

NEWSletter

of the History of Science Society

Vol. 44, No. 1
January 2015

From the HSS Editorial Office

From the HSS Editorial Office by H. Floris Cohen, HSS Editor

With Jay's kind permission, we in the Editorial Office have begun a series of columns for the *Newsletter*, under the no nonsense title of "From the HSS Editorial Office." The basic idea will always be the same. From a North American perspective, the *Isis* Editorial office seems far away, so we in Utrecht want to reassure the HSS membership that in between each issue of *Isis* the journal is alive and kicking, and in doing so inform you about a variety of matters that keep my team and me occupied. Topics touched on below include an overview of our procedure after an author has submitted a manuscript; further remarks for the benefit of a variety of special authors ("early science," "early career," and "non-Anglophone"); and, finally, an outline of my plans for the Focus section.

From Submission to Refereeing

Before submitting a manuscript to the *Isis* editorial office, you have first paid attention to the "Guidelines for Authors" on the *Isis* website (<http://www.press.uchicago.edu/journals/isis/instruct.html?journal=isis>). Besides the other, more technical matters, you will quickly find a guideline that invites you, in preparing a manuscript, to "strive to give the reader a sense of the wider significance of the point or points you are seeking to make." Given the unusual breadth of *Isis*' readership I expect our

authors to address topics that not only display impeccable scholarship as a matter of course but also have an import beyond their own specialty and/or beyond the specific period or region covered.



President Angela Creager and Editor Floris Cohen (right) exchange the new Editor's contract as Treasurer Adam Apt smiles on benevolently.

Once the inbox of IsisJournal.uu.nl displays receipt of a manuscript, a specially trained assistant, Didi van Trijp, begins to verify certain formal requirements. Has the author sufficiently blinded it? Is there assurance that the manuscript is original and not under consideration elsewhere? Is it free of an overdose of typos and sloppily phrased sentences? In short, has the author taken the

TABLE OF CONTENTS

From the HSS Editorial Office	1
Notes from the Inside Strategic Plan—Implementation	5
Stories of Lives Lived, Lessons for Living?	7
2014 HSS Meeting Survey Results	9
2014 JCSEPHS Event	12
The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future	13
HSS Annual Report	20
Member News	24
In Memoriam	27
News from the Profession	28
History of Science Society 2014 Prize Winners	37
Sarton Medal Speech: "Praising Famous Men"	39

Continued on Page 2

FROM THE HSS EDITORIAL OFFICE, *CONT.*

Guidelines into account? If yes, Didi provides me with a print-out (small margins, Book Antiqua letter, font size 9) of the non-blinded version. I do my best to read each new manuscript within a week. I may then find that it is so obviously not in the *Isis* ambit, either in view of the topic chosen or in the manuscript's failure to obey elementary criteria of scholarly quality in our discipline, as to make me consider what is known as a "desk rejection." In such cases I either reject the manuscript forthwith as unsuitable for *Isis* or, if I am in any doubt at all, I consult an Advisory Editor. I then ask the adviser whether she or he has grounds to correct my first conclusion. If the answer is yes, I initiate at once the same procedure that I follow for all the numerous manuscripts (and there are many of these) that are much too good for such summary judgment. That is, Didi sends the blinded electronic version to an Advisory Editor (there are thirty in all, with ten rotating out every year and being replaced by others), and also to one (or sometimes two) expert referees, usually but not always selected from outside the Advisory Editorial Board. The referees are requested to send me an extensive report (for which they are in possession of certain guidelines) within six weeks. Sometimes it takes a bit longer, but when the reports are in I read them attentively, think about them for a while, and arrive at a conclusion. Six distinct conclusions are then possible.

From Refereeing to Decision

The rarest conclusion is acceptance as is. Nobody is perfect, not even authors of very good manuscripts, and almost every manuscript can benefit from changes. The specific gravity of such needed improvement may vary in the following four ways:

- I may accept a manuscript pending certain specified, minor revisions. Luckily this happens with some regularity, or my job would be a most depressing one and your quarterly *Isis* would contain little else than book reviews and Focus sections. It is true that this first type of acceptance almost always concerns manuscripts in second, not first draft.
- Or I may accept a manuscript pending a more substantial final revision, to be drawn likewise from the referee reports and, on occasion, also from my own expert knowledge if I fancy that I have it.
- Or I may accept a manuscript conditional on major revisions. This variety is meant to confer two messages to the author: There is still quite a lot of work for you to do, yet you may rest assured that, if carried out to my satisfaction (in principle), as well as that of the paper's referees, the manuscript will in due time appear in *Isis*.
- Closely related, yet different in one major respect, is the next possible decision, which goes by the name of "revise and resubmit."

History of Science Society

EXECUTIVE OFFICE

History of Science Society

440 Geddes Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556
Phone: 574-631-1194; Fax: 574-631-1533
E-mail: info@hssonline.org
Web site: <http://www.hssonline.org/>

SUBSCRIPTION INQUIRIES

University of Chicago Press
Phone: 877-705-1878; Fax 877-705-1879
E-mail: subscriptions@press.uchicago.edu
Or write: University of Chicago Press,
Subscription Fulfillment Manager, PO Box
37005, Chicago, IL 60637-7363

EDITORIAL POLICIES, ADVERTISING AND SUBMISSIONS

The *History of Science Society Newsletter* is published in January, April, July, and October, and sent to all individual members of the Society.

The *Newsletter* is edited and published in the Executive Office. The format and editorial policies are determined by the Executive Director in consultation with the Society Editor. All advertising copy must be submitted in electronic form. Advertisements are accepted on a space-available basis only, and the Society reserves the right not to print a submission. The rates are as follows: Full page (10 x 7"), \$625; Horizontal or Vertical Half page (5 x 7"), \$375; Quarter page (5 x 3.5"), \$225. The deadline for insertion orders is six weeks prior to the month of publication and should be sent to info@hssonline.org. Please send photographs in a jpeg format, with a maximum size of 1024 pixels and a file size of 1 MB to maintain quality during sizing and printing. The deadline for news, announcements, and job/ fellowship/ prize listings is firm: Four weeks prior to the month of publication. Long items (feature stories) should be submitted eight weeks prior to the month of publication. Please send all material to the attention of the Executive office: info@hssonline.org.

© 2015 by the History of Science Society

FROM THE HSS EDITORIAL OFFICE, *CONT.*

This is likewise an invitation to prepare a second (or even a third) version in conformity with points listed by the referees and further specified in my accompanying letter. The difference with the previous case is that I reserve the liberty to conclude that an article, albeit judged qualitatively “okay” by the referees in the second round, is nonetheless too narrow and/or too specialized (in terms of the Guidelines) for publication in *Isis*, and/or too lengthy still in relation to the significance of the message it seeks to confer. Here I must take into further consideration such editorial dilemmas as whether perhaps there is an overflow or rather a temporary shortage of publishable manuscripts, or whether a reasonable proportion can still be maintained between (roughly) 20th + 21st century; 19th century, and pre-1800.

If none of these five outcomes, from “acceptance as is” to “revise and resubmit,” applies, then I must reject a manuscript, but not before expressing my hope or even my expectation that it will find a good home elsewhere. Please note that this kind of response actually constitutes the majority of letters I must write, as *Isis* receives about ten times more submissions than it could possibly publish, even if all manuscripts were of superb quality. Please note, too, that even with the rejection of a “revise and resubmit” manuscript the author has had the benefit (as a rule) of extensive, truly exquisite expert commentary, as I quickly found out when

Bernie Lightman, my predecessor, first introduced me to the editorial job.

Some Special Cases

I return now to the category of “revise and resubmit” in the specific sense defined above. The author receives the referee reports and my list of conclusions. How to deal with these documents? My message to authors in that situation would be: *please don't give up too soon!* This applies to all authors, yet during one meeting at the recent annual conference in Chicago I was confronted with an interesting suggestion that women may tend to give up more easily than men. Although I grant that there is a certain psychological plausibility to this apparent outcome of some piece of social science investigation, my experience thus far has taught me otherwise: of the five revised and resubmitted manuscripts accepted under my editorship, four were by women. By way of a general conclusion, then, I have decided to go out of my way to encourage all authors, no matter their gender, to revise and resubmit, without, of course, raising expectations, which I may not in the end be able to fulfill.

Speaking now of encouragement, I was asked at the annual meeting about submissions by scholars at an early stage of their career, chiefly PhD students. Here my response was twofold. Yes, acceptance happens: Less than a month prior to the annual meeting, on the recommendation of the referees in the second instance, I accepted an

article by a PhD student. However, more often than not the referees and I must conclude that the submission does not, or does not *yet*, display the required degree of scholarly maturity. Therefore, my general advice to early career historians of science who are considering whether or not to submit a manuscript to *Isis* is: You need not take eventual publication to be *a priori* out of reach for you, yet by all means consult your supervisor first!

There are two more categories of potential authors whom I would want to take heart if by any chance they have lost it. There are my fellow students of pre-1800 science and natural philosophy. Here I can be very brief. Just as Bernie did, I maintain a simple proportionality rule that broadly reflects *Isis* readers' spheres of interest. Just as I expect that every *Isis* issue will include at least one article that deals with the 20th century and one that covers chiefly or wholly 19th-century material, just so do I hope that the reader also encounters in every issue at least one article that covers earlier time periods. A somewhat more complicated case are those possible authors who, also like me, are not native Anglophones. Their case came up during the Saturday breakfast for non-US scholars for which our President, Angela Creager, took a most welcome initiative. What I said there may bear repetition here. Three distinct issues are involved: quality, language, and style of presentation. Regarding quality, broad criteria for acceptance remain the same for every single submission. In the matter of language, as early as 1919 George

FROM THE HSS EDITORIAL OFFICE, *CONT.*

Sarton decided to confine *Isis* to English and although a multilingual practice even for articles survived into the 1960s, I will stick to his original decision. Of course, Joan Vandegrift, our manuscript editor, has always had more work to do on occasional manuscripts by non-Anglophone authors but, within reasonable bounds in terms of how much time she has available, she will keep working on such more time-consuming articles in (as always) close consultation with the author. But there is also a matter of style of presentation. I understand that in many countries (e.g., in Southern or Central Europe or in Latin America or East Asia) numerous scholars habitually present their arguments in a manner rather different from what has, at least in the history of science, become the standard style. Whenever I discern inside any given manuscript an argument worthy of further consideration, even if it comes clad in unusual clothes, I shall take special care and attend in a spirit of sympathy to its march through our standing procedures.

From Acceptance to Publication

Back now to the general flow of things. For the most part (not counting transition periods, vacation, and other incidents), the time between an author submitting a manuscript and receiving one of six possible conclusions about it will, with a bit of luck, be some two to three months. How long the revision then takes is entirely up to the author. I can say a few more things about what, in the

case of acceptance, happens next. The successful author receives, together with our congratulations, a concise list of administrative requirements that must be fulfilled before, on a provisional basis, I assign the manuscript to a future issue. I then hand it over to Desiree Capel, the managing editor. She transmits to Joan Vandegrift all articles assigned to the specific issue that is destined to appear half a year later. Joan needs three months to prepare every issue for print (she does so in communication with the authors), and then sends its contents back to Desiree, who passes everything on to the journal production department of our publisher, the University of Chicago Press. In ongoing dialogue with her, the Press then takes three more months for actual production, with the authors' assistance being invoked for proof reading. The December issue usually takes somewhat more time, as an annual index still has to be prepared and the issue mails with the annual *Current Bibliography*. Generally speaking, however, once an accepted article has been sent to Joan, it appears half a year later. Even so, I may have reasons to assign at a late stage an article to a later or, on occasion, to an earlier issue than originally foreseen.

Throughout the entire procedure outlined here, all kinds of technicalities are involved that are exciting only to us *Isis* officers, but please be assured that our efforts are always directed toward keeping the period between submission and publication as short as we in our Utrecht office can possibly make it.

Focus Section

And now for the Focus section, the only portion of *Isis* that is available in open access. I shall go into greater detail in an Editorial in the June, 2015 issue of *Isis*—the first to carry a Focus section for which I bear full responsibility. But here are a few preliminary pointers.

In the first place, I intend to retain the genre, invented as it was by Bernie as soon as he became Editor. I also will stick with Bernie's original idea for the Focus section: to provide what he nicely called "think-pieces." My ideal Focus contribution is not written like a research article, only shorter, but is rather done by a person who, in full command of his or her broad subject, mulls over the specific topic assigned by the organizer of the Focus section and then suddenly sees the light—one sentence tumbles after another and she or he writes the piece in one inspired day. As with all scholarly work, the article requires careful documentation, yet it need not constitute original research. Instead, or in addition, it provides the reader with the harvest of a great deal of the author's earlier, original research plus the wisdom he or she has collected in thinking through the matters at hand in an original, creative way.

Further, so as to attain greater cohesion among the various contributions, I want just about every Focus section to emerge from a workshop specifically dedicated to the subject at hand (in a

FROM THE HSS EDITORIAL OFFICE, *CONT.*

rare case the Descartes Center at my university may be of assistance in this regard). I shall further subject every Focus section to some form of peer review, heavier perhaps than has been the case, yet light enough to enable the authors and myself to move forward quickly and not to lose pace.

