Welcome to San Francisco

by Brian Dolan, University of California, San Francisco

Geographical Orientation and Neighborhoods

For downloadable maps to these communities, visit http://www.sanfrancisco.travel/neighborhoods

The St. Francis Hotel is centrally located on Powell Street next to Union Square. It is surrounded in every direction by ethnically diverse areas with museums, shops, and restaurants. To get a sense of the landscape, here is a basic breakdown of some of the main neighborhoods in San Francisco and the direction to them from the hotel.

* Union Square – The Heart is Where the Hotel Is.
Often thought of as the retail heart of the city, it is interesting to note that Union Square has more theatres than any other neighborhood in San Francisco. Many were built not long after the 1906 earthquake and fire. Still, virtually every fashion label in the world has set up shop in and around Square, a landmark park in the heart of the downtown shopping and hotel district. Granite plazas, a stage, a café and four grand entrance corner plazas bordered by the park’s signature palms, pay tribute to the Square’s distinctive history and offer a forum for civic celebrations. The cable cars head up Powell Street from here traveling right in front of the conference hotel.

NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE NORTH
**Chinatown** – Just North of the Hotel. “Dragon’s Gate” entrance two blocks east and two blocks north.

Built near Portsmouth Square, the historic heart of San Francisco, Chinatown is the oldest and one of the largest in the United States. The entrance to Chinatown at Grant Avenue and Bush Street is called the “Dragon’s Gate.” Inside are 24 blocks of shops and restaurants, most of it taking place along Grant, the oldest street in San Francisco. This city within a city is best explored on foot; exotic shops, food markets, temples and small museums comprise its boundaries. Visitors can buy herbal remedies, enjoy samples at a tea bar or order a “dim sum” lunch. The former central telephone exchange of the Pacific Telephone and Telegraph Company stands at 743 Washington St. Now a bank, it is the first Chinese-style building constructed in San Francisco, and the exact site where California’s first newspaper was printed.

**North Beach** – North of the Hotel just past Chinatown.

North Beach, rich in Italian heritage, compresses cabarets, jazz clubs, galleries, inns, family style restaurants and gelato parlors into less than a square mile. A perfect spot for cappuccino and espresso, North Beach is transformed into one of San Francisco’s most electric playgrounds by night; live music and dancing keep the streets swinging. In the morning practice tai chi with the regulars in Washington Square and from here, catch the No. 39 bus to the top of Telegraph Hill. Coit Tower atop Telegraph Hill offers amazing views. Thirty local artists painted murals on its ground floor walls in 1933. This hill is also laced with stairways off Filbert and Greenwich streets as well as lush gardens. Not really the easiest place to get to on public transport, though various bus routes can be selected. Uber or Lyft may offer a better alternative.

**Fisherman’s Wharf** – North of the Hotel all the way to the water, just past North Beach.

Where the tourists are. More than 75 percent of San Francisco’s visitors include Fisherman’s Wharf on their itinerary. Waterfront marketplaces and the Wharf’s famous fishing fleet make for a terrific fish story. Fishing boats, sea lions fighting for space on rafts, seafood stalls, steaming crab cauldrons, souvenir shops, sourdough French bread bakeries … you know you’re in world-famous Fisherman’s Wharf. The historic F-Line streetcar and two cable car lines terminate in the area and sightseeing boats and boat charters link to Alcatraz (“The Rock”), Angel Island, Sausalito, and other points around San Francisco Bay.

**NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE EAST**

**Embarcadero/Financial District** – Walk east down any street north of the hotel and it will intersect with Market or directly with Embarcadero.

Sea captains and captains of commerce, the old haunts of the Barbary Coast and an island with worldly airs yield a bounty of fun. Lined with deep-water piers, The Embarcadero is literally where one embarks. At the foot of Market Street is the Ferry Building, a revived public space housing a food hall, restaurants and a farmers market. The Ferry Building is also the terminal for ferries to Marin County, Vallejo, Oakland and Alameda. Piers 7 and 14 offer vistas of the skyscrapers of the Financial District and the San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge. The Exploratorium, a “21st century learning laboratory,” engages all ages at its new home on Pier 15. Across the bay is Treasure
Island, a man-made island that was the site of the 1939 Golden Gate International Exposition. Jackson Square, one of 11 historic districts, has many buildings dating from the mid-1800s - some of which are supported by old ships masts.

Berkeley / “East Bay” / Oakland – while not SF neighborhoods, travel to Berkeley or Oakland is very easy by catching the BART at the Powell Street BART/MUNI station (Powell and Market), which takes the subterranean tunnel to the other side of the Bay.

NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE SOUTH
Market Street – Just two blocks south on Powell, the diagonally transecting Market Street is rapidly re-developing.
Central Market, also known as Mid-Market and in some quarters, as Twitter-hood – an homage to Twitter headquarters at 1355 Market St. – is roughly a seven-block area of Market Street. A combination of enterprise zone, high tech (in addition to Twitter, tenants in the area include Spotify, Square and Yammer), arts groups, retail and restaurants, Central Market is witnessing a boom in new, mostly residential, construction as well.

Market Street has long been the thoroughfare where the city celebrates, whether it’s the end of World War II or the parade celebrating the World Champion San Francisco Giants when crowds of 50 deep lined the city’s “Path of Gold,” the latter a reference to 321 lamp posts which feature distinctive amber colored lights.
This nexus of Civic Center, Hayes Valley, the Tenderloin and South of Market is easily accessed by the F-line historic streetcars. Major Broadway productions are featured on the stages of SHN’s Golden Gate and Orpheum theaters, and the American Conservatory Theater will open the new Strand Theater, 1127 Market St., in spring, 2015 with the West Coast premiere of Caryl Churchill’s Love and Information. The Warfield, 982 Market St., also hosts a number of Live Nation performances throughout the year. Night markets are springing up along the corridor (which is restricted to through traffic between 6th and 10th streets), and in the blocks closer to the Castro end of Market, there are a number of vintage furniture emporiums.

SOMA/Yerba Buena
South of Market, also known as “SOMA,” is more than two square miles of nightclubs, fashionable restaurants, art hubs, AT&T ballpark (home to the SF Giants), and UCSF’s new Mission Bay campus and hospital, celebrating the largest biomedical university expansion in the United States. Yerba Buena Gardens, “the largest concentration of art west of the Hudson River,” is an oasis in the heart of the city. Moscone Center and more than a dozen museums are located here as well as a memorial to Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. The South Beach area, recently transformed into a mixed-use waterfront neighborhood, includes the restored warehouses in the South End Historic District and several marinas.

NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE WEST
Civic Center
San Francisco’s professional opera, symphony and ballet companies are all located in historic venues opposite City Hall; the arts found here are as resplendent as the area’s Beaux Arts architecture. Across Van Ness to the west on Hayes Street is “Hayes Valley.”

**Fillmore/Japantown** – A mile walk down Post or Sutter Street
One of the most lively entertainment districts in San Francisco, the Fillmore is frequented by jazz, blues and rock-and-roll luminaries. Take advantage of the rich cross culture with the adjacent Japantown, the oldest of only three in the U.S.

**Golden Gate Park** – extending all the way to the Ocean
With more than 1,000 acres to explore, Golden Gate Park starts where the Haight-Ashbury ends and continues to Ocean Beach on the edge of the Pacific. Explore museums and landmarks, giant redwoods, trail, lakes, windmills and gardens. The Cliff House Restaurant (reservations required) has fantastic views of the Pacific.

**The Mission** – can take the MUNI or BART from Powell Street to Mission/16th Street
Featuring a culturally diverse and vibrant range of San Francisco’s art scene, the Mission offers murals, galleries, cafes, bookstores and boutiques with eclectic wares as well as Mission Dolores, one of the oldest structures in San Francisco. An array of Latin American cuisine.

**The Castro**
Sweeping views and grand Victorians, pride of place and person coalesce in an area embracing the “gay capital of the world.” Castro, Diamond Heights/Twin Peaks, Glen Park, Noe Valley, Upper Market San Francisco’s historic F-Line streetcars are one of the best ways to reach the Castro and Upper Market areas. The Castro, and nearby Noe Valley, offer village-like amenities including pedestrian-friendly streets, Victorian homes in historic Eureka Valley, an array of trendy stores and outdoor cafes for the “see and scene” crowd. The upper stretch of Market Street coils around the lower reaches of Twin Peaks. Noted for their sweeping vistas of the Bay Area, these crests are popular with sightseers. Glen Park on the lower slopes of Diamond Heights has a canyon park and is near a Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) station.

**TRANSPORTATION**

MUNI
https://www.sfmta.com/maps/muni-system-map
MUNI/San Francisco Municipal operates buses, trains, cable cars & the F-line heritage streetcar. The MUNI buses remain above ground while MUNI metro runs on rails and sometimes go underground. Bus stops come in many forms; small bus shelters, yellow paint on street poles, and white paint on streets. Metro stops can be found on an island in the middle of the street and stations.
Tips: For all MUNI times and buses you can go online to [http://www.511.org/](http://www.511.org/) or you can call 511. In addition to this there are also many different smartphone apps that provide maps, routes, and times.
WALKING GUIDE with labeled local attractions

BART (Bay Area Rapid Transit)
Bart map and fare info:
http://www.sanfrancisco.travel/sponsor/bay-area-rapid-transit

The BART system is the fast, easy, inexpensive way to travel around the Bay Area. BART’s all electric trains travel to/from Pittsburgh/Bay Point, Richmond, Dublin/Pleasanton, Fremont and Oakland International Airport in the East Bay. Trains from the East Bay go through the Transbay tube and under the San Francisco Bay to/from San Francisco and cities on the San Francisco Peninsula to San Francisco International Airport and Millbrae.

Arriving at SFO
Flying into San Francisco International Airport
After you’ve picked up your luggage, look for signs for the free tram service, AirTrain. The AirTrain Red line takes passengers to all the terminals, garages and BART, while the blue line does all that plus the rental car center. Take either line to the Garage G and BART stop and hop on the BART train going towards Pittsburg/Baypoint. On a BART map, it’s signified as the yellow line.
BART costs are associated with how far stations are; the further away, the higher the fare price. At each machine in the station, there are price charts displaying costs to and from stations. Buy your ticket, pass through the gates by slipping your ticket through, and get to the boarding areas. Don’t worry If you run out of funds when you exit; you can always add more inside the station. The BART fare from SFO to Powell Street, two blocks away from the conference hotel, is $8.65 ($3.20 for seniors).
You can use this BART tool to navigate which stations are closest to your destinations. Keep in mind that all BART services close at Midnight and resume at 4:00 am on weekdays, 6:00 am on Saturdays, and 8:00 pm on Sundays.

