policy. Dordrecht, the Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

15. Gibbons, Michael, Limoges, Camille, Nowotny, Helga, Schwartzmann, Simon, Scott, Peter, und Trow, Martin. 1994. The New Production of Knowledge. London: Sage.

16. Guala, Francesco. 2003. Experimental Localism and External Validity. In: Philosopy of Science 70/Supplement: S. 1195-1205.

17. Hansson, Sven Ove. 1998. Setting the Limit: Occupational Health Standards and the Limits of Science. New York: Oxford University Press.

18. Jasanoff, Sheila / Wynne, Brian. 1998. Science and Decisionmaking. In: Human Choice and Climate Change, Vol. I, eds. Rayner, Steve / Malone, E. L. (Hg.) (Columbus: Battelle Press), S. 1-87.

19. Kourany, Janet. 2003. A Philosophy of Science For the Twenty-First Century. In: Philosophy of Science 70: S. 1-14.

20. Krimsky, Sheldon. 2003. Science in the Private Interest: Has the Lure of Profits Corrupted Biomedical Research? Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

21. Latour, Bruno. 1987. Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

22. Lentsch, Justus. 2005. Wissenschaftliche Kreativität im Kontext politischer Entscheidung: epistemische Robustheit als Distinktionsmerkmal wissenschaftlicher Expertise. In: Kreativität: 20. Deutscher Kongress für Philosophie, 26.-30. September 2005 in Berlin ; Sektionsbeiträge, ed. Abel, Günter (Hg.) (Berlin: Universitätsverlag TU Berlin).

23. Mattila, Erika. 2005. Interdisciplinarity "In the Making": Modeling Infectious Diseases. In:

Perspectives on Science 13/4: S. 531-553.

24. Morgan, Mary S. 2004. Simulation: The Birth of a Technology to Create "Evidence" in Economics. In: Revue d'histoire des sciences 57/2: S. 339-377.

25. -----. 2003. Experiments without Material Intervention. In: The Philosophy of Scientific Experimentation, ed. Radder, Hans (Hg.) (Pittsburgh: Pittsburgh UP), S. 216-235.

26. Morgan, Mary S. / F. den Butter. 1998. What makes the empirical models-policy interaction successful? In: Economic Modelling 15/3: S. 443-475.

27. Norton, Bryan G. 2005. Sustainability: A Philosophy of Adaptive Ecosystem Management. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

28. Nowotny, Helga. 2003. Democratising Expertise and Socially Robust Knowledge. In: Science and Public Policy 30/3: S. 151-156.

29. Nowotny, Helga, Pestre, Dominique, Schmidt-Aßmann, Eberhard, Schulze-Fielitz, Helmuth, und Trute, Hans-Heinrich. 2005. The Public Nature of Science Under Assault: Politics, Markets, Science and the Law. Berlin u.a.: Springer.

30. Nowotny, Helga, Scott, Peter, und Gibbons, Michael. 2001. Re-thinking science knowledge and the public in an age of uncertainty. Cambridge: Polity Press u.a.

31. Oreskes, Naomi. 2004. Science and public policy: what's proof got to do with it? In: Environmental Science & Policy 7: S. 369-383.

32. Rheinberger, Hans Jörg. 1997. Toward a History of Epistemic Things: Synthesizing Proteins in the Test Tube. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

33. Rip, Arie. 2003. Science for the 21st Century. In: The Future of Science and Humanities, eds. Tindemans, Peter, Verrijn-Stuart, Alexander, und Visser, Rob (Hg.) (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press), S. 99-148.

34. Rudner, Richard. 1953. The Scientist Qua Scientist Makes Value Judgements. In: Philosophy of Science 20/1: S. 1-6.

35. Shinn, Terry. 2005. New Sources of Radical Innovation: Research-Technologies, Transversality and Distributed Learning in a Post-Industrial Order. In: Social Science Information 44/4: S. 731-764.

36. Shrader-Frechette, Kristine. 1997. Hydrogeology and Framing Questions Having Policy Consequences. In: Philosopy of Science (Supplement) 64: S. S149-S160.

37. Shrader-Frechette, Kristine, Naomi Oreskes, und Kenneth Belitz. 1994. Verification, Validation, and Confirmation of Numerical Models in the Earth Sciences. In: Science 263: S. 641-646.

38. Sims, Benjamin. 2005. Material and Social Order in Laboratory Work. In: Social Studies of Science 35/3: S. 333-366.

Publish or perish in 2007? Report of the publication sessions at the EASST conference 2006

Ragna Zeiss and Niki Vermeulen

2007, a New Year with New Year's resolutions: Let's get those publications out there! Publishing is a challenge for every researcher, but perhaps especially for researchers who are just starting their careers. The precise nature of the challenges differs since institutional and national contexts and practices constitute boundaries within which scholars (have to) operate. In some countries PhD students will not receive their PhD without having published some articles (these may even constitute the PhD thesis), in others the writing of a monograph is a first priority and only afterwards the scholar is encouraged to think about publications. However, whatever the context, for a next job in academia publications are needed and they become increasingly important. No publications or too few can mean: exit academia. This leaves us with challenges and questions: How best to write a publication? How to pick a journal? And also, do we need to publish as quickly as possible or should we concentrate on publishing in better journals which take longer to publish our work?

At the EASST conference in Lausanne (2006) a student session was organised to address some of these questions. A panel provided the audience with their ideas and suggestions around publishing first articles. The panel consisted of Ulrike Felt (University of Vienna, who talked about her experiences as editor of Science, Technology & Human Values), Sheila Jasanoff (Harvard University, about her extensive experience with publishing in various fields), Reijo Miettinen (Helsinki University, about publishing across academic fields and in particular STS and Organisation Studies), Sarah de Rijcke (PhD student Groningen University, about her experiences with academic and non-academic publishing), Sergio Sismondo (Queen's University Canada, about his experience as collaborating editor of Social Studies of Science), and Paul Wouters (Virtual Knowledge Studio Amsterdam, about his experience with journalism and academic writing). The beginning of 2007 seems a good time to recap some of these tips.

First of all a couple of things we all know, but still sometimes get wrong, and are therefore urged to check before we submit an article. Ensure that:

- You know the journal (what have been the discussions, the subjects, the theoretical approaches in the journal?) and the audience for which you write; many of the more implicit aspects of journals are not mentioned in the explicit guidelines, yet are very important.
- The paper addresses one clear question.
- The paper makes a specific and relevant contribution to the literature (with which you should be familiar).
- The paper is doable within the number of words available; focus on one key line of empirical research, don't put too much in!
- The different parts of the paper are balanced (not too long, not too short).
- The references, outline, spelling etc. are correct.

Next to these 'basics' you also need a publishing 'strategy'. The most important questions are: What is the contribution of the paper and why is it so intriguing that everyone in the field would want to read it? As STS researchers we know, of course, that what counts as a contribution and as intriguing very much depends on the field and the journal. It is therefore important to think about the journal one wants to submit to. There are several 'strategies'. First, one can concentrate on submitting one or more publications to the main journals in one's own field. If an article is accepted, it can be seen as the crowning glory of one's PhD work. Although the 'better' journals often take longer to publish an article and have a lower acceptance rate than other journals (Social Studies of Science receives between 120-150 papers a year of which about 30 get published; Science, Technology & Human Values receives about 110 papers and accepts 35), the panel members agreed that it is worth the effort and the time it takes, but also recommended other strategies.

A second strategy can be fruitful in case we have more pieces we would like to publish, we

would like to identify ourselves with other fields, or we need publications faster to ensure a next job. It may therefore be fruitful to broaden our view beyond the major STS journals and look into different fields as well. STS research generally touches on more than one academic field or discipline which opens additional opportunities and channels to publish the results of the research. One can think about theoretical journals of different fields or journals that are more practically/empirically oriented. Some of these journals may publish faster than others and some will be more widely distributed. For example, some of our work may have implications for organisations and/or management. We could then use the same data as we have used for another article, but elaborate on it in a different way and send it to different journals such as Organization or Organisation Studies. It was also recommended to look into possibilities of publishing in special issues as these can speed up the publication process. So check out the web pages of journals for special issues that relate to your research.

A third 'strategy' is having no strategy: Don't worry about the field you write in, but worry about ideas. It does not matter so much where your papers get published as long as they get published and they convey your ideas, commitments and arguments. If your ideas are good, they will be picked-up anyway as long as they are out there. Sheila Jasanoff illustrated this by saying, 'It was the STS field that found me, not the other way around.'

Pick your strategy (or combine them), remember that you can never have read everything and that this does not have to be your final and ultimate piece of research. Also mobilise your supervisor, as s/he has a role in teaching you how to publish! Keep it simple, don't use too much jargon, and don't give up: Let's publish!

Yet, although we all need to publish in 2007, we hope you will also be critical of the increasing emphasis on 'publish or perish'. In the EASST session following the 'how to publish session', 'unease' around the publication system was discussed. Academic scholars are increasingly evaluated on the basis of the number of papers they publish, often with an additional focus on publishing in 'highly rated' journals. Although it is important to publish and disseminate academic work, we also strongly believe that publishing should serve a purpose

and that academics should not start publishing just to meet the requirements of publishing. Yet, stories circulate that confirm a tendency towards publishing as an end in itself. For instance, people publishing three papers based on limited research material rather than one (raising their number of publications in spite of acknowledging that the quality of a single paper would have been much higher), or scholars starting to use material collected by BA/MA students to be able to write their articles so they meet the publication norm. Also, some journals try to compete by asking scholars to refer more to past issues of the journal, thus pushing it higher on the list.15 In our eyes, these developments are a cause of concern. Is the quality of our work not more important than the quantity? Could it in some cases be more important to disseminate knowledge in newspaper articles than in academic journals? And if so, why are these not rated? Should we not be critical about why and when we can best disseminate our work to whom?

These are the sorts of questions that were discussed by the panellists of this session (Ulrike Felt, University of Vienna; Claudia Koltzenburg, Hamburg University; Sergio Sismondo, Queen's University Canada; Chamu Kuppuswamy, Sheffield University; Peter Weingart, University of Bielefeld; Paul Wouters, Virtual Knowledge Studio Amsterdam). First of all distinctions were made: We cannot speak about one single publication system or one single 'unease'. There are many different ways of publishing (books, journals, conference proceedings) and different reasons for publishing (communication, cv building, responsibility to funding agencies, network building, access to ideas, prestige). Publishing in highly rated journals may be good for some of these reasons (prestige), but not for others (quick access to ideas). It may thus be useful to experiment with a variety of outlets, as for example working papers on the web. Since there may not be one publication system, according to some it does not make sense to think in terms of developing a completely new 'publication system'. Rather, we need to develop alternative practices and think about the social configurations we want to engage in and the role of research in social practices. Changes have already started: there is a (bottom-up) growth of

---

15 Note that the editors present at the session strongly disapprove of and do not participate in such activities.

blogs for science communication, wikipedia, multimedia and powerpoint at conferences and podcasts to distribute lectures. Chamu explored how dance can convey meaning of scientific work to a broader public in her dance on cloning dilemmas (**http://www.thixoforge.com/ sheffield/jsp/polopoly.jsp?a=24999&d=1404**).

Yet, despite these (positive) developments, some still think we should be critical of current evaluation and publication systems. This raises the tension of wanting to change something we are also participating in. Suggestions were made to create places where the academic/STS community can discuss these issues (can we buy shares and increase our influence?), negotiate them, and perhaps even participate in a collective experiment (i.e. including universities, governments, etc.). If we would be interested in such an experiment, we need to accompany the change rather than start it off and just wait and see where it leads us. Perhaps different 'systems' can even co-exist for a while. As an STS community, we could try to create discussion spaces and find out if we (collectively or individually, as some are sceptical about the very idea of an STS community) want to change (parts of) the publication systems and what our role could be in this. Perhaps the new online journal as described in this issue's editorial "Reviewing the Review" could be an example of a different publication outlet as well as a discussion space…

Recent Dissertations

Morten Sager

Pluripotent Circulations: Putting Actor-Network Theory to Work on Stem Cells in the USA, prior to 2001.

Ph D in Theory of Science, December 2005, The department of history of ideas and theory of science, Göteborg University, Sweden.