As to substance, I am thinking chiefly of Focus sections of three distinct kinds. One category is “how-to” (i.e., certain methodological issues) and another is “at the cross-roads” (between history of science and some neighboring discipline). I have further categorized a third variety as “looking

back + what next,” i.e., Focus sections dedicated to certain aspects of the past of the discipline with a view to how to move on from there. An example of the first kind would be “the formation and handling of concepts in history of science writing”; of the second kind, “interfaces among history of science, history of technology, and economic history”; of the third, “thirty years of practicing contextual history of science: making up the balance.”

What, in short, I want the Focus section to accomplish is to serve as a platform for a large

plurality of historically informed ideas about where our discipline is heading, or should be. I have already initiated several Focus sections along these lines, and I hope to receive many more from you. The *Isis* website, maintained by the University of Chicago Press, quickly leads you to specific guidelines for how to propose a subject for a Focus section, and also how (at a much later stage) to submit a completed section. Please think about it for a while, and give me the benefit of your best thoughts!

NOTES FROM THE INSIDE: *STRATEGIC PLAN—IMPLEMENTATION*

I enjoy Scott Adams’ cartoon, “Dilbert,” which explores the lives of engineers caught in the thrall of a clueless, pointy-haired boss. Since I am in the midst of reifying HSS’s recently approved strategic plan and Adams ran a strip on strategic planning, I thought I would share it with you. Wally, the engineer whose life’s purpose is to avoid work, tells Dilbert that he’s thinking of going into the strategic planning business. “If I understand the job description,” Wally says, “you basically hallucinate about the future and then something different happens.” To which Dilbert replies “You also have to pretend that it’s useful.” The punchline is Wally saying, “Really? That sounds hard.”

We historians know how difficult it is to nail down the past and how even more challenging it is to divine the future. And while it can seem like folly to envision the HSS in 3 to 5 years there is something fundamentally useful about it, and natural selection can serve as a metaphor to explain why. The officers of the HSS are constantly fielding various requests as we make our way through environmental demands. We cannot respond to everything and so to have a plan where we will focus on certain environmental cues will have the desirable effect (we hope) of promoting the Society’s survival. Notice that I did not say such responses will “ensure” survival and neither did I say what the HSS will look like in the future. The strategic plan will simply help us in our struggle for existence.

Please take a few moments to look at the plan, which appears in this *Newsletter*. As I work on the strategic steps to implement the plan, I am acutely aware of how much we rely on our members (please also see my annual report, which provides a glimpse of those efforts). For HSS to survive, we need members who are willing to help us realize our goals. It hardly needs to be written that without our members, the HSS will become but a footnote in the history of science.

Thank you for your membership.

Jay Malone
Executive Director



NDXII

TWELFTH BIENNIAL HISTORY of ASTRONOMY WORKSHOP

University of Notre Dame
Adler Planetarium and Astronomy Museum

June 24–28, 2015

CONFERENCE THEME: **Astronomy and Authority**

INVITED SPEAKER: **Michio Yano**, Professor of Faculty of Cultural Studies, Kyoto Sangyo University, Japan, and editor of the journal *SCIAMVS: Sources and Commentaries in Exact Sciences*

CALL FOR PAPERS: Open through March 1, 2015. Please contact **Liz Hamm** at elizabeth.hamm@stmarys-ca.edu by March 1 or visit the NDXII web page [below] for details. Proposals that address the theme receive preference, but all proposals will be considered.

www.nd.edu/~histast/

Stories of Lives Lived, Lessons for Living?

by Sarah A. Swenson, D.Phil Candidate in History of Science and Medicine, University of Oxford

[Editor's Note: This is part of a series of articles by Rhodes Scholars who chose to focus on the history of science at Oxford.]

A series of accidents heightened my interest in stories. The first, a car crash at the age of sixteen, dissolved my naive sense of certainty and left me searching. Long after my somewhat unexpected but full recovery seemed complete, I was hounded by an awareness that death could come to anyone and at any time.

At its center, my post-accident dilemma was ethical. I asked, given the limitations of a single life, what is the best way to live? Inasmuch as it triggered this question, my accident also activated my passion for history. When residual back pain kept me in bed for weeks at a time, my desire to ace Advanced Placement U.S. History was quickly eclipsed by a fascination for the lessons that could be drawn from a critical examination of historical fact and the narratives surrounding it. In trying to understand the nuanced lives of those who had lived before, I serendipitously discovered a variety of models for living that took into account both individual particularities and cultural commonalities.

It was with my personal ethical struggle in the background that I first learned of W.D. Hamilton's attempts to understand phenomena

from a biological view, such as altruism and its less admirable foil, selfishness. A few semesters into university, I was a zoology major (somehow thinking that was a more practical choice than history), and, of course, I had no idea that I would go on to study Hamilton's work and its influence through a historical lens. What struck me most at that point was that Hamilton had not only extended evolutionary theory to speak to topics outside the traditional range of biology but also that he had accomplished his widely celebrated feat at such a young age. When I took my first course on the history of biology, I began to understand the tangible and intangible ways in which the culture of a particular time not only influenced the questions scientists asked, but also bore on the solutions at which they arrived. What is more, I saw nineteenth- and twentieth-century scholars who were concerned with nature speak again and again to the problems that echoed in my own mind: Who are we? and What can we hope to achieve? While I may not always have liked the answers they gave, I found comfort in the fact that I was not alone in my existential ponderings.

Fortunately, I had the opportunity to study scientific approaches to human nature more closely through the Master's of Science program in History of Science, Medicine, and Technology

at the University of Oxford. By the time I had finished this degree and finally gained access to the materials in Hamilton's archive, I was less interested in how Hamilton had triumphed than I was in why he had chosen to approach altruism from a biological perspective. It was an interesting choice to have made in the decades following World War II, and I was intrigued that he continued to pursue it after he was strongly discouraged from doing so by his professors time and time again. A graduate student myself, I had been wholly more timid upon entering a new field of research, and I was determined to unpack the young Hamilton's frame of mind and understand why he held so steadfastly to his ideas. As hours in his archive turned to days, weeks, and months, as I read the news, letters, and diaries from a world I had never personally experienced, I began to feel as though I had the opportunity to live through more than one lifetime. In trying to see the world through the eyes of others, I traced commonalities in the human experience that transcend traditional limits of time or space, and in struggling to learn something through reassembling the recorded fragments of another individual's life, I felt, in small ways, like I could peer beyond the perimeters of my own.

The most rewarding aspect of my doctoral work has been knowing that through an

Lessons for Living, cont.

intimate understanding of the life and work of a single biologist I am able to tell at least two histories, one personal and the other social. In the end, Hamilton's record provides scholars with a sounding chamber through which the obsessions and concerns of an era can be heard. In attending to these reverberations, I hope that my scholarship adds to a wide body of literature within the history of science inasmuch as it allows us to see that, far from isolated figures, scientists pursue their work in dialogue with the rest of society. Perhaps it also provides us with the opportunity to think more critically about the extent to which our own lives are molded and shaped by the particular context of our time, especially if we desire to think beyond it.



Bonhams

Thank you to our 2014 meeting sponsors

- National Science Foundation
- Morris Fishbein Center for the History of Science and Medicine at the University of Chicago
- The Weinberg College of Arts and Sciences, Northwestern University
- The Graduate School, Northwestern University
- The Department of History, Northwestern University
- Science in Human Culture Program, Northwestern University
- University of Chicago Press
- University of Chicago Press, Journals Division
- University of Maryland, Baltimore County
- The Chemical Heritage Foundation
- Brent Dibner, Dibner Institute
- Miles Davis
- Pfizer
- Educational Advancement Foundation
- Albert C. Lewis
- David Kaiser, Germeshausen Chair funds
- Science, Technology and Society Program at the University of Michigan
- Program in Science, Technology and Society at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- Program for History and Philosophy of Science at the University of Notre Dame

2014 HSS Meeting Survey Results

With more than 1300 registrants, the 2014 History of Science Society Annual Meeting and the Philosophy of Science Association Biennial Meeting were the best attended joint meeting of our two groups. The post-meeting survey received 349 responses (27% of all attendees), 208 of them (60%) from current or past HSS members. Over 90% of those surveyed found Chicago to be satisfactory (more than 80% reported being “very satisfied”). We also received numerous comments asking for better use of the science-related resources of the host cities such as universities, museums, labs, etc. Last year’s reception at MIT’s science museum was mentioned by many respondents as a successful model. We should note that the MIT event, which cost almost \$45,000, i.e. \$90/person, was made possible by a generous donation from MIT and from Harvard as we celebrated the 100th anniversary of *Isis*. That event also required hiring a fleet of buses, which deepened our carbon footprint, so for future meetings we will try to locate off-site gatherings within walking distance or situated on public transit lines, as we did in Phoenix in 2009.

The Westin Michigan Avenue Hotel was also a popular venue for the meeting (only 17% of the responses to the survey indicated dissatisfaction) and, although we received some negative feedback about the high cost of the hotel especially for graduate students and junior faculty, more than 60% of respondents thought that the hotel’s location—downtown Chicago—increased their

overall enjoyment of the meeting. For example, we received positive feedback about the large number of choices of restaurants, bars, etc. near the hotel. With regard to the hotel’s spaces, feedback was generally positive: 70% of the respondents were satisfied with the book exhibit, 72% responded favorably about the session rooms, and 59% were content with the meeting spaces. Yet, we received several complaints about the “narrow” and “cramped” common spaces in the hotel, a fair concern and a trade-off for being in a downtown hotel. Another issue mentioned in several comments was the acoustics—mainly the interfering noises—in the session rooms.

The vast majority of respondents were happy with the HSS program; about 70% indicated that they were satisfied and only 3% reported being dissatisfied. Two main concerns, however, were repeatedly mentioned in the comments. First, this year there was a conflict between the HSS/PSA conference in Chicago and SHOT’s meeting in Dearborn, Michigan. Several respondents asked that we avoid these types of conflicts at future meetings. We in the Executive Office could not agree more, but this was a one-time event, brought about by some unusual circumstances (SHOT’s original hotel lost its liquor license, which would not have been a problem if Southern Baptists dominated SHOT’s membership, but as they do not SHOT had to scramble to find a new conference hotel). We are working closely with SHOT to try to prevent this from happening again so that if our meeting

dates ever do overlap, it’s because we are meeting together. Second, there were several comments, especially from faculty members, about missing at least some of the Thursday sessions because of teaching commitments. HSS’s Committee on Meetings and Programs had asked that we begin earlier on Thursday so as to create two extra session times. It was hoped that by doing so, we could reduce the number of concurrent sessions but still have room on the program to accommodate most proposals and thus avoid a high rejection rate. This strategy worked since we were able to limit ourselves to 10 concurrent sessions and still accept almost all session proposals (94%). However, the rejection rate for individual papers was around 40% and this number would have been much higher (over 50%) had we not added the Thursday sessions. Likewise, session acceptance would have dropped to around 75%. Because our strategic plan calls for us to limit the number of concurrent sessions, we will be looking for other ways to increase participation, such as through improved poster sessions, roundtables, etc.

Both of the receptions, the opening reception on Thursday and the joint reception on Saturday, received excellent overall feedback from the respondents, although some were dissatisfied with the opening reception’s food choices. Two issues have been mentioned in many comments: first, the reception was crowded. Second, many people found the method for getting drinks (buying a ticket and then going to a bar) unnecessary and

2014 HSS Meeting Survey Results, *cont.*

confusing. We in the Executive Office will admit that using drink tickets was confusing, but we are less sure about it being unnecessary, which leads us to say a few things about the opening reception. There are many who enjoy drinking beer or wine at a reception, and we believe that doing so helps stimulate conversation. But the price of a bottle of domestic beer, e.g. Budweiser, or a glass of chardonnay was just over \$10, which tends to stop conversation (or make it orbit around a single topic), so we decided to subsidize the price so that our attendees were paying a more manageable \$6/serving. The tickets were required to help the hotel track the subsidy that we provided. We also made soft drinks freely available to those who did not care to imbibe. The cost of alcohol is suggestive of food expenses so, although we do our best to provide a variety of hors d'oeuvres, our budget limits what we can do because we strive to keep registration as low as possible). One way we do this is through sponsorships and it is here that I want to express our thanks to our many sponsors (see the list on page 8) and to issue a challenge.

A Challenge: The Saturday night joint reception received rave reviews, and part of that had to do with a generous donation of 15 cases of beer by Lagunitas, which recently expanded from its West Coast roots to Chicago. This donation was made via introduction by HSS friend Jaime Jurado, who, ever since the Austin meeting in 2004, has kindly offered to help us land a beer donation from a local



2014 HSS Meeting Survey Results, *cont.*

brewery (unfortunately, most hotels do not allow beer donations). He also introduced us to Harpoon Brewery in Boston for the 2013 Meeting and helped us contact Lagunitas. So if any of our members have connections—and they may not be as magical as Jaime’s—we would be grateful if you could provide us an introduction. And a big THANK YOU to Lagunitas for their wonderful contribution. Now, back to the survey.

Almost 28% of those who attended the opening receptions also visited the tables of the Joint Caucus for Socially Engaged Philosophers and Historians of Science (JCSEPHS) event. 80% of the attendees were satisfied with the quality of the JCSEPHS presentations and 78% found the duration of the event to be satisfactory. Moreover, 89% of the respondents asked for a similar event at future meetings along with some suggested improvements, such as proper signage for the event. Incidentally, another two events that were not included in our surveys but for which we received positive and encouraging feedback were the HSS/PSA Graduate and Early Career Caucus Mixer on Thursday night and the HSS at Work/GECC Networking Event on Friday night.