Arriving at Oakland
Fly into Oakland International Airport (also known as OAK). After you’ve picked up your luggage, look for BART signs. Taking BART from OAK is the convenient, fast, low-cost way to get to San Francisco, as well as other surrounding cities. The new automated people movers go from OAK to the Coliseum station where you take a train to your final destination. OAK trains depart every 5 minutes from 8:00AM–8:00PM daily. Service is less frequent at other times.
The BART fare from Oakland to Powell Street, two blocks from the hotel, is $10.05 ($3.75 for seniors).

DINING

San Francisco has been a dining destination since the Gold Rush when prospectors would spend their coins on hangtown fry – an oyster and bacon omelet. Today the
year-round produce and diversity of restaurants allow creativity and innovation to flourish. While generally pretty pricey, in part owing to real estate costs and pressures created by drought, one can still find gems throughout the $ to the $$$$ range. While too many options exist to produce even the most basic of dining options, we take the liberty of sharing a few of our own favorites within easy transportation from the conference hotel.

**Belden Place** – walking distance to the hotel, Belden is a small alley on Bush Street between Kearny and Montgomery, in the “French Quarter of San Francisco.” This festively lit alley has seven restaurants with inside/outside seating. A range of American and European cuisine in the $$ - $$$ range.

**Mission/16th Street area.** Many Latin American choices, taquerias.


**Embarcadero (Ferry Building).** Even if fog creeps in to cover most of the peninsula there is still a good chance that it is sunny and calm at the Ferry Building, which has a few great outside seating options.

- Gott’s Roadside. American burgers and beers. $
- Hog Island Oyster Co. Recently expanded its space because lines were so long. Views of the Bay Bridge. $$
- Slanted Door. Causal atmosphere in this award-winning Vietnamese restaurant with Bay views. $$$

**Hayes Valley** (across Van Ness near Civic Center). Boutique and Michelin star-rated restaurants in this area notable for having more female executive chefs than any other area in the city such as:

- Traci Des Jardins’ Jardiniere
- Judy Rogers’ Zuni Café
- Patricia Unterman’s Hayes Street Grill, and most recently
- Dominique Crenn’s Petit Crenn.

Reservations usually required at all these restaurants which are in the $$$ to $$$$$ range.

**Notes from the Inside: We Are More Than Images and Voices**

by Jay Malone, HSS Executive Director

The 14 Sept 2015 issue of the *New Yorker* was of special interest because it contained an essay by the late Oliver Sacks, the neuro-scientist and writer who transformed how we think about others. An example of his influence was evident in an article in that same
issue by Atul Gawande, also a physician, who described some of the ways that the
good doctor Sacks had touched his life, especially the importance of “seeing” others.

Sacks frequently drew on literature to help him express ideas and in his essay
Gawande describes a time in which Sacks urged him to read E.M. Forster’s short story
“The Machine Stops,” published in 1909. The story presents a dystopic world run by a
Machine, a place where human interaction is limited to something akin to social
networking, a world in which travel is seen as unnecessary. But the protagonist, Kuno,
is not happy living in his cell below ground, relying on the Machine for his every need,
as do all the other humans not condemned as “unmechanical.” Kuno craves contact
with others, especially his mother Vashti, and his entreaty to her is poignant: “The
Machine is much, but it is not everything. I see something like you in this plate, but I do
not see you. I hear something like you through this telephone, but I do not hear you.
That is why I want you to come home. Pay me a visit, so that we can meet face to face,
and talk about the hopes that are in my mind.”

In our world of social media we seem to enjoy more contact with more people than any
other prior age, but Forster detected a fundamental problem when simulated interaction
replaces in-person exchanges, a kind of existence where we stop playing in the natural
world. Forster thought that this path would lead to a loss of what it means to be human.
At times, I have wondered if virtual meetings will ever replace our annual meetings, and, if they do, what will be the consequences (see Lynn Nyhart’s Isis Focus piece from
March 2013, “The Shape of the History of Science Profession, 2038: A Prospective
Retrospective” for one take on the consequences). We cannot measure the benefits of
simply sitting next to someone, taking in her gestures, her voice, and what she is trying
to say, but the advantages are many, and it seems worth it to me that we pour our labor
into the planning of the HSS meetings so that we can listen carefully to each other, even
if we cannot measure the value of it. Podcasts and virtual attendance will continue to
play an increasingly important role in our conferences, and I welcome these
innovations; I just hope that they never become substitutes. To really “see” a person we
need to be with them. It is the stuff that enriches our scholarship and each other, and I
hope that you will join us in San Francisco this 19-22 Nov.

Thank you for your membership in the HSS.

ARTICLE: Is Membership an Anachronism?
by Angela Creager, HSS President

I joined the History of Science Society nearly a quarter century ago (gulp!). The
incentives were pretty clear. I liked coming to the meetings, and members paid a
smaller registration fee. (They still do.) As I had trained in another discipline, the
affiliation itself mattered to me. And not least, I liked having Isis and the HSS Newsletter
come right to my mailbox. It saved me from photocopying articles in the library, and
meant I could read the book reviews hot off the press. In the past two decades,
electronic publishing has made the issue of journal access nearly moot, at least for
those with institutional access. Most of us now take advantage of social media and
other forms of communication to get news and connect to like-minded scholars. These shifts are changing how learned societies and a host of other voluntary organizations operate. As sociologist Robert Wuthnow has observed, many twenty- and thirty-year olds in the U.S. do not join churches, political parties, and other member-based civic organizations, preferring informal connections. Yet societies, churches, clubs, and other organizations still rely on having members in order to elect officers, raise budgets, and make decisions. The number of our individual members has been on a slow but steady decline for the last 20 years, as is the case in many academic societies. If the trend continues, how can HSS survive?

I think that membership in HSS still matters, but not because we’re an exclusive club—in fact, we welcome all comers. As part of the strategic-planning process of the last year, we had to wrestle with the question of who our primary “customer” is. (If you find that term off-putting, as many of us did, substitute “constituent,” the term we used in our Strategic Planning Report.) Whose lives are directly benefited by the activities of our organization? At first glance, it would seem that the answer is our members. But that’s actually too narrow. The Society’s meetings, publications, and resources serve a broader group than that. In the end, we described our constituents as “People committed to doing, making, or advocating for the history of science or who are learning to do so.” Our Strategic Plan aims to serve everyone who falls under that description. There are other groups we would also like to serve, such as educators and members of the public curious about the history of science, but our main constituents are those who know about our field and who are participating in it in some way or another. Serving them is our core mission, and not as a means for recruiting members.

So why join? Or, more to the point, why renew your membership in HSS? I offer you three reasons worth considering.

First, because you believe in HSS. Our journals, meetings, and advocacy matter to our field. Many of us are inter-disciplinary or multi-disciplinary, which is all for the good, yet history of science is its own thing, too. The Society represents and sustains our identity.

Second, because we believe in you. The greatest resource of the Society is our membership, and we need your input and involvement. At this juncture in time, those of you who work beyond the academy and outside the U.S. provide especially important perspectives. A higher percentage of the membership participated in last year’s elections for Vice President, Council, and Nominating Committee than in a long time. Our revised Bylaws, should the Society approve them, will have even more of our officers elected by the general membership. You are critical to our activities and to our future.

Third, because people can do things collectively that they cannot do individually. Many scholars are interested in finding ways to speak to the public, to make our findings useful to students and educators, or to articulate the value of history of science to policy-makers and funders. But it’s hard to do this as a lone individual. We can do these

---

things together, both through the efforts of our Society and through our cooperation with other organizations. Public engagement has been a particular focus during the past three years, with the founding of the Joint Caucus for Socially Engaged Philosophers and Historians of Science and the hosting of events sponsored through our Elizabeth Paris Endowment for Socially Engaged History and Philosophy of Science. (For our Paris event at the annual meeting in San Francisco we will host a public screening of Merchants of Doubt with a discussion following.)

I will not deny that the dues HSS receives from its members are a vital source of income for our activities. That said, I do not regard membership as primarily transactional. In fact, HSS is committed to serving you whether you join or not. Unlike many learned societies, we do not require panelists at our meetings to be members. Rather, becoming or remaining a member is a way to support and publicize the vibrant work in history of science. So join us!

INTERVIEW: Joan Vandegrift
On the occasion of her 30th Anniversary as Manuscript Editor to Isis
by Desiree Capel, Isis Managing Editor

Last year, during the first HSS annual meeting since Isis had moved to Utrecht, The Netherlands, we were notified that 2015 would be the year our Manuscript Editor Joan Vandegrift would celebrate her 30th anniversary with the journal. Since we could not let this event pass unnoticed, we invited Joan to tell us something about her experiences over the past three decades. A lot of things will have changed over the years, and we thought it would be interesting to know how the manuscript editing of Isis has evolved over the years. Of course we already knew about Joan’s excellent work to get all manuscripts, book reviews and other contributions to Isis in the best possible shape. We also realized that Joan is the only person who reads Isis literally from cover to cover, not once, but multiple times. First, during the editing process, where she often contacts the author for further clarification or to discuss matters, and then one more time during the proofreading phase. It is fair to say that Joan is the most experienced reader of Isis in the entire world. Someone who is so special for Isis, and who has so much experience, deserves to be put in the spotlight. Therefore we arranged for this interview, to which Joan fortunately agreed.

Q: Thank you for agreeing to be interviewed about your job as Manuscript Editor of Isis. I think it is very special that one person has been working for so long as the Manuscript Editor for Isis. There must be something about your job that you really enjoy. Can you tell us what that is?

A: I especially like the wide variety of fields and topics Isis covers. Even now, thirty years in, I still get to read about things that are completely new to me. I’ve also been fortunate to work for a series of appreciative editors and—especially in the years after the office at the University of Pennsylvania closed down—with some very capable and personable managing editors who have been genuine colleagues despite the distances between our offices.

Q: Having read more than 120 entire issues of Isis, it is fair to say you have become a real history of science expert. But what is your own background? Is that also in history?
A: I was a double major in English and history as an undergraduate. I did a master's in comparative literature at Chicago. I’d agree that, after all this time, I know a little about a lot of topics in history of science. But expertise—no!

Q: You started working for Isis in September 1985, but before that time you already worked as a freelancer for Isis, so you are actually celebrating your 30+ anniversary. How did you come to work for Isis?

A: When my husband and I moved to Swarthmore in 1982, I looked for some kind of publishing work in the Philadelphia area. There wasn’t much going on apart from medical publishing, and I ended up taking a job with W.B. Saunders. One of the people I worked with there was a young woman who had just graduated from Penn. She had had a work study job in the Isis office, and—after we got to know each other and she learned that I had worked at the University of Chicago Press—she offered to introduce me to Frances Kohler and the rest of the Isis folks. Frances was always on the lookout for people who were (or might become!) good editors, so after we talked she sent me home with some freelance work. After my daughters went off to part-time day care at the age of sixteen months, in September 1985, I started coming into the Isis office three days a week.