In this dissertation, stem cell research and politics in the USA are analyzed by using actor-network theory (ANT). Here ANT is put to work on largely textual materials, often directly from US political settings, such as Congressional debates and national panels. Also, I analyze and challenge ANT meta-theoretically, inspired by ongoing critique in Science and Technology Studies.

In part one the alternative notions of obligatory point of passage and boundary objects are applied to the political and public dynamics of human embryonic stem cell (hESC) research between November 1998 and August 2001. I suggest an integrated model that draws on the metaphor of a circulatory system of science and society. Although the negotiations concern one and the same scientific object, things and people may be coordinated differently depending on the resources at stake. Like previous cases of boundary objects, the hESCs are involved in the coordination of diverse actors. In contrast to previous cases, the hESCs are not merely forms that open for multiple uses, but also constrain and define diverse actors through their pluripotent capacities, main expected use within transplantation therapies, and the material sources of "spare embryos". To capture this composite content I argue that hESCs are strong boundary objects, or boundary packages.

Part two goes backward to understand how the configuration of the boundary package and its coordination of diverse actors were stabilized. In previous negotiations of human embryo research, in 1994-1996 "spare embryos" and transplantation therapies appeared as prospective elements of coordination. I trace how technological developments within in vitro fertilization together with funding structures contributed to a so-called standard procedure producing "spare embryos". Transplantation therapies to cure degenerative diseases such as Parkinson's disease and juvenile diabetes came to be regarded as both possible and urgent together with the coordination of patients and politicians. The defining issue of American politics since the 1970's – pro-life versus pro-choice – played a significant role in excluding alternative paths, sometimes in unexpected ways.

I claim that these processes call for a more compartmentalized conception of stabilization than previously used in ANT. Coordination of actors and configuration of elements happen in multiple circulations.

Finally, the study returns to the period of 1998-2001 to analyze some of the processes that made the "spare embryos" and transplantation therapies contribute to the configuration and coordination of hESCs. One such process was the terminological definitions of pluripotency between toti- and multipotency. The definitions helped to hook on the hESCs to previous circulations by positioning these stem cells between embryos and alternative stem cells.

The thesis provides the first book-length study of how the mutual reinforcement and intertwinement of several developments – dating at least as far back as Roe vs. Wade – helped shape the public and political "realities" of human embryonic stem cells in the 1998-2001 debates. In addition, I use the case as an opportunity to invite the reader to reflect on the possible uses and problems of the ANT approach.

For orders of the dissertation, please contact me at **morten.sager@theorysc.gu.se**.

Dear Members,

I am pleased to write a letter for the first issue of the EASST Review to be edited by Ann Rudinow Saetnan. We are delighted that Ann has agreed to take on the role of continuing and, as her piece in this issue explains, developing the review. At the Lausanne conference I spoke in person about the massive contribution that Chunglin Kwa has made to EASST over the years. I'll repeat those sentiments here - thank you, again, Chunglin. We owe you a lot.

Ann talks about the possibility of online innovation in respect of the Review. We have also made a step towards this kind of innovation in recent Council elections, and in the consultation of members about the development of the review. Please do check that we have your up-to-date email address, and that your spam filter is letting our emails through – we really do need this way of communicating with you, and we'll take care not to bombard you with irrelevant or inappropriate messages.

It is very heartening to see that elections were necessary in order to fill the recent vacancies on EASST Council: how nice that more people volunteered than were actually needed on this occasion. The successful candidates were Erika Mattila, Tiago Moreira, Marc Audetat and, as student representative, Conor Douglas. I am delighted to welcome them to council, and look forward to working with them. The retiring members of Council are Nik Brown, Claire Marris and Ann Rudinow Saetnan, although Ann of course stays with the Council as the new Review editor. We are extremely grateful to Ann, Claire and Nik for their inputs over the years.

Finally, I am pleased to announce that plans are underway for the 2008 joint conference with 4S, to be held in Rotterdam and organized by a capable team led by Roland Bal. In the non-conference year (for EASST) of 2007 we hope also to be able to support some smaller workshops. Details of how to apply for this funding will be announced by email and via the EASST web site – the deadline to apply for the first wave of workshops will be March 1st, and depending on available funds there may be a second wave.

Best wishes,

Christine Hine
EASST President
Guildford January 15, 2007

Conferences, Workshops and Calls for Papers

The *Sunbelt Social Networks Conference* will take place in **Corfu**, May 1-6, 2007. The International Network for Social Network Analysis (INSNA) welcomes proposals for individual papers and paper session organizers for the next Sunbelt social network conference, which will take place at the island of Corfu, May 1-6, 2007. See website: http://nicomedia.math.upatras.gr/conf/Sunbelt2007.

The conference provides an interdisciplinary venue for sociologists, psychologists, social and behavioral scientists, economists, political scientists, scholars in communication studies, STS, management and organizational studies, mathematicians, computer scientists, anthropologists, ethnologists, and others to present current work in the area of social networks. Proponents are invited to submit their paper titles and abstracts at the web page, https://cgi.sfu.ca/~insna/confpapers/ (full papers are not requested) until January 30, 2007. The name of the intended session can be specified by proponents themselves. However only those sessions will be actualized which contain more than five accepted papers. The process of evaluation of submitted papers will be finalized in February 2007. Questions about the conference should be sent to Moses Boudourides (sunbelt.corfu.2007@gmail.com).

Young People, New Technologies and Political Engagement is the title of the seminar to be held at the **University of Surrey**, 24-25 July 2007. Confirmed keynote speakers are Prof. Lance Bennett (Center for Communication and Civic Engagement, University of Washington); Prof. Stephen Coleman (Institute of Communication Studies, University of Leeds); and Dr. Anita Harris (Department of Sociology, Monash University). Against the backdrop of increasing concern about the disengagement of youth from politics and the public sphere, the relationship between new technologies and young people's political engagement and participation is a cross-disciplinary issue of considerable importance not only to academics but to practitioners and policymakers across the world. There is now a large body of literature which has explored the potential of 'digital democracy' to revitalise political life and challenge conventional forms of political participation. Separately, youth researchers have provided considerable insights into the way new technologies are influencing – and are themselves influenced by – the lives and identities of young people. Only recently, though, has significant research attention begun to focus upon the particular relationships – potential and actual – between new technologies and political engagement amongst the young. This seminar intends to contribute to the development of research and theory in this crucial area by providing a forum for scholars from across the world to share the findings of empirical and theoretical work, discuss the policy implications of their research, and strengthen their international and inter-disciplinary ties. We aim to bring together leading figures in the subject area from across the globe as well as to offer a valuable international forum for emerging projects and individuals. Proposals are therefore invited for papers focused upon any aspect of the relationship between young people, new technologies and political engagement. As well as encouraging contributions from a variety of academic disciplines and perspectives, we would particularly welcome papers from practitioners and policy-makers. The event is organised by the British Sociological Association's Youth Study Group in association with the University of Surrey's Institute of Advanced Studies and The Social Policy Association. We are able to offer up to six grants (of up to £200) to speakers travelling to the event from outside the UK. If you would like to be considered for such a grant, please make this clear when sending your abstract. Please send abstracts (of up to 250 words) to Dr Rachel Brooks at the University of Surrey (R.Brooks@surrey.ac.uk) by 23 February 2007 at the latest. Please include full contact details with your proposal. For further information, please contact Dr Rachel Brooks or Dr Paul Hodkinson (P.Hodkinson@surrey.ac.uk). Further information about the event will soon be available on the Institute for Advanced Studies website: http://www.soc.surrey.ac.uk/ias/.

A call for papers has been issued for the *Science & the Public Conference*, **Imperial College London**, 19th May 2007. Science studies research tends to focus on "the lab", being chiefly concerned with the internal workings of the scientific community. This conference aims to bring together the strands of academia that consider science as it intersects with non-scientific cultures. The conference title's

dichotomy between "science" and "the public" consciously references the approach often taken by the scientific community. We are aware of the variety of problems of referring to the "the public"; research problematising the term may form part of the conference programme. Other topics covered may include: Science and the arts (including science fiction); Innovation studies and science policy research; Popular science; NGOs, science and development; The continuing application of the "deficit model"; Public programmes aiming at "Engagement with Science"; Boundary work; Specific media: films, the internet, museums, radio and others; and Science and education: young vs. old, formal vs. informal. There is no especially contemporary focus and historical work on any of these areas would be most welcome. Neither do we limit submission to those within the science studies community, or only from the UK. We would particularly like to encourage those who take a critical approach to the topics described above to submit abstracts. Moreover we should stress this is an academic - rather than practitioner-focussed - conference. The conference will focus on, but not be limited to, early-career researchers. Abstracts (no longer than 300 words) for a 20-minute presentation should be emailed to scienceandpublic@googlemail.com by 1st March 2007. Enquires also to this address.

Negotiating the Future is the title of the seminar on 7 June 2007, organized by Unverstity of **Oslo**, Centre for Technology, Innovation and Culture (TIK). Thinking about the future implies imagining it in ways it might, should or should not come into being – and thinking of means to make it real in ways we perceive best. Negotiating means to 'carry on business', as *neg-otium* is latin for *business, not leisure*. So in the best sense of the word, when we negotiate something, we mean business. But negotiating means more than that. It means to deal with some matter or affair requiring agency for its successful handling, to arrange for or bring about something through conference, discussion and compromise. As well as to transfer to another or to convert something into cash or the equivalent value. Finally it can also mean to successfully travel, to negotiate a turn, or to complete or accomplish a trip. These negotiations, however, do not happen in an abstract environment, but between and through the actors involved. Therefore we invite discussions of situations, locations and moments when actors are busy arranging, discussing, compromising, converting

or finalising futures. This can include discussing the *roles of expectations in shaping scientific and technological change*, and how these expectations are carried or contested by experts and innovators, future designers, policy makers, producers, consumers and writers. Further we invite contributions on the complexity emerging in the *methods and techniques used for future processes*. What methodologies are actually in use and how are they used? How to meet methodological challenges posed by uncertainty, potential discontinuity and the plurality of legitimate points of view? At the same time, negotiating the future is a *slogan-like call for action* which is used (at least in Google search September 2006) for addressing issues as diverse as digital libraries and future user needs, organising conferences on court-annexed mediation, helping MIT graduates to find jobs, accessing workplace accommodations for citizens with disabilities, advertising publications about Labour Perspectives on American Business or the future of Islam, or assessing the job market situation for young IT professionals in Trinidad and Tobago. Therefore we also invite explorations of the products of negotiating: the inscriptions of futures in lasting materials. We are interested in reflection on our own approaches as researchers, and the collective imaginations we produce through our work. How do our findings contribute to *the future underway in the present*? Reflexivity also evokes responsibility *for how we are minding the future*. The language we use in this enterprise becomes crucial. Therefore we need approaches which explore our linguistic dependences on vision, temporality and materiality, and how we negotiate between real futures and worlds of imagination. These latter dynamics could open up a new perspective on neg-otiating futures, through questioning the negative prefix *neg - otiating* might give to our future conversations. The aim of the seminar is to draw on these fields of investigation to foster a discussion about the critical value of our analyses, conceptions and insights regarding the practices of future-oriented processes as well as our imaginative powers and assumptions regarding the future. Although we attempt a thematically broad approach, the seminar is part of a series of seminars at TIK which discuss the new forms of expertise, user involvement and the turn towards experts and consumers in scientific and technological areas of innovation. The seminar focuses therefore on critical enquiries and constructive perspectives on how user involvement, public dialogue and collective expectations may shape the outcome of

future processes and how they might contribute to new forms of policies and politics across society. Four central questions in this context are: How do expectations and other discursive drivers shape scientific and technological innovation and how are these future-oriented abstractions negotiated in public? How do current future methodologies deal with uncertainty, plurality and discontinuity and how are these concerns negotiated in future practices? How can resources from the socials sciences and humanities, including studies of language and literature extend our academic reflexivity on studying the future into engagements of public responsibility? If action, knowledge and ethics belong together, how can we bring them back into play in a relation of interdependence which concerns both us as researchers and our subject matters? These questions invite researchers with an interest in science and technology studies, political and interdisciplinary cultural studies to contribute with critical perspectives on the dominant rhetoric, material productions and strategic results of future discourses. The one day seminar opens with talks by our speakers (Barbara Adam, Marjolein van Asselt and Nik Brown) and plenary discussions. The afternoon workshop is dedicated to discussions with participants who have contributed with presentations circulated in advance. The seminar presents a unique opportunity for researchers to introduce their research to an audience beyond their usual field of expertise and make their questions relevant to people from different backgrounds. To this end we are looking for contributions between 2000-2500 words dealing with topics related to our central questions as well as the questions raised in the introduction to be received by April the 2nd, 2007. Replies will be send out by April the 16th, 2007. The number of participants will be limited to 30 - and the discussions with our key speakers will be based on the questions and materials emerging from the contributions. Contributions in Word format can be send to stefanie.jenssen-at-tik.uio.no with Cc to future-at-tik.uio.no.