Although only a small number (3%) of respondents used Dependent Care Resources during the meeting, providing this service is welcomed warmly in the comments—especially since 17% of respondents think that they are going to need to use a dependent care provider at future HSS meetings. “I fully support the continued provision

of the room” and “Really nice addition to HSS meetings” are a couple of the positive statements that we received.

Technology is now a vital part of HSS meetings. Fortunately, 77% of the respondents were satisfied with the audio/visual services provided in the meeting. Although 63% of the respondents used tablets or smartphones during the meeting, only 12% used the meeting program app, Grupio. Some 32% of those who haven’t used the app still prefer using printed programs, 16% prefer the online pdf version of the program, 31% did not know about the app, and only 4% found it not to be user-friendly. One of the hottest topics in our comments was the lack of wi-fi service in the meeting area, especially in session rooms. We sympathize completely and are looking into making wi-fi access available for all future meetings (which will either require an increase in registration fees or a wi-fi angel). Approximately 84% of the respondents said that they would be willing to pay \$10 (or less) in additional registration fees in order to have wireless Internet access in the meeting space.

Program quality, host city, and costs are, respectively, the most important factors for respondents in deciding whether or not to attend a conference. The importance of the meeting’s location cannot be underestimated. Chicago has always proven popular in post-meeting surveys as one of the more desired places to meet in the US, which helps explain the record attendance. The

top choice of cities? San Francisco, site of next year’s meeting (and \$99 room rates for graduate students at the conference hotel, the Westin St. Francis, across the street from Union Square in downtown San Francisco—a rate made possible by the fact that we are meeting the weekend before the US Thanksgiving holiday). As far as meeting outside of North America, 44% of respondents are amenable to this, while 18% responded negatively to the suggestion. Respondents are split evenly with regard to moving the HSS annual meeting to early August, rather than keeping it in November, in order to have a meeting in Europe—28% responded positively and the same number negatively. Given the difficulty that our members have in simply reaching the meeting early on Thursday during our traditional meeting time, a summer conference (with access to affordable dorm rooms) seems essential.

As you might imagine, it’s challenging to put on a conference that will make everyone happy, but we are heartened by the overwhelmingly positive responses. We hope you will continue to share the ways in which the meeting was helpful to you, as well as send your suggestions about how we can improve future meetings.

2014 JCSEPHS Event

by Paige Madison (Arizona State University)

At this year's joint History of Science Society (HSS) and Philosophy of Science Association (PSA) meeting in Chicago, the Joint Caucus for Socially Engaged Philosophers and Historians of Science (JCSEPHS) brought together experts and scholars in order to foster social engagement. Organized by Sandra Mitchell, Jane Maienschein, Rachel Ankeny, Dawn Digrius, and Julia Bursten, the event sought to bring to professional historians and philosophers of science the resources and know-how for social engagement.

The event took place on Thursday night, during the opening reception of the conferences, and included a number of tables dedicated to various aspects of social engagement. These tables focused on the following themes: Podcasts with Carla Nappi (University of British Columbia); Science Museums and Exhibitions with Kate MacCord and Erica O'Neil (Arizona State University); Engaging Federal Agencies and Committees with Lee Zwanziger (US Food and Drug Administration); Instant HPS: Short Videos for a General Audience with Sandy Mitchell, John Norton, and Trey Boone (University of Pittsburgh); Using Social Media (e.g. Facebook and Twitter) to Get Out

the Message with Paige Madison and Steve Elliott (Arizona State University); Talking with the Press with Naomi Oreskes (Harvard University); How I got Inside the Beltway with Jim Fleming (Colby College); Communicating Science on Socially Relevant Topics with Kevin Elliott (Michigan State University) and Dan McKaughan (Boston College); Protecting At-risk People and Consulting for Federal Agencies with Kristin Shrader-Frechette, Dustin Crummett, Emily Spencer, and Rebecca Thomas (University of Notre Dame), and Christopher Glueck (Indiana University); Deliberative and Participatory Projects with Rachel Ankeny and Heather Bray (University of Adelaide); Toolbox Project with Michael O'Rourke and Sean Valles (Michigan State University), and Chad Gonnerman (University of Southern Indiana); Library Talks for the Public with Dan Hicks (Western University); (History of) Science Cafes with Jessica Baron (HSS).

Visitors to the tables were able to discuss issues of social engagement and share tips for success, and visitors were given trading cards produced by JCSEPHS with tips on social engagement. This first event put on by JCSEPHS showed increasing interest in social engagement by both

historians and philosophers of science, and JCSEPHS hopes to put on similarly engaging events at meetings in the future. For further information on this event and future activities, please contact the JCSEPHS co-chairs: Dawn Digrius (ddigrius@calstate.edu) and Rachel Ankeny (rachel.ankeney@adelaide.edu.au).

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future

Respectfully submitted by the strategic planning Leadership Team: Angela Creager, Lynn Nyhart, Jay Malone

Download the plan at http://hsonline.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/12/Strategic_Plan_Public_2014_12_02.pdf

Early in 2013, the History of Science Society Executive Committee made a commitment to launch a structured strategic planning initiative to take on the tasks of reviewing the organization's mission; agreeing on a vision; identifying and coping with changing circumstances; providing a framework of deliberate priorities to guide day-to-day decision-making and allocation of human and financial resources; evaluating performance and organizational effectiveness; and making a sound case for philanthropic support.

The 2013 annual meeting in Boston marked the first formal meeting for strategic planning. Much behind-the-scenes activity led to a planning retreat in Chicago, where 40 members of the HSS, from around the world, gathered to debate and discuss whom the HSS serves and, essentially, our *raison d'être*. The retreat members identified six goals that they considered paramount.

Introduction

Strategic planning is an essential part of keeping an organization healthy. It typically involves reviewing the organization's mission; agreeing on a vision; identifying and coping with

changing circumstances; providing a framework of deliberate priorities to guide day-to-day decision-making and allocation of human and financial resources; evaluating performance and organizational effectiveness; and making a sound case for philanthropic support. Early in 2013, the History of Science Society Executive Committee made a commitment to launch a structured strategic planning initiative to take on these tasks, in a manner that would include as many members of the HSS as possible. We knew we lacked the expertise to undertake this process on our own, so we sought out a consultant. After interviewing several candidates, the EC hired Andrew Searle to lead us in our planning.

The 2013 annual meeting in Boston, where we celebrated the 100th anniversary of *Isis*, marked the first formal meeting for strategic planning. Council members and attendees at our business meeting, along with various committee members, were invited to discuss our mission statement. The Strategic Planning Committee (SPC), comprising 14 members of the HSS, met for the first time as Mr. Searle outlined how the process would unfold. The HSS was most fortunate that HSS President, Lynn Nyhart, agreed to serve on the Leadership Team during the planning (although her term as president would conclude in a matter of weeks), along with incoming

President, Angela Creager, and HSS Executive Director Jay Malone. Much behind-the-scenes activity led to a planning retreat in Chicago, where 40 members of the HSS, from around the world, gathered to debate and discuss whom the HSS serves and, essentially, our *raison d'être*. The retreat members identified six goals that they considered paramount (see below). The SPC then identified two "goal tenders" (goal leaders) for each goal and these goal tenders assembled their teams to help them establish the objectives, action steps, responsibility, and evaluative procedures for each goal. These goal teams met (virtually) over the next several months and each team created a draft that was then examined by the SPC.

The planning process helped HSS's officers and volunteers to think deeply about whom we serve and what our priorities should be, leading us to identify the areas on which we should devote our efforts. Although HSS serves as the de facto US national society for history of science scholars, the Society is also an international organization and this international scope was confirmed during our planning. This dual nature is intrinsic to our activities overall; it explains why some Objectives in the plan serve mainly US interests and others serve international interests. Most serve both.

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

Acronyms

BSHS	British Society for the History of Science
CSHPS	Canadian Soc for the Hy and Phil of Science
CoE	Committee on Education
CoF	Committee on Finance
CoMP	Committee on Meetings and Programs
CoP	Committee on Publications
CoRP	Committee on Research and the Profession
CoSSA	Consortium of Social Science Associations
EC	Executive Committee
EO	Executive Office
ESHS	European Society for the History of Science
FTE	Full Time Equivalent
GECC	Graduate and Early Career Caucus
IUHPS	International Union of the History and Philosophy of Sciences
JCSEPHS	Joint Caucus for Socially Engaged Philosophers and Historians of Science
JPASS	Journal access through JSTOR

NEH	National Endowment for the Humanities
NHA	National Humanities Alliance
NSF	National Science Foundation
PACHS	Philadelphia Area Center for the History of Science
SPC	Strategic Planning Committee

MISSION STATEMENT:

To foster interest in the history of science, promote discussion of science's social and cultural relations, and bring this understanding to others worldwide.

Goal 1: MEETINGS/NETWORKING

Create vibrant regular HSS meetings and facilitate networking through other associations and venues.

Objective 1.1: Host conferences that generate excitement.

- A. Improve experience of meeting for attendees by, for example, limiting number of concurrent sessions.
Who's Responsible: CoMP, Program Co-Chairs, and EO
- B. Enhance intellectual variety in program sessions in terms of different kinds of session

and event formats and diversity of topics and panel participants; and enable emerging scholars from within and beyond North America to attend. Synergistic with Step 1.2.B.

Who's Responsible: Program Co-Chairs, EO, Caucuses, and Special Interest groups

Objective 1.2: Facilitate networking both within and outside the HSS annual meetings.

- A. Feature events that connect scholars around vibrant themes and issues and that promote public engagement on the part of our members. Also contributes to Objective 4.3.
Who's Responsible: Program Co-Chairs, EO, Interest Groups, and Caucuses, esp. JCSEPHS
- B. Foster intergenerational and interdisciplinary networking, especially through supporting our formal and informal mentoring opportunities. Also contributes to Goal 3.
Who's Responsible: GECC, HSS at Work, Women's Caucus, EO

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

Goal 2: PUBLICATIONS/STANDARDS

Foster a publishing environment that promotes top quality history of science scholarship in diverse media for diverse audiences.

Objective 2.1: Maintain the outstanding quality of our print publications, while making HSS more welcoming of innovative research methods and modes of publication, from informal blogging to major online research projects.

- A. Provide members with an HSS authorized statement about the value of digital work and publication, with some guidelines for defining and evaluating it.
Who's responsible: CoP with whatever expert advice is needed
- B. Find ways to recognize and make visible outstanding digital products in our field, by publicizing examples, encouraging nominations for Hazen prize where appropriate, and considering the establishment of a new Society prize recognizing excellence in this area. See Step 3.2.B.
Who's responsible: EC, CoP, CoE, CoHP
- C. Ensure that activities of the CoP include attention to digital humanities and digital publication.
Who's responsible: EC, CoP

Objective 2.2: Analyze digital media opportunities as they relate to our publications and mission.

- A. Increase access and usability of the HSS bibliography through development of a new *Isis* research platform.
Who's responsible: Society Bibliographer with Sloan Foundation support, CoP
- B. Conduct an assessment of the potential benefits and costs of encouraging and publishing digital products beyond the bibliography. This can be profitably coordinated with our bid for publishers. Also contributes to Objective 4.3.
Who's responsible: CoP, EC, and EO, with input from Society Bibliographer and Editor

Objective 2.3: Provide opportunities for learning technical skills needed for digital scholarship.

- A. Promote digital workshops (e.g., THAT camps) at HSS annual meetings.
Who's responsible: CoP, CoMP, EO
- B. Collect syllabi that integrate digital methods.
Who's responsible: CoE

Goal 3: PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Support professional development of emerging history of science scholars inside and outside the academy.

Objective 3.1: SKILLS. Encourage historians of science to develop skills to succeed in a range of professions outside and inside the academy (tenure track and non-tenure track).

- A. Conduct regular workshops for graduate students on professional development, funding opportunities, and academic applications.
Who's responsible: GECC, HSS at Work, JCSEPHS, Annual Meeting Program Co-Chairs
- B. Conduct skill-building workshops for new and established historians of science at HSS meetings to develop competencies inside and beyond academe. Synergistic with Step 4.3.B.
Who's responsible: CoE, JCSEPHS
- C. Work with career development experts to develop a “Best Practices Guide” for departments on advising graduate students on broad career options.
Who's responsible: GECC, HSS at Work, EO

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

Objective 3.2: CULTURE. Foster a culture within the HSS that values, supports, and promotes all career paths for historians of science.

- A. Seek improved mechanisms to increase inclusion of outside-academy historians in HSS annual meeting program.
Who's responsible: CoMP, Annual Meeting Program Co-Chairs
- B. Sponsor, support, include on committees, and promote non-academic historians of science and their products across HSS events and publications. Synergistic with Objective 2.1.
Who's responsible: Hazen Prize Committee, HSS at Work, EO, Nominating Committee, Isis Editorial office
- C. Expand list of PhDs in History of Science (from ProQuest Dissertations) and search for their current employment, to generate list of people potentially served by HSS membership, inside and outside the academy. Synergistic with Steps 3.4.A and 6.1.B.
Who's responsible: EO, paid undergraduate assistant

Objective 3.3: SUPPORT. Provide non-monetary resources and support for historians of science inside and outside the academy so they can continue to flourish as scholars.