Q: You really know a lot about the history of science in general. Have you ever considered becoming a professional history of science scholar yourself?

A: Oh, NO! I’m not a scholar, and I find writing a very laborious process. Definitely not for me!

Q: So we may perhaps describe you as someone with a very broad knowledge of the history of science, which covers not only topics that have been treated in Isis, but also knowledge of many other publications and sources. This must be very helpful in your work as Manuscript Editor. Some people, who have not had the pleasure of working with you may think your work is limited to the mere polishing of the English language, but you do far more than that. Have you done so from the start, or is this something you took on because your experience with the history of science had increased?

A: I was very lucky that Frances Kohler, who was in charge of Isis and all other HSS publications when I first started with the journal, took a very wide view of the job and encouraged everyone who worked with her to do the same. Frances was a marvelous editor, and she made a point of hiring women with young kids who wanted to do serious intellectual work for a respectable part-time salary. I was hired as a copy editor, but she encouraged the people she worked with to think about what we were reading: of course you were supposed to catch the typos, but if you found a problem with the argument you were encouraged to mention that too. Frances always pointed out that Isis has a wide and varied readership, so if something seemed unclear to us as editors it would quite likely be unclear to many subscribers as well. That said, I always aim when editing a manuscript to respect the author’s voice, not impose my own. A good writer does not always make a good editor, because as an editor you have to let go of your own style and try to maintain the style of the author. If I do a really good job on a piece, my work should be invisible to anyone other than the author and myself.
Q: Many journals are typeset according to a particular style, like the APA, MLA, or Chicago style. *Isis*, however, has its own particular style. Has this been the same over the years you have worked for *Isis*? Do you know who introduced this style?

A: Somewhere in my desk there is an *Isis* style booklet—actual words on paper—that runs to ten or twelve pages. I don’t know where it came from, but it wasn’t original with me. I was given a copy when I first started working in the office, and I have the impression that it had been produced fairly recently—but I could be wrong about that. Some things just make life simpler: for example, we follow the first spelling of a word listed in the latest edition of Webster—not because the second spelling (say) is wrong but because the rule makes it easier to be consistent. And some things have changed: that style sheet has a list of guidelines for citing archival material, for example, but I’ve found that the elements vary so much that it isn’t always sensible to strive for consistency. Our style was, broadly, based on the *Chicago Manual of Style*—but we have not kept up as it has evolved over the years.

Q: A lot of things must have changed since 1985. What did an average working day look like back then, and what has changed since those early years?

A: Well, even then it began -- for me -- with a cup of coffee. In 1985 I sat down at my desk with a stack of paper and a good supply of sharp pencils; nowadays I settle in front of my computer screens. The actual process of thinking about and fiddling with the text hasn’t changed very much. Like all manuscript editors, I do something akin to typesetting now: if I should happen to tap the space bar twice between sentences or neglect to remove a bit of underlining in the text, it shows up that way in proof. Sometimes I miss being able to write a blanket covering note to the typesetter -- “Compositor: Please follow editor’s markup rather than manuscript presentation” -- and going on my merry way.

On the other hand, I do NOT miss having to send manuscripts to authors and the Press by mail! Since edited manuscripts could get lost in transit, I photocopied every essay before letting it out of my hands. This has rescued my work more than once. Manuscripts went out in large envelopes, with lots of stamps on them, which had to be dropped off at the post office. And before we had digital files, most figures were black-and-white glossy photographs, sometimes originals borrowed from museums. What if one of these got lost somewhere—or bent or stained or spoiled? Clearly, then, in some respects my life has become much easier now that everything is in digital format and can be sent via email.

Q: Many readers may not be aware of the fact that you also compose the annual index that is published in the December issue. The change from “only paper” to “mainly computer” must also have affected the way you compose the annual index. How did you do that in those early years, and how do you handle this nowadays?

A: When I started with *Isis*, the index was first compiled on file cards, one per entry. So, for example, an essay with two authors that included a name in the title would have four cards: a title card, two author cards, and a card for the named individual. Eventually someone (sometimes me, sometimes not) would go through and alphabetize the cards; then the entries would be typed up as an alphabetized list by Frances’s assistant or one
of the secretaries. Several stages of proofreading and correction ensued, with entries being combined as necessary (the name of an author who had contributed an essay and two book reviews, for example, would initially have three card entries; in the finished index, he or she would have just one entry, with all three elements included). In the next phase, the index was compiled electronically—but with all kinds of complicated coding. Here’s what an entry from the December 2005 index would have looked like when it went to the printer:


You can imagine how long it took to type up an entire volume year’s worth of entries! And the proofreading!!

Here’s what the same entry would look like now:


MUCH simpler, no?

Q: Do you always contact all authors of Isis articles, or do you contact authors only incidentally?

A: Every article and Focus author gets to see the edited manuscript of his or her essay. Occasionally I’ll send a piece back more than once, if the author’s changes have been extensive or if I’m unclear about something. I send out book reviews only occasionally, if I’m really unsure about something.

Q: The Isis editorial office has been in Utrecht, The Netherlands, since 1 July 2014. Your name looks like a typical Dutch or Flemish name (in Dutch you would write Van de Grift). Do your ancestors indeed come from Belgium or The Netherlands?

My father’s family came from the Netherlands. Family lore (how reliable, I cannot say!) has it that three brothers -- Robert, John, and Peter—came with Peter Stuyvesant. They settled in New York and Pennsylvania. I don’t know when the spaces and the capital G vanished.
ARTICLE: HSS’s Director/Empress of Media and Engagement
By Jessica Baron

People often ask me what I do. When I tell them that I coordinate outreach and communications for Notre Dame’s Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values and also hold the position of Director of Media and Engagement for the History of Science Society, they tend to wander away very confused. It doesn’t help much when I
tell them that my informal HSS title is the Empress of Engagement.² [can’t get this to show as a 1]

So, now that I’ve become a bit more visible in HSS, it’s probably time to explain the second part of that job description so that members and media alike know more about my work and how I can help them. (This is also partly for my mom so she can finally explain it to her friends.)

First, a bit of background about me: I received my PhD in History and Philosophy of Science from Notre Dame in 2013. I’m an historian of medicine by training and I wrote my dissertation on Florence Nightingale’s work to build a system of public health and public works in British India throughout the mid and late nineteenth century. I’ve also studied Classics and Anthropology at the Masters level, and all of that work was on illness, health, and healing as well.³ My personal interests extend to molecular biology -- I worked for a marine biologist to make ends meet in college -- and (reactions to) emerging technologies.

I belong to a newish species of academic – those who never wanted a traditional tenure-track job. So, while I’ve taught and done research, those things aren’t my focus; but the people who do do them are. My main job at HSS is to take scholarship in the history of science (broadly defined) and bring it to the media or directly to the public. An equally important part of my job is to foster a sense of community within HSS. This is why you’ll see me collecting and sharing news, editing the HSS Newsletter, and helping out at the annual meeting. Nearly all of my work happens behind the scenes, though I don’t mind taking center stage briefly to brag about our members, something most people don’t enjoy doing themselves. This is why I also have to keep my public speaking and emceeing skills polished.

Event planning is part of the job, especially when it comes to outreach events like the Elizabeth Paris lecture at the Chicago meeting and the Blue Marble event before that. I also try to keep the HSS website relevant and up-to-date, track our web analytics (so we know what’s working and what’s not), run all of the HSS social media accounts (and, relatedly, scour the news for relevant stories to share), as well as write and distribute press releases. In any time I have to spare, I try to forge and maintain connections with science writers and members of our sister societies, such as PSA and AAHM.

It’s a wonderfully fun and fulfilling job and part of what makes it great is that there’s always something more to do. Going forward, I’m trying to integrate more writing into my work, do more interviews with members (the first one is in this very Newsletter), and collect resources on some less traditional ways of presenting our scholarship at meetings and beyond.

² I lobbied for a Star Trek theme and asked to become Lt. Commander, but was overruled by the Star Wars-lovers in the Executive Office.
³ I made a deal with myself that I can brag about reading the entire published Hippocratic Corpus in Greek any time it’s even remotely relevant for the entire rest of my life.
I hope this explains a little bit about how I spend my time and that you'll call on me if you need anything along these lines or if you wish to discuss Florence Nightingale’s biomedical liberalism in British India.

INTERVIEW: Alice Dreger
By Jessica Baron, HSS’s Director of Media and Engagement

In an April 2015 issue, The New York Times called historian Alice Dreger “a sharp, disruptive scholar” and her new book, Galileo’s Middle Finger: Heretics, Activists, and the Search for Justice in Science (Penguin Press, 2015) “a splendidly entertaining education in ethics, activism and science.” Since then, she’s received international coverage for memorably Tweeted thoughts from her son’s sex education class and resigning her position at Northwestern University following a dispute over academic freedom with her dean. We caught up with her in the midst of her very busy speaking, research, and writing schedule to ask her about turning scholarship into activism.

Q: It’s inspiring to see how you incorporate activism into your academic research. You even have a great piece in Bioethics Forum called “My Top Ten Tips for Doing Activism in Academia.” How did you decide to become a scholar who “makes things happen”?

A: I have always been practically-minded, so, although I love scholarship, I really love doing scholarship that might help improve the world, especially for the disempowered and the wronged. In the mid-1990s, I was finishing my PhD in History and Philosophy of Science at Indiana University and I started publishing my work on the history of the medical treatment of people called “hermaphrodites” in the late 19th century. People born with the same conditions today started to contact me to ask me to help change the current medical system. I ended up joining the intersex rights movement as a result, and
then I ended up doing all sorts of other patient and research-subject advocacy. I talk about these experiences in my latest book, *Galileo’s Middle Finger: Heretics, Activists, and the Search for Justice in Science* (Penguin Press, 2015). Incidentally, the book is not a history of Galileo; it’s an exploration of current-day battles between scientists and activists over questions of human identity, and ultimately a call to defend academic freedom.

**Q: What advice do you have for academics who want to start engaging with the press? Any lessons or wisdom to pass along to those of us who aspire to do public outreach?**

A: I see dealing with the press as a way to do widespread education, so I take it very seriously. I run into scholars all the time who are amazed that the press coverage of my work tends to be quite accurate and well-framed. But I’m not just lucky. It happens chiefly because I specifically develop FAQ lists on my website to help reporters when there’s a story they might call me on. It’s a simple and unbelievably important technique for media relations. I also recommend working with a media relations person at your university; get to know those folks before your work becomes of interest to reporters, if possible, and have them help you draft press releases and practice interviews if you have important work coming out or if you have an important take on a big story. I got proper media training at the start of my career and it has made a big difference, so I always suggest academics call a media relations expert at their university and ask for training. Finally, if you want to develop relationships with good reporters, make a point of sending them leads on other people’s work so that you develop a rapport. Don’t be shy about using that rapport to call on them if you have something that might be of interest to them. But keep your communications brief; they are busy people.