The *Biennial Meeting of the International Society for the History, Philosophy and Social Studies of Biology (ISHPSSB)* will take place in **Exeter**, UK, on 25-29 July 2007. Since its inception, the International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology (ISHPSSB) has brought together scholars from diverse disciplinary backgrounds to discuss historical, conceptual, epistemological, political,

institutional, and ethical issues of the life sciences in an open and informal setting. Over the past twenty-odd years, attendance has increased from about 60 participants to about 350 in Guelph, 2005. In 2007, we hope to continue our tradition of an inclusive and experimental approach, while meeting the challenge of increased attendance. Scholars wishing to attend the meeting are now invited to submit session and paper proposals on the ISHPSSB website (visit http://www.ishpssb.org/meeting.html). Deadline for submissions is February 15, 2007, and abstracts should not exceed 500 words. Please also note the guidelines for paper acceptance that have been adopted by the Society. To facilitate communication in advance of submission, the ISHPSSB website also offers the possibility to post ideas for sessions and discussion panels (http://www.ishpssb.org/phorum/list.php?9). If you are interested in putting together a session or discussion panel by posting a call for contributions electronically, we urge you to specify a deadline for responses to you personally. While individual paper submissions are welcome, we strongly encourage submission of session and panel discussion proposals. For the 2007 meeting, we especially seek sessions that are innovative and cross-disciplinary in content and/or format; strengthen the lines of communication among historians, philosophers, social scientists, and biologists; open conversations that lead to new ways of thinking about the life sciences and the disciplines that study it; bring together people of different disciplinary and national backgrounds. The Society is open to proposals on any topic connected with the history, philosophy and social studies of the life sciences. For the 2007 meeting, we would especially welcome sessions in the following areas: Interdisciplinarity. Recent years have seen the foundation of interdisciplinary centres for the study of the life sciences and their social, legal, and ethical implications in a number of national contexts. At the same time there is a trend towards disciplinary segregation that has also been felt during the ISHPSSB meetings in recent years. What explains these trends of disciplinary specialization? Are historians, philosophers, and social scientists heading in similar directions, or are they heading far afield from one another? Is the pressure on biology studies to become 'policy relevant' acting against or actually encouraging specialization? Why do history, philosophy, and sociology of science tend to drift apart, while disciplines become less and less important in the life sciences

themselves? Anthropology of the Life Sciences. Recent years have seen a number of attempts to employ the empirical methods and the conceptual tools of social anthropology in the study of the life sciences, especially with respect to the effects of new reproductive technologies on conceptions of kinship and identity. Is there such a thing as an 'anthropological approach' to the life sciences, and if so, what could it look like? And is this indeed the field, as some of its protagonists claim, where historical, sociological, and philosophical studies of the life sciences could join hands to adequately reflect the complex, hybrid formations in which biological knowledge is produced today? Biology and Politics. From William Harvey's theory of blood circulation to Rudolf Virchow's cell theory, from Darwin's theory of evolution to present day conceptions of the genome as 'our common inheritance' – biological themes have always resonated with political ones. What is the impact that novel biological theories and practices have had on conceptions of human identity and agency, especially in the contested areas of sex/gender and race/ethnicity? And how do political agendas and contexts shape research in the life sciences? Systems Biology. Recent years have seen an upsurge of systemic approaches in biology that try to make sense of the vast amounts of data that have been accumulated by the genome sequencing projects and other data-gathering exercises. Systemic approaches have a long history in biology. But do their recent counterparts actually signal a return to a more holistic biology, or are we in fact witnessing the complete takeover of mechanism and reductionism in biology? And does systems biology raise new ethical, legal, and social challenges? Biology beyond the Evolutionary Synthesis. A lot of scholarly attention, especially in the philosophy of biology, has been invested into the interpretation and evaluation of evolutionary theory. Large areas in the biomedical sciences, however, are concerned with data collection or the elucidation of mechanisms and functions, activities that seem to gain little, if anything, from evolutionary speculations. Moreover, it becomes increasingly evident that the large majority of organisms, especially microorganisms, do not fit the standard model of speciation. How would a broader perspective on the life sciences affect our understanding of life? The basic time unit for sessions will be 90 minutes; sessions encompassing two such units (but not more) are welcome, as long as there are at least five formal participants over the two sessions. We encourage

innovative formats. If you are interested in proposing a session with an unusual format (e.g., with pre-circulated papers or requiring an unusual room format or special equipment), please contact us so we can make sure it is feasible. If you have any ideas, questions, or suggestions, please contact the program officers. Email contact is strongly preferred, but if you do not have access to it, you may also send letters via regular mail. If you write by e-mail, please make sure to include the term ISHPSSB in your subject line. Staffan Müller-Wille, ESRC Centre for Genomics in Society, University of Exeter, Amory Building, Rennes Drive, Exeter EX4 4RJ, United Kingdom, S.E.W.Mueller-Wille@exeter.ac.uk. Hans-Jörg Rheinberger,,Max-Planck-Institute for the History of Science, Boltzmannstr. 22, D-14195 Berlin, Germany, rheinbg@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de.

Utopias, Human Rights, and Gender in Twentieth Century Europe is the title of the workshop to be held 13-16 December 2007 at the **Freud Museum, Vienna**, sponsored by the Institute for Contemporary History, University of Vienna in association with the Freud Museum and Cooper Union (New York). The conveners are Prof. Dr. Atina Grossmann (Cooper Union, New York) and Prof. Dr. Carola Sachse (University of Vienna). The deadline for proposals (1 page and brief CV) is 31 January 2007. Twentieth century European history has been marked by catastrophic violence and persecution unleashed by movements and regimes promising to create racial, political, and social-economic utopias. It has also brought an unprecedented recognition and articulation of concepts of human rights, formulated in individual or collective (national, ethnic, or cultural) terms. Both utopian visions and conceptions of human rights have been inflected by, and shaped, definitions of gender. The workshop will focus on the tensions and contradictions between models for social utopias and concepts of individual human rights, between visions of utopia and gender equality, and between individual and collective rights and obligations. We welcome contributions dealing with the most prominent social movements, political regimes, and economic models in twentieth century Europe. These in part overlapping, in part competing, and in part uncompromisingly opposed movements, regimes, and models include Fascism, National Socialism, Communism, liberalism, Zionism, Americanism Social Democracy, and laissez

faire capitalism. We want to ask very broadly and in reference to each case: How were notions of the self and individual self-determination linked to models of social organization? What roles were assigned to men and women; to what degree were these roles hierarchical or egalitarian? How were ideas and ideals of collective and individuals rights reconciled and negotiated? To what degree were they conceived in terms of gender equality or difference? How were these ideas and ideals institutionalized and anchored in norms, laws, and discourses? How did "biopower" (to use Foucault's term) register in the political, social, and cultural history of utopian movements and regimes? How did the discourses and practices of "social rationalization" – explicit and pervasive across the political spectrum in the first half of the twentieth century – continue to work after the Second World War? How were they interrupted or recoded? What influence can be ascribed to alternative discourses, particularly psychoanalysis, in conceptualizing and mediating the relationship of individual and collective, as well as of women and men, in these utopian regimes and visions? Moreover, what sort of utopian notions are embedded in psychoanalysis? How did individual women and men reflect on their personal engagement in utopian social movements and political regimes in memoirs, correspondence, diaries, and other literary or visual documents? What is the place of gender as an analytic category in the historiography of modern utopias as well as in the formulation and institutionalization of human rights? We invite proposals from historians and scholars in a variety of related disciplines, including the social sciences and cultural and legal studies. Proposals related to ongoing graduate or post-doctoral projects are particularly welcome. Please submit a one page proposal and brief CV in either English or German to: irene.maria.leitner@univie.ac.at by January 31, 2007. We will notify the 12-15 selected participants in February 2007. Papers of no more than 15 pages must be submitted, in either English or German, by October 31, 2007. The workshop in December 2007 will focus on discussion of pre-circulated papers and prepared comments by the participants. A follow-up conference is planned for Fall 2008, for discussion of revised papers to be included in a German-language volume to be published in 2009. Travel costs for the first workshop will be covered. Funding for second workshop is pending. Contact: Prof. Atina Grossmann, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Cooper Union, 51 Astor Place, New York, NY 10003-7120, ag93@nyu.edu. Prof. Dr. Carola Sachse, Institut für Zeitgeschichte, Universität Wien, Spitalgasse 2, Hof 1, A-1090 Wien, carola.sachse@univie.ac.at.

Statistics as a boundary object between science and the state is the title of the international conference, in connection with the project "For Whom the Bell Curves," in **Trondheim**, Norway, 14-16 May 2007. The workshop will be open to a limited number (max 100) of senior and junior academics. PhD students who participate and present a paper will also be able to receive course credit. The keynote and plenary speakers are Alain Desrosières (Centre Alexandre Koyré d'histoire des Paris), Susan Leigh Star (Santa Clara University), Jean-Guy Prévost (Univeristy of Quebec at Montreal), Simon Cole (University of California, Irvine), Jonathan Kahn (University of Minnesota), Karen-Sue Taussig (University of Minnesota) and Ann Rudinow Sætnan (NTNU). The language of the workshop will be English. We will allow students to present papers written in French or in Scandinavian languages, but we request that the oral presentations be in English. Registration fee: NOK 565 (appx. €67). After 19 Mar 07: NOK 665 (appx. €78) Fee includes participation and coffee break snacks. Some travel grant funding will likely be available. Information about speakers and practical information on programme, conference dinner (not included in fee), accommodation and travel can be found at our website: **http://www.svt.ntnu.no/iss/ projects/bell/workshop.htm**. Historical analyses tell us that statistics as mathematical specialty and governmental practice evolved in interaction with the emergence of the modern state. These analyses take us to about the 1970's. Since then, we have seen: an explosion in computer power; a swing away from government planning and towards submission to the "invisible hand" of the market; and the erection of "firewalls" (however leaky) around our personal data. We invite contributions addressing how those changes, and others, may be affecting the practices of public statistics; which impacts they may have on the gathering, storing, sorting, classifying, analyzing, and deploying statistics, and thereby on practices of governance and on the lives of citizens. We especially welcome contributions related to our own five fields of investigation: Classification of populations into contested categories, e.g. race.; Criminal justice

databases and statistics practices; Health databases and statistics-based diagnostics; Statistics in municipal governance; and Analysis of algorithms found in the four above-listed areas. Abstract submission (300 words) and registration is available the website. Abstract submission deadline: 19 Feb 2007. Registration deadline: 19 Mar 2007.