- A. Survey historians of science outside academia to assess their satisfaction with HSS and determine their unique needs. Contingent on Step 6.1.B.
Who's responsible: EO, HSS at Work and/or CoRP, contract graduate student
- B. Promote JPASS and HSTM database as benefits especially helpful to scholars outside academia.
Who's responsible: EO, HSS at Work
- C. Work with PACHS and other relevant consortia to provide access to workshops, colloquia, and working groups conducted remotely that require membership login.
Who's responsible: EO
- D. Enhance visibility of non-academic job/fellowship opportunities on HSS website.
Who's responsible: EO, HSS at Work

Objective 3.4: NETWORKING. Develop strategies for building our “alumni” network of historians of science (especially those who work in non-academic settings) to facilitate career exploration, broaden the profession’s relevance to a wider audience, and give them a continued stake in the profession.

- A. Establish a database for member networking. Synergistic with Steps 3.2.C and 6.1.B.
Who's responsible: EO, professional consultant

Goal 4: BROADENING OUR REACH

Promote general interest in history of science among educators at all levels and the public, in part by providing opportunities to scholars to expand their audiences and make their work more effective and relevant.

Objective 4.1: Reconfigure the Governance/Employee Structures of the HSS to include accountability for ‘broadening our reach.’

- A. Increase engagement efforts among EO staff, making a new hire and redistributing tasks within the office.
Who's responsible: EO, EC, and CoF
- B. Rename Committee on Education "Committee on Education and Engagement" (or something along these lines) to reflect broader commitment.
Who's responsible: EC to bring to Council

Objective 4.2: Support the enhanced integration of the history of science into grades 7–12 and community college classrooms.

- A. Complete an “environmental scan,” identifying existing materials (broadly construed), individuals, and organizations that integrate history of science into

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

education, and write up these results in a formal report. Contingent on funding.
Who's responsible: EO, (new FTE,) student assistant

- B. Explore partnerships with organizations and individuals who have existing expertise in developing science and history curricula, and work to incorporate further the history of science into their work. Contingent on Step 4.2.A.
Who's responsible: EO (new FTE)
- C. Encourage participation at state, regional, and national science teacher conferences by HSS members and staff.
Who's responsible: CoE
- D. Sponsor HSS-branded workshops (at HSS Annual Meeting or locally) that bring together historians of science and educators to develop and refine educational materials to use in classrooms.
Who's responsible: CoE, supported by EO
- E. Consider developing a specific project, e.g., lobbying for a National History Day topic of Science and Technology and then developing connections around it.
Who's responsible: CoE, supported by EO

Objective 4.3: Develop new tools and opportunities for members to connect to broader audiences.

- A. Create a companion publication to each issue of *Isis* that briefly presents its content, written for a broader public (including media, with press releases).
Who's responsible: *Isis* office, EO Director of Media and Engagement
- B. Develop and promote more regular means for making media connections with journalists. Synergistic with Steps 3.1.B and 4.4, 5.1.
Who's responsible: JCSEPHS, EO
- C. Incentivize reach-broadening by encouraging nominations to the Hazen Prize. See also Step 2.1.B.
Who's responsible: EO, CoE

Objective 4.4: Devise strategies for making work done by historians of science more available and accessible.

- A. Explore and assess new means of distributing HoS content. Synergistic with Steps 2.2.A, 5.1.A, B.
Who's responsible: CoE, CoP, EO

- B. Host online forums and annual meeting events to expand coordinated social media use.
Who's responsible: CoE, JCSEPHS
- C. Sponsor annual meeting “engagement workshops” that focus on professional development of relevant skills. Connects with Steps 3.1.B and 4.3.B and Objective 5.1.
Who's responsible: CoE, JCSEPHS

Goal 5: ADVOCACY

Promote history of science in the United States by advocating on behalf of the field and its practitioners to the public, to government officials, to universities, and to potential employers of historians of science; and support advocacy of history of science in other countries.

Objective 5.1: Promote greater public recognition of History of Science.

- A. Expand EO commitment to media and engagement. See Step 4.1.A.
Who's responsible: EO, CoF
- B. Develop an online resources task force to elevate the profile of the history of science and keep entries up to date with latest scholarship. See Objective 4.4.
Who's responsible: CoE, JCSEPHS

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

Objective 5.2: Engage policy makers with history of science.

- A. Continue to collaborate with CoSSA and NHA in advocating for our discipline in the US (e.g. NSF and NEH).
Who's responsible: EO, Washington rep
- B. Continue to collaborate with the IUHPS as well as scientific societies and learned societies, in advocating for our discipline worldwide.
Who's responsible: EC, EO
- C. Develop a set of principles and policies on advocacy and lobbying.
Who's responsible: EC, ad-hoc governance committee

Objective 5.3: Promote enhanced employment opportunities for historians of science both within and outside of academia, especially in governmental positions.

- A. Establish a closer working relationship with Society for History in the Federal Government.
Who's responsible: EO, ad-hoc committee, to cooperate with Society for History in the Federal Government

Goal 6: MEMBERSHIP/GOVERNANCE

Produce a sustainable governance and financial system for HSS that will promote a welcoming, culturally and internationally diverse and interdisciplinary organizational culture.

Objective 6.1: Know our members.

- A. Revise Society organization to put in place a committee on membership. This may be a reworked Committee on Research and the Profession.
Who's responsible: EC in conjunction with EO
- B. Use this committee to establish a baseline analysis of our membership demography, and to analyze and monitor our current membership, and develop goals for diversification of membership. Contingent on Step 6.1.A; synergistic with Steps 3.4.A and 3.2.C.)
Who's responsible: New Committee on Membership, EO

Objective 6.2: Increase financial attractiveness of membership to diverse constituents.

- A. Survey membership about whether an income-based dues structure would be preferable; also Step 6.5.B.
Who's responsible: CoF and EO

- B. Offer new PhDs one year's complimentary membership.
Who's responsible: EO in conjunction with UC Press
- C. Communicate benefits of HSS membership to faculty at community colleges.
Who's responsible: Committee on Membership and EO
- D. Rebrand or reinvigorate Sponsor-a-Scholar Program to boost international membership from countries where cost of living or currency makes HSS dues unaffordable.
Who's responsible: Committee on Membership and EO
- E. Expand joint membership to national and continental (e.g., ESHS) societies beyond BSHS and CSHPS.
Who's responsible: Committee on Membership, CoF, and EO

Objective 6.3: Increase international participation during the next five years.

- A. Prioritize increasing the proportion of Council nominees working/living outside US/Canada.
Who's responsible: Nominating Committee

The HSS Strategic Plan: A Roadmap to the Future, *cont.*

- B. Invite more HSS members working/living outside US/Canada to serve on committees, to make them more geographically representative of membership.

Who's responsible: EC and/or Nominating Committee

- C. Identify technological means (and associated costs) that would allow remote participation of HSS Council and committee members in work of Society, should this enable a more geographically diverse participation of members in organization.

Who's responsible: EO and EC

Objective 6.4: Create a more open, transparent, and participatory governance structure aligned with HSS's strategic goals.

- A. Appoint an ad-hoc by-laws committee to alter governance in accord with Strategic Plan and Society mission with an eye towards a) simplifying appointments/elections, term lengths, and their relationship to Council if deemed desirable; and b) incorporating new committees or renaming and reconfiguring existing committees into by-laws.

Who's responsible: SPC, EC, and EO with feedback from existing committees

- B. Differentiate areas where volunteer coordination could be undertaken by committees or caucuses and those where EO leadership is required, with aim towards finding a place for managing volunteers in organizational structure.

Who's responsible: Ad-hoc by-laws committee (see A) in consultation with existing committee and EO

- C. Use HSS website to make governance more transparent.

Who's responsible: EO, EC, and Secretary

Objective 6.5: Assess and analyze revenues and expenditures with an eye toward a longer-term financial plan.

- A. Gather information from other medium-sized societies on how they balance sources of revenue, with an eye towards rethinking our long-term plans.

Who's responsible: CoF in conjunction with EO

- B. Survey membership about whether an income-based dues structure would be preferable; also 6.2.A.

Who's responsible: CoF and EO

- C. If Step 6.5.B generates sufficient interest, hire consultant to help with reworking dues structure and negotiate plan with press.



Plan Ahead Future HSS Meetings

Atlanta: 2016, 3-6 Nov.

Joint meeting with PSA and the Society for Literature, Science and the Arts

Toronto, Ontario: 2017, 9-12 Nov.

Seattle: 2018, 1-4 Nov.

Joint meeting with PSA

**Utrecht, The Netherlands: 2019,
Early August!**

(Our first meeting outside of North America)

HSS Annual Report

by Jay Malone, HSS Executive Director



The HSS Executive Committee taking a brief pause at the meeting in Chicago: Clockwise: Adam Apt, Treasurer; Floris Cohen, Editor; Marsha Richmond, Secretary; Jay Malone, Executive Director; Angela Creager, President; Janet Browne, Vice President

When a member of the HSS asked me for the Society's annual report, I was surprised (and delighted) by her request. Surprised because, during my many years at the HSS, I had not been asked for an annual report by a member (I do file biannual reports for the Executive Committee)

and delighted because it affords me the chance to describe our numerous activities.

Since many HSS members interact with the Executive Office as a byproduct of the annual meeting, there is the perception that the EO focuses solely on that event. And while we estimate

that approximately 50% of our time is devoted to each conference—handling duties that range from the call for papers, to abstract submissions, to assigning rooms, to ordering coffee—the other half of EO duties focuses on myriad activities, all of them devoted to our charge to “foster interest in the history of science.” And that is just the Executive Office. The Editorial Office, led by Society Editor, H. Floris Cohen, and housed at the Descartes Center in Utrecht, oversees the publications of the HSS, from *Isis*, to *Osiris*, to the *Current Bibliography*, as well as occasional publications. The important thing to remember is that most of these duties involve volunteers, those who give their time to furthering the history of science. And many of these volunteer hours are accounted for by the Society's officers.

The officers of the HSS—the President, Vice President, Editor, Secretary, Treasurer, and Executive Director (ex officio, non voting)—comprise the Executive Committee. These officers contribute hundreds of hours to the business of the Society, overseeing the functioning of the HSS. They report to the Council (16 elected members), the ultimate authority, but the officers handle the heavy lifting. It is they who provide the Executive Office and the Editorial Office with guidance and who are intimately involved in

HSS Annual Report, *cont.*

formulating the goals and priorities of the HSS. The Editorial Office, which includes the offices at Utrecht (*Isis*), the University of Oklahoma (*Isis Current Bibliography* (CB)) and the University of Rhode Island (*Osiris*) are under Dr. Cohen's supervision, with advice provided by advisory editors and the Committee on Publications. The Executive Office, run by Executive Director, Robert (Jay) Malone is staffed by our indefatigable Coordinator, Greg Macklem, our part-time (in name only) Director of Media and Engagement, Jessica Baron, and an ongoing rotation of students all of whom focus on a smorgasbord of activities: the annual meetings (and the biennial meetings of the Philosophy of Science Association); development work (from soliciting donors to finding friends for the Society); the HSS Web site, from content to functionality; the Society's financial accounts; the continuity of programs; the work of the standing committees and prize committees; the creation, editing, and distribution of the quarterly *Newsletter*; the supervision of NSF travel grants; good member services; the maintenance of relations with other scholarly societies and the public; oversight of occasional publications; and supervision of the Sponsor A Scholar program. Although this list is not comprehensive, it does describe in outline the major activities of the Executive Office.

The Executive Director's position was created in 1998, with one of the goals being to establish a more permanent presence for the HSS. Before that time, volunteers served as temporary secretary. And although the position of Executive Director is fixed, the location of the Executive Office is not. In 1998, the office was housed at the University of Washington. The University of Florida made a successful bid for the office in 2003 and in August 2010, the Executive Office relocated from Florida to the University of Notre Dame. Each relocation has benefited the Society by offering substantially more tangible support for the Executive Office.

Personnel

Greg Macklem, our Society Coordinator who began in September 2010, functions as the can-do person. As is the case in all small offices, Greg works on the finances, the annual meeting, the website... in short, he is involved in all aspects of the EO's functioning.

Although much of their time is devoted to assisting with conferences, our two ND grad students help us with multiple projects, such as *Newsletter* creation and editing, handling the prize committees and travel grants, and many other important activities, such as finding reviews of our prize-winning books (over 100 reviews) which are posted to the HSS web site.

We were exceedingly fortunate to add Jessica Baron, our Director of Media and Engagement, to our staff this past year. A Notre Dame PhD, Jessica, handles our social presence (Facebook, Twitter, Tumblr), along with many other duties. Her position is a quarter time one, one we share with the Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values here at Notre Dame.

Annual Meetings

As mentioned above, much of the Executive Office's activities center around the annual meeting. The first step in this activity is finding meeting sites. Because the HSS meetings are so large (ca. 650 attendees and ten to twelve concurrent sessions) and we meet in the last quarter of the calendar year when most schools are in session, we use conference hotels, rather than dorm rooms, for our annual meeting. Our members strongly prefer downtown properties in interesting cities. That combination usually means high hotel prices (something our members do not want) but the last recession provided an opportunity to negotiate reasonable room rates with hotels in the central districts of Boston (2013), Chicago (2014), San Francisco (2015), Atlanta (2016), Toronto (2017) and Seattle (2018). Each of these site visits required multiple hotel stays, meeting with the cities' convention and visitors' bureau, contract negotiations and lawyer's review, and

Continued on Page 22

HSS Annual Report, *cont.*

multiple other steps. And although we have no set geographic pattern, we try to meet at various locations throughout North America to give our members a somewhat local opportunity to attend the conference every few years. Some 70% of HSS members live in North America, but we identify ourselves as an international society and to fulfill that identity the Society will hold its first meeting outside North America, in Utrecht, The Netherlands, in 2019.