**Q: In your experience, how do you think the press approaches talking to an academic?**

A: Reporters rightly assume that most academics will speak in long and convoluted sentences that make it hard to convey important information or insights to a general audience. They also assume academics will send them dozens of corrections that the academics see as important and the reporters don’t. (Also true, and a good reason to have an FAQ; nip misconceptions in the bud.) Reporters also think academics expect them to do a lot of research and understand work that isn’t really in their field. You can help reporters by preparing before an interview: send some brief background material and practice what you want to say. Imagine what the questions are likely to be, and have succinct answers ready. (I often write down what I will likely say during an interview; that way I am clear and succinct.) If you want to talk about your published work, be able to express in two sentences what you really want them to know about that work. And always follow the rule, “answer the question they should have asked”. . . but keep in mind if you don’t answer the question they did ask, you may not end up in the published coverage.
Q: In a few of your essays, you still call historians your “peeps” -- what advantage does being an historian give you in the work you do?

A: My mate, an internist who has lived with me and watched me work for 20 years, says that historians have a secret weapon: the timeline. I know that sounds silly, but it’s amazing how much you can understand about a given topic if you approach it like a historian and bother to timeline it. Another advantage we historians have is our attention to sources; we are keenly aware that every “truth” comes from a source, and so we are always thinking not just about content but about our certainty level for that content. That kind of disciplinary intellectual humility makes us nimble and strong. I find that being an historian is also an advantage because I have a long-view of history, which means I know I don’t really matter in the history of the world. Knowing you don’t really matter is super liberating because you cannot be your own cause and because you can know that if you do screw up, history won’t remember it any more than history will remember what you got right.

Q: Should historians do more for the various social justice movements? Do you have any specific suggestions about what kinds of historians would be most useful to which movements?

A: Social justice movements are smarter when they are historically informed. I think they also get a certain stamina from understanding history. But historians should take on the work that matters to them, even if it is relatively useless and obscure, because the best scholarship is motivated scholarship.

Q: Do you care to name any other historians that are doing good and vital history/activism?

A: Naomi Oreskes, Erik Conway, Robert Proctor, and Susan Reverby are four who spring immediately to mind, but there are many. What I appreciate about these people is the serious attention to detail while also conveying a big message.

Q: If you could pick three people to really read your latest book (Galileo’s Middle Finger), whom would you chose?

A: (1) Francis Collins, because I’d like him to see how researchers can game the system of NIH funding while misleading their patients into accidentally becoming research subjects; (2) Pope Francis, because he’s very influential and I think he’d benefit from thinking about my argument that the pursuit of evidence is the most important moral imperative of our day; (3) Matt Damon. Don’t make me say why.

Q: What’s next for you?

A: This academic year, I’ll be editing an anthology with Francoise Baylis, a philosopher bioethicist at Dalhousie University, for Cambridge University Press on “bioethics in action”—first-person accounts of people who have tried to enact specific changes in
medicine and medical research. I’m also contracted to write a popular book for parents on how to talk to kids about sex. I’ll be continuing service as the ethics advisor to an NIH-funded Translational Research Network for intersex pediatric clinics. And I’m co-chair, with David Sandberg of the University of Michigan, of a medical education committee on intersex for the Association of American Medical Colleges. I also have a bunch of other projects, including running a nonprofit foundation that produces an online newspaper for the city where I live, East Lansing, Michigan. I am the chief government reporter, and I also dabble in gardening reporting. I resigned my position at Northwestern University following censorship by my dean. If another university wants to offer me another gig starting next year, I’ll consider the offer. I would prefer offers from institutions that have adopted the Chicago statement on academic freedom; see https://www.thefire.org/ny-daily-news-to-ny-colleges-adopt-u-of-chicago-statement-on-free-speech/

Q: Will we see you at the HSS Annual Meeting in San Francisco in November?

A: Yes. I’ll be part of a roundtable arranged by Joshua Howe on “Historians of Science in the Public Sphere” along with Erik Conway, Jane Maienschein, and Robert Proctor. I am really looking forward to it. And I’ll be happy to arrange some bar and coffee time for folks who want to talk more about these issues, especially for graduate students and junior faculty.
ARTICLE The Making of Intolerant Bodies: A Short History of Autoimmunity. The Promise and Peril of Collaboration between Scientist and Historian by Warwick Anderson and Ian R. Mackay

Anderson and Mackay believe their unusual writing collaboration, which produced Intolerant Bodies: A Short History of Autoimmunity (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014), demands a correspondingly unusual commentary and explanation:

Warwick Anderson recalls Ian R. Mackay as a formidable and rather unnerving senior physician at the Royal Melbourne Hospital (RMH) in the early 1980s. Mackay’s ward rounds were daunting theatrical exercises, slowly grinding from patient to patient, presenting countless opportunities, so it seemed, for Mackay to invigilate and sometimes intimidate medical residents and students. He would examine carefully every case history, sensitive to any inadequacy or omission or evasion. What he couldn’t
stand was slackness of any sort. Approaching sixty years of age, bearing an uncanny resemblance to Herbert von Karajan, Mackay was at the height of his powers, a leading clinical immunologist, and collaborator with Nobel laureates and other distinguished scientists who tagged along occasionally on these intermittently excruciating rounds. As a medical student on Mackay’s Clinical Research Unit (CRU), Anderson tried to disappear among the crowd. A few years later in 1984, as a resident, he came to admire the bravura performances and even to participate cautiously in the drama, careful to sidestep or slip away during the more confronting scenes. He remembers Mackay as demanding and unrelenting toward his colleagues, but kind and thoughtful with his patients, who often adored him. Above all, it seemed that Mackay, while undoubtedly “difficult,” was one of the few real intellectuals on the staff of the hospital.

Ian R. Mackay, however, has less recall of Warwick Anderson, the somewhat timid medical student and rather more intrepid resident. In the course of a long career, physicians see medical students and residents come and go, with few ever making much of a mark. Anderson took reliable case histories, worked efficiently, was good at multitasking, and seemed to engage closely with some more medically complicated patients, though he never struck his teachers as especially dedicated to clinical care or research. But Mackay had been impressed enough to offer him a residency on the CRU. (Later, he was surprised when the young doctor showed him some of his published poetry—he started paying attention then.) Mackay remembers the period as one of exceptional productivity for the CRU, enlivened by skirmishes among the exceptionally mettlesome personalities that populated the medical staff. The daredevil registrar (or senior resident) Bryan Youl, a fearless practical joker, went on to become a clinical neurophysiologist and pianist in London. Ian Frazer later developed the human papilloma virus vaccine against cervical cancer; John Mathews (who earlier had been involved in kuru research) became the foundation director of the Menzies School of Health Research in Darwin; and Mathew Vadas now directs the Centenary Institute at the University of Sydney. Sir Gustav Nossal still ran the adjacent Walter and Eliza Hall Institute (of which the CRU remained an important part), and his predecessor Sir Macfarlane Burnet lingered on, though he no longer attended clinical meetings. Former visiting fellows Carleton Gajdusek and Joshua Lederberg frequently came up in conversation. Inspired by the stellar cast, one of our medical students, Ken Smith, became an immunologist and later head of the Department of Medicine at Cambridge University. Anderson’s role in this show seemed, at the time, relatively minor. Certainly, he showed scant interest in immunology. At one point during their collaboration on Intolerant Bodies, Anderson told Mackay that he had learned through studying history the immunology he should have known as a medical resident. Mackay fixed him with his steely eyes for a while, then said: “Yes, indeed.”

Yet we regarded each other with mutual respect, enough for us to make efforts to stay in touch over the years. As a graduate student in the Department of History and Sociology of Science at the University of Pennsylvania, Anderson wrote with Mackay and Youl an odd little case study, now rather dated, of theophylline intoxication; and he published in Social Studies of Science a historical critique of the CRU’s pioneering computer-diagnosis program in the 1960s, an article that Mackay recalls as an irritation
and distraction. At the time, Mackay insisted on major changes to the final draft, to Anderson’s chagrin. Much later, when Anderson came to write *The Collectors of Lost Souls*, his history of the investigation of kuru, the fatal brain disease among the Fore people of New Guinea, he interviewed Mackay, who thus came to erupt regularly in the book as a sort of sardonic Greek chorus, commenting on the unfolding tragedy. Gajdusek, who was the chief instigator of kuru research, had developed with Mackay in 1957 the autoimmune complement-fixation test, which determined that active chronic hepatitis was an autoimmune phenomenon, caused when the body’s immune system attacked the liver. It became a landmark in the history of immunology.

When Anderson began to write *Lost Souls* at the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, he read the original articles announcing, in effect, this autoimmune hepatitis in *Nature* and *Archives of Internal Medicine*. As he did so, he remembered having looked after some of the patients, first diagnosed with the disease in 1957—by the 1980s, their case histories often ran to six or more thick volumes, full of progress reports and notes from social workers, among others. Anderson asked Mackay whether the RMH would have kept these records. Mackay hoped so, since he had written across the folders: “Please preserve—of historical importance.” Anderson approached Charles E. Rosenberg, his former Ph.D. advisor, suggesting he and Mackay might write for Rosenberg’s book series at Johns Hopkins University Press a collective biography of autoimmune hepatitis using these wonderfully rich records. Having written a dozen or so articles on the history of immunology, Mackay was eager to collaborate on the book. But when he inquired about the records, he learned the RMH had destroyed them—ironically in 1998, when the institution was celebrating its 150th anniversary and proclaiming its commitment to history. Mackay still wanted to proceed (and, not trusting the hospital, he’d made copies of sections of the case records). As it turned out, Rosenberg would prefer a general conceptual history of autoimmunity for his series. However, Anderson had mixed feelings, confirmed when some colleagues in the United States warned him that such a book would confuse readers, who expected him to write on medicine, race, and colonialism. But as he was moving to a small-scale scholarly community in Australia, where academic selection favored the generalist not the specialist, he eventually decided he could ignore these concerns. For him, it became a sort of “legacy” project, a chance to make sense of his clinical training.

Both of us were apprehensive about collaboration. As a scientist, Mackay was inured to the arrangement, but he suspected Anderson’s philosophical proclivities, what he perceived to be the historian’s inclination toward esoteric theory. In contrast, Anderson was generally wary of collaboration and feared the scientist would simply want to write a textbook of contemporary immunology, lacking historical perspective and conceptual suppleness. As a test, Anderson asked Mackay to read Jacques Derrida’s essay on how “autoimmunization” might substitute for deconstruction. To his surprise, the eighty-something immunologist was intrigued by the philosopher’s deployment of a fairly “accurate” version of autoimmunity. The response reassured Anderson. Mackay then tested Anderson by asking him to revise a draft essay for the *Journal of Neuroimmunology* on the historical relations of experimental allergic encephalomyelitis and the autoimmune disease multiple sclerosis—and this time the historian’s
contribution seemed sympathetic and compatible, and not rebarbative as expected. Together we then wrote a proposal for a research grant from the Australian Research Council (ARC), which proved successful. (Mackay believes he might be the oldest person to receive an ARC grant.)