Contentious "Progress" in Science and Technology is the title of a proposed session by SSTNET members at the 8th ESA Conference (European Sociological Association), to be held in **Glasgow**, 3-6 September, 2007. The SSTNET members have issued a call for papers. Fuelled by public and private investments in research and development, the speed of innovation has accelerated and also the pressure has increased to market innovations as early as possible. The ambivalent implications of this kind of "progress" have become a public issue. Risks inherent in scientific and technological innovations but also the vulnerability of modern society through potential misuse of high-tech achievements in areas such as ICT, biotechnology, nanotechnology, or energy machinery are on the agenda. Many risks have a global dimension. They affect also those who do not participate in the high-tech innovation journey. This is why assessing science and technology is no longer or can no longer be a technocratic exercise of circles of experts. Questions of governance of modern science and technology but also moral and ethical issues related to innovation and "progress" have moved to the center of public debate. This debate is driven mainly by civil society organizations which, however, often have to struggle gaining public attention. Papers are invited which from a conceptual or theoretical angle discuss these issues and/or present empirical studies. Registration and abstracts will be accepted from autumn 2006. Detailed information concerning abstract submission can be found on the conference website of the European Sociological Association http://www.esa8thconference.com. The provisional deadline for abstract submission is 15th February, 2007. A PhD students session will be organized to facilitate the involvement of PhD students in this growing research area. This PhD Students session will offer the opportunity to present current PhD work, the aim is not to have straight presentations, but to grant enough time to discuss central issues of the thesis. This session has no thematic restriction, being open to all PHD projects in the area of science and

technology. Write to the organizers of the SSTNET sessions. Luisa Oliveira: CIES / ISCTE , Higher Institute of Social Sciences and Business Studies, Lisboa, Portugal. Phone: (351) 217903077, Fax: (351) 217940074, E-mail: luisa.oliveira@iscte.pt; Raymund Werle: Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies, Köln, Germany. Phone: +49 221 2767224; Fax:+49 221 2767452; E-mail: _we@mpifg.de. Aaro Tupasela, Department of Sociology, PO Box 18 / 00014 University of Helsinki, Tel.: +358 9 19123970; Fax.: +358 9 191 2396; E-mail aaro.tupasela@helsinki.fi. Franc Mali (University of Ljubljana, Slovenia) Franc.mali@uni-lj.si. Katarina Prpic´, Institute for Social Research, Zagreb, Croatia, Phone: (385) (1) 48 10 264; Fax: (385) (1) 48 10 263; E-mail katarina@idi.hr.

The *Society & Sports Network (ESN)* of the European Sociological Association (ESA) invites you to submit papers, to be presented at the Eight ESA Conference in **Glasgow**, UK Topics to be addressed in the ESN sessions include: Sports and Culture; Sports, Politics and Governance; Sports and Health; Sports and Social Inequality; Sports and Fitness; Sports and Physical Activity; Sports, Civil Society and Voluntary Organizations; Sports and Social Capital; Sports and Economy; Sports and Media; Sports and Gender; Sports and Professionalization; Sports and Commercialization; Sports and Doping; and Sports and Technology. Other topics could also be of interest. Abstracts should be submitted through the online submission form on the website www.esa8thconference.com. The deadline for submission is 28 February 2007. Co-ordinator and contact address for Society & Sports: Ørnulf Seippel, ornulf.seippel@socialresearch.no, Institute for Social Research, Munthesgt. 31, 0260 Oslo, Norway, Phone: 0047 23086123/0047 97167500

The *Third Plenary Conference of the Tensions of Europe Network* will be held on 7-10 June 2007 in **Rotterdam**, The Netherlands. The European Science Foundation (ESF) and the Foundation for the History of Technology in the Netherlandsistory of Technology are jointly organizing the Launch Conference of the ESF EUROCORES Programme /Inventing Europe/ in conjunction with the Third Plenary Conference of the /Tensions of Europe/ Network (ToE). The ESF EUROCORES Programme /Inventing Europe/ and ToE strive, through collaborative

research and coordinating efforts, to promote studies of the interplay between technical change and European history. Instead of focusing on national histories, the emphasis of both initiatives is on /transnational/ technological developments that have shaped and are shaping Europe. For scholars interested in the role of technology in European history this event will provide a unique opportunity not only to present and discuss current and envisaged new research, but also to create new networks and plan coordinated activities for some years to come. We encourage scholars from all disciplines who study subjects related to the areas below to submit abstracts for the research sessions and roundtables organised by the Tensions of Europe network. These areas are drawn from the Inventing Europe themes (see http://www.esf.org/inventingeurope) and the Tensions of Europe Intellectual Agenda (see www.histech.nl/tensions). Building Europe through Infrastructures, or, how Europe has been shaped by the material links of transnational infrastructure; Constructing European Ways of Knowing, or, how Europe became articulated through efforts to unite knowledge and practices on a European scale; Consuming Europe, or, how actors reworked consumer goods and artefacts for local, regional, national, European, and global use Europe in the Global World, or, how Europe has been created through colonial, ex-colonial, trans-Atlantic, and other global exchanges; Synthetic methodological or historiographical explorations of the role of technology in transnational European history. For more information, contact Rüdiger Klein (inventingeurope@esf.org).

Networking in Science: The Gender Perspective is the title of the conference to be held in **Ermoupolis of Syros, Greece**, on July 6-9, 2007. The Commission "Women in Science" of the International Union for History and Philosophy of Science/Division of History of Science is organizing a conference to honor the 25th anniversary of the Commission's establishment. The venue is the Ermoupolis Seminars in Syros, a Cycladic island in Greece. The Ermoupolis Seminars constitute an important institution in Greece. For the last 23 years they have been organized the National Hellenic Research Foundation, http://www.eie.gr/http://www.eie.gr/, in collaboration to the Scientific Foundation of Cyclades. The seminars take place at the historical building of the Town Hall of Cyclades and the Industrial Museum of Ermoupolis, the

capital of Syros. The commission's meeting is held from the 6th to the 9th of July, 2007. The conference explores the importance of networking in science from a gender perspective. It is indubitable that networks play an important role in the development of science. Exchange of knowledge and expertise between scientists of several countries and universities stand on the top of their agenda. Parallel to this runs the importance of belonging to the "right" networks for the development of one's own scientific career. Historically participation in professional organisations and other scientific networks have been long ago recognized as the most essential part in the advancement of science. However, given the marginal position of women in science it is interesting to explore the role of gender in networking in science. In its 1999 Communication "Women and Science," the European Commission recognised that networks of women scientists have a key role to play. The conference aims to a sociological and historical understanding of the role of scientific networks to women's professional careers and the role of gender to the establishment and maintaining of scientific networks. Abstracts of contributed papers are due February 28, 2007. You could send your abstract either electronically or via mail to Dr. Annette Vogt, President of the Commission Women in Science of the DHS/IUHPS Max Planck Institute for the History of Science, Boltzmannstr. 44, 14195 Berlin, Germany, vogt@mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de, or Maria Rentetzi, Secretary of the Commission Women in Science of the DHS/IUHPS, National Technical University of Athens Efestion 11, Thisio, Athens 11851, Greece, mrentetz@vt.edu.

The PhD students of the Augustin Cournot Doctoral School are pleased to announce the upcoming fourth edition of the *Augustin Cournot Doctoral Days* (ACDD) to be held from the 10th to 12th April 2007 at the Université Louis Pasteur in **Strasbourg**, France. This interdisciplinary conference provides a stimulating environment in which international PhD students and young researchers can exchange their ideas with experienced researchers. The History of Science and Science & Technology Studies portion of the conference will focus notably on the history of science, technology and medicine, as well as sociology and other social studies of science. Papers on the following themes will be particularly welcomed: Risk and regulation; Health and environment; Clinical medicine; Innovation in therapeutics;

and Physical and observatory sciences. Sessions will not be limited to these topics.Accepted papers will be presented in parallel sessions focusing on each domain. The format is a 20 minute presentation followed by 10 minutes of questions and discussion. Plenary sessions are scheduled during the three days with the participation of senior researchers. Interested PhD students are expected to submit an extended abstract in English (apx. 1 page and three keywords) in electronic form to the following address: doctoraldays@cournot.u-strasbg.fr. Submission should include the author's name, affiliation, address, phone number and email. The fee is 60 euros, and it covers registration, noon and evening meals. Deadline for submission: 1 February 2007. Acceptance notification: 1 March 2007. Registration deadline: 15 March 2007. Communication of the full paper (optional - for publication on the ACDD website): 1 April 2007. For further information on the conference format and program details, please refer to: http://cournot.u-strasbg.fr/acdd.

There has been a call for papers for the sessions of the Research Network 'Sociology of Risk and Uncertainty' at the 8th conference of the *European Sociological Association* on 'Conflict, Citizenship and Civil Society', 3-6 September 2007 in **Glasgow**, UK. The deadline 15th February 2007. Risk and uncertainty are important issues in a growing amount of societal areas and social research. The management and negotiation of risk, its socio-cultural production in media coverage and discourses and the conflicts on its (unequal) allocation are focal themes in the sociology of risk and uncertainty. As there is a growing interest in how sociological macro phenomena are linked to everyday life, the call for papers of the research network covers a wide range of topics. It reaches from strategies to govern the risk society and the discoursive construction of risk and uncertainty via issues of health and illness to the ongoing reproduction of social inequalities. There is an additional focus on individual's experience and management of risk and uncertainty. The various links of risk and suffering are addressed as well as the phenomena of voluntary (high) risk taking. In a shared session with the RN Biographical Perspectives on European Societies the different forms of the management of risk and uncertainty during the course of their life as well as the impact of one's biography on the experience of risk and uncertainty will be examined. Session

topics include the following. Governing the Risk Society (Chair: Peter Taylor-Gooby, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK, P.F.Taylor-Gooby@kent.ac.uk). The emergence of the risk approach to managing uncertainty and the implications for governance across public and private sectors and personal life have been extensively analysed. This section invites papers which draw on these themes, and those which consider current developments, including but not limited to: Risk and Citizenship; Risk and Trust; New Public Policies and Risk; and Risk and New Forms of Management. Health, Risk and European Societies (Chair: Andy Alaszewski, Centre for Health Service Studies (CHSS), University of Kent, Canterbury, UK, a.m.alaszewski@kent.ac.uk). Health forms a major site for the articulation and construction of risk in late modern society. Failures to effectively identify and manage risk often result in major health problems even disasters while the uncertainty associated with health threats are a major factor in shaping individual and collective behaviour. We invite papers which address different dimensions of health and risk from issues of human agency, through the institutional structuring of risk to the societal construction of risk and uncertainty. Risk Discourses and the Media (Chair: to be determined). The media doubtless play an important role to disseminate knowledge about the world, which risks and uncertainties we have to expect and which worries and concerns torture us in everyday life. Nevertheless, the media only partly influence people's risk perception. The session aims to examine how media discourses (e.g. on GM-food, bird flue, divorce, youth, crime) construct risk and uncertainty and how media and the public are connected. Terrorism, Risk and Uncertainty (Chair: Gabe Mythen, Manchester Metropolitan University, UK, G.Mythen@mmu.ac.uk). Following on from high profile terrorist attacks in the United States, Spain and the UK, terrorism has become a crucial and contested problem in Western nations. Political debates have centred on the nature, communication and management of the terrorist threat. Meanwhile, academics have sought to understand the thorny issues that cluster around terrorism with recourse to extant risk theories. This theme seeks to make sense of current events by engaging with the risks and uncertainties that emerge around the terrorist threat, including its representation, mediation, interpretation and regulation. Submissions are invited for papers which engage with one or more of the following themes: Terrorism and

Changing Modes of Risk Assessment; Media Representations of Terrorism; Terrorism and the Politics of Fear; Security, Surveillance and Terrorism; Terrorism, Law and Uncertainty; and Terrorism, Crime and Governance. Risk, Uncertainty and Social Inequalities (Chair: Anwen Jones, University of York, UK, naj3@york.ac.uk). Beck's thesis on the risk society (1991) stated a change in societal reproduction mode from a society mainly driven by class differences to a society mainly driven by risk. Even though this assumption was continuously criticized there is still a lack of newer studies of the reproduction of social inequalities in the risk society and how risk and inequalities interact, whether they mutually amplify or weaken inequalities. Papers are invited which contribute to the understanding of the societal reproduction of social inequalities in the risk society. Risk, Uncertainty, and Social Suffering (Chair: Marja-Liisa Honkasalo, University of Helsinki, Finland (marja-liisa.honkasalo@helsinki.fi). Social suffering as a theoretical and methodological approach has recently been widely discussed within the domain of social sciences. Social suffering is approached from various perspectives; it is defined as a social category that connects different kinds of human problems, including pain, illness experience, political violence, and other trials for people to undergo or endure. Some scholars consider social suffering as lived experience, and as something that hinders the most meaningful in one's life. Still others, like Bourdieu, with his concept of misère considers sufferings in a plural and emphasizes human agency and praxis in shifting and multiple contexts of everyday life. The session aims to discussing the problems of risk in the context of social suffering, thus giving it a broader perspective upon the lived experience of uncertainty, contingency, and agency. Voluntary Risk Taking (Chair: Stephen Lyng, Carthage College, USA, slyng@carthage.edu). In the context of risk, research often focuses on the individual's prevention of or coping with undesired events. The reasons and forms of why people seek risks and uncertainties are less well examined even though voluntary risk taking is an essential part of our life (Lupton/Tulloch 2002; Lyng 2005). Voluntary risk taking is addressed in a range of areas as crime, leisure time, sex, sports, work, drug use etc. The session aims to pool forms of voluntary risk taking in European societies. Shared sessions with other research networks: Biography, Risk, and Uncertainty, with RN 'Biographical Perspectives on European

Societies', (Chair: Jens O. Zinn, j.zinn@kent.ac.uk and Robin Humphrey, Robin.Humphrey@newcastle.ac.uk). Biographical research and risk research are two rising stars of sociological and interdisciplinary research which converge in many respects. In risk research the pressing question on the factors how people perceive and respond to risk recently developed greater interest into narrative and biographical research since risk perceptions research, the psychometric paradigm and rational action approaches showed significant weaknesses. How current activities and orientations are embedded in the accumulation of experiences during the course of one's life is the central focus of biographical research. In this perspective risk perception and coping with risk is part of the overall management of one's life and its miseries and therefore only understandable against the background of one's biography embedded in a socio-historical context. Papers are welcome which examine people's everyday management of risks in a biographical perspective. Please submit your abstracts via the conference homepage, http://www.esa8thconference.com/abstractsubmission/index.php by 15th February 2007.