2024/2025

HSS will celebrate its 100th anniversary in 2024. With that anniversary in mind, we undertook a wide ranging and, we hope, thorough strategic planning process (see the strategic plan in this *Newsletter*). Involving over 100 members, the strategic plan was a byproduct of months of work and it will help us set our course into the future. It is my hope that this annual report will give members an idea of what it is the HSS does (one of the surprising findings from the plan is how poorly we have conveyed the range of our activities to the membership).

Program Continuity and Committee Oversight

The HSS boasts six standing committees: Committee on Education; Committee on

Honors and Prizes, Committee on Publications, Committee on Research and the Profession, Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Meetings and Programs. Each committee runs solely on the strength of volunteers, over 40 individuals. And in addition to these are the prize committees, overseen by the Committee on Honors and Prizes, the Nominating Committee (elected each year) and the various interest groups and caucuses, again, all staffed by volunteers. Here is a precis of the caucuses and interest groups:

Four Caucuses—distinguished by their professional goals

- *Graduate Early Career Caucus (GECC)*
Organizes mentorship programs, mixers, and informational sessions to help students and those launching their careers.
- *Women's Caucus*
Our oldest caucus, it is dedicated to furthering the interest of women in the history of science and in promoting excellence in scholarship on the history of women in science.
- *HSS at Work*
Dedicated to helping those who love the history of science and who choose to pursue a career outside of teaching.

- *Joint Caucus for Socially Engaged Philosophers and Historians of Science*

This caucus, formed in 2014 and which is also an official caucus of the Philosophy of Science Association, works on ways to make the history and philosophy of science socially relevant. Its early activities have focused on helping historians and philosophers of science engage the public in broad ways.

Eight Interest Groups—distinguished by their intellectual interests

We have seen a surge in our number of interest groups, with two new groups added in recent years. Our interest groups, listed approximately from oldest to newest, include the Forum for the History of Science in America, the Forum for the History of Human Science, the Forum for the History of Early Science, the Earth and Environment Forum, the Forum for the History of the Mathematical Sciences, the Forum for the History of Science in Asia, the Forum for the History of the Chemical Sciences, and the Forum for the History of the Physical Sciences.

Also vital to our programs are our delegates and representatives who serve as liaisons for the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Historical Association, the American

HSS Annual Report, *cont.*

Association for the Advancement of Science, the National Humanities Alliance, the International Union for the History and Philosophy of Science, and the Consortium of Social Science Organizations. These are the groups with which HSS has a formal relationship, and they are an essential part of our societal relations.

Web Site

This past year we launched our redesigned Web site (hssonline.org), a years-long endeavor that would not have been possible without our volunteers. Using WordPress as our content management system, we aimed to provide a site that could be updated easily and also serve as a useful resource for our members and for the public.

NSF Travel Grants

For over 20 years, the HSS has relied on the US's National Science Foundation to provide travel grants to support the research and work of graduate students, independent scholars, and recent PhDs in the history of science. And because of the stability and resources of the HSS Executive Office, we were able to expand the reach of the grants so that they benefited seven other academic societies, helping them professionalize their students and increase the diversity of their conferences: Philosophy of Science Association

(PSA); Society for the History of Technology (SHOT); the International Society for the History of Philosophy of Science (HOPOS), the International Society for the History, Philosophy and Social Study of Biology (ISH); the American Society for Environmental History (ASEH); the International Society for the Psychology of Science and Technology (ISPST); and the Society for Literature, Science, and the Arts (SLSA). Although these grants require a great deal of work, much of it uncompensated, the HSS feels that the grants are important enough to devote HSS resources to them. The grants also benefit greatly our interactions and relationships with other societies.

Relations with Other Societies

I continue regular contact with the secretaries and officers of numerous societies: SHOT, Society for Social Studies of Science, PSA, American Association for the History of Medicine, American Council of Learned Societies, American Association for the Advancement of Science, American Academy of Arts and Sciences, American Historical Association, International Union for the History and Philosophy of Science, and many others. Much of this contact is facilitated by HSS's membership in the ACLS.

NASA/HSS Space History Fellowships

We are in the third iteration of our five-year agreement with NASA to provide an annual fellowship to foster research in the history of space science. I am particularly grateful to NASA Historian, Bill Barry for his support and for the members of the fellowship committee which examine the applications and award the grants.

MEMBER NEWS

Ana Barahona (National University of Mexico, UNAM) has received the 2014 National University Award (Premio Universidad Nacional 2014) for her outstanding contributions to science and technology studies (S&TS), in particular, the history of genetics and evolution, the history of science in Mexico, and her remarkable teaching activity. This award is the highest recognition that the UNAM gives to professors who have had a distinguished career; the accolade is given in seventeen different specialities. Her award was for the Teaching of Natural Sciences (Docencia en Ciencias Naturales).

.....

Daniela Bleichmar, (University of Southern California) has been awarded the Herbert Baxter Adams Prize by the American Historical Association for her book *Visible Empire: Botanical Expeditions and Visual Culture in the Hispanic Enlightenment* (Univ. of Chicago Press). The AHA offers the prize annually for a distinguished book published in English in the field of European history. More importantly, *Visible Empire* also won the HSS's Levinson Prize for best history of science book in natural history. See the prize citation under the list of prize winners.

.....

Ronald Brashear (Chemical Heritage Foundation) was elected Chair-Elect of the American Chemical Society's Division of the History of Chemistry. He will begin his two-year term on the Division's

Executive Committee on 1 Jan 2015 and then become Chair on 1 Jan 2017.

.....

Víctor Navarro Brotons (Universitat de València) published *Disciplinas, saberes y prácticas. Filosofía Natural, Matemáticas y Astronomía en la sociedad española en la época moderna*, Universitat de València, Valencia, 2014.

.....

José Chabás and **Bernard R. Goldstein** (Emeritus, University of Pittsburgh), have published *Essays on Medieval Computational Astronomy*. Leiden: Brill, 2015.

.....

Frederick Rowe "Fritz" Davis (Florida State University) has published *Banned: A History of Pesticides and the Science of Toxicology*, Yale University Press. <http://yalebooks.com/Book.asp?isbn=9780300205176>

.....

Amy A. Fisher (University of Puget Sound) will replace **Catherine Westfall** as chair of HSS's Physical Sciences Forum (PSF), having been nominated and elected chair at HSS's Chicago Meeting. She is interested in hearing PSF members' thoughts on future sessions and workshops and, more generally, on the ways in which the PSF can better serve the community. You can contact her at afisher@pugetsound.edu.

.....

Building on the seminal studies of "organic memory" by Laura Otis (1994) and Daniel Schacter (2001), **Donald Forsdyke** (Queen's University, Canada) describes contributions of Darwin's research associate, George Romanes, to evolutionary psychology in "A Vehicle of Symbols and Nothing More." "George Romanes, Theory of Mind, Information, and Samuel Butler" (History of Psychiatry 2015; SAGE Publications, in press). A preprint version may be accessed at <http://post.queensu.ca/~forsdyke/mind02.htm>, and a corresponding lecture may be viewed at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ezcdIrR9r-w>.

.....

Jacob Darwin Hamblin (Oregon State University) has been awarded the Paul Birdsall Prize by the American Historical Association for *Arming Mother Nature: The Birth of Catastrophic Environmentalism*, Oxford, 2013.

.....

Jennifer Michael Hecht's latest book, *Stay: A History of Suicide and the Arguments Against It* (Yale, 2013) is coming out in paperback in January 2015.

.....

On 4 Feb 2014, **Pamela Henson** was awarded the Smithsonian Institution Secretary's Gold Medal for Exceptional Service. This is a singular award presented by the Secretary at a private ceremony and reflects the very important role Pam plays as Historian of the Smithsonian where she works

MEMBER NEWS, CONT.

with visitors and staff to understand the ongoing role of this institution in American intellectual and cultural life. Secretary G. Wayne Clough noted that Pam has kept the historical record straight for forty-two years since starting at the Smithsonian in the early 1970s and anticipates her doing so well into the future. <http://siarchives.si.edu/blog/and-award-goes>

.....

Dieter Kempkens, has published “Der Erfolg der Prognostica auf dem Buchmarkt in der Frühen Neuzeit,” in *Jahrbuch für Kommunikationsgeschichte* 16 (2014) pp. 5-27. Link to the complete summary: <http://www.steiner-verlag.de/programm/jahrbuecher/jahrbuch-fuer-kommunikationsgeschichte/jkg-162014.html>

.....

John Krige (Georgia Tech University) has been elected SHOT president for 2017–2018, vice president for 2015–2016.

.....

Robert (Jay) Malone (History of Science Society) was recently elected as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

.....

In November, **Adrienne Mayor** (Stanford University) was invited to give public lectures about her new book, *The Amazons: Lives and Legends of Warrior Women across the Ancient World*

(Princeton University Press, 2014) at Brooklyn College; Philadelphia’s Penn Museum; and the Smithsonian in Washington DC. She also gave a “Talk at Google” at Google Cambridge MA, which was livestreamed to Google Mountain View, as well as an after-dinner talk at The Brook, New York City. Her co-authored article “Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases” was published in *Hesperia (Journal of the American School of Classical Studies)* in September 2014; she also published “Who Invented Trousers?” *Natural History* magazine (October 2014) and “When Alexander Met Thalestris” *History Today* (January 2015).

.....

Arthur Murchison has published *War before Science: Sir Roderick Impey Murchison’s Youth, Army Service and Military Associates during the Napoleonic Wars*, Academica Press, 2014.

.....

Naomi Oreskes (Harvard University) has been awarded the Feis Award by the American Historical Association. This prize is offered annually to recognize distinguished contributions to public history, broadly defined. The prize is named in memory of Herbert Feis (1893–1972), public servant and historian of recent American foreign policy, with an initial endowment from the Rockefeller Foundation. <http://www.historians.org/awards-and-grants/awards-and-prizes/herbert-feis-award>. She and **John Krige** have

edited *Science and Technology in the Global Cold War* (MIT Press, 2014) and the film version of her book *Merchants of Doubt* (co-authored with **Erik Conway**) is being released by Sony pictures on 6 March 2015. <http://sonyclassics.com/merchantsofdoubt/>

.....

Peter Pesic has been named the director of the Science Institute at St. John’s College in Santa Fe, NM, which offers intensive, week-long seminars on important texts in science and mathematics. These seminars center on discussion between participants, including hands-on work with equipment and demonstrations; they are meant particularly to be helpful to teachers interested in promoting thoughtful discussion of scientific topics, but are also welcome to all serious participants. In summer 2015, the sessions will concern “A Tale of Two Geometries: Euclid and Lobachevsky” (June 29–July 3) and “Understanding Relativity: Texts by Albert Einstein” (July 6–10). For further information, please contact ppesic@sjc.edu.

.....

F. Jamil Ragep’s (McGill University) Canada Research Chair in the History of Science in Islamic Societies was renewed for seven years. The term is 2014–2021. <http://www.mcgill.ca/newsroom/channels/news/six-new-canada-research-chairs-mcgill-239586>. He and **Faith Wallis** (McGill) have edited *The Herbal of al-Ghāfiqī: A Facsimile Edition with Critical Essays* (Montreal:

MEMBER NEWS, CONT.

McGill-Queen's University Press, 2014). <http://www.mqup.ca/herbal-of-al-ghafiqi--the-products-9780773544758.php>

.....

Sally P. Ragep successfully defended her dissertation, "Mahmūd ibn Muhammad ibn 'Umar al-Jaghmīnī's *al-Mulakhkhas fi 'ilm al-hay'a al-basīta*: An Edition, Translation, and Study," at the Institute of Islamic Studies and Department of History and Classical Studies, McGill University in October.

.....

Naomi Rogers has been promoted to full Professor of the History of Medicine at Yale University, where she teaches medical students and residents in the School of Medicine, and undergraduate and graduate students in the Program in the History of Science and Medicine, in Women's, Gender, and Sexuality Studies, and in History. Her book *Polio Wars: Sister Kenny and the Golden Age of American Medicine* (Oxford University Press, 2014) has been awarded the 2014 Lavinia L. Dock Award by the American Association for the History of Nursing.

.....

Pamela H. Smith (Columbia University) is PI on a National Science Foundation Research Grant #1430843 "The Role of Tacit Knowledge in Experimentation," awarded to support The Making and Knowing Project <http://scienceandsociety.columbia.edu/research-clusters/from-the-workshop-to-the-laboratory/>.

She has also just published the following edited volumes:

- Christy Anderson, Anne Dunlop, and Pamela H. Smith, eds., *The Matter of Art: Materials, Practices, Cultural Logics*, c. 1250-1750, Manchester University Press, 2015, which explores attitudes to matter and materials in the early modern world, as well as the meaning, use, and production of materials for building, mining, and various types of artistic production.
- Pamela H. Smith, Amy Meyers and Harold J. Cook, eds., *Ways of Making and Knowing: The Material Culture of Empirical Knowledge*, Bard Graduate Center/University of Michigan Press, 2014, which examines the relationship between making objects (crafts) and knowing nature (the natural sciences) in Europe and its colonies from about 1450 to 1850.

.....