The grant enabled Anderson to fly regularly to Melbourne, where Mackay is based, and to discuss research and to work through drafts there. We could employ two dedicated research assistants, Edmund McMahon and Cecily Hunter. Anderson usually wrote the first draft of each chapter, often drawing closely on Mackay’s historical articles. Mackay would then go painstakingly through every sentence, often expressing approval, sometimes finding fault. He had more at stake in getting the science right: if there were any mistakes, he would likely be blamed, rightly or wrongly. Both of us found the process exhausting and time consuming, but it soon became clear that neither of us could write the book without the other. Immunology is exasperating in its technical complexity and obscurity—so much so that it has mostly resisted any thorough and accessible historical analysis. As an ordinary medical doctor, Anderson knew little of the intricacies of recent immunology. As an immunologist seeking to chronicle his field, Mackay needed the help of someone deft in historical narration, especially on the scale of a book. Frequently we argued over what should be included and what left out. Mackay usually contended that we needed to write more about technical aspects of immunology, and about recent developments, such as ideas about the influence of the gut microbiome. Anderson found the necessary incursions into the past thirty years discomforting. He wanted to write more about concepts like “self,” “tolerance,” and “surveillance”—and, predictably, to discourse on Derrida. But Mackay, with Rosenberg’s “collusion,” beseeched him to omit a few of the redundant Deriddean paragraphs, and to label the philosophical “conclusion” an Afterword. More than our friends and families could ever imagine, we compromised. (Some claimed to be amused that two such intolerant people—intolerable even—could be writing about immunological tolerance.) When our disagreements proved unresolvable, one of us would spin off an article on the inassimilable material. The resulting book is not perfect, but it’s as comprehensive, informative, coherent, and appealing as we could make it.

Ultimately, our collaboration depended on mutual respect and trust. Though both of us had mellowed over the years, it was not always easy. Senior immunologists, recalling the severity of Mackay in his earlier days, often wondered how the two of us could ever write a book together—others speculated on Anderson’s historian “lone wolf” tendencies. Sometimes Anderson regarded Mackay—when he persisted more than six months in rejecting one cherished phrase or another—as stubborn. Mackay complained that Anderson could be unyielding on even the most trivial aspects of literary style. We persevered. Our friendship remained intact. And through our labors we both learned a lot—about immunology, history, and ourselves.

Warwick Anderson is an Australian Research Council Laureate Fellow and Professor at the University of Sydney; and Ian R. Mackay is an honorary Professor at Monash University in Melbourne. It should be noted that Mackay disputes the accuracy of
Anderson’s memories of him and the CRU; while Anderson cannot believe he was so insignificant a medical resident.
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**MEMBER NEWS**

**Warwick Anderson** (University of Sydney) and Ian R. Mackay’s book *Intolerant Bodies: A Short History of Autoimmunity* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014) has been awarded the 2015 New South Wales’ Premier’s Award for General History. The judges called the book clear, engaging, and a “sophisticated but highly readable history [that] helps close the gap between medical science and the general public’s understanding.” Previous winners include Inga Clendinnen, Richard Bosworth, Chris Clark and Anderson himself for *The Collectors of Lost Souls: Turning Kuru Scientists into Whitemen* (JHU Press, 2008).

**Mitchell G. Ash** (University of Vienna) has published a volume jointly edited with Josef Ehmer entitled *Universität – Politik - Gesellschaft* (Vienna University Press, 2015). This is the second volume in a four-volume series on the occasion of the 650th anniversary of the University of Vienna. He has also published a book-length essay titled “Die Universität Wien in den politischen Umbruchzeiten des 19. und 20. Jahrhunderts” in the work.

**Ronald S. Calinger** (The Catholic University of America) has published *Leonhard Euler: Mathematical Genius in the Enlightenment* (Princeton University Press, 2015). This is the first full-length biography of Leonhard Euler.

**Matthew K. Chew** (Arizona State University) published “Ecologists, Environmentalists, Experts, and the Invasion of the “Second Greatest Threat”” in the *International Review of Environmental History* (Vol 1:7-40. 2015). This is the first issue of the journal from the Australian National University Press.

**Lorraine Daston** (Max Planck Institute for the History of Science), **Sally Ragep** (McGill University), and **Jamil Ragep** (McGill University), the Executive Board of the Islamic Scientific Manuscripts Initiative, announce the launch of a website that is making available images of 123 scientific and mathematical codices from the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin: [https://ismi.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de](https://ismi.mpiwg-berlin.mpg.de). They look forward to announcing other launches in the near future. Questions should be addressed to Sally Ragep at sally.ragep@mcgill.ca.

**Jean De Groot** was promoted to full professor in the School of Philosophy at The Catholic University of America, effective August 2015.


**Dawn Digrius** (California State University) and Howard Falcon-Lang have published “Palaeobotany Under the Microscope: History of the Invention and Widespread


The intellectual foundations of population genetics were attacked in 2014, both by its major historian, the late William Provine (in his self-published “The ‘Random Genetic Drift’ Fallacy”), and by one of its leading exponents, Masatoshi Nei (“Mutation-Driven Evolution,” Oxford University Press). Thus, historian Mark B. Adams now has support for his “La génétique des populations était-elle une génétique évolutive?” (Fischer J-L, Schneider WH (eds.) Histoire de la Génétique, 1990, pp 153-171. ARPEM, Paris).

“Likewise, **Donald Forsdyke** (Queen’s University, Canada) hopes for reappraisal of the speciation views of George Romanes and William Bateson (“The Origin of Species Revisited,” McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2001). There were many people to mention in the Acknowledgements of the latter text. However Will was up-front. The Acknowledgements began (p. ix): “I am indebted to William Provine whose works greatly eased the sifting of the ‘Darwinian’ literature.” More details of this debt were provided in the text.

**James Fleming** (Colby College) has been awarded the Eduard Brückner Prize 2015 for outstanding achievement in interdisciplinary climate research. The award, administered by the Helmholtz Zentrum Geesthacht für Material- und Küstenforschung, was presented on September 21 at the German Climate Conference in Hamburg organized by the Deutsche Meteorologishe Gesellschaft, [http://www.dkt-10.de/](http://www.dkt-10.de/). Geographer, meteorologist, glaciologist and climate scientist Eduard Brückner (1862-1927) was an early advocate for the importance of climate change and its effects on the economy and social structure of society.

The October 2015 issue of *Sky & Telescope* contains a strong review of *Setting Aside All Authority: Giovanni Battista Riccioli and the Science against Copernicus in the Age of Galileo* (University of Notre Dame Press) by **Christopher M. Graney** (Jefferson Community and Technical College). Owen Gingerich, author of *God’s Planet*, says that for students of the Copernican revolution, “here is an unexpected contribution that will force the experts to revise their lecture notes. Christopher Graney (with translation assistance from Christina Graney) has almost single-handedly revised the traditional story about Jesuit Giambattista Riccioli’s list of pro and con arguments for the heliocentric cosmology. Big surprise: in 1651 the geocentric cosmology had science on its side.”


Gerald Holton (Harvard University, emeritus), David Cassidy (Hofstra University), and James Rutherford have published *Comprendre la Physique*, (Presses Polytechniques et Universitaires, 2014).

Daniel Kevles retired from Yale on 30 June 2015. In 2015/16, he will be an Interdisciplinary Fellow at the NYU Law School and a Scholar in Residence at Columbia Law School. In the spring, he will teach a seminar (“The Engineering and Ownership of Life”) in the History Department at Columbia. He spent this last winter as the Visiting Mellon Senior Scholar at the Mertz Library at the New York Botanical Garden.

Anthony John Kinder, BA (Hons), MSc, DIC, FRAS, historian of astronomy, currently retired from the National Health Service of the UK is compiling an historical database of all members of the British Astronomical Association since it was founded in 1890, and of the Royal Astronomical Society since it was founded in 1820.

Director of the Center for Biology and Society (CBS) at Arizona State University, Jane Maienschein, was named an ASU University Professor—a new credential to add to her already impressive list of Parents Association, President’s, and Regents’ Professor titles. Maienschein was also awarded the [David L. Hull Prize](http://www.biohistory.org) by the International Society for the History, Philosophy, and Social Studies of Biology at the 2015 meeting in Montréal, Canada. Maienschein, in collaboration with Manfred Laubichler and several other ASU professors secured funding and ran a workshop on STS data-management protocols at the National Science Foundation. The outcome of this workshop promises to have a large impact on the HSS community.
Christoph Meinel (University of Regensburg, Germany, emeritus) was honored for his contributions to the history of chemistry with the 2015 HIST Award of the American Chemical Society’s Division of the History of Chemistry.

In response to the Ebola crisis in West Africa, Gregg Mitman (University of Wisconsin-Madison), in collaboration with Sarita Siegel, directed and produced a short documentary, *In the Shadow of Ebola*, which offers an intimate portrait of a family and a nation torn apart by the Ebola outbreak in Liberia. The film is available online on PBS/Independent Lens and has been adopted by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention as part of its mandatory training program for incoming Epidemic Intelligence Service officers. He also published an article, “Ebola in a Stew of Fear,” in the *New England Journal of Medicine* that offers a historical and cultural perspective on the outbreak and was part of a National History Center Congressional Briefing last November, along with Julie Livingston and Randall Packard, on Ebola and the African public health crisis.

Scott L. Montgomery (University of Washington) and Alok Kumar (SUNY, Oswego) have published *A History of Science in World Cultures: Voices of Knowledge* (Routledge, 2015). It is a fully up-to-date, detailed survey of the evolution of scientific thought in eight major world civilizations, with individual chapters devoted to ancient Egypt, Mesopotamia, Greece, China, India, Islam, pre-Columbian Americas, and Medieval-Renaissance Europe.

Ronald Numbers (University of Wisconsin-Madison, emeritus) and Kostas Kampourakis have published *Newton’s Apple and Other Myths about Science*, which debunks the widespread belief that science advances when individual geniuses experience “Eureka!” moments and suddenly comprehend what those around them could never imagine. The book will be available from Harvard University Press in early October 2015.

The North American Society for Oceanic History has selected Michael Osborne’s (Oregon State University) *The Emergence of Tropical Medicine in France* for honorable mention in their John Lyman Book Award category for “Naval and Maritime Science and Technology.”

Raffaele Pisano was awarded his Habilitation (HDR) as Full Professor by the University of Lorraine, France. He continues to serve as Vice President elect (2011-) of the Inter-Divisional Teaching Commission (DLMPS/IUHST). He is also under contract (with Paolo Bussotti) for a full translation from Latin into English of four volumes of Newton’s *Principia*, Geneva Edition (2020, Oxford University Press).