The *4th Dubrovnik Conference on Sustainable Development* (www.dubrovnik2007.fsb.hr) will be held on June 4-8 2007, in Dubrovnik, **Croatia**. A special session will be held on Sustainable Socio-Technical Transport Systems: Intellectual refreshments from and for the STS community. Many scholars, in particular those in the field of Science and Technology Studies (STS), argue for interdisciplinary collaboration to develop not only a better conceptual grasp of socio-technical systems but also to devise more effective policy advise on how to make such systems more sustainable. However, it has not yet become standard
practice for STS scholars to expose themselves to the engineering details of, say, more sustainable transport systems. Conversely, it seems fair to state that engineers typically do not systematically seek advice from social scientists – or only in an "end-of-pipe" fashion to advertise resource efficient products to public, corporate or private consumers. The 4th Dubrovnik Conference on Sustainable Development of Energy, Water and Environment Systems will try to provide a venue for a more truly interdisciplinary dialogue about sustainable development – in particular about sustainable transport. Its conceptual starting point is the

acknowledgement of sustainable development as a complex, multi-criteria challenge requiring interdisciplinary collaboration. Papers exploring "engineering, social, and environment aspects" of sustainable transport are therefore invited as contributions to the emerging field of sustainability science. The special session on a socio-technical understanding of transport systems will be a platform for such cross-fertilisation and mutual refreshment. Its contributions will offer insights from recent STS research about the hybrid constitution of sustainable transport systems and the systemic interweavement of their social, institutional and technical elements. Papers are also invited about concrete tools to put these insights to action, like Co-evolution audit, Strategic Niche Management (SNM), Constructive Technology Assessment (CTA), Co-Evolutionary Socio-technical Scenario Method (CEST-method) etc. Since dialogue involves talking and listening, the presenters are particularly encouraged to also disclose their concerns and knowledge gaps as potential "docking points" for contributions of their peers from engineering and natural science departments. It is intended to publish selected contributions to this unique dialogue in *Built Environment*, www.alexandrinepress.co.uk, whose editors have already expressed their interest in such a special issue. Session convenor: Dr. Ralf Brand, University of Manchester, ralf.brand@manchester.ac.uk, +44 / 161 / 2750317. Authors willing to present a paper should prepare a one-page abstract using the abstract template at www.dubrovnik2007.fsb.hr/AbstractTemplate.rtf . Abstract submissions are required by January 15 2007 via the web form. Copies of the abstract should also be sent to the session convenor at ralf.brand@manchester.ac.uk. All papers will be reviewed under direction of the Scientific Advisory Board; the session organiser is not involved in the Review Process.

Dangerous Trade: Histories of Industrial Hazard across a Globalizing World, the international conference on the historical relationship between industrial hazards and globalization, will be held December 13-15, 2007, at Stony Brook University, **Stony Brook, N.Y.** It will focus especially on two more recent periods of global economic integration, the late nineteenth/early twentieth and the later twentieth centuries. The conference will highlight several themes: (1) the making of hazardous industries in particular places. Issues may range from design,

engineering, and management of dangerous processes; to worker health and disease; to housing and sanitation; to air and water pollution; to ecological impacts on surrounding lands and livelihoods. The industries involved may be older, as in agriculture or mining or textiles, or newer, as in petrochemical or nuclear plants. For each period, we seek cases studies in both developed and developing worlds. (2) Knowing and controlling industrial hazards: Issues may include the evolving awareness of danger, risk, or dissemination; changing and conflicting styles of knowledge, whether lay or expert; changing means of detection and diagnosis; the influence of worker or environmental organizations and advocacy; different state and regulatory approaches and their impacts; and debates and struggles over solutions, whether technological, legal or political. (3) Historical relationships between intra-workplace and wider environmental hazards, and between the professional and legal terrains of "occupational," "environmental," and "public" health. (4) Cross-national passages in the making, recognition and remedy of industrial hazards. These may involve multinational companies, capital, managers, migratory workers, raw materials, experts, technologies, scientific or other cultural practices, government or international agencies, or labor or environmental groups. (5) Comparative and supra-national approaches to the history of industrial hazard. Our deliberations will strive for a more synthetic understanding of how the history of industrial hazards has varied across industries, nations, and periods, and of how, when, and why hazardous processes and their associated knowledge and remedy have (or have not) traveled from one nation or territory to another. The conference will have a workshop format, as we plan to move quickly to an edited publication. Accepted participants will be expected to submit a full manuscript version of their paper a month and a half beforehand, as a basis for conference discussions. Funds will likely be available for accepted presenters to cover food, lodging, and travel, national as well as international. We hope to strike an even balance between U.S. and non-U.S. participants. Paper proposals must include an abstract of at least five hundred words and a curriculum vitae. The deadline for paper proposals is March 31, 2007. They should be sent as email attachments, in Word or Wordperfect files, to csellers@notes.cc.sunysb.edu or else as hard copies, to Christopher Sellers, History Department, Stony Brook University, Stony

Brook, NY 11794 USA. Please address inquiries to Christopher Sellers, at the above email, or to Joseph Melling at J.L.melling@exeter.ac.uk.

Visualising Nature: Making Images and the Production of Biological Knowledge from Early Modern Natural History to Contemporary Life Sciences is the title of the **Ischia Summer School** on the History of the Life Sciences, Ischia, 3 July – 10 July, 2007. It is supported by Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn (Naples), Institut d'Histoire de la Médecine et de la Santé (Geneva), Max-Planck-Institut für Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Berlin), and History of Science Department, Harvard University (Cambridge, Mass). The Directors of the School are Giorgio Bernardi and Christiane Groeben (Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn, Naples) Janet Browne (Harvard), Bernardino Fantini (Geneva), Hans-Jörg Rheinberger (Berlin). The 2007 summer school will explore the relationship between making and knowing in the biological sciences as mediated by visual culture from the Renaissance to the modern day. We intend to focus on three interrelated themes. One theme concerns craft practices and the development of visualising technologies. The development of such techniques (engraving, photography, film and digital technologies) invariably takes place outside biology and therefore gives rise to problems of application, conversion and definition, all of which impact on the practice of biology. The second theme concerns the historical relation between theory and image in the formation of scientific arguments. The iconic images of an evolutionary tree, biochemical cycles or the double helix, for example, are wedded to our understanding of current research. Visualisation, in this sense, is the statement of theory. Third, there are the cognitive claims about reality that are made through images, for example through graphs, diagrams, moving images, time lapse or changes of scale, microscopy, computer simulation, museum display, the rhetoric of book illustration, TV wildlife films and medical imaging. Perceptual evidence has traditionally been given privileged epistemic status in science. Yet increasing use of non-optical detection methods and increasing reliance on statistical processing to generate data renders the status of the knowledge problematic. The aim is to bring together graduate and recent postdoctoral students with experts from a number of different fields to engage with the following key topics: 1.Techologies of making images and presenting biological materials, including the fine arts,

drawing and painting, craft practices, the impact of mechanical reproduction, anatomies and preparations (eg slides, models, specimens). 2.Changes of scale, microscopy, photography, X-Rays, the consolidation of agreement about the meaning of images, eyewitness reports, realism and observation, training. 3.Film and digital technologies; new instruments and new conceptual problems. 4. Images as theory and tool, diagrams, maps, scans, tables, graphs and iconic representations such as evolutionary trees, biological cycles, isotopic tracing. 5.Computer simulations, the enhancement of reality, the place of perceptual evidence in modern biology, genetic and epidemiological maps, the depiction of cells. 6.Visual display, museums, book illustration, spectacle, mass-media outlets. It is hoped to arrange time for participating students also to present a brief account of their own work. In addition there will be opportunities for a film screening, provisionally a selection of Jean Painlevé's classic natural history films (1940s). A visit to the laboratory of the Stazione Zoologica 'Anton Dohrn' in Naples is planned during which students can explore modern laboratory techniques and the famous aquarium. The emphasis of the course will be on encouraging discussion and exchanging ideas across disciplinary boundaries. English is the official working language. A background reading pack for the workshops will be sent to each participant in advance. The first and last days (Tuesday 3 July and Tuesday 10 July) are travelling days with no lectures scheduled. The island of Ischia can only be approached by ferry from Naples and participants arriving by air are encouraged to check the ferry timetables carefully. We will provide all necessary information. The weather at this time of year is extremely warm and sunny, especially around midday, and for comfort we schedule our sessions during the morning and late afternoon. Applications should be sent by 30 January 2007 to: Professor Bernardino Fantini, Institut d.Histoire de la Médecine et de la Santé, CMU, Case postale, 1211 Genève 4, Switzerland, Phone: +41.22.379.57.90; Fax: +41.22.379.57.92, Email: Bernardino.Fantini@medecine.unige.ch. Please include a brief cv, a statement specifying your academic experience and interest in the course topic, and a letter of recommendation. The group will be limited to about 25 participants. There is a small charge for students of 400 Euros each. This fee covers full board and lodging. The organisers gratefully acknowledge awards from the VolkswagenStiftung and the Stazione Zoologica Anton Dohrn (Naples).

Geometrical Objects: Architecture and the Mathematical Sciences 1400-1800, will be held at the **Museum of the History of Science and Worcester College, University of Oxford** on 19-20 March 2007. Recent scholarship in the history of science has underscored the mutually reinforcing relationship between "high" and "low," or theoretical and practical, forms of early modern mathematics. As many historians have shown, mathematicians of the period were deeply involved in problems of instrument making, surveying,

engineering, gunnery, and navigation. At the same time, the practitioners of these arts were increasingly concerned with questions of higher mathematics and natural philosophy as they pertained to the advancement of their craft. In fact, practitioners appear to have provided an important intellectual and technical context for many of the period's mathematical discoveries - an essential development, historians now maintain, in the larger history of the "scientific revolution." Architecture, too, was a "mathematical" art, almost wholly dependent on geometrical or arithmetic operations of some form or another. The process of design itself - insofar as it required the application of consistent proportional rules - was largely defined by them, as were many other basic tasks. Surveying, cost estimates, bookkeeping, and even the use of routine graphic techniques - perspective, scaled orthogonal drawing, and stereotomic diagrams - all entailed a certain amount of mathematical training. Nor were these skills limited to the design of buildings. Architects also used calculations in mapping cities, laying out fortifications, and planning hydraulic projects for gardens, dams, and canals. Military and civil engineering had long been part of the Vitruvian tradition. This symposium seeks to explore issues and questions raised by this situation. To what extent can the architect be considered a "mathematical practitioner"? What role did architectural practice and building technologies play in the broader evolution of mathematics? How did architects see themselves in relation to mathematicians and scientists? What are the documented cases of contact or conflict between these groups? Attendance is free but registration essential. For further information and a list of speakers see http://www.mhs.ox.ac.uk/architecture/.