Laura Smoller moved in August from the University of Arkansas at Little Rock, and is now in the Department of History at the University of Rochester.

.....

Mark Solovey's (University of Toronto) book *Shaky Foundations: The Politics-Patronage-Social Science Nexus in Cold War America* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press) is coming out in paperback in March 2015. Mark served as a senior editor for the two-volume

Oxford Encyclopedia of the History of Science, Medicine, and Technology in America (New York: Oxford University Press), 2014. For this work he also contributed two entries: "Social Science Research Council," and "The Social Sciences in America, Post-1945." With Alexandra Rutherford and Mike Pettit, Mark was a co-organizer of the Three-Day Workshop, "Social Science, Ideology, and Public Policy in the United States, 1960 to the Present" held at the University of Toronto, where he presented a paper "Reconstructing Social Inquiry, Social Inquiry for Reconstruction: Marcus Raskin, the Institute for Policy Studies, and the Critique of Scientism." He also gave a paper "Social Science Funding under Siege in More Conservative Times: The Case of the U.S. National Science Foundation in the 1970s," at the Annual Meeting of the Social Science History Association Meeting."

.....

Frank W. Stahnisch (University of Calgary, Canada) recently co-edited a book with **Thomas Hoffmann** (University of Ludwigsburg, Germany) entitled: *Kurt Goldstein. Der Aufbau des Organismus. Einfuehrung in die Biologie unter besonderer Beruecksichtigung der Erfahrungen am kranken Menschen* (Fink Verlag in Munich, Germany, 2014). The preface is by **Anne Harrington** (Harvard) and the forward by **Bernhard Waldenfels** (Bochum). This introduced and edited version of German-American neurologist Kurt Goldstein's (1878–1965) book is the first edition to appear with a

MEMBER NEWS, CONT.

German publisher, after Goldstein was forced to leave Germany under the Nazis. For more information see <http://www.fink.de/katalog/titel/978-3-7705-5281-8.html>.

.....

Jeff Sturchio was appointed president & CEO of Rabin Martin, a global health strategy consulting firm, last July. He received the Powered by EF 2014 Leadership Award of the Entrepreneurs' Foundation of the Silicon Valley Community Foundation last November for his contributions to global health and corporate responsibility. His recent essay on "Corporate purpose and social responsibility" (with Lou Galambos, Johns Hopkins University) appeared in Greg Urban, ed., *Corporations and Citizenship* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2014).

.....

Kara Swanson's (Northeastern University School of Law) book, *Banking on the Body: The Market in Blood, Milk and Sperm in Modern America*, was published by Harvard University Press in 2014. <http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674281431>

.....

David Topper's (University of Winnipeg) latest book, *Idolatry & Infinity: Of Art, Math, & God* was published by Brown Walker Press in September 2014.

.....

James Voelkel is co-curator of a new exhibition at the Chemical Heritage Foundation, *Books of Secrets: Writing and Reading Alchemy*. The exhibition opened at CHF on 5 Dec 2014, and runs through 4 Sep 2015. More information about the exhibit can be found at <http://www.chemheritage.org/visit/museum/exhibits/books-of-secrets>.

.....

Alex Wellerstein has begun a new appointment as Assistant Professor of Science and Technology Studies at the Stevens Institute of Technology.

.....

On 17 Nov 2014, **Frederick G. Weinstein**, MD, was appointed to the Institutional Review Board of the Greater Baltimore Medical Center. The Greater Baltimore Medical Center is a community teaching hospital affiliated with The Johns Hopkins Medical School. He is also continuing to serve as the chairman of the Ethics Committee.

In Memoriam

It is with deep sadness that we acknowledge the death of Dave Lindberg on 6 January 2015. Further information will appear in a future *Newsletter*.

Werner Callebaut (1952–2014)

Werner Callebaut, the Scientific Director of *The KLI Institute*, Professor of Philosophy, President of the ISHPSSB, Editor-in-Chief of *Biological Theory*, died in

Vienna, Austria, on 6 Nov 2014, at the age of 62. A touching obituary by his friend and colleague, Gerd B. Müller, can be found in the ISHPSSB Newsletter at <http://ishpssb.org/newsletter-fall-2014/>.



NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION

CHM Hosts Second Annual Festival of Medical History and the Arts: “Vesalius 500: Art, Anatomy, and the Body.”

Over 400 people attended the Center for the History of Medicine and Public Health’s (New York Academy of Medicine) second annual Festival of Medical History and the Arts on Saturday, 18 Oct. “Vesalius 500: Art, Anatomy, and the Body” celebrated the 500th birthday of anatomist Andreas Vesalius.

The day-long event explored the intersection of anatomy and the arts with a far-reaching roster of performers and presenters, including Heidi Latsky’s “GIMP” Dance Project; the comics



Festival Curator Riva Lehrer, left, and Center Director Dr. Lisa O’Sullivan

artists of Graphic Medicine; Sander Gilman on posture controlling the unruly body; Alice Dreger on inventing the medical photograph; Bill Hayes on researching hidden histories of medicine; Steven Assael, Ann Fox and Chun-shan (Sandie) Yi on anatomy in contemporary art; Chase Joynt’s Resisterectomy, a

meditation on surgery and gender; Brandy Schillace on ambivalent depictions of female anatomy in the 18th century; Lisa Rosner on famous body snatchers Burke and Hare; the art of anatomical atlases with Michael Sappol; medical 3D printing demos by ProofX; anatomical painting directly on skin with Kriota Willberg; Daniel Garrison on translating Vesalius for modern audiences; Jeff Levine and Michael Nevins on revisiting the *Fabrica* frontispiece; and others. Center staff conducted tours of the rare book room and presented an exhibit based on NYAM’s collections: **Brains, Brawn, & Beauty: Andreas Vesalius and the Art of Anatomy**. In addition, festival attendees could sign up for four hands-on art and anatomy workshops. For further information and for thoughts on the Festival by guest Curator Riva Lehrer, see **Reflections on “Art, Anatomy and the Body: Vesalius 500.”**

Columbia University in the City of New York

Columbia University in the City of New York has founded a Center for Science and Society (<http://scienceandsociety.columbia.edu/>) that brings together a wide variety of scholars and practitioners in the human, social, and natural sciences from Columbia’s campus and the New York City metropolitan area to support interdisciplinary research, teaching, and outreach about the roles of science, technology, medicine, and public

health in past and present societies. The Center is supported by an initial start up grant from the Andrew Mellon Foundation.

New ISHPSSB Prize

The International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology (ISHPSSB) seeks submissions for the newly inaugurated Werner Callebaut Prize.

This prize is intended to advance the careers of younger scholars working at the intersection of the fields represented by ISHPSSB. The 2015 prize will be awarded to the best manuscript utilizing an interdisciplinary approach based on a presentation at one of the two previous ISHPSSB meetings (Salt Lake City or Montpellier) by someone who was, at the time of presentation, a graduate student.

The prize is named in honor of Werner Callebaut, whose untimely death in 2014 (at which time he was serving as the President of ISHPSSB) inflicted a serious blow to the philosophy of biology community worldwide. Werner’s mentorship and guidance has benefitted the intellectual and personal development of countless philosophers and scientists over the last twenty years, and contributed greatly to making sure that philosophical and scientific work evolve in constructive dialogue and reciprocal respect. His work reached creatively across fields of relevance to the philosophical understanding

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

of biology (comprising areas as far removed as economics, evolutionary biology, history, sociology and cognitive science), as well as across national cultures, languages and traditions (most notably the 'continental-analytic' divide among philosophers of science), hence making a prize focused on interdisciplinarity most appropriate, especially for ISHSSPB which explicitly encourages interdisciplinary approaches.

The award will consist of a certificate and an award of \$500, as well as a permanent record of the award on a plaque which circulates every two years to the current winners. Submissions may be simultaneously considered for the Grene and the Callebaut prizes, but a paper may not be awarded both prizes. Submissions should be in the form of a paper accepted by or prepared for submission to a professional journal with an indication of the journal in question, along with a brief statement detailing the interdisciplinarity represented in the manuscript. An electronic copy, in Microsoft Word or PDF format, should be emailed to the Chair of the Callebaut Prize Committee, Rachel A. Ankeny, rachel.ankeney@adelaide.edu.au, no later than **15 February 2015**. The winning paper will be announced at the 2015 meeting in Montréal. The committee reserves the right not to make an award, or to split the award.

To make donations to the prize fund in honor of Werner, please visit the ISH donations page at <http://ishpsb.onefireplace.com/page-154695>, or

make a donation when renewing your membership or registering for the conference.

The History of Science Society Fellowship in the History of Space Science

The History of Science Society Fellowship in the History of Space Science, supported by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) History Division, funds a nine-month research project that is related to any aspect of the history of space science, from the earliest human interest in space to the present. The program is broadly conceived and includes the social, cultural, institutional and personal context of space-science history. Proposals of advanced research in history related to all aspects of the history of space science are eligible. Sciences of space and sciences affected by data and concepts developed in connection with space exploration include astronomy, Earth science, optics, meteorology, oceanography, and physiology. The fellowship is open to applicants who hold a doctoral degree in history or a closely related field, or students who have completed all requirements for the PhD, except the dissertation, in history of science or a related field.

What is Space Science?

The history of space science predates the founding of NASA. For example, the organizers of the International Geophysical Year (1957–1958)

realized the important contributions spacecraft data could make to science, and the launch of Explorer I in 1958 demonstrated that feasibility with its discovery of the Van Allen radiation belts. In addition, scientific questions that motivated spaces sciences and scientific principles from which it evolved have even earlier roots.

Sciences of space and sciences affected by data and concepts developed in connection with space exploration include astronomy, Earth science, optics, meteorology, oceanography, and physiology. Space science has implications for our understanding of the moon and planets, fields and particles in space, celestial bodies beyond the solar system such as stars and galaxies, the Earth itself, and the life sciences, especially exobiology. Some works on space science are listed at the NASA History Office Web site: <http://history.nasa.gov/>.

The Fellowship term is for a period of nine months. The Fellow will be expected to devote the term largely to the proposed research project. The stipend is intended for a nine-month fellowship during the period 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016. For further details on the stipend, please email info@hssonline.org. The starting and ending dates within that period are flexible. Funds may not be used to support tuition or fees. Sources of anticipated support must be listed in the application form. The stipend for 2015–16 will be \$21,250.

The application deadline for the 2015–16 Fellowship is Monday, **30 March 2015**. Further

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

details and application materials can be found at <http://hssonline.org/employment/fellowship-in-the-history-of-space-science/>.

Paul Farber to Deliver AAAS Sarton Lecture

This year's George Sarton



Memorial Lecturer in the History and Philosophy of Science, to be delivered at the American Association for the Advancement of Science meeting in San Jose, California, 15 Feb 2015, is Paul Farber, Distinguished Professor Emeritus, Modern Life Sciences, Intellectual History, Oregon State University. His title is “Darwinian Evolution and Human Race.” A former president of HSS, Dr. Farber’s background in zoology and active interest in ornithology led him to the study of the naturalist tradition from the early 18th century through the 20th century, with emphasis on the development of systematic methods for cataloging and analyzing the natural world. He also began research into evolutionary ethics and the results of biological evolution on the shaping of philosophy and psychology. This work eventually resulted in the publication of *Finding*

Order in Nature: The Naturalist Tradition from Linnaeus to E.O. Wilson and *The Temptations of Evolutionary Ethics*. In addition to his research and administrative duties, Paul took an active role in organizing publications and events for the history of science community, serving as an editor and contributor for several journals including the *Journal of the History of Biology* and *Endeavour*. A fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, he has published more than three dozen books, articles, and reviews and received honors and awards from Oregon State University, the Phi Alpha Phi Honor Society, and the History of Science Society. He currently studies the evolution of scientific thought, with an emphasis on race-mixing in the United States as a social and scientific phenomenon. In 2011, he published *From Scientific Racism to Modern Evolutionary Ideas*.

ISH in Montréal

The organization of the International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology conference (ISHPSSB 2015) is now under way. All relevant information can be found on the conference website: ishpssb2015.uqam.ca

Key dates:

- The conference is planned from Sunday afternoon, 5 July till Friday, 10 July 2015.
- The call for abstracts is open through **15 January 2015**.

- And early bird registration will start in January 2015.

General inquiries about the conference should be directed to Dr. Mathieu Charbonneau: ishpssb2015@gmail.com.

New Dissertations

You can view the latest batch of recent doctoral dissertations harvested from the issues 75-04 A and B of Dissertation Abstracts pertaining to the history of Science and Medicine at the following URL: <http://www.hsls.pitt.edu/histmed/dissertations>.

ProQuest has altered how they put out their individual issues. No longer do they correlate to one month, so the dating is more random. Thus titles will range from 2015—yes they have some 2015 dates—back into the late 1990s. Our thanks to Jonathon Erlen for compiling this list.

ANC-HPS Workshop

The Australian National Committee for History and Philosophy of Science (which is sponsored by the Australian Academy of Science) recently sponsored a workshop entitled “Theory Meets Practice: Master Class in Science Engagement and Policy Making.” The event brought together more than eighty people at the Shine Dome in Canberra and also was live streamed. Attendees included

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

historians, policymakers, science communicators, regulators, engineers, and people working in industry, among others. Six sessions involving pairs of speakers—one from a “theory” perspective and one from a “practice” perspective—covered a range of topics including involving the public in policymaking, biobanking and indigenous populations, communication of science to the public via popular media and museums, climate change communication, food labelling and regulation, and big data. Key themes included the limits of regulation, breaking down assumptions about the public (particularly relating to the “deficit” model), uses of narratives to engage the public, and the centrality of trust in policymaking processes. For more information, please see <https://www.science.org.au/events/theory-meets-practice-master-class-science-engagement-and-policy-making>.