Karen Rader was promoted to Professor of History in the Department of History at Virginia Commonwealth University in May. Her book *Life on Display* (co-authored with
Victoria E.M. Cain) won the American Education Research Association’s (AERA) Division F (History and Historiography) New Scholar’s Award in April 2015 and the History of Education Society’s annual book prize for the best book in the field in August 2015.

Martin Reuss was the first recipient of the “Public Outreach Career Award,” recently established by the American Society for Environmental History. The award was presented at the Society’s annual conference, which was held in Washington, D.C. last March.

David Rhees retired 4 Sept 2015 after 23 years of distinguished service as Executive Director of The Bakken Museum in Minneapolis, Minnesota. In 1992, when he arrived, The Bakken had seven employees, a budget of half a million dollars and served about 5,000 people a year. Today, The Bakken serves some 75,000 people a year with a budget of $2.4 million and a staff of nearly 40 educators, curators and other employees. A highlight of his tenure was leading an expansion and renovation project, completed in 1999, which doubled the size of the existing Tudor mansion adjacent to Lake Calhoun in Minneapolis. As a result, an organization that was known mainly to international scholars for its rich historical collection, was transformed into a broad-gauged public museum beloved by generations of children, parents, teachers, researchers, and other adults. A capstone of his career was completed in January with the publication of *Dreaming On With Earl Bakken*, which he co-edited, about the museum’s founder, inventor of the first transistorized cardiac pacemaker, and co-founder of Medtronic. Based on interviews with Bakken and his friends, family and colleagues, the book was the result in part of an oral history project on Minnesota’s medical device industry, or “Medical Alley.” In retirement, he plans to write a monograph on the history of medical technology in Minnesota and its global expansion.

Rachel Rothschild recently began a position as an assistant professor and faculty fellow at New York University’s Gallatin School of Individualized Study, after earning her Ph.D. at Yale University in May of 2015.

Alexandra Rutherford and Michael Pettit (both at York University, Toronto) have co-edited a special issue of the journal *History of Psychology* entitled “Feminism and/in/as Psychology” (Volume 18, No. 3: 2015). The issue includes an introduction by the editors and six articles that explore the conjoined trajectories of feminism and psychology and their relationship to gender and sexuality over the course of the 20th century.


Matthew Shindell left his postdoc in the Harvard University Department of the History of Science and moved into a new, permanent position at the Smithsonian Institution as Curator of Planetary Sciences at the National Air and Space Museum in September.


Dana Simmons (University of California, Riverside) has published Vital Minimum: Need, Science and Politics in Modern France (University of Chicago Press) in which she
traces the history of the vital minimum, revealing the intersections between technologies of measurement, such as calorimeters and social surveys, and technologies of wages and welfare, such as minimum wages, poor aid, and welfare programs.

**Ronald K. Smeltzer** has just published “Science Illustrated with Chine Collé: A Unique Example,” in *The Private Library* s.6, vol.7:2, Summer 2014. The primary subject is a complex method for color illustration, involving black-line lithography, attachment of colored paper, and hand-coloring in gouache and watercolor, in a mid-19th-century French chemistry book. (N.B. “2014” is correct; this issue is late.)

**Miriam Solomon** (Temple University) has published *Making Medical Knowledge* (Oxford University Press, 2015).

**Frank W. Stahnisch** (University of Calgary, Canada) has recently become an Editor-in-Chief of the *Journal of the History of the Neurosciences* (Routledge – Taylor and Francis Group, Philadelphia). For more information see [http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/njhn20/current#.VdS0Z843Wag](http://www.tandfonline.com/toc/njhn20/current#.VdS0Z843Wag). Together with **Dorothy Porter** (University of California at San Francisco) he has co-edited a book, entitled: *Trading Zones and Boundary Concepts in the History of Medicine and Medical Humanities*, which includes contributions by Abygale Woods, Aimee Medeiros, and Warwick Anderson. It will be published next month with the University of Utah Press, as a special volume of the *Western Humanities Review*. For more information see [http://ourworld.info/whrweb/](http://ourworld.info/whrweb/).

**Anthony N. Stranges** has published *Science Changed the World* (Kendall Hunt, 2015), an introductory survey of the history of science from ancient times to the present.

**Roger H. Stuewer** (University of Minnesota, emeritus) has been awarded an American Association of Physics Teachers Homer L. Dodge Distinguished Service Citation, which will be conveyed to him in a Special Session at the AAPT Meeting in New Orleans in January 2016.

**Virginia Trimble** (University of California, Irvine) gave three historically-oriented talks at the August Triennial General Assembly of the International Astronomical Union in Honolulu: “The Impact of WWI on Astronomy, a Teachable Century,” “As International as They Would Let Us Be (from Eratosthenes, via the Celestial Police, to the formation of the International Astronomical Union),” and “The Time-Line of Binary Stars from Discovery to the Establishment of Commission 42 to its Death.”

**Albert van Helden Awarded the 2015 LeRoy E. Doggett Prize**
The Historical Astronomy Division of the American Astronomical Society is pleased to announce that Professor Albert van Helden is the tenth recipient of the LeRoy E. Doggett Prize for Historical Astronomy. The Doggett Prize, the history of astronomy’s highest honor, is awarded biennially to an individual who has significantly influenced the field through a career-long effort. The 2016 LeRoy E. Doggett Prize awarded to Professor van Helden recognizes
• his outstanding scholarship in the history of the telescope,
• his extensive and insightful exploration of telescopic astronomy in the 17th and 18th centuries,
• his significant contributions to Galilean studies, and
• his dedicated service to the historical astronomy community and the public at large.

Van Helden is recognized as the leading authority on the history of the telescope. His scholarship is best illustrated in his magisterial monograph, “The Invention of the Telescope,” in the Transactions of the American Philosophy Society, published in 1977. An extension of this monograph points to van Helden’s second major scholarly project, Galileo’s rapid improvement of the weak (nominally 3X magnification) terrestrial telescope then spreading throughout Europe to make it suitable for astronomical observation. Van Helden’s other publications, in journals such as Isis, Osiris, and the Journal for the History of Astronomy, have enlarged upon these contributions, demonstrating, among other things, the limited role science played in the development of the telescope during the 17th century in contrast to the dramatic role the telescope played in the evolution of scientific understanding of the cosmos.

In his second book, Measuring the Universe, he summarized the development of observational astronomy from antiquity to the end of the eighteenth century. His discussion of the observations and interpretations of Ptolemy, Tycho Brahe, Galileo, Huygens, Cassini and others explains how the characteristics of the instruments available to astronomers limited their understanding of the fundamental astronomical problems of the time. In later papers on telescopic astronomy, Professor van Helden described the process through which observational astronomy approached maturity, as well as the idiosyncrasies of each important astronomer. He demonstrated how differences in their observing practices led some, but not all, to discovery. He illuminated the conflicts among leading astronomers over questions of interpretation and authority. Taken as a whole, his papers convincingly demonstrate van Helden’s mastery of the technical as well as the social aspects of observational astronomy.

Galilean studies constitute an equally important contribution of Professor van Helden’s career. He published the first complete English translation of Galileo’s Sidereus Nuncius to appear in the 20th century. Both Sidereus Nuncius and his translation of the letters passing between Galileo, Christoph Scheiner, and others in their debate on the nature of sunspots (On Sunspots in collaboration with Eileen Reeves), have been recognized for the integrity of their translations. Both books feature comprehensive interpretive introductions, comments in the text, and conclusions that ensure their accessibility. Neither book is likely to be displaced as a standard in this field of scholarship for decades to come. In other papers, van Helden describes Galileo’s career and the state of the science and culture in the community of astronomers around Galileo. Professor van Helden’s dedication to Galileo scholarship revealed itself in The Galileo Project (http://www.rice.edu/Galileo). Although his website was intended for secondary education, it is in fact an invaluable entry point for Galilean studies on a collegiate level.
Professor van Helden’s dedication to the history of astronomy, and more broadly, the history of science, could be characterized no more effectively than by pointing to his extended participation as a member of the editorial boards of the *Journal for the History of Astronomy* (for 25 years and more), and *Isis* (for five years). His stature within the history of science profession was acknowledged by his election as the History of Science Society’s President (1998-1999).

I was at the University of Bialystock’s biological field station in Gugny, a remote part of Poland, when news reached me of Will Provine’s death. I had been thinking of him that afternoon as I trekked through the woods with a small group of biologists visiting Biebrza, a conservation area and national park. I was starting to get tired,
uncomfortable, and my attention span was starting to go; keeping up with field biologists isn’t always easy, and, as I am known to say when I am challenged this way “if I had wanted to be a biologist, I would not have become a historian!” And that is the moment Will came to mind. Indeed, he comes to mind every single time I think of the relationship between history and science.

I pictured him way back in the spring of 1983 walking in the woods behind his farm in Marathon, New York with a visiting biologist from a nearby university. Will had just signed on to my doctoral committee at Cornell, as chair, indicating the shift in my training from science to history. He was now the “first-in-command” of my graduate education. He had invited me to his farm, a place that dominated his life until 2013 when a combination of illness and love necessitated his move. It was the first time I saw him in his element, so to speak; until then, he had been a typical historian, a book-loving scholar, a serious intellectual comfortable in the realm of ideas, whether that was in the classroom, the seminar, or in his enormous office, where the stacks of scientific reprints he collected had made an elaborate maze out of the room. He was different on his farm: he was a naturalist, a kind of field biologist of sorts. It wasn’t as though he could name every single living thing we encountered like many of the scientists I knew; he just loved feeling the earth under his feet, breathing the fresh air, and did not mind getting grubby. He delighted in the challenge of jumping over logs, walking through thickets, or climbing steep hills. Later on, he bought himself an enormous tractor, a kind of plaything in part, but a serious piece of farm equipment that enabled him to dig an enormous pond, adding to his farm’s environmental diversity -- and biological delight. He tried to teach me to use the thing once, but quickly gave up after I accidentally put it in reverse, taking it, and myself down a treacherous hill. Will loved his machines as much as he loved his wonderful books—tractors, cars, diesel engines or what have you, that he collected and kept in various stages of dismemberment in his huge barn. Indeed, he probably spent as much time with them as he did with his impressive collection of books comprising an extraordinary library specializing in evolution and genetics (he had begun to amass the collection while a bookseller early in his life). It wasn’t that unusual for him to come to the Cornell campus for a meeting or to teach, with grease on his trousers or under his fingernails; that just meant he had engine trouble with one of his many old Volvos, all of which seemed to be in a chronic state of disrepair.