Geographies of Nineteenth-Century Science: An

International Interdisciplinary Conference, will be held at the Institute of Geography, **University of Edinburgh** on 18-21 July 2007. See **http://www.geos.ed.ac.uk/geography/geog19c**. The conference themes are the Production of scientific knowledge; Mobility of scientific knowledge; and Consumption of scientific knowledge. The importance of space and the situated nature of knowledge in understanding the history of intellectual and social change have been increasingly acknowledged by scholars in a variety of disciplines. In this context, the 'spatial turn' evident in the history of science has been paralleled by work in geography which has paid attention to science's discovery, the sites of its reception and justification and studies of the nature of science's movement across space. In this regard, the time is right to reinforce interdisciplinary enquiry and establish new research frontiers by exploring the significance of geographical thinking to the making, movement and reception of science, here in the nineteenth century. Speakers: Sam Alberti (University of Manchester), Lawrence Dritsas (University of Edinburgh), Diarmid Finnegan (Queen's University Belfast), Aileen Fyfe (National University of Ireland, Galway), Graeme Gooday (University of Leeds), Sally Gregory Kohlstedt (University of Minnesota), Bernard Lightman (York University, Toronto), David Livingstone (Queen's University Belfast), Iwan Morus (University of Aberystwyth), Simon Naylor (University of Exeter), Theodore Porter (University of California, Los Angeles), Nicholas Rupke (University of Göttingen), Anne Secord (University of Cambridge), Sujit Sivasundaram (University of Cambridge), Crosbie Smith (University of Kent), Jon Topham (University of Leeds), Charles Withers (University of Edinburgh). Deadline for registration is 18 June 2007. This conference is sponsored by The British Academy, The British Society for the History of Science, Queen's University Belfast, The Royal Society of Edinburgh, the Historical Geography Research Group of the Royal Geographical Society (with the Institute of British Geographers) and The University of Edinburgh (Moray Endowment Fund).

The European Science Foundation (ESF) and the Foundation for the History of Technology in the Netherlands are jointly organizing the Launch Conference of the ESF EUROCORES Programme Inventing Europe in conjunction with the Third Plenary Conference of the Tensions of Europe Network (ToE). The ESF EUROCORES Programme Inventing Europe and

ToE strive, through collaborative research and coordinating efforts, to promote studies of the interplay between technical change and European history. Instead of focusing on national histories, the emphasis of both initiatives is on transnational technological developments that have shaped and are shaping Europe. For scholars interested in the role of technology in European history this event will provide a unique opportunity not only to present and discuss current and envisaged new research, but also to create new networks and plan coordinated activities for some years to come. We encourage scholars from all disciplines who study subjects related to the areas below to submit abstracts for the research sessions and roundtables organised by the Tensions of Europe network. These areas are drawn from the Inventing Europe themes (see http://www.esf.org/inventingeurope) and the Tensions of Europe Intellectual Agenda (see www.histech.nl/tensions). The conference seeks contributions that will treat technological change as an entry point into the contested practice of Europeanization. Four general areas to be explored are: Building Europe through Infrastructures, or, how Europe has been shaped by the material links of transnational infrastructure. Constructing European Ways of Knowing, or, how Europe became articulated through efforts to unite knowledge and practices on a European scale. Consuming Europe, or, how actors reworked consumer goods and artefacts for local, regional, national, European, and global use. Europe in the Global World, or, how Europe has been created through colonial, ex-colonial, trans-Atlantic, and other global exchanges. Synthetic methodological or historiographical explorations of the role of technology in transnational European history. The Program Committee welcomes proposals that address the overall conference themes in the following two formats: Research sessions with three papers based on original research, and an invited commentator. Because the conference encourages debate, appropriate time for discussion should be allocated to the commentators as well as the members of the audience. The papers will be pre-circulated to all conference participants. Conference participants are expected to have read the papers thus presentations should be brief. Roundtable sessions with an open agenda or one paper to start-off the discussion. The sessions will host no more than six discussants including the organizer and the chair. The organizer is responsible for preparing a dialogue paper to stimulate debate, and if relevant, supplementary material. Ideally,

the dialogue paper will be a brief piece that poses a number of historical problems and/or questions related to the conference theme that will be addressed in the debate. While the organizer should propose discussants, the Program Committee may make additional suggestions. The chair may decide either to limit the conversation to invited roundtable discussants or to allow the audience to ask questions and enter the debate. Research sessions will be allotted a minimum time slot of one and a half hours, and roundtable discussions one hour. The deadline for session and roundtable proposals is JANUARY 22, 2007. The session abstracts (maximum 600 words) should be submitted by the organizers together with the abstracts for the individual presentations (maximum 500 words each). To propose a roundtable, please submit a list of invited participants and an abstract (maximum 600 words). When giving the proposal a digital file name, please include the organizer's last name, and either RS for research session or RT for round table. The abstracts should be sent to the Program Committee by email to TOE@tue.nl . Please direct queries to the Program Committee Coordinator, Donna C. Mehos (d.c.mehos@tue.nl). The Program Committee will inform the session organizers about its decisions no later than March 1, 2007. Tensions of Europe is seeking travel funding for those who have no opportunity to participate otherwise. Costs of InventingEurope participants will be borne by ESF. More information will become available at the conference website www.histech.nl/tensions. Papers and roundtable discussion texts must be submitted to the Program Committee by May 1, 2007 because they will be distributed to all conference participants before the conference on a CD and made available on the website.

Re:place 2007, the Second International Conference on the Histories of Media, Art, Science and Technology, will be held at the **Haus der Kulturen der Welt, Berlin**, 15-18 November 2007. Re:place 2007, the Second International Conference on the Histories of Media, Art, Science and Technology, will take place in Berlin from 15 - 18 November 2007 as a project of Kulturprojekte Berlin GmbH in cooperation with Haus der Kulturen der Welt. This conference is a sequel to 'Refresh!', the first in this series, chaired by Oliver Grau and produced by the Database of Virtual Art, Leonardo, and Banff New Media Institute, and held at the Banff Center in Canada in September

2005, which brought together several hundred artists, scientists, researchers, curators and theoreticians of different disciplines. Re:place 2007 will be an international forum for the presentation and the discussion of exemplary approaches to the rapport between art, media, science and technology. With the title, 're:place', we propose a thematic focus on locatedness and the migration of knowledge and knowledge production in the interdisciplinary contexts of art, historiography, science and technology. The re:place 2007 conference will be devoted to examining the manifold connections between art, science and technology, connections which have come into view more sharply through the growing attention to media art and its histories over the past years. It will address historical contexts and artistic explorations of new technologies as well as the historical and contemporary research into the mutual influences between artistic work, scientific research and technological developments. This research concerns such diverse fields as cybernetics, artificial intelligence, robotics, nano-technology, and bio-technology, as well as investigations in the humanities including art history, visual culture, musicology, comparative literature, media archaeology, media theory, science studies, and sociology. The conference programme will include competitively selected, peer-reviewed individual papers, panel presentations, poster sessions, as well as a small number of invited speakers. Several Keynote Lectures, by internationally renowned, outstanding theoreticians and artists, will deliberate on the central themes of the conference. The conference will also include dedicated forum sessions for participants to engage in more open-ended discussion and debate on relevant issues and questions. Re:place 2007 welcomes contributions from established as well as from emerging researchers in diverse fields. The conference will be of interest to those working in, but not limited to, the following areas: art history and theory, literary studies, cultural studies, film and media studies, theatre, dance and performance studies, philosophy, history, gender studies, human-computer interaction, contemporary art, musicology, sound studies, anthropology, sociology, geography, science, technology and society studies, history of science, and history of technology. We are especially keen on empirical, conceptual, and historical contributions that exemplify and expand the diverse methodological and thematic concerns of this extended interdisciplinary area. These might include contributions to:

institutional histories of centers, sites, or events that have helped to concretize and engender the intersections between media, art, science and technology. Some broad areas could be: experimental arts spaces, collaborative research labs, significant exhibitions, etc. Place studies that highlight significant locations or situations where such interdisciplinary intersections or significant historical episodes have occurred. A few examples might be: 'Tesla in Budapest', 'Flusser in Brazil', USSR in the 1920s, 'Japan between 1950s-1970s,' etc. Historiographical issues, methods, and debates that pose critical questions in the formulation of the histories of the 'media arts'. These might include: archaeology, genealogy or variantology as methodological tools, bridging the divide between art and media history, sociologies of interactivity, etc. Theoretical frameworks from various philosophical and disciplinary positions. Topics might include the exemplary role of film studies or musicology for the study of media arts, or the significance of cultural specificities and location in media and technologies, etc. The migration of knowledges and practices from different contexts, whether disciplinary, institutional, geographical or cultural. Topics might include: the role of migrant artists in the development of new discourses and practices; the movement and adoption of disciplinary ideas from science into art contexts or vice versa, etc. Access the online submission form at: http://www.mediaarthistory.org/. See also http://tamtam.mi2.hr/replace.

Engineering European Bodies: When Biomedical Technologies Challenge European Governance, Bioethics and Identities is the Final Conference of the EU Project "Challenges of Biomedicine (CoB) – Socio-Cultural Contexts, European Governance & Bioethics," to be held at the **University of Vienna**, June 14-16, 2007. Over the last few decades, biomedical technologies have played a crucial role in re-engineering the human body on multiple levels, as well as in re-defining individual and collective identities. These processes challenge established cultural understandings, the way we govern new technologies as well as bioethical reflection. With the enlargement and integration of the European Union, questions relating to common governance of biomedical technologies including a European bioethics framework, have to be critically addressed both theoretically and empirically. Which roles do socio-cultural differences play and how do they figure in

shaping bodies and identities? What are the impacts on civic approaches to technologies, ethical argumentation and visions of governing? How are these differences handled in a common Europe? To address these issues, this conference builds on a comparative and interdisciplinary European research project "Challenges of Biomedicine". Going beyond the project it aims to bring together academics from bioethics, science and technology studies, cultural anthropology, medicine as well as policy makers on European and national levels. The goals of the conference are to discuss empirical work and ethical reflection related to the topic of socio-cultural varieties in re-engineering bodies as well as concepts of choice, agency and identity; to investigate the implications of biomedical technologies for the delivery of health care and the public health; to debate implications of biomedical technologies for European and national policy arenas; and to reflect on the methodological challenges of comparative and cross-disciplinary research. Plenary lectures addressing the key issues will be alternated by parallel sessions which are meant to bring together genuine empirical and theoretical work carried out in these areas within the project as well as by invited researchers. Abstracts for individual presentations in the parallel sessions are invited (closing date February 28, 2007). The conference explicitly aims at bringing together research from different disciplinary context such as bioethics, anthropology, science and technology studies. Presentations should fit the conference topic and relate to one of three topical threads, either on: (1) the impact of biomedical technologies on identities, concepts of choice and decision making; (2) the biotechnological shaping of human values and attitudes; or (3) public participation in and governance of biomedical technologies and the public health systems they are embedded in. Papers addressing cultural comparative and cross-disciplinary work and related methodological challenges, religious and gender issues, as well as reflections on the normative and political implications of the processes described above are explicitly invited. Presentation proposals should contain title, speaker(s), affiliations and contact details, which of the conference threads it relates to, and an abstract of 300 words. Please use the template file on http://www.univie.ac.at/virusss/workshops as basis for your submission and send it by February 28, 2007, to projekt.wissenschaftsforschung@univie.ac.at.

New Network Theory, the International Conference, will be held in **Amsterdam** on 28-30 June 2007. Organized by the Amsterdam School for Cultural Analysis, Institute of Network Cultures (Amsterdam Polytechnic, HvA), and Media Studies, University of Amsterdam, the conference (http://www.networkcultures.org/networktheory) also includes a public program with renowned speakers. The conference organizers are Geert Lovink (Institute of Network Cultures/University of Amsterdam), Sabine Niederer (Institute of Network Cultures), Richard Rogers (University of Amsterdam) and Jan Simons (University of Amsterdam). The object of study has shifted from the virtual community and the space of flows to the smart mob. When the object of study changes, so may the distinctions that dominate, particularly the schism between place-based space and place-less space, both organised and given life by networks. We would like to exploit the potential of writing contemporary network theory that suits and reflects the changes to the objects of study that come to define our understandings of network culture – a post-Castellsian network theory, if you will, that takes technical media seriously. It is time to look for elements that can make up a network theory outside of post-modern cultural studies (which marvelled at the place-less place) and ethnographic social sciences (which reminded us of the ground). What network culture studies needs is a 'language of new media,' perhaps even signage, to speak in terms of Lev Manovich; what it currently has is a science-centered 'unified network theory,' to paraphrase the language of Albert-László Barabási. Whilst it may come as no surprise to critical Internet scholars, the notion that networks are not random but have underlying structures remains the key insight for network scientists. Instead of posing new questions, the work that follows from that insight often seeks to confirm that structure and its accompanying patterns, across more and more network-like objects. The question remains which specific contribution critical Internet scholars and practitioners can make to opening up network thought. Such is the purpose of the network theory conference. How must we rethink network culture with a renewed emphasis on technical media and social software? Suggested Topics: Networks and Social Movements, Anomylous Objects / Parasites of the Net, Networking and Social Life, Social Software and Insider Networks, Network Policy, Network Governance / Organised Networks, Actor-Network Theory and the Assemblage, Gamers

Contribute to Network Theory, Network Knowledge Production, Networks and Disengagement, Media Networks, The Link, Locative Media and Networks, and Mapping Quests. Other topics may be suggested.