Cheiron CFP

Proposals are now being accepted for the 47th annual meeting of Cheiron: The International Society for the History of Behavioral and Social Sciences. We invite papers, posters, symposia/panels, or workshops that deal with any aspect of the history of the human, behavioral, and social sciences or related historiographical and methodological issues. The conference will be held at University of Kansas, Lawrence (about 45 minutes from Kansas City) with Edward K.

Morris and Ruth Ann Atchley as local co-hosts. The meeting will take place beginning Thursday, 18 June, to Sunday, 21 June 2015. Proposals are due by **15 January 2015** at 5 p.m. EST via email to jennbazar@gmail.com. For the full CFP and submission details, please see <https://www.uakron.edu/cheiron/annual-meeting/2015.dot>

The Montréal Summer School in the History of Science and Economics

Sponsored by the History of Economics Society, and hosted by the Interuniversity Centre for Research in Science and Technology (CIRST) and the Economics Department at ESG-UQAM

At several points in the history of science, economists have been significant players in shaping the landscape of research. Specifically, during World War II and the Cold War, economic rationality became a major benchmark of the transformation of the institutions of science. Historians of science have increasingly acknowledged the complex role played by economists and their ideas, just as historians of economics increasingly connect their narratives to larger developments in the sciences in general. This five full-day summer school, 14–19 July 2015, with established scholars from both fields, will provide students in the history of science with the knowledge necessary to contextualize

the tradition of economics, and students in the history of economics with a larger knowledge of general topics in recent history of science.

Speakers

- Hunter Heyck (The University of Oklahoma)
- Judy Klein (Mary Baldwin College)
- Thomas C. Leonard (Princeton University)
- Ted Porter (University of California, Los Angeles)
- Thomas Stapleford (University of Notre Dame)
- E. Roy Weintraub (Duke University)

Admissions and Scholarship

Applications are open for all PhD and post-doc students in the history of science, history of economics and neighboring fields. Applications by Master’s students will also be considered. Given that the intention is to encourage significant interaction, the number of participants is limited to 20. Applications should include a letter of motivation outlining the applicant’s graduate research project (1-2 pages) and one short reference letter. Students will have the opportunity to present their research projects. There is no participation fee. Students will provide for their accommodation and travel expenses. All students can apply for (limited) travel funding.

Deadline for applications is **1 March 2015**.

Local Organizers: Till Düppe, Alessandro Barattieri, Juan Carvajalino, and Yves Gingras.

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

For more information see <http://www.cirst.uqam.ca/en-us/activities/summerschool2015.aspx> or contact Till Düppe (duppe.till@uqam.ca).

The Center for the History of Political Economy at Duke University

The Center for the History of Political Economy at Duke University is now accepting Fellowship Applications for the 2015–2016 academic year. For a complete description of the Fellowship Program and how to apply, please visit the Center website at: <http://hope.econ.duke.edu/>.

For full consideration, applicants should have their completed applications in by **10 January 2015**.

Digital Einstein

Princeton University Press, in partnership with Tizra, Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and California Institute of Technology, announces the launch of THE DIGITAL EINSTEIN PAPERS (<http://einsteinpapers.press.princeton.edu>). This unique, authoritative resource provides full public access to the translated and annotated writings of the most influential scientist of the twentieth century: Albert Einstein.

THE DIGITAL EINSTEIN PAPERS website presents the complete contents of *The Collected*

Papers of Albert Einstein, and, upon its launch, the website—<http://einsteinpapers.press.princeton.edu>—will contain 5,000 documents covering the first forty-four years of Einstein's life, up to and including the award of the Nobel Prize in Physics and his long voyage to the Far East. Additional material will be available on the website approximately eighteen months after the print publication of new volumes of *The Collected Papers*. Eventually, the website will provide access to all of Einstein's writings and correspondence, accompanied by scholarly annotation and apparatus.

The Collected Papers of Albert Einstein is one of the most ambitious publishing ventures ever undertaken in the documentation of the history of science. Selected from among more than 40,000 documents contained in Einstein's personal collection, and 15,000 Einstein and Einstein-related documents discovered by the editors since the beginning of the Einstein Project, *The Collected Papers* provides the first complete picture of a massive written legacy. When completed, the series will contain more than 14,000 documents as full text and will fill thirty volumes. The volumes are published by Princeton University Press, sponsored by the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, and supported by the California Institute of Technology (<http://www.einstein.caltech.edu/>).

New Chief Executive Officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) Announced

I am delighted to announce that U.S. Congressman Rush D. Holt, Ph.D., a research physicist and former teacher, has accepted the position of Chief Executive Officer of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and executive publisher of the *Science* family of journals. Dr. Holt will transition to AAAS after his eighth term of service ends on Capitol Hill, during the association's 2015 Annual Meeting, 12–16 February, in San Jose, California.

Efforts to advance science, promote public engagement with science and technology, and ensure that accurate scientific information informs policy decisions—core AAAS activities—have also been central to Dr. Holt's long record of public service. He has represented Central New Jersey (12th District) since 1999. He earned his BA degree in physics from Carleton College, and he completed his Master's and doctoral degrees at New York University. A former AAAS Science & Technology Policy Fellow, he has held positions as a teacher and as an arms control expert at the U.S. Department of State. From 1989 until 1998, he served as Assistant Director of the Princeton Plasma Physics Laboratory.

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

Dr. Holt has a long track record of advocacy for federal investment in research and development, science education, and innovation. He has also broadly promoted the value of science communication, particularly for conveying the urgency of climate change, and he has said that “thinking like a scientist” can benefit the policymaking process. Incidentally, he is a five-time “Jeopardy!” champion, who famously beat the IBM supercomputer Watson in a simulated exhibition game intended to help promote innovation.

Dr. Holt will succeed Dr. Alan Leshner, who has been a fabulous leader for AAAS for the past 13 years. Alan’s legacy at AAAS will include the launch of a far-reaching Transformation Initiative and the association’s first open-access journal, *Science Advances*; leadership to promote international research cooperation and science diplomacy; the association’s productive Center for Public Engagement with Science and Technology; and a wide array of other efforts to ensure that scientific advances benefit society. Please join me in thanking Alan for his tremendous service, and in welcoming Rush as the new AAAS CEO and *Science* executive publisher.

Phillip A. Sharp
Chair, AAAS Board of Directors

BSHS and Cambridge Launch New Open Access History of Science Journal

Cambridge University Press and the British Society for the History of Science (BSHS) are pleased to announce their partnership to launch a new, peer-reviewed, open access, thematic journal, for the history of science. A call for proposals for the first volume of *BJHS Themes* has been released, seeking thematic collections of papers that animate, provoke and inspire the scholarly community.

Each volume of the journal will be free to read online from the date of its publication. By launching the journal in this way, the BSHS and Cambridge will encourage widespread engagement with the important ideas each volume will present, stimulating public and scholarly debate that will enhance our collective understanding of science in history. To fully promote onward exploration of each volume’s theme, the journal will use a Creative Commons license that permits re-use and dissemination.

BJHS Themes’ unique offering includes a rigorous pre-publication peer-review process, consistent with the top history journals, and the society will provide support to enable all authors, regardless of their funding status, to participate.

The journal will be edited by Jon Agar of University College London, who said, “I’m delighted to be

leading, as editor, this new open access journal. Too often, edited collections have hidden their insights, stories and analysis from their readers. I’m looking forward to hosting some great, public debates about the vital place of science in past societies and cultures.”

Greg Radick, President of the British Society for the History of Science, said, “the *British Journal for the History of Science* has long enjoyed a reputation around the world as one of the best journals in our field. *BJHS Themes* will carry on that tradition of excellence, for the benefit of a truly global readership.”

Daniel Pearce, Senior Commissioning Editor at Cambridge University Press, said, “we are delighted to be partnering with the BSHS to launch this bold new journal, breaking new ground in both history of science research and in academic publishing.” Further information:

- Alison Fox, afox@cambridge.org
- Homepage: www.journals.cambridge.org/BJHSThemes
- Mission statement: www.journals.cambridge.org/BJHSTmission
- Open access statement: www.journals.cambridge.org/BJHSTopen
- Call for proposals: www.journals.cambridge.org/BJHSTproposals

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

Pacific Circle's New Website

The Pacific Circle's Website is up and running at <http://thepacificcircle.com>, with new content being added periodically. The site includes all past issues of the *Bulletin* and *Newsletter*, documents from past conferences, useful links to affiliated groups, and a blog with announcements regarding upcoming events, members' publications, and more. Circle members can also submit their own announcements for posting on the blog by emailing thepacificcircle@gmail.com.

Public Scholar Program

The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) has announced a new grant opportunity, the Public Scholar Program, intended to support well-researched books in the humanities that have been conceived and written to reach a broad readership. Books supported through the Public Scholar Program might present a narrative history, tell the stories of important individuals, analyze significant texts, provide a synthesis of ideas, revive interest in a neglected subject, or examine the latest thinking on a topic. Most importantly, they should present significant humanities topics in a way that is accessible to general readers. The Public Scholar Program is open to both independent scholars and individuals affiliated with scholarly institutions. It offers a stipend of \$4,200 per month for a period of six to twelve months. The maximum

stipend is \$50,400 for a twelve-month period. Applicants must have previously published a book or monograph with a university or commercial press, or articles and essays that reach a wide readership. Application guidelines and a list of F.A.Q.s for the Public Scholar Program are available on the NEH's website at <http://www.neh.gov/grants/research/public-scholar-program>. The application deadline for the first cycle is **3 March 2015**. Recipients may begin the term of the grant as early as 1 Oct 2015 or as late as 1 Sept 2016. The official press release for the new program is available here: <http://www.neh.gov/news/press-release/2014-12-01>.

History of Science Books: Pickstone Prize Shortlist Announced

A new biennial prize will be awarded in December 2014 by the British Society for the History of Science for "the best scholarly book in the history of science (broadly construed) in English." It is named in honor of Professor John Pickstone, the University of Manchester historian of science, technology and medicine who sadly died in 2014.

The rubric states, "The winning book should mark a major advance in the understanding and interpretation of the scientific past." The judges have chosen a worthy shortlist, and they deserve congratulations and readers beyond the academy.

Link: <http://www.theguardian.com/science/the-h-word/2014/nov/17/history-science-books-pickstone-prize-shortlist>

Allan Nevins Prize

The Allan Nevins Prize is awarded annually by the Society for American Historians for the best-written doctoral dissertation on an American subject. The prizewinning work is published by one of the distinguished houses that support the prize: Basic Books; Bloomsbury Press; Cambridge University Press; University of Chicago Press; Columbia University Press; Farrar, Straus and Giroux/Hill and Wang; Harvard University Press; Henry Holt; Alfred A. Knopf; W. W. Norton and Company; University of North Carolina Press; Oxford University Press; University of Pennsylvania Press; Princeton University Press; Random House; Simon and Schuster; and Yale University Press. The prize is named in honor of the society's founder and first president.

Purpose: To honor dissertations for literary distinction and for making a significant contribution to historical knowledge. Prize: A certificate and two thousand dollars, and publication by one of the publishers listed above. A certificate will be presented to the dissertation sponsor. The prize will be awarded at the annual meeting of the society in New York in May, 2015.

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

Eligibility: The society defines history broadly and welcomes manuscripts on American arts, literature, and science, as well as biographical studies of Americans in any walk of life. The dissertation must have been defended or the PhD degree received in the previous calendar year, between 1 January 2014 and 31 December 2014. Dissertations already accepted for publication are not eligible.

Submission: Dissertations should be submitted by the chair of the department awarding the degree or by the dissertation sponsor. Please submit a digital copy, preferably in PDF form, as well as one hard copy, which should be bound in an effective yet inexpensive fashion. The hard copy will not be returned.

The nomination letter should include complete contact information for the student, including a telephone number and an email address that will be valid as of spring 2014. The nomination letter need state these facts and no others. No department may submit more than two dissertations.

Deadline: The digital and hard copies should be submitted no later than **31 January 2015**, to:

Professor Andie Tucher
Columbia Journalism School
2950 Broadway
New York, NY 10027

amhistsociety@columbia.edu.

URL: <http://sah.columbia.edu/content/information-0>

Call for Submissions: European Association for the History of Medicine and Health (EAHMH) Book Prize

Application deadline: 1 March 2015

Sponsoring Institution: The European Association for the History of Medicine and Health (EAHMH)

The European Association for the History of Medicine and Health (EAHMH) invites submissions for its book prize, awarded for the third time. The prize is designed for a monograph, published in or after 2013, which explains and interprets in a particularly rich, nuanced and/or innovative manner any topic related to the history of European medicine or health of any period and any region. The prize involves an award of €3000 (granted through the generous support of the Dutch Stichting Historia Medicinae and the German Robert Bosch Stiftung) and will be presented at the biennial conference of the association in September 2015. Information on the last two winners can be found on the EAHMH website: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/activity/mds/centres/eahmh/prizes/index.aspx>. Publishers as well as authors themselves can submit applications. To consider nominations, the jury will need three paper copies of the book by **1 March 2015**.