Will also had a taste for the bizarre, a fact I saw demonstrated on that first visit to the farm. He was an avid snake enthusiast, and kept a small collection of them in his sons’ bedroom. They were in large glass cages that lined the room—and they were huge! He was especially keen to show off his massive black indigo, a snake he thought especially beautiful, so he yanked the thing out of the cage lecturing to us about its sweet disposition, only to let out a howl when he was met with a set of fangs. Surprised by the attack, Will didn’t know what to do but to try to pull the thing off, making it worse in the process—the snake dug in deeper, leaving a spiral-like series of bite-marks. By the time the visiting biologist came to the rescue, pushing the shrieking, bleeding Will into the bathroom, forcing the snake and his hand into the bottom of the toilet bowl so as to cool the animal and release its grip, Will’s hand was a mutilated mess. The image of my thesis advisor, the distinguished professor of the history of science at Cornell, author of the widely read The Origins of Theoretical Population Genetics, co-editor of The Evolutionary Synthesis, with no less a historic figure than the late Ernst Mayr, and
the author of so many other important works, bending over a toilet bowl, writhing black
snake digging into hand, blood dripping everywhere, stuck permanently in mind. It came
in handy whenever I felt intimidated by the formality of the historical profession I was
hoping to join.

Nor was this some isolated incident on that farm. He and his first wife, Marie,
along with their two boys, Charlie and Stuart, made the farm a kind of sanctuary for
needy animals (including some graduate students, I need add). Stories of encounters
with those creatures, often made their way into the grad or undergrad history seminars
that Will taught. They were intended to amuse us or break the ice, but once in a while
left students aghast: was it really necessary to describe in gory detail the intestinal
parasite he found in one of the baby raccoons, and with that much glee? It was a history
course, not mammalogy or parasitology.

Will would often do or say things to intentionally shock as well as provoke, and
usually had a funny way of chuckling to himself, after telling you or showing you
something gross, creepy or weird. He had so much of the impish provocateur that I
often saw him as a cross between Dennis the Menace (the hair and overalls) and Huck
Finn, his Tennessee upbringing often coming across in his speech, rich in
Southernisms, and uttered with an inflected drawl (as in “dang,” “doggone it,” or “I’m
gonna bust his butt’’!). It was very effective when debating creationists who Will
engaged with extraordinary enthusiasm, alacrity, as well as respect. Well before his
exchanges with Phillip Johnson, and others that made him the delight of the Discovery
Institute, and well before he became a kind of celebrity in films like Expelled, Will
interacted with religious fundamentalists such as Luther Sunderland, inviting them to
class in the way of provoking discussions—and provoke he did, to my consternation,
when he made headlines with strong statements like if you believe in evolution and went
to church, you had to “check your brains at the church-house door.” I didn’t know
anyone could actually be a proselytizing atheist until I met Will—who else could make a
litany out of “I am an atheist, materialist, reductionist, determinist” and then conclude
with the claim “there is no free will” (the double meaning of “free Will” made it really fun).

In short, Will was no “compatibilist,” a term of derision he used against anyone
who tried to find a middle ground. He was especially disappointed with Carl Sagan, his
fellow Cornellian and friend, after reading Contact because it was too “soft” in its stance.
Will was expecting a hard-line position, especially after he and Sagan had been
co-teaching an entire course on science and religion. Will was, however, tolerant of
students and their views, who seemed to love him, the more hard-line he got. His
popular course in the history of biology was structured so as to engage the argument
from design and to follow its trajectory: it began with a close reading of Plato’s Timaeus,
moved to Descartes, then to Darwin’s On the Origin of Species (the whole thing) making
its way to Claude Bernard’s Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine. It
sounded like pretty standard reading, until I realized that it was a way of getting at what
really motivated him about the subject: namely, killing the argument from design.

He was at his best as agent provocateur in the classroom, sparking lively
conversation, and drawing out even the shyest of students. It made no difference
whether he was teaching a small seminar or a large lecture course—Will had the rarest
of abilities to bring everyone in, making teaching feel like a free exchange of ideas
between two friends. It made him one of Cornell’s most popular and beloved teachers, earning him teaching awards, and drawing small crowds of adoring students who could often be seen walking with him on campus or forming lines outside his door. He was a champion of student rights, a progressive to the core, earning himself the reputation of campus liberal, especially after he began to give access to anyone who wanted to use Olin, the research library (he kept stacks of access cards in his room). He was also one of the founders and first resident faculty in the co-ed Risley Residence Hall, which fostered creativity, free inquiry, and encouraged students to challenge prevailing social norms. He was especially proud of Cornell’s reputation for turning out misfits, and often evoked the term “Cornell maverick” for the ideal graduate.

Will’s liberal attitude did not, however, sit well with the mighty campus conservative, the late L. Pearce Williams, who just happened to be Cornell’s other distinguished historian of science. Pearce’s graduate courses were taught out of Olin, and he preferred to maintain the status quo. My introduction to Pearce still reminds me of that; it came with the sound of a karate chop on one of Will’s precious reprint boxes stacked in McGraw one day—“are you Will’s new graduate student” he said, entering the room filling it with his enormous physique. He didn’t wait for me to answer before he began extolling the virtues of historiography and launching an attack on the history of recent science—there was too much “noise” in the system, he said. “Noise in the system”? Will said when I queried him about Pearce, “that just means documents lost—work on living scientists, and interview them when you can” was his response. Reaching for a file folder, he placed in my lap his recent interviews with Barbara McClintock and added “work on scientists, focus on the science and you’ll be fine.” But I wanted to be a historian, not a scientist,” I said quite insistently, “I want to understand the past, on its own terms”; and so, despite the fact he wanted me to work with a biologist, despite the fact that they didn’t always see eye-to eye on things (that is an understatement, actually) he accepted Pearce as my “second-in-command.” I didn’t know that I was the only person in the history of Cornell to be able to work with both of them!

At the time, Will was in the throes of his famous collaboration with Sewall Wright. His emphasis was shifting towards technical internalist history of science; you practically had to be a mathematical population geneticist to understand it. He was recreating Wright’s own evolution of thought. It made sense, if you knew Will. He had received his PhD from the University of Chicago working with historian Alan Debus as his chair, but he had been most influenced by Richard C. Lewontin, a biologist, and considered him his true mentor. Will was actually a disappointed mathematician, himself. He told me later on when visiting me at the University of Florida, that he was devastated when he realized he would never be able to become a brilliant mathematician. I think this is what attracted him to Wright—the collaboration enabled him to use that region of his brain that delighted in abstract mathematical thought. Interestingly, he admired Wright and was very saddened by his death, but he also didn’t delve very deeply into Wright’s own peculiar metaphysical leanings. He only gave scant attention to Wright’s pansychism. I’ve always suspected Will just couldn’t accept that “flaw” in Wright.

The publication of Sewall Wright and Evolutionary Biology in 1986 changed his life. It was a tour-de-force, given high praise from the scientific community, the audience
he had come to value the most. I was there when he opened an envelope from Stephen Jay Gould, with a review of the book titled “Write on Wright, Right On!” Will just loved that. And he was ecstatic to see an entire feature article in Science on his radical reinterpretation of Wright’s metaphor of the adaptive landscape. Scientists were learning science from his work. He had done the exceptional—taking history to science and reaching a community that was being left behind by many historians of science. With all the attention the book drew, Will’s career skyrocketed, and combined with his charismatic lecture style, Will was invited to give seminars, all over the world. Back in the days before Homeland Security, that meant Will often cut arrival at the airport very close (he always cut things close). I can still picture him running, everywhere: long legs in blue jeans, a crumpled tweed jacket casually tossed, and beaten-up leather briefcase in hand.

Biologists just loved him, and invited him to join the Section of Ecology and Systematics right around that time. He was as happy as a clam (a favorite expression of his), tackling the next formidable project, a collaboration with Japanese geneticist Motoo Kimura. He was flying back and forth to Japan (some 13 times in total), when he began to have the seizures that were symptomatic of the brain tumor that eventually took his life. It took nearly 20 years for that to happen, meaning Will lived with cancer for a significant portion of his adult life. He faced it directly with honesty and humor, making a daily engagement with death part of his existence, especially while debating intelligent design advocates. He also managed to write, completing his last book, a challenge to genetic drift, and in good Provine fashion, managed to stir the pot of controversy over that.

In the last five years of his life, Will also fell in love, marrying Gail Light Provine in a secular ceremony and remarkably, gave up his farm. He gushed with happiness saying to me: “I am an atheist, materialist, reductionist, determinist…and romantic!” Gail was there when Will received the first David Hull Prize of the ISHPPSB meetings in Salt Lake City, Utah, with a bunch of Will’s former students in tow, but was also with him at the end, dying in their home. I last saw them both in May 2015, there in Horseheads, New York. Sadly, I was there for a memorial for Pearce Williams who died earlier this year of a prolonged struggle with Alzheimer’s. Will had only the kindest words and remembrances for Pearce, reminding me of the decency, graciousness, and open-mindedness for which Will is known. To me, however, he was first foremost and foremost a scholar, a formidable intellect, and although he appeared warm and inviting on the surface, he did not suffer fools gladly. The few of us who actually had Will as chair of their doctoral committee, knew that; Will believed in independence of mind and in high-quality work; he was tough, and uncompromising in that. His technical mastery of the subject is still not easily matched, and in cultivating an enormous audience of scientists who read his works, gives historians of science seeking relevancy food for thought.
The neutral theory of molecular evolution
by Motoo Kimura
Cambridge University Press (1983)
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Call for Papers - Eighth Joint Meeting of the BSHS, CSHPS, and HSS, 22-25 June 2016, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

The eighth joint meeting of the British Society for the History of Science, the Canadian Society for the History and Philosophy of Science, and the History of Science Society will take place in Edmonton, Alberta, Canada. Previous meetings were held in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (2012), Oxford (2008), Halifax, Nova Scotia (2004), St Louis, Missouri (2000), Edinburgh, Scotland (1996), Toronto, Ontario (1992), and Manchester, England (1988). The theme of the meeting will be “Transitions.” Although presenters are not confined to this theme, the Program Committee is seeking papers or sessions that reflect this theme and encourages participants to consider the broader scientific, scholarly and social implications associated with moments of scientific transition. Transitions might include such ideas as moving from one scientific meme to another, one locality to another, or generational change. The program will include themed sessions, plenary lectures, and panels. A typical presentation will be 20 minutes plus 10 minutes for questions, but special sessions such as round tables and panels will be accommodated.

The conference will take place at the University of Alberta. Founded in 1905, U of A is located in Edmonton, which is Canada’s most northern major city. Edmonton is known as the “Gateway to the North” and is the capital of the province. It is a major economic and cultural hub, situated on the banks of the North Saskatchewan River. The conference will include education and outreach activities, a reception at the Art Gallery of Alberta and a Conference Dinner. Delegates can explore the vibrant arts scene, and there are many festivals in June, including the Edmonton International Jazz Festival. Accommodations will be available on campus and near campus. The Program Committee welcomes proposals for sessions or individual papers based around the conference theme from researchers at all stages of their careers. Participation is in no way limited to members of the three organizing societies, but there will be a discount for members. Intending participants should also note that the usual HSS rules concerning presenting at successive conferences do not apply to this meeting.