The fifth *European Conference on Computing and Philosophy (ECAP)* is to be held on the campus of the **University of Twente**, Enschede, The Netherlands, on June 21-23, 2007.   ECAP is the European conference on Computing and Philosophy, the European affiliate of the International Association for Computing and Philosophy (IACAP, president: Luciano Floridi).   The conference will deal with all aspects of the "computational turn" that is occurring through the interaction of the disciplines of philosophy and computing. The conference is interdisciplinary: we invite papers from philosophy, computer science, social science and related disciplines. During this event special attention will be paid to IT, Cultural Diversity and Technoscience Studies. For whom and by who are technologies developed? Who and what is made visible or invisible by the standardisations and categorisations integral to technoscientific processes and artefacts? Who participates and on what and whose terms? Who

is included in the construction of technological discourses and artefacts? How do issues concering gender, class, ethnicity, age etc. and their intersectionality matter? How is the relation between 'the' social and 'the' technical through new technologies reconfigured? These are some of our main questions. We want to bring scholars together who are engaged in opening the blackbox of new technologies such as computing, AI, etc. and who want to challenge processes of normalisations. We invite research concerning gender and diversity in technology/IT; critical analyses from science and technology studies, feminist/gender research, postcolonial studies and other social and cultural studies of technoscientific practices in general. We are also looking for conceptualisations and ideas with regard to possibilities for intervention, change and alternative technology design, "in the engine rooms of technological production" (Wajcman 1991, p. 164). Authors should submit an electronic version of an extended abstract (total word count approximately 1000 words). The extended abstract submission deadline is Monday 29th January 2007. Please indicate your choice for the track in which you want to fit your abstract (number + name of track). Please submit to: ECAP07@gw.utwente.nl. See also http://www.utwente.nl/ECAP07.

News about Education

New for 2007, the *Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex*, **Brighton**, UK is offering an MA in Science, Society and Development. Two full scholarships available in 2007 for African students. What will future health and agricultural systems look like? Who will benefit from genetically modified crops or new vaccines? With climate change, will there be enough water for people to survive the 21st century? What are the implications of global pandemics of HIV/AIDS or bird flu? How can science and technology generate pro-poor economic growth? What does a global knowledge economy and society mean? Focusing on such pressing practical and policy questions in health, environment and agriculture, this programme provides students with a solid grounding in development concepts and theories, in combination with an understanding of the politics and governance of scientific knowledge and policy processes. Through exploring a combination of theoretical and practical perspectives, the course asks how science and technology can contribute to poverty reduction, social justice and environmental sustainability in the developing world. The programme, hosted by the Knowledge, Technology and Society (KNOTS) team at IDS, is linked to a new IDS-SPRU (Science and Technology Policy Research) research centre: Social, Technological and Environmental Pathways to Sustainability (STEPS). Throughout the programme, students work closely with individual supervisors who have a wide range of disciplinary and professional backgrounds and extensive experience in the developing world. Over three terms there are four compulsory courses and a series of shorter options. The lecture-based courses are combined with tutorial and supervisory support and a series of workshops, focusing on themes such as research methodology and professional skills. Students are assessed primarily through term papers (of 3,000 - 5,000 words) and a dissertation (of 10,000 words) At the end of the course, students will have gained: critical skills that enhance their employment opportunities in government, business, non-government organisations and industry; knowledge of the main theories, concepts and debates in development situating them in their historical and contemporary contexts and the ability to critically engage in policy analysis; a specialised focus on science, society and policy interactions, and particularly

the political and governance concerns arising around health, agriculture and environment; and a practical understanding of research and analytical methodologies and their application in diverse policy contexts. For entry in October 2007, fees are £10,400 for all students. Two full scholarships are available for African students for this programme; please contact Julia Brown for further information. For other sources of funding please see: www.sussex.ac.uk/Units/publications/pgrad2006/awards_for_graduate_studies. The University's postgraduate prospectus and application form can be downloaded from: http://www.sussex.ac.uk/pgapplication/ or obtained from: Postgraduate Admissions, Sussex House, University of Sussex, Brighton BN1 9RH, UK. E-mail: pg.admissions@sussex.ac.uk. For further information, see http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/teach/mascience.html, or contact Julia Brown, Programme Administrator, Phone: + 44 (0) 1273 678869. E-mail: teaching@ids.ac.uk.

A call for applications for PhD studentships and scholarships in the **History of Medicine at the Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London** has been issued. The Centre is the world's largest research institute devoted to the study of the History of Medicine. It invites applications from prospective PhD students for 3 years commencing September 2007. Candidates should normally have a Masters degree in a relevant subject. The Centre anticipates being able to offer two or three research studentships worth c. £19,000 pa plus the payment of "home" fees. Applications to study without a scholarship are welcome. Informal inquiries may be made to the Centre's Graduate Tutor, Dr. Helga Satzinger, h.satzinger@ucl.ac.uk. For further information and application forms, please contact Adam Wilkinson, ucgaawi@ucl.ac.uk. The deadline for the full application is 31 January 2007. For more details of the work of the Centre, please see www.ucl.ac.uk/histmed.

There is a Ph.d seminar on *Ethnography and Technology in relation to Gilles Deleuze's Philosophy* (http://www1.itu.dk/sw55657.asp), to be held at the **IT University of Copenhagen**

(Rued Langgaards Vej 7, DK-2100 Copehagen S) on 7-9 May 2007. This PhD seminar will investigate particular aspects of Gilles Deluze's philosophy in relation to technolgy, practice and materiality. Deleuze's writing often takes as its starting point the work of other philosophers, art and literature, with the aim of articulating new concepts. Ethnographical studies, on the other hand, try to describe, analyze and understand local or global cultural practices, based on observation and involvement in specific settings. Juxtaposing Deleuze and ethnography - not least of technical and scientific practice - we are specifically interested in exploring how concepts from Deleuze's philosophy can inform ethnographic work and knowledge-making practices, and how they may help us to engage with (or intervene in) science and technolgy in new ways. This cseminar investigates affinities between ethnographic approaches to the study of technology and Deleuze's wrintings. It invites explorations and questions such as (but not limited to) the following: What role can Deleuzian philosphy have in ethnography? How does Deleuze conceive material agency? What is practice for Deleuze? How can practice be delineated? What is technolgy in Deleuze's philosophy? What is the difference between technology and machines? What is the Deleuzian notion of interventionism? How can the study of technolgy become interventionist? The seminar is not an introduction to Deleuze, ethnography or sts. Students are supposed to be familiar with the writings of Deleuze and central themes within ethnography and sts. Students are obliged to give a short presentation of their work related to one or more themes of the seminar. Additionally the seminar will consist of lectures and discussions of central texts related to the themes. 4 ECTS to be awarded based on participation and presentation. To apply for the seminar students must write an e-mail to cje@itu.dk no later than March 23, 2007. Please state your name, address and affiliation and submit an abstract of your presentation (1 page) - see prerequisites above. Questions regarding the content of the seminar or the abstract can be directed to Søren Mørk (smork AT itu dot dk). The number of participants will be limited to 15. In the event we receive more applications than spots avaliable decisions about admission will be made by the organizers on the basis of relevance to the students PhD project and the abstract for presentation in relation to the topics of the seminar.

There is an expanded and revised Master's Programme in Science, Technology & Society at **Linköping University** in Sweden. Starting next fall, we will be offering a two year degree that gives students at the MA level the chance to learn about the relationships between technology and society. It is open to students with undergraduate degrees in the social sciences, humanities or technical/natural science fields. All of our courses are taught in English and the thesis work is also in English. Details about the programme can be found at: http://www.tema.liu.se/tema-t/master. If you come in contact with students who might be interested in studying here, please let them know about our programme! (Swedish Universities still don't charge tuition fees.)

For over 20 years, the **London Centre for History of Science, Medicine and Technology** has run a successful, highly-praised MSc programme focusing on history: the MSc in History of Science, Medicine and Technology. In September 2007 we launch a second MSc, tapping into our additional strengths in science and technology policy, sociology of science, and science communication. Thus, potential applicants also might consider the new degeree program, *MSc in Science, Technology, Medicine and Society*. Information on both degrees is provided on the Centre's Web site: http://www.londoncentre-hstm.ac.uk/. Queries about applications should be directed to our Admissions Tutors: Dr Abigail Woods (specialising in the history courses of the Centre)   Centre for the History of Science, Technology and Medicine   Imperial College London   South Kensington Campus   London SW7 2AZ UK   +44 (0)20 7594 1824 | a.woods@imperial.ac.uk; Dr Brian Balmer (specialising in the policy and sociology courses of the Centre)   Department of Science and Technology Studies   University College   London WC1E 6BT UK   +44 (0)20 7679 3924 | b.balmer@ucl.ac.uk.

The Tenth Intensive *Short Course in the Biographic-Narrative-Interpretive Method* (BNIM) takes place on 8 – 14 March 2007 in **London**. For over eight years in the UK, and more recently in New York, in Auckland (NZ) and Ljubljana (Slovenia), we have been running BNIM intensive trainings designed for PhD students and postdoctoral researchers in various pure and applied fields. Recently completed

PhDs and clinical doctorates by researchers using BNIM range over topics such as: reintegration of Guatamalan refugees; identity in informal care; men coping with sexual abuse; psychosomatic study of breast cancer; love and intimacy; motivation in occupational therapy; South African migrants to NZ; transitions in hearing voices' life stories; nurses' and health visitors' learning and professional practice; relationship experiences in psychosis and hospitalisation. We know of 18 more PhDs and clinical doctorates in process. Universities include Auckland, Birmingham, Dublin, de Montfort, East Anglia, Central Lancashire, East London, Essex, Exeter, Leicester, Kings College London, Leeds, Oxford, Oxford Brookes, Plymouth. BNIM assumes that "narrative" expresses both conscious concerns and unconscious cultural, societal and individual presuppositions and processes. It supports research into the lived experience of individuals and collectives, facilitating understanding both the 'inner' and the 'outer' worlds of 'historically-evolving persons-in-historically-evolving situations', and particularly the interactivity of inner and outer world dynamics. It especially serves researchers who need a tool that supports understanding spanning sociological and psychological dynamics and structures, and these treated not statically but as situated historically and biographically. Such research provides an innovative base for policy. Theoretical and methodological developments from recent research practice are raised for discussion. When you do the course, you automatically become a member of the Biographic-narrative-BNIM email list where news, questions and discussion circulate. Methodology can be lonely without a secure base and like-minded people working in

the same way as you. The course, the textbook, the Short Guide and the email list offer you support in using part or all of the BNIM tool-kit. Designed for PhD students and professional researchers, the course provides a thorough training in doing BNIM biographic narrative interviews, together with 'hands-on experience' of following BNIM interpretation procedures. Students develop a sense of how their own research projects might use such aspects and components. The cost is £600 if paid in full by February 1st. If paid later, the cost is £700. Taught by Prue Chamberlayne and Tom Wengraf in North London., the course's small number of students ensures close coaching and support for the intensive work that is needed for you to fully acquire both the understanding of principles and the practical capacity for proceeding with the systematic practices involved in BNIM -- both for BNIM and for other types of narrative interviewing and interpretation. You will be expected to have looked at (not read!) chapters 6 and 12 of Tom's textbook, Qualitative research interviewing: biographic narrative and semi-structured method (2001: Sage Publications), Preliminary and supplementary material will be provided. More recent debates and developments in theory and method are integrated into the programme. Before the course starts, you are expected to have studied the most recent version of the Short Guide to BNIM which will be sent to your email address. To get a copy of the 'Short Guide', to ask any questions or to book a place, contact tom@tomwengraf.com. To reserve a place, you need to send us a deposit of £100. To get an early-bird discount, you need to pay full cost by February 1st. Of the 6 places on the course, there are currently 2 still available.