Mailing Address:

iborowy@ukaachen.de

PD Dr. Iris Borowy

Institut für Geschichte, Ethik und Theorie der Medizin

RWTH Aachen

Tel.: +49 241 80 85611

URL: <http://www.birmingham.ac.uk/research/activity/mds/centres/eahmh/prizes/index.aspx>

2015 James T. Cushing Memorial Prize—Call for Nominations

The family, students, friends, and colleagues of Jim Cushing are pleased once again to solicit nominations for the *James T. Cushing Prize in the History and Philosophy of Physics*. In recognition of Jim's well-known role as a nurturer of new talent in the profession, this annual prize is intended to recognize and reward the work of younger scholars. The next winner will receive \$2,000 and an invitation to deliver a paper in the University of Notre Dame's History and Philosophy of Science Colloquium series during the 2015–2016 academic year. Work is eligible by nomination only. Eligible are all papers in the history and philosophy of physics published by a younger scholar within the three years prior to the current call for nominations (i.e., published no earlier than October 2011). Without defining

NEWS FROM THE PROFESSION, CONT.

“younger scholar,” our intention is to favor work produced by scholars who are no more than five years or so beyond completion of the PhD or, in a comparable way, new to the fields of the history and philosophy of physics. Nominated work will be evaluated by a committee drawn from the members of the Advisory Committee. A nomination should consist of a brief description of the significance of the nominated work and such information about the author as the nominator might think helpful to the evaluation committee (e.g., an abbreviated c.v.). The deadline for receipt of nominations is **1 March 2015**. The winner will be announced in May 2015. Nominations will be accepted by mail, fax, and email.

By Mail:

Cushing Memorial Prize
Program in History and Philosophy of Science
453 Geddes Hall
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN 46556

By Fax: 574-631-7418 (“Cushing Memorial Prize Nomination” on cover sheet).

By Email: Cushing.Prize.1@nd.edu

Contact Information:

Darrin Snyder Belousek
darrin.w.snyderbelousek@gmail.com

Support for Research at The Bakken: Research Travel Grant and Visiting Research Fellowship

The Bakken (Minneapolis, MN) awards short-term fellowships and travel grants to scholars and artists to support research using The Bakken’s library and artifact collections. The subject of the collections is the history of electricity and magnetism (with a focus on their roles in the life sciences and medicine) and include approximately 11,000 books, journals, and manuscripts, and 2,200 instruments, medical devices, and other artifacts. The awards are to be used to help defray the expenses of travel, subsistence and other direct costs of conducting research at The Bakken for researchers who must travel some distance and pay for temporary lodging in the Twin Cities in order to conduct research at The Bakken.

Visiting research fellowships are awarded up to a maximum of \$1,500; the minimum period of residence is two weeks, and preference is given to researchers who are interested in collaborating informally with Bakken staff for a short time during their research visit. Research travel grants are awarded up to a maximum of \$500 (domestic) and \$750 (foreign); the minimum period of residence is one week. Applications are due **9 March 2015** and travel must be completed by 1 December 2015.

The library collection includes works in early physics (natural philosophy) and early works on magnetic cures, electrotherapeutics, electrophysiology, and their accompanying instrumentation. The Bakken Library also possesses a fine collection of primary sources in mesmerism, animal magnetism, and hypnotism, and works documenting the history of parapsychology, psychical research, and phrenology. Significant holdings include many of the writings of Hauksbee, Nollet, Franklin, Mesmer, Galvani, Volta, Matteucci, Du Bois-Reymond, Marey, and Einthoven. Also of interest to researchers are small collections of 19th-century medical and electro-medical ephemera, trade catalogues and price lists, and miscellaneous scientists’ letters from the 18th-20th centuries.

The artifact collection comprises objects from the 18th century to the present, including electrostatic generators by George Adams, Edward Nairne, John Cuthbertson and others; magneto-electric generators; medical stimulators designed by Duchenne; induction coils; physiological instrumentation by E.J. Marey; recording devices; cardiac pacing devices; and accessories. Unorthodox devices are well-represented and include electric belts and hairbrushes, magnetic applicators, and radionics equipment.

For more information, application guidelines, or to access collections catalogues, visit www.thebakken.org/research.

HISTORY OF SCIENCE SOCIETY 2014 PRIZE WINNERS

Reingold Prize: **Iain Watts**, a student in the Program in History of Science at Princeton University, for his essay “Philosophical Intelligence: Letters, Print and Experiment During Napoleon’s Continental Blockade.” This prize is awarded for an outstanding graduate student essay.



Sarton Medal: The History of Science Society has awarded the 2014 Sarton Medal for Lifetime Scholarly Achievement to **Steven Shapin**, Franklin L. Ford Emeritus Professor in the History of Science at Harvard University.



and the Construction of Gender in the Age of Darwin.” This prize is awarded in recognition of an outstanding book or article on the history of women in science.

Levinson Prize: **Daniela Bleichmar**, for her book *Visible Empire: Botanical Expeditions and Visual Culture in the Hispanic Enlightenment* (University of Chicago Press, 2012). This prize is awarded biennially for a book in the history of the life sciences and natural history.



The Watson Davis and Helen Miles Davis Prize: **W. Patrick McCray** for *The Visioneers: How a Group of Elite Scientists Pursued Space Colonies, Nanotechnologies, and a Limitless Future*. The Davis Prize recognizes the best book for “a general audience” which “promotes the public understanding of science.”



Joseph H. Hazen Education Prize: **Monica H. Green** of Arizona State University, for outstanding contributions to the teaching of history of science. Green is a Professor of History at ASU who specializes in the Global History of Health and Medieval European History, particularly the history of medicine and the history of gender.



Pfizer Prize: **Sachiko Kusukawa** for her book *Picturing the Book of Nature* (University of Chicago Press, 2012). This prize is awarded in recognition of an outstanding book dealing with the history of science.



Derek Price/Rod Webster Prize: **Warwick Anderson** for his article “Hybridity, Race, and Science: The Voyage of the *Zaca*, 1934–1935.” This prize is awarded in recognition of excellence in a research article published in the journal *Isis* in the previous three years.



Margaret W. Rossiter History of Women in Science Prize: **Kimberly Hamlin**, Associate Professor of History and American Studies and Director of the American Studies Program at Miami University for her article “The Case of the ‘Bearded Woman’: Hypertrichosis



JÜRGEN RENN AWARDED THE 2014 FRANCIS BACON PRIZE FOR OUTSTANDING SCHOLARSHIP IN THE HISTORY OF SCIENCE



Jürgen Renn, Director at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin, has won the 2014 Francis Bacon Award for his influential studies of structural changes in systems of knowledge. In order to develop a theoretical understanding of knowledge evolution, he has published discussions and analyses of the origins of theoretical science in antiquity, the emergence of classical

mechanics in the early modern period and the revolutions of modern physics in the early twentieth century, including statistical mechanics, relativity, and the quantum.

He is a pioneer of open access in the humanities and has developed and contributed to major exhibitions on the history of science, such as “Albert Einstein—Chief Engineer of the Universe,” “Max Planck Revolutionary against his Will,” and “Archimedes: The Art and Science of Invention.”

Jürgen Renn is honorary professor for History of Science at Berlin's Humboldt and Freie universities Berlin and a founding member of the Berliner Antike Kolleg. He is a member of many national and international editorial and scientific boards, including the German National Academy of Sciences (the Leopoldina). In 2014 he was awarded the Gustav Neuschwander Prize of the European Society for the History of Science.



Administered by the California Institute of Technology and the Francis Bacon Foundation, the \$20,000 biennial award recognizes first-rate scholarship in the history of science and technology and historically engaged philosophy of science. As part of the award, Renn will spend a semester at Caltech as the Francis Bacon Visiting Professor in the Division of Humanities and Social Sciences, interacting with students and faculty. He will also give the inaugural lecture at a conference that will bring together outstanding physicists and historians to celebrate the first century of general relativity.

Sarton Medal Speech: “Praising Famous Men”

By Steven Shapin, on the occasion of receiving the 2014 Sarton Medal

Several years ago—and long before I got Angela Creager’s phone call about this extraordinary honor—my wife and I were taking one of our usual weekend walks in Cambridge’s Mount Auburn cemetery—a beautiful garden cemetery where Boston’s Brahmins have, for almost two centuries, liked to be interred.

We found ourselves in a hidden spot we’d never been before—with the very best views over Cambridge, Boston, and beyond. It turned out to be a small exclusive Harvard plot, with eminent students and faculty resting there since the middle of the 19th century.

I had no idea who might be buried there, but I found myself standing on the grave of George Sarton. The inscription on the headstone is simple: “George Sarton: Historian of Science”—then where and when he was born and died and the name and dates of his wife, who pre-deceased him. I like to think the implication was not that he was *a* historian of science, but *the* historian of science—the man who imagined, and worked to create, not just the subject but the discipline: its academic departments, its journals, its professional society, and many of the institutional realities that allow us to do our work and that now bring us here together. He is commemorated by many things, including the medal bearing his name.

Standing there, I joked to my wife that I would like be buried—ideally some years from

now—just to the left of Sarton and that my headstone should read: “Steven Shapin: Dates: Externalist.” Just then, I thought I felt a slight movement in the ground, possibly the result of angular momentum from our founder spinning six feet below.

Perhaps uniquely among recent recipients of this singular honor, I’ve been teaching graduate students about Sarton for many years, and I may be among the handful of people assembled here who’s actually read much of Sarton’s work and visited his archive in Widener Library.

It may surprise you that I read Sarton’s work full of admiration and respect—respect for his linguistic abilities—my own are inexcusably poor—and respect for the integrity and seriousness of his vision of what science signified and what the study of the history of science should signify.

Respect is not, of course, necessarily agreement, and, if we want to understand the past of our discipline, many would say it cannot be. I am far from the only person here distancing present-day



work in our discipline from the obligation Sarton felt to “praise famous men”; from his notion that the history of science was an enterprise that might someday be completed; from the central role of bibliography in his conception of the enterprise; from the judgment that science is humankind’s only progressive enterprise, a uniquely powerful solvent of national and cultural conflict; and, especially, from his conception of the history of science as a fundamentally different practice from all other species of history—because science itself was *sui generis*. Sarton argued that dedicated historians of science had to have their own discipline because no one else could do what they did.

And if you’re thinking that I might distance myself from our founder because of what we used to call

Sarton Medal Speech: “Praising Famous Men,” *cont.*

“internalism,” that’s wrong too, since Sarton was not a major player in the methodological conflicts that once constituted our discipline’s fault-lines. He didn’t much care about that sort of thing, and you can find in Sarton’s writings plenty of gestures to the pertinence of what we (sometimes carelessly) call “social context.”

My respect and admiration for Sarton derive for the most part from his embrace of the idea—that there was *some* sense of specialness attaching to the history of science, that it’s something significantly different from the histories of other sorts of culture and activity—art, politics, sexuality, war, and so on. Present-day legitimate notions of specialness preserve one thing from Sarton’s sensibilities—the acknowledgment that science, despite all our recent efforts to normalize it, and despite all the productive insistence that it should be studied as a typical form of culture, remains extraordinary. This specialness is something that should motivate us but something we should also try to account for as a historical phenomenon.

Science is special in our culture because of its reality-defining authority; because it is knowledge about the world which is, almost uniquely, taken *not* to be a situated human invention; because what is widely regarded its unique Method is so aggressively and consequentially marketed to other cultural practices; because it is taken to be

the Mother and Father of all the technical and commercial goods wanted by our civic institutions; because it now enjoys, as it did much less in the past, access to civic power; and because it does so much to constitute that power.

Even if we regard some of these specialnesses to be partly mythic, as historians we still have the task of showing how both myth and realities came into being, and how what we might still regard as myth becomes cultural reality.

The history of science should have a special place in a liberal curriculum—to the extent that we still believe in liberal education (as I do)—not just as another esoteric subject crying out for its space in an abundantly supplied course cafeteria but as a humanistic engagement with a subject which is taken to stand *against* the humanities. And if George Sarton did not think of things that way, his boss, Harvard’s president James Bryant Conant, definitely did. The history of science, Conant thought, should take its place at the center of General Education, and, while it may be visionary now to say this, Conant was right-- and we should seek out every opportunity to represent our subject as essential equipment for educated men and women.

When I was an undergraduate in a liberal arts college many years ago, all the freshmen were required to take a foundation course called “Humanities 110.” *No* scientific work had a place

in its otherwise excellent and well-presented syllabus. It was as if *Paradise Lost* was a great human product and Galileo’s *Letters on Sunspots* was not. That’s one of the bad bits about the perceived specialness of the sciences, even though much of what we have all accomplished over recent years should be seen as establishing science authentically as one of the humanities, its aura of specialness itself a human product.

That’s a sense of the specialness of the history of science that Sarton would probably not have recognized, or recognized as legitimate, but I’d like to think that he’d extend historical sympathy to the future of the discipline he did so much to found. I’d like also to think that the minor disturbance I felt when standing on his grave had a natural, or at least a natural-psychological, explanation, and that Sarton wouldn’t mind someone like me receiving this immense honor, or not mind very much.

I am enormously grateful to the colleagues who nominated me, to those who accepted their nomination and who reckoned I had any place in the distinguished company of past Sarton Medalists, and to so many people who have allowed me to spend this much of my working life trying to figure how science is made, extended, and made credible. I intend to go on trying to do that. I thank you all.