The deadline for submitting a session or paper proposal is 4 December 2015. Full details of how to submit your session or abstract can be found at: www.uab.ca/3societies. Inquiries concerning the program should be directed to: aede@ualberta.ca Inquiries concerning the conference should be directed to: threesocieties2016@ualberta.ca

News from the Center for Biology and Society and the Marine Biological History Project
Arizona State University’s Center for Biology and Society (CBS) has much to report. Ben Minteer, earned promotion to Full Professor and co-edited a new book for the University of Chicago Press titled, *After Preservation: Saving American Nature in the Age of Humans*, along with fellow CBS professor Stephen Pyne. Meanwhile, graduate student, Elizabeth Barnes, was awarded a Graduate Research Fellowship Program grant from the National Science Foundation, and Rachel Gur-Arie was named a Fulbright Grantee for Israel. The digital HPS projects run through CBS also hit new milestones. The *Embryo Project Encyclopedia* website reached over 100,000 page views in May, had an article cited in *Science* in November 2014, and was represented by graduate student Erica O’Neil at the Phoenix Comicon in June. The current leadership of the Embryo Project includes: Steve Elliott (Editor in Chief and Instructor), Erica O’Neil (Managing Editor of Encyclopedia Articles and Instructor), Federica Turriziani Colonna (Managing Editor), Paige Madison (Social Media Editor), Alexis Abboud (Instructor), and Kate MacCord (Project Coordinator).

The Marine Biological Laboratory (MBL) History Project, meanwhile, secured a new round of funding from the National Science Foundation that will keep its doors open through 2017. The MBL History Project, led by graduate student and Project Coordinator Kate MacCord, also has published 50 interviews with MBL scientists and community members on their YouTube channel and website, and five digital exhibits on their website, all of which are geared towards engaging broad audiences in the history of science at the MBL.

**Carole Adrienne** (Civil-War-Rx) would like to announce *Civil War Medicine*, a four-part series of the story of the violent birth of modern medicine. It documents a huge national health care emergency unlike anything ever before seen in America. New, efficient weapons technology challenged medical treatments and techniques in use since the Middle Ages. For more information, please visit their website, [www.CivilWarRx.com](http://www.CivilWarRx.com) to view more than 900 in-depth articles on medical treatment in the Civil War era.

**Public Understanding of Science, Technology & Economics** aims to give people a keener appreciation for the increasingly scientific and technological world in which we live and to convey some of the challenges and rewards of the scientific and technological enterprise.

The program’s primary aim is to build bridges between the two cultures of science and the humanities and to develop a common language so that they can better understand and speak to one another--and ultimately to grasp that they belong to a single common culture.

The Foundation has established a nationwide strategy that focuses on books, theater, film, television, radio, and new media to commission, develop, produce, and distribute new work mainstreaming science and technology for the lay public.

The Program supports the use of books, television, film, radio, theater, and new media.

For more information, please visit [http://www.sloan.org/major-program-areas/public-understanding-of-science-technology-economics/](http://www.sloan.org/major-program-areas/public-understanding-of-science-technology-economics/)
The Centre for Global Health Histories (CGHH) is running a number of public lectures at the University of York in the coming months. Each one will be held in the Berrick Saul Building, University of York, Heslington West Campus, starting at 6:00pm. All are welcome to attend these events, admission is free and no ticket required. Dates include September 22, October 1, October 22, and November 12.

University of Vienna Opportunities

The Faculty of Historical and Cultural Studies, in cooperation with the Faculties of Life Sciences, Mathematics, Philosophy/Education and Physics
The Doctoral Program (“DK program”) “The Sciences in Historical, Philosophical and Cultural Contexts” announces the award of:

- 1 fully paid doctoral student position (Category a) and
- up to 6 associate positions (Category b, for students with other basic support)

for 3 years (with the possibility of a 4th year if sufficient funds are available) beginning 1 January 2016.

With the support of the Austrian Science Foundation (FWF), the University of Vienna offers a Ph.D. program, the aims of which are: to offer a structured interdisciplinary curriculum in History, Philosophy and Cultural Studies of Science with the collaboration of international visitors, and to make possible the joint supervision of dissertations by historians/philosophers of science and natural scientists/mathematicians.

Positions in the program are funded for up to 3 years; PhD students who complete a 6 months stay abroad will be awarded a 4th year of support (if sufficient funds are available). Since participation in the curriculum is required, members of the DK program (in Category a and Category b) must reside continuously in Vienna and must participate once or more in the annual “Vienna International Summer University” in the first half of July, which is also part of the program.

Applications are due by 13 November 2015, and may be addressed to the Job Center of the University of Vienna, Universitätsring 1, 1010 Vienna, Austria (jobcenter@univie.ac.at) (key number 6069), or directly to the DK program, “The Sciences in Historical, Philosophical and Cultural Contexts” via dk-application2014@univie.ac.at. Application by E-mail with attachments (MS Word or PDF format please) is preferred; applications by post should be sent via priority air mail (latest postmark: 13 November). Contact for inquiries: Prof. Dr. Mitchell Ash: Tel.: +431 4277 40837 (Administrator: - 40871) E-mail: mitchell.ash@univie.ac.at.

For full details, click here. (scroll down for the English version)
The Reilly Center for Science, Technology, and Values at the University of Notre Dame invites you to:

**The Collaboration Conundrum: Special Interests and Scientific Research**  
5-6 November 2015

How do we bring the public and industry together to do research for the public good? Government reports and scholarly publications trumpet the value of fostering public participation in scientific research, and a number of funding agencies are now encouraging initiatives such as community-based participatory research (CBPR). Could the participation of citizen groups in industry-funded research increase the relevance, reliability, and acceptability of this work? The Collaboration Conundrum Conference brings together industry representatives and experts on important policy issues such as genetically modified organisms (GMOs), pollution and toxic chemicals, biomedical research, agricultural practices, and animal welfare to answer these questions. For information on the conference program, travel, and accommodation, please visit reilly.nd.edu/c3.

Registration is available by clicking here (or from the conference page). There is no fee for registration, but we request that you register by the deadline - Monday, October 26th - so that we can confirm numbers for catering purposes.

The Commission on Women and Gender Studies in the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine of the DHST/IUHPST recently held its quadrennial meeting in Prague at the Charles University. They will be soliciting suggestions of papers and sessions for the meeting in Rio de Janeiro in July of 2017 and for the biennial meeting in 2019. They encourage those interested in the Commission and its future activities to visit the website administered by Anne-Sophie Godfroy at http://wsc.hypotheses.org. Sign up for its listserv by sending a request to Donald Opitz at cowgs@mailman.dePaul.edu and “like” the Facebook page at https://www.facebook.com/cowogs.

**New Dissertation Abstracts** 75-12 parts A and B and 76-01 A and B can be viewed at 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 1990’s. There is one additional aspect to point out about this latest batch of dissertations that make it unique. The University of Southern California downloaded the past 75+ years of its dissertations into the current issues-thus you will find titles dating back into the 1920”s. While there are no abstracts for these earlier works there are full text of these dissertations available.

**The President of the Commission on Women and Gender Studies in the History of Science, Technology, and Medicine of the DHST/IUHPST** Maria Rentetzi presented the keynote at the “Heroic Journeys” research workshop in Brussels on 16th June: “The power of the ephemeral, unstable and informal networks of women in science.” See https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cultuurgeschiedenis/heroic-journeys

**Mystery of Matter**
A new three-hour HD documentary series charting the history of chemistry from the Enlightenment to the twentieth century is being broadcast nationally on the PBS network. Entitled “The Mystery of Matter: Search for the Elements,” the program has been in preparation over the last ten years by Moreno/Lyons Productions, in collaboration with Middlemarch Films. The series features reenactments with actors working on period instruments and speaking words of the scientists whom they portray, woven together with host narrative, animations, and plenty of talking-head commentary by historians of science. Particular emphasis is placed on the life and work of Joseph Priestley, Antoine Lavoisier, Humphry Davy, Dmitrii Mendeleev, Marie Curie, Harry Moseley, and Glenn Seaborg.

From the beginning, producer Stephen Lyons resolved to create a product with the highest professional historical standards. He obtained funding from the National Science Foundation, the Chemical Heritage Foundation, the Otto Haas Charitable Trust, the Camille & Henry Dreyfus Foundation, and the Arthur Vining Davis Foundation. He also sought continual advice from a galaxy of talent drawn from the international community of historians of science, including Robert Anderson, Bernadette Bensaude-Vincent, Marco Beretta, Christoph Meinel, and Mary Jo Nye. Chief historical advisers were Alan Rocke and Eric Scerri, and among those appearing as commentators, in addition to Rocke and Scerri, were Michael Gordin, John Heilbron, Roald Hoffmann, Richard Holmes, Frank James, Steven Johnson, David Kaiser, David Knight, Seymour Mauskopf, Lawrence Principe, Susan Quinn, and Oliver Sacks.

The three episodes were first broadcast nationally on Aug. 19, and the free on-demand videos on the PBS website, which were initially set to expire a month later, have recently been extended, and now they can be viewed from PBS.org until Nov. 19. Here are the URLs for each of the three hours of the series:
Episode one: http://video.pbs.org/video/2365543486
Episode two: http://video.pbs.org/video/2365543495
Episode three: http://video.pbs.org/video/2365543501

National Endowment for the Humanities Announces $1.7 Million for “Public Scholars”

WASHINGTON (July 29, 2015) — The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) today announced $1.7 million in grants to enable the publication of 36 nonfiction books that will bring important humanities scholarship into book clubs and onto best-seller lists.

These are the first awards made under NEH’s new Public Scholar grant program, which was created in December 2014 as part of The Common Good: The Humanities in the Public Square, an agency-wide initiative that seeks to bring humanities into the public square and foster innovative ways to make scholarship relevant to contemporary life. The Public Scholar Program builds upon NEH’s 50-year tradition of supporting the publication of nonfiction works that have profoundly influenced the way we understand history, politics, literature, and society. The Public Scholar awards support books that use deep research to open up important or appealing subjects for wider audiences by presenting significant humanities topics in a way that is accessible to general readers.
See the full list of Public Scholar grant projects (PDF).

**Bonhams Catalog** of History of Science & Technology is online as of 21 September 2015. Visit their website for more information:
http://www.bonhams.com/departments/CAT-SCI/
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2015 Elizabeth Paris Event
Saturday, November 21, 2015
7:15pm - 9pm

Merchants of Doubt Film Screening

There will be a brief introduction as well as a Q&A following the film by author Erik Conway

Supported by the Elizabeth Paris Fund for Socially Engaged History and Philosophy of Science