News from the Field

A new peer-reviewed, international, and interdisciplinary journal -- *Regulation & Governance* -- edited by David Levi-Faur, John Braithwaite (Australian National University), and Cary Coglianese (University of Pennsylvania), has been announced.The first issue of Reg&Gov will be published in March 2007. Regulation & Governance aims to serve as a leading platform for the study of regulation and governance by political scientists, lawyers, sociologists, historians, criminologists, psychologists, anthropologists, economists, and others.

Published quarterly by Blackwell, Regulation & Governance will seek to provide a forum for open and critical scholarly dialogue from different disciplines, using diverse methodologies, and from any area of regulation and governance. Visit the journal's website, submit a paper, and recommend the journal to a colleague. For further information about the journal, including submission instructions, please visit the website, http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/rego.

Science Studies, the international peer-reviewed journal dedicated to publishing articles on the study of science and technology studies, has issued a call for book reviews. Published since 1988, Science Studies is read in over 80 countries around the world. Our journal welcomes submissions of book reviews that fit into the scope of the journal. You might choose a title from our book list (http://www.sciencestudies.fi/books) or make suggestions of your own. Please consult the author guidelines at our Web Site (www.sciencestudies.fi). For further information, please contact the editor in charge of the book reviews: Mikko Rask, E-mail: mikko.rask@tkk.fi.

A call for papers has been issued for a special issue of *Science Studies*, the Interdisciplinary Journal for Science and Technology Studies **http://www.sciencestudies.fi/**. The issue is dedicated to Understanding Architecture, Accounting Society, with guest editors Simon Guy & Albena Yaneva, University of Manchester Architectural Research Centre (UMARC). The special issue aims at exploring the role STS theory can play in furthering our understanding of architecture and cities: what does it mean to produce a socio-technical explanation of buildings, urban networks, design processes, city developments? What kind of conceptual tools are needed to understand technological innovation as related to architecture or the dynamics of urban change, cognition in design or the practices in the studio, cities as socio-technical artefacts or the invisible urban networks that shape big metropolises? While contributions may cover methodological issues related to architecture and STS, we especially welcome papers which will base their findings on empirical examples and case studies, on fieldwork in architectural offices or studies of urban design and development processes. We encourage contributions on topics such as: design thinking and visualisation, design controversies, distributed cognition in architectural conception, co-evolution of cit ies and technical networks,

urban innovation and sociotechnical change, negotiations in design and city planning, the role of mediators in the negotiation process, "heterogeneous engineering" in architecture and urban planning, political and ethical issues in architecture, development and dynamics of urban sociotechnical networks. In the first instance, please send an abstract (up to 500 words) to Dr. Albena Yaneva (albena.yaneva@manchester.ac.uk). Abstracts will be reviewed to ensure a varied, yet integrated selection of papers around the topic of the special issue. Authors of accepted abstracts will be invited to submit a full paper, which will be subject to a double-blind review process (for details please refer to the Author Instructions http://www.sciencestudies.fi/authors). Important deadlines: Abstracts submission to guest editors April 1st 2007. Full paper submission June 1st 2007. The special issue is scheduled for publication in May 2008. The University of Manchester Architectural Research Centre (UMARC) is developing a research agenda that aims at critically understanding the co-evolution of design and development strategies and socio-economic processes shaping cities. This approach involves: the development and application of an innovative socio-technical approach to researching architecture, urban development, technological innovation and urban change; analysis and integration of previously disconnected research fields - architecture and urban planning, the property sector and utilities industry, and the stimulation of a collaborative, inter-disciplinary methodological approach to architectural research.

There is a postgraduate project, *Anthropology Matters*, comprising online journal, online discussions, teaching and research resources and international contacts directory. See http://www.anthropologymatters.com.

What is 'Image Science'? The Department for Image Science Team at the **Danube University Krems** suggests www.donau-uni.ac.at/cis.

Opportunities Available

The **Fraunhofer Institute for Systems and Innovation Research** (ISI) in Karlsruhe, Germany is looking for a researcher for its department *New and Emerging Technologies* starting in February 2007. The person should be a social scientist with academic experience in one of the following areas: Science Technology Studies, Sociology/ Philosophy/ History of Science and Technology. You will be working in the EU-research project "Converging Technologies" which may also be the basis for your Ph.D. work. You will be applying different concepts and methods of social science technology studies and will be able to look into different aspects of the convergence of technologies (Nano, Bio, Info, Cogno). For example, the following technological areas will be investi-gated in the project with regard to relevant institutions, approaches, and potential applications: Computational Neuro-science, Bio-ICT-Synergies, Artificial Intelligence, Human-Machine-Interfaces or Human Enhancement Technologies (further information concerning the project can be found online at: **www.contecs.fraunhofer.de**). You will have the opportunity to work in an interesting project with international contacts to leading research institutes, profit from a well equipped technical infrastructure, and enjoy on open and cooperative work atmosphere. We expect an excellent degree in social sciences and proven experience in methods of technology research. Also, you should be strongly interested in inter-disciplinary research and should not shy away from natural science/ technological subjects. In addition, you should have interest in quantitative methods of empirical research. Employment, salary and social benefits are based on the German tariff agreement for the public sector (TvÖD). The position is full-time for one year and is usually extended for a period of three years with a 50 percent part-time contract. During this period you will work 50 percent on ISI projects and are expected to work in parallel on your PhD thesis. Please send your application together with all relevant documents until January 19th 2007 using the code ISI - 769 to: Gudrun Krenický, Fraunhofer Institute System and Innovation Research (ISI), Breslauer Str. 48, 76139 Karlsruhe, Germany.   Information about the Institute: www.isi.fraunhofer.de. Contact persons for the project: Dr. Bernd Beckert (bernd.beckert@isi.fraunhofer.de) and Dr. Michael Friedewald (michael.friedewald@isi.fraunhofer.de) This job posting in German: https://fraunhofer.umantis.com/Vacancies/769/D escription.

The **Open Society Institute, Budapest**, has announced its Fellowship Program for 2007-2008. The *International Scholars Fellowship Program* invites highly-qualified scholars in social sciences and humanities from around the world to teach and/or consult at selected university departments in South Eastern Europe, parts of the former Soviet Union, and Mongolia. The program, part of the Academic Fellowship Program (AFP), welcomes applications from faculty, retired faculty, and others holding PhDs in anthropology, area/cultural studies, gender studies, economics, history, political science, international relations, psychology, public administration, philosophy, social work, sociology, public health, human rights & public law, and journalism/media studies. The program does not support scholars in philology, the visual and performing arts, or business. Candidates apply to teach outside their country of citizenship and must: Hold an internationally recognized PhD or JD. AFP accepts applications for fellowship placements in Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Kosovo, Kyrgyzstan, Macedonia, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Tajikistan, and Ukraine. AFP fellows are placed in carefully selected university departments that Are amenable to change and demonstrate a realistic and clear vision for future development. A list of current AFP partner departments can be found on our website. The list is subject to change in the 2007-08 academic year. The International Scholars Fellowship Program offers two arrangements: Nonresident International Scholars share their expertise with hostdepartments on a consulting basis, visiting the institution for several short consultations and remaining in contact for mentoring and advice between visits. Nonresident fellows are senior or well-established academics; recent PhD recipients are not be considered. Resident International Scholars live in the host country and teach courses for one academic year at partner universities. Fellows also work on a variety of projects within their host departments, and benefit from the diverse academic network

connecting AFP program countries. The resident option is available for placements ONLY in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, and Mongolia. Fellowships generally include a stipend, transportation, and accommodation. Resident fellows also receive health insurance and various other allowances. Application deadline: March 23, 2007. Fellowships begin in August or September 2007 and normally last one academic year, with the possibility of renewal. For applications and guidelines, please see our web site:
http://www.soros.org/initiatives/hesp/focus/afp, or write to Open Society Institute
Higher Education Support Program, Academic Fellowship Program, October 6 utca 12, H-1051, Budapest, Hungary, E-mail: afp@osi.hu, Telephone: (36-1) 235 6160; Fax: (36-1) 411-4401.

The **Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at University College London** seeks two full-time historians of medicine to complement the work of current members of staff. Sub-field and rank open, but two strong preferences have been identified: 1) an historian of the eighteenth century, and 2) an historian working on medicine and health in an area other than Europe, China, or India, especially Islamic medicine since 1500, medicine in Eastern Europe and Russia, or medicine in North America from an international perspective. Minimum requirements are a PhD in hand, and a track-record of publication in the proposed field of research. Salary according to rank and accomplishment, in the range from about £35,000 to £55,000. Applications are due by 9 February 2007; they may be submitted electronically or by post. It is anticipated that interviews will be conducted during the last week in March. The successful candidates will be expected to take up their duties in September. Please send a letter outlining previous research and teaching and lines of future research, together with a CV and the details of three persons who can be contacted for letters of reference, to Harold J. Cook, The Wellcome Trust Centre for the History of Medicine at UCL, 210 Euston Rd., London NW1 2BE, UK; or to h.cook@ucl.ac.uk. For further information, please see
http://www.ucl.ac.uk/histmed/news/index.html; queries can also be directed to h.cook@ucl.ac.uk.

The **Donald McGannon Communication Research Center at Fordham University** has announced its
Visiting Research Fellows Program, 2007-2008. The Donald McGannon Communication Research Center at Fordham University invites applicants for its new Visiting Research Fellows Program. Applicants are invited to apply for either a one semester or two semester appointment as a Visiting Research Fellow at the Center. The appointment carries no stipend; however, Fellows enjoy the benefits of a research affiliation with the McGannon Center, including office space at the Center on Fordham's Bronx campus; computer, telephone, and Internet access; and access to all Fordham University library and electronic resources. Fellows also have access to the McGannon Center's administrative support, as well as to the resources of New York City, one of the media capitals of the world. Fellows will have the opportunity to participate in McGannon Center events (such as conferences and seminars), with the Center covering travel expenses related to such participation, as well as the opportunity to collaborate on Center research projects. Fellows also will have the opportunity to take part in the activities of the university as a whole, including the activities of related enterprises such as the Fordham Law School's Information Law and Policy Research Center and the Fordham Business School's Center for Communication. The Center seeks candidates with research interests that overlap with the Center's areas of interest in order to maximize collaborative opportunities during the Fellowship period. Information about the Center's activities can be found at www.fordham.edu/mcgannon. The ideal candidate will be researching public interest-related regulation and policy issues pertaining to new media. The Center also seeks candidates with an interest in international policy issues. Fellows will be expected to offer one lecture in their area of specialization during the Fellowship period and to contribute one research paper to the Center's Working Paper series. The Fellowship program is open to university faculty, post-docs, and ABD graduate students from any disciplinary background. International applicants are particularly welcome. Candidates wishing to apply for Fellow status for the 2007-2008 academic year should submit the following: 1. A letter of application and intent to be in residence in the New York City area for the duration of the requested Fellowship period (Fall, 2007, Spring, 2008, or both). 2. A two- to three-page description of current research activities and of

how residency at the McGannon Center could assist in the completion of these activities. 3. A current curriculum vitae. 4. For graduate student applicants, names and contact information for three faculty references. Completed applications can be submitted electronically to: Visiting Fellows Program, Donald McGannon Communication Research Center, at mcgctr@fordham.edu or in hard copy to: Visiting Fellows Program, Donald McGannon Communication Research Center, Fordham University,441 E. Fordham Rd., Bronx, NY 10458, USA. The application deadline for the 2007-2008 academic year is March 1, 2007. Applicants will receive notification by May 1, 2007. Note: The McGannon Center can only accommodate 1-2 Research Fellows per academic year. Questions or requests for additional information can be directed to Philip M. Napoli, McGannon Center Director, at pnapoli@fordham.edu or at 718-817-4196.

Contents of this issue